

## **ADDENDUM No. 1**

### **RFP No. 25-52**

#### **2025 Geotechnical & Environmental Services**

**Due: November 12, 2025 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 three (3) 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 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. Respondents are directed to take note in its review of the documents of the following questions and City responses as they affect work or details in other areas not specifically referenced here.

Question 1: Should costs for an environmental site assessment report to summarize the environmental investigation be included under the line item "Environmental Work plan and Health & Safety Plan?"

Answer 1: No. Assessment costs should be included in the line item "Geotechnical Report".

Question 2: Should costs for temporary monitoring wells be included under the line item "Environmental Groundwater Sample"?

Answer 2: Yes.

Question 3: What drilling method should be used for Environmental Soil Borings (i.e. hollow-stem auger, sonic, hand auger, etc.)?

Answer 3: Direct push drilling methods should be used for Environmental Soil Borings.

Question 4: Under Proposal Evaluation (page 17), it states that "The committee may contact references to verify material submitted by the offerors.". Please provide clarification on reference requirements.

Answer 4: References shall include the firm/agency name, address, telephone number, project title, and contact person.

- Question 5: Proposed Fee Schedule has no anticipated quantities for “bundles” of work. Can the city furnish a hypothetical quantity for a “bundle” to allow allocating costs for non-scheduled cost items into appropriate scheduled items?
- Answer 5: No. The City does not guarantee either a minimum volume of work or a specific volume of work if a contract is awarded.
- Question 6: Can the City provide any “typical” frequency and duration of work “bundles” based on historical experience?
- Answer 6: No. The City does not guarantee either a minimum volume of work or a specific volume of work if a contract is awarded.
- Question 7: Can hourly, half-day, or daily rates be proposed for drilling? Possibly and hourly rate for Less than 4 hours, and an hourly rate for Greater than 4 hrs?
- Answer 7: Per foot rates are required to be included in the fee proposal, however, hourly rates may also be included as additional information.
- Question 8: Flagging Crew hours. Are these to be assumed straight time hours, no overtime, and no double time?
- Answer 8: Yes.
- Question 9: Can Soil Borings NOT include Pavement coring as better path forward and utilize a Pavement Core when a core is needed even with a soil boring?
- Answer 9: No. It is assumed that most soil borings will have a pavement core.
- Question 10: Are these cohesive soil strength tests achieved by using a standard split spoon sampler and a pocket penetrometer?
- Answer 10: Yes.
- Question 11: There are no bid items for classification and disposal of investigation-derived contaminated waste. Does the City require this for “non-environmental” investigations where contamination is not suspected?
- Answer 11: No. The City does not have special disposal requirements.
- Question 12: Is the City’s intent to award one contract to one responsive bidder? Or will multiple contracts be awarded? If multiple contracts, how will the City select the consultant for each “bundle” of work?
- Answer 12: The City anticipates selecting multiple firms should multiple firms provide favorable qualifications and pricing. The bundles of work will be assigned on a case-by-case basis.
- Question 13: Will project billings be on the basis of hourly labor costs, materials, and expenses, or fee schedule units in Table 1?
- Answer 13: Project billing will be based on the fee schedule in Table 1.
- Question 14: What is the term (length) of this contract?
- Answer 14: The contract is terminated when the dollar value authorized by Council is expended.
- Question 15: Who held the contract last year and what was the value?
- Answer 15: The contract was awarded to Material Testing Consultants, Inc., Mannik and Smith Group, Inc., and Tetra Tech, Inc. for a total of \$650,000.00
- Question 16: Confirm that the geotechnical engineering recommendations will only be for roadway reconstruction or rehabilitation projects.
- Answer 16: No. Possible requests for recommendation could be made for other projects such as storm water projects, sidewalk improvements, bridge improvements, etc. On

page 10 the RFP states, "Many of the borings requested through this contract will likely consist of 5-foot deep borings for road resurfacing/reconstruction projects. In addition, there will likely also be deeper borings for utility replacement and storm water infiltration projects. Most of the borings will be located within, or adjacent to, public streets."

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