



## Addendum No. 1

City of Coquitlam

RFP No. 25-061

### Consulting Services - Poirier Administration Building Renovation

Issue Date: June 25, 2025

Total Page Count: 3

This Addendum is issued to Proponents registered as attending the Mandatory Site Meeting on Thursday June 19, 2025. Proposals will only be received from the companies that are recorded on the City's Mandatory Site Visit - Registration Form.

Companies in attendance at the Mandatory Site Meeting are:

RATIO Architecture Interior Design + Planning Inc.	Stephenson Engineering in Cooperation of Salas O'Brien
Mallen Gowing Berzins Architecture Inc.	Prism Engineering Limited
Avalon Mechanical Consultants Ltd.	Thibodeau Architecture + Design
Chernoff Thompson Architects	AES Engineering
Peter Carter Architecture Inc.	Cloudscape Architecture Inc.
Omicron Canada Inc.	Aperta Consulting Inc.
Smith + Anderson (Vancouver)	RDH Building Science Inc.
DCYT Architecture	FaulknerBrowns Architects

Proponents shall note the following amendments to the RFP documents:

#### **REPLACE**

##### **R1) REPLACE**

**Proposal Submission Form delete and replace with REVISED Proposal Submission Form - REVISION No. 1, See Attachment No. 1 to this Addendum No. 1.**

#### **QUESTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS**

Q1. Can you confirm the dates – that design is to be completed by late 2026 (1.5 years duration) and construction is to take place in 2027?

**A1. All dates listed under 4.3 Completion Date and 6.7 Schedule in the RFP are preliminary target dates. The consultant is expected to propose feasible dates based on their experience, taking into account site access constraints, and ensuring they are no later than the proposed dates.**

Q2. Are building record drawings available from the original construction? To understand wall assemblies and details.

**A2. Not available**

Q3. Cost estimates are included in the various phases of work. Is that a service the proponent is to include, or does the city do their own estimating?

**A3. Cost estimate is part of this RFP Scope of Work.**

Q4. The building envelope scope was briefly discussed at the site tour, and it was noted there is no set budget at this time for that work. Do you want the Proponent to put forward their best ideas with separate prices for options? Or is there a set base scope to include in the proposal? Any clarification on how you want this portion presented would be appreciated.

**A4. The building insulation and window upgrade is expected to be included in the base RFP Scope of Work. The existing windows are single-glazed with painted wood frames and consist of a mix of fixed and operable units. A low-e film has been applied to the interior surfaces of windows on the south and east elevations. The City aims to reduce overall heat loss through the windows considering improving seals, adding an additional glazing layer, or exploring other innovative solutions proposed by the Consultants. No major wall insulation replacement is anticipated in this project.**

Q5. Are there any additional base building drawings related to the existing building envelope / wall components?

**A5. Drawing is not available**

Q6. Are any existing drawings available in CAD format?

**A6. File can be downloaded [Here](#).**

Q7. Are there any base building drawings available for Building Elevations?

**A7. Drawing is not available**

Q8. Is there any feasibility reports for the building insulation and window upgrades or is it part of this project?

**A8. There is no existing feasibility report available for the building insulation and window upgrades. Building insulation and window upgrades are included as part of this project Scope of Work.**

Q9. What is the anticipated construction budget for this project?

**A9. The feasibility study has already provided an overview of the major potential project costs. A detailed project budget will be developed based on the cost estimate provided during the design phase.**

Q10. Appendix A and Appendix B are electrical assessments for 2 separate services. Appendix A is for the Poirier Admin Building and Appendix B is for the complex nearby. Is the scope of this project to upgrade both services separately as recommended in the feasibility reports (Appendices A and B)?

**A10. The Consultant should recommend the most cost-effective approach to achieve the project goals. While it is not required to combine both services, this option will be considered if it proves to be more cost-effective and time-efficient.**

Q11. Please confirm that the objective of the service upgrades is NOT to combine both services to be power from the same transformer.

**A11. The Consultant should recommend the most cost-effective approach to achieve the project goals. While it is not required to power both services from the same transformer, this option will be considered if it proves to be more cost-effective and time-efficient.**

Q12. Appendix C contains four (4) options for mechanical upgrades. The scope of work does not seem to identify which option the city would like to proceed with. Different options require different amount of design work. Can the client confirm which option they would like to proceed with? Which mechanical system and is it for the full building or half the building?

**A12. Refer to 6.2 Project Objectives.**

Q13. Structurally, the scope of work depends on what options are selected. Can we only include the structural cost for the planning portion of the scope (this will include an assessment of the existing structural capacity based on s a site visit and as-built drawings review)? Once the selected option is finalized, the structural consultant can provide a fee to do the design and CA as per the RFP.

**A13. Structural engineer is part of the base RFP scope.**

Q14. Is a cost consultant required?

**A14. Cost Consultant is part of the base RFP scope**

Q15. Is the City targeting energy upgrades to meet any specific energy standards?

**A15. No.**

---

***End of Addendum No. 1***

Proponents take into account the content of this Addendum in the preparation and submission of the Proposal which will form part of the Contract and should be acknowledged on the Proposal Submission Form.

Upon submitting a Proposal, Proponents are deemed to have received all addenda that are issued and posted on the City's website and considered the information for inclusion in the Proposal submission.

*Issued by:*

Chris Overes  
Senior Procurement Specialist  
[bid@coquitlam.ca](mailto:bid@coquitlam.ca)