

## Addendum 2



Town of  
**SOUTH BRUCE  
PENINSULA**

### The Corporation of the Town of South Bruce Peninsula

#### Request for Proposal PW 17-02

#### Architectural Design and Consulting Services for Sauble Town Square Project

---

#### Addendum 2

February 28, 2017

This addendum forms part of the bid document for RFP PW 17-02 for the above noted project, and shall be read in conjunction with the bid document, posted February 15, 2017. The following revisions supersede the information contained in the bid document issued for the above-noted project to the extent referenced and shall become part thereof.

---

1. Is there a boundary survey and a topographical survey? Ideally, the topographic survey would extend from centre line of street to centre line of street and have a grid of about 10 feet or 3 metres in the north-south direction. If these documents are not available, will the Town provide them?

**Town Response: The Frontage of the property is 125 feet and the Depth is 205.8 feet. The Town will not provide a topographic survey at this time.**

2. Is there a geotechnical report describing the findings of a soil investigation? If this is not available, will the Town provide that to the proponents?

**Town Response: There has not been a soil report completed. The geotechnical report will be performed by others before the tendering process.**

3. Are there any hazardous substances and is there a requirement for a Record of Site Condition? Has a phase one environmental assessment been undertaken?

**Town Response: There is no record of any hazardous substances on site. An E.A has not been completed.**

4. The facility as a public outdoor theatre space would have a Group A Occupancy classification under the Ontario Building Code. Please confirm that this is the Classification and that an architect, structural engineer and mechanical and electrical engineering services are required for the project.

## **Addendum 2**

**Town Response: The Sauble Town Square will have a Group A Occupancy classification; an architect will be required for this project.**

5. Please describe the drawings or illustrations required to obtain council approval (3D rendering, plans, site plan, etc.).

**Town Response: The Town will require 2D plans and profile views, a site plan, and possibly a 3D rendering plan.**

6. Please describe the committee structure or meeting process anticipated and if possible, the number of meetings anticipated.

**Town Response: There is no “committee”; staff evaluates all RFPs and proposed works. After the evaluation process the decision to move forward with the proposed works is sent to Council where they decide either to move forward or not. The evaluation process usually takes about a week, prior to Council consideration. The Town anticipates that the recommendation on the award of the RFP will be presented to Council on March 21, 2017. The Town anticipates that the successful bidder shall be required to attend one meeting with Council where they present their design, with potentially a follow-up meeting later in the process, if necessary.**

7. Is there an anticipated approval milestone, such as the presentation to Council, and could the project be cancelled following that meeting?

**Town Response: Council’s approval of the presented design is required to proceed. It is Council’s desire to complete this project. The Town does retain the right to cancel the project if design cannot be agreed to by both parties.**

8. On page 12 of 23: Bullet Point 3 under “1 Proposal Submission” you are requesting that the consultant team include “Geotechnical Engineer”. Our provincial organization, the Ontario Association of Architects, strongly recommends this not be contained within the Architect’s Scope of Work since this is information related to the Owner’s land and any information pertaining to the Owner’s land, including items such as survey, soil conditions, designated substances, etc. be provided by the Owner to the Consultant Team. We request that this item be deleted from the submission requirements. It may be substituted that selected consultant team can “assist” in securing a geotechnical engineer on the Owner’s behalf, although the Owner will contract directly with the Geotechnical Engineer, Land Surveyor, etc. and provide this information to the Consultant Team.

**Town Response: Submissions should include the name of the company the successful bidder plans to use, or suggests the Town hires, for the**

## Addendum 2

**geotechnical engineering for the project. Bidders are not required to include geotechnical engineering fees in the proposal submission.**

9. On page 12 of 23: Bullet Point 7 under “1 Proposal Submission” you are requesting that a “...detailed cost estimate identifying the engineering cost to complete the project”. In our opinion this would be difficult to ascertain at this point without having prepared a design for the project, detailed project parameters in consultation with the Town or investigation of the site. We would request that this be deleted from the RFP submission as the estimated cost will be wide ranging and not provide reliable information which may adversely affect the overall project and a Quality Based Selection of the consultant team.

**Town Response: The request for a “detailed cost estimate” will not be deleted from the RFP submission. Engineering costs encompass the costs for Tasks 1 through 9, described on page 3 of 23 of the RFP document. The detailed cost would be the total engineering cost to complete the project; please see Addendum 1 for similar questions and clarification.**

10. On page 13 of 23: “2 Proposal Criteria” – relative to the previous question; the Town is assigning 25% of the score to item 5 “Budget” which we understand to be the “cost estimate” defined from the Proposal Submission requirements. Once again we would request this component be eliminated as we believe this will significantly skew the selection process for the consultant team and not provide reliable results as based on the design and parameters defined by the City through the design process cost could vary widely. Alternatively, if the Item 5 “Budget” refers to the Appendix A – Bid Forms, this seems to be a more appropriate criteria for selection of a consultant team and therefore please confirm how this portion will be scored since we are submitting (3) distinct Bid Forms for the same project??

**Town Response: It is understood that it is very difficult to estimate detailed costs prior to the final design. In the bid form there is the ability to break down tasks into units and estimated units required to completion. This allows a bid to be qualified with a unit estimate. It gives the evaluator the ability to compare units. The Town uses basically this standard bid form for all projects. The budget component is 25% of the scoring criteria; all projects have a budget, and the lowest budget amount does not guarantee the award. When other factors are equal, then budget would be the deciding factor. The budget component will not be removed.**

11. Can you please confirm the form of contract that will be used to retain the successful proponent (example: OAA Document 600)? Can a copy of this contract be made available, as it may clarify some of the scope questions that were partially addressed in Addendum 1?

## Addendum 2

**Town Response: The Town uses its own contract template. A typical engineering contract is attached to this addendum as a separate document.**

12. Appendix B, item 20 (b) (ii) requests professional liability insurance in the amount of \$2 million per occurrence. This is an extremely high requirement for a project of this scale and is not consistent with industry norms – would you consider reducing this requirement?

**Town Response: The level of insurance will not be lowered and the Town will require the professional liability insurance as described.**

13. Addendum 1, item 1 – Please advise if you require a Professional Quantity Surveyor (PQS) as a sub-consultant within the project team to prepare the final construction cost estimate?

**Town Response: The Town will not require a PQS as a sub-consultant for this project.**

14. Addendum 1, item 2 – The items listed under “Project Supervision” are generally not provided by an architect (with the exception of “Inspections”, which we would call “general review”). Is the general intention to provide pricing for Contract Administration (Office Function) and Contract Administration (Site Function)?

**Town Response: The Town requires the successful bidder to perform all tasks and functions as described in Addendum 1. The Town requests bidders to provide pricing on the bid forms for all functions listed for Task 6: Contract Administration, Task 7: Project Supervision, and Task 8: Project Administration.**

---

\*\* Please Note: This addendum notice must appear with your RFP submission.



Andrew Sprunt  
Manager of Public Works

---

Signature of Bidder

---

Name of Bidder (Please Print)

---

Company Name

---

Date