



## CITY OF ATLANTA

Kasim Reed  
Mayor

SUITE 1900  
55 TRINITY AVENUE, SW  
ATLANTA, GA 30303  
(404) 330-6204 Fax: (404) 658-7705  
Internet Home Page: [www.aflantaga.gov](http://www.aflantaga.gov)

DEPARTMENT OF PROCUREMENT  
Adam L. Smith, Esq., CPPO, CPPB, CPPM, CPP,  
CIPC, CISCC, CIGPM, CPPC  
Chief Procurement Officer  
[asmith@atlantaga.gov](mailto:asmith@atlantaga.gov)

February 10, 2016

Dear Potential Proponents:

**Re: FC-8662, Red Light Running Photo Enforcement System**

Attached is one (1) copy of **Addendum Number 5**, which is hereby made a part of the above-referenced project.

For additional information, please contact Ms. Joyce Webb, Contracting Officer, at (404) 330-6893 or by email at [jnwebb@atlantaga.gov](mailto:jnwebb@atlantaga.gov).

Sincerely,

Adam L. Smith

ALS/jnw



**ADDENDUM NO. 5**

This Addendum No. 5 forms a part of the Request for Proposals (“RFP”) and modifies the original solicitation package and any prior addenda as noted below and is issued to incorporate the following:

1. **Attachment No. 1:** Response to Seventy Five (75) Questions.
2. **Revision:** In Part 2, Section 3.2.3.3, replace “For each resume provided, Proponent must provide a minimum of two (2), one (1) to two (2) page letters of recommendation from clients for whom that individual has held a similar role within the past ten (10) years.” with the following: “For each resume provided, Proponent must provide a minimum of two (2) references (names) and their current contact information from clients for whom that individual has held a similar role within the past ten (10) years.”
3. **Revision:** In Part 1, Section 14: How to Submit Proposals, replace “FC-8420: Design Build MLK, Jr Recreational and Aquatic Facility,” with “FC-8662: Red Light Running Photo Enforcement System”.
4. **Revision:** In Appendix B, Section C: Commercial General Liability Insurance, Pesticide or Herbicide Applicator Coverage is not applicable to this project.
5. **Revision:** The Georgia Utility Contractor’s License has been removed as a requirement for this RFP. Please delete all references to the requirement of a Georgia Utility Contractor’s License from this RFP.

The last day for questions was Thursday, January 7, 2016 at 5:00pm.

**The Proposal due date has NOT been modified and Proposals are due on Wednesday, February 17, 2016 and should be time stamped in no later than 2:00 P.M. EST and delivered to the address listed below:**

Adam L. Smith, Esq., CPPO, CPPB, CPPM, CPP,  
CIPC, CISCC, CIGPM, CPPC  
Chief Procurement Officer  
Department of Procurement  
55 Trinity Avenue, S. W.  
City Hall South, Suite 1900  
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

**\*\*All other pertinent information is to remain unchanged\*\***



**FC-8662, Red Light Running Photo Enforcement System**

**Addendum No. 5**

**February 10, 2016**

**Page 3**

**Acknowledgment of Addendum No. 5**

Proponents must sign below and return this form with Proposal to the Department of Procurement, 55 Trinity Avenue, City Hall South, Suite 1900, Atlanta, Georgia 30303 as acknowledgment of receipt of this Addendum.

This is to acknowledge receipt of Addendum No. 5 for **FC-8662, Red Light Running Photo Enforcement System** on this the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Legal Company Name of Proponent

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Authorized Representative

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



# Attachment No. 1

---

## Questions and Answers

1. Georgia Utility Contractor's License - Section 1, Page 3, Item 11 states "The Proponent shall provide its Georgia Utility Contractor's License Number and a copy of the license with the documentation submitted in Part 4 of this RFP. A utility Contractor's license number held by a Subcontractor or issued by another state does NOT fulfill this requirement in lieu of the Proponent's Georgia Utility Contractor's License." From our experience, this license is not industry standard among photo enforcement companies and severely limits and restricts the competition for this RFP. It is our understanding that the majority of companies in the photo enforcement industry do not have this type of license. Typically the Utility Contractor's License is needed when a Contractor is digging more than 5 feet underground; our system install typically runs 2-3 feet underground.
  - o Due to the restrictive nature of this requirement, will the City remove the Utility Contractor's License requirement?
  - o If the City cannot remove the need for the license, will the City either allow the Contractor to partner with a subcontractor that has this license or allow the Contractor to obtain this license or show proof of the license after the contract award?

**Answer: See Addendum No. 5, Item No. 5.**

2. With regard to the requirement that the red light camera provider be a licensed Georgia Utility Contractor, would the City waive this requirement if all work being provided is done by a licensed subcontractor? If not, would the City consider the red light camera vendor's pending application for such license at the time of proposal submission? The reason for this request is because red light camera vendors do not generally carry such license, and waiving this would allow the City to receive more (and thus more competitive) proposals from camera vendors using local subcontractors who are more familiar with the City's infrastructure to perform the work.

**Answer: See Addendum No. 5, Item No. 5.**

3. Part 1. Section 11 Georgia Utility Contractor's License: For Section 11, the City requires the vender to provide a current Utility Contractors License. If the company submitting the proposal does not directly complete this work, but subcontracts it to a local construction company, would the Utility Contractors incense from the Company who will actually be performing the work be acceptable to submit for this requirement?

**Answer: See Addendum No. 5, Item No. 5.**

4. General: Can the contractor apply and obtain a license prior to beginning construction instead of having the license before submission and still meet the requirement.

**Answer: See Addendum No. 5, Item No. 5.**

5. Who do I contact with the State to determine if we have a GA. Utility Contractor's License?

**Answer: Contact the State of Georgia Construction Industry Licensing Board.**

6. Traffic Engineering (TE) Analysis and Report - Page 2 of exhibit A – Scope of Work, point 2-B: It is our understanding that the work outlined in the Traffic Engineering (TE) Analysis and Report was completed in RFP FC-7828 Red Light Running Photo Enforcement System Studies, issued March 16, 2015.

- Is that true and, if so, will the results/report be provided and will this requirement be modified?

**Answer: The City has not received a preliminary TE Analysis previous to this RFP.**

- If not, can this requirement be modified to the vendor conducting a survey of each potential site to determine the volume of red light runners?

**Answer: The Consultant is required to complete a TE study as per the Scope of Work.**

- Georgia Code §40-14-21 requires that for each designated intersection the City conduct a traffic engineering study that the City submit with its operation permit applications. The RFP requires that the Consultant perform the traffic engineering study. Please confirm that this requirement is not inconsistent with the requirements of Georgia Code §40-14-21.

**Answer: The City may appoint a consultant to perform the studies on its behalf.**

7. Part 1: 23 Award of Agreement; Execution Page 6. Will the City negotiate mutually agreeable modifications to the City's Draft Construction Services Agreement with the selected proposer? If so, does the proposer need to submit for consideration its proposed modifications to the Draft Agreement as part of the proposal for consideration?

**Answer: Proponent(s) should submit exceptions to the draft agreement with their proposal in the cover letter.**

If a proposer is selected and declines to enter into the Construction Services Agreement based on proposed modifications that are rejected by the City, will the proposer forfeit its bid bond?

**Answer: Yes.**

8. Was the previous RFP (FC-7828) for the Red Light Running Photo Enforcement System Studies awarded? If so, to whom?

- Can the City provide a copy of the results from any study performed in connection with that prior RFP?
- Can the City provide the list of the individuals who compiled the study?

**Answer: No, FC-7828 was not awarded.**

9. Section 2, pg. 4, 3.2.3.3 - The requirement on section 2, pg. 4, 3.2.3.3 requires letters of recommendation for each role identified in section 3.2.3.1 (i.e. Traffic Installer, Inspector, System Analyzer, Inspection Supervisor and Site Safety Officer).

- As the proposer is providing references and is guaranteeing the quality and timely completion of the project, can the City delete the requirement for letters of reference for individual members of the team given the likely burden on existing clients?
- If not deleted in its entirety, may this requirement be updated to only require the letters of recommendation for the Program Manager, instead of for all the roles identified in section 3.2.3.1?

**Answer: No. See Addendum No. 5, Item No. 2.**

10. Page 4 of Exhibit A – Scope of Work, point 3-B-5: States “the location name and a contact person shall be included with the sample sets”. Most municipalities request that personal information about violators remain confidential and do not want personal violator data released or cannot by law allow release of personal violator data.
- To clarify, the City is looking for a contact person to answer questions about the photos, not the contact information for the vehicle depicted in the photos, correct?

**Answer: Correct.**

11. Scope of Work page 5 of 16 B. 22: Is the City enforcing turn movements (right and/or left)?

**Answer: Yes.**

12. Scope of Work Page 10 of 16 Section 9 paragraph 3 and Scope of Work Page 4 of 16 #9: The camera must be able to capture three (3) color photographs per violation,...Is it acceptable to the City if the third image of the registration plate is cropped from either the first or second image that is taken by the camera? Does the data bar need to be on the plate image as well?

**Answer: The City prefers three (3) distinct images. However, if this is not possible, the third image may be cropped from either image 1 or 2.**

13. Page 7 of Exhibit A – Scope of Work, point 5-4: Please provide a list of reputable polling organizations approved by the City.

**Answer: The City does not have an approved list of polling organizations. Proponent(s) should use their best judgment when selecting a polling organization to use.**

14. Scope of Work Page 11 of 16 10 A 6: Please explain what a certified copy of the tag registration information is that needs to be provided for evidence packages and provide an example? Is there an associated cost with obtaining a certified copy?

**Answer: As part of violation processing a violation notice should include a copy of a certificate sworn to or affirmed by a certified peace officer employed by a law enforcement agency authorized to enforce the code section violated. A nominal cost may be associated with the procurement of this certificate.**

15. Scope of Work page 12/13 of 16 12. B. 1: The volume of certified mailings is unknown and significantly impacts vendor costs. In order to provide the best pricing to the City and to ensure a common evaluation of vendor pricing, will the City (1) reconsider allowing certified mail costs as reimbursable, or (2) specify an expected volume of monthly certified mailings that all vendors should assume for pricing?

**Answer: Proponent may assume one thousand (1,000) mailings for the purpose of this Proposal.**

16. Scope of Work page 11 of 16 10. A. 6: The volume of certified tag registrations is unknown and could significantly impact vendor costs. In order to provide the best pricing to the City and to ensure a common evaluation of vendor pricing, will the City (1) reconsider allowing certified tag registration costs as reimbursable, or (2) specify an expected volume of monthly certified tag registration volume that all vendors should assume for pricing?

**Answer: See response to Question 15.**

17. Section 3.2.3.1 Key Personnel Identification and Resumes: The RFP refers to a Traffic Installer, Inspector, System Analyzer, Inspection Supervisor, and Site Safety Officer as key personnel. Can the City please clarify these job descriptions? Is it acceptable for the vendor to provide key personnel on the program with different titles if they perform the functions in the job descriptions?

**Answer: Yes.**

18. Section 1, pg. 4, 14 requests that the package labeling include the following "FC-8420: Design Build MLK, Jr Recreational and Aquatic Facility". Should this be modified to "FC-8662: Red Light Running Photo Enforcement System"?

**Answer: See Addendum No. 5, Item No. 3.**

19. The proposal requests the following information about a proponent's previous red light program (data from approximately 2012):

- Annual number of detections
- Annual number of printed citations/notices
- Annual number of paid citations
- Annual collection (payment) rate
- The proposal also requests an estimate of the following values for the red light program:
  - Annual number of detections per system
  - Annual number of printed citations/notices
- The proposal document does not specify the number of requested systems. How many intersections does the City plan to assess during the Traffic Engineering Analysis?

**Answer: The successful Proponent should conduct their own research and evaluation to identify potential intersections and approaches for Red Light Camera Systems ("RLC"). Please see Question 21 for number of intersections.**

20. Section 7 of the Scope of Work (Project Work Plan) states that the first camera system must be installed within 90 days of final City selection and all camera systems thereafter must be installed every 60 days (in increments of five) until all systems are installed. If the Georgia Department of Transportation does not provide permits with enough time (through no fault of the contractor or City) to allow for the camera systems to be installed within the 90 and 60-day timeframes, would the City make an exception for those cases?

**Answer: It will be determined on a case by case basis.**

21. Is there an anticipated number of system builds upon contract award?

**Answer: If by "systems" you mean intersections with RLCs, please assume a range of 20-25 systems, however the vendor is responsible for determining a realistic number to make the program sustainable and successful from a safety stand point.**

22. How many red-light camera approaches does the City expect to be installed during the contract period?

**Answer: If an average of two (2) cameras per intersection is assumed, and based upon the assumptions identified in Response 21 above, it would be 40-50 approaches.**

23. If there is the possibility to expand the install base throughout the contract, please advise on the number of anticipated additional systems and the timeframe for any such anticipated expansion.

**Answer: It should be up to the vendor to determine additional systems according to contract timeline and approved intervals.**

24. What were the intersection locations and directions of travel of historical systems (from approximately 2012)?

**Answer: See response to Question 19.**

25. Where should we put our response to Exhibit A: Scope of Work in our proposal? There is no identified tab in the City's preferred layout. We recommend creating a Volume 3 and limiting it to 50 pages.

**Answer: The Scope of Work is provided to familiarize the proponents with the technical specs for the project. It does not require a response.**

26. Section 1, pg. 3, item 12 indicates that the pricing form be broken into the appropriate spaces. The pricing form provided asks for the Vendors contact information and the rest is blank. Will a modified form be released?

**Answer: The Proponents must submit their own Cost Proposal Form to include the information requested in the RFP.**

27. Will the term of the contract begin at contract signing or after the first enforcement system go-live?

**Answer: The term of the contract shall begin upon issuance of a Notice To Proceed (NTP).**

28. Exhibit A, pg. 15, A Lockbox – Will the City allow us to send the prior day's settled funds that are in the City's account minus any un-cleared checks (so that the account will not go negative when the check clears), any fee balance amount that the Contractor retains in the account to pay for fees the Contractor is responsible for and the amount of the merchant fees during the first few days of the month (so the account doesn't go negative)?

**Answer: This will be determined at the time of contract execution. You may include this as part of your proposed plan.**

29. Will the City be providing an updated SBE-3 form to eliminate the NAIC column?

**Answer: No. However, bidders may omit providing NAICS codes.**

30. Is the City open to negotiations of the sample draft Construction Services contract provided by the City in Section 5. Examples of terms we would like to discuss include unamortized cost recovery upon the City's termination for convenience pursuant to draft contract Section 11.1 Is the City open to these negotiations?

**Answer: See response to Question 7.**

31. Appendix A, pg. 6 notes the Small Business Enterprise target for this program is 35%, with a good fair effort to satisfy through subcontractors. Please confirm if this amount is a goal or a minimum requirement.

**Answer: This is a goal. However, all bidders must be sure to document their efforts to achieve the 35% goal by submitting a listing of certified firms they have contacted relative to this directive (on Form SBE-2). Failure to complete this requirement may result in your bid being deemed nonresponsive.**

32. Regarding Form 4.1 Certification of Insurance Ability: Due to the complexity of the RFP, our insurance company may not have the time to fully vet the document so may be unwilling to sign the Certificate of Insurance Ability form. While we have placed the request with our insurance company, would an acceptable alternative be to have an officer of the vendor sign the form?

**Answer: No.**

33. Regarding Appendix B - Insurance & Bonding Requirements (pg. 1 of 5), is a standard ACORD 25 Certificate of Insurance acceptable to meet this requirement?

**Answer: Yes.**

34. Regarding Appendix B- Insurance & Bonding Requirements (pg. 2 of 5), point 4 (notice of Cancellation & Renewal), may the timing obligation be reduced to 5 working days instead of the 15 days?

**Answer: No.**

35. Regarding Appendix B - Insurance & Bonding Requirements (pg. 3 of 5), point 8 (Additional Insured Endorsement Form), we agree with naming the City as an additional insured, however, our insurance company may not utilize form CG20260704. May we provide a substitute form that provides the same information?

**Answer: Yes.**

36. ISO Form – Please confirm that the ISO form requested is CG 00 01, not CG 00 00 01.

- o Please explain what the City would deem sufficiently “equivalent” or how the City intends to determine sufficient equivalency to the desired ISO form.

**Answer: As long as the form encompasses all of the specific requirements listed under General Liability in Appendix B then it is in compliance.**

37. In reference to Appendix B, Insurance & Bonding Requirements, Page 2 of 5, Item A.4, we respectfully request that the City consider adding email transmission for the notification to the City and extending the two-day timeframe for notification to at least five days. Most insurance policies have a 60 or 90-day cancellation provision.

**Answer: The City will provide an email address to the winning Proponent for notifications. Cancellation provisions will remain unchanged.**

38. Regarding Appendix B, Insurance & Bonding Requirements, Page 3 of 5, Item A.5, would the City waive this requirement?

**Answer: No.**

39. Regarding Appendix B - Insurance & Bonding Requirements (pg. 3 of 5), point 8 (Additional Insured Endorsement Form), the statement "the City must be an additional insured user "all insurance (except worker's compensation and professional liability" is extremely broad.

- o Will it suffice to name the City as an additional insured under CGL insurance, per item C in this Appendix, and Designated Insured status for Auto coverage, per item D in this Appendix?

**Answer: The City must be listed as an additional insured GL , auto and professional liability.**

40. Appendix B. C. Commercial General Liability Insurance Page 4 of 5: Is the City willing to remove Commercial General Liability Insurance extension requirements as stated in the RFP, which may cause unnecessary price increases? Is there is a requirement to purchase an installation floater?

**Answer: No.**

41. Regarding Appendix B - Insurance & Bonding Requirements (paged 5 of 5), point C requires CGL insurance include an endorsement for "Pesticide or Herbicide Applicator Coverage". As this is not relevant to this program, can this endorsement be deleted?

**Answer: Yes. See Addendum No. 5, Item No.4.**

42. Regarding Appendix B - Insurance & Bonding Requirements (paged 5 of 5), point E requires coverage "equal to 100 percent of the value of the contract".

- o As this program will include services in addition to installed equipment, can this Installation Floater coverage be modified to "equal to 100 percent of the value of installed equipment"?

**Answer: No.**

- o And, in order to determine bond amount what is the anticipated number of systems to be implemented

**Answer: See response to Question 21.**

43. Regarding Appendix B, Insurance & Bonding Requirements, Page 5 of 5, Item C, the "pesticide or herbicide applicator coverage" would not apply to the Red Light Running Photo Enforcement contract. Would the City waive this coverage, since it is not pertinent to the program?

**Answer: See response to Question 41.**

44. Appendix B. C. Commercial General Liability Insurance Page 4 of 5. (Pesticide): This requirement for Pesticide or Herbicide seems out of place and a bit unusual for this contract. Was this boilerplate language from another contract or RFOP that does not apply here? We are not planning to use pesticide or herbicide applications and currently does not carry such insurance. This insurance, if required, would entail having to add this coverage and add to the overall insurance costs. Please let us know if this requirement could be deleted. If this cannot be deleted, please explain why this is required or how it is applicable to this deal.

**Answer: See response to Question 41.**

45. Appendix B: 8 – Additional Insured: For clarification purposes, since the commercial general liability section is the only type of coverage referencing an additional insured requirement, please confirm that this additional insured requirement only applies to the commercial general liability area.

**Answer: See response to Question 39.**

46. Appendix B: 8 – Additional Insured: Since our Corporate insurance policy for commercial general liability already has a built in blanket additional insured endorsement, please confirm that the blanket endorsement would be acceptable here in place of the specific endorsement form referenced.

**Answer: No.**

47. Appendix B. C. Commercial General Liability Insurance Page 4 of 5: For clarification purposes, could the City confirm that your intent was the typical "Independent Contractors" coverage and not subcontractors. The reference to subcontractors seems out of place here.

**Answer: It is the Prime Contractor's responsibility to verify the Subcontractor/Independent Contractor is insured.**

48. Section 1, pg. 7, 24.3 notes that a performance bond and a payment bond will be required as part of this program. Will the City accept one payment/performance bond in lieu of two separate bonds?

**Answer: No.**

49. Section 1, pg. 7, 24.3 "Surety Bonds" - These bonds are typically provided once the contract is awarded to the vendor and a contract has been fully executed. Will the City adjust the bonding requirement to this timing?

**Answer: Performance and Payment bonds are required upon award of the Agreement, specifically at the time awardee executes the Contract. However, the bonds don't become effective until the Agreement is fully executed.**

50. Would the City please provide the performance and payment bond forms that will be required after contract award?

**Answer: Yes.**

51. Part 1: 24. Surety Bond: Could the City clarify that performance and payment bonds are issued after contract award and based on Corporate requirements after contract signing by both parties

**Answer: See response to Question 49.**

52. Part 1: 24.2 Surety Bond: Required sample bond forms were not included with the RFP. Could the City please provide copies so that we could have it reviewed by the surety carrier

**Answer: Yes.**

53. Part 1. 24.2 Surety Bond: Could we obtain copies of the referenced client performance and payment bonds?

**Answer: Yes.**

54. Part 1: 24.3.1 Performance Bond: Could the City please clarify the intent behind this wording. A surety performance bond needs to be tied into a contractual requirement of performance. If the Work is accepted and contract is over, please clarify that it is not the intent of the City to have the Contractor with no contract in place carry and pay for two additional years of a surety performance bond?

**Answer: Once the City has accepted the work for the Contractor the Performance Bond can be released.**

55. Part 1: 24.3.1 Performance Bond: If the Work is accepted, why is there a need to carry the same 100% performance bond through any such warranty period? Could the performance bond be reduced at such point?

**Answer: See response to Question 54.**

56. Part 1: 24.3.2 Payment Bond: Please provide the time period the requirement for the payment bond required under Georgia law for the payment bonds on public construction agreements.

**Answer: Proponent must obtain this information.**

57. We understand that the Proposal Guarantee must be five percent of the "lump sum amount." Would the City please clarify/define "lump sum amount"?

**Answer: The lump sum amount is the total Proposal price.**

58. Due to the complexity of the requirements of the City's RFP and the implications of the answers to our questions, will the City please extend the RFP due date for an additional 30 days? This will allow all vendors interested in bidding time to review all Questions & Answers and craft the most competitive proposals for the City's review.

**Answer: The Proposal Due date is February 17<sup>th</sup> 2016 at 2pm.**

59. Due to the RFP's complexity, would the City consider extending the proposal due date from January 20, 2016 to February 3, 2016?

**Answer: See response to Question 58.**

60. We are respectfully requesting an extension of the January 20 due date for two weeks later, to Wednesday February 3, 2016. Due to the RFP being released on December 11, 2015 and Fourth Quarter Close Out responsibilities, along with employee leave for the Christmas and New Year Holiday, we did not have the necessary preparation time that is necessary to submit an attractive and competitive proposal that is in the best interest of the City of Atlanta. Your RFP requires complete responsiveness and due diligence on our part to be compliant with each aspect of it. After the Pre-Bid Conference this morning, there is clearly questions that all of the vendors need answers to as we model and craft our response. It is our intent and desire to provide the City of Atlanta the best proposal possible.

**Answer: See response to Question 58.**

61. Will there be an opportunity to ask follow-up questions?

- o If so, will the due date be set after the last batch of answers are released?

**Answer: No.**

62. Is there an anticipated contract award date and a date for the winning vendor Notice to Proceed on the contract, ie. April 1 or July 1?

**Answer: The City will work diligently to award Contract as soon as possible.**

63. General: To ensure all vendors are bidding a cost equivalent proposal and a comparable project plan, would the City please provide a number of enforced approaches that all vendors should use in their pricing?

**Answer: See response to Question 22.**

64. General: To ensure all vendors are bidding a cost equivalent proposal and a comparable project plan, would the City please provide a number of approaches to have data collection and traffic engineering studies completed for all vendors to use in their pricing?

**Answer: See response to Question 22.**

65. General: May the successful vendor to attach equipment to City infrastructure to reduce the footprint of the equipment at the selected locations?

**Answer: No. Cameras should have their own pedestals. Safety analysis should be submitted to certify that the structure is breaking safe under federal and state standards.**

66. General: May the successful vendor to use existing underground infrastructure (e.g., conduit) to install red light intersections?

**Answer: Availability cannot be guaranteed. Installation should be totally independent.**

67. Addendum 3 Revision to Part 5 Exhibit A Scope of Work Pricing / Bids #4: The volume of required traffic engineering studies is unknown and could significantly impact vendor costs under services. In order to provide the best pricing to the City and to ensure a common evaluation of vendor pricing, will the City (1) reconsider allowing the traffic engineering studies to be reimbursable and add another category on the self-generated bid sheet, or (2) specify an expected volume of traffic engineering studies that all vendors should assume for pricing?

**Answer: Proponent may provide a line item for the TE studies on their Cost Proposal Form. However, the City will not commit to reimbursement of said item.**

68. Section 14.1, Page 4: The RFP requires Bidders to respond using 12-point font. May Bidders use a smaller, still readable font for the following: headers and footers, requirement text, exhibits, and tables?

**Answer: Yes.**

69. Section 14.1, Page 4: The RFP restricts page size to 8 ½ X 11 inch paper. For complex documents like Microsoft Project plans and architecture diagrams, may Bidders use larger paper folded down to 8 ½ X 11 inch size?

**Answer: Yes.**

70. Section 14.1; Page 4: Several requested documents/samples do not comply with font restrictions and they are not available in a native MS Office format for font adjustments. Please confirm that it is permissible to submit those documents as is:

**Answer: Yes.**

71. Required Submittal (FORM 3) Proponent Financial Disclosure, Page 3: Given the length of our audited financial statements, can Bidders provide these documents in electronic format only?

**Answer: Yes.**

72. Required Submittal (FORM 3) Proponent Financial Disclosure, Page 3: Given the length of our audited financial statements, can Bidders provide these documents printed double-sided?

**Answer: Yes.**

73. How to Submit Proposals, Page 4: The RFP requires bidders to mark the outside of the package with the name of the project, listed as "FC-8420: Design Build MLK, Jr Recreational and Aquatic Facility." Please confirm that the package should be marked "FC-8662: Red Light Running Photo Enforcement System"

**Answer: See response to Question 18.**

74. Part 5: Please confirm that we can take exception to Part 5 Draft Construction Services Agreement.

**Answer: See response to Question 7.**

75. Can you provide the City website where I can locate the list of Certified Contractors with the City that Bruce Bell spoke about at the Pre-Bid Conference.

**Answer: To access the Office of Contract Compliance registry of certified minority and female business enterprises go to [www.atlantaga.gov/contractcompliance](http://www.atlantaga.gov/contractcompliance) . Once you get to the Contract Compliance web page scroll down the page until you get to the link entitled registry of certified firms (the link is just below the downloadable certification forms).**