

EXPLANATION OF COMPETITION TERMS AND CONDITIONS NO. 8

On 4 February 2019, Správa železniční dopravní cesty, státní organizace, with its registered office at Dlážděná 1003/7, Prague 1, Postcode 110 00, ID No.: 709 94 234 (the “**Contracting Authority**”) commenced a procurement procedure on the architectural design competition called “**Architectural Design of the Veleslavín railway station**” published in the Tenders Electronic Daily under registration no. Z2019-004321 (the “**Design Competition**”). The Design Competition has been announced as an open design competition pursuant to Section 145 of Act No. 134/2016 Sb., on Public Procurement, as amended (the “**PPA**”).

As a follow-up on the explanation of competition terms and conditions no. 7 published on 4 March 2019, and based on the inspection of the site concerned, the Contracting Authority hereby provides an explanation of the competition terms and conditions on the basis of questions asked by attending participants in the course of the inspection of the site concerned (Question No. 1 – 21).

The Contracting Authority is hereby providing an explanation of the Competition Terms and Conditions pursuant to Section 98(3) of the PPA including the exact wording of the request without identification details of the prospective participants who has requested the explanation.

On 5 March 2019 the Contracting Authority received written request for explanation of the Competition Terms and Conditions pursuant to Section 98(2) of the PPA (Question No. 22 – 23) from prospective participant. The Contracting Authority provides the explanation of the Competition Terms and Conditions in both Czech and English languages.

	Question of the participant where the explanation was provided based on a request for explanation	Explanation of the Contracting Authority
1.	<i>Have there been any contemplations regarding the connection for passenger traffic – crossroads – nothing is working now, especially in the morning. When the railway station was being done, an additional crossroad was contemplated. Or is it no longer relevant for the competition? We mean the railroad crossing.</i>	<p>The Contracting Authority states in this respect that the railroad crossing will be removed as a result of the contemplated construction. The track to the airport will be on a different elevation level, and trains will enter a tunnel before the existing railroad crossing in the direction to the city centre. The portal of the tunnel is modelled in the digital underlying material available to participants on the Contracting Authority’s profile. The two tracks that will remain are dead-end tracks, ending at the Veleslavín station.</p> <p>There were contemplations as to whether this area concerned should not be expanded beyond Evropská street, but this idea was abandoned based on an agreement with the Prague City Hall and Prague 6 MD.</p>
2.	<i>In the model, the boundary/grade line of the new tracks is perhaps intentionally lowered to the future level, while further north-west from the boundary the area is not modelled. Is that an intention, because it should be the subject of the design? For example, there is a huge</i>	The Contracting Authority states that the modelling is intentionally incomplete because the Contracting Authority does not know what the participants will design to the north-west of the station. The Contracting Authority expects participants to propose landscaping.

	<i>amount of earth in that area, the removal of which is associated with large costs. Does the contracting authority take this into account?</i>	
3.	<i>What underlies the decision that a design of a railway station should be made without any land-use study for the surrounding areas, or even without an order for such land-use study. How can a large railway station be conceived without it being clear to what it will be connected? A large traffic junction, with no plan for the surrounding areas, without a land-use study. Why not start with a land-use study? What I am concerned about is the future development. Development and construction has not been dealt with, no one knows what will be here, and so on.</i>	The Contracting Authority is aware that the railway station is to be the first point of transfer to the subway, which already is here, and the Contracting Authority has been planning the railroad for a long time, and at this stage a specific railway station needs to be dealt with. In this competition the Contracting Authority is asking what the Veleslavín railway station should look like, and how the station design proposed by participants should be connected to the Surrounding Area Concerned. The competition should show how the Veleslavín station could be connected to the Surrounding Area Concerned, and that concept could then be used as inspiration by Prague 6 MD and the Prague City Hall. Historically, there have been numerous studies for this area, but they are no longer relevant. The Contracting Authority reiterates that the purpose of this Design Competition is primarily a design for the Veleslavín station. The Contracting Authority is only able to request a design of the station without its connections with adjacent areas; however, as the Contracting Authority intended to take a sensitive approach to the architectural competition and the location of the future Veleslavín station, it has also requested a conceptual design for the surrounding area concerned; nothing more than merely a conceptual design. The result of the architectural competition will, in respect of the Surrounding Area Concerned, be submitted to the Prague Institute for Planning and Development and the Prague City Hall, and possibly also to Prague 6 MD, so they can embody it into a future land-use study of the surroundings of the Veleslavín station.
4.	<i>The allocation table, which in detail summarises the construction plan which is not mentioned in the Competition Terms and Conditions. We have come across 2 items which define the track underpass or overpass and it looked like they should be located somewhere in the part east from here, and the exact km of the track was</i>	This is a specific question. If the participant needs a reference to items, the Contracting Authority suggests that this question is raised quite specifically, and in writing.

	<i>defined there, but we had no idea what it was.</i>	
5.	<i>What is the prognosis for the bus terminal which is not defined here? There is no definition of the status for which design should be made. We mean the status of the entire “foreground” in general, how it should be designed.</i>	The assumption is that the bus terminal will be moved somewhere else. Once the line to the airport is put into operation, just 2 or 3 bus spaces strictly for municipal transport would remain in this area, including some part that is beyond Evropská street. This should be sufficient for the whole area.
6.	<i>Does it mean that only the municipal transport will remain?</i>	This is a segment from Veleslavín to the Airport via old Ruzyně and via Dlouhá Míle where a large terminal is expected to be set up where all long-distance buses from Kladno and surroundings will terminate bringing commuters to Prague; there they will transfer to the train and will continue to the city centre or to the subway –they can transfer to A line at Veleslavín or Hradčanská, to B line at Masaryk Station, and to C line at Vltavská – Bubny.
7.	<i>Parking – is there any plan for a multi-storey car park or not?</i>	The Contracting Authority believes there are a certain number of parking spaces, and participants should propose this for local needs within the wider area concerned. The Contracting Authority states that the railway traffic will not generate the need for a multi-storey car park.
8.	<i>Our understanding of the assignment is that those 300 spaces in that multi-storey car park is a requirement of Prague 6, not that they should respond to the demand of the new commercial premises that will be developed here. This means that those commercial premises will of course have parking capacities of their own.</i>	Such a sub-centre should in itself offer approximately 300 parking spaces, regardless of the commercial premises.
9.	<i>Those 300 spaces cover what the commercial premises need, or is that in addition?</i>	The Contracting Authority states that this is simply a prerequisite for future traffic, not for the needs of the commercial premises. The Contracting Authority expects the participants to design the foreground of the station. This is adequate to the traffic load.
10.	<i>Can we thus expect an explicit condition that the defined 300 parking spaces in the multi-storey car park are not binding?</i>	The Contracting Authority states that you will not find those 300 parking spaces in the binding part of the Design Competition terms and conditions.
11.	<i>Are there any interests of which we are not aware and which may likely become manifested</i>	The Contracting Authority is not aware of any current interests. Regarding the surrounding

	<i>and at least to some extent determine the direction of what actually needs to be drawn.</i>	area concerned, the participants should take into account that there is a crossroad fixed somehow there, and an exit from the subway station, but otherwise the Contracting Authority is not aware of any other current interest.
12.	<i>Are there any underlying documents regarding the building which may but does not have to be preserved according to the competition terms and conditions? We do not know precisely what is inside it. We need to know its interior layout.</i>	According to the competition terms and conditions, prospective participants may suggest whatever should happen to the building (existing Veleslavín railway station building) afterwards – demolish, turn into a museum, café, anything, it is up to the prospective participants what they will suggest. The Contracting Authority publishes the basic documentation regard to this building and points out that it is not a focus and the dimensions in it are only indicative.
13.	<i>Several explanations and clarifications have been provided. Wouldn't it be possible to create a file, for example "digital underlying material" in DWG, where all the underlying materials would be unified on coordinates? The current status survey is there, the existing rail is there, then there is just a top-view outline in a PDF file – the rail axis with platform, which is not in DVG. Then there is a model without platforms, many other connections are missing, and it is not based on coordinates. So putting all these together does make some mistake possible, with ensuing problems in assessment.</i>	The model contains binding parts – track, traction, head of the tunnel, and the definition is sufficient there. The distances and elevations of individual parts in the model reflect the reality, and the model is sufficient for the design of the railway station.
14.	<i>The length of the platform is not binding, it has not been designed?</i>	The platform must meet the parameters set for this railroad line, the dimensions are specified in the Competition Terms and Conditions – Construction Plan (for the pair of main tracks no. 1 and 2, the side platforms are 200 m long and 4.5 m wide; for the dead-end pass-by tracks no 3 and 5, the island platform is 270 m long and 6 m wide). The exact position of the platform is the subject of the design – in relation to the wider area concerned.
15.	<i>But in the PDF file with the panel layout, where the platform can be seen, when transferred back to DWG the positions of the tracks do not match the DWG underlying material.</i>	The Contracting Authority states that the panel layout is only used for distribution in panels. The correct positions of the tracks and traction are in the model.

<p>16.</p>	<p><i>The tracks have been designed but are not shown in the coordinates. Why cannot the model be based on coordinates? Not all documents have been provided in a sufficiently good format to avoid any mistakes.</i></p> <p><i>The axes and heights of tracks are defined for the subway station lobby, but we do not know them. It has been said that the track is defined and binding – but we do not know its axis or height. It is not embedded in the system. Putting the two underlying materials together is impossible under current circumstances.</i></p>	<p>The Contracting Authority states that it will consider providing a supplement to the 3D model relating to the coordinate system. If the Contracting Authority should publicise any modification of or supplement to the existing 3D model, it will be made available on the Contracting Authority's profile.</p>
<p>17.</p>	<p><i>Is the length of the platform clear?</i></p>	<p>The length of the platform is known, but it can be shifted; it will depend on the design proposed by the prospective participant. The platform is defined by the position of the track. Correlations between the track and the platform are defined by applicable standards.</p>
<p>18.</p>	<p><i>Height of the traction electricity line – we do not know what the possible minimum height from the rails is.</i></p> <p><i>The standard sets out some ranges and there is a manoeuvring space to work with, but we do not know the exact number.</i></p>	<p>The Contracting Authority recommends that prospective participants should take 6.5 m above the top of rail as absolute minimum.</p> <p>It is recommended that prospective participants rely on this tentative figure – what actually matters is the position of the structure above the rails in relation to the positions of traction poles. For the sake of simplification the Contracting Authority suggests using the minimum distance of 6.5 m from the top of rail. The structure will have to be higher above the rail at some points, but the subject of this Competition is not to determine the height precisely; the height will be determined precisely in subsequent documentation.</p>
<p>19.</p>	<p><i>It would be useful to have floor plans of the subway station lobby. We only have an outline in the model, we do not know the position of shops, ramp heights etc. It would be good to have a B2D showing all that is under the ground. This is the principal means of connection between the railway and the subway.</i></p>	<p>There are 3 levels of the subway – platform.</p> <p>The Contracting Authority believes that for the purposes of this Competition it is fully sufficient to provide prospective participants, as part of the competition terms and conditions, with an informative drawing of where the point of connection with the subway will be. Technical documentation of the subway is non-public to a certain extent, as subway is a strategic transport structure.</p> <p>If the Contracting Authority does publish any related documentation concerning the subway premises, such documentation will be</p>

		made available on the Contracting Authority's profile. However, the Contracting Authority currently does not believe this will be the case because the information which is currently available to prospective participants with regard to the interconnection of the subway and railway is sufficient.
20.	<p><i>The connection point is behind this door. It will not be possible to directly access the platform from level -1?</i></p> <p><i>This is the route to the more distant track, and the track to the airport would be accessible from the level above this one?</i></p> <p><i>Only this one is marked with a circle, but not the upper one. Will it be possible to do this there, too? Isn't there some technology there, or something?</i></p>	Yes, the Contracting Authority states that it is entirely up to the prospective participants to design this, it can also be one level higher. On this lower level the height of the underpass is designed so that it is right underneath the tracks and it will be possible to walk under the designed track. The connection point is behind the glass pane doors at level -1 of the subway lobby – additional information by the Contracting Authority: <i>see the photo documentation attached to this Explanation.</i>
21.	<i>Is there anything beyond this wall? Some technology or anything?</i>	The Contracting Authority is not aware of anything. Nothing should be there, only utilities if anything.
22.	<p><i>Paragraph 6.1.1.1 (Graphic Part) of the Competition Terms and Conditions stipulates that:</i></p> <p><i>The graphic part will be prepared on 2 panels (with quality of 300 dpi) in accordance with Annex 7 to the Competition Terms and Conditions.</i></p> <p><i>Panel 1 will contain the layout in the scale of 1:1000, schematics and a free presentation of the proposed design</i></p> <p><i>However, contrary to the text, Annex 7 contains the layout in the scale of 1:750. Given the scope and relations in the area concerned we would prefer the scale of 1:1000, which allows an optimum depiction of the area concerned with all the significant relations.</i></p>	The Contracting Authority clarifies that prospective participants will submit the graphic part in compliance with Annex 7 to the Competition Terms and Conditions in the scale of 1:750.
23.	<p><i>Paragraph 6.1.1.1 (Graphic Part) of the Competition Terms and Conditions stipulates that:</i></p> <p><i>The graphic part will be prepared on 2 panels (with quality of 300 dpi) in accordance with Annex 7 to the Competition Terms and Conditions.</i></p> <p><i>Panel 2 will contain a three-dimensional image of the design (axonometry of the area, bird's eye</i></p>	The Contracting Authority states with respect to this question that the cut-out of the 3D image is only illustrative, and every prospective participant may choose their own cut-out so as to display all the substantial elements of the design.

	<p><i>view), text, explanatory schemes and a free presentation.</i></p> <p><i>Is the cut-out of the 3D view binding, or can it be modified so that it is optimally possible to also depict the "Surrounding Area Concerned" (in pink colour) with significant relations to the vicinity? Of course while maintaining the depiction of the entire "green area" concerned with the design of the station.</i></p>	
--	---	--

In accordance with Section 98(4) of the Public Procurement Act, the Contracting Authority extends the deadline for the submission of competition entries as stated below. The deadline for the submission of competition entries in the first phase of the Design Competition is:

- | | | |
|---|----------------------------|---|
| 1) Graphic part | Date: 12 April 2019 | Time: until 12:00 (noon) |
| 2) Files labelled "Contact address" and "Author" in <u>electronic form</u> | Date: 12 April 2019 | Time: until 12:00 (noon) |
| 1) Portfolio in <u>electronic form</u> | Date: 12 April 2019 | Time: from 3:00 p.m. till 10:00 p.m. |

Prague, 8 March 2019