



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

ADDENDUM #1

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) No.: 1220-030-2016-017
TITLE: GEOTECHNICAL SERVICES – SOUTH SURREY OPERATIONS CENTRE
ADDENDUM ISSUE DATE: March 4, 2016
CLOSING DATE AND TIME: ON OR BEFORE THE FOLLOWING DATE AND TIME (THE “CLOSING TIME”):
TIME: 3:00 p.m., local time
DATE: March 8, 2016

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 any Proponent not being familiar with this addendum. This Addendum #1 contains three (3) pages in total.

GENERAL NOTE:

Regarding Schedule C-5 – Proponent’s Financial Proposal, the City requests that financial proposals be itemized with the separation of services (onsite, offsite, and road works). Proponents are to provide detailed breakdown for each of the geotechnical services noted above for each stage of the project.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Q1: Is there an approximate budgetary expectation the city has in mind for the geotechnical consulting?

A1: No.

Q2: Scope section k) Soils investigation/report for all offsite roads. Would this be a separate report or could be included in the main geotechnical report?

A2: Proponents shall propose their own work methodology and reporting strategy that aligns with the project goals, objectives and overall schedule. Proponents are to provide soil investigation and recommendations for each road separately in separate sections.

Q3: Based on the site plans it appears that road widenings would not require substantial rebuild of existing roads, and therefore likely no site investigation within existing traffic areas?

A3: 23rd Avenue:

Site investigation within existing traffic areas will be required for 23rd Avenue. The geotechnical engineer shall confirm the condition of the existing road pavement/structure and provide recommendations.

24th Avenue:

Site investigation within the road widening strip that is associated with the project will be required. Since 24th Avenue is an arterial road site investigation within existing traffic areas may not be required. However, Proponents should provide separate pricing for site investigation within existing traffic areas for 24th Avenue.

Q4: Scope section I) says Geotechnical field review services and reports during the construction (etc). Would construction services be included as part of our current budget submission? Or just one budget up to the report submission? Or 2 separate budgets?

A4: Yes, also see general note above.

Q5: Project meetings and consultation – I would envision one (1) kickoff meeting with Surrey prior to commencing, then phone calls plus 1-2 meetings during the design phase with the structural/architect/etc. Would that be a reasonable expectation?

A5: Proponents should clearly indicate level of efforts and assumptions for the required services included the RFP document.

Q6: Does the City require the geotechnical consultant to carry out the entirety of QC density tests during construction for all of the Offsite portion of the project (i.e. road fill, trench backfill, etc.), or does the City envision the consultant carrying out QA during construction, and the Contractor to be responsible for QC density testing?

A6: Density reviews and testing during construction are required. Proponents are to provide separate pricing for this service.

Q7: The same question above with respect to the Onsite parking lot area.

A7: Density reviews and testing during construction are required. Proponents are to provide separate pricing for this service.

Q8: The RF Binnie Civil Site Plan, as well as the Schematic Design Report, do not appear to show 167th Street being constructed as part of this current scope of work. Is construction of 167th Street (and related geotechnical field review) included in the current scope of work?

A8: At the moment, work on 167th Street includes sidewalk and boulevard only, no roadworks. Density testing is also required for sidewalk construction. Proponents are to provide separate pricing for this service.

Q9: Is the existing pavement structure along 24th Avenue and 23rd Avenue to be evaluated and recommendations prepared for rehabilitation of this section of roadway, or are recommendations only required for the new widened pavement section outside the existing pavement structure?

A9: Refer to answer 3 above.

END OF ADDENDUM #1

All Addenda will become part of the RFP Documents.
