



SOQ ADDENDUM #2

Date of Addendum: February 14, 2025

NOTICE TO ALL POTENTIAL RESPONDENTS

The Request for Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) is modified as set forth in this Addendum. The original SOQ Documents and any previously issued addenda remain in full force and effect, except as modified by this Addendum, which is hereby made part of the SOQ Respondent shall take this Addendum into consideration when preparing and submitting its Proposal.

SCHEDULE FOR SELECTION

Addendum or Clarification Posted **February 14, 2025, 2.00PM PDT.**
 Proposal Deadline **March 6, 2025, 2.00PM PDT**

1.0 – SOQ

Section	Item	Number	Description of Change
7.2	B	1	<p><i>“Team Principals must submit a Submission, including a Prompt and an SOQ, in the following format: One (1) PDF copy of the Submission and attachments must be submitted electronically via email.”</i></p> <p>Delete the sentence above in its entirety and revise to read as follows:</p> <p>Team Principals must submit their responses in the following format: One (1) PDF copy of the Submission and attachments must be submitted electronically via email. The email must be addressed to jethier@gvha.ca and include the following Subject Heading:</p> <p><i>“Request for Statement of Qualifications: Professional Consulting Services Integrated Plan for the Victoria Harbour – Submission.”</i></p> <p>Please also provide a received and read request in the email submission to confirm receipt.</p>



2.0 – QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The following questions and answers are provided as a matter of information to clarify issues raised about the SOQ.

To the extent that changes to the SOQ are required based on the questions received, the SOQ has been modified as noted above in the SOQ section 1.0 of this Addendum.

Item	Questions and Answers
<p>2.1.</p>	<p><u>Question:</u> <i>Regarding Section 6.2., item 7: could you please clarify what the GVHA is expecting on this topic? “Financial and operational strategies and modeling that confirms a path to a financially sustainable harbour for the future, segmented by ownership groups. This would include revenue streams, grant funding and investment opportunities needed to be viable”. Will GVHA provide input on this item to the selected proponent? (e.g. existing operating revenues and costs, the drivers of those figures, and information about government grants/etc.)</i></p> <p><u>Answer:</u> As part of the Integrated Plan, we expect to see a full financial model that lays out the investment cost of the development that is being proposed, as well as the market value revenues that would be charged, and the annual market operational costs to maintain the facilities. This needs to prove whether the development is viable on its own, or whether it would require various levels of government or other sources of funding models to support it. We expect the proponent to provide the market intelligence on the cost and revenue models that are typical in the industry, as well as any potential grants that may be available. While GVHA has some operational data that may be supportive, there could be uses proposed that GVHA does not have data on.</p>
<p>2.2.</p>	<p><u>Question:</u> <i>Regarding the requirement for teams to have expertise in “Permitting” (section 4). Could you please clarify whether this is related to approvals, environmental approvals, Federal permitting, or other at this time?</i></p> <p><u>Answer:</u> All government levels of permitting that cover development, zoning, environmental, navigational (Air and Sea), archaeological, and other</p>



	<p>pertinent legislative or regulatory requirements that would be required to develop the water lot and upland areas. GVHA needs to understand the impacts and potential timing of those legislative and regulatory requirements. Through this planning review, it should be highlighted where barriers may exist to achieve the desired outcome of the plans and objectives.</p>
<p>2.3.</p>	<p><u>Question:</u> <i>The maximum file size noted in Addendum 1 is 10MB. Is there any scope to increase this or submit more than one file in separate emails if a single file exceeds 10MB?</i></p> <p><u>Answer:</u> We will increase the size to 20MB to accommodate all participants.</p>
<p>2.4.</p>	<p><u>Question:</u> <i>Please confirm what is meant by “a Prompt” (Item 7.2 B. of the Request for SOQ) to be included in the submission with the SOQ.</i></p> <p><u>Answer:</u> A revision has been made in Section 1.0 above.</p>
<p>2.5.</p>	<p><u>Question:</u> <i>Summary of Relevant Experience: Should the 5 No. relevant project examples be projects executed by the Principal (with subcontractor involvement if applicable) or should up to 5 No. project examples be provided for each firm (i.e. Principal and subcontractor firms)?</i></p> <p><u>Answer:</u> Ideally, we would want to see relevant project examples from the collective team that is being presented in the SOQ. If the Principal and subcontractor have not worked together before with relevant project examples, then identifying more than five examples may be required. We are more focused on ensuring we understand the quality of the experience being presented, rather than limiting the examples presented.</p>

<p>2.6.</p>	<p><u>Question:</u></p> <p><i>Requirement 7.1.1.i, copied below for convenience, is not 100% clear to us. Could you please confirm that the consultant is requested to present past project experiences (maximum 5) and the role it played on those projects?</i></p> <p><i>‘i. Summary of Relevant Experience: Include information on no more than five (5) projects the firm worked on that are most like this Project and the portion of the Services that the team member would undertake. Detail the specific role the subcontract firm played on the example project.’</i></p> <p><u>Answer:</u></p> <p>Please read in conjunction with the answer provided in 2.5 above. We are looking to validate the experience of the team, with project examples that include clarity on what role the team played on those projects</p>
<p>2.7.</p>	<p><u>Question:</u></p> <p><i>Could you please confirm that the references referred to in requirement 7.1.1.j, copied below for convenience, are Client references?</i></p> <p><i>‘j. Provide two (2) references from relevant projects.’</i></p> <p><u>Answer:</u></p> <p>We are looking to hear from previous Client references for past projects you or your team have completed that would be similar to the requirements of the Integrated Planning Project.</p>
<p>2.8.</p>	<p><u>Question:</u></p> <p><i>Can you please clarify the level of detail or expected length for the responses to the 4 questions under Requirement 7.1.1.l.</i></p> <p><u>Answer:</u></p> <p>GVHA would like to see enough information in this section to help us understand who would be on the project team and if they are qualified and experienced. There is no expected length of submittal in this area. Firms are encouraged to showcase their team makeup with enough detail to ensure we can make a proper assessment of the experience and quality of the individuals.</p>



<p>2.9.</p>	<p><u>Question:</u></p> <p><i>Scope boundary – Please elaborate on the inland extent and scope related to upland transportation corridors that should be considered outside the boundary area shown in Appendix B. Please confirm whether related consultation is a suggestion rather than a requirement, i.e. consultation with stakeholders outside the boundary is only necessary if deemed appropriate.</i></p> <p><u>Answer:</u></p> <p>The extent and influence of the transportation corridors are to be evaluated to determine opportunities and constraints to the properties and their future state. Some consultation with the relevant Authorities will be required to confirm available data and information necessary for the planning process. The RFP will provide additional detail on the scope of these tasks.</p>
<p>2.10.</p>	<p><u>Question:</u></p> <p><i>Confirm that no new climate change risk and vulnerability assessment (physical or transition risk) are expected to form part of the Scope of Work, instead existing relevant studies for the City of Victoria should be used to inform relevant integrated adaptation initiatives for the GVHA property areas.</i></p> <p><u>Answer:</u></p> <p>The proponent will be expected to use the most current studies produced by the Province, Capital Regional District, and the City of Victoria. No new climate change or vulnerability analysis is contemplated. The proponent may opt to provide other supplemental data or information that is relevant to the planning process that may highlight additional risks or issues that are pertinent to GVHA Properties.</p>
<p>2.11.</p>	<p><u>Question:</u></p> <p><i>What is the expected full duration of the engagement process?</i></p> <p><u>Answer:</u></p> <p>Engagement is expected to begin in June 2025 and will run for the duration of the project. Once both the Planning Consultant and the Engagement Consultant are in place, collaboration between these two parties and GVHA will determine the processes and cadence of work efforts.</p>



<p>2.12.</p>	<p><u>Question:</u></p> <p><i>The submission requires a team organization chart and expected subcontract firm team members. Is there flexibility in refining this team composition if selected for the RFP, or does the team structure need to remain unchanged?</i></p> <p><u>Answer:</u></p> <p>See Addendum #1 Question/Answer 2.4</p>
<p>2.13.</p>	<p><u>Question:</u></p> <p><i>The document emphasizes opportunities for Xwsepsum Nation and Songhees Nation’s economic development. Can the team provide more information on the scope of work envisioned for the detailed economic development analysis and how this should be integrated into the submission. Should proponents propose specific strategies, or will these be co-developed during the planning process?</i></p> <p><u>Answer:</u></p> <p>GVHA is actively working with the Nations on their economic development strategies, so that is excluded from this scope of work. The IP scope of work would include identifying new business opportunities for the Nations, along with the financial modeling of such, that would fit into the overall IP development plans and their viability. For the SOQ, we would expect proponents to either show examples where have had experience in this area, or to identify how they approach this throughout the IP process. There may be different approaches that the proponents wish to explore, and we encourage them to share these approaches with us for consideration.</p>
<p>2.14.</p>	<p><u>Question:</u></p> <p><i>The document mentions financial and economic models as part of the work. Will GVHA provide any existing baseline data or past studies economic data, or should the proponent assume a full economic analysis?</i></p> <p><u>Answer:</u></p> <p>Please see the answer provided on question 2.1 above. As for the economic models, GVHA collaborated with partners in the region for a Victoria and Esquimalt harbour economic impact study, utilizing data from 2019. There are also more recent economic data on tourism and cruise available. This</p>



	<p>can be found at https://gvha.ca/economic-impact-study/ . We may consider updating the 2019 data this fiscal, that has not been confirmed yet. For purposes of this IP, we would expect that the proposed development would highlight the expected economic results of the development in comparison to the most recent baseline data that is available.</p>
<p>2.15.</p>	<p><u>Question:</u> <i>The selection criteria include Creativity and Vision (30%). Are there particular priorities or themes that GVHA is looking for innovative proposals?</i></p> <p><u>Answer:</u> Priorities would include the ability to (1) highlight successfully executed developments that address mixed uses, such as industrial, commercial, residential and public amenities, ideally with water based components that connect the commerce between land and water (2) validate that the team can understand, interpret, identify and create climate resiliency and adaptation solutions (3) showcase prior executed projects that would appeal to this region, with vibrant and harmonious solutions.</p>
<p>2.16.</p>	<p><u>Question:</u> <i>Could you please provide a copy of the standard form contract terms and conditions that the successful proponent would be expected to agree to so we may review prior to submitting our SOQ on this assignment?</i></p> <p><u>Answer:</u> A GVHA Professional Services Agreement (PSA) will be provided as an attachment to the RFP.</p>
<p>2.17.</p>	<p><u>Question:</u> <i>Please clarify that after the successful firms are shortlisted, what % weighting of the RFP selection criteria will be on price.</i></p> <p><u>Answer:</u> We will not provide weighting % on price at this stage. Evaluation Criteria and their weighting will be provided in the RFP. This will be confirmed in the RFP. As a not for profit, price will be a factor in the decision.</p>



<p>2.18.</p>	<p><u>Question:</u> <i>In additional to the 8 member agencies (Destination Greater Victoria, X^wsepsəm Nation, Songhees Nation, City of Victoria, Capital Region District, Victoria Chamber of Commerce, Township of Esquimalt, and Victoria Esquimalt Harbour Society), please confirm the full list of indigenous groups, public agencies, community organizations, regulatory approval agencies, and any other stakeholders expected to be involved with this project so we can accurately estimate the level of effort involved, assign appropriate resources in our organization chart, and propose a suitable stakeholder engagement strategy.</i></p> <p><u>Answer:</u> We will be collaborating with the successful Planning and Engagement Consultants to ensure that engagement is fulsome and complete as necessary. At this stage we do not have a completely curated list available at this time we would expect the consulting team to help us identify the appropriate stakeholders. We expect that engagement sessions will be grouped and held according to the various stakeholder categories, such as have been identified in the question. As X^wsepsəm Nation and Songhees Nation are the two rightsholders for the region related to the IP, these will be the two Nations that are engaged with. More information will be provided in the RFP’s for both the Planning Consultant and the Engagement Consultant.</p>
<p>2.19.</p>	<p><u>Question:</u> <i>Please confirm what background planning study reports and past stakeholder engagement reports related to the properties involved may be available to the successful proponent.</i></p> <p><u>Answer:</u> A list of available reports will be included in the RFP.</p>
<p>2.20.</p>	<p><u>Question:</u> <i>Will an AACE Class 5 cost estimate be acceptable to GVHA for all costing efforts on this assignment?</i></p> <p><u>Answer:</u> At this Juncture, AACE Class 5 will be acceptable for all costing efforts. However, as planning proceeds GVHA may request more accurate costs for specific areas and will address changes of this requirement during th finalization of the RFP or through the normal scope management of the Contract.</p>



3.0 – INFORMATION

The following item(s) are provided as a matter of reference and information only to all respondents and do not modify or become part of the Contract Documents.

Item	Drawings
N/A	N/A

END OF ADDENDUM