

ADDENDUM No. 1

RFP No. 26-36

Treeline Gateway Design Engineering

Due: August 11, 2026 at 11:00 A.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 ten (10) 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 – City of Ann Arbor Non-Discrimination Declaration of Compliance**
- **Attachment D – City of Ann Arbor Living Wage Declaration of Compliance**
- **Attachment E – 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. 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, Section II 4 C xiii change to read as follows:

Coordinate all elements of the design with the Vision Zero North Main Transportation Study. At the present time the Study is considering the possibility of placing roundabouts at the intersection of N Main and Summit and Depot Streets. In view of the potential reconfiguration of traffic in the area beneath the Treeline Gateway Segment, this area should be as open as possible. As a result, it is suggested that support structures be

extended to the ground in only 3 areas and as far as possible away from the adjacent streets. These areas are: 1) north of Depot Street and south of 906 N Main [Main Street Motors], 2) two properties on N Main between Summit and Depot, and 3) portion of 721 N Main adjacent to N Main Street. An amended copy of "TREELINE ROUTE – PHASE 1" dated 01/22/2026 [RFP # 26-36 ATTACHMENT A] is attached to this addendum showing these parcels in blue. In addition, a clearance of 16'-0" must be provided below the structure over this entire area. The preceding requirements will aid in the design of the N Main Street Improvements and the maintenance of the buried Allen Creek Drain. This is only to define the problem. Respondents may have other solutions. (see Attachment A – Midwestern Consulting exhibit revised 07-21-26)

Page 16 RFP 26-36 SECTION III 4 D Public Engagement amend v) to read as follows:

v) production of informational flyers, emails, and mass mailings [the Treeline Conservancy will pay the reproduction and mailing costs of any mass mailings];

II. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The following Questions have been received by the City and The Treeline Conservancy. 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: Beyond completing the trail connection, what does success look like for this project?

Answer 1: We are optimistic! With the east/west Border-to-Border Trail, the north/south Iron Belle Trail and all that is happening around Argo Dam at the north end; the center of Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Stadium plus UM South Athletic Complex; and Florida (eventually) to the south, a well-designed Gateway Segment will help make it happen. That the Treeline provide a safe trail alternative to the illegal use of the railroad tracks. Much, of course, will depend on the availability of government grants and a charitable public. One step at a time!

Question 2: Has the owner established any expectations regarding bridge type, span length, vertical clearance, or preferred materials?

Answer 2: See RFP II, 4 A.

Question 3: Are there guidelines or restrictions from MDOT regarding bridge supports, construction access, or maintenance?

Answer 3: See RFP II, C vii and xiv

Question 4: Are there operational or security concerns related to the railroad that need to be considered in the final design?

Answer 4: No. All design work on Amtrak/MDOT-Rail property will be performed under a separate contract.

Question 5: What level of community interest (or opposition) is anticipated?

Answer 5: We anticipate a high level of interest from our community as we currently have demonstrated interest in our progress through our social media following, email engagement, and website traffic. In an active and vibrant community one never knows. A unique and exciting design combined with positive public engagement and an imaginative response will, hopefully, bring dissenters on board. The Consultant will play a major role in turning public participation, positive or negative, into a productive force. We also anticipate high interest at all levels of government — local, state, and federal. They have all been involved.

Question 6: Are there stakeholder groups that should receive special attention?

Answer 6: Disability advocate community, small children, bicyclists, neighboring properties, and property owners that have entered non-binding agreements to use their property.

Question 7: How many public meetings do you anticipate?

Answer 7: See RFP II, 4 D .

Question 8: What type of fundraising efforts do you expect the design team to support?

Answer 8: See RFP II, 4 D.

Question 9: What is the stakeholder structure for decision making?

Answer 9: A Conservancy staff member will be appointed as a single point of contact to facilitate decision making with the city, the Treeline Conservancy board, the Conservancy staff, and a soon to be appointed Design Review Committee. The Consultant will be an active participant with the assigned staff member in communicating with all stakeholders

Question 10: Can you explain the design team communication process with stakeholders and the community?

Answer 10: See Answer 9 and RFP II, 4 D.

Question 11: Besides construction documents, renderings, and engagement materials, do you also expect to see a physical model, animation(s), a fundraising package and/or presentation boards?

Answer 11: No

Question 12: What are the three most important proposal evaluation criteria?

Answer 12: See RFP III.

Question 13: Will interviews emphasize technical qualifications, design approach, team chemistry, or project management?

Answer 13: See Answer 12

Question 14: Is local experience more important than signature bridge experience? Or vice versa?

Answer 14: The signature bridge experience is more important

Question 15: Has FEMA issued any preliminary determinations regarding bridge construction on deed-restricted floodway properties?

Answer 15: No, FEMA has only been introduced to the Project

Question 16: What are the responsibilities for remediation and management of contaminated materials between the consultant and Tetra Tech? Additionally, what is the status and schedule of EGLE's work at 800 N. Main?

Answer 16: See RFP II, 4 C. xvi. EGLE is planning to remediate 800 N Main in the fall of 2026.

Question 17: Will the selected consultant be required to conduct any studies necessary to support the NEPA classification or the Section 106 determination of effect from the Michigan State Historic Preservation Office?

Answer 17: Yes, this should be included in the Scope.

Question 18: What level of stakeholder facilitation is expected from the consultant team? How many public meetings should proposers include in their bid?

Answer 18: See Answer 10

Question 19: What assumptions regarding utility relocation should proposers include in their submissions?

Answer 19: See RFP II, 4 C. ii

Question 20: Is the current alignment of the Gateway Segment, as shown in the presentation and on the TLC website, the basis for design? Should bidding design teams include pricing for refined or alternative alignments as part of their design efforts?

Answer 20: See RFP II, 4 A.

Question 21: Will you consider prefabricated bridge solutions, or is the Gateway Segment intended to be fully custom fabricated as depicted in the visualizations presented at the meeting?

Answer 21: Yes

Question 22: What level of public engagement and fundraising materials are expected from the project team? Are there specific milestones or completion dates tied to funding efforts that might drive the schedule?

Answer 22: See Answer 11. Currently there are no completion dates tied to funding efforts.

Question 23: Since TLC will not consider changes to the Professional Services Agreement, are the terms negotiable after the award?

Answer 23: Yes, prior to execution of contract.

Question 24: Do the Treeline Conservancy (TLC) and the City of Ann Arbor anticipate obtaining federal funding for the project? If so, will the selected consultant be responsible for completing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) classification or obtaining a Section 106 determination of effect from the Michigan State Historic Preservation Office? If NEPA or Section 106 processes are required, which agency's process will be followed (e.g., FHWA direct grant, MDOT LAP, DNR Land & Water Conservation Fund)?

Answer 24: Yes, and Yes. The consultant will be responsible for this effort, and for determining which process will be followed.

Question 25: Is there a target design and conceptual construction budget for the Gateway Segment? Are there any aesthetic, branding, or fundraising-driven design objectives for the "signature bridge"?

Answer 25: See RFP II, 4 A

Question 26: What level of renderings is expected for public engagement and fundraising efforts?
Should these visualizations meet news release quality standards?

Answer 26: See RFP II, 4 D

Question 27: What are the current and anticipated funding sources for design engineering services for this project?

Answer 27: State grant (\$1.0 million), City in-kind, and Charitable contributions

Question 28: For purposes of preparing the cost proposal, should the project be assumed to be FAR compliant?

Answer 28: Yes

Question 29: The RFP states that plans are to be developed in AutoCAD; however, it is our understanding that MDOT requires Bentley MicroStation for plan development and review. Will MicroStation be permitted on this project to facilitate coordination with MDOT and agency plan reviews?

Answer 29: Yes.

Question 30: Public communications have referenced a fundraising goal of \$2.8million for the design and engineering phase. Is this intended to include the work performed by Midwestern as well?

Answer 30: Yes

Question 31: Please confirm whether the selected consultant's base scope is intended to include services through completion of construction documents, permitting, bidding support, and award of the construction contract only. Are construction administration services after award of the construction contract excluded from the base scope and should be listed as optional additional services?

Answer 31: Yes

Question 32: Should the fee proposal include separate phase breakdowns for preliminary engineering/concept design, design development, construction documents, permitting/ agency approvals, public engagement, and bidding support? Can you provide recommended completion percentages for each phase?

Answer 32: Yes

Question 33: How frequently does the City/Treeline Conservancy expect the Engineer's Estimate to be updated during design?

Answer 33: See RFP II, C xxii – allows consultant to define schedule

Question 34: Are you able to delineate the area of limitation of the consultant's design scope at 721 North Main Street between Summit and Felch Street?

Answer 34: See RFP II, 4 C xii

Question 35: The RFP states that design work on 721 North Main shall be limited to continuation of the bridge structure, associated features, earth fill required to support the trail to grade, lighting, drainage, and related work. Should respondents assume there will be coordination with the consultant team developing the design of the park?

Answer 35: No

Question 36: Does the City/Treeline Conservancy have a preferred design direction, structural approach, or material strategy for the signature bridge?

Answer 36: No

Question 37: A preliminary Gateway concept is included in the RFP materials. Should respondents treat that concept as a preferred starting point, a reference only, or one of several possible alternatives?

Answer 37: Simply a concept, open to creative solution

Question 38: Are there preferences regarding whether the bridge should be enclosed, partially covered, open-air, or protected in specific locations?

Answer 38: No

Question 39: Have preferred locations/quantities for additional vertical access points or other enhanced amenities been identified or refined by the Treeline Conservancy beyond those identified in the conceptual design?

Answer 39: See RFP II, 4 C v

Question 40: If respondents use Midwestern Consulting's survey, will the cost of that survey be carried by Treeline Conservancy outside the consultant's fee, or should it be included in the respondent's fee proposal?

Answer 40: Yes, the Treeline Conservancy will pay; proposers should not include this cost in their Fee Proposal

Question 41: Will the survey include right-of-way limits, easements, all public and private utilities, tree locations, tree DBH/canopy information, vertical utility information, Allen Creek Drain information, and all features needed for final engineering documents? Will the design team have the agency to identify any deficiencies in the survey and request additional information?

Answer 41: Yes, Yes

Question 42: Has the consultant or agency responsible for the MDOT Rail property segment been selected? Should respondents include coordination meetings with the separate MDOT Rail property design team in the base scope?

Answer 42: Yes, No

Question 43: Are there known clearance, setback, fencing, security, or operational requirements from MDOT Rail, Amtrak, WATCO, or other railroad-related entities that must be incorporated into the design?

Answer 43: No

Question 44: Please confirm whether FHWA review is required and, if so, what federal process or documentation is anticipated.

Answer 44: See RFP II, C xiv and xv

Question 45: Please confirm whether MDOT review is required for the bridge, trail, traffic, right-of-way, railroad-adjacent work, or federal aid compliance.

Answer 45: Yes

Question 46: Please confirm whether EGLE permits are anticipated for floodplain, wetlands, water resources, contaminated soils/groundwater, or other environmental conditions.

Answer 46: Yes

Question 47: Please confirm whether FEMA approval is required for improvements within the deed-restricted floodway area at 721 North Main. Are there existing WCWRC requirements, easement conditions, or design limitations related to improvements over, adjacent to, or within the Allen Creek Drain corridor?

Answer 47: Yes, Yes

Question 48: Please confirm whether WCWRC approval is required for work within or near the Allen Creek Drain easement.

Answer 48: Yes

Question 49: Should respondents include coordination with the Michigan State Police as referenced in the RFP, and if so, what specific approval or review is anticipated?

Answer 49: Yes, to be determined

Question 50: Should respondents include coordination with MDNR, and if so, what specific permits or approvals are anticipated?

Answer 50: Yes, to be determined

Question 51: Are respondents expected to prepare and submit permit applications directly to agencies, or prepare materials for submission by Treeline Conservancy or the City? Who will be the permit applicant for each agency approval: the consultant, Treeline Conservancy, the City of Ann Arbor, or another entity?

Answer 51: Consultant will submit directly

Question 52: Are there known federal funding or earmark requirements that will affect design standards, procurement, documentation, environmental review, Buy America requirements, or project delivery?

Answer 52: No, not at this point.

Question 53: Should the consultant include hydraulic or hydrologic modeling in the base scope?

Answer 53: If the consultant believes it is necessary for the design of the project, then it should be included.

Question 54: Should the consultant include floodplain modeling or no-rise certification in the base scope?

Answer 54: Yes.

Question 55: Should the selected consultant prepare a Due Care Plan, Construction Soil Management Plan, Health and Safety Plan, or Soil/Groundwater Handling Plan, or will these be prepared by Tetra Tech? What level of coordination with Tetra Tech should respondents include in the base scope?

Answer 55: If the consultant feels that it might be necessary, it should be included as an additional service.

Question 56: Should respondents include geotechnical investigation, borings, laboratory testing, and a geotechnical report in the base scope?

Answer 56: Yes. See RFP II, 4 C iii

Question 57: If additional test holes or utility potholing are required, should respondents include an allowance in the fee proposal or identify this as an additional service?

Answer 57: If the consultant feels that it might be necessary, it should be included as an additional service.

Question 58: The RFP notes a likely major conflict with overhead high-voltage wiring and other overhead utilities. Has any preliminary coordination occurred with the affected utility companies?

Answer 58: No

Question 59: Should respondents include utility relocation design in the base scope or only coordination with utility owners?

Answer 59: See RFP II, 4 C ii.

Question 60: Should respondents include subsurface utility engineering beyond standard utility mapping in the base scope?

Answer 60: Yes, See RFP II, 4 C ii

Question 61: Are you able to specify the desired composition, size, and appointment process for the Treeline Gateway Advisory Design Committee?

Answer 61: No

Question 62: Can you identify how many meetings respondents should assume for the following: Advisory Design Committee meetings, Public meetings, Stakeholder / Property owner meetings?

Answer 62: See Answer 7.

Question 63: Should respondents include website design, website content, periodic updates, or all of the above? Who will host and maintain the website after the consultant's work is complete?

Answer 63: Yes, See RFP II, 4 D

Question 64: The RFP states that public engagement materials should support Treeline Conservancy fundraising. Can you identify the expected level of fundraising graphics, renderings, narratives, or presentation materials. Are photorealistic renderings, animations, physical models, or virtual presentation tools desired as part of the base scope?

Answer 64: See RFP II, 4 D

Question 65: Please confirm the expected drawing milestones for the design process, such as concept, preliminary engineering, 30%, 60%, 90%, and final construction documents.

Answer 65: To be identified in respondent's proposal

Question 66: What are the expected deliverables per each phase? Should BIM or 3D modeling files be submitted to the City/Treeline Conservancy, or are CAD/PDF deliverables sufficient?

Answer 66: See RFP II, 4 C xviii

Question 67: What project delivery method is anticipated for construction: design-bid-build, construction manager, general contractor, or another delivery method? Should construction documents be structured around City of Ann Arbor public bid requirements, MDOT bid requirements, or a Treeline Conservancy procurement format?

Answer 67: Design -bid- build; We anticipate there will be federal funding support. We don't know the funding source at this point. See RFP I, A; See RFP II, 3; See RFP II 4 C xxiii

Question 68: Should respondents include bid phase services through award of the construction contract only?

Answer 68: Yes.

Question 69: Will Tetra Tech be preparing a Section 7a Compliance Analysis for the project detailing the soil and groundwater management requirements, and detailing any required soil and groundwater remediation?

Answer 69: Yes

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



MIDWESTERN
CONSULTING

3815 Plaza Drive Ann Arbor, Michigan 48108
(734) 995-0200 • www.midwesternconsulting.com



TREELINE ROUTE – PHASE 1
CITY OF ANN ARBOR

DATE: 1/22/2026 JOB NO.: **25263**

SCALE: 1" = 250

SHEET 1 OF 1