



746-2021 ADDENDUM 2

PRIME DESIGN CONSULTANT SERVICES FOR SOUTH WINNIPEG RECREATION CAMPUS (SWRC) – PHASE 1

URGENT

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

ISSUED: April 20, 2022
BY: Tracy Stople
TELEPHONE NO. 204 986-2221

THIS ADDENDUM SHALL BE INCORPORATED INTO THE BID/PROPOSAL AND SHALL FORM A PART OF THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS

Template Version: Add 2021-03-05

Please note the following and attached changes, corrections, additions, deletions, information and/or instructions in connection with the Bid/Proposal, and be governed accordingly. Failure to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum in Paragraph 10 of Form A: Bid/Proposal may render your Bid/Proposal non-responsive.

PART B – BIDDING PROCEDURES

- Revise: B7.5.3 to read: Further to B7.5.2, 11"x17" may be used for organizational chart, schedule, **and Form P: Person Hours or a table of your own design.**
- Revise: B7.5.4 to read: Further to B7.5, no additional pages for section dividers, cover letter, and forms are allowed. **A cover page may be submitted, without effecting page count.**

PART D – SUPPLEMENTAL CONDITIONS

- Add: D7.6.2(o)(xiv) plan and conduct stakeholder & public engagement activities in accordance with the approved engagement plan.
- Revise: D11.1.3 to read: The Consultant will develop and lead the tendering of a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the Independent Commissioning Agent who will provide commissioning services on the building envelope, mechanical and electrical systems, equipment and components. The Consultant will issue addendums, respond to any questions the proponents have and participate in the evaluation of the proposals. The City will then contract with the Independent Commissioning Agent independently from the Consultant. The Consultant will work with the Independent Commissioning Agent as part of the project team to incorporate commissioning into the project design and construction.

APPENDICES

- Add: Appendix_D SWRC Feasibility Study – Gibbs Gage Architects – May 2019
- Add: Appendix_E SWRC Phase 1 Preliminary Functional Program – October 2020

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Q1: Section D21.5: Would \$5M be a typical amount of insurance that a sub-consultant would carry? Can you also clarify what the term "comparable" means in relation to the Subconsultants?

A1: In addition to the response provided in Q23 of Addendum 1, by "comparable" means that the Subconsultants need to provide evidence of Commercial General Liability and Professional Liability as outlined Sections D21.2(a) and D21.2(c). The limit to be provided, especially for the Professional liability, should be

determined by the Consultant. Since the Consultant knows what each specific Subconsultants work will include and the possible risk/exposure.

Q2: Engagement D8.13.1(f) states that summaries corresponding to each engagement phase must be completed. Please confirm this applies strictly to the phases identified in D.8.12. Stakeholder and Public Expectations [Pre Design, Schematic, Design Development].

A2: Yes, as per D8.13.1(f) the engagement summaries are only needed in the project (design/construction) phases where public engagement activities are occurring and the summary only needs to address the engagement that occurred in that phase. At the end of the project, as per D8.13.1(g) there is a requirement for a public engagement report that addresses the full breadth of the engagement.

Q3: Will the City be able to share feasibility study done by Gibbs Gage? This will allow us to understand the work done to date which will inform our approach, methodology, and workplan. Can the functional program list complete with area allocation be shared with the Proponents.

A3: The SWRC Feasibility Study (Appendix D) prepared by Gibbs Gage Architects in 2018 was a point in time exercise to define stakeholder/community needs, a preliminary building program, and a concept for the entire recreation campus. The Study was premised on developing the full vision of the recreation centre, pool, library, attached high school and overall site. Much has changed since that time, including both the high school and elementary school proceeding to construction, identifying a Phase 1 project scope that met ICIP funding limitations, and the shift to a City-operated facility. The Study and SWRC Phase 1 Preliminary Functional Program (Appendix E) provide a starting point for further refinement and validation of the facility and site program through internal and external stakeholder discussions. Refer to D3.5 for funded project scope.

Q4: Under Section D.21.2(c), a Project Specific Professional Liability insurance is required. Can you please indicate why this is a requirement? In our experience it is not usual for clients to request such an insurance and it can be very difficult to obtain. Can the City consider removing this requirement and asking for general professional liability insurance instead?

A4: The City is requesting a Project Specific Professional Liability policy for this project that is anticipated to cost \$60 million (D3.6). It is not unusual for the City and other municipalities to request Project Specific Professional Liability policy based on the scope of services outlined in D5 of the RFP. A project specific professional liability policy will ensure the limit is not eroded by other projects due to other claims/losses on those projects.