

# ADDENDUM No. 1

## RFP No. 20-22

### Streetlight Replacement and Asset Management

**Due: June 2, 2020 at 2:00 P.M. (local time)**

The information contained herein shall take precedence over the original documents and all previous addenda (if any), and is appended thereto. **This Addendum includes seven (7) pages.**

**The Proposer is to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 1, including all attachments in its Proposal by so indicating in the proposal that the addendum has been received. Proposals submitted without acknowledgement of receipt of this addendum may be considered non-conforming.**

**The following forms provided within the RFP Document should be included in submitted proposal:**

- **Attachment C - Non-Discrimination Declaration of Compliance**
- **Attachment D - Living Wage Declaration of Compliance**
- **Attachment E - Vendor Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form**

**Proposals that fail to provide these completed forms listed above upon proposal opening may be rejected as non-responsive and may not be considered for award.**

#### I. CORRECTIONS/ADDITIONS/DELETIONS

Changes to the RFP documents which are outlined below are referenced to a page or Section in which they appear conspicuously. Offerors are to take note in its review of the documents and include these changes as they may affect work or details in other areas not specifically referenced here.

#### Section/Page(s)

#### Change

Page 14

As provided in RFP No. 20-22 Document:  
Section II.B – Scope of Services, Additional Items, Item vi.  
Refining modeling assumptions and running new asset management scenarios in the Assetic software tool.

As updated herein:  
Section II.B – Scope of Services, Additional Services, Item vi.  
Updating data inputs (such as condition inventory data, unit cost data) and running existing asset management scenarios in the Assetic Predictor software tool. Refining modeling assumptions and running new asset management scenarios may also be required.

*Comment: The intent of this change is to update the Assetic modeling task, clarifying that the focus of the task would be updating data to run the model. The task as previously stated – refining modeling assumptions and running new asset management scenarios – may still be considered by the City, but shall not be the focus of work.*

As provided in RFP No. 20-22 Document:

Section III.B – Past Involvement with Similar Projects – 30 Points

The written proposal must include a list of specific experience in the project area and indicate proven ability in implementing similar projects for the firm **and** the individuals to be involved in the project. A complete list of client references must be provided for similar projects recently completed. The list shall include the firm/agency name, address, telephone number, project title, and contact person. Past experience shall be provided on items detailed in both sections outlined in the Scope of Services (“Design, Plan Preparation, and Construction Engineering” and “Additional Items”).

As updated herein:

Section III.B – Past Involvement with Similar Projects – 30 Points

The written proposal must include a list of specific experience in the project area and indicate proven ability in implementing similar projects for the firm **and** the individuals to be involved in the project. A complete list of client references must be provided for similar projects recently completed. The list shall include the firm/agency name, address, telephone number, project title, and contact person. Past experience shall be provided on items detailed in both sections outlined in the Scope of Services (“Design, Plan Preparation, and Construction Engineering” and “Additional Items”).

Past experience shall be provided on items detailed in both sections outlined in the Scope of Services (“Design, Plan Preparation, and Construction Engineering” and “Additional Items”). Please provide details regarding past experience with Assetic Predictor software.

*Comment: The intent of this additional language is to prompt offerors to provide more information regarding their experience with Assetic Predictor, given the specialized nature of the software.*

## II. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The following Questions have been received by the City. Responses are being provided in accordance with the terms of the RFP. Potential offerors are directed to take note in its review of the documents of the following questions and City responses as they may affect work or details in other areas not specifically referenced here.

Question 1: Is the City looking to audit/assess the remaining ~35% of those city owned fixtures as a part of this scope of work

Answer 1: Audit/assessment of the remaining City streetlights is not specifically scoped as part of RFP 20-22. City staff and Consultant may consider execution of this additional work scope as part of **Additional Services (item vii)** related to streetlight asset management. City staff are seeking to apply best practices of asset management in determining how and when to assess inventory.

Question 2: Is there a specific pricing document that the City will be providing as a template?

Answer 2: No – offerors should provide pricing as outlined on Page 16 of the RFP Document.

- Question 3: The RFP references approximately 300 streetlights slated for replacement. Are these same lights those which would potentially be painted as part of **Additional Services (item i)**, or does this item refer to a larger/separate set of lights?
- Answer 3: **Additional Services (item i)**, related to preparation of streetlight painting bidding documents, can focus on the approximately 300 streetlights identified in **Design, Plan Preparation, and Construction Engineering**. City staff are seeking assistance as to the cost effectiveness of painting poles, as opposed to replacement. City staff are open to any extrapolations that can be reasonably made from the identified 300 streetlights to the larger population of City streetlights.
- Question 4: Are streetlight bases part of the replacement scope?
- Answer 4: Yes, foundations/bases shall be identified for repair/replacement.
- Question 5: Can you provide the current streetlight standards for the City?
- Answer 5: [Current streetlight installation/construction standards](#) can be found on the City's [Design, Building and Construction Resources page](#).
- Question 6: What additional detail can the City provide about what how concentrated geographic areas could be chosen?
- Answer 6: Prior construction efforts have addressed the most critical needs. This allows for some flexibility for the City and Consultant to be more thoughtful on replacements. As an example: if two streetlights that are in similar need of repair but are at different locations, the light that would have fewer logistical demands (e.g. it wouldn't add to mobilization needs, or creates fewer conflicts with other construction work) should be prioritized.
- Question 7: Who would be responsible for reviewing work from Consultant?
- Answer 7: City staff would be reviewing this work. This is in line with continuing past work, where City staff has provided oversight/review over work from past consultants.
- Question 8: Given the difficulty of printing/assembling materials while many professional staff are not at their respective offices, will the City of Ann Arbor accept electronic submittal (PDF) in lieu of a physical submission?
- Answer 8: As outlined within the RFP Document on Page 5 - "[Proposals submitted late or via oral, telephonic, telegraphic, electronic mail or facsimile will not be considered or accepted.](#)" However, if the "three (3) additional proposal copies" are an issue the City will accept as responsive "one (1) original proposal" and "one (1) digital copy of the proposal preferably on a USB/flash drive as one file in PDF format".
- Question 9: What additional criteria can the City provide on when photometric calculations might be warranted?
- Answer 9: Where individual lights are being replaced, photometric calculations would not be necessary. In locations where many lights along a corridor are being replaced, photometric calculations may be required.
- Question 10: Does the City have a total budget in place for this project?
- Answer 10: Yes, this work is in the current FY2021 budget, adopted by City Council on 5/18/2020. For all activities related to streetlight replacement – including design, construction, materials, City staff time, and potential consulting services – the maximum FY2021 budget is \$530,000.
- Question 11: If interviews with consultant teams occur (tentatively scheduled for week of June 8, 2020), would a these be conducted virtually?
- Answer 11: Yes. If interviews are deemed necessary, the City will conduct them via Microsoft Teams, similar to the 5/7/2020 pre-proposal meeting.

Question 12: Can the City provide previous year's Construction Bid Package for reference?

Answer 12: Links to ITB 4557 (2019 Streetlight Replacement):

- i. ITB:[https://www.a2gov.org/departments/finance-admin-services/purchasing/Documents/ITB\\_4557\\_Document.pdf](https://www.a2gov.org/departments/finance-admin-services/purchasing/Documents/ITB_4557_Document.pdf)
- ii. Plans:[https://www.a2gov.org/departments/finance-admin-services/purchasing/Documents/ITB\\_4557\\_Plans.pdf](https://www.a2gov.org/departments/finance-admin-services/purchasing/Documents/ITB_4557_Plans.pdf)
- iii. Addendum:[https://www.a2gov.org/departments/finance-admin-services/purchasing/Documents/ITB\\_4557\\_Addendum1.pdf](https://www.a2gov.org/departments/finance-admin-services/purchasing/Documents/ITB_4557_Addendum1.pdf)

Question 13: Should permit fees be included in Bid price?

Answer 13: As streetlight replacement is a public project, ROW permit fees for the construction plans will be waived. Permits will still be required for construction, but without fees.

Question 14: Should the pricing include only bill rates, or a total effort estimate as well?

Answer 14: As indicated on page 16 of RFP 20-22, the proposal shall be organized as a more complete effort estimate for **Design, Plan Preparation, and Construction Engineering**. For **Additional Services**, a fee schedule will suffice.

Question 15: What is the anticipated frequency of project meetings as outlined in **Design, Plan Preparation, and Construction Engineering (item b.)**?

Answer 15: Meetings are anticipated to occur on a monthly basis. This frequency is subject to change if the City/Consultant determine a different frequency is preferred for a given period of the project.

Question 16: Is the intent to bid all 300+- at once, or by group?

Answer 16: Past practice has been to bid all work at once. It is anticipated that a similar approach would be used moving forward. However, budget considerations would also dictate how much can be done in a given fiscal year.

Question 17: Are all AA lights currently fed by DTE secondary?

Answer 17: Yes.

Question 18: Is there a target date for bidding work out?

Answer 18: The target date for publishing bid documents is set as November 2020, though this is subject to change.

Question 19: How often are the requests to review documents (outlined in Item n.) anticipated?

Answer 19: Review will be required at least once before publishing items for bid. There will likely be 2 or 3 review cycles.

Question 20: Are any other permits anticipated beyond City of Ann Arbor?

Answer 20: The only other potential permits that City staff foresee at this time would be permits with the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) for any replacement locations that exist along state trunklines.

Question 21: Is the Contractor final authority for design & standards or will the city have their group review and approve each submission?

Answer 21: City will need to approve submissions.

Question 22: Have any changes/updates been made to the streetlight Assetic model by the City since the original creation by OHM and submittal to City?

Answer 22: Some elements of the City's model in Assetic Predictor predate current City staff, making it difficult to determine what changes occurred when. Any changes more significant than data entry (such as updating streetlight condition inventory data and/or repair/replacement unit costs) would merit discussion between City staff and the Consultant about if/how to proceed with such updates. (See Section I.

Corrections/Additions/Deletions of this addendum for more detail, where **Additional Services (item vi)** has been updated).

Question 23: Does the City intend to provide access to their Assetic license for the consultant to perform the updated Assetic related work, or should the consultant consider a license cost in the proposal?

Answer 23: Assetic Predictor license fees will be covered by the City – the consultant may consider adding a line item in proposal response to address the expense.

Question 24: The RFP states an initial contract duration of 18 months, with potential of up to two one-year extensions. Is the intent of the initial 18-month contract to address the approximated 300 streetlights, and the extensions addressing streetlights beyond those 300 streetlights? Or would the approximated 300 streetlights be phased throughout the initial contract and two contract extensions?

Answer 24: The intent of the 18-month contract is to address the approximated 300 streetlights. One-year extensions would be considered for future needs beyond these 300 streetlights at the City's discretion. The number of lights to be replaced will be a function of available budget.

Question 25: **Design, Plan Preparation, and Construction Engineering (item d)** states: "Implement field information and prepare all plan/profile views and construction details needed for the design drawings in accordance with City of Ann Arbor standards." Does the profile refer to a typical cross section or actual survey?

Answer 25: In this context, "profile" refers to a typical cross section. It is not expected that topological survey work will need to occur as part of this project.

Question 26: Does the City of Ann Arbor have existing surveys of the areas in either AutoCAD or MicroStation?

Answer 26: See prior question – topographical surveys will not be necessary to complete this work.

Question 27: Does the City of Ann Arbor Engineering Unit have shop drawings and details for each streetlight and lamppost, including manufacture, make and model number, anchor-bolt size and pattern, foundation details, post details (wall thicknesses, mast heights, arm styles and lengths), luminaire details, electrical details, replacement cost data, repair cost data, etc.?

Answer 27: Yes, the City of Ann Arbor possesses the necessary specifications and drawings, which would be provided to the Consultant in the course of project progress.

Question 28: Is there an established consultant's budget for this program or is it based on time and expenses? If there is a fixed budget, can you provide an anticipated level of effort for the 2-year agreement (part-time, full-time, as needed)?

Answer 28: The consultant's budget shall be established as a fixed sum amount, which can be based on the assumption of completing the necessary project work for 300 streetlights. The level of effort over the course of the initial 18 month agreement would be on a part-time basis, potentially becoming closer to "on demand" at certain points within the project.

Question 29: Under the design scope, are the consultants going to prepare foundation design documents for each pole type that is being replaced? Where required due to condition, are we to assume the existing poles would be replaced in kind (same style and manufacturer), if available?

Answer 29: Yes, consultants shall prepare foundation design documents as needed. Existing poles would not necessarily be replaced in kind, as the City aims to standardize types of light poles and fixtures in its inventory.

- Question 30: The RFP indicates “approximately 300 streetlights,” which may potentially be more than 300. For estimating purposes, what is the maximum number of streetlights anticipated to be involved in this project and what percentage would be replaced?
- Answer 30: 300 is the maximum number of streetlights anticipated to be replaced through this project. Unless work is performed on **Additional Items (item i)** related to potential painting of streetlight poles, all poles addressed via this project would be replaced.
- Question 31: Will the selected firm be precluded from bidding future streetlight projects with the City?
- Answer 31: As one of the project deliverables of the selected firm will be a bid package, the same firm would be unable to bid on that specific project. However, the selected firm would not be precluded from bidding on other streetlight projects.
- Question 32: Page 13, sub-bullet e. – Please elaborate on the expectations of what this coordination will entail.
- Answer 32: The expectation is that the Consultant will use [MISS Dig](#), a utility location service, as a resource to assist in minimizing impact to underground utilities.
- Question 33: Page 13, sub-bullet h. – Please elaborate on the expectations of what this preparation of demolition documents will entail.
- Answer 33: Demolition documents shall accompany construction documents, and shall detail which components need removal, protection, or salvaging. See [ITB 4557](#) for further details.
- Question 34: Page 13, sub-bullet i. – Do the construction drawings need to be stamped by a licensed engineer?
- Answer 34: Yes – plans shall be prepared by a professional engineer, licensed in the state of Michigan.
- Question 35: Page 15, Section A.2 – Are bidders required to be licensed in the state at the time of bid submission? Or can this happen upon award, as long as it is in place prior to contract execution?
- Answer 35: Staff from the offerors shall reflect their qualifications, current as of the date/time of submitting proposals to RFP 20-22. As mentioned above, a PE registered in the State of Michigan would need to prepare the construction drawings.
- Question 36: Page 13, sub bullet g: Will the second photometric study required include all 3012 City owned lights?
- Answer 36: No.
- Question 37: Will the streetlight development standards be incorporated into the City's upcoming new Orange Book, or will these standards be developed as a separate document?
- Answer 37: Standards developed as part of Additional Items (items ii and iii) would be incorporated into revisions of the City’s existing design/engineering/construction standards (aka, the “Orange Book”).
- Question 38: Can the City provide additional detail or a reasonable assumption of the expected geographic spread of the project scope? For instance, can the City provide an assumption as to the spread of the lights, such as 100 lights will be within the DDA and involve full block replacement, 150 lights will be outside the downtown core but grouped together and the 50 lights will be spread throughout the City as individual lights not in a grouping?

Answer 38: Based on the map provided in Attachment A of the RFP, distribution would be approximately:

- i. 25% of lights concentrated within downtown/DDA district.
- ii. 65% of lights are split evenly across 4 concentrated areas/corridors throughout City (non-downtown/DDA).
- iii. Remaining 10% spread throughout the City.

Question 39: What does the 5G co-location coordination involve? Is the consultant just recommending preference to replacements that can be done by the cell companies as part of a co-location, or does this refer to review and approval of documentation submitted by the cell companies? Previously Chuck would review electrical feed and pole condition and provide some guidance, is the consultant now taking that role?

Answer 39: City staff will be looking for recommendations from the Consultant as to replacements that can be done by the cellular companies as part of a 5G co-location.

Question 40: Will the list of pre-proposal meeting attendees be provided?

Answer 40: The list of organizations/firms who attended the pre-proposal meeting on 5/7/2020, conducted virtually via Microsoft Teams, is as follows:

- City of Ann Arbor
- Metro Engineering Solutions
- Enlighten Solutions
- OHM Advisors
- Consulting Engineering Associates
- HDR
- Wade Trim
- Stantec
- Tanko Lighting
- NTH Consultants
- Corby Energy

Offerors are responsible for any conclusions that they may draw from the information contained in the Addendum.