



ADDENDUM NO. 1

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS / PROPOSAL ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN SERVICES

Residences at Trolley Park
1445 Dallas Street, Aurora, Colorado 80010

Solicitation	Request for Qualifications / Proposal for Architectural Design Services
Owner	Housing Authority of the City of Aurora
Project	Residences at Trolley Park
Addendum Number	1
Date Issued	October 21, 2026

Addendum Instructions

This Addendum No. 1 forms a part of the Request for Qualifications / Proposal for Architectural Design Services for the Residences at Trolley Park and modifies or clarifies the solicitation documents as described below. Except as specifically addressed in this addendum, all other requirements, terms, conditions, and deadlines of the RFQ/P remain unchanged.

Respondents shall acknowledge receipt of this addendum in Exhibit B – Acknowledgement of Addendum included with their response. In the event of a conflict between this addendum and the original RFQ/P, this addendum shall govern.

Questions and responses are provided below.

Questions and Answers

Item	Question and Response
1	Question: Residents during construction: Will residents stay in their units during the renovation, or will AHA temporarily relocate them by building, floor, or unit? Who owns the relocation plan and phasing sequence, and will ownership engage a relocation consultant? Response: Residents are expected to be temporarily relocated during construction. Relocations will be phased, and ownership will collaborate with the design and construction teams to determine the most efficient relocation and construction phasing strategy. Relocation consultant will be engaged and contracted directly with AHA.

2	Question: Added units: Has AHA done any zoning or site capacity review for adding units within the property lines? Is there a target unit count for the feasibility study, and if added units move forward, is that design part of this contract or a separate amendment? Response: AHA is not aware of any zoning issues that would preclude adding units; however, the selected Architect of Record will be responsible for confirming applicable zoning and site capacity requirements. AHA has targeted a minimum of 12 units and maximum of 30 additional units; with a majority 2-bedroom, 2-bathroom layout with equal square foot bedrooms; and a community room with 3 offices. AHA intends for the added-unit and amenity scope to be included in the initial contract. If the added-unit scope does not proceed or is materially revised, the contract will be amended accordingly.
3	Question: Existing drawings: The 2023 PCA references construction documents by Odell Architects dated March 9, 2006. Will AHA provide the full architectural and MEP sets, CAD files, and any as-builts or recent survey to the selected team? Response: Yes, the 2006 drawings are available and will be provided as an exhibit.
4	Question: Due diligence: The updated PCA, Structural Condition Report, and Phase I ESA arrive in November 2026. Can the architect rely on these and the 2023 D3G PCA as the basis for scope? Are hazardous materials testing (asbestos, lead) and a topographic/utility survey owner provided or part of the architect's scope? Response: The selected architect may rely on the 2023 PCA as the basis of scope. The forthcoming updated PCA, Structural Condition Report, and Phase I Environmental Site Assessment will be provided by ownership. All survey services, including topographic survey and utility locating, will be directed by the Owner and performed by a party other than the design team or its consultants.
5	Question: Consultant scope: Which disciplines does AHA expect under the architect (civil, structural, MEP, fire protection, landscape, energy modeling, green certification, accessibility review)? Will ownership hire the green building consultant and energy rater required by the CHFA QAP, or should those sit under the AOR? Response: The selected architect is expected to retain and manage the accessibility design (observation reporting by Owner), civil, structural, mechanical, electrical, and plumbing disciplines. Ownership will work with the selected team to confirm the applicable energy consultant, energy rater, and related CHFA requirements and determine the appropriate contracting structure.
6	Question: Per CHFA's 4% checklist: Schematic drawings, elevation, site plan, and floor plan (plans, architectural narrative, and specs if available).
7	Question: Cost proposal format: Since fees are due from shortlisted firms at interviews, will AHA provide a fee form or preferred breakdown (lump sum by phase, hourly NTE, reimbursables, additional services rates)? Should the added-unit design and additional amenities designs be priced as an alternate? Response: Shortlisted firms will be provided with a cost workbook to complete. The workbook will include the required fee breakdown, pricing format, reimbursable and additional-services information, and instructions for pricing the added-unit and amenity scopes.
8	Question: Capacity Worksheet: The worksheet covers projects of \$3,000,000 or more. Should lead discipline consultants submit their own worksheets, and can a firm with no overlapping \$3M projects explain capacity in a short narrative? Response: Lead discipline consultants and other subconsultants are not required to submit separate Capacity Worksheets. The architect is responsible for confirming that its proposed consultant team has sufficient availability and capacity to fulfill all obligations under their respective agreements with the architect and to support the architect's contractual obligations to AHA.

9	Question: Insurance: Is evidence of the \$2M per occurrence / \$4M aggregate professional liability needed with the RFQ response or only from the selected firm at contract? Will AHA accept a project-specific policy or excess coverage to meet it? Response: AHA has confirmed a policy of \$1M per occurrence / \$2M aggregate is acceptable. Evidence of coverage will be required from the selected firm only.
10	Question: Construction administration: How often does AHA expect site observations during construction, and what is the anticipated construction duration so we can size CA staffing? Response: Weekly on-site construction meetings are expected. Site observations should be completed at the beginning and end of each renovation phase. If additional units are added, monthly site observations are expected for that scope. The anticipated construction duration is approximately 12 to 14 months. Current planning assumes 8 to 10 renovation units per phase, resulting in approximately four to six residential unit renovation phases, plus two to three phases for common-area work.
11	Question: Amenity subconsultants: It is understood that the selected architect will serve as the prime design professional and retain, contract with, manage, and be fully responsible for all subconsultants required to complete the services. New site amenities often require their own subconsultant(s) (for example, a playground designer), but specific amenities have not yet been determined. After deciding which amenities are feasible and desired, will AHA contract with those subconsultants directly? Response: The contracting responsibility for specialty consultants will be determined once the program scope and required amenities are defined. If the selected design team is directed to retain and manage specialty consultants, the architect's contract will be amended appropriately to include those services.
12	Question: Standard coverage for Professional Liability is typically \$1M/\$2M aggregate. Will this coverage be considered? Response: Yes, Professional Liability at \$1M / \$2M aggregate is acceptable.
13	Question: Is it anticipated that the deficiencies in the forthcoming structural conditions report will be addressed ahead of this project scope, or will this project address any noted deficiencies in addition to the changes described for this project? Response: No deficiencies identified in the Structural Condition Report or Property Condition Assessment will be addressed prior to this project. Accordingly, all identified deficiencies shall be considered part of this project's scope.
14	Question: Are the original drawings, calculations, and/or geotechnical report available to the selected design team? Is a current geotechnical investigation planned? Response: All available historical documentation will be provided to the selected team. The design team will be responsible for verifying the completeness and accuracy of the available documentation. No updated geotechnical investigation or report is currently planned.
15	Question: Is the MEP retrofit anticipated to replace existing mechanical equipment generally in kind, or are more substantial system changes, including electrification, equipment relocation, or new rooftop equipment, being considered? Response: The extent of the MEP retrofit will be determined largely by the project's energy-modeling goals and the applicable tax-credit requirements. Replacement of existing equipment generally in kind is preferred; however, the specific system modifications required by the project's funding sources are not yet known.
16	Question: Will any selective demolition, material testing, or other intrusive investigations be necessary to confirm existing structural conditions be performed under separate owner-contracted services? Response: Any selective demolition required to support investigation of existing conditions is expected to be performed by others and will not be included in the scope of the design team or its consultants.

17	Question: Will the Owner provide all survey items, or should the proposal include survey services in the scope and fee estimate, including the following? • ALTA/NSPS Land Title Survey • Topographic Design Survey • SDP survey sheet or other planning-document survey sheets Response: All survey services will be directed by the Owner and performed by a party other than the design team or its consultants. Survey services should not be included in the design team's scope or fee proposal.
18	Question: Is the Owner aware of any easement dedications or vacations required for the new improvements? Response: None are currently known.
19	Question: Are the original civil construction drawings, approved drainage reports, utility plans, and any subsequent as-built or record drawings available for review? Response: The drawings currently available are the 2006 construction drawings. No other historical documents are available at this time.
20	Question: Is the anticipated civil engineering scope primarily limited to addressing existing drainage deficiencies and accessibility improvements, or should the proposal anticipate a broader site redevelopment? Response: Civil engineering requirements are anticipated to be limited to accessibility and drainage improvements as required by the final design.
21	Question: To what extent should the civil engineer evaluate the feasibility of adding dwelling units? Should the proposal anticipate conceptual site layouts and utility/drainage assessments only, or full civil engineering design for a potential addition? Response: It is currently anticipated that any additional development will occur above the subterranean garage. Accordingly, the civil engineering scope for the potential addition is expected to be limited to utility coordination, site drainage, and accessible paths of travel.
22	Question: Will there be additional exterior amenity spaces that will require civil engineering design? Response: Unknown at this time.
23	Question: Have the causes of the reported negative drainage and water intrusion been investigated? Are there specific known problem areas, or should the civil engineer include an evaluation of the entire site drainage system? Should a civil site assessment report be included in the fee proposal? Response: Some drainage and water-intrusion issues have been investigated and addressed. Additional investigations will be considered to identify the remaining issues. Shortlisted firms will receive a fee proposal workbook; which will list a civil site assessment or related investigation if desired.
24	Question: Is the intent to address drainage deficiencies through localized grading and drainage improvements, or should the proposal anticipate modifications to the existing underground storm drainage system? Have the existing storm sewer pipes been adequately cleaned, and are videos available to verify existing conditions? Response: This has not yet been determined. A fee proposal is not being requested at this time.
25	Question: Beyond drainage and accessibility improvements, are modifications anticipated to the existing parking, driveways, sidewalks, landscaping, trash enclosures, or other exterior site improvements? Response: Unknown at this time.
26	Question: Has the City of Aurora been consulted regarding the proposed renovations and potential building additions? What civil engineering plans, studies, or site development approvals are anticipated?

	Response: No, the City of Aurora has not been consulted at this time. AHA expects the selected architect to guide the required planning, studies, approvals, and agency coordination in collaboration with its consultants.
27	Question: Are improvements to the existing water, sanitary sewer, or fire service systems anticipated? If additional units are constructed, should utility capacity evaluations and potential service upgrades be included? Response: If additional units are constructed, the selected architectural team and its consultants are expected to evaluate the applicable utility requirements and advise the Owner regarding any necessary capacity studies, service upgrades, or related improvements.
28	Question: Will the architect or a separate accessibility consultant identify the required exterior accessibility improvements, or should the civil engineer perform an independent assessment of existing exterior accessible routes and parking facilities? Response: The selected architectural design team, including its applicable consultants, is expected to identify, coordinate, and facilitate accessibility requirements across the entirety of the project.
29	Question: Will the Owner provide a geotechnical engineer to evaluate existing drainage and water intrusion issues, including potential subsurface drainage or foundation waterproofing recommendations? Response: If geotechnical services are determined to be required, they will be provided by the Owner and should not be included in the design team's scope.
30	Question: What is the anticipated construction duration, and what level of civil engineering construction administration, site visits, and construction-phase coordination should be included? Response: The anticipated construction duration is approximately 12 to 14 months, subject to the final program and design. The Architect of Record will be responsible for ensuring that the construction administration services, site visits, and construction-phase coordination provided by its subconsultants are appropriate and consistent with the project requirements.
31	Question: Can the Owner provide the previous drainage repair proposal, including any exhibits, recommendations, or supporting investigations? Response: The previous drainage repair proposal, including available exhibits, recommendations, and supporting investigations, will be provided to the selected team.
32	Question: Potential additional dwelling units: Has AHA identified a preliminary target number of additional units or potential locations within the property? Is there a target date for determining whether the additional units will advance into the full design scope? Response: AHA has not established a preliminary target number of additional dwelling units. The feasibility study should evaluate an appropriate balance of unit quantity, unit types, and resident amenity spaces. It is currently anticipated that any additional development would occur above the subterranean garage. AHA intends for the added-unit scope to be included in the initial contract; however, the timing for determining whether the additional units will advance into full design is expected to be determined by mid January 2027. If the added-unit scope does not proceed or is materially revised, the contract will be amended accordingly.
33	Question: Existing building documentation: Are original construction documents available for the existing buildings, including architectural, structural, civil, and MEP drawings? If so, are electronic CAD files available, or only PDF documents? Response: All available historical project documentation, including architectural, structural, civil, and MEP drawings, will be provided to the selected team. The design team will be responsible for verifying the completeness and accuracy of the available documentation. CAD files are not known to be available at this time.

34	Question: Does AHA anticipate formal resident engagement meetings during programming or schematic design? If so, should the architectural team plan to organize and facilitate these meetings, or will AHA lead these efforts? Response: Formal resident engagement meetings are not currently anticipated during programming or schematic design. However, subsequent resident engagement will be lead by the relocation team and necessary AHA Staff, with architect support.
35	Question: Sustainability and energy performance: Has AHA identified a preferred green building certification program or specific energy-performance objectives for the renovation? Should the architect anticipate retaining the green building consultant, or will that service be provided separately by AHA? Response: No specific sustainability goal or green building certification program has been identified at this time. It is anticipated that sustainability and energy-performance requirements will be established based on the requirements of the project's funding sources. The Owner prefers that the selected design team retain and manage the sustainability consultant.
36	Question: Is there a plan to phase the unit remodeling work within the occupied building? If so, can AHA share the preliminary phasing plan? Response: Unit renovations are expected to be phased while the building remains occupied, with residents temporarily relocated during work in their units. Current planning assumes approximately 8 to 10 units per phase, resulting in approximately four to six residential renovation phases. The final phasing plan and unit turnover sequence will be developed collaboratively by the Owner, Owner's Representative, design team, construction team, and relocation consultant, as applicable, based on the final program and design.
37	Question: Is the \$10 million to \$14 million range hard cost only? Does it include escalation to a late-2027 construction start, owner contingency, and FF&E? Response: The \$10 million to \$14 million range represents construction hard costs only and is based on an anticipated late-2027 construction start.
38	Question: If the feasibility study supports added units, is the addition expected to be included in the same March 2027 4% LIHTC application, follow the same schedule, and be delivered under the same construction contract? Response: Yes. If the feasibility study supports proceeding with additional units, the added-unit scope is expected to be included in the March 2027 4% LIHTC application, follow the same overall project schedule, and be delivered under the same construction contract.
39	Question: Which green building certification will the project pursue under the CHFA QAP (Enterprise Green Communities, NGBS, LEED, or another program)? Will the certification consultant or rater be owner-provided or included as part of the architect's team? Response: No specific green building certification program has been identified at this time. The applicable certification and energy-performance requirements will be determined based on the CHFA QAP and other project funding requirements. The Owner prefers that the selected design team retain and manage the required sustainability consultant, certification consultant, and/or energy rater.
40	Question: What design deliverables does Dwelling Development need for the March 2027 application, and by what date? The schedule shows conceptual drawings in January 2027, which leaves very little time before submission. Response: The architect is anticipated to provide conceptual drawings and program determinations to support the March 2027 application. The selected general contractor will prepare the associated cost estimate.
41	Question: Are full CAD or PDF record drawings available? Response: All available historical project documentation and record drawings will be provided to the selected team. The design team will be responsible for verifying the completeness and

	accuracy of the available documentation. CAD files are not known to be available at this time; available documentation may be limited to PDF format.
42	Question: The PCR reports water intrusion at the stucco, windows, and planters, as well as flooding at Units 108 and 109, the trash room, and the community room. Will AHA fund a building envelope consultant and destructive testing? If so, will those services be owner-provided or included in the architect's scope? Response: Any destructive testing and/or building envelope consulting is expected to be performed by others and will not be included in the scope of the design team or its consultants.
43	Question: Please confirm which consultants the architect is expected to retain and manage. Response: The selected architect is expected to retain and manage the civil, structural, mechanical, electrical, plumbing, accessibility, and sustainability disciplines required for the project. The design team is also expected to retain and manage any required certification consultant and/or energy rater. Specialty consultants, including building envelope, acoustical, code-review, landscape, or similar services, should be included when required by the final program, design, funding requirements, or fee proposal workbook. Survey and geotechnical services, if required, will be provided by the Owner and should not be included in the design team's scope. Low-voltage and access-control systems are anticipated to be delivered as design-build scopes through the CM/GC.
44	Question: What form of agreement will AHA use with the architect (AIA B101, AIA B133, or an AHA form)? If the team is awarded the work, will AHA issue a notice to proceed to the selected architect team? Response: The anticipated form of agreement is AIA B133. A notice to proceed will be issued to the awarded team.
45	Question: Will interviews be conducted in person or virtually? Response: Interviews will be conducted in person.
46	Question: For the Capacity Worksheet, does "projects valued at \$3,000,000 or more" refer to construction value or professional fee? Response: The threshold is based on total project value. If the total project value is not known, use the total construction value.
47	Question: Is there a page limit or required format for the response? Is there a maximum file size for the emailed submission? Response: There is no page limit or maximum file-size restriction. If the submission file exceeds 15 MB, respondents should provide a link for AHA to access and download the file.
48	Question: Will preference be given to firms performing design work locally, or will evaluation points be reduced for teams utilizing design professionals from additional offices? Response: Preference will not be given based on whether design work is performed locally, and evaluation points will not be reduced solely because team members are located in additional offices. However, the design team must be familiar with and capable of working within the City of Aurora's requirements and must be available to review field conditions promptly during construction when needed by the project.
49	Question: Can AHA identify the members of the selection committee and their respective roles? Response: The RFQ selection committee will consist of Martin Petrov, Heidi Mitchell, Jake Hopper, and Sarah Lara. The interview selection committee is expected to consist of the same members. If the interview committee changes, the shortlisted firms will be notified through the interview instructions.
50	Question: Is the anticipated \$10 million to \$14 million construction budget an established project funding limit or a preliminary planning allowance? Are there financial parameters the design team should use when evaluating project feasibility and scope recommendations?

	Response: The \$10 million to \$14 million range is a preliminary planning range for construction hard costs. Following selection, AHA will work with the selected design team and Dwelling Development to establish the applicable project funding limits and financial parameters for evaluating feasibility and scope recommendations.
51	Question: How does AHA anticipate coordinating architectural design decisions with its financial advisor to evaluate development feasibility, project funding, and long-term financial performance? Response: AHA will work collaboratively with the selected design team, construction team, and Dwelling Development to coordinate design decisions, project funding, and development feasibility. The team will evaluate the program and project pro forma to ensure the proposed scope supports AHA's operational and financial needs for the property during construction and over the long term.
52	Question: What specific design deliverables and level of cost certainty will be required to support the anticipated March 2027 LIHTC application, and which project decisions must be finalized before that submission? Response: The architect is expected to provide conceptual drawings and program determinations sufficient to support the anticipated March 2027 LIHTC application and complete the required CHFA architect certifications. The selected general contractor will prepare the associated cost estimate, and the architect will assist the project team in reviewing that estimate. Before submission, the project team is expected to establish the preferred program, including whether the additional dwelling units will proceed, the anticipated unit and amenity scope, and the primary design assumptions needed for Dwelling Development and AHA to evaluate the project pro forma and application feasibility.
53	Question: Will the updated Property Condition Report and Structural Condition Report identify recommended corrective work and associated costs, or should the selected design team anticipate developing supplemental assessments and cost evaluations? Response: The updated reports may identify recommended corrective work and may include associated preliminary costs. The selected design team is expected to incorporate the identified corrective work into the project design, and the construction team will develop the corresponding construction pricing. Supplemental assessments or evaluations should be recommended by the design team if needed to adequately define the required work.
54	Question: For the programming and feasibility services described in Section 6.C, what level of comparative analysis and documentation does AHA expect to support selection of a preferred scope before proceeding into schematic design? Response: Feasibility should include zoning and code capacity (verify an addition would be legally conforming), site constraints (easements, utility locations, existing buildings and parking), test-fit options (including general size, massing, and unit count), and order of magnitude cost (which the CM/GC can also assist with).
55	Question: Should the response be submitted as one combined PDF? Are there any page-limit, file-size, or file-naming requirements, and must the notarized affidavit be submitted as an original hard copy? Response: The response should be submitted as one combined PDF. There is no page limit or maximum file-size restriction. If the submission file exceeds 15 MB, respondents should provide a link for AHA to access and download the file. No notarized affidavit is required.
56	Question: The August Owner's Representative RFP described adding units "within the existing building footprint," while this RFQ states "within the existing property boundary lines." Should respondents assume the new units may be located in a new building on site, within the existing buildings, or both?

	Response: Additional units are currently anticipated to be developed within the existing property boundary lines. Development within the existing building footprint is no longer being considered.
57	Question: Does AHA expect residents to remain in place during unit work, relocate temporarily on site, or relocate off site? Is there a maximum number of units AHA will allow to be offline at one time? Response: Residents are expected to be temporarily relocated off site during work in their units. Current planning assumes approximately 8 to 10 units will be offline per phase, resulting in approximately four to six residential renovation phases. The final number of units offline at one time will be established through coordination among the Owner, Owner's Representative, design team, construction team, and relocation consultant based on the final program, design, and phasing plan.
58	Question: Does AHA expect the architect or the CM/GC to lead development of the construction phasing plan and unit turnover sequence for occupied units? Response: The construction phasing plan and unit turnover sequence will be developed collaboratively by the Owner, Owner's Representative, design team, construction team, and relocation consultant, as applicable. Once the phasing plan is established, the project team will collectively work toward the approved schedule and phasing requirements. The Owner's Representative will lead coordination and monitoring efforts to ensure the required unit turnover sequence is maintained.
59	Question: Which engineering and specialty consultants should be included on the architect's team, such as structural, MEP, civil, landscape, building envelope, and accessibility consultants? Response: The selected architect is expected to retain and manage the civil, landscape architecture, structural, mechanical, electrical, plumbing, accessibility, sustainability, building envelope, acoustical, and code-review consultants required for the project. The design team is also expected to retain and manage any required green building certification consultant and/or energy rater. Survey and geotechnical services, if required, will be provided by the Owner and should not be included in the design team's scope. Low-voltage and access-control systems are anticipated to be delivered as design-build scopes through the CM/GC.
60	Question: Will the full 2023 Property Condition Report, including appendices, be provided to respondents? Will the updated Property Condition Report, Structural Condition Report, and Phase I Environmental Site Assessment be shared as soon as they become available in November? Response: The 2023 Property Conditions Report (PCR) that was included as an exhibit is the correct and final document (despite the "draft" noted). Yes, the updated PCR, Structural Conditions Report and Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment will be shared with the selected Design Team in November as soon as they become available.
61	Question: Is the architect expected to participate in the CM/GC interviews scheduled for November 16 and 17? Response: Yes, we would like one of the design team members assigned to this project to participate in the CM/GC interviews.
62	Question: Will the renovation be required to comply with Build America, Buy America requirements? Response: This requirement will depend on funding sources but it should be anticipated that it will be required.
63	Question: What sustainability goals are anticipated for the project? Response: No specific sustainability goal or green building certification program has been identified at this time. It is anticipated that sustainability and energy-performance requirements will be established based on the requirements of the project's funding sources.

64	Question: Should the design team anticipate electrification of the building or buildings? Response: Building electrification is not anticipated at this time. However, AHA is open to electrification based on feasibility and cost considerations.
65	Question: Will AHA retain and provide a surveyor for the project? Response: Yes. All survey services will be directed by the Owner and performed by a party other than the design team or its consultants.
66	Question: Will existing design drawings or as-constructed record drawings be available? Response: Yes, the 2006 drawings are available and will be provided as an exhibit.
67	Question: For stakeholder and resident engagement, will the architect lead the process, or will AHA lead these efforts? Response: AHA anticipates this will be done in tandem, but prefers the architect to lead the stakeholder engagement. Re: resident engagement, that will be lead by the relocation team and necessary AHA Staff, with architect support.
68	Question: Are there any special resident relocation requirements that the design team should consider? Response: HUD's URA guidelines must be adhered to, which will fall under the responsibility of the relocation specialist. The community is a diverse population with nine different primary languages present in the households.
69	Question: Please confirm the scopes to be provided under the architect. The current assumption includes civil, landscape architecture, architecture, interiors, structural, mechanical, electrical, plumbing, and sustainability services, with low-voltage and access-control systems delivered as design-build scopes through the CM/GC. The architect would also typically retain third-party building envelope, accessibility, acoustical, and code-review consultants. Will construction administration inspections and testing for building envelope, accessibility, and acoustics be included under the architect's scope or provided separately by the Owner? Response: The selected architect is expected to retain and manage the accessibility design (observation reporting by Owner), civil, structural, mechanical, electrical, and plumbing disciplines. Ownership will work with the selected team to confirm the applicable energy consultant, energy rater, and related CHFA requirements and determine the appropriate contracting structure.
70	Question: Is there a page limit for the RFQ response? Response: There is no page limit for the RFQ response. There is also no maximum file-size restriction; however, if the submission file exceeds 15 MB, respondents should provide a link for AHA to access and download the file.

Acknowledgment

Receipt of this Addendum No. 1 shall be acknowledged by each respondent in the space provided in Exhibit B of the RFQ/P.

Issued by:

Housing Authority of the City of Aurora
c/o Artaic Group, Owner's Representative

— End of Addendum No. 1 —