



66-2010 ADDENDUM 15

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR PROFESSIONAL CONSULTING SERVICES FOR THE DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE WINNIPEG POLICE SERVICE HEADQUARTERS AT 266 GRAHAM AVENUE (FORMER CANADA POST BUILDING) IN WINNIPEG

URGENT

PLEASE FORWARD THIS DOCUMENT TO WHOEVER IS IN POSSESSION OF THE BID OPPORTUNITY

ISSUED: June 18, 2010
BY: Coleen Groening
TELEPHONE NO. (204) 986-2491

THIS ADDENDUM SHALL BE INCORPORATED INTO AND FORMS PART OF THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS.

Template Version: A20070419

Please note the following and attached changes, corrections, additions, deletions, information and/or instructions in connection with the Request for Proposals, and be governed accordingly.

NOTE:

Addendum 15 revises the Scope of Service for this Request for Proposal to provide the City with 100% design services.

All revisions contained in Addenda 15 Request for Proposal are indicated as "Revised" or "Added".

The requirement for LEED related services is deleted.

A new Word version of Table 1(R2) is issued.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Responses to Questions not yet answered will be included in further Addenda as the responses are developed.

Clause and Page numbering may be changed as a result of Addendum 15 revisions. Please read the revised clauses carefully.

PROPONENT CONFERENCE QUESTIONS

PQ8 With regards to D6.1.1 relative to fees —different project delivery methods result in different potential consultant time requirements. For the base RFP response, we assume that our fee will be based on a standard design/bid /build process for the three potential packages because it is not possible to confirm at this time, the possible outcome of a CM process with possible multiple tender packages?

PA8 See Addendum 15 Request for Proposal

PQ37 In reference to D12 Critical Stages; we are of the opinion that completion of work ready for the procurement process (D12.1 a), (D5.1 Scope of Services a-d) be completed by March 31, 2011

PA 37 See D4.2 Addendum 15 Request for Proposal

PQ37-1 Q1. Is the \$102 million intended to cover what are commonly known as “hard costs” with “soft costs” being covered by separate budget allowances?

PA37-1 See D4.2 Addendum 15 Request for Proposal

PQ37-2 The Shindico Report contains a Class D Estimate of \$97,534,735 (2009 costing) prepared by Bird Construction. This is for the work as described, drawn and contained in the Shindico Report. That Bird Budget number is qualified by 28 exclusions, many of which will impact significantly the “hard costs.” The RFP budget is \$102,000,000 which is \$4,465,265 more than the Bird Budget.

Q2. Has the City done an estimate of the additional costs to the Bird Construction Budget of the construction “hard cost” exclusions?

PA37-2 No

PQ37-3 Q3. Is this budget increase of \$4,465,265 and the \$9,000,000 contingency intended to cover all expected additional “hard costs” including the exclusions listed in the Bird Budget?

PA37-3 See D4.2 Addendum 15 Request for Proposal

PQ37-4 Q4. Is it the intention that the Pre-Design Project Budget Review (D.5.1.(a)(iv)) be undertaken by the Project Manager and the consulting team to establish an affordable and achievable Construction Budget for all “hard cost” construction work as required and as described in the Shindico Report?

PA37-4 No

PQ37-5 Q5. Or is it the expectation that the total value of Construction Contracts for which the consultants will prepare tender documents will not exceed \$102,000,000 and the focus of the Pre-Design Project Budget Review will be to adjust the scope of work as currently defined in the Shindico Report to meet the \$102,000,000 budget?

PA37-5 Yes

PQ45 What form will the Design/Build portion of the project take?

- P3;
- Design/Build;
- Design/Build/Finance;
- Design/Build/Turn Key; or
- Design/Build/Leaseback?

PA45 Not yet determined

PQ46 Re D5.9 Who is the independent Project Coordinator and what is their related experience? Please provide the proponents with the scope of their contract as this person potentially now plays a key role.

PA46 Not yet determined

PQ47 The scope of services listed under Construction Services D5.1.(f)

- (iii) Construction Inspection and Review;
- (v) Progress reports/Evaluation;
- (vi) Interpretation of contract documents; and
- (vii) Review of Shop Drawings product Data/Sample.

As well as the scope of services listed under Post-Construction Services D5.1.(g)

- (i) Project Inspection;
- (ii) Deficiency Assessment;
- (iii) instructions for Correction of Deficiencies;
- (iv) Client Consultation.

are normally not included in the scope of services provided by a Bridging Consultant as all of those responsibilities are borne by the P-3 or Design, Build, Finance partner to the City. We ask that these items be deleted from the Scope of Services. If any of the items are to be included, such as client consultation after completion or reports to the client during construction- we request that you clarify their scope and intent.

PA47 See Addendum 15 Request for Proposal

PQ48 After the Proponent's meeting this afternoon it became apparent that the attending consultant team representatives do not believe that there is reasonable time to adjust a response to the RFP for the Winnipeg Police Services HQ for a June 24, 2010 submission. We respectfully request an extension to July 8, 2010.

PA48 See Addendum 15 Request for Proposal

PQ49 Upon further review it is our opinion that a final submission date of December 15, 2010 for items (a) Pre-design thru (d) Drawing and Specification Preparation (assuming 30% design) is not a reasonable timeframe to complete the required services in. We therefore request a revision to the submission date of March 31, 2011.

PA49 See Addendum 15 Request for Proposal

PQ50 The City of Winnipeg has redefined the scope of work and role for the Consultant team to be selected for this project as an Advocate/Bridging consultancy role. The scope indicates this role is advisory after the (e) Procurement stage. As such the responsibility for adherence to the dates of substantial and total performance of the remaining design and construction should not be a requirement of the consultant awarded the contract

for services for this Advocate role. We request all reference to the Consultant meeting these dates be eliminated from this RFP as it belongs in the proposed Design-Build scope of work.

PA50 See Addendum 15 Request for Proposal

PQ51 We are of the opinion that it will take some time to revise our proposals. We propose July 8th, 2010 for the date to complete the work.

PA51 See Addendum 15 Request for Proposal

PQ52 In reference to D12 Critical Stages; we are of the opinion that completion of work ready for the procurement process (D12.1 a), (D5.1 Scope of Services a-d) be completed by March 31, 2011.

PA52 See Addendum 15 Request for Proposal

PQ53 Critical Stages D12.2 a & b, we are taking the comments as information. Responsibility for total performance will lie in the hands of the Design Build contractor. Further D12.2 a, the date of December 30, 2011 is unrealistic. We would recommend that this date be identified as "to be determined by the project team, including the successful proponent." An intent to have the shooting range available as soon as possible can be identified.

PA53 See Addendum 15 Request for Proposal

PQ54 Given the change in delivery process, we request that the due date be changed to July 8th, 2010 at 4:00 p.m. in order to give us sufficient time to revise our proposal.

PA54 See Addendum 15 Request for Proposal

PQ55 Given the change in delivery process, we request that the due date for the Firing Range and Total Performance be removed from the RFP as they will now be the responsibility of the Design/Build team.

PA55 See Addendum 15 Request for Proposal

PQ56 Given the change in delivery process, please confirm that all LEED related services will be removed as they are now the responsibility of the Design/Build team and not the Advocate Architect.

PA56 See Addendum 15 Request for Proposal

PQ57 Under D5.1(c) and (d) Scope of Services we have been told that that the Bridging Consultant will be responsible for "30% design". It is important that "30%" be clarified so that all proponents are pricing the same scope of services

PA57 See Addendum 15 Request for Proposal

PQ58 In a previous question, we outlined that Construction Services D.1.(f) (iii) (v) (vi) and (vii) as well as Post-Construction Services D5.1(g) (i)(ii) (iii) (iv) are normally not included in the scope of services provided by a Bridging Consultant as these are the responsibilities of the Design/Build partner to the City. We asked that these items be deleted from the Scope of Services. If any of the items are to be included, such as client consultation after completion or reports to the client during construction, we requested that you clarify their scope and intent.

PA58 See Addendum 15 Request for Proposal

PQ59 Due to the need to prepare performance documents for a Design/Build Tender as well as resolve program and schematic design/design development (depending on the discipline involved), we request that the target date for completion be extended from December 15, 2010 to March 31, 2011.

PA59 See Addendum 15 Request for Proposal

PQ60 Submission deadline be extended to July 8, 2010

PA60 See Addendum 15 Request for Proposal

PQ61 Completion date for Scope of Services relating to D5.1(a) to D5.1(d), inclusive, being planning, programming, 30% design and specification documents, be extended to March 30, 2011.

PA61 See Addendum 15 Request for Proposal

PQ62 Revise RFP Item D12.2 critical stages dates for construction in accordance with revised date in Item (b) above and to suit the City's anticipated construction delivery method.

PA62 See Addendum 15 Request for Proposal

PQ63 The City to clarify type of contract expected to be awarded to Design/Build Contractor (i.e. CCDC-type contract). This will assist Consultant with further identifying their specific roles and responsibilities.

PA63 The City has not yet determined the details of the Design/Build procurement strategy.