

Request for Qualifications

for the

Design-Build-Finance-Operation and Maintenance

WWTP Upgrade Project

RFQ #2153

Addendum/Clarification #2

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

Date Issued: May 29, 2013

Amendments to RFQ:

SECTION 1.9 - AVAILABLE INFORMATION AND DATA ROOM ACCESS

The following information from the Information Session and Site Tour held May 23, 2013 has been added to the Data Room and SaskTenders:

Data Room:

- The two (2) information session presentations
- The pre-design animation (Note: The animation was previously loaded to the Data Room)
- The video of the whole proceedings
- Scripts of the material read by those that lead the site visit

SaskTenders:

- Written questions and answers (Note: Posted to SaskTenders through this Addendum/Clarification – Questions and answers in the Clarification section below supersede the informal responses provided verbally at the information session)

SECTION 2.2 – PROCUREMENT PROCESS

Under the bullet “SR 2 Package”, replace the first bullet “detailed design for the Project” with “design development reports (which include drawings and plans relating to the proposed design solutions)”.

SECTION 5.1 – TEAM MEMBERS’ EXPERIENCE

In the second sentence delete the second bullet that states “your Project Lead’s backup;”.

Clarifications to RFP:

The following is a list of Respondent 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:

In section 4.1 (pgs. 20 – 21), the RFQ indicates that only team members with written formal consent will be considered during the RFQ evaluation. Will more complete and comprehensive teams receive a higher grading in the RFQ evaluation than those with certain elements of design, construction or operational disciplines not addressed?

Answer 1:

It is the City’s intent to evaluate the Project Lead(s), the Design-Build JV partners, the O&M Contractor(s), and the Financing Team, and not sub-consultants and subcontractors that may be needed to support the project delivery in relatively minor roles.

Despite the foregoing, it is up to the Respondent to determine how many Team Members it presents in its RFQ submission to demonstrate the pertinent experience. Respondents are referred to Section 5.1 for recommendations on what types of experience it may wish to consider pertinent.

Question 2:

Do the approval limits (\$) include P3 Canada funds, if awarded?

Answer 2:

The approval limits reflect uses of cash (i.e., project cost estimates), regardless of the sources of funds used to pay such costs.

Question 3:

The RFQ asks for an estimate of the probability that the Key Individual will be available throughout the Project. Please clarify if this means, for example, that the DB Key Individual should be around for the portion of the Project for which they are relevant.

Answer 3:

Yes, the estimate should indicate the availability of the Key Individual for the portion of the Project relevant to the individual’s role.

Question 4:

Can summary write-ups in the team members/individual experience sections be included, before all the tables?

Answer 4:

Yes.

Question 5:

Can tabloid size (11 x 17) paper be used for the tables in Appendix B?

Answer 5:

Yes.

Question 6:

Can the team member/individual experience tables be reformatted, without altering the requested information, or must they stay in the provided layout/format?

Answer 6:

The tables may be reformatted cosmetically and for clarity of presentation, however the row order and column order should be preserved.

Question 7:

Can the tables be transposed for the ease of presentation and spacing (portrait to landscape)?

Answer 7:

Please refer to the answer to Question 6 above.

Question 8:

It was mentioned that the Financial Capacity Score would be 1-10, with 6 as a minimum passing grade. Will there be a weighting applied to the Financial Score in overall RFQ evaluation or is it just pass/fail?

Answer 8:

The Financial Capacity Score will be used only on a pass/fail basis.

Question 9:

Can you clarify what information is requested in Key individual resumes vs. table 4.2.15.2?

Answer 9:

That decision is left up to the Respondent.

Question 10:

Regarding the page limit goals of the RFQ: at what point would exceeding the page limit be considered too much? For example, development can be completed to much more detail by using more pages, and page limit flexibility will impact how much information is provided.

Answer 10:

The page limit goals of the RFQ are intended as guidance only. The intent is to allow minor flexibility to Respondents and avoid triggering compliance failures on measures such as word count, page count, etc.

Question 11:

Will the RFQ score be carried out for the RFP process?

Answer 11:

RFQ scores will have no role whatsoever in the evaluation of the various RFP submission requirements.

Question 12:

How will scoring be done?

Answer 12:

RFQ submissions will be evaluated independently by each evaluator. Final scoring will be done through a consensus process involving all evaluators.

Question 13:

Who are the evaluators for the RFQ phase?

Answer 13:

The majority of the RFQ submission evaluators are City of Regina staff. A small number of AECOM and Deloitte staff will also be evaluators.

Question 14:

Can you clarify what the intention is behind the "Project Lead Back-up," as mentioned in section 5.1 Team Member Experience? The reference in this section seems to imply a back-up firm or company is required for the Project Lead.

Answer 14:

An addendum will be issued which will delete the reference to the "Project Lead Back-up" in the RFQ.

Question 15:

Is there a preference for single-sided or double-sided printing for the RFQ response?

Answer 15:

There is no preference.

Question 16:

What type of relief event is the City contemplating when there is a failure at McCarthy Boulevard Pumping Station?

Answer 16:

Operation of McCarthy Boulevard Pumping Station will be the City's risk and responsibility, and therefore the Successful Proponent will be granted relief in accordance with the terms in the DBFOM Agreement. A draft of the DBFOM Agreement will be appended to the RFP.

Question 17:

Process modelling was set up for 10 degrees Celsius water temperatures. Where were the temperatures presented in the Preliminary Design measured? Is more temperature data available for the influent stream?

Answer 17:

The temperatures were measured at the primary treatment plant. Additional temperature data can be found in Figure 19 of the Flow & Load Projections and Wastewater Characterization Technical Memorandum and in Table 6 of the Predesign Report. The annual reports also provide details on monthly temperature data (e.g. page 23 of the 2007 Annual Report). All of these documents are located in the Data Room.

Question 18:

What is envisioned for SR-2, "Detailed Designs"?

Answer 18:

See Section 2.2 amendment above.

Question 19:

Has a Permitting and Permit Responsibility summary or matrix been prepared, and is it available?

Answer 19:

A summary of permit responsibility will be uploaded to the Data Room.

Question 20:

Can you provide the temperature range for treated water?

Answer 20:

The temperature of the treated effluent can be found in the Annual Reports (e.g. page 23 of the 2007 Annual Report).

Question 21:

When is it possible to start the Due Diligence for the bidders?

Answer 21:

Proponents may commence on-site due diligence of existing infrastructure once the Proponents have been short listed. It is envisaged that a schedule of site visits will be provided to the Proponents for planning purposes.

Question 22:

How is the City planning to provide due diligence reports on the condition of the existing Plant?

Answer 22:

The Code and Condition Assessment and Priority Upgrade Requirements TM has been provided in the Data Room as information for the Respondents. Additional information related to Digesters 1 and 2 will be uploaded to the Data Room. During the RFP process, the City will be providing opportunities for Proponents to conduct their own due diligence inspections. The City intends to drain and clean various structures during the RFP process to assist the Proponents in their due diligence inspections.

Question 23:

Will Proponents be allowed to conduct their own investigation at the Plant?

Answer 23:

Proponents will be allowed to conduct some investigation during the RFP process. Some investigations, such as inspection of digesters may not be possible due to operational constraints. The City is not planning on allowing Proponents to conduct geotechnical investigations during the RFP phase, however the City is planning to conduct additional geotechnical investigations during the RFP phase to assist the Proponents.

Question 24:

Who is responsible for the risk of defects and failures in the existing Plant during construction? What type of relief will be provided in the event of a major failure at the existing Plant soon after Close?

Answer 24:

A risk allocation approach is being developed which takes into account the current condition of the major components of the plant.

In general, the City is currently planning on transferring risk of defects and failures for the following at the start of the Term:

1. Structures and buildings.
2. Mechanical and electrical equipment that the Successful Proponent wants to retain as part of its design.

The City is planning on retaining the risk of defects and failures for mechanical and electrical equipment that the Successful Proponent does not want to retain after substantial completion. Full relief is envisaged for failure of these items, as long as failure is not due to negligence of the Successful Proponent.

Question 25:

The RFQ notes that an objective is to ensure the Project co-ordinates and supports the City's existing contracts, including a contract with Western Potash Corp. for access to effluent. Is this the only contract that currently exists, and will the contract(s) be made available in the electronic data room?

Answer 25:

No, this is not the only contract existing; this contract and any others will be available in the electronic data room during the RFP phase.

Question 26:

Process recommendations have selected Biological Nutrient removal, coupled with chemical (metals salt) addition for added phosphorus removal. Is there significant VFA data available for review (for example, influent VFAs)? Can you elaborate more on chemical addition and effluent filtration?

Answer 26:

Significant VFA data is not available. Some VFA data is presented in the Predesign Report in Table 3 of Appendix A. The City plans on taking additional wastewater samples for VFA analysis.

Question 27:

Can additional information be provided regarding the process planned for the concessionaire taking on the current City operations personnel? What has been considered to date?

Answer 27:

Under Saskatchewan labour law, the Successful Proponent will be required to assume responsibility for those existing union personnel.

The process of staff transfer is currently been worked on and will be detailed at the RFP stage.

Question 28:

Is there any history of toxicity in the effluent?

Answer 28:

Results from the rainbow trout toxicity tests will be uploaded to the Data Room.

Question 29:

What are possible future requirements for toxicity testing?

Answer 29:

The Permit to Operate will be uploaded to the Data Room.

Question 30:

Is a new outfall required?

Answer 30:

A joint on the existing 900 mm concrete outfall pipe failed in 2012, resulting in erosion of the creek bank between the failed joint and the outfall structure. The pipe upstream of the failure and the outfall structure were not affected by the joint failure. A new 1050 mm PVC pipe section was connected to the 900 mm concrete pipe. The difference in pipe diameters between the PVC and concrete pipe was sealed using concrete on the outside and bentonite rods on the inside. The repaired joint has performed satisfactorily since the 2012 repair, although it is uncertain how robust the joint will be over the long term. Information on the failure and repair will be provided in the Data Room.

Whether or not a new outfall is required will be at the discretion of the Proponent.

Question 31:

Can you provide a list of any DB constraints or prescriptive items expected in the RFP phase?

Answer 31:

Design-build constraints are in the process of development and will be provided in the RFP. A list of constraints is not available at this time, and will likely not be available until the RFP stage.

Question 32:

Are there any public and/or union challenges anticipated?

Answer 32:

Waterwatch Regina, a citizen coalition that includes community activists, The Council of Canadians Regina Chapter, CUPE 21, Making Peace Vigil and Clean Green Regina is currently collecting signatures on a petition opposing Council's decision of a DBFOM procurement for the Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrade Project.

Question 33:

How will the City review and audit work performed by the selected team?

Answer 33:

The details related to reviewing and auditing are in the process of development, and will be included in the RFP.

Question 34:

We have a concern with Article 5. Due to the way we receive and store electronic information, we cannot completely destroy documents that we receive electronically. We have been advised by our legal counsel that it has become very standard to exclude from the requirement to destroy and/or return all confidential information, any information that has been backed-up on a recipient's computer records.

Can this revision be incorporated into the document?

Answer 34:

At this time, the City is not prepared to amend Article 5 of the Confidentiality Agreement, appended as Schedule D to the RFQ. Reasonable concerns of a Recipient as to extent of locating and destroying electronic documents can be considered by the City at the time of specifying instructions for destruction in a manner satisfactory to the City.