CITY OF Grand Junction COLORADO
PURCHASING DIVISION

ADDENDUM NO. 3

Date: November 17, 2026
From: City of Grand Junction Purchasing Division
To: All Proposers
RE: On-Call Professional Surveying, Mapping, and Related Services, RFP-6006-26-KF

This Addendum modifies the Solicitation and provides the City's responses to questions received, as outlined below.

Please take note of the following:

1. Amendment to Section 6.8 – Award

The first bullet of Section 6.8 is deleted and replaced with the following:

- Award one or more Contracts within each service category, including award to a single Firm, designation of primary and secondary Firms, or establishment of a pool of qualified Firms for as-needed assignments. The City may use different award arrangements in different categories. Awards will be based on the qualifications-based evaluation, any documented interview consensus recommendation, and successful negotiations. A Firm may receive an award in one or more categories.

All other provisions of Section 6.8 remain unchanged.

2. Questions and Answers

General

1. **Question:** Are there any data-residency or data-handling restrictions on City data being processed outside of the US?

Answer: Refer to Sections 2.15 — Confidentiality and 2.25 — Services, Work Product and City Ownership. Proposers shall disclose any proposed storage, processing, or access to City data outside the United States for City review and acceptance. Additional data-handling or geographic restrictions may apply to individual assignments based on the information involved, project requirements, applicable law, or funding conditions.

2. **Question:** Is there any limit on the share of services that may be subcontracted? For example, may the prime subcontract all data acquisition (Category G) and the Colorado PLS responsible-charge review (Category E), while performing processing, mapping, and technical review itself?

Answer: Proposers shall describe their proposed team structure, subcontractors, and division of responsibilities in accordance with Sections 5.7 and 7.0 — Subcontractor Disclosure. The City will evaluate the proposed arrangement under the published evaluation criteria and determine its acceptability in the City's best interest. The City may request additional subcontractor references from Firms advancing to the interview stage. Applicable professional and responsible-charge requirements remain in effect.

3. **Question:** Can all subcontractors be named with signed commitments at proposal submission, or may specialty providers for individual assignments (e.g. aircraft operators) be added later with City approval?

Answer: The City requires Proposers to identify **all** anticipated subcontractors and specialty providers at proposal submission in accordance with Section 7.0 — Subcontractor Disclosure. Any additions or substitutions after award are at the City's sole discretion and would require the City's prior written approval. Signed subcontractor commitments are not required with the Proposal.

4. **Question:** Will the City consider a limitation of liability (e.g. capped at the required insurance limits or the assignment fee) if submitted under Exceptions?

Answer: No. The City will not accept a limitation of liability capped at insurance limits, assignment fees, or another specified amount, as this would transfer unacceptable risk to the City. Required insurance establishes minimum coverage and does not limit the Firm's liabilities or obligations under the Contract.

5. **Question:** Does the City have specific data-security requirements for City data (e.g. encryption, approved cloud storage, cross-border transfer restrictions, data destruction at Contract end)?

Answer: Refer to Sections 2.15 — Confidentiality and 2.25 — Services, Work Product and City Ownership, and Question 1 of this Addendum. The RFP does not prescribe specific encryption methods, approved cloud providers, cross-border transfer restrictions, or data-destruction procedures. Proposers shall describe their proposed data-handling and security practices, including storage and processing locations, for City review.

Category E – Survey Submittal and Plat Review

6. **Question:** Can the City indicate the approximate number and type of submittals reviewed per year (e.g., subdivision plats, condominium maps, improvement survey plats, legal descriptions, easement documents)?

Answer: Refer to Sections 4.2.5 and 4.6.3. In 2026, surveyor review has averaged approximately 30–50 hours per month. Future submittal volume is

unknown, and no minimum workload is guaranteed. Proposers shall describe their staffing availability and capacity under Section 5.7.

7. **Question:** What turnaround times does the City expect for first reviews and for resubmittal review?

   Answer: Proposers shall describe their review process and proposed turnaround times for initial reviews and resubmittals under Section 5.8. Required schedules will depend on the assignment. If a Firm cannot meet an assignment's schedule, the City may select another awarded Firm within the applicable category in accordance with Section 4.4.1.

8. **Question:** Does the City expect per-submittal fixed pricing, hourly by labor classification, or both?

   Answer: Proposers may offer hourly, fixed, or other applicable pricing as provided in Sections 4.6.6, 4.6.7, and 5.6 and Addendum No. 1, Question 7. The basis of compensation will be established for each assignment in accordance with the Firm's Contract rates and accepted pricing conditions.

9. **Question:** How many review cycles should a typical scope include before additional authorization is required?

   Answer: The number of review cycles will depend on the assignment. The Firm shall identify the proposed review cycles in its project-specific scope under Section 4.4.2, consistent with Section 4.2.5. Changes requiring additional authorization shall follow Section 4.4.4.

10. **Question:** In what format are submittals provided (PDF only, or also CAD, DWG, or LandXML for closure checks)?

    Answer: Submittals for review are generally provided in PDF format.

11. **Question:** Will the selected firm have access to the City's electronic review platform?

    Answer: The City will coordinate with the selected Firm(s) to establish how review documents will be accessed and comments submitted.

12. **Question:** Could the City provide representative samples of each submittal type (subdivision plat, condo map, ISP, boundary survey, legal description/exhibit, easement/ROW doc, surveyor checklist), plus one multi-round resubmittal and one example of City-issued comments?

    Answer: The City will not provide sample submittals, multi-round resubmittal packages, or review comments for this Solicitation. Applicable submittal

requirements are described in the City's published Submittal Standards for Improvements and Development (SSID) and applicable development review checklists.

13. **Question:** Which MCLCS zone applies for the City, and are City GIS parcel data and published control points available to reviewers?

    Answer: Refer to Section 4.5.1 — Survey Control and Section 4.3.3 — City-Provided Information and Coordination. The applicable MCLCS zone varies by project location; most projects will be in Zone GVA. Public GIS parcel information and additional control records may be provided when available.

14. **Question:** Roughly how many survey/plat submittals does the City process per month/year (for sizing)?

    Answer: Refer to Section 4.6.3 — Budget and No Guaranteed Work and the response to Question 6 of this addendum.

15. **Question:** Does the City have a standard review checklist or comment template, or should the Firm propose its own?

    Answer: Refer to Section 4.2.5 — Category E; Section 4.5 — Professional Standards, Survey Control, and Deliverables. The City will work with the Firm to establish the comment submission process. Refer to the City's published Submittal Standards for Improvements and Development (SSID) and applicable development review checklists.

16. **Question:** Will this category be awarded to a single firm or could multiple firms partner?

    Answer: Refer to Item 1 of this Addendum amending Section 6.8 — Award, and Sections 4.1 and 4.2. Proposed teaming and subcontracting arrangements shall be described in accordance with Sections 5.7 and 7.0.

17. **Question:** Are AI-assisted/automated QA tools acceptable within the review, is disclosure required, and are there confidentiality/data-handling constraints on processing City submittals with cloud-based tools?

    Answer: AI-assisted or automated QA tools may support technical reviews, provided the Firm independently verifies the results and remains responsible for its review comments. Proposers shall disclose proposed external AI or cloud-based processing services and associated data-handling practices for City review and acceptance. Use of these tools shall comply with Sections 2.15 and 2.25 and shall not result in unauthorized disclosure or use of City information.

18. **Question:** Can the City provide a sample completed review (e.g., review checklist and consolidated comment letter) and the current surveyor submittal checklist used for plats and legal descriptions?

Answer: The City will not provide completed review examples for this Solicitation. Refer to the City's published Submittal Standards for Improvements and Development (SSID) and development review checklists for submittal requirements. Review comments shall comply with Section 4.2.5.

Category G – Geospatial Mapping and Reality Capture

19. **Question:** Data acquisition (aerial, UAS, or mobile) would be performed by a named US-based subcontractor, our team (based outside the US) would perform processing and mapping, and a Colorado PLS subconsultant would perform survey control. Is this structure acceptable to the City?

Answer: The described team structure may be proposed for evaluation but is not preapproved. Proposers shall describe their proposed team structure, subcontractors, and division of responsibilities in accordance with Sections 5.7 and 7.0 — Subcontractor Disclosure. The City will evaluate the proposed arrangement under the published evaluation criteria and determine its acceptability in the City's best interest. The City may request additional subcontractor references from Firms advancing to the interview stage. Applicable professional and responsible charge requirements remain in effect. Refer also to Question 1 of this Addendum regarding processing City data outside the United States.

20. **Question:** Does the City have a preferred GIS platform, format (e.g., Esri file geodatabase), schema, or metadata standard for GIS-ready deliverables?

Answer: Refer to Sections 4.2.7 and 4.5.3 and Addendum No. 1, Question 5. Any assignment-specific GIS platform, format, schema, or metadata requirements will be identified during assignment scoping.

21. **Question:** Will the City make available existing imagery, LiDAR, GIS layers, and survey control for processing assignments?

Answer: Refer to Sections 4.3.3 — City-Provided Information and Coordination and 4.4.1 — Assignment Selection and Requests. Existing imagery, LiDAR, GIS information, and survey control may be provided for an authorized assignment, as appropriate and as available. The availability of any specific dataset is not guaranteed.

22. **Question:** What is the City's preferred delivery method for large datasets (secure cloud transfer or physical drive), and is there a preferred tiling scheme?

Answer: A secure cloud transfer provided by the Firm is acceptable, unless an assignment has specific requirements, which will be provided with the assignment. The City does have tiling schemes and naming conventions which will be shared if they are required for a specific assignment.

23. **Question:** Without disclosing a budget, can the City indicate the typical size, type, and frequency of past work (e.g., corridors, parks, drainage areas, project acreage)?

Answer: Refer to Addendum No. 2, Questions 1 and 4, and Section 4.6.3 — Budget and No Guaranteed Work.

24. **Question:** Can the City provide sample deliverables from previous type work (e.g. orthophoto tile, LiDAR point cloud, DEM or contours, GIS layers, metadata and accuracy report), so that proposers can align with the City's expected outputs?

Answer: The City will not provide sample deliverables. Refer to Sections 4.2.7 and 4.5.3 for deliverable requirements.

25. **Question:** Can the City provide its CAD and GIS standards or templates (e.g. layer and symbology standards, point codes, title blocks, drawing and metadata templates), or confirm where these are published?

Answer: Refer to Section 4.5 — Professional Standards, Survey Control, and Deliverables, particularly Section 4.5.3 — Deliverables and Records. The City's CAD and GIS standards can be made available upon request for an assignment; however, this is not anticipated to be common.

Notice: The deadline for submitting questions has passed. **No further questions will be accepted.**

This Addendum amends the Solicitation as outlined above. All other terms and conditions of the Solicitation remain unchanged.

Proposers must acknowledge receipt of this Addendum by completing the acknowledgment section on the **Solicitation Response Form** (Section 7.0).

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Respectfully,

Kathleen Franklin
Senior Buyer/Purchasing Agent
City of Grand Junction