



# City of Richmond

December 9, 2011  
File: 02-0775-50-4611/Vol 01

**Business and Financial Services Department**  
Finance Division  
Telephone: 604-276-4218  
Fax: 604-276-4162

**Attention: To All Proponents**

Dear Madame/Sir:

**Re: Request for Proposal 4611P – Lulu Island Dike Master Plan - Addendum One**

This Addendum includes items of clarification, forms part of the Contract Documents and shall be read, interpreted and coordinated with all other parts. Please review and consider the following information in the preparation of your Proposals:

**I. Notes from Pre-Bid Meeting Held December 8, 2011**

Noted below are the questions received and answers provided during the meeting on December 08<sup>th</sup>, 2011 at Richmond City Hall.

In attendance at this meeting were representatives from the following organizations:

1. Associated Engineering
2. BTA Works
3. City of Richmond
4. Delcan
5. Dillon Consulting
6. HB Lanarc-Golder
7. Northwest Hydraulic Consultants
8. SNC-Lavalin
9. Stantec

**Item 1.0 – Section 9.0: Project Scope**

- Q1) The RFP makes reference to the first phase of the Dike Master Plan. Is the budget of \$200,000.00 (CAD) for the first phase or does it fund future phases?
- A1) The budget is to fund the first phase, which makes up the scope of work outlined in the RFP.

**Item 2.0 – Section 10: Consultant Duties**

2.1 Section 10.1

- Q1) Is there a number of options the City is looking for?

- A1) No. The City is looking for creativity and viable options that will fit in with the character of the areas and provide protection from future sea levels. As part of these options, the City is also seeking interactive strategies for communicating with stakeholders including developers and residents.

2.2 Section 10.1 a)

- Q1) What is the basis for the 4.7m crest elevation?  
A1) It is an elevation that the City is comfortable planning to. No further elevation analysis is required for task 10.1.
- Q2) How does 4.7m relate to the existing heritage buildings (i.e. the Gulf of Georgia Cannery)?  
A2) Existing heritage buildings are below this elevation.
- Q3) Does 4.7m include wave effects?  
A3) Yes, although no analysis has been done on wave run up.
- Q4) Is there a target design year?  
A4) No. At this time the City is planning to a target elevation not a target year.

2.3 Section 10.1 e)

- Q1) Has the City had discussions with the public about sea level rise?  
A1) No. But we know that residents in the area do not want larger dikes.
- Q2) Is sea level rise discussed in the OCP?  
A2) No.
- Q3) Would the City prefer to deal with this project's technical issues and stakeholder requirements before the OCP's adoption and then do the public consultation after the OCP is adopted?  
A3) No.
- Q4) Would Council want to include sea level rise issues in the OCP?  
A4) City staff will deal with this, if requested by Council.
- Q5) Describe the public consultation process.  
A5) City has provided for two rounds of public consultation. The City would like Proponents to define their processes for facilitating public consultation. The first round could include a presentation of contemplated concepts and having the public rank them; the second round would include more detailed dialogue with the public.

2.4 Section 10.2

- Q1) What are the elevation issues and wave issues?  
A1) Currently there are no elevation and wave issues but this may change in the future due to sea level rise.

2.5 Section 10.3 a)

Q1) Does the City have a specific site in mind, i.e. Steveston?

A1) No.

Q2) Are there areas the City is more interested in?

A2) No. The locations selected should be representative of the diversity that exists in the City.

2.6 Section 10.3 b)

Q1) Is the City's preference for a one-story parking garage?

A1) No, the number of stories does not matter.

**Item 3.0 – Section 12: City Provided Items**

Q1) Is this information available prior to submitting the proposal?

A1) No.

**Item 4.0 – Section 13.1: Project Schedule**

Q1) When do you expect to have this contract awarded by as the project completion is targeted for April 26<sup>th</sup>, 2012?

A1) It will depend on the Submissions that we receive and on our process time to review and evaluate them. However, any delays to the award of contract will be factored into extending the project schedule. Proponents are required to submit a project schedule as outlined in the RFP.

**II. Individual Meeting Requests – Deadline Extended**

Please be advised that the deadline to book an additional meeting with the City has been extended:

WAS: Friday, December 9<sup>th</sup>, 2011 at 4:00 pm

IS NOW: Tuesday, December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2011 at 4:00pm

Please be advised that meeting times will not be available between December 15<sup>th</sup>, 2011 and Jan 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2012 (revised from January 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2012).

If the proponent requires further clarification on the above addendum, please contact Kerry Gillis at [purchasing@richmond.ca](mailto:purchasing@richmond.ca).

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Kerry Lynne Gillis', written in a cursive style.

Kerry Lynne Gillis  
*Buyer 2*

KG:kg

pc: Andy Bell, Project Engineer  
Lloyd Bie, Manager, Engineering Planning