

Request for Qualifications
for the
Design-Build-Finance-Operation and Maintenance
WWTP Upgrade Project
RFQ #2153
Addendum/Clarification #4

This Addendum/Clarification shall be incorporated into the Request for Qualifications.

Date Issued: June 11, 2013

Amendments to RFQ:

In Section 6.3, Financing Plan, replace the second bullet on Page 25 with the following:

- The delivery of security that will be required to be delivered with the SR3 submission (i.e. final price proposal), such security currently anticipated to be a letter of credit in the amount of \$10 million to be held until such time as an equivalent amount of construction progress has been made;

Clarifications to RFQ:

The following is a list of submitted questions and the associated City of Regina response. Firm names have been removed however the wording of the questions is otherwise identical as received.

Question 1

The Finance Plan states:

“the delivery of security that will be required to be delivered upon execution of the DBFOM agreement (such security currently anticipated to be a letter of credit in the amount of \$10 million to be held until such time as an equivalent amount of construction progress has been made”.

Does this reference the security package from the construction contractor or does it reference bid security?

Answer 1

The reference is to the security to be provided at the time of SR3 submission, which comprises a proposal deposit and preferred proponent deposit. By means of an amendment to the RFQ, it will be clarified that the security will be due at the time of SR3 submission rather than upon execution of the DBFOM agreement.

Question 2

We request an amendment to the RFQ Submission Deadline from June 25, 2013 to July 9, 2013.

Answer 2

At this time, the City is not considering an extension to the RFQ open period.

Question 3

In Appendix F of the RFQ – Summary List of Requested RFQ Submission Information Items, the consortium's plans are listed in the following order: Design-Construction Plan, Operation and Maintenance Plan, Financing Plan, Consortium Management Plan. In our experience, Consortium Management Plan would typically be the first plan presented as it provides a higher level overview and structure that is further detailed in the other three plans. Could the City of Regina consider allowing the placement of Consortium Management Plan as first of the four plans submitted?

Answer 3

Nothing in the RFQ is intended to dictate an order of presentation of information items within a Respondent's RFQ submission.

Question 4

Are we allowed to use current City of Regina employees as "Client References" for previous projects/experience in the statement of qualification?

Answer 4

City of Regina employees should not be used as "Client References" in the RFQ submission.

Question 5

With reference to question #6, Addendum #2, does the City mean that we can reflect the order of the headings in the appendix tables as presented in a manner outside of the specific table format provided by the City? For example, would it be acceptable to the City if we reversed columns with rows while protecting the order of the headings?

Answer 5

The tables may be reformatted cosmetically and for clarity of presentation, however the row order and column order should be preserved, and the tables should not be transposed (i.e. columns should not be reversed with rows).

Question 6

We would respectfully request that the City of Regina reconsider providing an extension to the RFQ Submission deadline for the benefit of all the Applicants.

Answer 6

At this time, the City is not considering an extension to the RFQ open period.