



Owner's Representative Addendum

RFP #RPL-2019-7

Addendum/Clarification #1

This Addendum/Clarification shall be incorporated into the RFP and shall form part of the contract documents.

October 29, 2019

A copy of RPL's Master Services Agreement has been added to the [Additional Information](#) made available on a secure online site to those Proponents who indicated an intention to respond to this RFP and who submit a signed copy of the "Intent to Respond and Non-Disclosure Agreement" attached to the RFP as Appendix B.

The following is a list of Proponent submitted questions and the associated response.

Questions:

1. The schedule is focused on phase 1, with project initiation to begin first week of January and the first draft of the business case due 7 weeks later. Is the reason for it to be done this quick for fiscal planning purposes?

Yes, the board would like to move to a decision as quickly as possible and our budget process begins in the spring.

2. If this moves past phase 1, is the intent to have the same consultant involved in further phases?

As stated in 4.2.1 of the RFP, "Upon completion of Phase I, should RPL choose to move forward with further Project work, RPL's preference is to have the Consultant continue as RPL's owner representative for subsequent Project phases."

The RFP is structured so that this is possible. There are exit points if things aren't going well but also the ability to directly contract the Consultant for future phases through statements of work.

3. If someone participating in phase 1 is interested in doing the architecture work would they be limited if they continued as the Owner's rep?

Participation by any firm in the activities of the Owner's Rep, either as the Owner's Rep, subcontracted by the Owner's Rep, or as an entity with common management or ownership as the Owner's Rep, would provide the possibility for them to access insider knowledge and an unfair advantage in the competition for any work put to tender as a result of the work undertaken by the Owner's Rep. This would be perceived as an unfair process and a conflict of interest and any such vendors would be deemed ineligible Proponents for future work on the Project outside the scope of the Owner's Rep.

Using an example to clarify, if an architecture firm is involved, directly or as a subcontractor, in providing services in Phase 1 to update the Functional Program document, that architecture firm would be ineligible to bid on work associated with the architecture and design of any resulting building project.

For further clarity, if Company A is a large firm with separate divisions that undertake both project management and architecture lines of business, and their project management division is contracted by RPL as the Owner's Rep and the architecture division is not involved in the services provided by Company A to RPL, even if the contract ends at the end of Phase 1, Company A's architecture division would be deemed ineligible to bid on architecture services for the design of the construction or renovation of the building.

4. To clarify the previous question, if we wanted to subcontract an architectural firm to assist with aspects of phase 1 work. The architectural team would have to forfeit bidding on the architectural work down the line as a result of working with us?

As per the answer to question 3 above, yes, any architectural team involved in Phase 1 work would not be an eligible proponent for architectural work on the project outside the scope of work that the Owner's Rep is contracted to do.

5. Can you describe past work done to develop a business case? Are options already being considered and has the board narrowed it to any options from past work?

The outcomes of past work can be seen in the documents in the Additional Information made available on a secure online site to those proponents who indicate an intention to respond to this RFP and who submit a signed copy of the "Intent to Respond and Non-Disclosure Agreement" attached to the RFP as Appendix B.

The past work has provided context for the Board, who have now asked for further and better substantiated information and further analysis of options that will support the Board's decision making on Central Library renewal.

6. In section 6.1.4 Approach, Methodology and deliverables - Estimate for hours fees, subsequent phases – is this focused-on phase 1 only?

RPL is asking proponents to provide estimates for hours and fees for all phases of the project. It is expected that the estimates for the work in Phase 1 will be relatively accurate, and that estimates for future phases will have to be based on specific assumptions about how such subsequent phases of the project are approached.

Since much of the work in each phase will be defined in prior phases, we ask that you provide the assumptions you are using to determine your estimates, and that you consider providing estimates for different potential directions the project may take. For example, if you base your estimates on a design-build approach to procurement then please indicate this, and you may also want to provide estimates for other alternate approaches such as design-bid-build.

The estimates for subsequent phases are intended to help RPL evaluate Proponent's understanding, approach and experience with the type of work expected of the Owner's Rep through the life of this project, and to provide us with insight into each Proponent's perception of the scope of the work required.

7. Section 4.2.1 talks specifically about Phase 1; this would require a deeper dive into community process and workshops?

Yes, it is expected that work will need to be undertaken as part of Phase 1 to get community input on the project and the options being considered.

The process for pursuing a public project of this nature will have to be properly defined in Phase 1, which will include building community support, determining and pursuing funding options (including fund raising in the community), and pursuing appropriate approvals to move forward.

8. Are vendors with current contractual agreements with Regina Public Library restricted from submitting a proposal, or being part of a Proponent team?

No, there are no restrictions on current RPL suppliers from submitting a proposal or being part of a proposed team. For clarity, this includes those vendors with standing offer agreements in place with RPL.

9. Please clarify the expectations of the financial analyses required in Phase 1.

In section 4.2.1 number 7 we explicitly ask for financial analysis of funding sources and options, including grants and borrowing. We also expect each option identified for consideration, including options for location, build vs. renovate, design & construction procurement approach, etc., to have a financial analysis completed that includes estimated costs.