

RFP ADDENDUM #3
 Date of Addendum: November 18, 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.

The question acceptance deadline is 12 am EST on November 20, 2024.

1.0 – RFP

Item	Section	Description of Change
		none

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> Under B.2 Scope of services it is indicated that the project is intended to be delivered using the services of a construction manager. Please confirm when the construction manager will be engaged by CGUC. Please clarify if the intent is to use a CCDC 5A or CCDC 5B construction management model.</p> <p><u>Answer:</u> The construction manager/general contractor will be hired after the design team has been selected. The intent is to use a CCDC 5B construction management model.</p>
2.2	<p><u>Question:</u> Under B.2 Scope of Services, please clarify the role of the successful Proponent in “review and recommendation of pre-qualification”. Is CGUC intending to pre-qualify a construction manager, and what is the proponent’s role in the pre-qualification process? i.e. assigning CGUC review of prequalification submissions only or preparation of pre-qualification RFP and complete review of submissions?</p> <p><u>Answer:</u> Conrad Grebel will lead the selection process for a construction manager. The design team’s input is requested in reviewing proposals and</p>

	<p>participating in the selection process, as this is key to the success of the project team.</p> <p>2.3 <u>Question:</u> Please clarify the scope of services to be included, if any, as related to question c. in Appendix B regarding investigation of a ground source heat pump alternative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Is scope to include a comprehensive feasibility study exploring a ground source geo-exchange system for the site, complete with costing, payback analysis, approvals review etc?b. Has the CGUC consulted with the City or Region regarding installing a geo-exchange system at the Grebel site? If so, has the AHJ indicated if this is acceptable or if there is a preferred system type (open or closed loop)? <p><u>Answer:</u> Appendix B contains questions we are wondering about – we would like some initial information and advice from our design team on what is feasible or makes sense given our budget and project scope. We are not sure that the proposed design for heating and cooling best fits our needs and would like to explore alternative designs. We are not asking for a comprehensive study on a ground source heat pump at this time, nor have we consulted with the City or Region about this.</p> <p>2.4 <u>Question:</u> Package 3 scope, “Residence Heating and Cooling” requires an electrical service upgrade complete with a new Utility provided pad-mounted transformer. On other current projects with UW we have been given a timeline from the Utility of 10-14 months from design approval for delivery of a transformer. Has CGUC consulted with Enova regarding delivery timelines, or is there flexibility in the preferred schedule for completion of the heating/cooling system work to occur in spring 2026 to ensure that the electrical upgrade can be completed prior to needing to commission the new system?</p> <p><u>Answer:</u> We have not consulted with Enova regarding delivery timelines, but there is flexibility for the heating/cooling system work to occur in spring 2026 if needed.</p> <p>2.5 <u>Question:</u> The feasibility report indicates that CGUC had selected washroom renovation option 3 as preferred. Please confirm if the intent is to proceed with washroom renovation option 3 (combine 2 washrooms, and refresh the third washroom on each floor)</p> <p><u>Answer:</u> We have identified Option 1: Refresh existing multi-stall washrooms and Option 3: Consolidated washrooms – one double bay, one single bay as our best options but have not yet made a final decision.</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2.6	<p><u>Question:</u> Some of the work scopes described in the RFP had multiple options explored and costed during the study phase. Will the prime proponent be expected to explore and cost multiple options for the washroom upgrade and the Heating & Cooling Unit Replacements work packages in Phase 1 and/or Phase 2 ?</p> <p><u>Answer:</u> We expect to choose one of the identified options for the washrooms based on the information we already have, so exploration and costing of multiple options won't be necessary for the washrooms. We would like some further exploration and costing of options for the heating and cooling work. See answer 2.3 above.</p>
2.7	<p><u>Question:</u> I just wanted to confirm that you need the "Letter of Good Standing" for the architect only, and not each sub-consultant.</p> <p><u>Answer:</u> That is correct.</p>

END OF ADDENDUM