



The Niagara Parks Commission
Agency of the Government of
Ontario since 1885

ADDENDUM # 5

FOR

WEGO Transit and Fleet Operations Center Expansion

Request for Proposal No: RFP-22-2024-AD
Issue Date of Addendum: January 10, 2025
Proposal Submission Deadline: Jan 23, 2025 at 2:00 p.m. ET

ADDENDUM # 2

This RFP may only be amended or supplemented by an addendum. If The Niagara Parks Commission (“NPC”), for any reason, determines that it is necessary to provide additional information relating to this RFP, such information will be communicated to all Proponents by addenda by way of Bonfire. Each addendum shall form an integral part of this RFP.

NPC is issuing this Addendum to all potential Proponents to:

- advise them of the responses to the questions that were submitted by potential Proponents of the RFP, and/or;
- advise them of the clarifications/changes to this RFP.

Proponents are responsible for obtaining all addenda issued by the NPC.

Amendments:

1. In the Mandatory Requirements Schedule, remove item 4 (“Subcontractor Listing Schedule”) entirely and replace with the following:

4. Subcontractor Listing Schedule

Within 24 hours following the Proposal Submission Deadline, using the Subcontractor Listing Schedule, each Proponent shall provide the names of all subcontractors whose prices have been included in the Proposal. NPC reserves the right to request alternate subcontractors.

2. Following the Proposal Submission Deadline, NPC will issue a Public Notice notifying Proponents of the project reopening so the Subcontractor Listing Schedule can be submitted by the Proponent.

Submission of the Subcontractor Listing Schedule shall be submitted in the same manner as the rest of the Proposal and in accordance with section 2.8 (“Proposal Submission”).

Proponent will only have access to submit their Subcontractor Listing Schedule. The Proponent shall not be permitted to submit other documentation other than that pertaining to the Subcontractor Listing Schedule.

3. The list of Subcontractors shall not be changed without the NPC’s written approval.
4. Replace Rated Elements Schedule with Rated Elements Schedule REV 1. (attached to this Addendum)

Addenda are the only means of verifying, clarifying or changing any of the information contained in the RFP. Other than the RFP Coordinator, no employee or agent of NPC is authorized to change the content of this RFP and/or any addenda.

No communications are to be directed to anyone other than the RFP Coordinator.

The “RFP Coordinator” is Adam De Giuli

All questions regarding any errors, omissions or ambiguities, or to seek additional information must be submitted by Proponents via Bonfire's Opportunity Vendor Discussions board before the Proponents' Deadline for Questions. Do not submit questions to the e-mail address in Section 1.7 (RFP Coordinator)".

Rated Elements Schedule REV. 1

Rated Element	Available Points	Evaluation
Part A Proponent's Experience and Qualifications <i>(available points: 30)</i>		
<p><u>Proponent's Project Experience</u></p> <p>Using Project Experience Response Schedule, the Proponent should provide a detailed description of <u>3</u> completed projects where the Proponent acted as the general contractor for the project. The project examples should meet the following, with a maximum score of 10 points per project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All projects completed within the last 5 years; • Project values should not be less than \$500,000. • The project examples should explain and demonstrate why the projects are relevant and comparable in terms of the Services requested in this RFP. <p>Project description details are to be provided within the Project Experience Response Schedule as per the instructions therein.</p> <p>NPC will only evaluate the first 3 projects listed (if more than that number are submitted).</p> <p>All submitted projects may be subject to reference checks.</p>	30	Per Evaluation Matrix

Rated Element	Available Points	Evaluation
Part B Project Team Experience (available points: 25)		
<p><u>Project Management and Site Supervisor</u></p> <p>The Proponent should provide resumes for their in-house Project Manager and Site Supervisor to be assigned to this project.</p> <p>Higher points will be awarded for demonstrating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • proposed individuals' experience with projects of similar scope, size and complexity. • the proposed individuals possess the applicable qualifications and expertise that align with the scope of work described under this RFP. 	25	Per Evaluation Matrix
Part C Work Plan and Methodology (available points: 30)		
<p>The Proponent should describe in writing its proposed methodology and strategy, that clearly demonstrates an understanding of the project, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Proponent understands the risks associated with the high-staff area where the construction is taking place in and should explain in writing their plan to control the site with minimal or no impact to operations of staff activities. (7 Points) • The Proponent clearly identifies and describes the understanding of all work requirements related to the Project's Specification Schedule (6 Points) • The Proponent has access to all appropriate tools, machinery, and apparatus to complete the project. (1 Point) • The Proponent to deliver the assignment for achieving the following Substantial Performance date of October 31, 2025. (1 Point) 	15	Per Evaluation Matrix

Rated Element	Available Points	Evaluation
<p><u>Proposed Schedule</u></p> <p>The Proponent should provide a proposed schedule, preferably in Gantt chart format or excel format, that outlines a timeline in relation to the project milestones to deliver the assignment for achieving the Substantial Performance date of October 31, 2025.</p> <p><u>Higher points will be awarded for schedules depicting greater detail and project task breakdown.</u></p> <p>The Proponent should submit an example schedule from a previous completed project of similar scope and detail how it met the timelines of the project.</p>	10	Per Evaluation Matrix

Rated Element	Available Points	Evaluation
<p><u>Escalation Procedures</u></p> <p>Provide details of problem escalation procedures/process which the Proponent has in place to deal with performance issues, both internally and with respect to its subcontractors. Higher points will be awarded to Proponents that can provide immediate response time and resolution to maintain project schedule. Proponent to provide a communication plan/strategy to mitigate schedule delays and product supply.</p>	5	Per Evaluation Matrix
<p>Part D Health and Safety (available points: 10)</p>		
<p><u>Health and Safety Management Program</u></p> <p>It is expected that each Proponent must clearly demonstrate a well-established health and safety management program to ensure that workers and work sites are safe from injury.</p> <p>In the case that the Proponent has achieved CORTM Certification in Ontario, please submit the Certificate of Recognition along with a current Letter of Good Standing from the Infrastructure Health and Safety Association (IHSA).</p> <p>If Proponent's are not CORTM certified, they may submit the following elements of their established health and safety management program for review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and safety program table of contents (5 points) • Health and safety Policy statement (dated and signed) (5 points) 	10	Per Evaluation Matrix

Rated Element	Available Points	Evaluation
<u>Part E Submission Quality (available points: 5)</u>		
<p>The Proponent's Proposal will be scored based on its overall presentation.</p> <p>Up to 3 points for writing the narrative portions of the Proposal in a clear, concise, and logical fashion and limiting Proposal content to information requested. Points will be awarded as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 out of 3 points = Proposal content is clear and well written (e.g. grammar, syntax, spelling, etc.), with professional presentation. The Proposal responds logically to the requirements. • 2 out of 3 points = Proposal content is mostly clear and well written. The Proposal responds to the requirements and contains limited marketing material. • 1 out of 3 points = Proposal content is not clearly written. Content is included that does not clearly address the requirements. • 0 out of 3 points = The Proposal is not clear and is difficult to understand. <p>Up to 1 point for ordering/structuring the Proposal to match the order and sequence of the rated criteria as stated in the RFP. Proposals will receive 1 point, subject to a deduction of 0.5 points for each requirement or criterion that is presented out of numeric sequence, to a maximum of 2 deductions.</p> <p>Up to 1 point for highlighted information in the Proposal that is specifically relevant to an evaluation factor or minimum qualifications and ensuring any cross-references within the Proposal for highlighted information are easily identified and clearly found. Points will be awarded as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 out of 1 point = The Proposal contains highlighting, summary tables or cross-references to minimize duplication of content and facilitate review. References indicated in the Proposal are correct. • .5 out of 1 point = The Proposal contains highlighting, summary tables or cross-references. Cross-references indicated in the Proposal include some errors. • 0 points = The Proposal does not include any highlighting or cross-referencing, and it is difficult to locate information that addresses the requirements. 	5	As stated in this criterion (Part E Submission Quality)