

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS “RFP” NO. PS20201267
CONSULTANT FOR GRANVILLE CONNECTOR INTERIM CONNECTOR DESIGN AND
NORTH LOOPS REMOVAL**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS NO. 3

ISSUED ON January 19, 2021

Q1	Has there been an Archaeological Overview conducted for the project? The RFP noted that stakeholders and First Nations have already been consulted, so an overview may have occurred. There does not appear to be any archeological related documents in the reference docs. What is the Archeological scope if anything?
A1	<p>An Archaeological Overview is underway and will be fully managed by the City. While stakeholders and First Nations have been consulted during the preliminary design phase, approval and related permitting for the final design and related construction works has not been obtained.</p> <p>Please refer to QA2 response for clarification regarding the Consultant’s role with respect to the archaeological scope.</p>
Q2	The RFP notes that the independent review should be carried out by one of the prequalified companies under RFA PS20181461 Pre-Qualification of Engineering Consultants - Structural Services - Bridge Sub-Category. As some, many, or all the firms on this list may be submitting their own proposal for this RFP, are we still to engage one of them for our team? Does the City see any conflict of interest in doing this? Please confirm this is allowed.
A2	This City does not see a conflict of interest with prequalified City consultants partnering with each other for the independent review and prefers this approach.
Q3	<p>Are any of the three below disciplines required for the project. We believe not, but all three are mentioned in one form or another in the reference documents and or the RFP.</p> <p>a. Architecture b. Urban Design c. Landscape Architecture</p>
A3	The Consultant's expected scope with respect to architecture, urban design and landscape architecture is to carry out drawing reviews, flag any necessary design changes that may be identified during the progression of the detailed design and provide suggestions/alternatives to the City Team.

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS “RFP” NO. PS20201267
CONSULTANT FOR GRANVILLE CONNECTOR INTERIM CONNECTOR DESIGN AND
NORTH LOOPS REMOVAL**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS NO. 3

Q4	<p>Certain parts of the scope in Article 3.2.1.4, are not clear. Please clarify if we are to price for detailed design, tendering, and construction services for the text that is underlined in the below copy of Article 3.2.1.4.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">3.2.1.4 New Large Overhead Vehicle Signage along Main Span.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The new lane alignments resulting from the Interim Connector will impact the efficacy of the existing overhead signs on the Bridge. The Consultant shall design and develop a plan to install new large overhead vehicle wayfinding signs, the layout and location of which will be developed and approved by the City as part of the sign plan, to replace existing signage <u>This design may or may not include Advanced Warning Flashers. As part of this plan, the Consultant must explicitly detail any retrofits or upgrades required (structural, electrical, or other) to the bridge structure as a result of these signs.</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The Consultant shall confirm the results of the analysis and outline any required upgrades or constraints with the proposed overhead signs via e-mail and at the bi-weekly meeting. A formal summary of the results should be included in the Design Report. <u>Should the City proceed with the installation of new overhead signs, the resulting upgrades, if any, must be incorporated in the design drawings.</u></p>
A4	<p>Yes, items underlined are to be priced for detailed design, tendering, and construction.</p>
Q5	<p>Article 4.11 - Please clarify the scope and intent in the sentence underlined in the below copy of article 4.11. The Consultant can design the pipes for it’s immediate area of work on this project (the local pipes that tie to the City’s systems), if all external flows / information is provided, and it is confirmed that the downstream systems can handle the anticipated flows. We believe it a large endeavor to model the whole system capacity of the City’s utilities that we tie to, as it would entail whole upstream and downstream analyses, combined with current and potentially future zoning flows. The City’s engineering department, having full knowledge and models of their systems, should do these analyses, similar to the City modelling and providing the watermain size(s) for the new roads. The “local” systems (CBs, storm sewers, sanitary sewers) of this project should be designed by this Consultant.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">4.11 Utilities Requirements</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><u>The Consultant is required to review the City’s utility capacity requirements while completing the analysis for detailed design and construction planning.</u> All detailed designs and construction plans must be coordinated and integrated with other civil infrastructure work in the area, including private site development. The major utilities include, but are not limited to, water, sewer, storm and</p>

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS “RFP” NO. PS20201267
CONSULTANT FOR GRANVILLE CONNECTOR INTERIM CONNECTOR DESIGN AND
NORTH LOOPS REMOVAL**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS NO. 3

	electrical/telecommunications duct infrastructure etc.
A5	<p>Storm sewer capacity calculations will not be provided by the City. It is expected that capacity calculations are performed by the Engineer of Record for the area contributing to the storm sewer design. This includes the entire upstream catchment area. The City will provide guidance for the successful Consultant on future storm system modifications (if any) and future developments in the catchment area.</p> <p>Sanitary sewer upgrades are not required as part of this project.</p>
Q6	The Consultant must also consider and include in their design any secondary structures that may need to be decommissioned in order to facilitate the removal of the loops, such as but not limited to the Black Top and Checker Cab building located within the west loop”. Has the City commissioned a hazardous building materials assessment for the Black Top and Checker Cab building? If so, can a copy of this report be provided?
A6	Yes - this assessment is underway and a copy of the report will be provided once finalized.
Q7	<p>Section 4.18 of the RFP requires the Consultant to “Develop a traffic signal phasing memorandum that includes diagrams outlining the framework for the traffic signal timing plans to be generated through an iterative process using a combination of microsimulation software and intersection capacity analysis software to determine an optimal signal phasing and signal timing strategy”. Reviewing the Synchro and Paramics files prepared by Parsons it is not evident what traffic volumes are to be used for the purposes of developing the above mentioned signal phasing memorandum and ultimately, the signal timing sheets. Please could you advise:</p> <p>(a) What peak hour vehicle turning movement volumes as well as pedestrian/cyclist volumes are to be used?</p> <p>(b) How many peak periods are to be analyzed?</p>
A7	<p>Weekday AM and PM Peaks are suitable for the details of the memorandum, however, the City may request or have questions regarding proposed operations off-peak.</p> <p>Final designs will require 24/7 signal timing plans be provided for review and accepted by the City.</p>
Q8	For the carrying cost to coordinate and deal with coast mountain bus, typically they need some charge code/purchase order for their internal engineering people to cover their costs/time, is it reasonable to conclude this internal cost by CMB the city will cover this? not sure how to allocate some budget for their internal costs and as follow-up Brian, I believe CMB will just embed this cost into the eventual quote that will come out that breaks out their cost for all materials, equipment, labour, temp diesel buses, inspectors etc, but I did have a couple projects where they wanted something up front, I would think for a City project

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS “RFP” NO. PS20201267
CONSULTANT FOR GRANVILLE CONNECTOR INTERIM CONNECTOR DESIGN AND
NORTH LOOPS REMOVAL**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS NO. 3

	they would just embed this internal staff cost as part of their ultimate cost proposal for the project and lastly, not an open question, but I see in the participant list a consultant who is on the Coast Mountain Bus approved consultants that does their trolley wire/infrastructure design, not sure if there is any conflict of interest potential because of this for them??
A8	Any work to be carried out by CMBC on their own asset in connection with this project will be paid by the City directly to CMBC. Consultants should only account for the coordination cost and any associated deliverables required to facilitate coordination and ultimately, obtain approval.
Q9	Section 8.2 of RFP Point vii mentions carrying out field tests as part of consultant's responsibilities. Consultants are usually required to review field tests during construction rather than carrying them. Please clarify.
A9	This point relates to Consultants who may wish to carry out investigative field tests during the detailed design phase to confirm or obtain information pertaining to design assumptions. Construction related QC tests will be the responsibility of the Prime Contractor and Consultants will only need to review these field tests and accept results.
Q10	Section 8.2 of RFP expects consultant to have full time presence on site during construction. in order to provide a level competition ground, would the City consider providing an expected construction duration to all proponents to use to estimate the fees?
A10	A tentative construction schedule has been provided in Part B - Section 2.3 - Overall Project Schedule.
Q11	Section 5.1.2 of RFP; can you please clarify if the City expects two separated design reports for Package A and B? or can they be combined at 75% and 90% submissions?
A11	The City expects to receive two separate design reports for Package A and B.
Q12	Will a structural computer model of the bridge be available to the winning proponent? This will provide a level competition basis for proponents who have not been part of the previous phases of the project.
A12	A model for the Main Span relating to the long-term Connector design has been uploaded to the RFP site as a reference file. No other models will be provided to Consultants.

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS “RFP” NO. PS20201267
CONSULTANT FOR GRANVILLE CONNECTOR INTERIM CONNECTOR DESIGN AND
NORTH LOOPS REMOVAL**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS NO. 3

Q13	Can the City please provide clarification about the expectation regarding Signed and sealed letters of assurance per Section 9.b of the RFP.
A13	<p>Not required. ¶Part B - City Requirements - Section 9 Post Construction Services is amended as below:</p> <p>9 POST-CONSTRUCTION SERVICES</p> <p>The Consultant shall provide the following post-construction services and records, not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Record Drawings as per City standards (format shall be in AutoCad, PDF, and hard copies); b. Signed and sealed letters of assurance for the constructed works;
Q14	<p>Following reference documents are either not available on the FTP site or are corrupt. Could the City please upload them to the FTP site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Geotechnical Bore Logs - Building 36, Granville Island (can't be downloaded) b. Section 3 - Record Drawings - 1952 (corrupt) c. Truss Span Record Drawings - 1995 (corrupt) d. Summary of Foundation Recommendations, Building 36, Granville Island, Vancouver, BC (not on FTP site) e. TCM Pier N18 Grounding - Misc. Repairs (2019) (not on FTP site)
A14	All files listed have been re-uploaded to the FTP.