Revised Schedule:

The City is experiencing a delay to the procurement process for the 16th Street Mall project. The delay has been caused by the recent federal government shutdown and those impacts to the federal NEPA process for the project. The City is working to resolve those schedule issues and provide a firm procurement schedule as soon as possible. Final NEPA document reviews are ongoing and once completed, the public release of the NEPA documents will be known. At that time, we will provide specific dates for the SOQ submittals and subsequent RFP phase of the project procurement. The City believes that it is in the best interest of the project that potential proposers have the scope knowledge of the NEPA documents prior to submitting qualifications for the project. Please review the redlines for this addendum for any known revisions to the procurement schedule.

Questions and Answers:

Q1: Does the City have an expected NEPA document release date?
A1: The City does not have a firm NEPA document release date. The federal government shutdown has affected the NEPA process and associated schedule. We intend to provide a firm date for the NEPA documents’ public release as soon as that date is confirmed.

Q2: Does the City intend to extend the RFQ due date based on the actual receipt of the NEPA documents? If so, can a general extension duration be provided?
A2: Yes, the City intends to extend the RFQ due date for proposals. Specific dates will be provided when known, but we intend to allow 30 days after the public release of the NEPA documents before requiring Statement of Qualifications submittals.

Q3: In Addendum #2, tab 4, p. 20, the sentences were removed that stated to mark this section as Confidential if the Submitter does not want their information incorporated into the RFP. Please confirm that the entire SOQ will remain confidential to each team until after award, and that no one’s information will be incorporated into the RFP. We understand Section III. C Colorado Open Records Act, but this should not be applicable until after award of the project post-proposal (not after shortlist of SOQs). Please also confirm that SOQ’s will not be released to anyone requesting them via CORA until after award of the project.
A3: Submitters should not assume that any information submitted under Tab 4 is confidential. It is true that SOQ’s would not be released via a CORA request until after contract execution.

Q4: At the pre-submittal meeting, it was mentioned that the submittal due date would most likely be delayed since the environmental documents have been delayed. Please confirm if the due date will be extended and if
yes, please also confirm that the question due date will be extended. A4: No budget information will be provided as part of the RFQ process.
A4: Yes, the City intends to extend the RFQ due date for proposals. Specific dates will be provided when known, but we intend to allow 30 days after the public release of the NEPA documents before requiring Statement of Qualifications submittals.

Q5: What is the intent of the indemnity clause in Section III S. of the RFQ?
A5: The City believes the language speaks for itself. However, as an example, the City would expect to be protected against third-party claims from companies engaged by a submitter in connection with preparing the SOQ or otherwise relating to the SOQ or project.

Q6: What is the status of the utility relocation agreements? Please provide the list of utility companies that the City is getting agreements with.
A6: The City is in the process of creating utility relocation agreements specific to the 16th Street Mall Project. The details of those agreements and all project scope related to utilities will be provided in the RFP.

Q7: As has been done on some past projects, please provide a list of selection committee members.
A7: The City will not be providing selection committee names for the RFQ procurement process.

Q8: Can the timeframe for the project be adjusted to reflect the anticipated delay due to the incomplete environmental documents? Specifically, we ask that the deadline for submission of questions be extended by a minimum of two weeks, and more appropriately by the same extension time that will be given to the SOQ submission.
A8: Yes, the City intends to extend the RFQ due date for proposals. Specific dates will be provided when known, but we intend to allow 30 days after the public release of the NEPA documents before requiring Statement of Qualifications submittals. The question due date has also been extended. Please see redlines attached to this addendum for the new date.

Q9: What is the anticipated timing for the issuance of the Addendum that will identify the new schedule and environmental documents?
A9: The City does not have a firm NEPA document release date. The federal government shutdown has affected the NEPA process and associated schedule. We intend to provide a firm date in a future addendum for the NEPA documents’ public release as soon as that date is confirmed.

Q10: Regarding the key personnel, we recognize the adjustments that were made in Addendum #2, however we would like to further request that the Design Build Project Manager requirements be modified to accommodate a minimum of 15 years of heavy civil construction experience and not 20 years of Design Build experience. 20 years of Design Build experience will be difficult to accommodate due to the timing of design build in the heavy civil construction market/industry. During the RFQ workshop meeting, it was stated by CCD that these would be “guidelines” rather than requirements. Can CCD please confirm that what is stated in the RFQ may be used as guidelines and not requirements?
A10: Please see revised RFQ. The 20-year Design Build experience language has been modified to a “guideline and expectation”.

Q11: Can CCD please confirm that it is acceptable to submit the SOQ in a spiral bound format?
A11: The City will accept SOQs in either a plastic comb binder format or spiral bound format. No three ring binders will be accepted.

Q12: As currently configured, the RFQ requires litigation information for the Submitter in Tab 2, Submitter Experience. For multi-firm teams and joint ventures, this may require several pages in a page limited document. Please confirm that this material is outside the page count restrictions. Also, is it acceptable to include this information in the Appendix?
A12: Litigation disclosure information will not be included in the page count restriction. Yes, it is acceptable to include the information in the Appendix.

Q13: The Litigation information that is requested appears to be the same information that is to be provided with our Special Permission Application and that was provided with our general CCD prequalification. Please confirm that the City actually requires this information to supplement what has already been provided. A13: Yes, the City will require proposers to include the litigation disclosure in their SOQ. Prequalification documents are reviewed independently by the Prequalification Board, and SOQs will be reviewed by the selection committee.

Q14: The City currently is reviewing Qualifications for the Professional Services for On-Call ADA Architectural and Technical Design Services (Project Control No. PWIMP2018-003). Please indicate if the services procured under this contract will have overlap, primacy or other affects/input in to the current ADA scope anticipated under the 16th Street DB Project. A14: All ADA services procured under the 16th Street Mall contract are standalone and separate from the ADA Design services contracts.

Q15: Will ADA/Engineering subconsultants selected under the Professional Services for On-Call ADA Architectural and Technical Design Services (Project Control No. PWIMP2018-003) be precluded from providing services for the current ADA scope anticipated under the 16th Street DB Project? A15: All conflict questions must be submitted in writing and include specific firm names.

Q16: Please provide a list of disallowed stakeholders, if any (e.g. stakeholders, community or otherwise who proposers who proposers may not speak with during the Statement of Qualifications procurement process) A16: All questions regarding the project procurement must be submitted to Dani Abbott via the procurement email box.

Q17: It can be reasonably argued that the normal litigation "load" for any firm is partially and directly proportional to the firm’s size and gross yearly revenues (more work = greater exposure). Thus the requirement to detail litigation in "Tab 2 - Submitter Experience" may have an unequal effect on specific proposers larger than others. We respectfully ask that this requirement is eliminated from the Page Count (e.g. allowed as an attachment or appendix item) A17: Litigation disclosure information will not be included in the page count restriction. Yes, it is acceptable to include the information in the Appendix or as an attachment.

End of Addendum #3