

ADDENDUM No. 1

RFP No. 26-18

Farmers Market Visioning & Engagement

Due: April 8, 2026 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 fourteen (14) 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 – Non-Discrimination Declaration of Compliance
- Attachment C - Living Wage Declaration of Compliance
- Attachment D - 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. 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: Similar to the Parks & Recreation Department's Asset Management Plan, has there been other prior research on farmers markets, generally, or on this farmers market, specifically, the city has done that should be considered?

Answer 1: No, and that is partly why the City is running this specific RFP with the deliverables that have been identified. There have been several studies that have taken place about aspects of the Farmers Market in the past. While any materials that are stored in our archives will be made available to the selected consultant, it would likely be out of date and should not be relied upon for the current project - RFP No. 26-18.

Question 2: Who does the City feel needs to be part of this process? Who do you want to engage more that hasn't been at the table as much as you'd like?

Answer 2: The Farmers Market vendors absolutely need to be engaged. Vendors are the heart and soul of the Farmers Market, and they are a primary reason

why patrons come back repeatedly. The vendors are going to need to feel heard and understood throughout, otherwise the City expects issues to emerge from a lack of engagement and trust as it has in prior conversations about the Farmers Market design and operations. The Farmers Market neighbors, such as the Kerrytown District Association (KDA) and the City's Downtown Development Authority (DDA), also have a vested interest in the Farmers Market thriving. The Farmers Market vendors, the KDA and the DDA are three key stakeholders. Ultimately, the City is interested in hearing from a wider range of stakeholders to learn about how they think the Farmers Market can better serve the community.

Question 3: Do you have someone on your team who tracks profits from vendors, trends on what they're selling, and/or changes due to nearby markets?

Answer 3: The City only tracks sales that come from Ann Arbor Farmers Market tokens & related programs (Credit/Debit, SNAP/EBT, Double Up Food Bucks, & Prescription for Health). Vendors are not required to share additional sales data with the City. The City does have detailed records of the numbers of vendors in each category and what individual vendors are selling, but staff are not tracking these as 'trends' per se. Changes due to nearby markets are difficult to quantify, especially since the Ann Arbor Farmers Market is a much older and more established market than all markets in the state except for Detroit Eastern Market.

Question 4: You describe balance of strategic planning and engagement, financials? Do you see it as balanced or is engagement more heavily weighted?

Answer 4: While the City envisions both prongs (engagement and visioning) of this effort as equal going into the project, the understanding is that it could evolve and more or less engagement may be necessary as the project progresses. The City would ask everyone to be prepared for adaptations on the project's approach as it progress over time.

Question 5: It appears that a big part of this effort is benchmarking. Are there any other markets you see as aspirational or equivalent?

Answer 5: Staff see the most equivalent market to the Ann Arbor Farmers Market as the Fulton Street in Grand Rapids. Both markets are around the same age, size, and are both year-round. However, the Fulton Street market's management structure is very different than the Ann Arbor Farmers Market. Other similar public markets/urban farmers markets in Michigan include Flint, Detroit Eastern Market (though they are larger), and Muskegon (though they are smaller). The Ann Arbor Farmers Market is regarded as one of the best markets in Michigan and has been recognized in the top 10 of farmers markets in the country. Some aspirational markets are the Dane County Farmers Market (Madison, WI), Ferry Building Farmers Market (San Francisco, CA), and the Boston Public Market (Boston, MA).

Question 6: Financial sustainability was mentioned. Is it profitable now or does it break even? Is the ultimate goal to break even?

Answer 6: Historically, the Farmers Market was a City enterprise fund with the expectation being break-even. Since moving from an enterprise fund, the operation has rarely fully recovered expenses through its fees and programming. The space provides an essential service to the community

through the market operations but has been utilized for other functions on non-market days. The welcomed outcome of this project would identify financial best practices as well as non-market opportunities to support the fiscal health of the market to reduce the impact on the Ann Arbor park system.

Question 7: Curious if any existing City staff were involved in previous engagement, visioning or design processes that didn't work?

Answer 7: No existing City staff were involved in prior engagement, visioning, or design processes.

Question 8: Are there preferred formats or tools for collaboration, data sharing, and public-facing materials?

Answer 8: Yes, the consultant should expect to post all relevant materials and data on the Engage Ann Arbor (<https://engage.a2gov.org/>) platform.

Question 9: The Farmers Market is next to the Kerrytown shops. Do you know what the current relationship is to the shops?

Answer 9: In general, the relationship is positive. As part of this process, the City would like to have an intentional conversation with the Kerrytown shops. A thriving Farmers Market is a benefit to the Kerrytown shops, and vice versa. The Farmers Market draws significant business to the Kerrytown shops on market days. The Farmers Market parking lot is used by Kerrytown shoppers. On market days, the Farmers Market reduces available customer parking within the parking lot. The consultant will need to understand those current dynamics to understand the implications of any final recommendations made for the future of the Farmers Market.

Question 10: Are you looking to us for guidance on timeline?

Answer 10: The City is targeting a 12-month process. However, the City also is approaching the 12-month timeframe as a goal and not a requirement. There is no interest in rushing this engagement process, and the goal is to be careful and thorough. However, the more time spent getting to a final report prolongs the subsequent efforts to actualize future improvements. There will be need to be a thoughtful balance put to this project's timeline and the longer-term goals of bringing the outcomes into the implementation stage. In general, the priority is to have a meaningful engagement and visioning process with the community and stakeholders, but the City does not want to draw out the timeline too long because of the cascading implications for subsequent efforts. As well, the Parks & Recreation Department has also initiated a two-year Parks & Recreation Open Space (PROS) Plan process recently approved by City Council. Having the Farmers Market efforts and the PROS Plan efforts aligned is an overarching goal. The PROS Plan will include heavy community engagement, and there will be a need for coordinating complimentary and non-duplicative engagement efforts. That coordination will be defined as both processes take shape. One of the challenges with both timeline/processes is keeping the two engagement efforts distinct. The Farmers Market engagement process is limited to the market only, while the PROS Plan is for all 163 parks throughout the city. The PROS Plan may elicit a lot of responses about Farmers Market separate from this engagement process, and the City

will work to make all that feedback available to the team coordinating Farmers Market engagement efforts.

Question 11: The RFP mentioned statistically valid surveys. Are there any other requirements around engagement? Do you have a City-wide engagement plan?

Answer 11: No, but the City does have a relatively new engagement page: Engage Ann Arbor (<https://engage.a2gov.org/>). The City does have a Community Engagement Toolkit that is intended to support and guide different engagement processes, however this specific effort would go beyond the basic standards set forth in that guidance.

Question 12: Is the Engage Ann Arbor platform maintained by the City or by a vendor?

Answer 12: Social Pinpoint Inc. was the vendor that helped the City develop the platform, but the City has since directly assumed the management of Engage Ann Arbor.

Question 13: Is Farmers Market vendor parking an issue? You mentioned customer parking, but vendor parking can be painful. Can you talk about that? Is it a free for all?

Answer 13: Yes, vendor parking is a longstanding and clear operational challenge. The early arrival to unload can be chaotic and a point of stress. This is especially true since the surrounding construction has been taking place and contractors have been using the parking lot. The City has had conflicts with construction staging during unloading hours. It already had the potential for contention during normal operating conditions, but conditions over the past two years have made it even more difficult.

Question 14: This plan is about the future, correct?

Answer 14: Yes. While feedback throughout this process may include a lot of comments about current stressors and disruptions to the Farmers Market experience, this process is ultimately focused on what the Farmers Market will look and feel like after all the disruptions are over. This process is about looking beyond all of current challenges and gathering ideas and input for the future of the Farmers Market. However, there are certainly lessons to be learned and integrated from the current challenges, especially as it relates to the eventual implementation of any new Farmers Market improvements.

Question 15: In the design scenarios, how much do you want to get into construction mitigation and timeline during capital improvements?

Answer 15: Construction mitigation planning was not part of original vision for this process, but the City would welcome it as a feature of a final product depending on the recommendations that emerge. The City understands that continual disruptions, both unexpected and planned, are a big part of the current context and that they influence the community's stamina for entertaining further disruptions even if they are driven by a need or desire for improvements, ultimately. The City acknowledges that the timeline and scope of disruptions may be the very first thing people think of when they read the recommendations that come from this effort, and the City can certainly appreciate why that would be a first thought.

Question 16: Regarding the surrounding construction, are the public told timelines for those developments and do the construction projects have public engagement efforts attached to them?

Answer 16: Developers send postcards per community participation requirements and the City sends postcards again if required for public hearings. Regarding the development projects surrounding the Farmers Market area, whatever efforts have taken place have not assuaged all concerns. Whether it be related to traffic circulation, parking conflicts, noise, or other factors, the developments are a continual tension point with Farmers Market operations, patrons and vendors.

Question 17: When the City receives feedback or comments on the surrounding developments, what is the primary channel you hear this feedback through?

Answer 17: Typically, the feedback is received directly from customers and vendors to the staff at the Farmers Market and sometimes received via emails and calls. Public comments at public meetings, such as at the Public Market Advisory Commission meetings, are also common, particularly from vendors who attend the public comment periods to express concerns.

Question 18: I understand that the big outcome of this process is to build consensus among different stakeholders. Is your hope to have also gotten approval from planning commission or other public entities, and would that be led by staff or consultant?

Answer 18: The Farmers Market is a part of the City's Parks & Recreation Department, and that department reports to the City's Parks Advisory Commission (PAC). Additionally, the Farmers Market staff report directly to the City's Public Market Advisory Commission (PMAC). The final report for this effort needs to be presented to PAC and PMAC, and staff would like the report ratified by both bodies, as well as to the Downtown Development Authority (DDA) and possibly City Council or others. Typically all of the scheduling and internal process elements are handled by City staff, and the consultant supports with the presentation to the bodies.

Question 19: What are you most nervous about in terms of outcomes for this project?

Answer 19: The City has concerns about failing to make everyone feel heard through this process, and missing important voices in the conversation. There is less concern about the process revealing disagreements, because those are expected from the start. However, amidst that disagreement, the City is going to stay focused on everyone feeling that they had a chance to be heard in the conversation. There is also concern about developing another plan for the Farmers Market that does not move forward, which has happened with prior projects at the Farmers Market. Parks & Recreation staff also want to ensure proper coordination with the Parks & Recreation Open Space (PROS) Plan process that is underway. The objective is to keep the focus of this process on the Farmers Market and not get detracted by feedback on topics unrelated to the Farmers Market.

Question 20: What are you seeing in terms of final deliverable? Report, presentation?

Answer 20: The final deliverables are the report described in the RFP, as well as support with several presentations to City's Parks Advisory Commission (PAC), Public Market Advisory Commission (PMAC), Downtown

Development Authority (DDA) and possibly City Council or others. As well, it is crucial that the final report includes recommendations that can translate into a subsequent RFP for design and engineering.

Question 21: How much do you want recommendations for interim operational solutions?

Answer 21: The City would accept such recommendations but is ultimately more focused on future. The City is prepared to weather temporary operational challenges in exchange for successful improvements being made to the Farmers Market.

Question 22: Based on structure, all deliverables will be public?

Answer 22: Yes.

Question 23: Interviews, transcripts, can those be private or are those all in public domain?

Answer 23: This project will be operating according to the Michigan Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA"). The City wants to ensure transparency throughout this process. Written records are generally subject to disclosure. However, there are opportunities for collecting anonymized public and/or stakeholder feedback that can be explored, where responses would be subject to disclosure but the respondent's identity would be anonymized.

Question 24: Does the City of Ann Arbor have a Communications Department that has to review narrative or materials before they get published?

Answer 24: The City has a communications team that would support with any social media, press release, or similar features of this project. That team would also do an internal review of the final draft of the report, as well as the City's Accessibility Coordinator to ensure compliance. The City will also be exploring options for publishing the final report in different languages.

Question 25: Do you have someone who does translations at the city?

Answer 25: No, the City does not have any staff internally to support translations. For this project, translation efforts may be the consultant's responsibility. The Farmers Market has many Mandarin-speaking customers, so that translation effort is a baseline need for this project. The City does have [LanguageLine](#) services, and staff can explore if that could be available to the consultant for this process.

Question 26: The plans from 2011, is that something you would share with consultant to see what's been done?

Answer 26: Yes. The selected firm would be provided with any available information on prior Farmers Market engagement or design process that have taken place.

Question 27: I really like the idea of having an engagement group of those who don't use market yet. Curious about scale that you're looking at -- citywide, county? How much of a regional destination do you see it being? What is your customer base?

Answer 27: The City would look to the consultant to advise on that.

Question 28: Has your organization worked with a consultant on this type of project or other projects in the past?

Answer 28: Yes.

Question 29: Do you prefer to work with a consultant in the Ann Arbor area?

Answer 29: No preference.

Question 30: Given the unexpected condemnation of the office building, are there any recent architectural, structural, or site surveys of the remaining market infrastructure that the consultant will be provided access to, or are we expected to procure new baseline site assessments?

Answer 30: The City will provide all relevant information, surveys, drawings, reports, etc. related to the previous and existing Farmers Market infrastructure. The City does not expect the consultant to provide all of these items in a new baseline assessment.

Question 31: Has the City previously conducted broad public engagement regarding the Farmers Market or Kerrytown District in recent years? If so, will the consultant have access to this raw data to establish baseline trends?

Answer 31: No, the City has not conducted broad public engagement regarding the Farmers Market or Kerrytown District in recent years.

Question 32: Did the firms involved in the 2024 forensic investigation and demolition receive or participate in any pre-proposal briefings, site walkthroughs, or planning discussions related to this visioning scope? If so, will equivalent background information be made available to all proposers through an addendum?

Answer 32: Included in this Addendum 1 is a list of all the pre-proposal meeting attendees. No individual meetings, site walkthroughs or planning discussions were provided to any firms. OHM Advisors (OHM) was the lead consultant on Parks & Recreation Asset Management Plan, and the subsequent assessment of the capital assessment for the entire Farmers Market site. OHM Advisors also assisted with construction administration related to demolition of the former Farmers Market office building. Hubbell, Roth & Clark Inc. (HRC) performed the Architectural Investigation for the former Farmers Market office building, and architect of record for the Demolition Engineering Documents. Neither HRC nor OHM were involved in the development of RFP #26-18. Both OHM and HRC have long-standing on-call relationships with the City of Ann Arbor and would be inherently familiar with many past and present projects.

Question 33: With multiple advisory commissions and external organizations involved (DDA, Parks & Rec, Kerrytown District, etc.), who will serve as the final approval authority for signing off on interim deliverables, survey instruments, and the final report?

Answer 33: First, City staff will approve on an internal basis. Second, the final report would be presented to City's Parks Advisory Commission (PAC), Public Market Advisory Commission (PMAC), Downtown Development Authority (DDA) and possibly City Council or others. The City would be seeking ratification of the final report by those various bodies.

Question 34: Will City staff actively assist in recruiting participants and providing warm introductions/contact lists for the 'stakeholder interviews,' or is the consultant solely responsible for all community outreach and lead generation?

Answer 34: City staff will assist with identifying stakeholder groups and assisting with consultant introductions.

Question 35: To help proposers develop a realistic project schedule, can the City confirm a standard internal review and approval cycle for draft deliverable so we can build appropriate buffer into each phase milestone?

Answer 35: For any phase of the project where the consultant expects review and approval by City staff, a minimum of four (4) weeks should be budgeted for those internal reviews by City staff. For the final report, a minimum of four (4) weeks should be budgeted. For scheduling presentations to the City's Parks Advisory Commission (PAC), Public Market Advisory Commission (PMAC), and the Downtown Development Authority (DDA) a minimum of two (2) weeks should be budgeted, while presentations or resolutions sent to City Council should budget a minimum of eight (8) weeks.

Question 36: Are the meetings with the various boards and commissions expected to be conducted in-person, or will the City allow for virtual facilitation to maximize the budget?

Answer 36: Some of the meetings will be virtual, and some of the meetings will be conducted in-person. The details on which meetings will be held in-person and which will be held virtually are not known at this time.

Question 37: To ensure the proposed capital investment scenarios align with the City's strict A2Zero carbon neutrality goals, is the consultant expected to conduct new environmental site and stormwater capacity assessments, or will the City provide baseline utility data?

Answer 37: The consultant is expected to have a working understanding of the City's A2Zero plan and goals, and to bring those goals into the community engagement conversations and as features of the subsequent recommendations in the final report.

Question 38: Regarding the requirement for 'statistically valid surveys,' does the City have a required confidence level and margin of error (e.g., 95% +/- 5%), or a minimum required sample size they expect the consultant to achieve?

Answer 38: The City would look to the consultant to advise on that.

Question 39: For the 3-5 'future capital investment scenarios,' is the consultant expected to provide professional architectural renderings and hard construction cost estimates (requiring a licensed architect/estimator on our team), or are high-level conceptual diagrams and historical benchmarking estimates acceptable?

Answer 39: The City is looking for the consultant to provide it with 3-5 'future capital investment scenarios' that describe amenities, capital improvements, and conceptual layout for the Farmers Market. These scenarios should not include renderings or detailed design as part of the final deliverable. The goal is to develop scenarios that inform the City's evaluation of potential market improvements while avoiding detailed or prescriptive designs. High-

level conceptual design should be limited to outlining the various scenario's amenities, improvements and layout, but refrain from design or architectural renderings. For costing, high-level estimates based on industry standards (such as cost per square foot) are appropriate. This will help us understand overall feasibility before moving into detailed design.

Question 40: Will the consultant be granted full access to the raw data from the 2024 National Community Survey to establish baselines and reduce redundant public surveying regarding market and park utilization?

Answer 40: At this time, the City is not certain whether it would be able to access to the raw datasets from prior National Community Surveys. Reports for 2024 and prior years can be access here: <https://www.a2gov.org/city-communications/community-survey/>

Question 41: How frequently does the City anticipate structured check-ins or presentations to staff and advisory groups?

Answer 41: The City anticipates weekly (four times per month) check-ins for the first few months, and transitioning to bi-weekly (twice per month) check-ins after that initial launch. Quarterly or similar, it would be advisable to have the consultant and staff present on progress to various bodies, such as the Public Market Advisory Commission.

Question 42: Will the City directly cover the 'hard costs' associated with public engagement (e.g., venue rentals, catering, translation/interpreter services, printing, and participant incentives/gift cards), or must all of these expenses be rolled into the consultant's fully burdened fee proposal?

Answer 42: The City will cover costs such as venue rentals, catering, printing, etc. The City does have [Language Line](#) services, and staff can explore if that could be available to the consultant for this process.

Question 43: Will the consulting firm (and any of its sub-consultants) selected for this Visioning & Engagement phase be precluded from bidding on the subsequent architectural and engineering RFP mentioned in the scope?

Answer 43: No, the selected firm is not precluded from bidding on a subsequent RFP related to this RFP #26-18.

Question 44: Beyond the delivery of the final report, are there specific quantitative metrics the City will use to evaluate the success of this project (e.g., a specific number of community members engaged or a required vendor satisfaction score)?

Answer 44: No.

Question 45: Is there a recording or other summary available of the pre-proposal meeting from March 13, 2026?

Answer 45: There is no recording. All of the questions and answers discussed in that meeting are represented in this Addendum 1.

Question 46: Will the City be able to provide data, resources, and information relevant to this scope of work? As an illustrative example: existing Farmers Market costs and staffing information.

Answer 46: Yes, this information will be provided to the selected consultant.

Question 47: Does the City have a preference regarding the total number of community engagement activities?

Answer 47: No. The City would look to the consultant to advise on that.

Question 48: Is the City open to remote community engagement activities? For example: virtual interviews or community meetings.

Answer 48: Yes. The City is not interested in that format exclusively, but are certainly open to offering virtual and/or hybrid engagement opportunities

Question 49: For in-person community engagement activities: will the City be able to provide space to host these?

Answer 49: In most cases, yes.

Question 50: Will the City publicize community engagement activities? Or is the consultant expected to publicize these opportunities?

Answer 50: The City will publicize community engagement activities.

Question 51: Does the City have a timeline for this project? And/or a date by which the project must be completed?

Answer 51: The City is targeting a 12-month process. However, the City also understands that the 12-month timeframe is a goal and not a requirement. There is no interest in rushing this engagement process, and the goal is to be careful and thorough. However, the more time spent getting to a final report prolongs the subsequent efforts to actualize future improvements at the Farmers Market. So, there will be an attempt to balance the timeline for the process with the longer-term goals of bringing these engagement outcomes into the implementation stage.

Question 52: Does the City require any deliverables in addition to the final report?

Answer 52: In addition to the final report, the City would require support with several presentations on the report's findings made to City's Parks Advisory Commission (PAC), Public Market Advisory Commission (PMAC), Downtown Development Authority (DDA) and possibly City Council or others. The City would be seeking ratification of the final report by those various bodies.

Question 53: How does the City envision balancing potentially competing priorities among key stakeholder groups (e.g., vendors, nearby residents, advisory commissions) during the visioning process?

Answer 53: The City expects to hear similar, overlapping and divergent perspectives throughout this process. The City expects the recommendations furnished by the consultant to represent, at least in part, the wide array of priorities that were voiced in the engagement process by the wide variety of stakeholders.

Question 54: Is there an established decision-making framework or hierarchy for resolving divergent stakeholder input?

Answer 54: No. The City would look to the consultant to advise on that.

Question 55: Beyond the final report deliverable, how will the City measure the success of the engagement and visioning process itself (e.g., participation diversity, consensus-building, actionable outcomes)?

Answer 55: The City will feel this process is a success if the wide variety of stakeholders feel they have been meaningfully engaged, and if a recommendations from the final report can be successfully translated into an actionable next step for making improvements at the Farmers Market.

Question 56: Are there specific performance indicators or benchmarks the City would like the consultant to track throughout the project?

Answer 56: The City would look to the consultant to advise on that.

Question 57: Can the City elaborate on how the Parks & Recreation ADA Transition Plan and Asset Management Plan should practically inform recommendations, particularly where there may be tradeoffs between accessibility, cost, and site constraints?

Answer 57: The City is committed to investing in improvements to the Farmers Market site barriers identified in the Parks & Recreation ADA Transition Plan. While the City understands there are site constraints and budget implications for meeting accessibility goals, the Parks & Recreation Department is committed to creating an accessible environment for vendors, staff and patrons at the Farmers Market. Regarding the Asset Management Plan, there are several funding constraints that need to be considered as the Farmers Market is part of a vast City park system with significant current and future maintenance burdens and capital funding constraints which are primarily funded through the Parks Maintenance & Capital Improvements millage.

Question 58: To what level of detail should the financial strategy be developed (e.g., high-level cost ranges vs. more detailed pro forma or operating models)?

Answer 58: Regarding the Farmers Market operations, the City would look to the consultant to advise on that after engaging in more detailed discussion around existing operations and staffing capacities. While the City is open to exploring differing level of analysis on the Farmers Market's operational resilience and sustainability, the results and recommendations would likely need to remain at a high-level that details cost-benefit scenarios associated with any recommended changes, similar to the cost-benefit scenarios developed for future amenities and capital improvements detailed in the final report. For costs related to design, engineering and construction of the Farmers Market, high-level estimates based on industry standards (such as cost per square foot) are appropriate. This will help us assess financial feasibility and guide decision-making before moving into the next more detailed design phase.

Question 59: Are there known funding constraints or anticipated funding sources that should guide scenario development?

Answer 59: Yes, there are several funding constraints that need to be considered as the Farmers Market is part of a vast City park system with significant current and future maintenance burdens and capital funding constraints which are primarily funded through the Parks Maintenance & Capital Improvements millage. There are potential funding sources that could support future capital

improvements including Ann Arbor Downtown Development Authority, donors and grants depending on the future options advanced by the City.

Question 60: Does the City have expectations regarding statistically valid survey methods versus more qualitative engagement approaches?

Answer 60: No, there are no set expectations. The City would look to the consultant to advise on that.

Question 61: Are there priority populations or historically underrepresented groups the City has found particularly difficult to reach that should receive additional focus?

Answer 61: Yes, and the selected consultant would be connected with City staff that can provide relevant guidance to address that concern.

Question 62: For the 3-5 future scenarios, what level of design resolution is anticipated (conceptual narratives, diagrams, or preliminary spatial layouts)?

Answer 62: The City is looking for the consultant to provide it with 3-5 'future capital investment scenarios' that describe amenities, capital improvements, and conceptual layout for the Farmers Market. These scenarios should not include renderings or detailed design as part of the final deliverable. The goal is to develop scenarios that inform the City's evaluation of potential market improvements while avoiding detailed or prescriptive designs. High-level conceptual design should be limited to outlining the various scenario's amenities, improvements and layout, but refrain from design or architectural renderings. For costing, high-level estimates based on industry standards (such as cost per square foot) are appropriate. This will help us understand overall feasibility before moving into detailed design.

Question 63: Should scenarios include phased implementation strategies or be presented as standalone alternatives?

Answer 63: The City is open to phased implementation strategies as an approach, as well as standalone alternatives.

Question 64: Are there any concurrent or upcoming planning, capital, or downtown initiatives that may influence or overlap with this project and should be considered in our approach?

Answer 64: A significant amount of development is taking place in Ann Arbor. These developments supported by the newly approved Comprehensive Plan will likely influence this project and future operations. This project should take into consideration the future of the area as much, if not more, the history associated with space.

Question 65 - 69: The City received several questions regarding the budget for RFP #26-18:

- To ensure our proposed methodologies (particularly the statistically valid surveys and capital cost estimating) are scaled appropriately to the City's expectations, has the City established an anticipated budget range or a maximum Not-to-Exceed cap for this engagement?
- Do you have a budget that you're working with or looking for guidance?

- What is the budget for this project?
- Does the City have an established budget range or not-to-exceed amount for RFP #26-18 – Farmers Market Visioning & Engagement?
- Is there a maximum budget for this work?

Answer 65 - 69: While funding is secured for this project, a specific budget has not been finalized. The City's goal is to find the best value based on the needs to ensure fiscal responsibility.

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



**City of Ann Arbor Purchasing
Request for Proposal (RFP) Pre-Proposal Meeting**

RFP# 26-18 – Farmers Market Visioning & Engagement

First /Last Name	Department/Entity	Phone #	E-Mail Address
1. DUSTIN LOVE	URGE		DUSTIN@URGEIMPRINT.COM
2. ANDREA CARBINE	NEW VENTURE	908.635.1934	ANDREA@NEWVENTUREADVISORS.NET
3. NICOLAUS PAPP	DESIGN WITH JOY	510 316 2575	nford@designwithjoy.org
4. LISA ASSENMACHER	Piper + Gold Public	Relatano 517-648-0366	lisa@piperandgold.com
5. LAUREN PEDIGO	PROGRESSIVE COMPANY	810 423 9347	LPEDIGO@WEAREPROGRESSIVE.COM
6. ADRIANNA MELCHIOR	HRC	248 535 3328	amelchior@hrcengv.com
7. Dana Hawthorne	BRI	919-946-7048	dhawthorne@briad.com
8. CHRISTY SUMMERS	BRI	734.662.2622	Csummers@briad.com
9. Amanda Edmonds	Beehive Strategic Project for Public Space	734 714 6892	amanda.edmonds@gmail.com
10. Laura Walker	OTHER WORK	248.991.1457	LAURA@THEC-WORK.COM
11. BRANDON WOODLE	SMITHGROUP	630.776.6678	BRANDON.WOODLE@SMITHGROUP.COM
12. LAURA MARIE PETERSON	H+A ARCHITECTS	248.914.0234	LAURA@ONEPLUSONE.PLUS
13. Jay Marks	Great Lakes Strategic	517-441-6866	jaymarks@greatlakesstrategic.com
14. Angela Forno	AN SPALPING DEBECKER	313 208 3809	angajafortino@sda-eng.com
15. Andrea Prena	Crowe LLP	317-209-2308	andrea.prena@crowe.com
16.			

Opened By: _____