

ADDENDUM 2

Project:	CODC – Water Reservoir Project	Addendum No.:	2
		No. of Pages:	5
		Date:	July 31, 2012
		Doc. No.	890092-0045

The following change(s) in the RFP Documents are effective immediately.

This Addendum forms part of the RFP Documents.

The following Addendum is formatted in a question and answer format as presented by the proponents.

ITEM DESCRIPTION

2.1 **Question:** Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) - Has this parcel of land been excluded from the ALR yet? If not, is this considered part of the scope of work for this project or is the City going to be looking after this aspect of the project themselves? Our experience is this process can take some time, where does this fit into the project schedule?

Answer: No, the parcel of land is not excluded from the ALR. The City will be looking after this aspect of the project themselves.

2.2 **Question:** Environmental Assessment – Is completion of an Environmental Assessment considered part of our scope of work? Section A-2 (2.6 and 2.7) makes reference to preparation of environmental assessments and impact studies as well as the review of the studies by others. Can you confirm? The level of involvement required for this project as well as who is responsible and where this is accounted for in the schedule?

Answer: The completion of an Environmental Assessment is not considered part of the scope of services. Revise, ACEC document 31-2009, Schedule A – Engineer’s Scope of Services, Section A-2, item 2.6 from yes to no.

2.3 **Question:** Value Engineering – Section A-1 (1.4) makes reference to participation in a value engineering program. What does this involve? These sessions usually take a significant amount of time. Where is this work being proposed in the schedule?

Answer: The Engineer shall allow one day for a Value Engineering session to verify that the designs meet the City’s needs after the 66% design submission. If additional sessions are needed, the City will extend this service as required.

- 2.4 **Question:** Public Participation and Information Program – Section A-1 (1.3) makes reference to attendance at information session – what is involved here?

Answer: Revise ACEC Document 31- 2009 Schedule A, A-1 Consulting and Advisory Services item 1.4 from yes to no.

- 2.5 **Question:** Financial Submittal – Section 8.3.2 identifies the breakdown of the fees, however this does not match that outlined in Section B-1.3. Section B-1.3 outlines Section A-3 to A-7 as fees based on percentage cost.

Answer: Follow Appendix B for the breakdown of your financial proposal.

- 2.6 **Question:** Financial information – are we supposed to fill out Schedule B or Appendix B? Please confirm.

Answer: Complete and submit Appendix B

- 2.7 **Question:** Appendix B – under disbursement section – what are we to include under the Disbursement mark-up (% of cost). Please clarify as under b) is outlines that the applicable markup is to be included. Are we not to include disbursements for Phase 3?

Answer: The mark-up on disbursements is at the discretion of the consultant. Many firms charge a percentage mark-up on disbursements to cover administration and overhead costs. Please identify what that percentage is for comparison with other firms.

- 2.8 **Question:** Page 8 of 21 it appears the financial calculations is based on the fixed price for phases 1 and 2. Does this mean the phase 3 and the disbursements will not form part of the evaluation? Please confirm?

Answer: Evaluation of the hourly rates does not form a part of the evaluation.

- 2.9 **Question:** Project Schedule – Do we need to include an MS Project Schedule as part of the proposal submission, or is the format to be submitted after award?

Answer: A proposed schedule is to be submitted.

- 2.10 **Question:** Meeting locations – Are all meetings to take place in Dawson Creek?

Answer: Yes. The Engineer may also utilize conference call or any other technologies to conduct an effective meeting.

- 2.11 **Question:** Construction Contract Resident Services – Are construction resident services expected to be full-time?

Answer: Unknown at this time. Hourly rates are only requested for Phase 3.

- 2.12 **Question:** It is stated in the terms of reference that both the survey and geotechnical investigations have been completed for this site. We are assuming the work done to date will meet our needs. Is it fair to assume that any additional survey or geotechnical investigations required for design purposes will be addressed in the future via a change order?

Answer: Yes, this will be considered as an additional service.

2.13 **Question:** Our understanding is that this is very preliminary work. What if additional survey and/or geotechnical work is required for this project? Do you want us to include this as part of our fee estimate now, or will this be addressed in the future? Does the survey include topographic survey for site access?

Answer: See item 2.12. Additional Services will be added to the Engineer's scope as required. Any services not included in your proposal and are needed will be added as a change order.

2.14 **Question:** Our understanding is that proposal submittals are due at your office in Vancouver at 2:00 on July 31st. Will an email submittal with hard copies to follow suffice or do the hard copies need to be delivered by 2 pm as well? Please confirm?

Answer: Refer to Addendum No. 1 for revised closing date. E-mails are accepted with a hard copy to follow within 24hr. If the consultant chooses to submit an electronic file, a password can be attached to the PDF file to unlock the financial portion.

2.15 **Question:** GC 6.4 identifies that the Client will engage the services of a specialist to perform ancillary services as necessary. Do you still want us to carry their fees as part of our proposal, or should we just include their proposal and identify them as part of our team? Please confirm.

Answer: The proposal should be clear to the team you are proposing with all disciplines and company identified. The Engineer is to carry their sub-consultants fees as part of the proposal.

2.16 **Question:** Is the cover page and index (table of contents) included in the 20 page limit?

Answer: No.

2.17 **Question:** We have completed numerous large scale projects in Alberta that can highlight our experience in this type of project. Is there any reason why all project experience needs to be from BC only? Would large scale earthworks projects (i.e.: land development, sewer lagoons etc. be seen as relevant project experience.

Answer: Large scale earthworks projects in Alberta or elsewhere would be seen as relevant project experience.

2.18 **Question:** It appears that Section A-7 (7.1) is asking for the same work as Section A-8 (8.3). Can you please outline the differences?

Answer: No it's not the same. The services in Section A-7(7.1) are asking for periodic reviews that adhere to Construction Administration Services. Section A-8 (8.3) relates to documented field reviews performed by the engineers or their sub consultants to communicate progress and identify potential risks.

2.19 **Question:** Is there a possibility that this project could cost less than \$12 Million? Our % fees will be based on this assumption and will a fee negotiation happen if the project value decreases below \$12 Million?

Answer: Refer to Addendum No. 1.

2.20 **Question:** The RFP states that this is a dams, dykes and reservoir related project. Is there a component of this project that would include a review of the pumping and transmission main sizing requirements or interconnecting piping?

Answer: Yes. The information will be available to the successful proponent.

2.21 **Question:** Is there any proposal to include development on the adjacent lands or will they remain undeveloped?

Answer: Adjacent lands are not owned by the City. They will remain undeveloped.

2.22 **Question:** A recent tender included a CCDC contract. Is this the format that will be utilized for this project?

Answer: Not known at this time.

2.23 **Question:** The RFP suggests that a value engineering exercise will be held for this project. Who would be that value engineering team other than the City, project manager and the chosen engineering team?

Answer: The City, Project Manager, and Engineer plus sub consultants as required will form the value engineering team committee.

2.24 **Question:** If there is extra soil material is there a location to dispose of it or will this be a challenge?

Answer: No, this will be a challenge. This is a question during the construction stages and has no relevance for this RFP.

2.25 **Question:** Is there a location to place excess topsoil?

Answer: Not relevant to this RFP.

2.26 **Question:** The geotechnical report indicates that preliminary pond plans were reviewed. Are these plans available for review? Are there any forebays included?

Answer: Preliminary ponds sketches will be available to the successful proponent.

2.27 **Question:** Is the existing survey suitable for detailed design purposes? How many points were picked up or what is the contour interval available? Or is more detailed survey required?

Answer: If more detail is required as assessed by the Engineer more points will be obtained by the City. Topography information will be provided to the successful proponent.

2.28 **Question:** It is assumed that the digital survey information would be available for use. Is this correct?

Answer: Yes, digital survey information will be provided to the successful proponent.

2.29 **Question:** Are any utilities or easements on the site?

Answer: Locations of utilities or easements will be assessed with the successful proponent and the City's engineering department. Additional services may be required to coordinate this work with local utility locators to create contract documents.

2.30 **Question:** Have any of the approval agencies provided any feedback at this time.

Answer: No.

2.31 **Question:** Was a Phase 1 EA completed during the purchasing of the property?

Answer: No.

2.32 **Question:** Have the reservoir building materials been tested to ensure that leachate would not contaminate the water?

Answer: No testing has been done.

2.33 **Question:** Will access require Highway's approval?

Answer: No. Access is already in place.

2.34 **Question:** What security requirements are needed?

Answer: None at this time.

2.35 **Question:** Is interconnection of the proposed reservoir to the existing raw water supply and storage system to be included in the scope of services for all phases.

Answer: Yes

2.36 **Question:** As noted on page 8, Criterion 4, please clarify that Engineer Project Manager does not mean the Project Manager for the winning Consultant is required to be a Professional Engineer.

Answer: The Engineer Project Manager does mean the Project Manager for the winning Engineer is required to be a Professional Engineer.

2.37 **Question:** Please clarify the requirement of A-1 1.7 *Provision of Rendering*?

Answer: The proponent is to allow some time for graphical representations and sketches.

MHPM Project Managers Inc.

Date: July 31, 2012

Distribution:

BC Bid/CODC Website/Merx.
File