



City of Colorado Springs

**ADDENDUM #1
Q24-006 AB
03/19/2024**

NAME OF PROJECT: "On-Call Consultant"

PROPOSAL DUE DATE: REMAINS: MONDAY, APRIL 1, 2024 - NO LATER THAN 5:00 PM MST

This document shall become as fully a part of the above named solicitation and Contract Documents as if included and shall take full and complete precedence over anything stated or shown to the contrary in them.

Acknowledgment: Each Offeror shall indicate in the place provided acknowledgment of receipt of this Addendum.

Each and every Offeror, subcontractor, and material supplier shall be responsible for reading each and every item in this Addendum to ascertain the extent and manner it affects the work in which he is interested.

*****CHANGES TO THE PUBLICATION NOTICE*****

The following items and information are corrections and additions to the above referenced project.

1. Pre-proposal Meeting Sign-In Sheet (see attached)
2. Submitted questions and Mountain Metropolitan Transit's responses (see attached)
3. UPDATED Price Sheet to include rates column – please submit this updated price sheet in Envelope #2 (NOT EVALUATED)

**This is a qualifications-based selection and price will not be evaluated. The price sheet shall be provided as a separate document, independent of the technical proposal. This submitted price will only be reviewed by City staff after a selection is made and will be used in the contract negotiation process.*

Offeror shall acknowledge receipt of this addendum by signing below, and this addendum must be returned as part of the proposal.

Signature

Date

Firm

Q24-006 AB
On-Call Consultant
March 7, 2024 10:30 AM



FIRM	NAME	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Lollar Engineering	Doug Lollar	
Stantec	Aaron Egbert	Aaron.Egbert@stantec.com
Stantec	Craig Blewitt	Craig.Blewitt@stantec.com
Moore Associates	Kathy Chambers	kathy@moore-associates.net
Metric Engineering	Brandy Pleas	Brandy.Pleas@metriceng.com
Plante Moran	Lori Blackmon	Lori.Blackmon@plantemoran.com
Kimley-Horn	Anthony Pratt	Anthony.Pratt@kimley-horn.com
Kimley-Horn	Amy Garinger	amy.garinger@kimley-horn.com
HDR	Yelena Onnen	Yelena.Onnen@hdrinc.com
Inceed	Christine Miller	CMiller@inceed.com
Inceed	Allison Fredstrom	AFredstrom@inceed.com
MMT	Ashlee Brehm	
MMT	Patty Bailey	
MMT	Jacob Matsen	
MMT	Lan Rao	

**Q24-006 AB On Call Consultant
Mountain Metropolitan Transit**

	Questions	MMT Response
1	What is the overall budget defined for this contract?	The magnitude of the overall budget ranges from \$2,500,000 - \$5,000,000.
2	Who are the current providers/incumbents?	MMT does not have a current provider for these services so the requested information is not available.
3	If any to the above question, please provide us with the response documents that they have submitted previously.	Please see response to #2.
4	How many vendors are you planning to award?	The City (MMT) intends to make more than one award. The number of awards is dependent on the proposer's ability to satisfy the requirements set forth in the RFQ.
5	Last spending? If any.	Please see response to #2.
6	Do we need to provide actual resumes too for Project Manager Planner / Analyst? If yes, how many can we submit per position?	Proposer should provide resumes for all key personnel that they expect to work on the project. It is up to the proposer how many resumes they wish to submit, but MMT recommends providing resumes for those individuals, especially project manager(s), that would oversee the various tasks.
7	When can we expect the start of the project?	Please see RFQ, Section 1.12 Performance Period
8	Any pain points from current vendors? If any?	Please see response to #2.
9	(pg 6) The RFQ states the proposals go to the City of Colorado Springs; will MMT staff be on the evaluation team?	Yes.
10	(pg 12) points out the submission of a project schedule; can we confirm that is not a requirement since the work is not yet defined?	A project schedule is not required for proposal submission
11	(pg 13) refers to addressing whether the technical solution is realistic; can we confirm that this is not a requirement for the RFQ?	Addressing whether a technical solution is realistic is not required for proposal submission
12	(Pg 15) refers to "showing key activities"; we are unclear how to address this with the work not being defined.	A detailed schedule showing the key activities is not required for proposal submission
13	Exhibit 5 (pg 54) states that the consultant is precluded from submitting bids for future procurements; would this prevent us from responding to a City (not MMT) RFP? For example, if the work we perform is technology consulting, would we be prevented from responding to a similar proposal for the City?	A consultant(s) selected to provide services outlined in the scope of work may be precluded from submitting proposals/bids as a contractor or subcontractor if the specifications, requirements, and scope of services for such work were developed or influenced by the work performed under this scope of work.
14	Exhibit 6 (pg 58) asks for a list of current projects. As a large, national firm, we have many open projects. The form also requests contact names. Our firm has a policy of not releasing this information unless we have a release from our clients, and this is generally done after the work is complete. What is the best way to approach a response to this item to demonstrate our qualifications and experience while satisfying the requirement for information?	Proposers should select those references that are most reflective of the widest range of the tasks within Exhibit 10. Proposers can utilize both completed and open projects to include on the list, use your best judgement when determining what project to include.
15	Is "locally based" an evaluation criterion? (Information requested on Exhibit 1, Proposal Certification, on page 22 of the RFP)	No, 'locally based' is not an evaluation criteria. Please see Exhibit 9 - Evaluation Scoresheet.

16	Please confirm that bidders are not required to provide teams that can complete all projects on the Project Task List (Exhibit 10), and that bidders may submit qualifications for only certain types of projects.	MMT can confirm that bidders are not required to provide teams that can complete all projects on the Project Task List. Bidders may submit qualifications for only the projects they deem themselves qualified for.
17	During the prebid conference, you indicated that the proposer's <i>approach</i> to understanding and compliance with project requirements, schedule management, capabilities, capacity, etc., were more important than the actual questions listed in this section (pages 13-16), given this is a bench-type contract and is not looking for a response for a specific project. Please confirm that it will not count against bidders if they do not include elements such as technical solutions or project schedules (such as that mentioned on page 15).	That is correct, MMT will not count against bidders for not including elements such as technical solutions or project approach.
18	The RFP requires a minimum of three references. However, Exhibit 10 includes a very broad range of project tasks. Is the City looking for bidders to provide a reference under each type of task, or just three references overall?	MMT understands that including a reference pertaining to every task may not be feasible; however, proposers should select those references that are most reflective of the widest range of the tasks within Exhibit 10.
19	On Exhibit 6, under previous and current similar projects, what information are you seeking with respect to "Size of Project"? The instructions appear to clarify this as "contract amount," but that is requested on a separate line.	Include projects that are similar to the type of work the bidders plan to submit for.
20	Do you use scheduling software? If so, what platform? Would remote access be made available for the winning provider?	MMT utilizes the Trapeze platform for scheduling. Remote access is generally not allowable; however, MMT would be willing to discuss whether or not remote access is allowable at the time a task order would be initiated.
21	Has the City established a specific DBE goal for this project?	No, MMT has not specified a DBE goal for this project.
22	Can proposals be submitted in a sans serif font for better readability?	Yes, MMT will accept this. Please ensure font size is 10 or above.
23	Can resumes be placed in an appendix?	Yes, per the RFQ, page 15, resumes do not count toward the page limit.
24	Are subconsultants required to complete any of the forms? If so, which ones?	No, subconsultants are not required to complete any of the forms. Please list your subconsultants on the certification form.
25	Can use an 11x17 for our fee? - Is the fee to be attached in the Xcel file provided?	Yes you can use 11x17 for your proposed fees, however, the excel file was provided for use and submission in BidNet Envelope #2.
26	Do divider pages count towards the page limit?	No.
27	Can we include a graphical cover? If so does this count towards the page limit?	No.
28	Does the 10 pt font requirement apply to graphics?	No.
29	Should we include hourly rate sheets for subconsultants?	Yes.
30	Can we include RFP information and graphical elements, such as firm and City logo, RFP number and name, and deadline date in our headers and footers within the one-inch margin?	Yes, bidders can include the RFQ information and graphical elements in headers and footers within the one-inch margin.
31	Does an 11x17 count of one or two pages?	Each submission on 11x17 paper would be counted as 1.
32	Does the cover letter count towards the page limit?	No. Per 2.2 of the RFQ, the cover letter shall be no more than three pages.