



Contract 3049P

Russ Baker Way HOV / HPV / Transit Lane

Traffic Operational Analysis and Functional Design

1. Introduction

The City of Richmond, in partnership with the Greater Vancouver Transportation Authority (GVTA), and the Vancouver Airport Authority (YVR), proposes to engage the services of a transportation engineering consultant to assist in preparing the *Russ Baker Way HOV (High Occupancy Vehicle) / HPV (High Priority Vehicle) / Transit Lane Traffic Operational Analysis and Functional Design*.

The objective of this request for proposal is to provide the City with qualified proponents capable of carrying out the work herein defined. The subsequent proponent submissions will form the basis for evaluation, interview and selection.

2. Submission Details

Six (6) copies of proposals marked “**Russ Baker Way HOV / HPV / Transit Lane Traffic Operational Analysis and Functional Design Contract 3049P**” addressed to the Purchasing Section, will be received at the Information Counter, Main Floor, Richmond City Hall, 6911 No. 3 Road, Richmond BC V6Y 2C1, until 12:00 pm/Noon., Local Time, on Thursday, May 17, 2007. Submissions received after this time will be returned to the sender.

The City reserves the right to cancel this Request for Proposal for any reason without any liability to any proponent or to waive irregularities at their own discretion.

Proposals may be withdrawn by written notice only, provided such notice is received at the office of the City’s Purchasing Section prior to the date/time set as the closing time for receiving proposals.

Proposals shall be open for acceptance for 90 days following the submission closing date.

All proposals will remain confidential, subject to the Freedom of Information and Privacy Act.

Any interpretation of, additions to, deletions from, or any other corrections to the Proposal document, will be issued as written addenda by the City of Richmond. This includes any questions that are received by City of Richmond Staff that affect the Proposal Process. It is the sole responsibility of the potential Bidders to check with the City of Richmond's Website, and / or BC Bid to ensure that all available information has been received prior to submitting a bid.

3. Enquiries

3.1. Clarification of terms and conditions of the proposal process shall be directed to:

Purchasing

David Phipps

Phone: 604-276-4287

Supervisor, Purchasing Section

Business & Financial Services Dept

Email: purchasing@richmond.ca

City of Richmond

Technical

Donna Chan, P. Eng.

Phone: 604-276-4126

Manager, Transportation Planning

Email: dchan2@richmond.ca

City of Richmond

The City, its agents and employees shall not be responsible for any information given by way of verbal/oral communication.

4. Project Background and Consultant Duties

Please refer to the terms of reference included with this Request for Proposal.

5. City Provided Items

As determined by the City including:

- Report to City Council dated February 7, 2007 entitled *Russ Baker Way-Arthur Laing Bridge Corridor- Traffic Management Initiatives* – available at: http://www.richmond.ca/_shared/assets/022607_item2016636.pdf
- Traffic counts and signal timing along the study corridor available at: <http://www.richmond.ca/services/ttp/signals/counts.htm>
- GIS cadastral (dxf format) and aerial photo (last flown May 2005) (tif format) for the study corridor.
- Past conceptual designs completed for the provision of a northbound YVR priority lane along Russ Baker Way.

6. Budget

A budget of \$50,000.00 Canadian, including all applicable taxes, has been assigned to this project, including a final report and all associated costs. All such costs shall not exceed this amount.

7. Project Schedule

The project is to be completed by August 23, 2007, with work commencing in the week of June 4, 2007. A project schedule is to be submitted with the proposal.

8. Proposal Submissions

All proponents are required to provide the following information with their submissions:

- a description of the consultant's understanding of the project objectives and outcomes, and how will they be achieved;
- identify the specific staff to be assigned to this project and their relevant experience, qualifications, roles, responsibility, availability, and schedule of fees;
- provide a priced methodology complete with a time allotment for each task, correlated with the items of work set out in the Terms of Reference. This approach will form the basis for payments to the successful proponent;
- a detailed schedule of activities and tasks related to the specified work program including milestones, project meetings, interim reports and progress reports required;
- specify what coordination and meetings the City will be expected to provide; and
- a minimum of three (3) client references from projects of a similar size and scope.

9. Working Agreement

The successful proponent will enter into a contract for services with the City based upon the information contained in this request for proposal and the successful proponents submission and any modifications thereto. Proponents may include their standard terms of engagement.

10. Evaluation Criteria

Proposals shall be evaluated to determine the best value offered to the City against conformance to the following criteria:

- qualifications, availability, and previous experience of the proponent and its team members;
- understanding and ability to meet the work program objectives, outcomes and schedules
- comprehensiveness / clarity / presentation of proposal;
- proposed costs;
- references, and
- interview (if necessary).

TERMS OF REFERENCE**RUSS BAKER WAY HOV / HPV / TRANSIT LANE****TRAFFIC OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS AND FUNCTIONAL DESIGN****CITY OF RICHMOND****1. Purpose**

This document contains the Terms of Reference and Work Program for the undertaking of the *Russ Baker Way HOV / HPV / Transit Lane Traffic Operational Analysis and Functional Design*.

2. Introduction

Russ Baker Way is one of the major roadways connecting Richmond, YVR and Vancouver. Due to traffic congestion on northbound Russ Baker Way, significant transit and vehicular delays were reported from No.2 Road Bridge to Miller Road during the am peak periods. These delays may have been caused by congestion on Arthur Laing Bridge in the downstream. For example, transit route #491, #496, and C92 buses were reported to experience delays ranging up to 15 minutes from Dinsmore Bridge to Cessna Drive on Russ Baker Way. Traffic destined for the Vancouver International Airport was reported to experience delays up to 25 minutes on northbound Russ Baker Way from the No. 2 Road Bridges to Miller Road. These delays can be much higher when there is an incident on the Arthur Laing Bridge.

In addition, concerns have also been expressed regarding the weaving traffic in the westbound direction on S.W. Marine Drive within the relatively short distance between the north end of Arthur Laing Bridge and Milton Street. The weaving problems were observed to be caused by conflicts between the steady stream of off-ramp traffic from Arthur Laing Bridge and the left-turning traffic originating from the east along S.W. Marine Drive.

To improve traffic operations and encourage transit and high occupancy vehicle usage, Richmond City Council has directed staff to carry out an assessment of the feasibility of extending the existing northbound High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) facility along the subject corridor. It is proposed that the existing facility be extended from the north end of No. 2 Road Bridge to the south end of Arthur Laing Bridge, to not only serve HOV's, but also transit vehicles and high priority vehicles (HPV) for YVR-related traffic travelling to/from and within YVR including the Main and South Terminals. For more background information, the report to City Council dated February 7, 2007 entitled *Russ Baker Way-Arthur Laing Bridge Corridor- Traffic Management Initiatives* can be accessed via: http://www.richmond.ca/shared/assets/022607_item2016636.pdf

In advancing the initiative noted above, the City of Richmond, in partnership with the Greater Vancouver Transportation Authority (GVTA) and the Vancouver Airport Authority (YVR), is inviting qualified transportation engineering consultants to carry out this study. The scope of work in this study includes two main parts:

- Part 1 shall focus on performing traffic operational analysis, defining the functional requirements and operation parameters of the HOV/HVP lane, and reviewing and recommending strategies/mitigation measures to address any traffic network impacts, traffic operational safety and efficiency issues by mode, enforcement, community impact issues (including “rat running,” etc.) related to the extension of the existing HOV facility.
- Part 2 shall involve the preparation of a functional design and preliminary cost estimates to implement such a facility.

3. Study Area

The study area includes Russ Baker Way, between the north end of the No. 2 Road Bridge and the north end of Arthur Laing Bridge (including the corridor of S.W. Marine Drive to W. 70th Street); Moray channel twinned Bridge in the east and Templeton Street in the west.

4. Study Goals

- For **Part 1** of the study, the consultant is required to carry out traffic performance and operational analysis to identify the functional requirements of the HOV/HVP facility, to review and recommend strategies/mitigation measures to address any traffic network impacts, traffic operational safety and efficiency by mode, enforcement, community impact issues related to the extension of the existing HOV facility. In addition, the expected benefits (i.e., in travel time saving, intersection and corridor performance, etc.) for all user groups (i.e., general purpose (GP) traffic, HOV, HPV, and transit vehicles) shall be quantified and included as this part of the study.
- For **Part 2** of the study, the consultant is required to prepare a functional design (to 1:500 scale), along with any property impacts and preliminary cost estimates to construct the proposed HOV / HPV / Transit facility along the subject corridor. Previous conceptual designs prepared on the provision of a northbound YVR priority lane along the subject corridor will be made available to facilitate this design work.



5. Work Items and Study Schedule

The consultant is required to carry out, but not limited to the following tasks related to this study according to the timeline noted:

| Work Item | Date |
|--|----------------------|
| 1. RFP due date | May 17, 2007 |
| 2. Contract awarded | Week of May 28, 2007 |
| 3. Project initiation meeting including work program finalized | Week of June 4, 2007 |
| 4. Traffic Operational Analysis | June-July, 2007 |
| 4.1. Data Collection | June, 2007 |
| 4.1.1. Conduct travel time, speed, vehicle occupancy and vehicle classification (GP, HPV, trucks/commercial vehicles, public/private buses, taxis, limousines, etc.) surveys for northbound along the study corridor including both the GP and HOV lanes during the AM and PM peak periods for one typical weekday (3 runs for each peak period). | |
| 4.1.2. Compile existing traffic information (counts, laning, signal timing, etc., to be provided by the City) and develop future traffic data for 2008 opening day of the proposed HOV / HPV / Transit facility as well as 2018 - 10-years after opening. The future traffic conditions shall include traffic anticipated from any future nearby developments, such as the proposed BCIT Aerospace Campus. Future traffic volumes shall be generated by applying certain growth rates and information available in the YVR Master Plan. As such, the consultant is NOT expected to use land use-transportation forecast models to generate future traffic volumes. | |
| 4.2. Corridor Performance | June-July, 2007 |
| 4.2.1. Analyze 2008 and 2018 traffic performance of the study corridor, including travel times, speeds, volume to capacity ratios, level of service, vehicle occupancy, and safety impacts under existing conditions and the proposed extension of the HOV / HPV / transit lane. | |
| 4.2.2. Determine the benefits (i.e., travel time savings, corridor performance, safety, etc.) anticipated from the provision of the HOV / HPV / Transit lane, for GP, HOV, HPV, and transit traffic. Recommend the vehicle occupancy requirement (i.e. minimum number of occupants) for the proposed HOV facility. | |

| | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| <p>4.2.3. Carry out a high-level review of and recommend conceptual options (e.g. the use of Arbutus rail corridor) to alleviate weaving concerns at the north end of the Arthur Laing Bridge in Vancouver, due to the left-turning westbound traffic on S.W. Marine Drive (to W. 70th Street) weaving into the northbound traffic coming off the bridge (heading north to Granville Street).</p> | |
| <p>4.3. Traffic Control Measures and Enforcement</p> | <p>June-July, 2007</p> |
| <p>4.3.1. Identify any potential operational issues associated with the provision of the proposed HOV / HPV / transit lane and recommend mitigation measures including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Violations and abuse • Drivers' confusion • HOV/transit conflicts • Facility effectiveness • Adaptability to changes • Maintenance | |
| <p>4.3.2. Evaluate and recommend measures/strategies and estimate associated costs to protect the integrity and legal enforcement of the proposed HOV / HPV / transit lane (i.e., to minimize the illegitimate use of the proposed facility) including but not limited to those related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enforcement plan and related resources • Identification of authorized users • Regulatory changes • Special signals, signage, and markings • Physical delineation • Reporting violations • On-going monitoring | |
| <p>4.3.3. Evaluate and recommend any additional enhancements with estimated associated costs that will optimize the performance of the proposed facility including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ITS measures • Other transit priority enhancements • Future refinement and expansion of facility | |
| <p>5. Functional Design and Preliminary Cost Estimates</p> | <p>July-August, 2007</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>5.1.1. Prepare 1:500 scale functional design drawings (in AutoCad) as per City's standard format for the proposed extension of the HOV / HPV / transit lane. Pavement marking and signage plans (under separate layers in AutoCad) shall be prepared to accompany the functional drawings. The drawings shall include but not be limited to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • initial design concepts for discussion and agency endorsement • existing and proposed property lines and road works with dimensions • removal and relocation of existing streetlights, traffic signals, sign posts and structures, medians, islands, road works, landscape, vegetation, ditches, utilities, and any other physical features • location of proposed traffic control devices, laning, markings, signage, signals, refuge for enforcement vehicles, and other physical features | |
| <p>5.1.2. Prepare Class "C" cost estimates for the proposed HOV / HPV / transit lane and any of the recommended traffic control measures and enhancements. The cost estimates should also include costs to install new and/or remove/relocate any existing lighting, utility, traffic signal, signage, etc., poles or services as noted in Section 5.1.1.</p> | |
| <p>5.1.3. Prepare estimates of annual operating costs of the proposed HOV / HPV / transit lane and any of the recommended traffic control measures and enhancements other than those related to a typical non-HOV facility (e.g. pothole repair, repaving and rehabilitation). The cost estimates should also include extraordinary costs to operate, enforce, and maintain the proposed HOV facility, including but not limited to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • replacement of HOV related traffic control devices and other special physical road features • enforcement by RCMP • management of HPV use • monitoring of facility performance | |
| <p>6. Report Finalization</p> | <p>August 23, 2007</p> |
| <p>6.1.1. Draft report and functional design for review and comment - Hard copies and an electronic copy of the document and design including all appendices, calculations, traffic data, drawings, etc.</p> | <p>August 7, 2007</p> |
| <p>6.1.2. Revise the draft report to address/incorporate comments from City, GVTA and YVR staff</p> | <p>Week of August 13, 2007</p> |
| <p>6.1.3. Report and Design Finalized</p> | <p>August 23, 2007</p> |
| <p>6.1.4. Presentation of study findings and design to City, GVTA and YVR</p> | <p>Week of September 19, 2007</p> |

6. Study Deliverables

- Bi-weekly progress meetings, including key milestone meetings to present the draft report and design to City, TransLink and YVR staff. Minutes of the meetings to be prepared by the consultants.
- Presentation of final recommended plan to City, TransLink and YVR senior officials and board members.
- Draft and final reports including data, and functional design drawings including a reproducible original and electronic copy (compatible with City software) of all work.

7. Schedule

The timing for completion of this project is August 23, 2007. The proposed schedule will include meetings, milestone events and associated deliverables. A final presentation of the study findings, recommendations, and design by the consultant is required in September, 2007.

8. Work Program with Budget Allocation

- Identify the budget allocation for each major task and milestone event within the work program as outlined in Section 5.
- *Please note that the intent of this Work Program is sequential and performance based: invoice payment will be based upon receipt and approval by City Staff of specified deliverables, not on an automatic monthly basis.*
- *Please note that fees (less Holdback and GST) will become payable on APPROVAL by City staff of performance and/or receipt of the specified deliverables.*

9. Study Roles

The study should be guided by an interagency steering committee made up of representatives from each of the funding partners of the study: City of Richmond, TransLink and YVR.

(1) City Team

The study shall be managed by the Manager, Transportation Planning, referred to as the **Project Manager** hereafter.

Input into the study process may also be provided by a City Team comprised of:

- City interdepartmental staff (e.g. Transportation, Engineering, Planning, RCMP)

The Project Manager will:

- manage the consultant contract, work program and coordinate input from and meetings with the City Team;
- provide available City data, reports and maps;
- provide limited copying/printing service;

- assist in preparing maps and graphics for presentation purposes, and
- complete other tasks, as agreed.

(2) Consultant

The Consultant will perform the Contract Work as defined in this Request for Proposal Document. The Consultant is strongly encouraged to build into their work program a series of working sessions with City staff and other key stakeholders (GVTA and YVR) as the work progresses.



Note: Receipt of this completed form will assist us in calling for future bids. Please complete and submit this form prior to the closing date and time as shown on the Request for Quotation/Proposal/Tender form.
Please remember to include Quotation/Proposal/Tender No. at right.

Quotation/Proposal/Tender No.

3049P

A Quotation/Proposal/Tender is not being submitted for the following reason(s):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> We do not manufacture/supply the required goods/services | <input type="checkbox"/> Cannot obtain raw materials/goods in time to meet delivery requirements |
| <input type="checkbox"/> We do not manufacture/supply to stated specifications | <input type="checkbox"/> Cannot meet delivery requirements |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Specifications are not sufficiently defined | <input type="checkbox"/> Cannot quote/tender a firm price at this time |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information to prepare quote/proposal/tender | <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient time to prepare quote/tender. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Quantity too small | <input type="checkbox"/> We are unable to competitively quote/tender at this time. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Quantity too large | <input type="checkbox"/> We do not have facilities to handle this requirement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Quantity beyond our production capacity | <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing restrictions (please explain) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cannot meet packaging requirements | <input type="checkbox"/> Agreements with distributors/dealers do not permit us to sell directly. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cannot handle due to present plant loading | <input type="checkbox"/> Other reasons or additional comments (please explain below) |

| | | | |
|---|---|----------|-------------|
| I / We wish to quote / tender on similar goods / services in future <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | Authorized Company Official – Signature and Title | | Date |
| | This space for City of Richmond Comments | | |
| Firm Name | | Address | |
| City | | Province | Postal Code |
| Telephone Number | | | |



This Agreement dated the ☼ day of July, 2006, at the City of Richmond, in the Province of British Columbia

Between:

City of Richmond
6911 No. 3 Road
Richmond, BC
V6Y 2C1

(the "City")

And:

☼
(the "Consultant")

Whereas:

- A. The City is ☼ (the "Event or Project");
- B. The City requires a ☼ the Event or Project;
- C. The City issued a Request for Quotation ☼ for the supply and delivery of ☼;
- D. The Consultant is willing and prepared to deliver ☼;

NOW THEREFORE in consideration of the mutual covenants and agreements set out below, the parties covenant and agree as follows:

11. Responsibilities and Duties

11.1. The Consultant shall be responsible for the following as per Request for Quotation ☼/Proposal ☼ and the Consultant's submission dated ☼.

- a) ☼
- b) ☼
- c) ☼
- d) ☼
- e) ☼
- f) ☼

- g) ✖
- h) ✖

11.2. The Consultant agrees to conduct himself professionally and with integrity so as not to embarrass or discredit the City throughout the performance of the duties and responsibilities set out in this agreement.

12. Compensation

- 12.1. In exchange for carrying out the duties and responsibilities set out in this agreement, the City agrees to pay to the Consultant, the amount of \$✖ plus GST per ✖ for the duration of the term of this agreement, but total amount of payments not to exceed \$✖ plus GST.
- 12.2. Once per month, commencing no sooner than ✖, the Consultant shall submit to the City a written statement of account and setting out a detailed summary of hours worked, meetings attended and the status of ✖ (the "Statement of Account").
- 12.3. The Statement of Account must show the amount of GST charged and include the Consultant's GST registration number and City Purchase Order number.
- 12.4. The City agrees to make payments to the Consultant within ten (10) working days of receipt of the Consultant's Statement of Account.
- 12.5. The Consultant shall, on a monthly basis, submit to the City a list of expenses incurred in carrying out the duties and responsibilities set out in this agreement and, upon approval of such expenses by the City, the City will reimburse the Consultant for such expenses.

13. Performance Standards

- 13.1. The Consultant is responsible for meeting the following ✖ targets:
 - ✖The Consultant agrees to comply with following project deadlines:
 - ✖The Consultant shall prepare a report to the City on a monthly basis indicating ✖ what targets have been met over the preceding month and the status of efforts in relation to the targets set out.

14. Benefits

- 14.1. The Consultant hereby waives all rights, claims, and entitlements whatsoever afforded to employees of the City pursuant to the Group Life Insurance Plan, Long Term Disability Plan and the Dental Plan and any other such benefits. The Consultant agrees to pay, as required by Federal or Provincial Statutes any payments for Income Tax, Workers Compensation, Unemployment Insurance, Canada Pension Plan, Superannuation and other such payments.

15. Independent Contractor

- 15.1. The Consultant is an independent contractor and no agency, joint venture, association, partnership, employer-employee relationship is created between the City and the Consultant.

16. Assignment And Subcontracting

- 16.1. The Consultant will not, without the prior written consent of the City, assign, either directly or indirectly, any right or obligation of the Consultant under this agreement.
- 16.2. No sub-contract entered into by the Consultant will relieve the Consultant from any of his obligations or impose any obligation or liability upon the City to any such sub-contractor.

17. Indemnity

- 17.1. The Consultant agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the City, its agents, employees, and elected officials, against any damages, liabilities, or costs, including reasonable attorney fees and defence costs, arising from or allegedly arising from or in any way connected with any act or omission by the Consultant, his employees, officers, volunteers, servants, or agents, or persons for whom the Consultant has assumed responsibility, in the performance or purported performance of this agreement.

18. Insurance

- 18.1. The Consultant shall, at his own expense, carry and keep in force during the term of this agreement, the following coverage.
- a) Professional liability insurance with a minimum limit of \$250,000.00 for each occurrence and \$500,000.00 aggregate.
 - b) Comprehensive general liability insurance with a minimum limit of \$2,000,000 per occurrence with a cross-liability clause.
- 18.2. The City may require a dedicated limit of the Consultant's professional liability policy be allocated to cover the Consultant's work while contracted by the City.
- 18.3. The City shall be added as an additional insured under the Consultant's comprehensive general liability insurance.
- 18.4. All insurance policies shall provide that they cannot be cancelled, lapsed or materially changed without at least 30 days' notice to the City.
- 18.5. Prior to the commencement of the services hereunder, the Consultant shall file with the City a copy of each insurance policy and certificate required. All such insurance shall be maintained until final completion of the service.

19. Representation

- 19.1. The parties hereto agree that for all purposes hereunder the City shall be represented by the ☺.

20. Ownership of Products

- 20.1. The City shall take title to and ownership of all materials and products developed by the Consultant pursuant to this agreement, including reports, drawings, schematics, computer files, and designs developed, except those covered by

copyright. All materials and products produced shall be provided to the City upon expiry of this agreement.

21. Confidentiality

21.1. The Consultant shall not disclose any information provided by the City, specifically proprietary, sensitive, personal or confidential information or that developed resulting through the performance of this agreement to any other party without the express written consent of the City. All information provided to the Consultant or developed by the Consultant pursuant to this agreement shall be returned to the City upon the expiration of this agreement. The Consultant acknowledges that the City is subject to the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act of British Columbia.

22. Related Companies

22.1. The Consultant shall not during the term of this agreement, perform a service for or provide advice to any person, firm or corporation where the performance of the service or the provision of the advice may or does, in the opinion of the City, give rise to a conflict of interest between the obligations of the Consultant to the City under this agreement and the obligations of the Consultant to such other person, firm or corporation.

23. Term

23.1. This agreement is valid for the period commencing ☼ and ending ☼ (the "Expiration Date"), or such later date as may be mutually agreed upon.

24. Termination

24.1. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this agreement, either party may terminate this agreement at any time upon at least two (2) weeks' written notice delivered to the Parties at the addresses shown on the first page of this agreement, or such shorter time and in such a manner as may be agreed upon by the parties.

24.2. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection 14.1, if in the opinion of the ☼ the Consultant has breached a material covenant, the City may cancel this Agreement immediately without notice.

25. Notices

25.1. Any notices or other communications required or permitted hereunder shall be sufficiently given if delivered, or if sent by prepaid regular mail, to the addresses of the parties set out on the first page of this agreement, or to such other addressees as shall have been specified by notice in writing by either party to the other. Any such notice or communication shall be deemed to have been given, if delivered, and if mailed in Canada, on the fourth business day after the date of mailing.

26. Feminine/Masculine

26.1. Wherever the singular or masculine is used throughout these Terms the same shall be construed as meaning the plural, the feminine or body corporate or politic where the context or the parties hereto so require and vice versa.

27. General

27.1. This Agreement may be amended upon mutual agreement of the parties in writing.

27.2. This Agreement and the rights and obligations of the parties hereunder shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of British Columbia.

27.3. This Agreement sets out the entire agreement of the parties and no representations, warranties or conditions have been made other than those expressed or implied herein. No agreement collateral hereto shall be binding upon the City unless made in writing and signed by the City.

The City and the Consultant Agree to these Terms the day and year first above written.

Consultant

City of Richmond



City of Richmond

6911 No. 3 Road
Richmond, BC V6Y 2C1

Fax Cover Sheet

To: Name: All companies receiving copies of the Request for Proposal –
Company: **3049P Russ Baker Way HOV / HPV / Transit Lane, Traffic Operational Analysis and Functional Design**

File: 02-0775-50-3049/Vol 01
Date: May 9, 2007
Fax: Various

From: Department: Business & Financial Services Department
Name: Daianna Panni
Buyer, Purchasing

Phone: 604-276-4270
Fax: 604-276-4162

If you have any problems with this fax, contact: Daianna Panni at 604-276-4270

Total no. of pages, including cover sheet: 2

Mailed original to follow: No

urgent

for your action

Message: 3049P Russ Baker Way HOV / HPV / Transit Lane, Traffic Operational Analysis and Functional Design

Addendum Number 1

Q1. Is the aerial photo controlled?

A1. The orthophotography was rectified to survey control points and the image is geo-referenced through the standard orthophotography process.

Q2. Are there curbs?

A2. Curbs would be shown in the photo but are not referenced. The shoulders are paved as a bicycle lane for the most part along the section of Russ Baker Way from the No 2 Road bridge to the existing HOV lane.

Q3. Why is the RFP on BC Bid?

A3. The City endeavours to ensure that our bid process is fair, equitable and transparent. Therefore, we post the request for proposals on BC Bid.

IMPORTANT - CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. Any other distribution, copying, or disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original transmission to us by mail without making a copy.
2230792

- Q4. There appears to be a substantial amount of traffic data counts to be done.
- A4. As indicated on page 2 of the RFP, the City's website has a link to available traffic counts – once the project is awarded, more detailed count information may be available for different days, months and years at the locations indicated on the link.
- Q5. Questions regarding the budget and cost-sharing arrangement.
- A5. The budget is \$50,000 including all applicable taxes and is cost-shared between the City of Richmond, TransLink and YVR. The proposals submitted will be reviewed by all three agencies. The City is taking the lead in managing the study, however, the study will be guided by an interagency steering committee made up of representatives from the City, TransLink and YVR.
- Q6. What is the definition of High Priority Vehicles (HPV)? Is there any specific identification of the HPV that the enforcement agency can recognize?
- A6. HPV are YVR-related traffic travelling to/from and within YVR including the Main and South Terminals. The proponent is to 1) identify any potential operational issues associated with the proposed HOV/HPV/transit lane and recommend mitigation measures and 2) evaluate and recommend measures/strategies and estimate associated costs to protect the integrity and legal enforcement of the proposed HOV/HPV/transit lane, as noted in Tasks 4.3.1 and 4.3.2.
- Q7. For Work Item 4.1 Data Collection, it is specified that traffic surveys are required for the northbound direction along Russ Baker Way. Is traffic survey for the southbound direction along Russ Baker Way required as well?
- A7. The existing HOV lane is in the northbound direction only. The primary objective is to extend the existing facility from the north end of the No 2 Road Bridge to the south end of the Arthur Laing Bridge to not only serve HOV's but also transit vehicles and HPV's. Therefore, we require traffic surveys be conducted for the northbound direction along Russ Baker Way. If the proponent identifies a need for conducting a traffic survey for the southbound direction, he/she should rationalize the merits of conducting this survey.
- Q8. For Work Item 4.2 Corridor Performance, is there a particular software (e.g. VISSIM) required for determining the traffic performance and the benefits to the various vehicle classes due to the proposed HOV lane extension? What are the standard traffic operational software packages that are acceptable to Richmond? e.g. HCS, Synchro, VISSIM, CORSIM, If we proposed to conduct the traffic analysis using a software package not used by Richmond, is it acceptable? We are not clear if the traffic model is part of the deliverable or just the input and output data.

- A8. The City will accept industry recognized software capable of outputting the parameters indicated in Tasks 4.2.1 and 4.2.2, i.e., travel time, speed, v/c, LOS, vehicle occupancy, safety impacts, etc. Yes, the traffic model, if one is used, is part of the deliverable as is the input and output data. The use of a traffic model for this assignment is optional, not a requirement.

Sincerely,

Daianna Panni
Buyer
Purchasing