

February 25, 2019

Posted via PDF (6 pages + Attachment)

ADDENDUM NO. 3
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL NO. 9117-18-7752
CLOSING DATE: 12:00 NOON (LOCAL TIME), MARCH 27, 2019

For: Basement Flooding Protection Program (BFPP) Capacity Assessment Studies
Study Areas 46-61, and 63-67

Please refer to the above Request for Proposal (RFP) document in your possession and be advised of the following:

I. REVISIONS

1. Section 2.3.2.I,

Delete item 20 "Service Connection (Drain Card) Records" in its entirety.

2. Section 2.3.3.b, Table 2.3

Revise the number of Total Flow Monitors in Study Area 48 (Bundle A) from 33 to 27.

2. Section 2.3.3.f.

Replace the existing with the following:

"As part of TM#1 and further described in Section 2.3.5, the Consultant will identify flood clusters that are inherently at a greater risk of flooding due to drainage system configuration. For the flood clusters within the Study Areas listed in Table 2.3, the City's available rainfall and flow monitoring data may not satisfy the model calibration storm event requirement and/or may not be aligned with the location of the flood clusters. Furthermore, the Study Areas in this RFP that are not listed in Table 2.3 do not have available sewer flow monitoring data. As such, the Consultant shall prepare and submit a rainfall and flow monitoring plan tailored to each Study Area as part of TM #1. The requirements of the rainfall and flow monitoring plan are described in Section 2.3.6 below. Note that some areas may require specific traffic control plans and/or time of day restriction to undertake this task."

3. Section 2.3.6

Replace the existing section title with the following:

"RAINFALL AND FLOW MONITORING PLAN (TM #1)"

4. Section 2.4.3.i

Replace the existing with the following:

"Organize and facilitate a minimum of four (4) workshops with the City. The workshops may include topics such as solutions development, review of non-compliant nodes, evaluation of alternatives, constructability reviews, cost estimating, bundling of solutions, etc."

5. Section 3.4.6.d

Replace the existing with the following:

"The Proponent, at a minimum, should identify the following key team members: project manager, head modeller, lead modellers, QA/QC lead, EA specialist, field investigation lead, preliminary design manager, municipal engineer, and cost estimation lead. The Proponent should identify one (1) person for each role, with the exception of the lead modellers, where a minimum of two (2) lead modellers are preferred for each Project. Proponents who identify more lead modellers than the minimum specified will receive a higher score in this category."

6. Section 3.4.8.j

Replace the existing with the following:

"Provide one time-task breakdown for the study phase for each Project (Bundles A – E) and a sample time-task breakdown for preliminary design services, including TM#5, local calibration, and data collection and reporting based on Bundle A and the scope of work associated with the Maximum Construction Cost as outlined in Table 5.3A (Addendum No. 2). Hourly rates or disbursement amount should not be included in the Technical Proposal. Each time-task breakdown includes the estimated person-hours for team members required to complete the various components of the Project (study phase and preliminary design). Each time-task breakdown should be expanded based on the scope of services presented in this RFP."

7. Section 3.4.8.m

Replace the existing with the following:

"Proponents who opt to be considered for a second Bundle should include a time-task breakdown for undertaking the study phase scope required for Bundle F in the appendices, which will be developed as per the above requirements based on the assumption that the Proponent will be undertaking the Project for Bundle A as their first Bundle, and accordingly consider the resources that will need to be dedicated to performing the Bundle A Project."

8. Section 5.5.1.a

Replace the existing with the following:

"Allowance for Additional Site Investigation and Specific Flood Issue Analyses. This includes field investigations and data collection that are beyond the 50% Study Area base scope, FS&IP components that are recommended by the Consultant and are not included in the base scope, and to refine the model utilizing radar-derived rainfall data during the Study phase."

II. ATTACHMENTS

1. Request for Digital Data Legal Disclaimer Form – Locations of past flow monitoring sites (1 page). Refer to Q11 in Addendum 2. The form had not been attached to Addendum 2 and is provided with the current addendum.

III. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q1. Can the City kindly confirm that only those personnel who fall into the roles specified in Table 3.2 below (section 3.4.6, page 76 of the RFP) are to complete the table? Should other staff on the org chart include a CV for reference?

A1. Only the Proponent team members listed in Table 3.2 of the RFP need to be specifically identified in the equivalent table in the Technical Proposal. A CV is not required for other staff who are not identified for a role listed in the table.

Q2. In section 3.4.6 (page 75 of the RFP), the City mentions the term "QA/QC Team Mangers" and on Table 3.2 it mentions a QA/QC Lead. Can City please clarify what is the difference between a QA/QC Lead and QA/QC Team Managers?

A2. "QA/QC Team Managers" should say "QA/QC lead". See Section I above.

Q3. On page 77 of the RFP, the City included a role under Engineering Survey Lead, should this role be included in Table 3.2?

A3. Refer to Addendum 2, Section I, Items 2 and 6, and Section III, Q6/A6.

Q4. Page 80 Section 3.4.8 (b) of the RFP, please confirm that 16 separate schedules are required for bundles A-E (i.e. Bundle B (schedule for area 50, 54, 49 and 53)

A4. Refer to Addendum 2, Section I, Item 3, and Section III, Q8/A8.

Q5. Page 80 Section 3.4.8 (K) of the RFP, is a Time Task Breakdown for each bundle A-E required (5 Time Task Breakdown)?

A5. Refer to Addendum 2, Section I, Items 4 and 5, and Section III, Q7/A7.

Q6. Do all sub-consultants need to be named at the proposal stage, or can some be deferred to preliminary design (e.g. engineering surveys)?

A6. All sub-consultants shall be named and shown on the organizational chart as per 3.4.5.e.6 and 3.4.6.b.

Q7. P. 77 of the RFP identifies a survey lead for the project. Please confirm if this role is required to be named as part of the key study team member.

A7. Refer to Addendum 2, Section I, Items 2 and 6, and Section III, Q6/A6.

Q8. Can the City provide names of the firms that attended the mandatory meeting?

A8. No, pursuant to the Auditor General's report, the document purchase list and list of mandatory meeting attendees are no longer made available to the public.

Q9. Which Provisional Cash Allowance item covers the task to refine the model utilizing radar-derived rainfall data during the Study phase?

A9. Item E.1 in Tables 5.4A to 5.4F. See Section I above.

Q10. Table 5.2A-F for "Unit Price Provisional Items – Study" includes task items for TM #1 Rainfall and Flow Monitoring Plan Implementation. The site assessment task (2.3.6.b.1) to take site photographs and confirm suitability of installation locations is not listed as a provisional item. Is the site assessment considered base scope?

- A10. The site assessment task (2.3.6.b.1) is covered under Unit Price Provisional Items B.1 and B.4 in Tables 5.2 A to F for flow and rainfall monitoring respectively, and is not considered base scope.
- Q11. Does the time-task matrix and organization chart (11x17) count in the page limit?**
- A11. Refer to Addendum 2, Section III, Q9/A9.
- Q12. Please confirm the Total MCC for Table 5.3 Bundles A-C and E should be \$47,150,000 rather than \$47,250,000.**
- A12. Refer to Addendum 2, Section II, Item 2, and Section III, Q10/A10.
- Q13. In Table 5-3D the MCC value is \$31.5M but footnote 'B' states that the MCC is \$47.25M for all preliminary design services. Please confirm what value should be considered as the correct MCC value for bidding purposes.**
- A13. Refer to Addendum 2, Section II, Item 2, and Section III, Q10/A10.
- Q14. Please confirm the Subtotal Provisional Cash Allowances – Preliminary Design for Table 5.4 Bundles A should be \$2,125,000 rather than \$2,045,000, and Bundle D should be \$1,555,000 rather than \$1,425,000.**
- A14. Refer to Addendum 2, Section II, Item 2, and Section III, Q10/A10.
- Q15. P.20/43 of the RFP identifies the requirement to prepare a constructability report as part of TM3. Is the constructability report intended to be submitted as a separate deliverable in advance of TM3?**
- A15. The constructability report is part of TM#3. Refer to 2.3.12.m.
- Q16. P. 30 of the RFP references a preliminary assessment report as part of TM1. Is the preliminary assessment report intended to be submitted as a separate deliverable in advance of TM1?**
- A16. The preliminary assessment is part of TM#1. Refer to 2.3.5.m.
- Q17. P.25 of the RFP lists Service Connections (Drain Card) Records as a required figure for TM1 but p.35 suggests that foundation drain connections are to be reviewed as part of TM2. Please confirm when drain card reviews are to be completed.**
- A17. Drain card reviews are intended to take place for the flood clusters as part of TM#2. See Section I above.
- Q18. P.38 of the RFP references radar –derived rainfall data. Can the City confirm what file format the data is in, e.g. *.shp?**
- A18. Radar-derived rainfall data is available as 1 km² UTM-aligned grid averages at 5-minute intervals in .xlsx and ASCII formats. Total precipitation and maximum intensity contours are also available in .shp file format.
- Q19. P. 51 of the RFP notes the need for additional field investigations for preliminary design which appears to duplicate the efforts of the field investigation program completed in TM2. Is it the City's intent to resurvey areas for preliminary design study assignments?**
- A19. The primary objective of the field investigation completed as part of TM2 is to gather the data required to ascertain the basement flooding causes for the flood clusters and to support the model build. The primary objective of the field

investigation as part of the preliminary design is to review the sites of the proposed assignments.

Q20. Is the time-task breakdown expected to only cover the study phase? It is difficult to define the preliminary design tasks and level of effort involved without a clear scope of works.

A20. A time-task breakdown is required for both the study phase and preliminary design services. See Section I above.

Q21. We have reviewed the asset data provided by the City and note for the manhole asset class a flow type of "DUAL". Can you please provide clarification of what this flow type includes?

A21. A manhole is classified as a Dual Manhole if it contains both the storm and the sanitary sewers within the same chamber, typically separated by a wall.

Q22. Under Section 2.4 General Project Requirements, the RFP outlines 2 workshops with the City and the BFPP Program Management Consultant (2.4.3.i). TM #3 scope of works includes 1 workshop to develop solutions (2.3.12.k); and 1 workshop to present the table of non-compliance, evaluation of alternatives, and the constructability report (2.3.12.q). TM #4 scope of works includes 2 workshops with the City. Please confirm the number of expected workshops for the project.

A22. A minimum of four (4) workshops as outlined in sections 2.3.12.k and 2.3.12.q are required. See Section I above.

Q23. Is the Rainfall and Flow Monitoring Plan (2.3.6) submitted as a separate deliverable from TM #1?

A23. The Rainfall and Flow Monitoring Plan as described under Section 2.3.6 is part of TM #1. See Section I above.

Q24. Can you please clarify, if the City currently has basement flooding data at a more granular level than ward? Ideally geocoded to street level?

A24. Historical reported basement flooding incidents are available for specific addresses that reported the flooding to the City and can be seen on Figures 2.23 to 2.43 of the RFP. This data will be made available to the Consultant.

Q25. We estimate the number of monitoring locations needed to support the analysis for this project could be as high as 600. Furthermore, we estimate that all of these flow meters would need to be in the ground by July 15th if we are to have the best chance of capturing one or more severe storm events in 2019. Given that ADS is fully capable of supplying and installing 600 meters in 8 weeks with sufficient advance notice, the above estimates lead us to the conclusion that it will be best if the contract is awarded prior to May 15th. The City's timeline seems to be at odds with this. Can you give us some guidance as to when the meters should be in the ground and what the time span of the monitoring portion of the project should be?

A25. The Consultant is expected to submit a rainfall and flow monitoring plan as part of draft TM#1. The implementation of the flow monitoring program will commence upon City's approval of such plan, as per Section 2.3.6.b. The monitoring program for each Study Area would span a period of 24 continuous months including the winter periods when equipment may not be maintained, as per Section 2.3.6.a.9.

Should you have any questions regarding this addendum contact Aimee Yang by email at aimee.yang@toronto.ca.

Please attach this addendum to your RFP document and be governed accordingly. Proponents must acknowledge receipt of all addenda in their Proposal as per Appendix A section 4, of the RFP document. All other aspects of the RFP remain the same.

Thank you,



Sabrina DiPietro
Acting Manager
Construction Services
Purchasing and Materials Management Division

**Toronto Water - Water Infrastructure Management
Metro Hall, 18th Floor
55 John St.
Toronto, ON M5V 3C6**

Please state briefly the intended use of the data:

Please list data requested:

The following GIS layers with associated applicable attributes to be determined by Toronto Water:

- Past sewer flow monitoring sites for RFP 9117-18-7752

Please provide the email address of the data recipient:

1. The following disclaimer applies to the release of data:

While efforts are made to see that the supplied information is accurate and up-to-date,

- (i) neither The City of Toronto nor any of its employees, officers or servants shall be liable for damages arising from any errors or inaccuracies therein, nor from any misuse, misinterpretation or misapplication thereof, whether due to the negligence of such employees, officers, servants or otherwise;
and**
- (ii) the said information is made available to the recipient thereof solely on condition that the recipient and all the recipient's heirs, executors, administrators, successors and assigns assume full responsibility for any risk associated with the use or misuse thereof and hold harmless The City of Toronto and its employees, officers and servants from all damages of the type described in clause (i) hereof.**

2. The following conditions apply to the release of data:

- A) Toronto Water (TW) Water Infrastructure Management (WIM) must be acknowledged as the source of data;**
- B) The user will endeavour to bring to the attention of TW WIM any errors detected in this data;**
- C) The user will not market the data to third parties without the explicit written permission of TW WIM;**
- D) The user acknowledges that release of this data by TW WIM does not constitute conveyance of any rights or ownership of the data to the recipient and;**
- E) In the event the user undergoes a change in either ownership or organization, the authorization will become null and void.**

I acknowledge the above disclaimer and agree to the conditions:

SIGNATURE

DATE

NAME

POSITION

FIRM

Please sign this agreement and return to:
Purchasing and Materials Management
Purchasing Services – Professional Services
Toronto City Hall
18th Floor W., 100 Queen St. W.
Toronto, Ontario M5H 2N2.
Attn: Aimee Yang
Phone #: 416- 397-4803
Email: Aimee.Yang@toronto.ca