



— CITY OF —  
**PORT ALBERNI**

**FACILITIES CONDITION ASSESSMENT**

**RFP 002-24**

**ADDENDUM #3**

---

- A. Change to RFP Closing Date and Time:**  
Monday, March 11, 2024 at 2:00:00 PM, Local time
  
- B. Change to deadline for questions to be received:**  
Friday, February 23, 2024 at 2:00:00 PM, Local time

**C. Response to Questions received from interested parties:**

#	Question	Answer
1	Can the CPA please clarify or summarize the level of existing documentation available to be reviewed for the affected buildings? We do not expect to have access to these before closing of the RFP, but it would be helpful for estimating effort/fees to know whether record drawings, previously-completed assessment reports, operating manuals, existing BAS access, trendlogs, utility data, etc. are available for each of the buildings noted in the “Table of Assets to Be Assessed”.	The City has, and will make available to the successful proponent, record drawings or issued for construction drawings (including architectural structural, mechanical, and electrical) for most of the original construction and extensions/additions of the facilities in the project scope, with the <b>exception</b> of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Glenwood Recreation Centre (federal wartime construction)</li> <li>• Gyro Youth Center</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Day Care facility – drawings available for original construction but not for building extension</li> <li>• Klitsa Park buildings.</li> </ul> <p>The City has, and will make available to the successful proponent, record drawings of most, but likely not all, past major renovation projects.</p> <p>The City has, and will make available to the successful proponent, HVAC DDC trend logging data for the following facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RCMP</li> <li>• Echo '67 Centre</li> <li>• Multiplex</li> <li>• City Hall</li> <li>• Gyro Youth Centre</li> <li>• Glenwood Rec Center</li> <li>• Echo Park Field Houses</li> <li>• Fire Hall.</li> </ul> <p>The City has, and will make available to the successful proponent, O&amp;M manuals for an estimated 80% of the mechanical equipment likely to be included in the project scope.</p> <p>The City has, and will make available to the successful proponent, utility billing records for all facilities.</p> <p>Proponents should not assume any additional assessment reports will be available, aside from those already mentioned/ included with the RFP.</p> <p>The City will have very limited staff time available to search City records for additional information beyond that already identified in the RFP documents.</p>
<p><b>2</b></p>	<p>Our expectation would be that the CPA provide a municipal staff representative familiar with each facility to assist the team with building and roof access for all site visits, and that this representative would accompany our team for the duration of our reviews. Please confirm whether this is the case?</p>	<p>A facilities maintenance employee familiar with the buildings will accompany consultant staff during site visits.</p>

<p><b>3</b></p>	<p>Schedule A indicates that proponents will be responsible for developing a safety plan for building inspections, and for supplying of own equipment for access to rooftops or other elevated building features. We would normally assume that site-specific fall-restraint or confined space entry would not be required for a portfolio-level assessment. Please confirm if this assumption is correct?</p>	<p>The scope of assessment should be limited such that site-specific fall-restraint and/or confined space entry are not required. For sloped roofs, inspection should only be performed on portions of the roof which can be safely viewed/examined from the platform of a man lift or from an extension ladder, at locations where a site-specific safety plan is not needed.</p> <p>For flat roofs with unprotected edges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only roof areas that allow for inspection at a safe distance from unprotected roof edges at all times (i.e. &gt; 6.5 feet), should be inspected.</li> <li>• Where no fixed permanent roof access points exist, access should be completed by man lift or portable ladder, if this can be done safely, and only where a site-specific safety plan is not required.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4</b></p>	<p>Does the CPA have specific expectations for format of the end deliverable (i.e. Do each of the listed buildings require an independent self-contained report document? Or may the observations and recommendations for all 18 buildings be summarized in subsections within a single report?)</p>	<p>The deliverable may be a single report with building observations and recommendations divided into subsections by building, or individual reports may be provided, as preferred by the successful proponent.</p>
<p><b>5</b></p>	<p>The “Table of Assets to Be Assessed” indicates that Emergency Power Systems are to be assessed in some buildings. Is there any desire to also include assessment of Lighting and/or Life Safety Systems in any buildings?</p>	<p>“Emergency Power” in the table refers to emergency power generators, and associated fuel tanks, enclosures, noise control, and pollution control accessories, if any. No assessment of emergency lighting or life safety systems is required.</p>
<p><b>6</b></p>	<p>Page 2 of the RFP - Purpose: The RFP talks about the deliverable as a singular report. Can the City clarify if the intent is to combine all facilities assessment requirements into one report or does it require one report per facility?</p>	<p>The deliverable may be a single report with building observations and recommendations divided into subsections by building, or individual reports may be provided, as preferred by the successful proponent.</p>
<p><b>7</b></p>	<p>Page 6 of the RFP - Schedule: There is no information provided by the City for an expected completion of the project. Based on the scoring of the proponent’s submission there are potentially three scoring levels. In order for us to achieve a partial or a full score we would need to know this date so we then can determine what resources will be needed to complete the project on or before this date. Can the City provide their expected completion of the project?</p>	<p>The City does not have a set target date for project completion. However, the results will be required by the successful proponents of another City project currently in procurement (RFEI #003-24). To minimize risk of schedule impact to the other project, the completion of the Facilities Condition Assessment should not be unduly delayed. It is important that respondents provide enough detail in their workplans and schedules to allow the evaluation team to assess the appropriateness of the schedule relative to the work plan proposed. Evaluators may also compare individual respondents’ schedule durations to the mean and range of schedule durations submitted by other respondents, and award less points</p>

		<p>to outliers (if a sufficient number of proposals are received to judge a consensus opinion on appropriate schedule range).</p>
<p><b>8</b></p>	<p>Addendum 1, Schedule A – A1 Project Definition states: “For the facilities and building systems identified ... Estimate capital cost of replacement (or rehabilitation, as appropriate), to a planning study level of accuracy (-50% to +100%)”</p> <p>a. Can the City please clarify if the cost of replacement is referring either to the entire facility, building systems (e.g. plumbing, envelope, etc.) or to individual building component/elements?</p> <p>b. Facility condition assessment reports often have a defined capital threshold, but none is mentioned in the RFP, or addendums. Repair/replacement cost below this capital threshold will be considered part of the operational and maintenance budget for that specific facility and therefore no repair/replacement cost will be included in the report for these items. Can the City provide us with the capital threshold they want us to use? Can the city please confirm if the capital threshold is assumed to apply to the overall systems or the individual components/elements?</p>	<p>a. Cost estimates are to be provided for each recommended repair/replacement exceeding capital thresholds. Where the consultant recommends total facility replacement rather than individual systems rehabilitation, the consultant may rely on the City’s most recent property valuation report (September 2022), but should adjust it based on latest available cost data and indices.</p> <p>b. For replacement/rehabilitation/repair needs estimated to be necessary/recommended within the zero to five-year horizon, a capital threshold of \$20,000 per building system, may be applied (separately at each building). For replacement/rehabilitation/repair needs estimated to be necessary/recommended within the six to twenty-year horizon, a capital threshold of \$50,000 per building system may be applied (separately at each building). For the purposes of threshold value determination, each building may be considered separately. For example, Mclean Mill visitor center facility consists of four buildings; Repair and replacement needs within the five-year horizon would have a \$20,000 threshold for building #1 roof system, \$20,000 for building #2 roof system, etc.</p>
<p><b>9</b></p>	<p>Addendum 1, Schedule A – A1 Project Definition states: “Assessments and cost estimates are to be made from the perspective of maintaining the functionality, code compliance and level of service present at the time of construction...”</p> <p>a. Can the City please clarify if the cost estimates are expected to be based on a visual, low-level assessment by a generalist or a ‘full-on’ detailed assessment by a specialist?</p>	<p>The City expects the estimates to be made on the basis of visual evidence, available drawings and other documentation, and the consulting team’s expertise. Invasive examination or testing is not expected. The proposal evaluation weighting is intended to provide the City with best value for money (cost vs. level of expertise), and the City does not have a set expectation for level of expertise to be provided. See also Question 10.</p>

<p><b>10</b></p>	<p>Addendum 1, Schedule A – A2 Services Required of the Engineer states: “The Client requires the Engineer to provide the following...”</p> <p>a. Is it the expectation of the City that all work activities for this project be performed by engineer(s), or is acceptable that the work is performed by other qualified personnel under the supervision of an engineer?</p> <p>b. Must the engineer(s) involved in the delivery of the project be registered in British Columbia?</p> <p>c. Does the City require the final report(s) to be authenticated (stamped) by a registered engineer(s) in the province of BC?</p>	<p>The City expects that the assessment of structural elements be performed by, or performed under direct supervision of, a professional engineer licensed in British Columbia.</p> <p>The City does not specifically require that other elements of the project scope be performed by, or performed under direct supervision of, a professional engineer licensed in British Columbia.</p> <p>The City does not specifically require that the deliverables be sealed by a professional engineer. Respondents should make their own determination whether any services to be provided fall under the reserved practice of professional engineering in the province of BC.</p>
<p><b>11</b></p>	<p>Addendum 1, Schedule A – A2 and page A-5 and Addendum 2 – Section C: Schedule A lists 18 facilities to be assessed and Addendum 2 lists 22 facilities. Can the City confirm which list is the correct facilities list?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• McLean Mill Visitor Centre consists of four adjacent free-standing buildings. They are lumped into a single table entry in Schedule A.</li> <li>• The facilities at Klitsa Park were inadvertently omitted from Schedule A. A revised version of the table is attached.</li> <li>•</li> <li>• The Day Care facility was inadvertently omitted from the Facilities Building Details Table in Addendum 2. A revised version of the table is attached.</li> </ul>
<p><b>12</b></p>	<p>Schedule A – A2, Page A-5: The header in table provides what areas (components) and type of assessments (i.e. seismic) are expected and not expected to be performed at the listed facilities. Can the City confirm whether the scope of the assessment at each facility will be limited to just what each header title describes?</p>	<p>The component assessment scope includes only those where “Yes” is indicated in the Table of Assets to Be Assessed, Page A-5. Building systems not identified in this table (e.g. plumbing, electrical) are not in scope.</p>
<p><b>13</b></p>	<p>Addendum 1, Schedule A – A2, Page A-5: The facility table indicates that one facility requires a seismic assessment. There are different standards used in Canada and some of these standards are divided into different levels. Can you please tell us which standard, and if applicable, which level the City is expecting for the seismic assessment?</p>	<p>The proposed seismic assessment of the Glenwood Center has been reconsidered. Seismic assessment is no longer within the scope of this RFP.</p>

14	Normally a facility condition assessment forecasts the assumed capital expenditures for a pre-set timeframe into the future (depending on client needs normally in between 10 and 25-years). Can the City please provide a timeframe for the forecast period?	A 20-year forecast (minimum) is to be provided.
15	Can the City provide a confirmed list of buildings included within this scope? The list in the RFP and the list provided in Addendum #2 do not display the same number of buildings.	See Question 11.
16	Do you have an approximate budget that could be shared for this project?	The City has tentatively allocated \$75,000. If the fee proposed by the successful respondent is substantially higher, the City may opt to allocate additional budget, or reduce the project scope. See also Conditions 2 (f) and 2 (g) of the RFP.
17	Do you require that specialist engineers go to site to review components (mechanical, electrical, structural) and then are stamping and sealing each section of the report or is a more generalist approach acceptable- where the assessment team is composed of staff with significant Building Condition Experience and report is provided under the supervision of a senior architect and/or engineer. A specialist review approach would add significant costs to the project.	See Question 10.
18	The table provided has a column listed as additional scope for the Multiplex Arena and Echo 1967 Recreation Centre. Is this scope to be included or excluded from the FCA?	The arena ice surface refrigeration system and the swimming pool mechanical systems are included in the scope of the assignment.
19	Does the project need to be completed in a certain timeframe or are you leaving it to the proponent to provide a realistic schedule.	See question 7.
20	What is the capital term for the reporting requirements (i.e., identifying capital projects occurring in the next X years)? Commonly these reports outline planning for next 10 yrs, 20 yrs, or 30 yrs.	See question 14.
21	What is the dollar threshold used to identify a capital expenditure for reporting purposes? Commonly these reports identify projects that exceed the threshold of \$5,000, \$10,000 or \$25,000, with items less than the threshold excluded from reporting as they assumed to be handled as a maintenance / operating expense.	See question 8.

<b>22</b>	What components are excluded from the review? Page A-5 lists “building systems to assess”. Can we assume the following components are excluded: Plumbing/drainage, Electrical, Communications/Security, Fire Alarm/Suppression, Elevators/Lifts	See Question 12.
<b>23</b>	In Schedule B, Item B1.2 – are the % allocations adjustable or are those set values?	For the purposes of the proposal, the % allocations are set. The intent of the % allocations should not exceed earned value. If the successful proponent can demonstrate to the City that these % allocations are significantly out of alignment with earned value / required level of effort, the City will consider modifying these contract terms.

**D. Inclusion of Revised Building Details Table and Revised Facilities Condition Assessment Table (below)**

All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

Inquiries to:  
Purchasing  
purchasing@portalberni.ca  
City of Port Alberni  
4850 Argyle St  
Port Alberni, BC V9Y 1V8

## PRC Dept RFP 002-24: Facilities Building Details (Revised for Addendum 3)

Site	Address	Number of Storeys	At Grade Area (m <sup>2</sup> ) (Ground Floor)	Basement Area (m <sup>2</sup> )	Foundation	Framing	Floor Structure	HVAC	Roof
Public Works Office and Maintenance Shop	4150 6 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1	1,516	N/A	Reinforced Concrete Foundation	Concrete Block Frame	Concrete Slab on Grade	Hot Water Boiler with Convectors and Suspended Gas Space Heaters	Wood Structure with Sealed Membrane
Parks Office and Maintenance Shop	4150 6 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1	1,459	N/A	Reinforced Concrete Foundation	Concrete Block Frame with Steel Columns	Compacted Gravel and Concrete Slab on Ground	Electric Baseboard Heat and Suspended Radiant Space Heaters	Wood and Steel Structure with Elastomeric Membrane
City Hall	4850 Argyle St	1	781	536	Reinforced Concrete Foundation	Concrete Block Frame	Concrete Slab on Grade and Elevated Concrete Joist and Deck (above partial basement)	Hot Water Heating with Air Exchange System and Air Conditioning	Steel Structure with Sealed Membrane
Klitsa Park Residence and Fieldhouse	4000 Compton Rd	1	196	N/A	Reinforced Concrete Foundation	Wood Frame Structure	Concrete Slab on Grade	Electric Baseboard Heat and Electric Space Heaters	Wood Structure with Asphalt Shingles
Klitsa Park Concession and Washroom	4000 Compton	1	89	N/A	Reinforced Concrete Foundation	Wood Frame Structure	Concrete Slab on Grade	Electric Baseboard Heat	Wood Structure with Asphalt Shingles
Arena Building	3250 9 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1	4,602	319	Reinforced Concrete Foundation	Concrete Block Frame	Concrete Slab on Grade and Wood Structure	Suspended Gas Heaters with Ventilation System; and Hot Water Heating with Air Exchange System	Wood Structure with Asphalt Shingles and Sealed Membrane
Fire Hall	3699 10 <sup>th</sup> Ave	2	725	N/A	Reinforced Concrete Foundation	Concrete Block Frame	Concrete Slab on Grade	Hot Water Heating and Air Conditioning; and Suspended Gas Heaters with Ventilation System	Wood Structure with Sealed Membrane
RCMP Detachment	4444 Morton St	1	1,958	N/A	Reinforced Concrete Foundation	Concrete Load-Bearing Walls	Concrete Slab on Grade and Elevated Concrete Joist and Deck	Hot Water Heating with Air Conditioning	Concrete and Steel Structure with Sealed Membrane
Echo Centre	4255 Wallace St	1	4,728	518	Reinforced Concrete Foundation	Concrete Block Frame	Concrete Slab on Grade, Elevated Concrete Joist and Deck and Wood Structure	Rooftop Heating and Cooling	Wood Structure with Sealed Membrane
Alberni Valley Multiplex	3737 Roger St	2	6,447	N/A	Reinforced Concrete Foundation	Concrete and Masonry Load-Bearing Walls	Concrete Slab on Grade and Elevated Concrete Joist and Deck	Rooftop Heating and Cooling; and Partial Radiant Natural Gas Heaters	Steel Joist with Wood Deck and Sealed Membrane Roof Cover



Site	Address	Number of Storeys	At Grade Area (m <sup>2</sup> ) (Ground Floor)	Basement Area (m <sup>2</sup> )	Foundation	Framing	Floor Structure	HVAC	Roof
Alberni Harbour Quay – Port Building	5440 Argyle St	2	202	N/A	Reinforced Concrete Foundation	Wood Frame Structure	Concrete Slab on Grade and Wood Structure	Forced Air Furnace	Wood Structure with Metal Roof Cover
Alberni Harbour Quay – Marine Commercial Building	5440 Argyle St	1	734	N/A	Reinforced Concrete Foundation	Wood Frame Structure	Concrete Slab on Grade and Wood Structure (Above Retail and Restaurant Sections)	Electric Baseboard Heat	Wood Structure with Metal Cladding
Alberni Harbour Quay – Spirit Square	5440 Argyle St	1	290	N/A	Reinforced Concrete Foundation	Wood Frame Structure	Concrete Slab on Grade	Electric Baseboard Heat; and Forced Air System	Wood Structure with Metal Cladding
Echo Park Bob Dailey Stadium Grandstand	4480 Vimy Rd	1	292	N/A	Reinforced Concrete Foundation	N/A	N/A	NIL	TBD
Echo Park East Fieldhouse	4200 Wood Ave	2	177	N/A	Reinforced Concrete Foundation	Concrete Block Frame	Concrete Slab on Grade and Elevated Concrete Joist and Deck	Forced Air Heat	Wood Structure with Metal Cladding
Echo Park West Fieldhouse	4200 Wood Ave	1	175	N/A	Reinforced Concrete Foundation	Concrete Block Frame	Concrete Slab on Grade and Elevation Concrete Joist and Deck	Forced Air Heat	Wood and Concrete Structure with Metal Cladding and Brick Pavers
Glenwood Recreation Centre	4480 Vimy St	1	1819	N/A	Reinforced Concrete Foundation	Concrete Block Frame	Concrete Slab on Grade and Wood Structure	Hot Water Heating and Electric Baseboard Heat with Ventilation System	Wood Structure with Sealed Membrane
Gyro Youth Centre	4400 North Crescent	1	269	3,072	Reinforced Concrete Foundation	Wood Frame Structure	Concrete Slab on Grade and Wood Structure	Forced Air Heat	Wood Structure with Asphalt Shingles
McLean Mill Visitor Complex – Administration Building	5633 Smith Rd	1	32	N/A	Treated Wood Foundations	Wood Frame Structure	Wood Structure	Electric Baseboard Heat	Wood Structure with Metal Roof Cover
McLean Mill – Washroom Building	5633 Smith Rd	1	40	N/A	Reinforced Concrete Foundation	Wood Frame Structure	Concrete Slab on Ground	Electric Wall Heaters	Wood Structure with Metal Roof Cover
McLean Mill Visitor Complex – Convention Centre	5633 Smith Rd	1	271	N/A	Reinforced Concrete Foundation	Wood Frame Structure	Concrete Slab on Ground	Packaged Hot and Cold Unit	Wood Structure with Metal Roof Cover
McLean Mill Visitor Complex – Gift Shop	5633 Smith Rd	1	40	N/A	Treated Wood Foundations	Wood Frame Structure	Wood Structure	Electric Baseboard Heat	Wood Structure with Metal Roof Cover
Day care facility	4222 Cedarwood St.	1	1040	N/A	Reinforced Concrete Foundation	Wood Frame Structure	Concrete Slab on Grade And Wood Structure	Forced Air Heat	Wood Structure with Tar and Gravel Roof Cover

**City of Port Alberni; Parks Recreation & Culture Dept.  
RFP 002-24: Facilities Condition Assessment  
Table of Assets to Be Assessed (Revised for Addendum 3)  
21-Feb-24**

Site	Address	Approx. Floor Area (m <sup>2</sup> )	Year Built (approx)	BUILDING SYSTEMS TO ASSESS								Additional Systems
				Roof System	HVAC	Exterior (cladding, coatings etc.)	Int. Paint/Coatings	Emerg. Power Generation	Seismic	Structural (excl. seismic)		
Multiplex Arena	3737 Roger St	6300	2001	No	Yes	No	No	N/A	No	No	Ice refrigeration mechanical	
Echo '67 Recreation Centre (w/ Aquatics Centre, Library, Museum)	4255 Wallace St.	5200	1967, 1992 and 2006	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Swimming pool & related mechanical	
Former Arena (Industrial Heritage Society)	3250 9th Ave.	5200	1962	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	N/A	No	Yes		
RCMP Detachment Office	4444 Morton St	2400	2006	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No		
Glenwood Recreation Center	4480 Vimy St.	1800	~1940	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	N/A	No	Yes		
Public Works Ops Bldg	4150 6th Ave	1500	1965	No	No	Yes	No	N/A	No	Yes		
Parks Ops Bldg	4150 6th Ave	1500	1965	No	Yes	No	No	N/A	No	Yes		
City Hall	4850 Argyle St	1300	1958	Yes	Yes	No	No	N/A	No	No		
Day Care Facility	4222 Cedarwood St.	1100	1961	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	N/A	No	Yes		
PAFD Station	3699 10th Ave	1100	1967	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No		
Harbour Quay - Marine Commercial Bldg	5440 Argyle Street	700	1961	Yes	No	Yes	No	N/A	No	No		
Gyro Youth Center	3245 7th Ave	600	1940	Yes	Yes	No	No	N/A	No	No		
McLean Mill Visitor Center complex (4 bldgs)	5633 Smith Rd.	500	1998	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	N/A	No	No		
Echo Park East Field House	4200 Wood Ave	400	1992	Yes	No	No	No	N/A	No	No		
Stadium Grandstand	4480 Vimy St.	400	1960	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	Yes		
Harbour Quay - Port Bldg	5440 Argyle Street	300	1983	Yes	No	Yes	No	N/A	No	No		
Harbour Quay - Spirit Square (main bldg and washroom bldg)	5440 Argyle Street	300	1983	Yes	No	Yes	No	N/A	No	No		
Echo Park West Field House	4200 Wood Ave	300	1992	Yes	No	No	No	N/A	No	No		
Klitsa Park (Field House bldg & washroom/concession bldg)	4000 Compton Rd	300	~1980 & 2010	Yes	No	No	No	N/A	No	No		