MISSOULA COUNTY
REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS ADDENDUM

RFQ NAME: Missoula County TIF Economic Analysis RFQ
DUE DATE September 18, 2026, at 5:00 p.m. Mountain Time

ADDENDUM NUMBER: 08-2026-01-A

To All Offerors:

Attached are written questions received in response to this RFQ. These questions, along with the County's response, become an official amendment to this RFQ.

All other terms of the subject "Request for Qualifications" remain as previously stated.

Acknowledgment of Addendum:

The offeror for this solicitation must acknowledge receipt of this addendum. This page must be submitted at the same time as the qualifications, or the qualifications may be disqualified from further consideration.

I acknowledge receipt of Addendum No. 08-2026-01-A

Signed: ___________________________________

Company Name: ____________________________

Date: ______________________

Reference: Section 5-Cost Submission (Page 11)

1. Should proposers submit a cost proposal as part of the Qualifications submittal document or as a separate PDF? Also, is the cost proposal counted toward the 10-page maximum mentioned on page 10 of the RFQ?
    a. Cost proposals should be submitted separately. See Section 2, page 8.
    b. No, the cost proposal is separate from the Qualifications submission mentioned in Section 4 on page 10 and does not count towards the 10-page maximum.
2. Could you please confirm that hourly rates are sufficient to satisfy this section? Is it acceptable for proposers to submit hourly rates that adjust annually for expected inflation through 2030 vs. a fixed rate for the entire contract term?
    a. Yes, hourly rates are sufficient to satisfy this section. See Section 5 on page 11.
    b. Yes, it is acceptable to submit hourly rates that adjust annually for expected inflation.

Reference: Section 1 – RFQ Overview, Description of the Scope / Project Management (Pages 3–5)

3. How does the County expect the anticipated task orders to be allocated among ongoing district administration activities (e.g., annual reviews, financial planning, cost-benefit studies) and review of private TIF applications?
    a. Task orders will be allocated on an as-needed basis depending on the size and maturity of the TIF district and complexity of the private TIF applications. In a typical year, staff anticipates issuing 1 to 3 task orders with 1 to 2 of these likely associated with private TIF applications.
4. How significant a component of the anticipated contract workload does the County expect market feasibility studies and development feasibility analyses to be?
    a. Market feasibility studies and development feasibility analyses will be a very significant component of the anticipated contract workload.

Reference: Section 1 – RFQ Overview, Description of the Scope, District Creation and Administration (Page 4); Section 3 – Scope of Project (Pages 9–10)

5. Does "district administration" include continuing disclosure or post-issuance compliance work (e.g., EMMA filings) for outstanding TEDD-related debt, or is it limited to fiscal and economic analysis supporting County staff and Commissioner decisions?
    a. District administration is limited to fiscal and economic analysis supporting County staff and Commissioner decisions.
6. Does the County anticipate needing municipal advisory support for future bond issuances, or is the scope limited to pre-issuance fiscal and economic analysis?
    a. The scope is limited to pre-issuance fiscal and economic analysis.

Reference: Section 4 – Offeror Qualifications (Pages 10–11); Section 6 – Evaluation Process (Pages 11–12)

7. Is experience with continuing disclosure or municipal advisory services relevant to the "Qualifications and Experience" criterion (50 points), or is that criterion focused primarily on economic and fiscal analysis capabilities?
    a. Qualifications and Experience is focused primarily on economic and fiscal analysis capabilities.

Reference: Section 4 – Offeror Qualifications, Proposal Content and Page Limit (Page 10)

8. Given the five-page, double-sided proposal limit, does the County consider TIF-specific analysis experience most relevant, or should offerors also emphasize broader public finance experience, including district administration and continuing disclosure services?
    a. TIF-specific analysis experience is most relevant for offeror's qualifications.