

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL “RFP” NO. PS20201111
CONSULTING SERVICES FOR WEST FRASER LANDS CHILD CARE AND WASHROOMS

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS NO. 3

ISSUED ON: October 19, 2020

Q3.1	<p>I have a couple of questions with regards to this RFP Architects Agreement, Schedule A, Basic Services:</p> <p>a. 1.23 calls for a traffic consultant to be included in the architect’s proposal but under Part B, Scope of work 2.2, it is not listed. Please confirm if this consultant is required to be included in the Fixed fee?</p>
A3.1	<p>Part B, Scope of work, 2.2 indicates “...including the following disciplines”, which does not rule out the involvement of others. The services of a traffic consultant may be required to validate traffic management at drop-off and pick-up times for on-street stopping and parking. To eliminate uncertainty proponents are asked to allocate a budget of \$5,000, within their fee, for the engagement of a traffic consultant at a future time.</p>
Q3.2	<p>b. 1.33 calls for coordination of delivery of city’s equipment with Contractor. Typically, this would fall within the contractors Scope of work, as it is in reference to deliveries on site. Could you clarify?</p>
A3.2	<p>1.33 reads - “Coordination of City’s Equipment - Coordinate delivery, receipt, and installation of City’s equipment with Constructor. - FI”. The contractor (Constructor) is responsible for coordinating deliveries of materials and equipment within the construction contract scope. This item refers to coordination of “City’s” Equipment, with the “Constructor”. It would be applicable to equipment such as appliances procured by the City outside the construction contract, but incorporated into the work.</p>
Q3.3	<p>c. 1.40 Commissioning services are requested to be included, but in section 1.9 is says commission falls under the City’s scope of work. Please clarify if it’s to be included in the fixed fee or not?</p>
A3.3	<p>1.9 which indicates that the City will (directly) engage a commissioning agent for “services over and above take-over at completion of construction”, and 1.40 which indicates the consultant will provide “services related to commissioning of the building” are not contradictory. “Services related to commissioning of the building” might include attending commissioning</p>

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL “RFP” NO. PS20201111
CONSULTING SERVICES FOR WEST FRASER LANDS CHILD CARE AND WASHROOMS**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS NO. 3

	meetings and coordinating the work of mechanical and electrical consultants related to commissioning.
Q3.4	d. 2.7 Coordinating multiple contractors (for demolition) - is there currently a structure on the site? I thought it was unencumbered?
A3.4	The site is currently unencumbered. The coordination of Multiple Constructors is intended to address a situation where pre-loading of the site, or other site preparation, may be required. Please refer to amendment no.3 (AMD 3).
Q3.5	e. 5.2 Prepare class D estimate & 6.1 Class C estimate, are requested but in 1.10 & 4.10 is says Cost Estimating falls under the City’s scope of work. Please clarify if it’s to be included in the fixed fee or not?
A3.5	Items 1.10 and 4.10, as well as the body of the Architect Agreement, make it clear that Construction Cost Estimating Consulting Services are the City’s scope and responsibility. Item 5.2 and 6.1 refer to preparing or incorporating Construction Cost Estimates in design reporting; please assume this refers to incorporating the Cost Estimates prepared by the City’s Cost Consultant into the Schematic and Design Development reporting.
Q3.6	f. 5.5 Architectural models & 5.6 Architectural renderings- is the request to have a physical model & renderings to be included in the fee or the coordination with the modeler? Please clarify if it’s to be included in the fixed fee or not? And if required, please provide additional detail for the detail level and scale of model required as they do vary substantially in costs.
A3.6	We believe an elevation is acceptable for the DP notification. Schedule A Items 5.5 Architectural Models and 5.6 Architectural Renderings, legend annotation to be revised from “F1” to “N/A”. Please refer to amendment no. 3 (AMD 3).
Q3.7	The RFP requires a \$5M in aggregate professional liability insurance, as per the Architects Agreement. Given the limited size of the project, would a \$2M per occurrence and in aggregate professional liability insurance be considered to be acceptable?
A3.7	No. Our Risk Manager prefers to keep the same insurance requirements in anticipation of significant signing and approving duties to be performed by the successful Consultant until construction is completed.
Q3.8	Please clarify if the Proponents are to carry 3rd Party Passive House Certifier under the fixed fee proposal, or will this consultant be selected and retained by the City?
A3.8	3rd Party Passive House Certifier to be selected and retained by the City.

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL “RFP” NO. PS20201111
CONSULTING SERVICES FOR WEST FRASER LANDS CHILD CARE AND WASHROOMS**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS NO. 3

Q3.9	<p><u>Please clarify Enhanced Commissioning and Enhance Commissioning Provider</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Between Schedule A items 1.9 (C), 1.40 (F1), 9.10 (F1), 10.2 (F1) AND RFP Part B Section 3.6b. Is it the intent, for the proponents to provide support (and within their fee) for the Enhanced Commissioning Provider to be retained by the City (RFP Part B Section 3.6)?
A3.9	<p>Please refer to A3.3 above, re items 1.9 and 1.40.</p> <p>Item 9.10 is keyed “N/A” and relates to “additional general review of major components produced at off-site prefabrication or manufacturing facilities”; it does not seem relevant to the question.</p> <p>Item 10.2 confirms that “Post Construction Services related to Enhanced Commissioning and Monitoring of Energy Use and Environmental Conditions for 2 years following Substantial Completion” is to be included in basic services. RFP Part B 3.6.6 indicates that “Post-construction services, as required in support of the City’s Enhanced Commissioning Provider” are to be included as Basic Services.</p> <p>Similar to A3.3 above, the consultants’ “services related to commissioning of the building” are not to be conflated with the services of a commissioning provider retained directly by the City.</p> <p>Yes, the intent is as stated in the question.</p>

END OF Q&A No. 3