



ADDENDUM NO. 1

Issue Date: August 16, 2023
Project Name: Continuing Geotechnical Engineering Consulting Services
RFQ Number: 2023061
RFQ Opening Date: **August 22, 2023**

This addendum is being released to answer questions received to date and make modifications to the RFQ documents. Duplicate questions may not receive a direct response. The information and documents contained in this addendum are hereby incorporated in the RFQ. This addendum must be acknowledged where indicated on the firm information form, or the RFQ may be declared non-responsive.

Questions and Answers

1. Can you please provide the total amount of fees that went towards Geotechnical Services during the term of the prior contract?
\$77k
2. Does the County have a list of projects that are planned throughout the duration of this new contract?
There is no detailed list, but you can reference the capital improvement plan for information on larger projects anticipated:
<https://ircgov.com/communitydevelopment/planning/CP/2030/Ch06-Capital-Improvements.pdf>
3. Does the County prefer presentation on hard copy responses (e.g. spiral or comb binding vs three-ring binder)?
No preference
4. Page 3 of the RFQ (items 6-12) lists forms required in original and electronic copies. In what section of the original/electronic response(s), should these be included?
We prefer in front for the printed original, and at the end for electronic for ease of location.
5. Are tabs/page dividers permitted with responses?
Tabs are permitted
6. Since the County wishes responses to be concise, is a Table of Contents requested or desired?
If SOQ is organized as detailed in the RFQ, a table of contents is not necessary. One is not requested, or desired.

Addendum 1

7. For Section 3 - Project Team, should respondents include an organizational chart in addition to resumes?

An organizational chart may be included, but is not required.

8. We understand any changes to the sample agreement should be submitted in “Track Changes” format. Since pdf format is an option for the electronic proposal, please confirm if the agreement should be included in Word format with the electronic response or if respondents may include a PDF version after suggesting changes.

Please submit the agreement as a pdf, with track changes visible.

9. Page 3 of the RFQ indicates a “specimen insurance form” is required for the response. Please clarify if the language should be for a sample COI.

The specimen insurance form is the same as a sample COI.

10. Item 3b (page 3 of RFQ) requires respondents to identify the representative “assigned to manage the County’s project.” Since this scope addresses multiple services, is it acceptable to provide multiple project managers? Or does the County prefer to connect with a single Project Manager for the contract?

It is acceptable to provide multiple project managers.

11. Item 5 (page 3 of RFQ) requires respondents to provide “current workload” and team availability. Our firm realizes the County wishes responses to be as concise as possible. To that end, is there a specific timeframe (e.g., past 12 months, past three years) for proposers to focus the workload response?

Workload under item 5 should indicate your current availability to provide services. Please provide projected future availability of your team in section 5 for the timeline of your choice. You do not need to also provide availability in section 3, if you would prefer to only provide in section 5.

12. Are you able to advise the percentage of this contract that will be plan review?

We do not have an estimated distribution of types of work or scope.