
RFP ADDENDUM #2
Date of Addendum: November 13, 2024

NOTICE TO ALL POTENTIAL RESPONDENTS

The Request for Proposals (RFP) is modified as set forth in this Addendum. The original RFP Document remains in full force and effect, except as modified by this Addendum, which is hereby made part of the RFP. Proponents shall take this Addendum into consideration when preparing and submitting their Proposals.

PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL DEADLINE

The Proposal submittal deadline remains the same and is not changed by this Addendum.

1.0 – RFP

| Item | Section | Description of Change |
|------|---------|---|
| 1.1 | B.7.2 | Amend to read as follows: “Conrad Grebel University College will require a Letter of Good Standing from the Proponent’s financial institution as part of the proposal.” |

2.0 – QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The following questions and answers are provided as a matter of information to clarify issues raised about the RFP. To the extent that changes to the RFP are required based on the questions received, the RFP has been modified as noted above in the RFP section of this Addendum.

| Item | Questions and Answers |
|------|---|
| 2.1 | <p><u>Question:</u> It looks like perhaps some of Phase 1 and Phase 2 (from the Scope of Services section on page 3 of the RFP) may have been completed already, since a report with energy modelling details and construction cost estimate details was provided in the RFP materials, so I’d like to confirm the scope we should carry for this one to ensure there is no accidental doubling up of work already done. The essential question is whether the scope on page 3 of the RFP is accurate in terms of what has yet to be completed as of today since the WalterFedy report included in the documents appears to include some of the content being requested in the RFP.</p> <p><u>Answer:</u> We are looking for Phase 1 to build on the provided report. We would like further exploration of design options, as detailed in Appendix B of the RFP, taken to the schematic design phase. The questions in Appendix B are some of the questions we would like addressed in the design work of Phase 1. In terms of the scope of the requested energy modelling, we would like to understand the impact to our ongoing operating costs (utilities, maintenance, etc.) of switching from our current natural gas system to a hybrid or electric-based system.</p> |
| 2.2 | <p><u>Question:</u> Can the University confirm it will obtain a third-party contractor for designated substances?</p> |

| | |
|-----|---|
| | <p><u>Answer:</u> Based on the most recent designated substances report completed September 2024, there are no asbestos-containing materials (ACM) in the areas that would be affected by this project. Although it is unlikely that it will be needed, in the event that ACM or other designated substances are encountered, Grebel will arrange for abatement by qualified professionals. For clarity, do not include asbestos abatement in your proposal.</p> |
| 2.3 | <p><u>Question:</u> Since the structural engineering scope is unclear at this point, is it acceptable to include a structural allowance in the proposal?</p> <p><u>Answer:</u> Yes, including an allowance for structural engineering in the proposal is acceptable.</p> |
| 2.4 | <p><u>Question:</u> How often will the construction contract administrator be required to visit the site?</p> <p><u>Answer:</u> The frequency of visits will be dictated by the progress of the work. Site attendance is important to solve issues as they arise and can therefore impact the schedule of the work. Proponents should propose what they believe will be a suitable schedule and also provide a 'unit rate' per visit for any additional site visits or onsite meetings.</p> |
| 2.5 | <p><u>Question:</u> Is there a formal pricing form to be submitted?</p> <p><u>Answer:</u> No, however we request that the fee proposal be separate from the rest of the proposal as outlined in B.4.3 of the RFP.</p> |
| 2.6 | <p><u>Question:</u> In Addendum #1, bullet point 5 notes the use of both a construction manager and a general contractor, with no sequential tendering. Please clarify how you anticipate the function of both of these roles in the project delivery.</p> <p><u>Answer:</u> The expectation is that the general contractor will be the construction manager.</p> |
| 2.7 | <p><u>Question:</u> Can the University provide a filled-out OAA contract?</p> <p><u>Answer:</u> No, the successful proponent will be responsible for providing a draft contract for discussion.</p> |
| 2.8 | <p><u>Question:</u> Just a question related to the renewal project: part of making a building more efficient is changing the insulation value and air-tightness of the building envelope. You need to be able to retain heating and cooling within the spaces. If there is poor insulation and air tightness, energy costs and</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>consumption will go up or remain high, regardless of the technology. Is this something to be included in the scope of work, budget and consultant fees?</p> <p><u>Answer:</u> No, at this time we are not including building envelope or window upgrades in the scope of work. You will see that an exploration of window replacement and additional wall insulation/cladding was explored in the provided report, but we have not chosen to proceed with those measures at this time due to budget and the low emissions reduction provided by those measures. As noted in RFP section A.6 we are proceeding with packages 1, 3, 5 and 6 from the report at this time.</p> |
|--|--|

3.0 – INFORMATION

The following item(s) are provided as a matter of information only to all respondents and do not modify or become part of the Contract Documents.

| Item | Description |
|------|--|
| 3.1 | <p>The following is a list of attendees at the optional site meeting on November 8.</p> <p>Andrew Portengen, Walter Fedy Phil Agar, Philip Agar Arch Hassan Pouladi, CES Engineering Ltd. Rebecca Macfarlane, Atria Architects & Engineers Inc Josh Bedard, ABA Architects Janet Li, Evoq Architects Greg Piccini, MSS Architects Peter Recht, David Carter Architects Toni Trstenjak, Dynamis Eng Zam Abdulla, Callidus Eng Nnamdi Anombem, Ivan S. Franko Architect Brennan Klys, CS+P Architects Brian Dyce, Witzel Dyce Engineering Aliaa Othman, Thinkform Elisia Neves, Fabrik Architects Ann Demaiter, DEI</p> |

END OF ADDENDUM