

**VILLAGE OF PEMBERTON**

**Design Services for Field Amenity Building and Storage Building**

**RFP #2023-01**

**ADDENDUM NO. 1**

**1. RESPONSES TO PROPONENT INQUIRIES**

**QUESTION 1:** Can you confirm status of funding for this project?

**ANSWER 1:** Provincial funding has been secured

**QUESTION 2:** How many site visits/in person meeting should be included?

**ANSWER 2:** Assume two for the design lead, none for subconsultants.

**QUESTION 3:** Will a commercial kitchen ventilation system (NFPA 96) be required for the building?

**ANSWER 3:** The kitchen will have counter top appliances and a basic oven / range requiring a standard hood fan.

**QUESTION 4:** Are lump sum fees to be provided up to tendering?

**ANSWER 4:** Yes

**QUESTION 5:** Are IFC drawings and Schedule CB to be included?

**ANSWER 5:** No

**QUESTION 6:** Are issued for Building Permit drawings to be included?

**ANSWER 6:** Yes

**QUESTION 7:** Are fees for Schedule B to be included?

**ANSWER 7:** Yes

**QUESTION 8:** Can the disciplines required from the consultant's team be confirmed? Are code, envelope and, energy compliance consultants optional? Landscape architect not necessary?

**ANSWER 8: Code, Envelope, Energy Compliance, and Landscape consultants are optional for proposal submission. Inclusion of these services can be discussed after Proponent selection has been completed.**

**QUESTION 9:** Is ISL Engineering's quote to be included in the proposal?

**ANSWER 9: Not mandatory. It will not change the evaluation since all Proponents will have the same civil scope/fees.**

**QUESTION 10:** Who is the RFP addressed to?

**ANSWER 10: The Village of Pemberton, C/O Marco Cusano at McElhanney ([mcusano@mcelhanney.com](mailto:mcusano@mcelhanney.com))**

**QUESTION 11:** Are post tender and construction stages to be included?

**ANSWER 11: No. Re-evaluation of project scope, budget, and timelines will take place at a later time. Assuming all project indicators are viable it is anticipated that a simple contract extension will be negotiated with the engaged Proponent.**

**QUESTION 12:** Will a new BC Hydro Utility Service be required for this project? Or is existing being upgraded. Is there any information available on the existing service?

**ANSWER 12: The recently installed soccer field lighting system was sized to supply the facilities identified in this RFP. Electrical conduit is in proximity to the proposed amenity building.**

**QUESTION 13:** How many EV Chargers are to be allocated for in the design?

**ANSWER 13: Four (4) parking spots (two (2) x dual port Level 2 slow chargers)**

**QUESTION 14:** Does VoP require the consultant to be a certified architect?

**ANSWER 14: No. The Proponent may be a design firm (i.e. not registered for sealing) that subcontracts an Architect or Architectural firm for the purpose of providing sealed drawings.**

**QUESTION 15:** Will the VoP be contractually engaged with each subconsultant and have the proponent manage subconsultants or will the proponent manage subconsultants and engage directly with subconsultants?

**ANSWER 15:** The Preferred Proponent will be contractually engaged with all subconsultants except the Geotechnical Engineer and the Quantity Surveyor.

**QUESTION 16:** Please advise on the contract type with reference to the consultant contract structure?

**ANSWER 16:** Likely CCDC31 – 2020 Service Contract Between Owner and Consultant, to be confirmed. The RFP notes AIBC Doc 8C as an option, though this contract may not be suitable for the preferred governance structure.

**QUESTION 17:** Will the fee submission include lumpsum for each subconsultant or will a lump sum inclusive of all consultants be included?

**ANSWER 17:** Prefer lump sum broken out for each subconsultant.

**QUESTION 18:** Would the building design services proposal for this RFP ideally include each subconsultants proposal as an attachment for full transparency?

**ANSWER 18:** Yes.

**QUESTION 19:** How will services beyond *Deliverables and Schedule* be addressed? Will proposals outline minimum basic required services and fees?

**ANSWER 19:** Proponents must be capable of delivering the services required beyond *Deliverables and Schedule* as it is anticipated that a contract extension will be negotiated. However, no proposal content is required to address these efforts.

**QUESTION 20:** The scope of technical support during tendering includes?

**ANSWER 20:**

- i. drafting supplemental/technical specifications for inclusion in bid documents
- ii. reviewing overall draft bid documents
- iii. attending pre-bid meeting
- iv. reviewing and drafting responses to bid period queries
- v. reviewing bid submissions and providing an award recommendation letter

**Note,** if significant value engineering is required it will be considered additional effort, though efforts will be made early on to mitigate the risk of needing value engineering.

**QUESTION 21:** Will there be one set of documents for both buildings? Are they going to be tendered and phased as one project, permit? Or could multiple packages be required for phasing/breaking out the construction contract?

**ANSWER 21:** Details of the delivery method will be confirmed with support from the Preferred Proponent. It is possible the two buildings will be constructed at different times and possibly by different contractors. Note the form and character of the two buildings will differ from each other which may lend itself to construction by different contractors of the required specialization.

**Permit applications are likely to be submitted separately to avoid delay. Note this project is considered a priority for the Village so permitting review will likely be fast tracked.**

**QUESTION 22:** In the table Deliverables and Schedule, it is noted construction period services for civil works. Please advise on the scope. Would this consist of managing construction RFI's fielding these to the civil sub-consultant, managing typical SI / CO / CCO / CD process? Would the managing consultant also be required to provide payment certification on contractors claim for the civil construction works?

**ANSWER 22:**

The civil scope will not impact evaluation as all Proponents are to use ISL. The construction scope to be completed in 2023 is exclusively civil, so the Village can coordinate directly with ISL for management of this effort, with only ISL's invoicing and minor design coordination for future building works being channeled through the Preferred Proponent during this period.

**QUESTION 23:** Is there breakdown of budget allocations? Is the overall budget exclusively construction cost or inclusive of soft cost consultant fees?

**ANSWER 23:** Approximately \$2.5M is available. This is to include the proposed +/-180m sanitary and water service extensions to site, nearby storm connection, EV chargers, parking lot with soft wayfinding lighting (assume two poles), the two buildings with all fixtures, furniture, and equipment, all consulting fees, and contingency. Wayfinding lighting that is not part of the building will be managed by ISL, therefore this scope/fee will be the same for all Proponents and will not impact selection of the Preferred Proponent.

**QUESTION 24:** Is there already (or will be) sufficient electrical service in place to support the design program for the building(s) including the servicing for EV charging stations?

**ANSWER 24:** There is already sufficient electrical supply in proximity to site.

## **2. REVISED SUBMISSION DEADLINE**

Submission deadline is extended to **2pm Friday May 5<sup>th</sup>, 2023.**