

---

Questions and Answers:

Q: Please provide us with the sally port gate dimensions (length, height, and width between gates) for all the site locations. This will help to determine what size of vehicle/crane can be utilized for deliveries and site installation.

A: Contractor to use site services drawings provided.

Q: Please provide us with the intermediate gate dimensions for all gates on the inside of the institution that could pose as an obstacle for equipment on route to building locations.

A: Contractor to use site services drawings provided

Q: It was advised at the GIGO site visit that attaching the site security construction fences to institution perimeter fences and existing buildings has been deemed acceptable. Please provide a specification on an acceptable method of attachment for each.

A: Must be done in accordance with previously issues fence construction specification.

Q: Please provide clarity on the following document discrepancies between the Meeting Minutes and Addendum 15;

Document - Meeting Minutes

Question: Is paving part of this requirement?

Response: If damage is done to paving due to any work such as installing drainage, the paving is to be repaired. Joyceville institution specifically calls for a new parking lot and this is to be included in the contract price and not the unit price table.

Document - Addendum 15

Q: Is the civil works to be part of the bid price or is the intent to be covered later based on the unit rates provided?

A: Unit price tables and previous answers. Some work is included in the Lump Sum Amount – ie. Parking lots identified on the PDF drawings are to be included.

Please clarify which statement is to take precedence.

A: Any paving indicated in the PDF site drawings is required to be in the LUMP SUM PRICE. this includes the Joyceville parking lot, and the Bath new paved area and any area that is specifically identified on the PDF site sketches. Existing roadways or parking areas that are damaged due tot construction or excavation must be replaced and will be included in the UNIT PRICE TABLE as amounts cannot be pre-determined.

Q: Please provide clarity on the following document discrepancies between the Meeting Minutes and Addendum 15;

Document – Addendum 15

Q: Please confirm that all asphalt paving is included in the UNIT RATE TABLE (TEA) and not included in the LUMP SUM AMOUNT (LSA). Including – Replacement of asphalt removed during the course of construction.

A: Yes.

Document - Meeting Minutes

No was the answer

Please clarify which statement is to take precedence.

A: Any paving indicated in the PDF site drawings is required to be in the LUMP SUM PRICE. this includes the Joyceville parking lot, and the Bath new paved area and any area that is specifically identified on the PDF site sketches. Existing roadways or parking areas that are damaged due tot construction or excavation must be replaced and will be included in the UNIT PRICE TABLE as amounts cannot be pre-determined.

Q: Please provide the site address and site service drawings for the Bath regional treatment centre (RTC) GI building.

A: Same as Bath and Millhaven.

Q: Please clarify where the Bath RTC is located in regards to the current Bath Institution and the exact location of the additional GI building.

A: See Merx for Site PDF. Coordinate with the site services drawings provided.

Q: With the 'GO and GI Institution Details Checklist' there are two forms (A096E and A098E) which do not specify what site location they address.

Please clarity which sites these two checklists are for.

A: The name of the document uses the institution and refers to the buildings at that institution.

Q: Addendum 15 covered site service/utilities for the initial (9) buildings. No information was issued to reflect the two added GI buildings for Bath GI-RTC and GI for Joyceville. When will these be made available?

A: See Merx. These two PDFs were issued.

---

Q: Attachment 73 shows GI building for Bath in a different location than previously issued documents including hand out on site visit. Could you please clarify which is the correct location?

A: See Merx, (att 102) as the latest and correct version.

Q: Utility site services-  
Missing info on Bath GI-RTC and GI

A: See Merx. Bath Site services was issued with Millhaven. Both location are on the same sheets.

Q: Emergency power supply – Source, type and location not known.

A: Bath and Millhaven have an emergency generator connecting to both institutions. All systems are backed-up.

Q: The latest power and communication drawings, issued as part of addendum 14, show location of existing electrical manholes. It is anticipated that Electrical duct banks serving the new buildings will be terminating in the nearest manhole and are to be included as part each contractors base bid for all the services shown above. Please confirm.

A: Yes

Q: Existing services within each Electrical manhole are not clearly defined and no information indicating;

(a) if all connections are required to be made within the manhole or

(b) If electrical work is to be carried for connection to another location utilizing existing unobstructed spare ducts?

Information relative to the point of termination, Systems, spares, compatibility, routing within the existing building defined locations and termination info are require to be provided. i.e. Bath GO note3 – requires to run services to BA04 but no Building info are provided. Please Clarify?

A: Use manholes where convenient. Design-builder to determine best method.

---

Q: The construction and installation depth of the electrical duct bank is anticipated to satisfy code and industry standards. Since elevations of existing site services and utilities are not known at this point and invert elevations for existing services are not provided any interference with existing site utilities and site services and depth of excavation cannot be anticipated at this point. Evaluation of site conditions is to be done post award of contract. Will PWGSC assign an allowance for unknown site conditions to be carried by all contractors in their base bid? Please Clarify?

A: PWGSC does not carry an allowance. If unknown site conditions cause additional work - it is covered by a Change Order. However - geotech is provided for each site so there should not be an issue.

Q: Site services

Info on availability of existing services for Bath GI-RTC and GI are missing.

A: See Merx. Provided on same sheets as Millhaven

Q: Existing gas services - are missing

A: See Merx. Provided on same sheets as Millhaven

Q: Invert Elevations for existing site services are not provided. Thus depth for excavation and installation of new services is not definable. Are we to assume that installation of new services just below frost line will be adequate to serve the new building connections and deal with site specific issues later as part of site specific conditions utilizing unit rates provided for site works? Please clarify?

A: Yes

Q: Soils Reports - Fenbrook Site GI & GO

GI site based on Peto McCallum Geotechnical report requires that building be supported on Pile foundations and structural slab for the Ground Floor

GO site suggests that is possible for the building to be founded on a mat foundation with larger than normal expected settlements.

For both building locations we believe that the construction teams can benefit from additional soils investigation. Additional site soils investigation and information on proximity buildings will allow us to provide you with value for money suitable to the project needs.

Will PWGSC/CSC consider setting an allowance for further investigation, design and construction of the footing for these buildings to forgo increased costs for the construction of these buildings?.

A: A: No. Geotech report provided provides sufficient information to determine this.

Q: Site Security – IB does not identify if any site security will be required to be carried by Contractors for each of the sites. Given the 24/7 site security carried by CSC on site we anticipate that no security provisions are required to be included by general Contractors for each of these sites. Please clarify.

A: Correct. Site is already patrolled 24/7 and commissionaires will be provided during working hours.

Q: Exterior windows - Room Data sheets indicates minimum required area for the exterior windows based on the various program spaces. i.e Office - 2.5m<sup>2</sup>. These areas vary based on the requirements of the individual program spaces. Please provide full window sizes and total amount for all exterior windows. It may be economical to provide two generic window sizes, one large window size 1828mm X 1270mm (w X h) and one small window size 1270mm x 1270mm (w X h)?

A: It is up to the designer to determine. Meet window area requirements.

Q: Interior window screens for GI building - Room Data sheets indicate minimum required area for the interior screens to be 1.44m<sup>2</sup>. Please confirm that a window size of 1600mm x 915mm = 1.46m<sup>2</sup> will suffice as a recommend size?

A: Provide as per room data sheets.

Q: Annex B –GC4.1 PROTECTION OF WORK AND PROPERTY

1) The Contractor shall protect the Work and its site against loss or damage from any cause and shall similarly protect all Material, Plant and real property under the Contractor's care, custody and control whether or not such Material, Plant and real property are supplied by Canada to the Contractor.

2) The Contractor shall provide all facilities necessary for the purpose of maintaining security, and shall assist any person authorized by Canada to inspect or to take security measures in respect of the Work and its site.

3) Canada may direct the Contractor to do such things and to perform such work as Canada considers reasonable and necessary to ensure compliance with or to remedy a breach of paragraph 1) or paragraph 2), and the Contractor shall comply with such direction.

Could you please clarify if this is meant to provide 24/7 additional security to the site or it is meant only for cases where the existing security is compromised due to required construction work? Could you please clarify and provide examples of intend for better understanding?

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EQ734-123167/A

Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client

R.056399.001

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

017

File No. - N° du dossier

PWL-1-34156

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

pw1003

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

---

A: Correct. Site is already patrolled 24/7 and commissionaires will be provided during working hours.

Q: For Beaver Creek GO the sanitary sewer connection will cross watermain, electrical and communications. No inverts are provided for the storm sewer to be relocated. The existing services may have to be relocated.

A: Carry in contract.

Q: For Bath GI, the building is in a different location than what was shown originally? Is this intentional? No inverts are provided for the sanitary and storm sewer connection. These services will also cross existing water and communication which will also be relatively shallow and in conflict.

A: Yes this is intentional. Designer to carry costs for connections in Lump Sum amount.

Q: For Fenbrook GO, the existing sanitary sewer to the East no inverts are provided. The service will likely have to be placed deeper in order to cross beneath the communication and watermain (but the existing inverts would have to be confirmed for this to work.) An allowance should also be included if we need to relocate watermain to drain the services.

A: No allowances. Contractor to carry in Lump Sum amount.

Q: Given the amount of site dependent questions on existing services and inability to ascertain some of the site conditions pertaining to existing services, existing buildings and other site conditions which may have a bearing in the solution provided to arrive at value for money benefit for PWGSC/CSC we strongly recommend that the relocation and site services connections, including new fire hydrants required if any, be part of a cash allowance set and carried by all Contractors.

A: No allowances are carried in this PWGSC contracts.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EQ734-123167/A

Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client

R.056399.001

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

017

File No. - N° du dossier

PWL-1-34156

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

pw1003

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

---

**Q: Soils Reports - Fenbrook Site GI & GO**

GI site based on Peto McCallum Geotechnical report requires that building be supported on Pile foundations and structural slab for the Ground Floor

GO site suggests that is possible for the building to be founded on a mat foundation with larger than normal expected settlements.

For both building locations we believe that the construction teams can benefit from additional soils investigation. Additional site soils investigation and information on proximity buildings will allow us to provide you with value for money suitable to the project needs.

Will PWGSC/CSC consider setting an allowance for further investigation, design and construction of the footing for these buildings to forgo increased costs for the construction of these buildings?.

**A: No.** Existing reports provide ample information to make a determination of foundation design.

**Q: We are missing the Bath and recent GI Institution Checklists? Please provide as soon as possible.**

**A: The Bath Checklist is the same one as Millhaven. (It should have been titled "Millhaven and Bath").**

**Q: Can you confirm if the existing building FBJ located at the Fenbrook site was constructed on piles?**

Considering the GI building for this site is to be constructed adjacent to FBJ, the foundation design/construction information would be helpful in determining if a pile foundation is required.

**A: There is a geotechnical report provided which is to be used by the consultants in the Design Build group to determine foundation type.**

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EQ734-123167/A

Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client

R.056399.001

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

017

File No. - N° du dossier

PWL-1-34156

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

pw1003

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

---

Q: The site drawings that were distributed at the bidder's conference show that the Bath GI building is located on the south east side of the existing BT06 building. While the site drawings that were issued on August 3rd have the GI building on the north west side of the BT06 building and it is also located where the existing BT09 building is currently situated.

Please clarify which drawing / building location takes precedence.

A: Bath GI is located South of BT06.

Q: The site drawings issued on August 3rd for the Joyceville institution do not show the location for the GI Building, the site plan only shows the location of the GO building.

Please update the current site service drawings to show the location of the GI building.

A: A separate drawing was issued showing the Joyceville GI. See Merx.

Q: Attachment #94 BC59/GO

Ref: Item G – No provisions for Card Access

Ref: Item H – Applicable security to be clarified?

– is the intent for the clarification to be provided before closing? If not, please advise what allowance if any should be included as part of the bid?

A: The Beaver Creek Facility has no Card Access system at this time, so none is required for that GO Building.

The Beaver Creek facility uses SENSTAR, the new system in the GO building is to be integrated to the existing system.

No allowances.

Q: Attachment# 95 - FB "V" - GI&GO

Ref: Item G – Swipe Card System used?

Ref: item H – Applicable security

- is the intent for the clarification to be provided before closing? your checklist indicates a clarification will be provided. If not, please advise what allowance if any should be included as part of the bid?

A: The Fenbrook Facility has a card access system: DELCO, integration is required for those GI and GO buildings.

The Fenbrook Facility uses SENSTAR, the new GI and GO building is to be integrated to the existing system.

No allowances.

---

Q: Attachment 96 – No building identification. Please Clarify?

A: Title of the document is the instruction and building. Joyceville GI and GO

Q: Attachement #97 – MH GO & GI  
Item G – Swipe card? Looking for one?

A: There is none required.

Q: Item H – nothing noted?

A: Correct.

Q: Could you please clarify if this means we need to carry one ( i.e. Stanley) for both GI & GO?  
"

A: No.

Q: Item H – Nothing is noted? Please clarify if any security provisions are to be carried?

A: No.

Q: Attachment #98 – No Building identified – TBD  
Ref: Item H – Applicable security

A: Document title is the institution and building. Warkworth.  
None required.

Q: What building & location this applies to?

A: GI only

Q: Is there any security requirements?

A: No card system.

Q: Detail check lists are provide for some buildings only ( attachment # 94-99).  
Will there be any additional detail lists issued?

A: No.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation  
EQ734-123167/A  
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client  
R.056399.001

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.  
017  
File No. - N° du dossier  
PWL-1-34156

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur  
pwl003  
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

---

Q: Amendment #8 – Q & A

Item Re; Joyceville room schedule – indicates room data sheet will be provided? When will these be provided?

A: Room data sheets were provide in the original tender. They apply to every GI and GO regardless of location. See Merx.

Q: Will alternative building locations be considered?

A: No.

Q: Does PWGSC require new hydrants for each building or can we assume that the existing hydrants that fall within 45 m of the new building are acceptable?

A: New hydrants will be required as per Code. Design-builder to determine and price.

Q: The Civil Performance Specification indicates that subdrain shall be placed in "all" excavations. Normally subdrain is placed in areas such as parking lots, storm sewers or structural elements such as footings when identified by the geotechnical. Can PWGS please clarify what they mean by all excavations?

A: As per normal construction practices.

Q: Will PWGSC provide locates for underground services? Does PWGSC have existing profiles/as-builts/ inverts for these utilities or will they consider an extra for utilities that are in conflict. Can PWGSC provide additional information for all of the utilities identified in the RFP for relocation in order to accurately price their relocation?

A: Locates are the responsibility of the contractor.

Q: For the Civil Performance Specification, Section 2.9.8, Excavation, This requirement is a bit unusual and excessive. Is it the intent to excavate an additional 600mm below the subgrade when in rock? Sections 2.1 References, MTO Standards which deals with excavation in rock and 2.2.1.4 Site Grading identify that transition zones shall be used when changing subexcavation grades which are provided in the Ontario Provincial Standards

A: No.

---

Q: Question re tolerances, Section 2.15? Document also references OPS, can we use the tolerances provided in OPS rather than those in Section 2.15 of the Civil Conformance Spec?

A: Yes.

Q: Cement grade specified is unusual Grade 80-100? Please verify and clarify?

A: A document reference was not provided for this specification question. However, the intent within the RFP is as follows:

--Concrete for curbs and gutters and pre-cast items defined in: Turnkey Project Manual, 2.0 Civil performance Specifications, 2.20 Materials, part 5 and 6.

-- Concrete Floors defined in: Turnkey Project Manual, 4.2 Building Systems and Materials, 1.0 Concrete Floors.

--Structural Concrete is defined in: 5.0 Structural Performance Specifications, 5.2 Reference Codes, Standards and Guidelines, part 1.

--These references are provided to the Design Builder as performance specifications. An appropriate design professional is responsible for interpreting and deciding on specifics relating to all concrete design.

Q: ADM#10; Attachment#40 & 99 – BC- GO

Note:5 – Power, data, CCTV, Telephone & FA existing services are shown to be at BC03

A new duct bank connecting new building E&C services will be required to be installed. A direct ductbank will be provided from the electrical room to the existing location in building BC03.

What is the construction of BC03 Building at point of Entry? Is the direct routing from point of entry to the existing location easily accessible?

A: The construction of Building BC03 is: Concrete Block with Steel Siding. The access is by an exterior door to a hallway to the Mechanical Room where the services are available.

Q: FA connection will be done at existing Siemens subpanel at BC03 and only minor reprogramming of the existing FA panel is anticipated. Please confirm?

A: An anticipated Fire Alarm upgrade, by others, has not occurred this year, making connection to the BC03 sub-panel an insufficient service access point. The Design Builder is to allow for new cabling back to the Duty Office in Building #12.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EQ734-123167/A

Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client

R.056399.001

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

017

File No. - N° du dossier

PWL-1-34156

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

pw1003

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

---

## Revised and Added Documents

### Breakdown of Lump Sum Pricing by Institution

Revised:

For Information Purposes

Breakdown of Lump Sum Pricing by Institution

Institution	Buildings	Cost Per Institution
Bath	GI & GO	\$
Bath RTC	GI	
Beaver Creek	GO	\$
Fenbrook	GI & GO	\$
Joyceville	GO & GI	\$
Millhaven	GI & GO	\$
Warkworth	GI	\$

## **MANDATORY SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS**

### **SECTION 4: MANDATORY SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS**

To be considered compliant, a submission must meet all of the mandatory evaluation criteria. Submissions not meeting all of the mandatory requirements will be given no further consideration. The Bidder must:

1. Submit the bid to the Bid Receiving Unit prior to the closing date and time indicated on the front page of the solicitation document;
2. Complete and submit signed Bid Price Form (Annex A);
3. Provide Bid Security per IB17 of the Instructions to Bidders; **(Include Bid Security in the "Technical Portion" of the submission (Envelope One))**
4. Declaration Form (Appendix E) (Include this in the "Technical Portion" of the submission (Envelope One))
5. Team Identification Form. (Appendix D) (Include this in the "Technical Portion" of the submission (Envelope One))
6. Complete List of each Individual who is currently on the Bidder's Board of Directors. (Appendix 1) (Include this in the "Technical Portion" of the submission (Envelope One))
7. The consent to a criminal record Verification form (PWGSC-TPSGC 229) (Appendix 2) (Include this in the "Technical Portion" of the submission (Envelope One))

### **SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS - CHECKLIST**

The following list of documents and forms is provided with the intention of assisting the Bidder in ensuring a complete submission. The Bidder is responsible for meeting all submission requirements.

- Proposal - one (1) original, plus four (4) bound copies, plus one (1) CD
  - Note: the maximum number of pages (including text and graphics) to be submitted for the Technical Portion is 30 pages (100 all inclusive)
- Front page of RFP - acknowledged
- Bid Price Form (in a separate envelope) - completed and signed
- Front page(s) of any solicitation amendment(s) - acknowledged
- Bid Security included with **"Technical Portion" of the submission (Envelope One)**
- Team Identification - see typical format in Appendix D
- Declaration - completed and signed form, provided in Appendix E
- Verification of Team - confirmed One team identification information; signed and dated
- Code of Conduct and Certifications - Proposal**

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EQ734-123167/A

Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client

R.056399.001

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

017

File No. - N° du dossier

PWL-1-34156

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

pwl003

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

---

Proponents must submit the following as part of their proposal:

(a) Complete List of each Individual who is currently on the Bidder's Board of Directors.

(b) a properly completed and signed

Consent to a Criminal Record Verification (PWGSC-TPSGC 229) form

(<http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/app-acq/forms/formulaires-forms-eng.html>) for each individual named in the aforementioned list.

□

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EQ734-123167/A

Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client

R.056399.001

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

017

File No. - N° du dossier

PWL-1-34156

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

pwl003

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

---

## APPENDIX E

### Declaration Form

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EQ734-123167/A

Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client

R.056399.001

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

017

File No. - N° du dossier

PWL-1-34156

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

pw1003

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

### Request for Proposal (RFP) Declaration Form

Name of Proponent: \_\_\_\_\_

Procurement Business Number (PBN): \_\_\_\_\_

Street Address: \_\_\_\_\_ Mailing Address (if different than street address)

\_\_\_\_\_

City: \_\_\_\_\_ City: \_\_\_\_\_

Prov./Terr./State: \_\_\_\_\_ Prov./Terr./State: \_\_\_\_\_

Postal/ZIP Code: \_\_\_\_\_ Postal/ZIP Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone Number: ( ) \_\_\_\_\_ Fax Number: ( ) \_\_\_\_\_

E-Mail : \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Organization:**

- Sole Proprietorship       Incorporated Joint Venture
- Partnership                 Limited Partnership Joint Venture
- Corporation                 Partnership Joint Venture
- Contractual Joint Venture

**This Request for Proposal (RFP) Declaration Form must be submitted and will form part of any proposal. Failure to include such representation and warranty with the proposal and/or not executing the signature block below will render the proposal as non-responsive. The completed form should be included with your Phase One Proposal.**

**Education, Professional Accreditation and Experience:**

All statements made with regard to the education, professional accreditation and the experience of individuals proposed for providing services under the Contract are accurate and factual, and we are aware that Canada reserves the right to verify any information provided in this regard and that untrue statements may result in the proposal being declared non-responsive. Should a verification by Canada disclose untrue statements, Canada shall have the right to treat any Contract resulting from this solicitation as being in default and to terminate it accordingly.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EQ734-123167/A

Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client

R.056399.001

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

017

File No. - N° du dossier

PWL-1-34156

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

pw1003

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

---

**DECLARATION:**

I, the undersigned, being a principal of the Proponent, hereby certify that the information given on this form and in the attached Proposal is accurate to the best of my knowledge.

**Name (print):** \_\_\_\_\_ **Capacity:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Signature** \_\_\_\_\_ **Telephone Number: ( )** \_\_\_\_\_

**Telephone Number: ( )** \_\_\_\_\_

**Fax Number: ( )** \_\_\_\_\_

**E-mail Address:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

PWGSC contact will be with the above named person

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EQ734-123167/A

Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client

R.056399.001

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

017

File No. - N° du dossier

PWL-1-34156

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

pw1003

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

---

## **APPENDIX D**

### **Design Build of Generic Support Building GI GO VARIOUS LOCATIONS, ONTARIO**

### **Proponent's Team Identification Format**

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EQ734-123167/A

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

017

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

pwl003

Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client

R.056399.001

File No. - N° du dossier

PWL-1-34156

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

*The Design Firms' architects and engineers shall be, or eligible to be, licensed, certified or otherwise authorized to provide the necessary professional services to the full extent that may be required by provincial or territorial law.*

**Proponent:**

Proponent's Name: .....

**Builder:**

Name of Builder's Firm: .....

Name of Builder's Project Manager: .....

Name of Builder's Site Superintendent: .....

**Architectural Design Firm:**

Name of Architectural Design Firm: .....

Name of Project Architect: .....

Provincial licensing status: .....

**Electrical Engineering Design Firm:**

Name of Electrical Engineering Design Firm: .....

Name of Electrical Project Engineer: .....

Provincial licensing status: .....

**Mechanical Engineering Design Firm:**

Name of Mechanical Engineering Design Firm: .....

Name of Mechanical Project Engineer: .....

Provincial licensing status: .....

**Structural Engineering Design Firm:**

Name of Structural Engineering Design Firm: .....

Name of Structural Project Engineer: .....

Provincial licensing status: .....

**Civil Engineering Design Firm:**

Name of Civil Engineering Design Firm: .....

Name of Civil Project Engineer: .....

Provincial licensing status: .....

**Landscape Architecture Design Firm:**

Name of Landscape Architecture Firm: .....

Name of Project Architect: .....

Provincial licensing status: .....

**RATED REQUIREMENTS**

Proposals meeting the mandatory requirements will be evaluated in accordance with the following criteria. The clarity of the proposal writing will form part of the evaluation (use of language, document structure, conciseness and completeness of the response):

<b>NON RESPONSIVE</b>	<b>INADEQUATE</b>	<b>WEAK</b>	<b>ADEQUATE</b>	<b>FULLY SATISFACTORY</b>	<b>STRONG</b>
<b>0 point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>4 points</b>	<b>6 points</b>	<b>8 points</b>	<b>10 points</b>
Did not submit information which could be evaluated	Lacks complete or almost complete understanding of the requirements.	Has some understanding of the requirements but lacks adequate understanding in some areas of the requirements.	Demonstrates a good understanding of the requirements.	Demonstrates a very good understanding of the requirements.	Demonstrates expert understanding of the requirements.
	Weaknesses cannot be corrected	Generally doubtful that weaknesses can be corrected	Weaknesses can be easily corrected	No significant weaknesses	No apparent weaknesses
	Proponent lacks qualifications and experience	Proponent does not have minimum qualifications and experience	Proponent has minimum qualifications and experience	Proponent is qualified and experienced	Proponent is highly qualified and experienced
	Team proposed is not likely able to meet requirements	Team does not cover all components or overall experience is weak	Team covers all components and will likely meet requirements	Team covers all components - some members have worked successfully together	Strong team - has worked successfully together on comparable projects
	Sample projects not related to this project's needs	Sample projects generally not related to this project's needs	Sample projects generally related to this project's needs	Sample projects directly related to this project's needs	Leads in sample projects directly related to this project's needs
	Extremely poor, insufficient to meet performance requirements	Little capability to meet performance requirements	Minimum acceptable capability, should meet minimum performance	Satisfactory capability, should ensure effective results	Superior capability, should ensure very effective results