

Addendum #3, #4 & #5

RFP #2024-001

Site Master Planning & Rezoning Leadership

Campus Communities recently posted a Request for Proposals for a design team to lead site planning and rezoning at its Abbotsford campus, on September 23, 2024. The following questions have been received and are answered below:

Addendum #3 Questions & Responses:

1. Sustainability goals are not especially well defined in the RFP, which approach does the Client prefer:
 - a. Higher Cost: Include a dedicated sustainability workshop where goals are established with the client and we review options relative to those goals.
 - b. Lower Cost: The Sustainability consultant maintains a light “presence” at project meetings and master plan reviews to layer in sustainability context with less of a structure. Without formal goals the feedback provided here will be less impactful.

Response: The Client prefers the Lower Cost approach with the Sustainability Consultant taking a “light” presence at project meetings.

2. Please confirm if a Mechanical Engineer is required for District Energy Preliminary Scope?

Response: No mechanical engineering or any other type of specialized engineering advisory on District Energy requirements are needed for the purposes of the proposal. All such work, if any, will be added to scope (or provided by third parties) once plans are confirmed for the inclusion of a district energy plant at a site (such plans are under review and the district energy plant may be located elsewhere). At this stage the responsibility of the Design Team will be to work with the Client to simply designate a portion of a parcel for use as a district energy plant (with building volume as directed by third party specialist advisors) with the capacity for conveniently connecting to external rights-of-way for pipes/services.

Addendum #4 Questions:

3. Appendix “D” – Technical Criteria: Section 13 of the response asks for samples of work. Can you clarify if this is the actual work product for other projects or the reference to example projects that we would reference for this project? It should be noted that not all projects are in the public realm and therefore would be confidential.

Response: A reference to similar projects and similar work are sufficient. In such cases, provide a summary description of the work or link to third party websites if in the public domain (however please do not submit any confidential or sensitive materials or samples).

Addendum #5 Question:

4. For the Indigenous Participation Plan, we note that the RFP has a different approach than the one discussed at the site visit and through the RFP site visit PDF. Can you please confirm which approach we should take for the response?

Response: The RFP criteria and addenda take precedence over all other materials. Please follow the approach outlined in the RFP. Note the site visit deck was supposed to summarize the RFP methodology. Our apologies if that was confusing.

This amendment shall form a part of the competitive process document. It is the responsibility of the respondent to ensure they monitor the Campus Communities website for updates issued up to and including the submission response date. Addendums can be found here:

campuscommunities.ca/opportunities_01/

For more information, please contact procurement@Campuscommunities.ca

Thank you,

CAMPUS COMMUNITIES