

RETURN BIDS TO:
RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:
Bid Receiving Public Works and Government
Services Canada/Réception des soumissions Travaux
publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Pacific Region
800 Burrard Street, 12th Floor
800, rue Burrard, 12e étage
Vancouver, B. C.
V6Z 2V8
Bid Fax: (604) 775-7526

SOLICITATION AMENDMENT MODIFICATION DE L'INVITATION

The referenced document is hereby revised; unless otherwise indicated, all other terms and conditions of the Solicitation remain the same.

Ce document est par la présente révisé; sauf indication contraire, les modalités de l'invitation demeurent les mêmes.

Comments - Commentaires

Vendor/Firm Name and Address
Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution
Public Works and Government Services Canada -
Pacific Region
800 Burrard Street, 12th Floor
800, rue Burrard, 12e étage
Vancouver, BC V6Z 2V8

Title - Sujet Remediation Consultants	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation E0276-110680/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 004
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20110680	Date 2012-03-15
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$XSB-016-6610	
File No. - N° de dossier XSB-0-32362 (016)	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2012-03-28	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Pacific Daylight Saving Time PDT
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Curt Steckhan	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur xsb016
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (604) 666-1465 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (604) 775-7692
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Delivery Required - Livraison exigée	Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée
Vendor/Firm Name and Address Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur	
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/ de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)	
Signature	Date

Solicitation Amendment 004

Questions and Answers

- Q1:** Is the Senior Program scoring for program dollar value (i.e. \$0-\$250,000) on a sliding scale or is it just set points for each program dollar value range?
- A1:** For the Senior Program Coordinator category, Value criteria, the scoring is based on set points as follows: value of consulting fees >\$1,000,000=1 point; value of consulting fees between \$250,000 and \$1,000,000=0.5 points; value of consulting fees<\$250,000 or blank=0 points. The only sliding or prorated criteria is for the Corporate Capability category, Experience criteria.
- Q2:** Where the RFP requires that proposals describes a proponent's experience, can you please clarify if "risk management work" includes risk assessment (e.g., bullet No. 1 for Senior Program Coordinator on page 55).
- A2:** F.1.2 Submissions (5) requests the Senior Program Coordinators to describe their program risk management experience. Program risk management is with respect to risks that might affect the program (eg risks that impact scope, quality, time, or budget). This does not include Risk Assessment work, which uses a risk based approach to ensure a contaminated site does not present an unacceptable risk to human health and ecological receptors.
- Q3:** For evaluation of senior environmental engineers/scientists, would projects be considered viable where the person being evaluated was on staff at the federal custodial department and working within the PWGSC project team for the site remediation?
- A3:** For the Senior Environmental Engineer/Scientist Category, an individual for a federal custodial department that retained PWGSC to perform remediation or risk management work for a project may identify PWGSC under the Client criteria for that project. However, as per F.1.3.1.1, the individual must clearly identify that they performed the role of a Senior Environmental Engineer/Scientist; if they did not perform this role then no points will be awarded for any criteria for that particular project.
- Q4:** In what capacity is Risk Assessment considered to Risk Management? If at all.
- A4:** In F.1.2.1 programs must be remediation or risk management work to be considered, and in F.1.3.1 projects must be remediation or risk management work to be considered. However, as per F.1.2.1, scoring is based on the program relevancy to PWGSC work, and as per F.1.3.1, scoring is based on the project relevancy to PWGSC work. The types of PWGSC work that are relevant are described in the Statement of Work, which does not include performing a Human Health or Ecological Risk Assessment.
- Q5:** Is Risk Management considered an Innovative Remedial technique?
- A5:** As per the Technical Evaluation Template, "other care and maintenance/risk management activity" are considered a Conventional Remediation Technique.
- Q6:** In the Corporate Capability section and table (F.1.1.2) for requested roles, the listed accreditations generally support the proposed roles except for the Junior CADD/GIS role. We are unaware of any specific accreditation that pertains to the CADD/GIS role in BC/Yukon or nationally. In light of this, we suggest the accreditation scoring (0.05) be given full scoring if the resume shows that the individual is trained and experienced for the role. Can you please comment on this suggestion, or inform us what accreditations are relevant for CADD/GIS.
- A6:** An example of relevant professional accreditation for the CADD/GIS category would be a ASCT (Applied Science Technologist) or a Certified Technician (CTech) under the Geomatics (GIS) discipline as accredited by the Applied Science Technologists & Technicians of British Columbia.

-
- Q7:** As confirmation in regard to relevant accreditations, we are aware of professionals that have a "Certified Environmental Practitioner In Training (CEPIT)" role with the Canadian Environmental Certification Approvals Board (ECO Canada). As it is a national accreditation program for environmental practitioners, we wish to confirm it is equivalent to "Environmental Professional/Environmental Professional in Training (EP, EPt).. or equivalent" as listed on page 52 (of 63) for any of the relevant roles.
- A7:** In discussions with ECO Canada, the CEPIT certification has been superseded by EPt. Therefore the CEPIT is considered equivalent and as per F.1.1.1 (b) is considered relevant professional accreditation.
- Q8:** When working with AAND and First Nations group, AAND receives and reviews the proposals from consultants. If they approve the proposal then they release funding to the First Nations group. At this point the First Nation group becomes our client but AAND remains the technical authority. They receive updates on work progress and budgets and provide technical review of reports. So both AAND and First Nations are involved with the project. My question is, would both AAND and the First Nations groups be considered OGDs for a project? Or would you consider AAND an OGD since they maintain involvement and are the funding source?
- A8:** In discussions with Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada, they are integral with the contracting, project management, and technical aspects of the work. Thus work done for First Nations with the involvement of AANDC would be considered an Other Government Department under the Client criteria.

We are extending the RFSO Closing Date until March 28, 2012.

All other clauses and conditions remain unchanged.