

Addendum #1

Issue Date: August 25, 2020

Description of Addendum

The purpose of this Addendum is to address Respondent Enquiries by amending or clarifying the terms or contents of the Request for Qualifications for Design-Build Services.

Respondent Enquiries

Question #1

Source

2.5 Data Room

Request

The District has discovered a typo in the RFQ in the above-mentioned section.

Response

The District clarifies that this statement should read:

“In the event of a conflict or inconsistency between the paper form of a document and the digital, electronic or other computer readable form, the electronic conformed version of the RFQ in the custody and control of the ~~Province~~District will govern and take precedence.”

Question #2

Source

Key Individuals (Page 9)

Request

Can the Respondent combine any of the 11 Key Individuals, as 1 Key Individual may possess the experience to meet the requirement of two or more of the 11 listed Key Individuals?

Response

As noted in the RFQ (Section 1.2): "Key Individuals may fill multiple roles provided they have the qualifications and experience for all the roles."

The District does not intend to evaluate additional Key Individuals during the RFP stage.

Question #3

Source

Utility Accommodation (Page 16)

Request

The importance of relocating utilities on the Project is key to meeting the Project schedule. We request that the District negotiate and provide cooperative agreements with all affected utility owners prior to the RFP. If the District is not able to negotiate cooperative agreements with the utility owners, is the District prepared to commit to providing an allowance or compensable event related to inabilities to relocate the utilities on time to meet the District’s schedule?

Response

The District will confirm utility relocation responsibilities in the RFP.

The District is currently consulting with utility providers to collect requirements that inform the reference concept design and RFP requirements. Responsibility to finalize the design will be transferred to the Design-Build Contractor under the Design-Build Agreement.

It is anticipated that Design-Build Contractor will be responsible for coordinating and managing the utility relocations that are necessary to perform the work in accordance with the RFP. This may include coordinating and managing utility relocations, site access work, and work related to permits, approvals, safety, environmental matters and other work normally undertaken by a general contractor.

It is further anticipated that a failure by a third party to perform utility relocations in a timely fashion may be a reimbursable delay under the Design-Build Agreement.

Question #4

Source

2.3.1 Permitting (Page 15)

Request

Long lead approvals – Provided the DBC remains within the District’s right-of-ways and design parameters, please confirm that the three agency’s permits will be issued so not to affect the schedule?

Response The schedule in Section 2.4 of the RFQ is subject to third party regulatory approvals and these dates may be adjusted during the Competitive Selection Process. Consistent with Section 2.3.1 of the RFQ, the District will provide the three approvals / permits / authorizations discussed in that section. The anticipated requirements and commitments from these permits will be provided in the RFP.

Question #5

Source Geotechnical Conditions (Page 16)

Request Data room – The current geotechnical information provided is insufficient to reasonably and adequately assess the geotechnical risks. Uncertainty in geotechnical information adds significant costs in the DB tender method. Therefore, if additional geotechnical data is provided prior to the RFP, this will give all Respondents the ability to appropriately price the work, and not add unnecessary risk money. Please indicate to what extent will the District provide additional geotechnical data the DBC can rely on prior to the RFP? Can the Respondent suggest additional investigation?

Response Yes, additional geotechnical information will be provided in the RFP.

In May/June 2020, the District conducted geotechnical investigations to supplement the existing information. This involved a test hole at each abutment, and a test hole mid-river near the existing pier. The factual geotechnical information from this investigation will be provided in the RFP. It is anticipated that the Design-Build Agreement will be entitled to rely on the factual information.

It is anticipated that the RFP will allow the Proponents to request additional geotechnical information, and the District will undertake the investigations it deems necessary.

Question #6

Source Anticipated Project Schedule (Page 17)

Request What is driving the completion dates? With a February or March 2021 notice to proceed, a six-to-nine-month design duration, permit risk, third party agency risk, utility agreement risk and tight fish windows, a December 2022 bridge opening is extremely aggressive. Please provide an explanation on why the District chose that date – perhaps the DBC may be able to provide options. Given that heavy snow fall

season is January to March, final landscaping could not take place until likely May, and bridge demolition and final clean-up work, while it could take place, would unnecessarily add significant costs.

Response The Substantial Completion, Total Completion, and Project Closeout milestones are prescribed in the Project's funding agreement and are subject to change for the RFP.

Question #7

Source 3.2 Haisla Nation (Page 20)

Request To what extent will the Haisla Nation and/or its affiliates influence the RFQ and RFP process?

Response The Haisla Nation, including their affiliates, will not have a role in the development of the RFQ or RFP, or the evaluation of the submissions.

Question #8

Source Technical and Financial Submission (Page 23)

Request Once the three shortlisted Respondents are notified, we recommend the RFP award be based solely on price. What is the intent of the District of Kitimat? Will the RFP award also be based on any qualifications or non-price components?

Response As noted in the RFQ (Section 4.2), the District intends to evaluate technical submissions for compliance with the specifications and requirements set out in the RFP. The technical submissions may include preliminary project plans and/or technical reports.

At this time, it is anticipated that, provided that the technical submissions meet or exceed the RFP Evaluation Criteria, the District expects to award the Contract to the lowest priced Proposal.

Question #9

Source Security Deposit (Page 25)

Request Will the District consider supplying the RFP documents to the shortlisted contractors for a short review period (i.e. 2-weeks) prior to requesting the \$50,000 deposit?

Response The second sentence in Section 4.6 Security Deposit of the RFQ has been revised to state the following:
"If selected as a Proponent, ~~and prior to receiving the RFP,~~ the shortlisted Proponents are expected to be required to provide:"

The remainder of Section 4.6 Security Deposit of the RFQ remains unchanged.

However, to further clarify, the following steps are intended to take place:

1. Through the evaluation of Responses to this RFQ, the District intends to identify a shortlist of three Proponents.
2. The shortlisted Proponents will be provided a draft Design-Build Agreement.
3. The shortlisted Proponents will be given 10 Business Days to review the draft Design-Build Agreement.
4. The shortlisted Proponents will be required to provide the Security Deposit (\$50,000) and a written undertaking to the District stating that it will submit a Proposal in the RFP stage within 10 Business Days of receiving the draft Design-Build Agreement.
5. If one or more of the shortlisted Proponents does not provide the Security Deposit (\$50,000) and a written undertaking in accordance with paragraph 4, then the District intends to notify the next highest ranking Respondent(s) and invite them to submit a Proposal in accordance with the same requirements.

Note: the shortlisted Proponents will not be given an opportunity to comment on the draft Design-Build Agreement until after the Security Deposit has been received and the RFP stage has begun.

Question #10

Source Appendix A: Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria

Request | What is the maximum file size that will be accepted for Responses to the Contact Person?

Response | The maximum file size that will be accepted for Responses (i.e. emailed to the Contact Person) is 50MB.

Should the file size of the Response exceed 50MB, Respondents are encouraged to set up an FTP site and provide the appropriate link and login credentials to the Contact Person in advance of the Submission Time.

Responses received after the Submission Time will not be considered.

Question #11

Source | Appendix A: Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria

Request | Will there be a confirmation email to confirm the Response has been received?

Response | Yes, the District will send a confirmation email to confirm the Response has been received.

-End of Addendum-