

ADDENDUM NO. 1

TO: Interested Firms

FROM: **Sadia Khan, PE, Ph. D., Assoc. DBIA**
Construction, AES, and Facilities Assistant Procurement Manager
General Services – City Procurement

DATE: **February 11, 2026**

PROJECT: **Progressive Design-Build Services for Bryant Farms Road Extension Phase II Project
(Rea Road to Ardrey Kell Road)**
RFQ # 269-2026-166

The following items are being issued herein for clarification, addition and/or deletion and are incorporated into the solicitation referenced above.

MODIFICATIONS TO RFQ

1. On page 15 of the RFQ, delete **Section 2.6.18.2** in its entirety and replace it with the following:

2.6.18.2 Projects that utilized the following delivery methods: 1) progressive design-build (PDB), 2) construction management at risk (CMAR), **3) Construction Manager/General Contractor (CMGC)**, 4) design-build fixed price or 5) traditional design-bid-build. Projects are listed in priority order with PDB being the preferred delivery method. To avoid any doubt a PDB project will be rated higher than a CMAR, design-build fixed price or design-bid-build project and a CMAR project will be rated higher than a design-build fixed price or design-bid-build project.
2. On page 27 of the RFQ, delete **Section 4.3.2.2.1** in its entirety and replace it with the following:

4.3.2.2.1 Only resumes for Key Personnel, **Alternate Key Personnel**, and up to five Other Team Members should be submitted.
3. On page 27 of the RFQ, delete **Section 4.3.2.2.2** in its entirety and replace it with the following:

4.3.2.2.2 Key Personnel **and Alternate Key Personnel** resumes are limited to two (2) pages each.
4. On page 29 of the RFQ, delete **Section 4.3.3.1** in its entirety and replace it with the following:

4.3.3.1 Section 2 Page limit: Total 10 pages maximum with Project Descriptions at 2 pages maximum and per project; Project/Team Member relationship chart at 1 page maximum. **Page allocation across sections is at the proposer's discretion, provided the pages do not exceed the specified limit.**
5. On page 31 of the RFQ, delete **Section 4.3.4.5** in its entirety and replace it with the following:

4.3.4.5 ~~Provide comments on the Project scope versus budget as described in this RFQ and perceived needs of the Project~~ **Provide comments on the alignment of the Project scope with the City's established budget and the Offeror's approach to managing scope, risk, and decision-making during the project.**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. As we formulate our response as to if the project scope can be performed within the \$57 million budget, we'd like to ask if a budget breakdown is available to share with all contractors? Preferably if a budget with geometric unit rate prices is available (i.e.. CY of borrow, TN of steel, CY of concrete, etc...) that would be ideal.

Response: The following planning-level pay items and quantities are provided for reference only. These quantities are intended to support high-level understanding of the anticipated scope; the selected Design-Builder remains fully responsible for developing its own detailed quantities and cost estimate.

Item	Quantity	Unit
Mobilization	1	LS
Undercut Excavation	2,500	CY
Comprehensive Grading	1	LS
Select Material	2,500	TN
Erosion Control	1	LS
18" R.C. Pipe Culverts, Class IV	8,214	LF
24" R.C. Pipe Culverts, Class IV	8,214	LF
Masonry Drainage Structures	41	EA
Frame with Grate (all types)	41	EA
Thermoplastic Pavement Marking Lines, 6", 90 mils	3,727	LF
Thermoplastic Pavement Marking Lines, 24", 120 mils	435	LF
Thermoplastic Pavement Marking Lines, 6", 120 mils	14,225	LF
Thermoplastic Pavement Marking Lines, 12", 120 mils	1,355	LF
Thermoplastic Pavement Marking Symbols, 90 mils:	50	EA
Contractor Furnished, Type E Sign	256	SF
Sign Erection, Type E	48	EA
Bridge (63' x 252')	15,876	SF
Reinforced Concrete Box Culvert (2 @ 7' x 7')	77	LF
Water Line Relocation	2,300	LF
Sewer Line Relocation	500	LF
Milling Asphalt Pavement, 0.0" to 3.0"	2,697	SY
Asphalt Concrete Base Course, Type B 25.0C	10,927	TN
Asphalt Concrete Intermediate Course, Type I 19.0C	5,898	TN
Asphalt Concrete Surface Course, Type S 9.5C	4,573	TN
Asphalt Binder for Plant Mix	1,284	TN
2' 6" Concrete Curb and Gutter	15,740	LF
1' 6" Concrete Curb and Gutter	367	LF
1'-6" Median Curb and Gutter - CLDS 10.17B	320	LF
Concrete Wheelchair/Accessible Ramps (22 ramps @ 16 SY)	352	SY
6" Concrete Shared Use Path (SUP)	16,970	SY

Item	Quantity	Unit
12" Concrete Truck Apron	480	SY
5" Monolithic Concrete Islands	450	SY
Wall, Modular Concrete Retaining	10,100	SF
4" Concrete Sidewalk or pad	750	SY
Traffic Signals	2	EA
Signal Modification	1	LS
Traffic Control	1	LS
36-inch DIP	6,600	LF
36-inch GV	8	EA
12-inch DIP	4,700	LF
12-inch GV	10	EA
8-inch DIP	200	LF
8-inch GV	4	EA
Standard Hydrant	8	EA
HV Double Storz Hydrant	8	EA
2-inch Air Release	4	EA
2-inch Blow Off	4	EA
Anode Test Station	2	EA
DIP Fittings	50,000	LB
Foundation Conditioning Material	600	TON
Bore under creek	250	LF

2. Please clarify if Construction Manager/General Contractor (CMGC) projects will be rated equivalent to Construction Management At Risk (CMAR) per Section 2.1.18.2 of the RFQ?

Response: For purposes of evaluation under this RFQ, Construction Manager/General Contractor (CMGC) project experience will be considered equivalent to Construction Management At Risk (CMAR) project experience, provided the CMGC project demonstrates similar characteristics related to early contractor involvement, collaborative delivery, progressive pricing, and shared risk management consistent with CMAR delivery.

Offerors should clearly identify the delivery method used and describe how the CMGC project aligns with the characteristics of CMAR as outlined in the RFQ.

3. Section 4.3.2.14 states resumes are required for Alternate Key Personnel. Section 4.3.2.2.1 states only resumes are required for Key Personnel and five other Team Members. Please confirm whether resumes for Alternate Key Personnel are required. If they are required, which format should we follow (one-page or two-page)?

Response: As defined in the RFQ, Alternate Key Personnel serve as backup personnel who may be assigned if a Key Personnel individual is unable to fulfill their role. Offeror providing Alternate Key Personnel, shall be subject to the same resume format and page limitations as Key Personnel. Resumes for Alternate Key Personnel shall not exceed two (2) pages each.

- 4. Does the number of projects presented under each category effect scoring? With a 1-page relationship chart, presenting 9 projects would limit each to a 1 page maximum description.**

Response: The number of projects presented does not, by itself, affect scoring. Offerors are encouraged to present projects that best demonstrate relevant experience and alignment with the evaluation criteria, within the page limits established in the RFQ.

The City will evaluate the quality, relevance, and clarity of the project experience presented rather than the quantity of projects submitted. Offerors should use their judgment to determine the number of projects to include and the level of detail provided for each, so long as the total page limits are not exceeded.

- 5. If we choose a Design-Build project to highlight, are we allowed to present it only as a design or construction effort and have it only count toward the project maximum (3) in that category?**

Response: If a referenced project was delivered using a Design-Build delivery method but the Offeror or proposed Project Team member served only in a design role, the project may be presented under the design experience category and will count toward the maximum number of projects allowed in that category.

Similarly, if the Offeror or proposed Project Team member served only in a construction role, the project may be presented under the construction experience category and will count toward the maximum number of projects allowed in that category.

Projects may be presented under Section 4.3.3.4 (Collaborative Project Delivery Experience) if the proposed Project Team members worked together on the referenced project in a collaborative delivery capacity consistent with the intent of that section.

- 6. Could you please share more detail on timing of funding and associated restrictions? Will this funding framework apply to all construction items, or specific items?**

Response: Funding for the project will be 100 percent City-funded. The CDOT portion of the funding is programmed across multiple bond cycles, while Charlotte Water funding is provided through its adopted Capital Investment Plan.

The funding framework referenced in Section 4.3.4.12 reflects the City's current capital planning assumptions and anticipated timing of funding availability across multiple fiscal years. While additional funding sources may become available that could expedite portions of the work, the City is seeking an approach that addresses the current phased funding plan. At this stage, funding allocations by fiscal year are intended to guide overall project planning and sequencing rather than prescribe specific construction activities or limits by funding source.

Offerors are encouraged to describe a flexible and collaborative approach to managing phased funding while maintaining project momentum and minimizing impacts to overall delivery, recognizing that funding timing and constraints may evolve as the project advances.

- 7. Does the City have the location of the possible areas of debris? Does the City know the nature of the Debris? Is there a possibility of contamination/GeoEnvironmental concerns?**

Response: The City does not have confirmed locations, extents, or detailed characterization of the debris.

The Design-Builder will be responsible for performing geotechnical investigations, subsurface utility engineering, and any additional evaluations necessary during Phase 1 services to confirm subsurface conditions, identify potential debris, and assess any associated risks in accordance with applicable regulations and standards.

8. Has the City made commitments or had discussions with the stakeholders regarding any special aesthetic considerations for treatments on Retaining Walls? Bridges Rails? etc.?

Response: The City has not made any commitments or finalized decisions regarding specific aesthetic treatments for retaining walls, bridge rails, or other architectural features. Final decisions related to aesthetic treatments will be developed during Phase 1 services through continued coordination with the City and stakeholders, balancing community input, technical requirements, budget, and long-term maintenance considerations.

The Design-Builder will be expected to support the City in maintaining consistent and transparent communication with stakeholders and to incorporate public input into the design process where appropriate, while recognizing that not all preferences may be feasible or adopted.

9. Will the DB Team be committed to using the exact firms/subcontractors listed in these forms, and/or the individual percentages listed, or are these meant for a general plan for CBI goal achievement, with exact teaming and committed percentages to be reevaluated at the contract execution stage for both Phase 1 and Phase 2?

Response: The firms and participation percentages identified in Form 5 represent the Design-Build Team's commitment at the time of SOQ submittal and will be evaluated accordingly.

The Design-Build Team will be expected to utilize the firms identified in Form 5 for Phase 1 and Form 5 for Phase 2 and to meet the proposed participation levels listed. These commitments are not intended to be illustrative or aspirational.

Any proposed changes to listed firms or participation percentages shall require prior City review and approval and must be supported by documented justification. Changes based solely on convenience or preference will not be considered sufficient justification. Any approved changes must continue to support achievement of the applicable Charlotte Business INclusion (CBI) goals.

Final confirmation of participation levels will occur at contract execution and through subsequent amendments, as applicable, consistent with the commitments evaluated during the procurement.

10. Who is responsible for ROW Acquisition payments? ie. will this money be paid by the Contractor or directly from the City?

Response: The Design Builder is responsible for providing all required right of way acquisition services, including coordination with the City's Real Estate Division, preparation and implementation of the Real Estate Acquisition Management Plan (RAMP), and support documentation required for acquisitions and condemnations. Payment to property owners for right of way acquisition, easements, and relocation costs will be handled directly by the City.

11. Regarding the RFQ's request to "Provide comments on the Project scope versus budget as described in this RFQ and perceived needs of the Project", would the City be willing to consider asking for this response in a separate sealed envelope separate from the scorable RFQ response? In a true Progressive Design-Build procurement, final pricing should have no bearing on the scoring of the qualification package, and we are concerned that a response to this question could be viewed as favorable or unfavorable in a very subjective manner. We understand the need of the City for market input into the overall budget, and therefore propose

that this question be responded to by Contractors in a separate sealed envelope to be opened after all scoring is complete.

Response: The intent of this question is to understand each Offeror's approach to managing scope, risk, and decision-making during Phase 1 services in order to align the Project with the City's established funding framework. The City is not requesting pricing, cost proposals, or detailed evaluations of budget adequacy as part of the RFQ.

Offerors should focus their response on processes, methodologies, and collaborative practices that will be used to guide design development, identify key cost drivers, manage risk, and support informed scope and funding alignment within a Progressive Design-Build delivery approach. If an Offeror identifies potential funding or scope considerations based on its experience with similar projects, those observations may be noted at a high level without providing cost opinions or estimates.

Responses will be evaluated qualitatively based on demonstrated project understanding and approach and will not include cost-based scoring. As such, a separate sealed response is not required, and responses to this question will be evaluated consistent with the RFQ evaluation criteria.

- 12. Section 1 – 4.3.2.5 states "In tabular format, identify prior projects included in the SOQ on which any individuals proposed as Key Personnel for this project held roles as Key Personnel. Identify the roles those proposed Key Personnel held on those prior projects in the table." Section 2 – 4.3.3.7 states "Include a single matrix chart illustrating the relationship/connection of the Project Team for this Project working on the up to nine (9) Projects of Similar Scope and Complexity provided per 4.3.3.2, 4.3.3.3. and 4.3.3.4 of this RFQ, from both company/firm perspective and Key Personnel and Alternate Key personnel perspective." With these two matrices showing the same information, is it acceptable to refer the reader back to Section 1 as part of Section 2 and to only show the matrix once as part of Section 1?**

Response: While there is some overlap in the information presented in Section 1 – 4.3.2.5 and Section 2 – 4.3.3.7, the two matrices are intended to communicate different aspects of the Project Team's qualifications.

The table required in Section 1 is personnel-focused. It identifies prior projects on which proposed Key Personnel served in Key Personnel roles and specifies the roles they held. Its purpose is to demonstrate individual experience and leadership continuity.

The matrix required in Section 2 is team-focused. It illustrates the relationship and integration of the Project Team across the referenced Projects of Similar Scope and Complexity, from both firm and individual perspectives. Its purpose is to demonstrate prior collaboration and team cohesion.

Because the intent of the two matrices is distinct, Offerors should provide each in their respective section as requested. While underlying data may overlap, each matrix should be structured to address the specific objective of the section in which it appears.

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 1