

## **ADDENDUM No. 2**

### **RFP No. 25-40**

#### **Private Property Tree Maintenance**

**Due: September 26, 2025 by 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 two (2) pages.**

**The Proposer is to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 2, 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 A – Legal Status of Offeror**
- **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: Requiring the vendor to collaborate on a few town hall style meetings throughout the term of this contract seems both manageable and appropriate. Including the possibility that the vendor may need "to assist with individual outreach if needed," on the other hand, could be problematic and feels too open-ended in terms of the amount of time one might end up spending trying to make this project work (presumably unpaid time spent knocking on doors, making calls, attending other events, etc.) Perhaps this last part could either be removed from the bid, transitioned specifically to city personnel, or narrowed in scope?

Answer 1: The "to assist with individual outreach if needed" clause is in place to cover unexpected engagement needs that may arise as this program develops. However, we anticipate that there will be limited engagement asks of the contractor, outside of attending events that will be scheduled and planned by the City.

Question 2: Scheduling initial visits and subsequent visits for work with people takes a lot of time due to varying availability. If the vendor merely has to notify people of a visit and then carry it out, that's one thing. But if the goal is to meet onsite with the property owner to share assessments and recommendations and discuss goals, issues, challenges, scope, and expectations, that's going to require a lot more unpaid time and work. To also be required to coordinate schedules with a forestry

employee's availability "for every site visit" complicates things even further (not to mention will absorb a lot of precious time from someone on staff). With a reputable and trusted company, perhaps only a few front end inspections are necessary to get things going on the right track?

Answer 2: Because this contract is being funded by a Federal grant, we are required to closely document every dollar spent. This means that every site visit will need to be attended by a City Forestry employee, every scope of work must include all work done and be mutually agreed upon by all parties before work begins, and any changes to scopes of work must be documented and mutually agreed upon.

Question 3: On the residential tree care side, even in situations where communication, documentation, and the execution of proper tree care goes as planned, some people still end up having questions and misunderstandings. One would assume that the fact the work is free will minimize these scenarios, but in the event there are issues unrelated to a failure of the vendor to communicate and carry out agreed upon work it seems reasonable to know who on staff will be the one with the knowledge and experience to verify work was done to standard as specified and then take over any remaining communication with residents/owners in these situations. Will you be handling all of this communication and decision making? Will it be Nick from the Forestry department? Someone else perhaps?

Answer 3: Sean Reynolds, OSI Senior Analyst, will be the lead in all communications with the contractor and with any participants in the program. The City Forestry department will assist with any communications requiring verification of work.

Question 4: Tree work is highly variable. Every species is different. Every tree is different. Every site is different. Every property owner is different. Every prescription for care is different. I just don't see how any reputable company can commit to assigning a price/tree based on DBH with all of these variables in play. And I'd be very concerned about any outfit that does submit a fee schedule in this manner. I would say that it might be possible for bidders to at least present their hourly rates for services like consultation, pruning, removal, cabling, etc. except that rates don't provide any insight into how efficiently crews work.

Answer 4: DBH is easily measured and a per-tree fee schedule is preferred for grant reporting purposes. In addition to the DBH-based per-tree fee, the City will consider adding a percentage (to be determined during negotiations) of the DBH-based fee to any tree that both the contractor and the City Forestry employee in attendance at a site visit deem to be in need of additional or higher-difficulty work beyond what is covered by the DBH-based estimate.

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