

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

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS NO. 2

ISSUED ON January 12, 2021

Q1	<p>We may not be able to proposed if this language remains (and is to be incorporated into the agreement as is noted).</p> <p>Item 10.6 on Page 43 appears to require the Consultant to pay for reviews that the City in its discretion, deems chargeable. We have not seen this before, and this can be very onerous.</p> <p>Please kindly consider deleting Item 10.6 from the requirements.</p>
----	--

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

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS NO. 2

10.6 Acceptance of Design Deliverables

The Consultant’s design submissions will be reviewed by a large number of City staff from applicable functional areas, and by external partners/stakeholders and their representatives, such as consulting engineers representing land owners and developers or third party utility providers. As such, the Consultant is required to concisely and effectively track and resolve any comments received throughout the design progress using a Comment Tracking Log, see Section 10.5 above.

In response to the City’s experience from recent design consulting engagements, where the City has experienced a significant portion of detailed design submissions ignoring or not incorporating previous comments made from City staff, and the resulting unnecessary additional time required from City staff to review and re-comment on submissions, the Consultant is advised:

43

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS NO. PS20201267
CONSULTANT FOR THE GRANVILLE INTERIM CONNECTOR DESIGN & NORTH LOOPS REMOVAL
PART B - CITY REQUIREMENTS**

- i. Design package submissions that do not include a fully completed comments sheet (including the Consultant’s response to each comment) will be immediately rejected by the City Project Manager and all costs associated with the resubmission will be at the expense of the Consultant (and no request for additional cost or schedule will be approved);
- ii. Where it is apparent that previous comments have not been incorporated into future designs (with the exception of comments that are not essential to the progress of design) the Consultant will be required to resubmit the design package to include these comments within one week (at no cost to the City and with no implication to the overall Project schedule); and
- iii. Where a re-review of a submission is necessary by City staff, the Consultant will be required to compensate the City for this additional staffing resource due to the lack of quality control provided in that submission and to cover the resource costs for staff.

The City will determine the manner by which such compensation will be paid by the Consultant to the City, which may include setting off such amounts against the fees payable by the City to the Consultant. The determination of compensation as described by the final item above will be based on direct tracking of staff time for a particular re-review. While a total cost is difficult to estimate at present (re-reviews could be either a full or partial submission), the hourly rates for indicative staff that are involved in the design review process is outlined in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Indicative Staffing Costs for Re-submission Reviews

Staff Member	Hourly Rate (Including Benefits and Overhead)
Engineering Assistant IV	\$59.80/hr

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

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS NO. 2

	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Electrical Technician I</td> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: right;">\$61.54/hr</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Electrical Engineer I</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$79.53/hr</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Civil Engineer I</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$79.53/hr</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Civil Engineer II</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$89.79/hr</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Civil Engineer II+</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$96.10/hr</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Branch Manager</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$103.70/hr</td> </tr> </table> <p>Further, given the expedited timelines for this assignment, if it is found that the Consultant's 50% design submission is not substantially in conformance with the City's Design Submission Requirements (in terms of content and clarity), or that the provided designs are not substantially in conformance with the City's design standards, then the Consultant will be required to prepare and submit a 70% design submission for the applicable design packages, with no provision of additional fees or schedule to the Consultant.</p> <p>The incentive scheme detailed above is intended to encourage the Consultant to pay close attention to and respond appropriately to City staff comments. This incentive scheme will be</p> <p style="text-align: right;">44</p> <hr style="border: 1px solid gray;"/> <p style="text-align: center;">REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS NO. PS20201267 CONSULTANT FOR THE GRANVILLE INTERIM CONNECTOR DESIGN & NORTH LOOPS REMOVAL PART B - CITY REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>incorporated by the City into the agreement to be entered into by the successful Consultant and the City.</p>	Electrical Technician I	\$61.54/hr	Electrical Engineer I	\$79.53/hr	Civil Engineer I	\$79.53/hr	Civil Engineer II	\$89.79/hr	Civil Engineer II+	\$96.10/hr	Branch Manager	\$103.70/hr
Electrical Technician I	\$61.54/hr												
Electrical Engineer I	\$79.53/hr												
Civil Engineer I	\$79.53/hr												
Civil Engineer II	\$89.79/hr												
Civil Engineer II+	\$96.10/hr												
Branch Manager	\$103.70/hr												
A1	<p>The Part B - City Requirements - 10.6 Acceptance of Design Deliverables clause was added based on past experience, where Consultants re-submitted design without incorporating the City comments. As such its been asked in clause 10.5 for MUST use of a "Tracking Log". And if that's not done or items missed, only then clause 10.6 can be invoked.</p> <p>The Proponents opinion that "the Consultant to pay for reviews that the City in its discretion, deems chargeable" is not accurate. If the tracking log is diligently maintained and shared along with their submission mentioning (checking the box) that such and such comments have been added and there is no outstanding comments, I believe it will address all parties concerns.</p>												

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

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS NO. 2

Q2	<p>Part B - City Requirements, Section 6.5 Archaeological Studies, First Nations Referrals & Permits indicates that the consultant is to work with the City’s Archaeologist (or delegate), and the City’s Archaeologist will coordinate with First Nation Partners. However, in Part C Form of Proposal - Key Personnel item d indicates archaeological services. Would you please clarify the roles, responsibilities and scope for the Consultant Team and the City Team for archaeological issues related to this project.</p>
A2	<p>Part B - City Requirements - Section 6.5 Archaeological Studies, First Nations Referrals & Permits indicates that “The City Archaeologist will coordinate with First Nation partners to facilitate field representation. The Consultant may be requested to provide input or materials, as required, to facilitate communication with First Nation partners.”</p> <p>To confirm, the City Team is responsible for coordinating with First Nations Partners. The Consultant is responsible for providing all relevant information and materials (schedules, drawings and details, locations, methods, etc...) to the City Team to facilitate this coordination and establish procedural requirements. The Consultant is also responsible for facilitating field participation to City and First Nations field representatives and ensuring all ground works operate under the procedures outlined by the City Archaeologist (chance find procedure, hydrovac procedures, etc...). Given there is a previously recorded archaeological site in proximity to the Project area, the Consultant team should have experience with planning and managing the risk of encountering/impacting archaeological resources.</p>
Q3	<p>Part C Form of Proposal - Key Personnel Item B indicates the team is to include experience in architecture and urban design. Part B Section 4.6 Civil (Streets) Design Requirements indicates the City will be responsible for sign and painting plans as well as landscape plans. Would you please clarify the anticipated scope for the consultant team related to architecture and urban design?</p>
A3	<p>The Consultant's expected scope with respect to architecture and urban design 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.</p>
Q4	<p>Part B Section 1.2.4 refers to the Stantec, VIA Architecture (2020) Granville Bridge Connector Memo - Urban Design Concepts and indicates it would be included in the reference documents. This report appears to be missing from the reference documents. Please provide this report for our reference.</p>
A4	<p>The memo has been uploaded to the FTP site under the following file name:</p> <p>GRANVILLE CONNECTOR CONCEPTUAL DESIGN - URBAN DESIGN MEMO- 2020.pdf</p>

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

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS NO. 2

Q5	“Will the City provide all electronic files and work to date? In particular, will the structural modelling and analyses files be provided? Firms other than the incumbents will be at a significant disadvantage if they will be building models from 0% done, as oppose to incumbents who will be starting from 75% done, or wherever they left off.”
A5	<p>While the City has provided traffic modelling files, the City will not be providing structural modelling and analysis files completed by previous Consultants. Consultants are expected to create and rely on their own structural models and analysis.</p> <p>Structural analysis that has been completed to date on the Connector related to the long-term design and was at a conceptual/preliminary level. Structural analysis that has been completed to date on the North Loops Removal scope is high-level. Any perceived disadvantages could be negated by Consultants that focus on value-added services in their proposals, which are evaluated based on overall value that comprises multiple factors and is not dependent upon one aspect of the proposal.</p>