



## **ADDENDUM NO. 1**

**DATE:** July 1, 2026  
**FROM:** City of Grand Junction Purchasing Division  
**TO:** All Offerors  
**RE:** Update to Transportation engineering design standards Manual And Grand Junction Municipal Code Title 21 RFP-5941-26-DH

Offerors responding to the above referenced solicitation are hereby instructed that the requirements have been clarified, modified, superseded and supplemented as to this date as hereinafter described.

Please make note of the following clarifications:

1. **Q:** The timeline in the RFP indicates that the contract will not be executed until August 10, but the work is intended to be completed by November 15. Understanding the conversation in the pre-bid meeting, I've included the timeline for hearings I put together below. Would the City reconsider the completion date for the project, ideally 6 months for the work followed by hearings, if desired?

- Min. 3 weeks for internal legal/planning QA review prior to Sep. 15 (likely longer given nature of request)
- Sep. 15: Required public notice
- Sep. 22: PC (There is technically Oct. 13, but that does not give enough time to meet internal deadlines in CivicClerk for publication)
- Oct. 21: 1st Reading
- Nov. 4: 2nd Reading

**A:** After receiving feedback on the timeline of this proposal the City is willing to adjust the completion date to January 29, 2027 and include additional time for hearings if necessary.

2. **Q:** It was indicated in the Council Workshop that there is a list of issues identified in TEDS by staff. Can this be provided, along with any other lists identifying issues or work already completed by the task force? (Understood that this does not indicate the full scope of the project.)

**A:** There are actually two documents that we can make available. The first is a list maintained by city staff that primarily consists of suggested edits and revisions to the TED's Manual. The second is a document developed by one of our Task Force members that summarizes the key pain points and issues the Task Force identified with the current TED's Manual. Links to both documents are provided here:

- [HACTF TEDS Scoping Meeting Discussion Topics \(PDF\)](#)
- [Staff Proposed TEDS Changes \(PDF\)](#)

3. **Q:** Understanding that the direction and recommendations from the housing committee are key drivers of the revisions, how does management intend to handle situations where the consultant recommendation may conflict based on best practices, ethics, or other influences?

**A:** The expectation is that the consultant will work collaboratively with both staff and the Task Force throughout the project. The Task Force meets twice each month, providing regular opportunities to discuss recommendations, address concerns, and work toward consensus where differing viewpoints exist. The proposer should plan on participating in these meetings at the point in the project whereby consultant lead discussions are anticipated to be necessary to seek input, share deliverables, and other points in the project that may be necessary for project success. Participation in these meetings may be conducted virtually or in person. Additional meetings may also be needed and can be scheduled, as may be identified by the Consultant HACTF meetings are recorded for the public and past meetings can be reviewed [here](#) and additional information can be found on the city's EngageGJ page [here](#).

If the consultant's professional recommendations differ from the Task Force's direction, those differences should be discussed openly, with the goal of reaching a recommendation that is supported by both parties whenever possible. However, if the consultant believes that a different approach is warranted based on industry standards, best practices, professional ethics, or experience in other jurisdictions, that recommendation should still be presented and considered.

Ultimately, any differing perspectives can be brought forward for discussion, and City Council will make the final decision regarding the recommended revisions.

4. **Q:** There's a lot of different ways that this could go with research of peer communities and revision pieces. Are you able to state a budget that you have for this so that we can tailor the scope appropriately for the budget?

**A:** We do not have a specific budget identified for this project at this time. The final cost will be informed by the proposals received and the recommended scope of work. Our Community Development Department often looks to Fort Collins, Lakewood, Greeley, Colorado Springs, Montrose, Fruita, and Durango as peer communities.

5. **Q:** Will the City be able to get a fully updated version of the Code prior to the start of the project, to ensure that a complete document with all recent amendments codified is available? This may be off-cycle with the eCode360 codification schedule but would be critical in providing accurate revisions. Will other amendments be ongoing during the duration of the project?

**A:** Yes. The City will make available a fully updated version of the Code prior to the start of the project. The next scheduled recodification is scheduled for late August 2026. For any amendments that have been adopted by Council after this recodification we will make sure to provide ordinances and supplemental information.

6. **Q:** The Council Workshop indicated four chapters of Title 21 that would be considered as part of the scope and that it was not intended to be a full code update. The RFP does not identify these chapters. Is the purpose to leave the scope broad in case other issues come up or is it now intended to be a full update to Title 21?

**A:** Four chapters of Title 21 were discussed at previous HACTF meetings, those include 21.05 - Site & Structure Development Standards; 21.06 - Natural Resources & Environmentally Sensitive Lands; 21.07 - Landscaping, Buffering, and Screening; and 21.09 - Subdivision

Standards. The scope was left broad in the event other issues are identified, however it is not intended to be a full update to Title 21.

The original solicitation for the project noted above is amended as noted.

All other conditions of subject remain the same.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "K Nelson". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "K" and "N".

Kassy Nelson, Buyer  
City of Grand Junction, Colorado