ADDENDUM NO. ONE

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

CITIZEN SURVEYS

PROJECT NO. 340-26

CITY OF THORNTON, CO

TO: Prospective Proposing Firms and all others concerned

DATE: November 4, 2026

PURPOSE: To provide additional information and clarification to the solicitation documents for the above-referenced Project.

1. The following questions and answers are provided for additional clarification to the RFP. All answers from Thornton in response to Vendor submitted questions have been provided below in **bold text**.

   Question No. 1: Is there a not-to-exceed (NTE) budget for the project? Please clarify whether the RFP response and budget are meant to cover (a) just the initial period with a cap of $30,000, (b) the broader survey every two (2) years (2027, 2029, 2031) or (c) also include interim pulse surveys (2028, 2030, 2032).

   Answer No. 1: No, there is not a NTE budget for the project. Historically, the City has budgeted $30,000 for annual survey services and recognizes that additional pulse or follow up surveys could potentially cost more.

   Question No. 2: Is the $30,000 estimated 2027 budget a ceiling, and does it include travel, printing and postage? To clarify, if an out-of-state firm is selected for this work, the firm would have to absorb all travel costs, including meals?

   Answer No. 2: The $30,000 estimated 2027 budget is based upon previous years' of survey costs. The costs of printing and postage are included in this budgeted cost. Refer to Section D.5 – Reimbursable Expenses of the main RFP document for all questions regarding reimbursable expenses, with those listed within the RFP as items that are currently known but are not limited to such items.

Question No. 3: Thornton's budget limits the ability to provide an approach that goes beyond a traditional paper/electronic survey methodology.

Would the city consider increasing the budget (adding two years' worth of funds) to allow for a more robust two-year survey/approach design?

Does the City have other funding available for community partner/member stipends for assistance in outreach?

Answer No. 3: The City will review each proposal and the value provided relative to the proposed cost.

Question No. 4: 5 of 28 Section B.1 indicates that Thornton's previous agreement with ETC Institute has reached its expiration date, with no further contract renewals.

Can the City clarify whether this solicitation represents a fully competitive procurement intended to establish a new contractual relationship with a selected vendor, with all qualified firms being evaluated on an equal basis, or whether there are any provisions or considerations associated with the prior contractual relationship that may affect the selection process?

Answer No. 4: Thornton's publicly posted RFPs are open, fair, and competitive solicitations.

Question No. 5: Given that ETC Institute has served as Thornton's survey provider during the previous contract period, it presumably has substantial institutional knowledge and historical information regarding the City's survey program.

Since the RFP specifically requires the selected consultant to build upon prior survey results and provide historical comparisons, will Thornton make all relevant historical survey materials available equally to all proposers? Specifically, will this include prior survey instruments, methodologies, sampling and weighting procedures, historical datasets, and previous reports necessary to establish continuity and conduct meaningful comparisons?

Answer No. 5: Thornton would make this information available to the Vendor who is awarded from this solicitation.

Question No. 6: Section B.4 identifies the initial award period as extending through December 31, 2032, while Sections D.4 and F.1 reference annual renewal periods and subsequent renewal years.

Can the City clarify the intended contract structure, including whether the agreement will remain in effect through December 31, 2032, subject to annual appropriations, or whether it will be subject to annual renewal or extension options?

Answer No. 6: The intention of the award is to award through December 31, 2032, via a formal agreement, which will be subject to annual funding appropriations. There should be no need for annual contractual renewal amendments.

Section D.4 – Pricing and Annual Price Updates provides context to proposing Vendors on their submitted pricing being firm and fixed through the initial project period (through December 31, 2027), as well as how price increases are allotted for with future years' of work (i.e., surveys in future years based upon hourly price costs).

Question No. 7: Please clarify how submission of pricing on the form provided works beyond the initial contract period ending 12/31/2027.

Answer No. 7: The awarded Vendor will provide an hourly rate for those positions that work on a survey. The hourly rates of those positions may be adjusted per Section D.4 of the RFP, with future rate increases being the basis for future work considerations. See Section B.13 – Future Work Considerations.

Question No. 8: It appears previous primary survey efforts aimed to collect 800 completed surveys. Is that the minimum expectation for completed surveys for this effort in each wave? What about for any interim pulse surveys? Is there a minimum number of responses for each of the four wards?

Answer No. 8: There is no minimum expectation for completed surveys, other than ensuring statistically significant results. Prior survey efforts have focused on collecting sufficient surveys to provide statistically significant analysis per ward, which is still desired.

Question No. 9: What is the expected sampling size for citizen responses for the LatinX community?

Answer No. 9: There is not an expected sampling size, just a desire to ensure that this community is adequately represented in the survey results.

Question No. 10: The RFP says the council wards are roughly the same size. Is there an online resource that provides demographic breakdowns by ward?

Answer No. 10: That information is not available online but can be made available to the eventual Vendor.

Question No. 11: The Pricing Form includes a second tab ("Sheet1") about fleet maintenance and repair. Can you confirm that tab doesn't apply to this RFP?

Answer No. 11: The "second tab" that the questioning Vendor is mentioning was hidden within Excel and does not apply to this RFP. The questioning Vendor elected to "unhide" sheets from the Pricing Form to find this mistake.

Question No. 12: The schedule in B.10 calls for an April 2027 survey, but the Council memo in Appendix 3 lists "Q4-2027: Conduct survey." Which timeline applies?

Answer No. 12: The City anticipates conducting a survey in the Spring of 2027.

Question No. 13: Appendix No. 3 includes a 2026 survey report, but Section B.3 – Estimated Quantities shows no service requested in 2026. Who conducted the 2026 survey?

Answer No. 13: This was the survey that was conducted in late 2025 with the results presented in early 2026.

Question No. 14: Will the selected vendor receive the raw data from past surveys? For each prior survey, will the City provide the number of surveys mailed and the number of completes by mail, phone and online?

Answer No. 14: The City will provide the final survey reports.

Question No. 15: Will the City provide an address list, such as utility billing records, or should the vendor buy one?

Answer No. 15: The City will not provide an address list.

Question No. 16: Past surveys used a random mail sample. The City also reaches residents through text surveys, T-Alert emails, and City Voice. Can those channels be used to invite residents? If open-link responses are collected, should they be reported separately from the random sample?

Answer No. 16: The City can leverage existing platforms to support the survey. If open-link responses are collected, the Vendor shall integrate those results in a way that maintains the sampling and statistical significance requirements.

Question No. 17: The Council memo suggests letting residents choose topics of interest and capturing partial responses. Is that expected for the 2027 survey?

Answer No. 17: Not necessarily, this was an idea that was considered as part of the discussion with City Council.

Question No. 18: Besides English and Spanish, which other languages should the survey offer?

Answer No. 18: The City desires a model that is accessible to as many languages as possible, noting that English and Spanish are the primary languages for the Thornton community.

Question No. 19: For pulse or targeted surveys, what audiences and how often does the City expect, for example businesses, youth, or facility users?

Answer No. 19: The audiences would be determined at a later date.

Question No. 20: The Council memo recommends a public online dashboard to track survey results and actions. Is a dashboard part of this scope? If so, should the vendor host it?

Question No. 20: The dashboard is not part of this scope.

Question No. 21: For GIS mapping, which neighborhood boundaries should be used? What file format does the City prefer?

Answer No. 21: The City prefers Feature Classes within File Geodatabase.

Question No. 22: Form G.4 asks about AI used to prepare the proposal. Are there any limits on using AI tools during the work itself, for example to code and analyze open-ended responses? With the Disclosure of Generative Artificial Intelligence (A.I.) Usage Form (Section G.4), how will the City consider disclosed Gen AI usage in the evaluation of proposals? For example, would the use of Gen AI tools to assist with drafting or editing proposal text, with all content reviewed and verified by vendor staff, affect a proposal's scoring or responsiveness?

Answer No. 22: All proposals submitted to Thornton in response to this RFP shall be affirmed by the proposing Vendor that everything submitted is true with no submitted information to be correct, no matter who the originator may be. Should the proposing Vendor use GenAI to create the proposal submittal, the proposing Vendor is required to state which sections of the proposal are a result of the Vendor's use of GenAI. Should the Vendor knowingly use GenAI but fail to disclose its use to create the proposal submittal and then this failure to proactively notify Thornton be discovered, Thornton may elect to deem the proposal as non-responsive and reject it from future consideration if the Vendor has not notified Thornton ahead of time through the completion of the form (Section G.4).

Question No. 23: Will the City share the relative weight of each evaluation criterion?

Answer No. 23: Thornton does not have a relative weight assigned to each evaluation criteria at this time, however, Thornton reserves at its sole discretion to set such weighting on or before the start of the evaluation process.

Question No. 24: For the 2023 and 2025 community surveys, can the City share the number of households mailed, the number of mailings/reminders sent, the source of the sampling frame, and the response rate (overall and by ward)?

Answer No. 24: No.

Question No. 25: Were the 2023 and 2025 survey results weighted? If so, which variables (e.g., age, ethnicity, homeownership, ward) and population targets were used, and will the City provide the 2025 survey instrument, respondent-level data, and any weighting documentation from prior surveys?

Answer No. 25: The City is unable to provide this information.

Question No. 26: The guideline schedule in Section B.10 shows the survey published in early April and closed in mid-April. Is the City open to a longer field period if it would improve response rates and representation, provided the final report is delivered on a timeline acceptable to the City?

Answer No. 26: Yes, the City is looking for the Vendor to propose a reasonable schedule.

Question No. 27: Is the first survey under this contract expected in spring 2027, with subsequent surveys every two years (2029, 2031)?

Answer no. 27: Yes, however there is the potential for more frequent surveys, either annually or pulse/targeted.

Question No. 28: For the pulse or targeted surveys mentioned in Section B.3, does the City have an anticipated frequency, topic, or method in mind? Should these be priced as separate optional line items on the Pricing Form?

Answer No. 28: There is not an anticipated frequency. Refer to answer # 7.

Question No. 29: During the project, does the City have any policies or restrictions on the vendor's use of Gen AI tools for work tasks such as coding open-ended survey responses, data analysis, or report drafting? Are there any restrictions on processing respondent data with such tools?

Answer No. 29: Thornton is currently drafting a citywide policy on the use of GenAI, however, that policy is not currently available. See the answer provided to Answer # 22 for additional information.

Question No. 30: On page 9, 9 of 28 Section B.11 referencing previous work samples, please describe the samples required, e.g., complete final reports, presentations, other study materials, etc.

Answer No. 30: Complete final reports are what is being required with your proposal submittal.

Question No. 31: Should core survey questions keep their prior wording so results can be compared over time?

Answer No. 31: Not necessarily, but for certain questions it will be important that the results can be compared to prior surveys.

Question No. 32: Which Colorado and U.S. cities does Thornton consider comparable for benchmarking? Would comparisons with selected peer municipalities in Colorado and elsewhere in the United States, using publicly available community survey results and documenting differences in survey methodology and question wording, satisfy the City's preference for regional and national benchmarking?

Answer No. 32: That will be determined in partnership with the Vendor.

Question No. 33: May work samples mask proprietary findings, or mark client-identifying details as confidential, provided client name, date and contact remain?

Answer No. 33: The proposing Vendor may mark such items as "Confidential" or "Proprietary" per Section E.7 – Confidential and Proprietary Information, however, the proposing Vendor shall not redact such information from their previous work samples prior to submitting their proposal.

Question No. 34: Is the current IRS W-9 (March 2024 revision) acceptable in place of the October 2018 version?

Answer No. 34: Yes.

Question No. 35: Please confirm the RFP response needs to be organized in a format according to the order in Section C.2.

Answer No. 35: Yes. See Section C.2 – Proposal Questions regarding a Vendor's proposal being potentially deemed as non-responsive should the Vendor fail to follow this requirement.

Question No. 36: On page 8 of 28 Section B.9 Meetings, Presentations, and Reports, are the meetings to be in-person or can they be virtual? What are Thornton's expectations around conducting the kick-off meeting and presentations virtually vs. in-person? If in-person, how many trips should be budgeted each year?

Answer No. 36: The City is open to virtual coordination of all presentations and meetings.

Question No. 37: Does the city have in-house translation support or is that expected to come out of this budget?

Answer No. 37: Translation services are expected to come out of the project budget.

Question No. 38: Does the city expect a similar approach to 2023 that includes mailed surveys? If so, are materials and postage covered by the city?

Answer No. 38: Materials and postage are expected to come out of the project budget.

2. l other terms and conditions shall remain unchanged except as provided by this Addendum. Proposing firms must acknowledge receipt of this Addendum in their Proposal.

END OF ADDENDUM NO. ONE

Andrew Miskell

Digitally signed by Andrew Miskell
Date: 2026.11.04 14:15:45 -07'00'

Andrew Miskell, CPPB Date
Purchasing Manager