

## **ADDENDUM No. 2**

**RFP No. 21-27**

### **Engineering Services State and Hill Streets Improvements Project**

**Due Date:  
October 21, 2021 at 2:00PM (Local Time)**

The information contained herein shall take precedence over the original documents and is appended thereto. **This Addendum includes eight (8) pages.**

**The Proposer is to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 2, including all attachments (if any) in its Proposal by so indicating in the proposal that the addendum has been received. Proposals submitted without acknowledgment of receipt of this addendum may be considered nonconforming.**

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

- **Attachment B - City of Ann Arbor Non-Discrimination Declaration of Compliance**
- **Attachment C - City of Ann Arbor Living Wage Declaration of Compliance**
- **Attachment D - Vendor Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form of the RFP Document**

**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. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

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

Question 1: Item #6 on page 12 says the consultant shall perform a geotechnical evaluation and pavement core survey. Is the intent for the consultant to hire a Geotech or use an approved Geotech through the City's As-Needed Geotech contract?

Answer 1: The intent is for the consultant to hire a Geotech firm and include that work as part of their proposal.

Question 2: Item #10 on page 12 requests the gathering and study of traffic data at intersections as necessary to properly design the safety improvements. Can

clarification be provided on the intersections anticipated to be counted and studied? It seems a comprehensive review of all key intersections would prudent but can be viewed subjectively.

Answer 2: Provide 24 hour counts at 4 locations total between State Street and Hill Street; and turning movement counts at State/Packard, Packard/Hill, State/Hill, Hill/Division, Hill/Fifth, State/South University, and State/Granger; and crash analysis for the corridor.

Question 3: Other than improvements at intersections/ramps, and where utility and bikeway improvements are made, are there any other streetscape improvements that should be anticipated on the project?

Answer 3: No other streetscape improvements are anticipated for this project.

Question 4: Are lighting improvements mentioned on page 3 assumed only at crosswalks or should the consultant assume lighting along the State Street roadway?

Answer 4: Lighting improvements are planned only for crosswalk improvements.

Question 5: Are there any irrigation systems within the project limits operated by the City that will need to be accounted for and maintained?

Answer 5: None that we are aware of.

Question 6: What is the total anticipated construction cost for the project?

Answer 6: Approximately \$3.5 Million

Question 7: Is the intent to have the entire project bid as one contract, and administered through the MDOT LAP program (including water main, streetscape and bikeway work which may be non-participating)?

Answer 7: Yes.

Question 8: Under SECTION II – SCOPE OF SERVICES, Paragraph 2, Item b. for Hill Street describes that the project is to include resurfacing from Fifth to Church utilizing COVID relief funding, and Item c. under that same Paragraph 2 notes that the safety improvements from Fifth to Forest would utilize Highway Safety Improvement Grant funding. Is the portion of Hill Street between Church Street and Forest Avenue to be resurfaced as part of this project scope?

Answer 8: No.

Question 9: Does the City desire pedestrian or bike signal improvements for the separated two-way bike facility at the major intersection of State and Hoover?

Answer 9: Transition between the separated two-way bike facility and traditional bike lane configuration north and west of the intersection will need to be designed. Pedestrian or bike signal improvements may be a necessary mechanism for the safest transition.

Question 10: Would the City accept the use of available LiDAR Data (1' contour data) in conjunction with conventional topographic survey to create the base plan for the project sites?

Answer 10: Yes.

Question 11: On top of Page 12 of the RFP document under scope of work item #5, it notes that the consultant shall arrange for test holes to be dug during potholing efforts at critical crossings. Is the intent of the RFP that City will provide the manpower through Public Works to dig the test holes, or will City utilize one of their as-needed Contractors to dig the test holes, or is the Consultant required to hire a Contractor as a subcontractor to dig the test holes.

Answer 11: It is not anticipated that crossings will be determined critical such that they would require potholing during the design phase.

Question 12: Under Section II of the Scope of Services, Item #10 (on page 12 of RFP) it is described that Consultant shall obtain traffic information including turning movements at intersections as necessary throughout the project corridor to design the safety improvements and evaluate non-motorized improvement needs including detailed analysis of the Packard to State block. Does this Item #10 in Section II only apply to the applicable Hill Street portion of the scope of work for non-motorized improvements, or does it also include portions of the State Street scope of work? If it should include the State Street portion, can the city clarify which portions?

Answer 12: Additional clarification is provided in Answer 2 for specific intersections where turning movement counts are anticipated.

Non-motorized improvement needs have generally been identified as part of the HSIP grant application process and limited funds are allocated for additional improvements. The consultant will design the improvements as identified in the HSIP grant.

Crosswalk improvements indicated in the RFP for the State Street Scope of Services will include RRFB's (rectangular rapid flashing beacons) along the corridor.

Question 13: Upon reviewing the Scope of Services and the anticipated project construction schedule it appears that the funding associated with the Hill (5<sup>th</sup> to Washtenaw) Safety Improvements (Federal FY22) is not aligned with the expected bid date February 2023 as the deadline for obligation of the needed federal funds will occur a few weeks before September 30, 2022 at the very latest.

- Do you propose breaking this safety work out separately from the project as currently proposed?
- Are there other clarifying details about the requested work, outcomes, or objectives that are trying to be achieved that could be shared to help better understand how this element of the funding is expected to be utilized for the purposes of preparing our work plan?

Answer 13: For the purpose of obligating the funding in FY22, the Hill Street Safety Improvements project will need to be prepared separately from the State and Hill Street Water Main and Resurfacing Improvements project. The Hill Street Safety Improvements project will be submitted to MDOT as a standalone Local Agency Program project for purposes of obtaining obligation of funds in FY22.

Upon obligation of the funding, the Hill Street Safety Improvements project will be withheld from letting and included in the bid package for the State and Hill Improvements project.

Question 14: The requested Scope of Services for the Hill Safety Improvements work describes "Safety Improvements utilizing Highway Safety Improvements Program Grant funding. Evaluate non-motorized improvements needs, including detailed analysis of the Packard to State block." Also, the page of the Capital Improvements Plan for project the Hill Street Safety Improvements, TR-OT-22-03, states "In street pedestrian signing; enhanced cross-walk markings; positive contrast street lighting at pedestrian cross-walks; enhanced intersection stop with reflective post sheeting." We would greatly appreciate sharing additional clarifying information with regard to the City's expectations as to the number or specific types of treatments that are desired to be installed so that we can better assess the level of effort needed to provide the finished product that the City expects as part of this project element. Conversely, if the expectation is that the Offeror study various treatments for review and consideration, so that they can be further examined for compliance with the City's Standards or adopted plans, please let us know. Do you anticipate

signalization improvements to any of the intersections along Hill Street as part of the scope of work?

Answer 14: HSIP funding is limited for the Hill Street safety improvements, and therefore will be used towards street lighting, pavement markings and signage improvement. It is not expected that the Offeror study various treatments for review and consideration. RRFBs are anticipated, but not full signalization.

Question 15: The RFP also states that the City desires to install a new 12" water main to replace the aging 6-inch water main along Hill Street from 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue to S. State Street. Given the number and sizes of the existing public sanitary sewers; storm sewers, and water mains that existing in this area and their extremely close proximity to each other, the installation of a new 12-inch water will be extremely challenging. Also, there are undoubtedly several other private utilities in this area as well that will need to be understood and evaluated in order to determine if it is possible to work around them. Consequently, we respectfully request copies be provided to the Offerors for review and evaluation of the existing City public utilities in the project limits in order to determine what options exist for designing and constructing this proposed 12-inch water main in this area.

Answer 15: Record documents of existing utilities will be provided to the selected Consultant.

Question 16: The RFP states on page 10 that COVID Relief funding will be utilized for a portion of the Hill Street resurfacing work. Since this is a new funding source, please provide additional information or the City's expectation with regard to the obligational process which this money will be required to utilize.

Answer 16: The City's understanding is that COVID Relief funding follows the same process to obligate the funds and bid the project as STP funds.

Question 17: With regard to the proposed water main and resurfacing work along Hill Street, it appears from the data sheets provided in the RFP that the funding for this work is not aligned with the anticipated construction timeline. For example, both projects along Hill Street indicate funding in City FY 24 and 25. The City's new FY begins on July 1<sup>st</sup> of each calendar year, thus for FY 24 projects, the funding isn't available until July 1<sup>st</sup> of 2023. Consequently, if the project is intended to be bid through MDOT in the February 2023 Bid Letting, the funding will not be available for at least five months. Does the City desire to bid the water main and resurfacing work along Hill Street as a separate project or will you internally shift other projects around within the CIP in order to make these funds available?

Answer 17: The City will shift other projects as necessary to fund the project as indicated in the RFP schedule. This Hill Street watermain and resurfacing projects are being moved forward in the current CIP update, which is underway but not finalized.

Question 18: Does the City have any prior approved design exceptions or other administrative approvals for the Treeline Trail work from MDOT Local Agency Programs (LAP) staff? Has MDOT approved a design exception or have you begun a dialogue with them? Can you please confirm that the proposed cross-section of the State Street project will be required to be designed to meet the cross-section as shown in Figure 12 on Pg 32 The Treeline Master Plan? Do you anticipate signalization improvements part of the scope of work along S. State Street, especially at Granger?

Answer 18: The City has not communicated with MDOT regarding the Treeline Trail. The anticipated cross-section for Treeline Trail is similar to what was installed on E. William Street in downtown Ann Arbor. The intent is to introduce the Treeline Trail into this area within the scope of the resurfacing project. See Answer 9 for additional information.

Question 19: While we understand and appreciate the City's needs to complete this work in calendar year 2023, is it possible to delay the receipt of the proposals for approximately 7 to 14 calendar days after the receipt of answers to these questions so that we may review all information and evaluate the effects of the answers on our proposed project timeline and effort required to prepare a proposal that is responsive and reflects the City's desire to design and construct infrastructure that meets the needs of its citizens both now and in the future?

Answer 19: A 7-day extension has already been provided. Additional extensions are not being considered at this time.

Question 20: Based on our current understanding of the updates to the City's Standard Specifications for Construction, it appears that the updated Standard Specifications will not be ready for use by August, 2022. Consequently, we believe that the existing standard specification and library of Special Provisions will be utilized for this project. Please confirm that this assumption is correct.

Answer 20: The project shall reference current required MDOT Standard Specifications. With regard to the City's Standard Specifications, the updates are nearing completion and the updated version is anticipated to be implemented for the 2023 construction season. The consultant will use the City's drafted updated Standard Specifications to prepare Special Provisions for this

project. The Consultant will have access to any Special Provisions that have been prepared using the updated version.

Question 21: As part of the NEPA Clearance Process it is necessary to know if there are any Historic Properties/Districts located within the project limits. Also, it is important to know if there are any known hazardous or toxic waste sites or areas of Non-hazardous materials located within the project limits or within 500' of the project limits. This would also include any areas that have been subject to prior environmental remediation of prior LUST sites. Can you please confirm if any of these sites are known, or suspected, to exist within the currently proposed project limits or required 500' buffer area? We presume the answer is no, but it would be good to understand that fact prior to the submittal of a design proposal as it could have a significant impact on design costs and project timelines due to regulatory approval by MDOT.

Answer 21: We are unaware of any known hazardous or toxic waste site or areas of non-hazardous materials located within the project limits or within 500' of the project limits.

Question 22: We are assuming that this work will be performed under the provisions of the City of Ann Arbor's NPDES MS4 Permit and a separate permit will not be necessary, can you please confirm this?

Answer 22: A Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Permit under the City's NPDES MS4 jurisdiction is required for any disturbance over 200 s.f., and therefore a separate permit is required without a permit fee.

## **II. CORRECTIONS/ADDITIONS**

Correction to the RFP document Addendum 1 is described below. The Proposer is 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.

### Addendum 1 stated:

Section II, 2.c. Scope of Services, Hill Street, Fifth to Forest. See Attachment I for the HSIP award letter description of safety improvements. City shall complete application for funding to be transferred to FY 2023.

### Correction:

The City will no longer pursue transferring the HSIP grant funding to FY 2023. As indicated in Answer 13 above, the Consultant will provide a separate project to MDOT for the purpose of obligating the HSIP funding.

Addition to the RFP document Addendum 1 schedule is in **bold font** below. The Proposer is 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.

<u>ACTIVITY/EVENT</u>	<u>ANTICIPATED DATE</u>
Written Question Deadline	October 14, 2021, 10:00 a.m. (Local Time)
Proposal Due Date	October 21, 2:00 p.m. (Local Time)
Interview Consultants (if needed)	Morning of November 4, 2021
Consultant Selection and Final PSA Negotiations	Week of November 8, 2021
Expected City Council Authorizations	December 20, 2021
PSA Execution, Award, Notice to Proceed	January, 2022
<b>Final Submittal of Hill Street Safety Improvements Project Construction Plans, Special Provisions and Cost Estimate to MDOT for obligation of HSIP grant funding</b>	<b>August, 2022</b>
Final Submittal of <b>State Street and Hill Street Water Main and Resurfacing Project</b> Construction Plans, Special Provisions and Cost Estimate to MDOT for advertisement and bidding of project	November, 2022
Bid Letting through MDOT <b>of both projects</b>	February, 2023*

\* The actual bid opening date will be as published in the MDOT Local Agency Programs FY 2023 Project Planning Guide.

The above schedule is for information purposes only and is subject to change at the City's discretion.

Proposals submitted shall further define an appropriate project schedule in accordance with the requirements of the proposed work plan. The final schedule will be negotiated based on the final scope of work and work plan agreed to by the City and the selected firm.