



**CITY OF PORT ALBERNI**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)**  
**RFP #002-24**

**PARKS, RECREATION & CULTURE**

**Facilities Condition Assessment**

**Issued: Tuesday, February 6, 2024**

**Closes: 2:00:00PM PST, Wednesday, February 28, 2024**

## INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS

### Purpose

The purpose of this Request for Proposal (RFP) is for the City of Port Alberni (CPA) to procure professional building condition assessment and construction cost estimating services, for the inspection of major City-owned facilities and the preparation of a report which documents their current conditions, remaining service life expectancies, and projected capital costs for rehabilitation and/or replacement.

The report will inform the development of a departmental master plan and capital budget forecast, to be carried out by the City later this year (separate project).

### Definitions

“*agreement*” refers specifically to the potential contractual agreement between CPA and a *successful proponent* arising from this RFP process, in accordance with the “Form of Agreement” described below.

“*closing time*” means the time specified on the cover page of this RFP, except as amended by issue of addendum.

“*prime consultant*” means a firm submitting an EOI or proposal on behalf of a team of two or more firms, and/or a firm under contract to CPA that sub-contracts a portion of the contracted work to one or more other firms.

“*Respondent*” and “*proponent*” mean a firm that submits a proposal to the City in accordance with the instructions and conditions outlined herein.

“*RFP*” and “*Request for Proposal*” mean this Request for Proposal, including any attached appendices and schedules, and all addenda.

“*Successful proponent*” means the *respondent* firm whose proposal submission receives the highest score in the evaluation process described herein, and who is willing and able to enter into contract with the City.

### Conditions

- 1) *Respondents* are solely responsible for any costs or expenses incurred related to the preparation of the submission.
- 2) CPA retains the rights to:
  - a) withdraw or cancel the RFP,
  - b) revise the RFP, and/or extend the *closing time*, by issue of addendum,
  - c) make public the names of *respondents*,
  - d) clarify or verify, with the *respondent* or with third parties, information included in a *respondent’s* submission,

- e) reject a submission by a *respondent* which has a claim against CPA, or has instituted legal proceedings against CPA, or against whom CPA has a claim or instituted a legal proceeding,
  - f) initiate a new RFP or other procurement process for the same services, and
  - g) negotiate a modified scope and budget with the *successful proponent*, in the event that the submitted price exceeds the available project funding.
- 3) CPA has no obligation to enter into *agreement* with any *respondents*.
  - 4) Where the *successful proponent* is a *prime consultant*, CPA will not enter into the *agreement* with any firms other than the *prime consultant*.
  - 5) As a public body, the CPA is subject to the *BC Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*. Applicable laws may require disclosure of information submitted to CPA. The information collected will be used by CPA solely for the purpose stated herein.
  - 6) Questions regarding this RFP must be directed in writing, **referencing the competition number** to:

Dave Arsenault, P.Eng.  
Project Manager  
Fax: 250-723-1003  
[purchasing@portalberni.ca](mailto:purchasing@portalberni.ca)

- 7) Questions must be submitted by end of day, Wednesday, February 21, 2024. Questions submitted after this date will not be answered.
- 8) No oral explanation or interpretation by City staff shall modify any requirements of the RFP.

### **Submission Instructions**

- 1) Responses to this RFP must be submitted by email, in PDF format, to [purchasing@portalberni.ca](mailto:purchasing@portalberni.ca). File size must be less than 20 MB.
- 2) Addenda, if any, will be posted to the City of Port Alberni website. *Proponents* are responsible for checking if addenda have been posted.
- 3) Submissions received after the *Closing Time* will not be accepted or considered.
- 4) If a submission is deemed not to contain sufficient information to allow City staff to evaluate the qualifications of the respondent, the submission will be disqualified.

### **Submission Contents**

- 1) The proposal must be in English.
- 2) The proposal submission must contain the following:
  - a) Cover page identifying the CPA reference # for this RFP,

- b) Corporate names, addresses and phone numbers of all firms comprising the *respondent* team,
  - c) Where the *respondent* is representing a team consisting of more than one corporation / business, the *prime consultant* must be identified,
  - d) A team organization and qualifications summary, up to four pages in length, summarizing the relevant qualifications of the proposed team members and firm(s), and identifying the roles and responsibilities of each member of the team.
  - e) Appendix containing resumes for the proposed team members. This may include multiple staff options for the same role or area of expertise, but should not include any staff that the *proponent* knows would not be available or able to fulfil that project role. It is not necessary to identify or provide resumes for staff who will perform junior/ support/ administrative roles on the project team.
  - f) Two client reference contact names and phone numbers, from two relevant previous or current projects.
  - g) Proposed work program, up to six pages in length, identifying key tasks, deliverables, and milestone schedule.
  - h) Completed Schedule B (template attached to this document).
- 3) In addition to the above mandatory requirements, the proposal submission may optionally contain additional material in an appendix. However, additional material will only be considered for the purposes of clarifying and confirming the expertise and experience that is explicitly identified in the required content listed above.

### **Evaluation of Submissions**

If a submission is deemed not to contain sufficient information to allow City staff to evaluate the qualifications of the *respondent*, or if the submission is otherwise incomplete, the submitting *respondent* will be disqualified from consideration.

City staff will review and evaluate the submitted proposals according to the criteria and scoring system outlined below.

| <b>Evaluation Element</b> | <b>Criteria</b>  | <b>Points Available</b> |
|---------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| Key staff expertise       | Extent of demonstrated evidence of relevant expertise possessed by proposed project manager and subject matter experts.  | 35                      |
| Corporate-wide expertise  | Extent of demonstrated evidence of relevant expertise possessed by the firm(s) staff, other than proposed key staff. These may be staff resources that are not proposed to be part of the project team, but who are available for consultation on specific issues. | 10                      |
| Workplan                  | Extent to which the project workplan demonstrates a clear understanding of the project requirements.   | 15                      |
| Schedule                  | Schedule is realistically achievable but not excessively drawn-out.  | 10                      |
| Price                     | Lower price preferred, but budget must be sufficient to complete the required scope  | 30                      |
| <b>Maximum Points</b>     |  | <b>100</b>              |

The general guide for scoring the *expertise* elements will be:

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| Extensive experience in all relevant areas of expertise                                     | full points |
| Lacking evidence of expertise in one key subject area, or limited evidence in several areas | half points |
| Little or no evidence of relevant expertise in multiple key areas of expertise              | no points   |

Where multiple possible staff are proposed for the same key role, the expertise scores will be based on a blended average of the expertise of staff proposed.

The general guide for scoring the *Workplan* element will be:

|  |             |
|--|-------------|
| Workplan demonstrates high degree of project understanding, and presents an effective, tailored strategy to completing the work                  | full points |
| Workplan is appropriate but generic or limited in detail, and demonstrates some evidence of project understanding                                | half points |
| Workplan is not well suited to project requirement and does not indicate project understanding, OR, insufficient information to allow evaluation | no points   |

The general guide for scoring the *Schedule* element will be:

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| Schedule is somewhat aggressive but realistically achievable                  | full points |
| Schedule marginally unrealistic, or significantly longer than expected        | half points |
| Schedule is deemed unachievably short, or more than twice as long as expected | no points   |

For the *Price* element, the score will be calculated based on the average price of all qualifying proposals received, as follows:

|  |                   |
|--|-------------------|
| Price greater than 80% of average price, but less than or equal to average price   | full points       |
| Price greater than 65% of average price, but less than or equal to 80% of average price<br>OR<br>Price greater than average price, but less than or equal to 125% of average price | Two-thirds points |
| Price greater than 50% of average price, but less than 65% of average price<br>OR<br>Price greater than 125% of average price, but less than or equal to 200% of average price     | One-third points  |
| Price less than or equal to 50% of average price<br>OR<br>Price greater than 200% of average price   | no points         |

The *respondent* submitting the highest-scoring proposal will be the *successful proponent*. In the event that the *successful proponent* is unwilling or unable to enter into *agreement* with CPA, then the next highest scoring *respondent* will become the *successful proponent*.

**Form of Agreement**

The Form of Agreement for the professional service contract between the City and the *successful proponent* will be the *Engineering Agreement Between Client and Engineer for Studies and Reports*, ACEC-Canada, Document No. 36-2012.

**ATTACHMENTS**

|            |                                |
|------------|--------------------------------|
| Schedule A | Engineer's Scope of Services   |
| Schedule B | Fees and Reimbursable Expenses |
| Schedule C | Reference Information          |

**End of RFP**