

**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

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Dam Safety Reviews - Lower Rice	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EQ754-133441/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 002
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> R.059226.001	<b>Date</b> 2013-06-24
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$PWL-023-1858	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> PWL-2-35144 (023)	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2013-07-04</b>	<b>Time Zone</b> <b>Fuseau horaire</b> Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Lau, Karen	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> pwl023
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (416) 512-5297 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (416) 512-5862
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b> Frankford Dam Meyers Dam Hagues Reach Dam Ranney Falls Dam Trent-Severn Waterway Peterborough Municipality, ON	

**Instructions: See Herein**

**Instructions: Voir aux présentes**

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

---

### **Amendment No. 002**

This amendment is being raised to:

- (1) make revision to PD 7 Schedule
- (2) make revision to SRE 2 Proposal Requirements
  - SRE2.2 Specific Requirements for Proposal Format;
- (3) make revisions to SRE 3 Submission Requirements and Evaluation
  - SRE 3.2 Rated Requirements section of the RFP,
  - SRE 3.3.1 Evaluation Table ; and
- (4) provide responses to Requests for Clarification.

#### **(1) Revision to PD 7 Schedule**

PD7.2 Completion dates shown are relative to the award date:

Delete:

In its entirety

**Insert:**

<u>Stage</u>	<u>Time from Award Date</u>
Award of Consultant Contract:	baseline
- Dam Safety Review	
- <b>Inspection</b> Report	20 weeks
- DRAFT Dam Safety Review Reports	14 months
- Final Dam Safety Review Report	16 months

#### **(2) Revision to SRE 2 Proposal Requirements**

##### **SRE 2.2.1 Specific Requirements for Proposal Format**

Delete:

.1 The maximum number of pages (including text and graphics) to be submitted for the Rated Requirements under SRE 3.2 is Forty (40) pages. The following are not part of the page limitation mentioned above:

**Insert:**

.1 The maximum number of pages (including text and graphics) to be submitted for the Rated Requirements under SRE 3.2 is **Fort-five(45) pages**. The following are not part of the page limitation mentioned above:

**(3) Revision to SRE 3 Submission Requirements and Evaluation****i) Revision to SRE 3.2: RATED REQUIREMENTS -****SRE 3.2.3 Expertise and Experience of Key Sub-Consultants and/ or Specialist (3)****Delete:**

(3) The Proponent should provide, for each key personnel of the Key Sub-Consultants and/or Specialist in the Team Identification Form in Appendix "A ": (minimum of two (2) key personnels for each Key Sub-Consultants and/or Specialist)

**Insert:**

(3) The Proponent should provide, for each key personnel of the Key Sub-Consultants and/or Specialist in the Team Identification Form in Appendix "A ": ( **provide** two (2) key personnels for each Key Sub-Consultants and/or Specialist)

**ii) Revision to SRE 3.2: RATED REQUIREMENTS -****SRE 3.2.5 Scope of Services****Delete:**

In its entirety

**Insert:**

- (1) Demonstrate understanding of the full scope of services for this project. Describe how the Proponent proposes to plan, organize and manage the delivery of all project services and deliverables, through each and every phase of the project, in a manner that will meet project time, cost, quality and scope objectives and requirements.
- (2) The Proponent should provide:
  - (i) A demonstration of the Proponent's understanding, in their own words, of the full scope of services and deliverables required for this project;
  - (ii) A Project Work Breakdown Structure (PWBS) for **Frankford Dam 6 and Lock 6** including, but not limited to:

- 
- a) deliverable-oriented groupings of all project activities, tasks and deliverables;
  - b) clear assignment of responsibilities for activities, tasks and deliverables to project team personnel in specific areas of expertise, with an estimation of levels of effort in terms of number of hours of all identified resources; (employee hourly rates and value of work (\$\$) are not to be included).
- (3) A Project Schedule for **Frankford Dam 6 and Lock 6** including, but not limited to:
- (i) logical sequencing of all project activities, tasks and deliverables, taking into consideration project constraints and challenges;
  - (ii) start and finish times for all key activities, along with target dates for major project milestones and deliverables.
- (4) Provide a general schedule for the remaining three sites with target dates for major project milestones and deliverables only.**

**iii) Revision to SRE 3.2: RATED REQUIREMENTS -  
SRE 3.2.6 Management of Services (2) (i) c)**

Delete:

c) detailed profiles of key positions and of key team members for these positions (use links to SRE 4.3 as appropriate);

**Insert:**

c) detailed profiles of key positions and of key team members for these positions (use links to **SRE 3.2.3** as appropriate);

**iv) Revision to SRE 3.3: EVALUATION AND RATING - SRE 3.3.1: Evaluation Table  
SRE 3.2.2 Expertise and Experience of Lead Engineer 3(ii)**

Delete:

3(ii) A description of expertise and experience (with number of years) and demonstration of how he/she is relevant to the specific needs of this RFP (use references to SRE 4.2 as appropriate);

**Insert:**

3(ii) A description of expertise and experience (with number of years) and demonstration of how he/she is relevant to the specific needs of this RFP (use references to **SRE 3.2.1** as appropriate);

**v) Revision to SRE 3.3: EVALUATION AND RATING - SRE 3.3.1: Evaluation Table**

**SRE 3.2.3 Expertise and Experience of Key Sub-Consultants and/ or Specialist - minimum of two (2) key personnels for each Key Sub-Consultant and/ or Specialist in the Team Identification form in Appendix "A"**

**Delete:**

SRE 3.2.3 Expertise and Experience of Key Sub-Consultants and/ or Specialist - minimum of two (2) key personnels for each Key Sub-Consultant and/ or Specialist in the Team Identification form in Appendix "A"

**Insert:**

SRE 3.2.3 Expertise and Experience of Key Sub-Consultants and/ or Specialist - **provide** two (2) key personnels for each Key Sub-Consultant and/ or Specialist in the Team Identification form in Appendix "A"

**vi) Revision to SRE 3.3: EVALUATION AND RATING - SRE 3.3.1: Evaluation Table**

**SRE 3.2.3 Expertise and Experience of Key Sub-Consultants and/ or Specialist - minimum of two (2) key personnels for each Key Sub-Consultant and/ or Specialist in the Team Identification form in Appendix "A" 3(ii)**

**Delete:**

3 (i) A description of expertise and experience (with number of years) and demonstration of how they are relevant to the specific needs of this RFP (use references to SRE 4.2 as appropriate);

**Insert:**

3 (i) A description of expertise and experience (with number of years) and demonstration of how they are relevant to the specific needs of this RFP (use references to **SRE 3.2.1** as appropriate);

#### **(4) Requests for Clarification**

**Q2.** Considering that the technical proposal is limited to 40 pages, can we submit the PWBS and schedule for one dam site in the proposal and in Appendix for the 3 other sites, considering that they will be pretty similar? Any difference could be mentioned in the text. This will allow to optimize use of the available pages.

**A2.** The maximum number of pages is increased to forty-five (45) pages. See above revision to SRE 3.2.5 Scope of Services.

**Q3.** Reference: PD 7.7 Completion dates show are relative to the award date

- Investigation Report

Can you please confirm that this report is the deliverable for RS 1.2 Pre-Field Inspection.

**A3.** The Investigation Report in PD7.2 refers to the Inspection Report described in RS1.16.3. See above revision to PD 7 Schedule.

**Q4.** I would also like to request a page limit extension of ten (10) pages. I understand that time is of the essence and that PWGSC would like to limit the number of pages submitted to ensure a timely turnaround on the review and award of this procurement, but with the requirement of presenting 4 separate Project Work Breakdown Structures and 4 separate Schedules (one for each Dam and associated structures) it will be difficult to fit all the requested information into 40 pages while ensuring the project work breakdown structures and schedules are legible and detailed

**A4.** Please refer to A9 which removed the need for 4 separate Project Work Breakdown Structures and 4 separate Schedules. The maximum number of pages is increased to forty-five (45) pages.

**Q5.** For SRE 3.2.1 – “Achievements of Proponent on Projects”, is it acceptable to include one or more of our projects where we have completed all of the analyses and field work for the DSR and have submitted the Draft DSR Report but submission of the Finalized DSR Report is still pending the client's review of the Draft DSR Report?

**A5.** The RFP asks for 3 projects “undertaken” and makes no distinction between completed or partially completed projects.

**Q6.** For SRE 3.2.3 – “Expertise and Experience of Key Sub-Consultants and/or Specialist”, PWGSC is requesting a minimum of 2 key personnel for each Key Sub-Consultant and/or Specialist. Is PWGSC requesting that the proponent identify for each specialist discipline one Lead person and a back-up person (who will take over the Lead role if necessary if for any unforeseen reason, the initial Lead person can not fulfill the role) or one Lead person and a second person who will be working under the Lead person, or 2 Senior persons who will be working together on the DSR? Typically, we have a Lead

Engineer for each discipline (ie, Structural Engineer, Hydrology / Hydraulic Engineer, Geotechnical Engineer, Mechanical Engineer, Electrical Engineer, etc) and as required other engineers working under the leads. Could you please clarify.

**A6.** The requirement for Lead Engineer is covered under SRE3.2.2, and the requirement for back-up is covered in SRE 3.2.6. The required information in SRE 3.2.3 is to provide two key personnels for each Key Sub-Consultants and/or Specialist.

**Q7.** Item (3) under SRE 3.2.5, Scope of Services, clearly states the requirement for a Project Schedule for EACH DAM SITE. For the sake of efficiency, consistency and economy, we feel it is important that the work for all four project sites be conducted by the same project team. As a result, we also feel it is important to be able to easily compare the schedules for all the sites, to ensure that the overall schedule is realistic. Therefore, would it be acceptable to put all tasks on a single schedule, but use different colours, say, to identify each project, as well as tasks that are common to all projects?

**A7.** Please refer to A9

**Q8.** Are there any Operations, Maintenance and Surveillance (OMS) Manuals which contain stage-discharge curves for the spillways?

**A8.** There are no OMS manuals. The RFP is asking the consultant to prepare the stage-discharge curves in RS 1.9.

**Q9.** Section SRE 3.2.5 Scope of Services of the RFP stated that the Proponent should provide a Project Work Breakdown Structure (PWBS) and a Project Schedule for EACH DAM SITE.

We respectfully suggest that the DSR work for the Dams and locks ( four sites located in the same region) will be carried out concurrently and we ask PWGSC whether a single Work Breakdown Structure (PWBS) and a schedule can be submitted for the whole project.

**A9.** Basically, the proposal is to contain one typical Project Work Breakdown Structure (PWBS) and a Project Schedule for Frankford Dam 6 and Lock 6. In addition, the consultants will ask to provide a separate summary schedule showing only the main key activities for the other three sites. See above revision to SRE 3.2.5 Scope of Services.

**Q10.** Can the Propoent modify the last page of "Appendix C – Price Proposal Form" to add additional lines under "Staff" to accommodate the number of team members the Proponent has and to include additional lines to include rates for different engineering / drafting levels ?

**A10.** Yes.

- 
- Q11. On Page 73 – first sentence PWGSC makes reference to “SRE 4.3”. We do not appear to have “SRE 4.3”. Are we missing “SRE 4.3” ?
- A11.** Please refer to **Revision to SRE 3.2: RATED REQUIREMENTS - SRE 3.2.6 Management of Services (2) (i) c)** above.
- Q12. On Page 76, item 3 (ii) reference is made to “SRE 4.2”. We do not appear to have “SRE 4.2”. Are we missing “SRE 4.2” ?
- A12.** Please refer to **Revision to SRE 3.3: EVALUATION AND RATING - SRE 3.3.1: Evaluation Table -SRE 3.2.2 Expertise and Experience of Lead Engineer 3(ii)** above.
- Q13. Appendix A does not list some key positions that we would normally fill for a project of this type. May we add positions and names to complete the team we would like to propose, or are we limited to the spaces that are currently included?
- A13.** Yes. But the Consultant Team must include all the positions in the Appendix “A” - Team Identification format. Please refer to SRE3.1.2 Consultant Team Identification. Failure to meet this requirement will render the proposal non-responsive.

All other terms and conditions remain the same.