

RETURN BIDS TO:
RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:
Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions -
TPSGC
11 Laurier St. / 11 rue Laurier
Place du Portage, Phase III
Core 0A1/Noyau 0A1
Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5
Bid Fax: (819) 997-9776

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
**THIS PROCUREMENT CONTAINS A SECURITY
REQUIREMENT**

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

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution
Consultant Services Division/Division des services
d'experts-conseils
11 Laurier St./11 Rue Laurier
3C2, Place du Portage
Phase III
Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet Animal Wing to Wet Lab Conversion	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EP008-121856/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 001
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client R.044033.002	Date 2012-03-20
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$FE-112-59430	
File No. - N° de dossier fe112.EP008-121856	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2012-04-25	
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: El-Zarka, Edward	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur fe112
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-6097 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-3160
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: Sir Frederick Banting Research Centre, 251 Sir Frederick Banting Way, Ottawa, ON	

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

This amendment will form part of the contract documents.

1. Proponents are advised that the closing date is extended from April 10, 2012 to April 25, 2012.

2. The following is in response to inquiries received in relation to this solicitation.

Question 1:

Is Revit an acceptable platform for delivery of this project? If so, does PWGSC have a BIM format standard that is transferable to the future building operators?

Answer 1:

The RFP requires the files be provided to PWGSC in the international file format. Revit packages capable of producing this file format, as well as all other requirements of the RFP, are acceptable.

Question 2:

SI 1 Introduction item 2 of the RFP (page 3 of 24) recognizes the amount of effort required for Proposal 2. and states that after submission of Proposal 1, the consultant teams will have time to confirm if they wish to proceed to Proposal 2 with a fee proposal. Approximately 4 additional weeks would be required to prepare Proposal 2 once the results of proposal 1 are known. Please confirm when proposal 2 (incl fee envelope) is due.

Answer 2:

At this time, the closing date and duration of Phase 2 cannot be confirmed.

Question 3:

SI2 Proposal Documents, Item 1a) of the RFP (page 3 of 24) notes General Instructions (GI's) are part of the proposal documents. We apologize but we could not located this part of the documentation in what we downloaded from Merx. Where is this referenced document found?

Answer 4: Reference to the RFP, Section 2 of "Agreement" (page 7 of 24), all terms, conditions and clauses, including the General Instructions, are available on PWGSC's Web site:

<http://ccua-sacc.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/pub/acho-eng.jsp>

Answer 3:

Reference to the RFP, all terms, conditions and clauses, including the General Instructions, are available on PWGSC's Web site:

<http://ccua-sacc.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/pub/acho-eng.jsp>

Question 4:

Page 19 of the RFP, RS1 item 1.2.1.1 RS1A, bullet 4 notes that "registration of the project is required with the selected sustainability tool". The level of effort for Registration for each sustainability tool varies significantly which will lead to significant variation in fee quoted by the various consultant teams. Does PWGSC intend to have the project officially registered or rather design to a sustainability tool as is frequently done on Crown projects with no actual registration? For instance, LEED registration requires a very large amount of paperwork collected during construction and a detail final submission for registration that requires a significant level of effort.

Answer 4:

The project is to be capable of registration, however the successful proponent is not required to pursue registration. Such registration shall be pursued by the Crown, at no expense to the proponent, based on client requirements at the end of the project. The project is to be designed to a sustainability tool, but without registration.

Question 5:

Page 14 of the RFP, PD 8 Consultant Services requests the services of an indoor air quality/ monitoring/ alarm specialist. Please confirm what the Crown expects the scope of work to be for this specialist as we can find no other reference in the TOR.

Answer 5:

In the context of the Animal Wing to Wet Laboratory Conversion, 3rd and 4th Floors, Sir Frederick Banting Building project the "indoor air/ monitoring/ alarm specialist" service is to include for the following:

~ design the laboratory to meet the required codes in addition to the Health Canada Bio-Safety requirements, ~ ensure that the systems are designed for continuous monitoring and control, complete with alarm to warn that the system is not operating within the design levels of tolerance.

Question 6:

Page 60 of the RFP, RS 10, Concept Design, notes a Class "C" estimate is listed as required. Page 22 of the RFP, 2.2 General, 5th bullet, requests a class C for each option. The "chart of reviews and approvals" on Page 17 of the RFP seems to require one class D,C,B and A. Please confirm which requirement is correct.

Answer 6:

Reference to page 58 of 146 of the RFP, RS 2.2 General, 5th bullet, **DELETE** "Prepare a Class "C" cost estimate for each option;"

and **REPLACE** with

"The Class "C" cost estimate is to include analysis of the cost for each option."

Question 7:

Page 60 of the RFP, RS 10, the last paragraph describes the requirement to submit "an up to date estimate" at each review (one assumes at 33%, 66% and 99%). Are these three class B's in addition to the class B estimate required at the end of Design Development? Page 30 of the RFP, 4.2 General just requests a class A estimate and makes no mention of the 3 other construction estimate updates requested on page 60. The "chart of reviews and approvals" on Page 17 of the RFP seems to require one class D,C,B and A. Please confirm number and type of estimates required in the "contract document" stage.

Answer 7:

Refer to the entirety of section RS 10.4.

Question 8:

4.2 Existing Documentation - to be made available for successful Proponent, Item 1. Record Drawings for the "Sir Frederick Banting 3rd and 4th Floor Demolition"

Will electronic AutoCAD drawings of the Record Drawings for the "Sir Frederick Banting 3rd and 4th Floor Demolition" and existing conditions be made available to the successful proponent?

Answer 8:

Machine readable drawings will be provided, however these will not be unlocked and editable files.

Question 9 :

Page 32 of the RFP, item 4.4.2, 7th and 8th bullet, seems to request the consultants to provide "one set of soils investigating report with amendments if required" and "one set of designated substances survey report". These documents are normally a client responsibility. Architects are not insured for this type of work as it is beyond the normal purview of Architecture. Are we to assume that Hazardous substances will be removed by PWGSC pre-construction as Architects are not insured to review hazardous substances.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EP008-121856/A

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

001

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

fe112

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

R.044033.002

File No. - N° du dossier

fe112EP008-121856

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

Answer 9:

Proponents are to carry sub-consultants as required to fulfil all requirements of the RFP. There are currently no known Designated Substances in the applicable workspace, however the consultant is responsible for further testing prior to construction.