



PURCHASING SECTION
13450 – 104 Avenue, Surrey, BC V3T 1V8
Tel: 604-590-7274
E-mail: purchasing@surrey.ca

ADDENDUM NO. 1

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) No.: 1220-030-2015-024

TITLE: RCMP EXPANSION – FORMER CITY HALL

ADDENDUM ISSUE DATE: JUNE 23, 2015

CLOSING DATE AND TIME: ON OR BEFORE THE FOLLOWING DATE AND TIME (THE “CLOSING TIME”):

TIME: 3:00 P.M. (LOCAL TIME)

DATE: JULY 3, 2015

INFORMATION FOR PROPONENTS

The following information is provided to answer questions raised by Potential Proponents for the above named project, to the extent referenced and shall become a part thereof. No consideration will be allowed for extras due to the Proponent or any sub-Proponent not being familiar with this addendum. This Addendum No. 1 contains four (4) pages in total.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

- Q1.** The RFP on page 19 of 54 refers to 16,000 sf of existing vacated spaces within the RCMP Main Detachment and Annex with are to undergo limited renovation and reconfiguration to suit internal expansion. Can we assume that the 16,000 sf is the limit of vacated space in the building as part of this consolidation? Can the proponent rely on this 16,000 sf as the limit of renovation in this building, or is there some intention to extend the renovations beyond the 16,000 sf into adjacent floor space that would not be vacated due to staff moves into City Hall?
- A1.** **The values and areas indicated in the RFP offers the proposed extent of limited renovation within the Main Detachment. Change in area would be recognized as a change in scope.**
- Q2.** The budget of between \$5M - \$10M is vague, as is acknowledged in the RFP. While we understand that the detailed programming and design phases of the work will better define the construction budget and you are suggesting that the proponent apply a percentage fee to that budget following the end of the design phase, are you therefore allowing the proponents to similarly limit their estimate of hours for each staff member to complete the work to JUST the pre-design and design phases? This would seem only fair, as we won't know the extent of the work post-design until the design phase has been completed, so we are not in a position to provide hourly dedications.

A2. An estimate of hours for the Construction Contract Administration phase is not essential, but may help determine a percentage fee.

Q3. In a similar vein, you have indicated that our attendance at "minimum bi-weekly" meetings is required. Who from the design team will be required at each of those meetings – just the representatives from the Prime Consultant, or all the team disciplines? Are the meetings expected to run through the entire design and construction process until project completion? Moreover, you have indicated that the proponent is expected to attend "as needed meetings with the City's Engineering, Planning & Development and other regulatory departments who are separate from the Project Team." Do you have any further guidance as to the extent of these meetings for the purposes of assigned estimated hours for staff attendance.

A3. Bi-weekly design and construction phase meetings are considered standard industry practice and it would be acceptable for sub-consultants to attend on an as-needed basis. Other departmental meetings would be on an as-needed basis to secure information and permits.

Q4. It is not clear from page 15 if Advisory Design Panel submissions will be required (or from page 17, if Council, City boards or other committee presentations) will be required.

Again, this question impacts our ability to provide detailed estimates of time required. Can this requirement be confirmed, please?

A4. The Project Team make effort to avoid exterior improvements that may necessitate DP or ADP submissions. City Council and other committees reserve the right to request presentations, as necessary. Please itemize separate cost or hourly rates for additional presentation meetings and/or preparation of any required presentation materials, in addition to work included.

Q5. Similarly, there will be implications from the seismic, mechanical and electrical base building assessments to be done that will impact both scope of work and time dedication. Did the City consider taking care of those studies first and having the reports available for the design team to better estimate necessary scope and time required?

A5. The Project Team requires seismic assessment reporting for information only. Mechanical assessment has been performed and information included by appendix. Existing electrical system assessment is ongoing and utilization will be a function of design team review.

Q6. We would recommend the involvement of a CP but this appears to be up to the proponent as per Page 16. Is the City prepared to pay for a CP directly, or is the proponent responsible for the added cost but relative efficiencies gained by having a CP involved. Should we propose to include one in our team, or would this negatively impact our fees total evaluation and scoring?

A6. CP services are an elective part of the design team.

Q7. The early works tender package possibility to improve schedule is another reason that our time assignments cannot be predicted until after the design phase.

A7. Demolition and Abatement is suggested as a practical early works package to aid in expediting the delivery program.

Q8. The RFP indicates that the proponent's scope is to provide for Commissioning, yet page 16 refers to "the Commission Agent" in the same phrase as "the Project Manager". Is the City providing an independent Commission Agent, or is this a discipline to be carried by the proponent.

- A8. Consultants are to include for coordination and review of standard construction trade commissioning. The City reserves rights to engage a separate Commissioning Authority to oversee the work.**
- Q9.** We are assuming that the City is not carrying a QS and only the proponent team will be doing that – Can you confirm that as well please?
- A9. The Proponent team is to include a Quantity Surveyor. The City may elect to engage a Project Manager, or early Construction Manager to review and provide additional cost input.**
- Q10.** In the RFP there is mention of the City of Surrey Sustainability Charter. This in turn references energy efficiency for City buildings. Is there an energy target or a sustainability target? Will LEED certification be required?
- A10. Project intent is to meet current code and ASHRAE standards, if possible without making changes to the existing building envelope. Energy efficiency will be an evaluation consideration for the HVAC retrofit options. LEED certification is not a specific request of the RFP.**
- Q11.** Are CAD files available for either the existing City Hall or RCMP Detachment buildings? If so, which disciplines are there files for?
- A11. Architectural plans and interior area survey drawings are available for the former City Hall. The original Main Detachment building was completed in 1988 and was not developed in CAD. A/M/SP/E discipline drawings are available in ACad for various Main Detachment renovations. All discipline drawings are available for the Annex building.**
- Q12.** Has a detailed Space Allocation Program been developed for the project or is this to be included in the proponents scope of services?
- A12. Space allocation has been drafted, but has yet to be finalized. The latest draft will be supplied to the successful Proponent for use and further development.**
- Q13.** Will the project require an inventory and analysis of existing equipment and furniture for potential re-use? If new furniture is anticipated, will selection and tender of furnishings be the proponents responsibility?
- A13. Office furniture layout is required. Existing furniture inventory and new workstation purchasing will be performed by the City (as indicted on Page 20).**
- Q14.** Is the structural assessment of existing City Hall Tower intended to evaluate the potential to provide a Post Disaster facility? Will any components of the program require Post Disaster capability?
- A14. Structural assessment is not intended to evaluate for use as a post-disaster operations centre, but to advise on expected level of performance.**
- Q15.** Has there been a Condition Assessment of the building? Are there any expected exterior upgrades anticipated for either building?
- A15. No exterior envelope upgrades will form part of this work, unless related to the design (i.e.: mechanical penetrations, security protection).**
- Q16.** Has an Environmental Assessment been done for the existing buildings, and are any abatement requirements anticipated for either building?

A16. Refer to Appendix 7 for Former City Hall AIM Report; Main Detachment AIM Report will be made available to the successful proponent. Further survey/testing will be performed by the City.

Q17. has any consideration been given to an extension?

A17. In order to avoid delays created by an out of session Council through August, an extension is not being considered at this time.

Q18. Para 5 bullet 16 notes to 'Incorporate City & RCMP standards with respect to IT, security and access control...'.
Where there is a conflict between the two standards, please confirm that RCMP standards will take precedence.

A18. Generally the RCMP standards will supersede City standards, however the RCMP will be further assessing and tailoring a moderated/abridged standard for this specific installation.

END OF ADDENDUM

All Addenda will become part of the RFP Documents.
