

ADDENDUM No. 1

RFP No. 26-39

ZONING CODE REWRITE AND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCESS IMPROVEMENTS

Due: August 11, 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 four (4) 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: Will a cover page, table of contents, cover letter, and tab/section dividers be excluded from the 60-page (30 sheet) limit?

Answer 1: Yes, those sheets can be excluded. The page limit is recommended to encourage a focused response, but exceeding the limit will not disqualify a proposal.

Question 2: Because the two initiatives have distinct budgets and deliverables, should the Fee Proposal identify the costs for the UDC Rewrite separately from the Development Review Process Improvement work program?

Answer 2: Yes.

Question 3: Which meetings and engagement activities does the City expect the consultant team to attend in person, as opposed to virtually?

Answer 3: City staff will lead engagement events with the public but will rely on the selected firm to help design meeting format and the materials. As for meetings, it is expected that the consultant will attend a minimum of 10 Planning Commission meetings during the drafting phase to seek feedback on important decision points. Staff estimates that five of these meetings will be virtual, and the remainder in person, to be determined collaboratively by the consultant and staff based on desired outcomes, or important milestones in the process. Additionally, two City Council

meetings shall be attended virtually.

Question 4: Does the City expect the consultant to develop the parcel-by-parcel translation methodology and make individual zoning assignments, or will City staff establish the initial correspondence between the Comprehensive Plan future land use categories and proposed zoning districts?

Answer 4: The City expects the consultant to develop a GIS-based parcel-by-parcel Zoning Map that will be adopted along with the new zoning code. The Comprehensive Plan provides guidance on how to convert the Future Land Use Map to a new Zoning Map. The exact methodology for translating the former to the latter can be done collaboratively between staff and the consultant.

Question 5: Will the City Attorney's Office provide ongoing legal review of draft UDC provisions, including review for compliance with Michigan enabling legislation, or should the consultant team include independent land-use legal counsel?

Answer 5: The City Attorney's Office will provide an ongoing legal review of the draft UDC, however, it is listed as a desirable qualification that consultants are familiar with Michigan law so as to avoid common zoning practice recommendations that are not permitted in this state (i.e., inclusionary zoning). Respondents should share information about any law firms, attorneys, or other legal resources that respondents have on staff or consult with when formulating recommended ordinances and approaches.

Question 6: Is the consultant expected only to provide the Development Review Process Improvement Report and recommendations, or should the scope and fee include implementation assistance for non-UDC recommendations such as new forms, process maps, applicant guides, performance metrics, or customer-service protocols?

Answer 6: No, the scope of the work is limited to evaluating the development review process and providing recommendations for improvement. The consultant should recommend implementation actions, however, the actual implementation of those non-UDC recommendations is outside the scope of this contract and would be considered a separate task.

Question 7: Attachment A states that a firm not incorporated in Michigan should attach a "Certificate of Authority." Must an out-of-state consultant secure authorization to transact business in Michigan at the time of proposal submission, or may the consultant obtain authorization once selected for the project before contract execution?

Answer 7: The consultant can obtain authorization once selected for the project before contract execution.

Question 8: Could the City please share the total anticipated budget for this project, including both initiatives and through the final draft UDC and Zoning Map?

Answer 8: Zoning Rewrite: Up to \$650,000 over a two-year period, subject to City Council budget approval.

Development Review Process Improvement Report: \$65,000

Question 9: Are there specific development types that are currently difficult to permit or review under the existing code? What are some common bottlenecks in the current review process?

Answer 9: Some of the particular challenges of the current language which the City seeks to fix with the new code include:

- Applying current standards to existing nonconforming lots and structures. This

is especially true when the current standard requires a minimum threshold (i.e. two stories).

- Exceptions, alternatives, and unique situations. These are plentiful yet difficult to find, challenging to explain, and either missed or misunderstood causing frustration, delay, and costly revisions.
- Broad standards of approval using vague language such as “minimum necessary” and “reasonable.”
- Excessive requirements, tied to the full extent of a site, regardless of context or scope of work, existing conditions, or standard of approval. This is particularly problematic for relatively minor projects on large sites.
- Number of districts. Although well intended each time, the City’s habit of creating new districts to address a new goal or situation has resulted in an overwhelming number of total districts, many of which are practically identical except for one or two aspects.
- Unrealistically high, or low, standards for an urban setting, particularly for minimum lot area and lot area per dwelling unit, maximum floor area ratio, minimum setbacks, and lot accessibility. This often results in saying “no” to desired development, especially “missing middle” residential development.

Question 10: What performance metrics currently exist for development review timelines?

Answer 10: The City keeps track of the number of days the development review process takes from submission to approval. However, the days are not distinguished between active review and waiting for the developer’s next submission.

Question 11: Is the City interested in form-based, hybrid, or performance-based zoning approaches?

Answer 11: The City is open to any of these approaches if they prove to be suitable to meet our goals.

Question 12: Does the City expect the consultant to lead all outreach activities, or be a partner/resource to the City’s outreach activities?

Answer 12: The City expects the consultant to be a partner/resource for public engagement. Because the amount of engagement may change during the process, City staff will plan to take the lead. Staff will be responsible for scheduling and conducting public engagement, the consultant partner will partner by brainstorming the approach and providing materials (e.g. display boards, engagement tool materials, maps, etc.) to be utilized by City staff.

Question 13: Are there underrepresented communities that require targeted engagement strategies?

Answer 13: Low-income households, persons with disabilities, students, and renters are often underrepresented in City engagement opportunities.

Question 14: How many community engagement events should offerors assume the selected firm will design materials for across each phase?

Answer 14: The number of community engagement events should be provided in the offeror’s scope. If the City decides to hold more engagement events than outlined in the scope, then staff would plan to adjust the materials previously provided by the consultant for future uses.

See response to 13 above, yes, the consultant will be expected to provide

materials as unique engagement activities are determined, scheduled, and conducted.

Question 15: Which online codification service does the City intend to use to host the final UDC?

Answer 15: To be determined. All chapters of the City Code are currently codified by Municode, except for Chapter 55 Unified Development Code which has been published on the City's website since 2018. Following adoption of the rewritten Chapter 55, the City intends to select an online codification service and cease self-publishing. Any proposed platform should include an estimated cost range for services for a minimum 5-year period.

Question 16: Should the hover tooltip requirement for defined terms function within the codification platform, in a standalone web document, or both?

Answer 16: Ideally, both.

Question 17: Are recommendations regarding permitting software or technology systems within the scope of the Development Review Process Improvement Report?

Answer 17: No.

Question 18: Approximately how many of the estimated staff, Planning Commission, and City Council meetings does the City expect to be attended in person rather than virtually?

Answer 18: Staff meetings will be primarily virtual to save travel costs when applicable. See response number three above for Planning Commission and City Council Meetings.

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