

ADDENDUM

Request for Qualifications (RFQ) District of Hudson's Hope New Community Centre

RFQ ADDENDUM #2

Date of Addendum: January 17, 2024

NOTICE TO ALL POTENTIAL RESPONDENTS

The Request for Quotation (RFQ) is modified as set forth in this Addendum. The original RFQ Documents remains in full force and effect, except as modified by this Addendum, which is hereby made part of the RFP. Respondent shall take this Addendum into consideration when preparing and submitting its Proposal.

Addendum #2 clarifies that the Final Development Design phase is part of the Stage 1 scope of work once the RFP is issued. This clarification impact Section 1.3.4 and 1.3.5.

- 1.3.4 While it is uncertain when the District may receive funding from upper levels of government, the District is proceeding with retaining Architect Services in a two-stage contract approach. The contract approach is identified below:
- a) Stage 1 Contract includes: Program & Scope Development Phase, Concept Design Phase, Schematic Design Phase, and final Development Design phase.
 - b) Stage 2 Contract includes: ~~Design-development Phase~~, Construction documentation, Tender, Construction, Quality Management, Commissioning and Warranty.
- 1.3.5 The MUCC Project Leaders will direct and coordinate the project and is leading this RFQ to retain an Architect Team to undertake the next phase of work. Below are the expected milestones for the entire project.

Milestone	Date
RFQ - Notice of successful respondents January 30, 2024	March 1, 2024

Issue RFP to successfully pre-qualified firms	June 2024
Award of Stage 1 Contract for Architect Team Services	September 2024
Concept Design option approved	January 2025
Schematic Design approved	May 2025
Development Design approved	September 2025
End of Stage 1 – Decision to Proceed	December 2025
<i>Award of Stage 2 Contract for Architect Team Services</i>	<i>TBD</i>
<i>Design Development Phase complete / approved</i>	<i>TBD</i>
<i>95% Construction Documents complete</i>	<i>TBD</i>
<i>Bid Document Review complete</i>	<i>TBD</i>
<i>Revisions made and approval to tender</i>	<i>TBD</i>
<i>Site Plan Process</i>	<i>TBD</i>
<i>Building Permit</i>	<i>TBD</i>
<i>General Contractor Pre-qualification complete</i>	<i>TBD</i>
<i>Issue Tender</i>	<i>TBD</i>
<i>Award of Construction Contract</i>	<i>TBD</i>
<i>Occupancy</i>	<i>TBD</i>

QUESTIONS

Additional questions that have been received and responded to via email.

Is the budget provided a "project" or "construction" budget? **The amount provided was an estimate based only.**

Can the District share the proposed Building Area available at this time? **It has not been finalized. Options included replace existing building and location, or expand off other recreation amenities (i.e., arena). Has not been finalized, looking for input through RFP process.**

Section 4.2 section 1 requests to include "respective projected costs of their involvement". We understand this to be an RFQ and no Fees are being submitted at this time. Please confirm no fees are required. **Correct.**

Are Hourly Rates for various positions required as part of this Submission? **No.**

The RFQ outlines 4 primary subconsultants - Structural, Mechanical, Electrical, Civil.

Would the District like the inclusion of larger team qualifications?: ie. Cost, Code, Envelope, Landscape Architecture. Or will these sub-consultants be included as part of the team submissions for Short-listed teams later in the process? **If you have information on the larger team, please include.**

Will the District contract its own cost estimate? or should the prime consultant carry this contract? **Prime.**

I am writing to ask if a full consultant team is required for our response to this request for qualifications. Each submission will be evaluated on the strength of its' submission. **If you have a full team, please include it.**

It seems that only the architectural design team qualifications are currently required and that sub-consulting engineers are not. **Section 4 on the evaluation criteria is looking for sub-consultant team qualifications:**

Provide a one (1) page bio for each of the following Engineering Leads: Structural, Electrical, Civil and Mechanical, indicating experience, extent of individual's time to be devoted to the project, and notable achievements in the area of this work assignment and include services on a minimum of two (2) comparable projects with description, role on the project, construction budget and year substantially completed.

Evaluation of the Staff will include an assessment of the firm's overall ability to provide adequate resources to this project.

As this project is proposed to be delivered using an Integrated Design Process (IDP), could you please clarify:

- 1) Is the District Retaining an IDP facilitator for inclusion in the team? **No.**
- 2) If one if not provided by the District, does the architect need to have internal experience with IDP delivery, or can a 3rd party IDP facilitator be subcontracted as part of the project team? **Can be either.**
- 3) Does the IDP facilitator need to be named in the proposal response? **Ideally, I would say 'yes' that the IDP facilitator needs to be named in the proposal response. The reason is that we are shortlisting firms that are qualified in the IDP delivery. No naming them would make it difficult to properly evaluate a firms submission and whether they are qualified.**

The RFP asks for an IDP approach. As per the link and paragraph above, there are two ways this process happens. One is informal - which is basically what Architects do all day long. We work with all stakeholders and our consultant team to put together the best solution that meets the various needs, site constraints, budget etc. The critical thing is that all the stakeholders and all the consultants are involved from the start, not brought in later.

Not sure what you mean by informal IDP. At this time, the RFP is to identify experienced firms with IDP experience. I suspect that through the process, there will always be the need for input from structural, mechanical, and electrical engineers as they implement the design and suggest appropriate systems. Is this what you mean by informal or conventional design?

On the reference template, there is a field that asks "Hudson's Hope Public Library: Yes/No Reno/New" and one that asks "Others Yes/No Reno/New". Can you clarify the expected answers to these questions? We think perhaps you want confirmation that the referenced project includes a library or the other scope items, but your clarification would be appreciated.

In terms of your first question, you are correct in that we are looking for the type of renovation project or new construction. If you have worked on a library project, was it a new build or renovation of an existing structure. Under the 'Others' section, please outline one of the other larger projects your firm has worked on and again, whether it was a new build or renovation.

Could you confirm if you're looking for Design Team only for this, or if you're wanting a General Contractor included in Phase I for pricing purposes? If a contractor is included in the Phase I for pricing, would you deem them as being in conflict and ineligible to bid on the project when it comes to that phase?

Our focus is on the Design Team. I would say that if you have the General Contractor information to include it. You can always identify it separately if you feel that will be easier. The GC would still be eligible to bid on the project when it comes to that phase.

Who would be responsible for costing? Should the consultant team carry a cost consultant? Or will the client hire a third party? And if the consultant team will be responsible for costing, could this be a General Contractor OR a Quantity Surveyor (Cost Consultant)?

General Contractors can be a little more in tune with conditions on the ground, particularly with a "remote" site like Hudson's Hope.

And a final follow up question - if it can be a GC, would that then bar them from submitting to a future tender process?

The consulting team would be responsible for costing. I suspect the consulting team would identify the type of person to want to use in this role (i.e. General Contractor or Quantity Surveyor). I agree that a qualified General Contractor would have a better understanding with the conditions on the ground in northeast BC.

If it is a General Contractor, the firm would not be barred from submitting to a future tender process.

Our team has a question for this RFQ. The evaluation criteria for this RFQ requests information on the Architect / Design Team and Sub-Consultants in the proposal criteria, but does not mention the builder/general contractor (GC).

Could you please clarify if we would need to include a builder's qualifications in the RFQ proposal response as well? Or will the District issue a separate RFQ for contractors?

Thanks for your question. If you have builder's qualifications, please include it with your proposal. As stated in our documentation, the intent we are trying to achieve through the RFQ Process is to develop a short-list of qualified firms to send out the RFP document. In this sense, if you feel including the builders' qualifications, will provide a more comprehensive submission, please include them if they are available.

Any luck getting answers on whether this is a formal or informal IDP project, or what the desired energy target/framework might be?

To answer your remaining questions. No decision on formal vs. informal IDP and no discussion or direction on desired energy target/framework.