

## **Guelph/Eramosa Township Roads Needs Study – Municipal Road Inventory Condition Assessment and Capital Improvement Plan – Response to Questions**

In keeping with the Section 10 – Summary of Key Dates, the following is a summary of all questions received by August 8<sup>th</sup> along with a response and/or required clarification.

Q1: Item 3 indicates that the invitation is to provide professional engineering services; is a P.Eng designation required for the work?

A1: A P.Eng designation is not required. However the relevant civil related experience and technician or technologist designation is required.

Q2: Is a GIS geodatabase indicating existing sections available as a starting point for the project?

A2: The data from the Townships last roads study is stored in an ESRI File Geodatabase, with mapping generated from that database. It will be available to the successful consultant for completion of the study

Q3: Professional Liability/ Errors and omissions insurance at the \$5m level seems a bit high for this type of work. Is there any movement on that?

A3: The Professional liability insurance under 25c) shall be \$2,000,000.

Q4: The RFP references an Asset Management software tool that will be developed further to provide life cycle cost analysis etc... Could you please clarify? Is there an existing tool to be modified? IF so can it be reviewed during the RFP period?

A4: The Municipality does not currently employ an Asset Management Software tool. The intention is to have the ability to migrate the data received under this project to a future software/tool.

Q5: Confirmation on the level of effort required to provide data in a format that can be imported into the CityWide software.

A5: The level of effort required is expected to include confirmation from Citywide that the spreadsheet format is appropriate for future migration by the municipality/Citywide. The consultant is not expected to migrate the data as part of the project.

Q6: Confirmation regarding the options for performing inspections directly in the CityWide program or uploading data into the program.

A6: Options for performing inspections directly into Citywide is not an expectation of the project. It may however be considered an asset. Uploading is not part of the project

Q7: Does the municipality currently have their data in CityWide?

A7: The road assets are in Citywide under the municipalities Tangible Capital Assets. Condition information from the previous roads needs study is included in that database.

Q8: Can we assume that the Municipality will be migrating the required data into CityWide and that the consultant will not need to upload this data?

A8: Correct. The municipality will migrate the spreadsheet data received into whichever asset management software is ultimately chosen.

Q9: Please confirm that the municipality intends to use CityWide as their enterprise asset management software. In this respect, can we assume that the Road Needs Study (RNS) work does not

include the development of an Asset Management tool to provide life cycle cost analysis, optimization strategies and long term budget estimates for the Township's road network, including future budgeting for rehabilitation, reconstruction and preventative maintenance. In the absence of developing this Asset Management tool the 5 year plan for the RNS will be based on the Priority Guide Number formula in the 1991 MTO Inventory Manual, along with engineering judgement. However it should be noted that the process in the 1991 manual does not reflect life cycle cost analysis, optimization strategies or consideration of budget scenarios. Alternatively these strategies can be provided in the RNS work, however their results may differ from those in the CityWide Asset Management approach. Please confirm if the expectation is to only provide a Needs Analysis/Prioritized 5 Year Capital Plan or whether the more extensive Asset Management Plan for the roads is requested.

A9: As per answer 4, the municipality does not currently employ an asset management software tool. Citywide modules are utilized for other municipal functions. (Tangible Capital Assets, Work orders). There is heavy consideration from a consistent platform standpoint to utilize Citywide for asset management planning. In terms of project deliverables, the scope shall include the condition ratings along with Now, 1 to 5 and 6 to 10 year recommendations. A 5 year detailed plan to be included as outlined under Items 30.1 and 30.2 of the RFP. The consultant is free to utilize any asset management planning software or tools for this component.

Q10: For the traffic analysis component (capacity, Level of Service) can we assume that the Township will provide all count data required (i.e., no new traffic counts are required)? The consultant will identify any additional count locations (with counts to be provided by the Township) in order to allow for the required update to traffic forecasts for the road network.

A10: The consultant will be provided our most recent traffic count locations. The consultant to provide recommendations on additional required locations to create, update and maintain the MMS classification map. The completion of those counts will be outside the scope of the project.

Q11: Is a 5 or 10 year plan required?; the RFP mentions both.

A11: As per A9, recommendations based on the MTO Inventory Manual are to be identified out to 10 years (Now, 1-5, 6-10). However the detailed capital plan in line with recent Capital Budget Amounts is for the following 5 years. This shall be considered an opportunity for the consultant to demonstrate their Asset Management Software tool utilizing life cycle, optimization strategies, budget considerations etc.

Q12: The project appears to be a lump sum project by the proposal submission. However, item 32.5c requires the proposed hours and disbursements for each project team person. What is the intent here, as if it becomes public, it may disclose a business practice of parties providing a proposal.

A12: Proposed hours and disbursements are not required for the lump sum project.

Q13: Item 26 is a mix of lump sum and upset limit wrt to invoices. Schedule 2 includes 2 items. Please clarify.

A13: Payment terms in the RFP are to be revised to delete first paragraph of Item 26. Payment shall be on a percent complete of lump sum amount. Two items are included in Schedule 2, however cost evaluation will be based on Total amount without consideration for breakdown between Engineering Fees and Disbursements. The consultant may breakdown fees between the two items, with the understanding that percent complete may differ between the two.

Q14: Item 32.6 indicates that prices shall be exclusive of HST. Schedule 2 indicates to include all taxes.

A14: A revised Schedule 2 is attached which includes a separate line for HST.

Resulting from the questions received, the Township is revising the evaluation criteria in Item 32.8 as follows:

Evaluation Criteria		Weight Factor Per RFP	Revised Weight Factor
1	Demonstrated project understanding and methodology	20	<b>40</b>
2	Experience	30	<b>30</b>
3	Time-lines/Fees	50	<b>30</b>
<b>Total</b>		100	<b>100</b>