



Project:	17 Ave SE Extension & Stampede Trail: Roadway & Public Realm		
Addendum No.	2		
No. of Pages:	2	Date of issue:	July 14, 2017

The following change(s) to the Request for Proposal (RFP) for the 17 Ave SE Extension & Stampede Trail: Roadway & Public Realm, dated July 14, 2017 are effective immediately. This RFP Addendum Document forms part of the Request for Proposal.

ITEM

1. Question:

Because the Calgary Stampede is currently occurring, it is not favorable to visit the proposed site. Is it possible to get an extension to allow for a field visit to the site?

Response:

No.

2. Question:

Would CMLC cover costs for hydrovac exploration of the existing utilities as a separate item, independent of the Prime Consultant's Budget, during the Preliminary Engineering portion of this project?

Response:

If exploratory hydrovacating is required to clarify high-risk uncertainties in the Preliminary Engineering stage, its costs will be a separate budget line item, independent from the Prime Consultant's fees, and will be invoiced to CMLC. However, these costs will be managed and tracked by the Prime Consultant, and will be represented in the Project Budget.

3. Question:

Is there an existing study performed on this proposed project? If yes, is it available to the proponents prior to issuance of the proposal to assist in our scope and pricing?

Response:

There are several existing studies on the Transportation Engineering scope of the project; however, they are not considered relevant to this RFP and will not be made available to the proponents during the RFP stage.

4. Question:

Of the proposed preferred options for sub-consultants fields, are additional write-ups required in the proposal for the two options provided? Or, would the “future competitive proposal”, which they will write at the required time in the project’s schedule be enough?

Response:

The future competitive proposals will be the appropriate time and place for these write-ups. Please do not include write-ups on the pairs of other consultants in your proposals, simply provide the lists. You may be asked in the interview, however, what your experience or history is with your selections are, and why you selected them.

5. Question:

On page 18 of the RFP the interview of proponents is listed as July 4, 5 or 6, 2017 elsewhere in the RFP it is stated as August 3-4, 2017. Please ensure that the July dates are in error.

Response:

The interview dates are August 3-4, 2017.

6. Question:

Is CMLC open to proposals that would roll in-house services into the Prime Consultant role, as a value-added proposition, so that they can be delivered by a single integrated team without further procurement?

Response:

Proponents are permitted to list their in-house engineering resources as sub-consultant options; however CMLC does not consider in-house capability to be inherently advantageous in and of itself. We are looking for the best resources to complete the project.