

RETURN BIDS TO:
RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:
Regional Manager/Real Property
Contracting/PWGSC
Ontario Region, Tendering Office
12th Floor, 4900 Yonge Street
Toronto, Ontario
M2N 6A6
Ontario

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
Regional Manager/Real Property Contracting/PWGSC
Ontario Region, Tendering Office
12th Floor, 4900 Yonge Street
Toronto, Ontario
M2N 6A6
Ontario

Title - Sujet 450 SSS Re-survey	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EQ447-130640/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 001
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client R.023276.307	Date 2012-09-11
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$PWL-035-1727	
File No. - N° de dossier PWL-2-35057 (035)	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2012-09-25	
Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT	
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: Woodhall, Lauren	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur pwl035
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (416) 512-5873 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (416) 512-5862
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: PWGSC-TPSGC Port Hope Port Hope, ON L1A 3S4	

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 001

This amendment is being raised to include the Basis of Selection and the Evaluation Criteria for this requirement.

Under Part 4 - EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND BASIS OF SELECTION , 2. Basis of Selection

DELETE; In its entirety.

INSERT: 2. Basis of Selection - Highest Combined Rating of Technical Merit and Price

To be declared responsive, a bid must:

- a) comply with all the requirements of the bid solicitation; and
- b) meet all mandatory criteria; and
- c) obtain the required minimum of 840 points overall for the technical evaluation criteria which are subject to point rating. The rating is performed on a scale of 1200 points.

The selection will be based on the highest responsive combined rating of technical merit and price. The ratio will be 70 % for the technical merit and 30 % for the price.

To establish the technical merit score, the overall technical score for each responsive bid will be determined as follows: total number of points obtained / maximum number of points available multiplied by the ratio of 70 %.

To establish the pricing score, each responsive bid will be prorated against the lowest evaluated price and the ratio of 30 % .

For each responsive bid, the technical merit score and the pricing score will be added to determine its combined rating.

Neither the responsive bid obtaining the highest technical score nor the one with the lowest evaluated price will necessarily be accepted. The responsive bid with the highest combined rating of technical merit and price will be recommended for award of a contract.

The table below illustrates an example where all three bids are responsive and the selection of the contractor is determined by a 70/30 ratio of technical merit and price, respectively. The total available points equals 1200 and the lowest evaluated price is \$150,000.00.

Basis of Selection - Highest Combined Rating Technical Merit (70%) and Price (30%)

	Bidder 1	Bidder 2	Bidder 3
Overall Technical Score	1100/1200	900/1200	1000/1200
Bid Evaluated Price	\$200,000.00	\$175,000.00	\$150,000.00

Calculations	Technical Merit Score	1100/1200 x 70 = 64.17	900/1200 x 70 = 52.50	1000/1200 x 70 = 58.34
	Pricing Score	150/200 x 30 = 22.50	150/175 x 30 = 25.72	150/150 x 30 = 30.00
Overall Rating		86.67	78.22	88.34
		2nd	3rd	1st

Under ANNEX E - EVALUATION CRITERIA

DELETE; In its entirety.

INSERT:

ANNEX E

TECHNICAL EVALUATION

1.0 Proposal Requirements

1.1 Requirement for Proposal Format

In addition to the items identified in Part 3 Article 1, the following proposal format information should be noted when preparing the proposal:

- 1.1.1 279mm x 432 mm (11" x 17") fold-out sheets for spreadsheets, organization charts etc. will be counted as two pages.
- 1.1.2 The order of the proposals should follow the order established in Section 1.1 Technical Evaluation

1.2 Specific Requirements for Proposal Format

The maximum number of pages (including text and graphics) to be submitted for the Rated Requirements under 2.2 Point Rated Technical criteria is [forty (40)] pages.

The following are not part of the page limitation noted above;

- Covering letter
- Licensing Information
- Code of Conduct Certifications
- Security Requirement Information

- Consultant Team Identification
- Declaration/Certifications Information
- Front page of the RFP
- Front page of revision(s) to the RFP
- Price Proposal Form

Consequence of non-compliance: any pages which extend beyond the above page limitation and any other attachments will be extracted from the proposal and will not be forwarded to the PWGSC Evaluation Board members for evaluation.

2.0 Technical Evaluation

Failure to meet the mandatory requirements will render the proposal as non-responsive and no further evaluation will be carried out.

2.1 Mandatory Technical Criteria

		COMPLY		Identify Page No. In Proposal
		YES	NO	
1	<p>The bidder must be an Environmental Consulting Firm licensed, or eligible to be licensed, certified or otherwise authorized to provide the necessary environmental and professional services to the full extent that may be required by Federal or provincial law applicable to the project in the province of Ontario.</p> <p>A copy of the Certificate of Approval or a confirmation letter from the professional licensing body must be provided at bid closing.</p>			
2	<p>The laboratory used for this requirement must be licensed by the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC) if the lab is located in Canada, or by the applicable state/country nuclear regulatory authority if not located in Canada for the handling, use, packaging, transport and managing of a radioactive material.</p> <p>Provide the name of the laboratory and the provide a copy of the CNSC license or the Regulatory License recognized by the state/country if outside of Canada.</p>			
3	<p>Each Bidder must identify their team, by completing the form included herein as Appendix "1" to Annex "E" (or an identical facsimile)</p> <p>a) As a minimum the team must include the following titles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Project Director •Project Manager •Senior Consultant - Environmental 			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Senior Consultant - Radiological •Quality Assurance Specialist •Health and Safety Specialist •Communications Specialist •Radiation Protection Specialist •Radiological Survey Specialist •Geotechnical Specialist/ Geoscientist <p>b. One of the following senior positions (i.e. Project Director, Project Manager, Senior Consultant - Environmental, Senior Consultant - Radiological) must be registered as a Qualified Person , Environmental Site Assessment (QP ESA) under the Ontario Regulation 153/04 as amended from time to time.</p> <p>c. One of the following senior positions (i.e. Project Director, Project Manager, Senior Consultant - Environmental, Senior Consultant - Radiological) must be certified by the National Environmental Health Association (NEHA), or the National Radon Safety Board (NRSB) or an agency agreed to by AECL.</p>			
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--

2.2 Point Rated Technical Criteria

2.2.1. Achievements of Bidders on Similar/Comparable Projects

In this section, bids will be assessed based on their ability to demonstrate:

- (a) relevance of the sample projects provided in the bid to the scope and size of the work described in the RFP; (50%)
- (b) demonstrated experience in performing survey work in an occupied residential setting (25%)
- (c) demonstrated ability to manage projects on time and on budget. (25%)

As a minimum the information provided in this section should include the following:

Provide a brief project description including a list of the key personnel for three (3) projects completed within the last twenty years , or currently underway. All three projects should be Environmental Investigation projects including radiological surveys or the assessment and remediation of Low Level Radioactive Waste (LLRW). In the event of projects submitted by a Joint Venture (JV), one of the Joint Venture Parties must be the primary consultant for all sample project submitted.

In the event that a Bidder, for example, submits only one project in this section, that bidder cannot achieve more than one third of the total number of marks.

In the event that more than three projects are provided only the first three that appear in the bid in order will be considered.

2.2.2. Achievements of Key Sub-consultants on Projects

In this section, bids will be assessed based on their ability to demonstrate:

(a) relevance of the sample projects provided in the bid to the scope and size of the work described in the RFP. (100%)

As a minimum the information provided in this section should include the following:

Provide two (2) projects completed within the last ten years or currently underway for each of the following key sub consultant:

- Radiological investigation sub-consultant.
- Geotechnical (Drilling) sub-consultant
- Analytical Laboratory

In the event that a Bidder, for example, submits only one project in this section, that bidder cannot achieve more than one half of the total number of marks.

In the event that more than two projects are provided, only the first two that appear in the bid in order will be considered.

In the event that the bidder also performs the sub-consultant services identified above, it is acceptable for the bidder to submit the project information required.

2.2.3. Achievements of Key Personnel on Projects

In this section bids will be assessed based on

(a) demonstrated relevant experience in the proposed role. (see table below)

(b) educational qualifications and professional accreditation - P.Eng., P. Geo., PMP, QP ESA. Etc.; (see table below)

(c) years of experience (see table below)

The total number of points assigned to each position is as follows:

- Project Director (20 pts)
- Project Manager (15 pts)
- Senior Consultant - Environmental (15 pts)
- Senior Consultant - Radiological (15 pts)
- Quality Assurance Specialist (10 pts)
- Health and Safety Specialist (10 pts)
- Communications Specialist (10 pts)
- Radiation Protection Specialist (10 pts)
- Radiological Survey Specialist (10 pts)
- Geotechnical Specialist/ Geoscientist (10 pts)

Total : 125 points

Each position will be evaluated identically in accordance with the process described in the table below. Each position will receive a mark out of 100 points. That mark will be adjusted , depending on the total number of points assigned for the position , for example for the Project Director the mark out of 100 will be divided by 5 for a score out of 20, for the Quality Assurance Specialist a mark out of 100 will be divided by 10 for a final score out of 10 .

Relevant Projects	50 points
Provide descriptions of 3 projects the proposed person has worked on. Types of Relevant Projects: Contaminated Site Assessments Low level Radiological Waste Remediation Radiological Surveys	50 - very similar to proposed project 30 - Somewhat similar 10 - Slightly similar 0 - Not similar (each project will be weighted equally for a total of 50 points when assigning points)
Education and Professional Accreditation	20 points
Undergraduate degree, no accredited certifications	5
Graduate degree, no accredited certifications	10
Undergraduate degree, accredited certifications	15
Graduate degree, accredited certifications	20
Years of Experience in the Proposed Position	30 points
Project Director Less than 5 years Minimum 5 years 5 - 10 years Over 10 years	0 10 20 30
Project Manager Senior Consultant - Environmental Senior Consultant - Radiological Less than 10 years Minimum 10 years 10 - 15 years Over 15 years	0 10 20 30
Quality Assurance Specialist Health and Safety Specialist Communications Specialist Radiation Protection Specialist Radiological Survey Specialist Geotechnical Specialist/ Geoscientist Less than 5 years Minimum 5 years 5 - 10 years Over 10 years	0 10 20 30

2.2.4. Understanding of the Project and Scope of Work

The bidder should propose a manageable approach to the work that demonstrates a clear understanding of the functional/technical requirements detailed in the Statement of Work. The approach should also reflect an understanding of the sensitivities associated with work within a residential community.

In this section bids will be assessed based on:

- (a) a demonstrated understanding of all of the technical aspects of the work as detailed in the Statement of Work; (40%)
- (b) a demonstrated understanding of all of the logistical, administrative and regulatory aspects of the work; (20%)

(c) a demonstrated understanding of the broader goals and objectives as they relate to working in a government context, addressing sustainable development, maintaining a positive relationship with the community and other priorities. (20%)

(d) Demonstrate evidence of Quality Assurance procedures. (20%)

As a minimum the information provided in this section should include the following:

- Work Plan - description of general approach and of each work element, detailed breakdown of major tasks, resources and deliverables
- Project schedule - proposed major milestones schedule corresponding to each major task and deliverable
- The Client User's philosophies and values
- Regulatory requirements and implications
- Quality management issues related to all major tasks identified in Statement of Work.

2.2.5. Management of Services

The Bidder should describe how the work will be managed to ensure continuing and consistent control as well as production efficiency. The bid should demonstrate an understanding of potential problems that might arise during the performance of the work along with strategies to address these problems.

In this section bids will be assessed based on their ability to demonstrate:

- (a) an organizational structure that is logical in order to maximize work efficiency; (25%)
- (b) an understanding of the types of problems that might arise during the work; (25%)
- (c) an understanding of the logistical complexity of this project given the size of the project and the unique interactions with the public and other stakeholders. (25%)
- (d) the communication strategy and internal reporting relationships to support quick and successful resolution to all problems. (25%)

As a minimum the information provided in this section should include the following:

- Identification of back-up resources
- Outline of an action plan of the services with implementation strategies and sequence of main activities
- Organizational chart of the Bidder's team identifying position titles with specific names describing roles and responsibilities.
- Risk management issues, challenges and constraints and proposed plans/solutions
- Reporting relationships
- Communication strategies with internal and external stakeholders.

3.0 EVALUATION AND RATING

3.1 Proposals will be reviewed, evaluated and rated by a PWGSC Evaluation Board in accordance with the following to establish Technical Ratings:

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EQ447-130640/A

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

R.023276.307

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

001

File No. - N° du dossier

PWL-2-35057

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

pw1035

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

Criterion	Weight Factor	Points	Weighted Rating
1. Achievements of Bidder	2.5	0 - 100	0-250
2. Achievements of Key Sub-Consultants	1.0	0 - 100	0 - 100
3. Achievements of Key Personnel	2.0	0 - 125	0 - 250
4. Understanding of the Project and Scope of Work	3.5	0 - 100	0 - 350
5. Management of Services	2.5	0 - 100	0 - 250
Technical Rating			0 - 1200

Items 1, 2, 4, and 5 will be scored using the Generic Evaluation Table below. Item 3 will be scored according to the grid included in Item 3 above.

3.2 Generic Evaluation Table

PWGSC Evaluation Board members will evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the Bidder's response to the evaluation criteria using the generic evaluation table below:

NON RESPONSIVE	INADEQUATE	WEAK	SATISFACTORY	FULLY SATISFACTORY	STRONG
0 percent	20 percent	40 percent	70 percent	80 percent	100 percent
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
--	---------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------

To be considered further, proponents **must** achieve a minimum Technical Rating of seventy (70%) percent.

No further consideration will be given to proponents not achieving the pass mark of eight hundred and forty (840) points.

3.3 Financial Evaluation

3.3.1 Mandatory Financial Criteria

Bidders must submit their financial bid in accordance with ANNEX B, Basis of Payment. The total amount of Goods and Services Tax (GST) or Harmonized Sales Tax (HST) is to be shown separately, if applicable.

The price of the bid will be evaluated in Canadian dollars, the Goods and Services Tax or the Harmonized Sales Tax excluded,

The bid evaluation price will be calculated as follows: $T1 + T2$ (see Annex B, Basis of Payment). $T2$ will be the aggregate of the estimated quantities multiplied by the firm unit price.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EQ447-130640/A

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

R.023276.307

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

001

File No. - N° du dossier

PWL-2-35057

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

pw1035

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

Appendix 1

Bidders must identify the team by completing this form or an identical facsimile.

Position	Name of Proposed Individual
Project Director	_____
Project Manager	_____
Senior Consultant - Environmental	_____
Senior Consultant - Radiological	_____
Quality Assurance Specialist	_____
Health and Safety Specialist	_____
Communications Specialist	_____
Radiation Protection Specialist	_____
Radiological Survey Specialist	_____
Geotechnical Specialist/ Geoscientist	_____

Name and Position of Proposed Individual certified as a Qualified Person , Environmental Site Assessment (QP ESA) under the Ontario Regulation 153/04. (Must be the Project Director, Project Manager, Senior Consultant - Environmental, or Senior Consultant - Radiological)

Position: _____ Name: _____

Name and Position of Proposed Individual certified by the National Environmental Health Association (NEHA), or the National Radon Safety Board (NRSB) or an agency agreed to by AECL. (Must be the Project Director, Project Manager, Senior Consultant - Environmental, or Senior Consultant - Radiological)

Position: _____ Name: _____