

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL “RFP” NO. PS20170292  
CONSULTING SERVICE FOR ARBUTUS GREENWAY**

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS NO. 3**

ISSUED ON MARCH 23, 2017

Q3.1	<p>Follow up question for City’s response per A2.10 as below:</p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p>Does “one (1) additional information page for each key member” refer to CVs, i.e., does the City permit only one-page CVs for each key team member? Or is the “one (1) additional information page for each key team member” a separate document from the CVs that are included as an appendix to the Proponent’s proposal?</p>
A3.1	<p><b>Only one (1) additional information page is allowed for each key member of the team within the appendix. It is expected that between the summaries provided within the body of the proposal and the one additional page per key team member there will be sufficient information within the complete proposal to characterize each key member’s relevant education, qualifications and professional experience.</b></p>
Q3.2	<p><i>The City expects the proposal will include references for all sub-consultants of the project team, not simply the prime consultant.</i></p> <p>Does the City require Appendix 4 - Proponent References to be completed only by the prime consultant and Appendix 9 - Sub-Consultants completed only by the sub-consultants?</p>
A3.2	<p><b>Appendix 4 should be used by the lead consultant to provide references. Appendix 9 should be used for each of the key sub-consultants to provide relevant references. Submit one (1) page for each sub-consultant.</b></p>
Q3.3	<p>What level of topography is available? Will there be a full topo survey available for the team?</p>
A3.3	<p><b>One (1) metre contour information for the entire City, and City-wide LiDAR are currently available through the City’s Open Data catalogue.</b></p>

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL “RFP” NO. PS20170292  
CONSULTING SERVICE FOR ARBUTUS GREENWAY**

	<p><a href="http://data.vancouver.ca/datacatalogue/index.htm">http://data.vancouver.ca/datacatalogue/index.htm</a></p> <p>The City is also currently undertaking a comprehensive detailed topographical survey of the entire corridor and will make it available to the successful proponent as it becomes available.</p>
Q3.4	Have utility locates been completed?
A3.4	<b>Many of the utilities along the corridor have been surveyed. The detailed topographical survey currently underway of the entire corridor is expected to locate all remaining utilities.</b>
Q3.5	Has any soil testing been completed?
A3.5	<p>Environmental soil testing has been undertaken along the corridor as per the Environmental Assessment noted in A3.12 and there are no Areas of Potential Environmental Concern or Potential Contaminants of Concern.</p> <p>No geotechnical soil testing has been undertaken to date.</p>
Q3.6	It is stated that the proponent needs a Registered Professional Transportation Engineer with years’ experience and licensed with APEGBC. Is there any flexibility with this requirement? Would 9 years meet the minimum?
A3.6	<b>No. To clarify, the years of experience may include experience prior to APEGBC registration.</b>
Q3.7	Pg A-4: section 7.2 asks for ‘fixed prices’ to be fixed for the full term. Does the City intend to compensate the Proponents on a time and materials basis? Please confirm.
A3.7	<b>The fixed fees should cover the entire scope of work. Work outside of the scope will be addressed through the Change Order process.</b>
Q3.8	Pg A-4 Please confirm if the Pricing requirements within section 7.0 are correct. They appear to be more applicable to the provision of goods rather than for professional services. In particular, the requirement within Section 7.1 which requires pricing to include PST conflicts with that in the Section 5.1 of the Professional Services Agreement which states that both PST and GST are additional to fees and disbursements.
A3.8	<b>Section 7.0 in Part A is a general condition and Section 5.1 in the Agreement is specific to the professional service. If the service you will provide is not taxable under the PST act, only the GST will be reflected as a separate amount.</b>
Q3.9	Pg B-22: 14.3. Not clear if the cost should include the cost of the facility to hold the Charrette.
A3.9	<b>The cost of the facility to hold the Charrette should not be included.</b>

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL “RFP” NO. PS20170292  
CONSULTING SERVICE FOR ARBUTUS GREENWAY**

Q3.10	Pg. B-7 Sec 6.5 - In the team expertise table, under Civil Engineering “3D topographical surveying” is listed. Section 18 on pg. B-28 lists Topo as being out of scope. Please confirm if there is a requirement for the proponent to acquire topo survey or not.
A3.10	<b>This expertise requirement refers to the possibility that the Proponent may, during the course of the project, identify additional 3D topographical surveying requirements. The actual collection of that survey information will be undertaken by the City and is not within the scope of this RFP.</b>
Q3.11	The Detailed breakdown of professional fees requests “title” and “Name”. Is it acceptable for the proponent to include generic rates at accommodate technical staff or must all staff be specifically identified?
A3.11	<b>The detailed breakdown of staff proposed to be involved in the project pertains to key staff members. The proponent is not required to specifically identify individual technical support staff and may elect to use a typical qualification and hourly rate(s) to identify the technical support envisioned for the project.</b>
Q3.12	Will the Phase 1 EA carried out by CP be made available to proponents during the proposal stage? When?
A3.12	<b>The Arbutus Greenway Project Team has determined that both Phase 1 and Phase 2 Environmental Assessments have been conducted of the entire corridor and that there are no Areas of Potential Environmental Concern, nor of Potential Contaminants of Concern. Therefore the Environmental Assessment requirements noted within this RFP (10.2m) are no longer within the scope of services being sought. Furthermore there is no longer a requirement to include the Environmental expertise noted within Section 6.5.</b>
Q3.13	10.6b: (h) Conceptual signal control analysis and design  A provisional sum item for transportation planning and traffic analysis is also included. Is intersection traffic analysis noted here part of the provisional sum item? Or, is traffic analysis at intersection required as part of the base RFP? If so, how many scenarios/horizon years are expected to be modelled?
A3.13	<b>Traffic analysis of the greenway’s road intersections are within the base scope of service. Intersections off the corridor that might be implicated by the greenway would be part of the provisional scope. A one (1) time horizon should be allowed for.</b>
Q3.14	Are there any existing traffic models (Synchro, Paramics, etc) available from past work on the corridor?
A3.14	<b>A full model of the entire corridor is not available. The City may have access to models of a few intersections along Arbutus from past project.</b>