

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL "RFP" NO. PS20170292  
CONSULTING SERVICE FOR ARBUTUS GREENWAY

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS NO. 2

ISSUED ON MARCH 17, 2017

Q2.1	Can the City please confirm whether AECOM needs to use any pre-qualified subs on the Arbutus Greenway project? And if so, can the City provide the list of acceptable pre-qualified subconsultants?
A2.1	<b>The City does not have a list of pre-qualified consultants for the project. The Proponents can assemble their respective team at their discretion considering the requirements stated within the RFP.</b>
Q2.2	The RFP indicates in Section 18.1 item c (pg B-28) that Hazardous/contaminated materials assessment is out of scope and will be prepared by the City's Environmental Services group.  However Environmental is listed as a required expertise (pg B-7) and item 10.2 (m) pg b-13 states: "Undertake a Stage Two (2) Environmental Site Assessment of the corridor."  Please clarify if an environmental engineer is required on the proponent team and if so what is the anticipated scope of work.
A2.2	<b>Please refer to table 6.2 for the minimum composition of the Proponent's team. The Proponent is expected to undertake an environmental assessment of the corridor as per the British Columbia Ministry of Environment's August 2016 Technical Guidance 11 called 'Guidance for a Stage 2 Preliminary Site Investigation and Detailed Site Investigation'. Detailed analysis of potentially hazardous/contaminated materials that might be discovered through Stage 2 is not part of the scope of work.</b>
Q2.3	Item 10.5 c) (pg B-14) states that the proponent should allow for up to 5 meetings with the public (preferred concept) during stage one.  However, on page B-25 it states that public engagement begins on February 15, 2018 in phase 2 masterplan. Please clarify the extent of public meetings we should allow for in our scope of work.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL "RFP" NO. PS20170292  
CONSULTING SERVICE FOR ARBUTUS GREENWAY  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS NO. 2

A2.3	<p>As outlined in Section 10.5, the proponent is expected to support two rounds of public and stakeholder engagement that are part of Design Stage One - Conceptual Design. Key dates for this phase of work are shown in Section 16. For greater clarity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The first round of engagement is planned for October 2017 and will seek community input on schematic design concepts, using a multi-day design workshop / charrette process. See Section 14 for more details.</li> <li>• The second round is planned for February 2018 and will focus on the preferred concept. The City will be responsible for planning and organizing this round of engagement; however, the design team will be expected to link in and provide support for this process as described in Section 8.1(e). Refer to Sections 10.5(c), 10.5(e), and 10.5(f) for the number of meetings anticipated as part of the assessment of the preferred concept. <u>Please assume 4 hours per meeting and include 4 key members from the Proponent's team.</u></li> <li>• The public engagement identified as a Key Deliverable in Section 16, on B-25, refers to the Preferred Concept. <u>Please assume 3 hours per meeting and include 2 key members from the Proponent's team.</u></li> </ul> <p>The Master Plan Development is expected to commence in March 2018.</p>
Q2.4	<p>Item 17.1 under the Design Methodology and workplan section the RFP calls for a work plan matrix that tabulates the hours and fees for each discipline. Is this the same as the "Table 1: DETAILED BREAKDOWN OF BASE PROFESSIONAL FEES" in the commercial proposal or is the matrix in addition to the requirements of the commercial proposal?</p>
A2.4	<p>In addition to Table 1 in the commercial proposal, the Proponent should include a Gantt Chart (or equivalent) and a table of hours per person (template provided as Appendix 3 - Table 3 &amp; 4, see Amendment 3) to illustrate a work plan that can complete the scope of services described in this RFP, including milestones.</p>
Q2.5	<p>The table in 6.2 and the table in 6.5 overlap but aren't the same. Both are identified as minimums but use alternating titles. Can you clarify and summarize?</p>
A2.5	<p>The list provided in 6.2 refers to the minimum composition of the proponent's team. The list provided in 6.5 refers to the minimum experience that the City anticipates the proponent's team will possess in order to undertake the scope of work described within this RFP.</p>
Q2.6	<p>Figure B-1 identifies the north and south planning study areas. Item 10.3 (f) identifies assessing and developing schematic designs for connections in these areas and 10.4(i) identifies the refinement of the connections suggesting both</p>

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL "RFP" NO. PS20170292  
CONSULTING SERVICE FOR ARBUTUS GREENWAY  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS NO. 2**

	<p>within the base scope. Item 13.0 identifies transportation planning in the north and south planning areas [which we assume includes the connections in 10.3(f)] are within the provisional work. It is uncertain how the connections can be assessed and determined without the transportation planning provisional work. Can you please clarify if any work in the planning study areas is within the base scope of work?</p>				
<b>A2.6</b>	<p>The base scope of work requires the identification of and development of designs for greenway connections in the north and south planning areas. However, the scope of work for transportation analysis in these areas is yet to be determined and will be part of the transportation planning 'Provisional Work'. As noted in section 13 the City is asking the proponent to include, as a line item in their proposal, the allocation of \$150,000 to be used to undertake transportation planning analysis as it relates to the scope of work described in this RFP. The City will work with the successful proponent to define the best use of this allowance in support of this RFP's scope of work and the project's overall objectives. The City anticipates some of the \$150,000 will be used to assess the transportation implications of the Arbutus Greenway on the Northern and Southern Planning Areas.</p>				
<b>Q2.7</b>	<p>Can you clarify the level of detail expected for item 10.3 (h)? In particular with regards to physical structures such as washrooms and wayfinding signage?</p>				
<b>A2.7</b>	<p>The City anticipates the Arbutus Greenway Master Plan will include public realm features and elements that will help to define the identity of the greenway. As item 10.3h is associated with the development of schematic concepts, we anticipate the 'suite of iconic features and elements' will be, at this stage of the planning and design process, relatively schematic possibilities, not refined propositions. The refinement of the form and character of these features and elements will evolve through the subsequent stages of design development associated with sections 10.4 and 11.0.</p>				
<b>Q2.8</b>	<p>Further to the question above, is an architect a required team member? Is a signage/wayfinding consultant required?</p>				
<b>A2.8</b>	<p>Section 6.2 lists the minimum composition requirements for the Proponent's project team. Additional members of the team are at the discretion of the lead Proponent.</p>				
<b>Q2.9</b>	<p>In sourcing the local expertise as noted in the 6.2 table we are running into challenges with timing around the Vancouver and Burnaby Spring Break/School Closure that both run from March 13th to March 24th. Is an extension possible to accommodate this?</p>				
<b>A2.9</b>	<p>Yes. The new times and dates are as follows (see Amendment 3):</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 20px;">Deadline for Enquiries</td> <td style="text-align: right;">4:00 p.m., March 28, 2017</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 20px;">Closing Time</td> <td style="text-align: right;">3:00 p.m., April 4, 2017</td> </tr> </table>	Deadline for Enquiries	4:00 p.m., March 28, 2017	Closing Time	3:00 p.m., April 4, 2017
Deadline for Enquiries	4:00 p.m., March 28, 2017				
Closing Time	3:00 p.m., April 4, 2017				

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL "RFP" NO. PS20170292  
CONSULTING SERVICE FOR ARBUTUS GREENWAY  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS NO. 2**

	Interviews with Short-listed Proponents	TBD, May 1, 2017
Q2.10	Can you clarify the content of the 2 page "key personnel" section in the proposal. With a multi-disciplinary team it is difficult to provide any amount of professional information and role description per key person per firm and fit within this page constraint. There is an allowance to extend into attachments at the end of the proposal. Is there another page limit constraint to work within that will allow all the pertinent information to be together or is there an order to follow so that specific roles are within the 2 pages?	
A2.10	The proponent is expected to provide, within 2 pages, brief summaries of their key personnel that highlights their respective qualifications. Proponents are entitled to include, as an appendix, one (1) additional information page for each key team member that provides a more comprehensive biography.	
Q2.11	The proponent is defined as an 'entity' submitting the proposal on page A-1. Page C-10 requests narratives related to various experience of the 'proponent' which is delivered through various consultants. Can you confirm that the 'proponent' in these instances refers to the project team of consultants under a prime consultant?	
A2.11	In this proposal the Proponent refers to the complete project team of consultants led by a prime consultant, not simply the prime consultant.	
Q2.12	Further to the definition of the 'proponent' above, page C-13 Appendix 4 requests proponent references. Can you clarify if only the prime consultant is to provide references or if it is key disciplines on the team?	
A2.12	The City expects the proposal will include references for all sub-consultants of the project team, not simply the prime consultant.	