



CITY OF PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND

Department: Planning and Development

RFP Title: Planning, Engineering, And Design Services for Safe Streets Projects

Opening Date: 01/29/2024

Addendum #: 2

Issue Date: 01/19/2024

The purpose of this addendum is to answer questions received by the Planning Department



CITY OF PROVIDENCE
MAYOR BRETT P. SMILEY

Bid Addendum #2

Planning, Engineering, And Design Services

for Safe Streets Projects

MinuteTraq ID: 43591

ADDENDUM NO. 2

Planning, Engineering, and Design For Safe Streets Projects

PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND

The information, clarifications and revisions contained in this addendum are to be incorporated as ADDENDUM NO. 2 – PLANNING, ENGINEERING, AND DESIGN SERVICES FOR SAFE STREETS PROJECTS (4.5 YEAR BLANKET CONTRACT). All referenced changes are to become part of the Contract Documents:

- This addendum answers initial questions submitted to the Planning Department,

Q: Could you please confirm if “Bid Form 4: Affidavit of City Vendor” is required if our company / executive officers are not headquartered in Rhode Island? We do have a Rhode Island office, but it is not the corporate headquarters. The note “Executive officers who are not residents of the state of Rhode Island are exempted from this requirement” is making me question the inclusion of this form in our response. If not required, should we include it just indicating “N/A” so it is not seen as missing?

A: All forms included in the RFQ are required. The way this form was filled out by Arup in a recent proposal available [here](#) (on page 4) was to enter “0” in the field for “The number of persons or entities in your entity that are required to report under Sec. 21.-28.1 (e):” and to still fill out all the fields and check the appropriate boxes for a through d.

Q: We would like to submit a question related to the recent addendum that was issued for the SS4A RFQ. It is mentioned that separate tabs for each task should be used – however we are finding this approach may lead to a longer and more repetitive response. Is it acceptable to keep items like project understanding and approach in a combined section with defined subheadings that address each task individually in addition to the project as a whole? Or is the preference to repeat any information that may be relevant to more than one task within each task’s section?

A: Either method of organizing the response is acceptable, as long as your qualifications for each task can be evaluated independently. Combining items like project understanding and describing in a clear manner how it applies to each task is fine as long as the section’s organization is intuitive for the reviewer.

Q: During the pre-bid meeting you stated you are looking for responses only from firms that will be prime contractors for tasks 1-4 in the RFQ. Can you clarify the City’s intended approach to provide skills/knowledge in some of the areas listed within the task descriptions that might be provided by subcontractors to the prime firms? Would any work under these tasks be bid separately to the City’s pre-qualified list, especially if the selected prime firms may not have certain expertise in-house?

A: The City’s intended approach is to allow for subcontractors to be utilized as part of task orders associated with this blanket contract. It is only the initial qualification phase for which only prime contractors will be evaluated. In addition, task orders may be issued for specific areas of expertise or for specific geographies, depending on the needs of the project. Any task

ADDENDUM NO. 2
Planning, Engineering, and Design
For Safe Streets Projects

PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND

orders associated with this contract will utilize only the list of qualified firms selected through this solicitation, while it is the City's expectation that some subcontractors on task orders may not be firms on the list, due to specialized expertise at that company.