

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 Dam Safety Reviews - Upper Kawartha	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EQ754-133603/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 001
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client R.063182.201	Date 2013-07-16
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$PWL-042-1864	
File No. - N° de dossier PWL-3-36011 (042)	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2013-07-25	
Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT	
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Specified Herein - Précisé dans les présentes	
Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Correia-Reid, Vincent	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur pwl042
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (416) 590-8259 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (416) 512-5862
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: Rosedale Dam & Lock 35 Little Bob River Dam Victoria Road Dams Burleigh Falls Dam & Lock 28 Buckhorn Dam & Lock 31 White's Portage Dam Six Mile Like Dams Trent Severn Waterway Peterborough Municipality, 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

Amendment No. 001

This amendment is being raised to (1) Incorporate Revisions to the Project Brief section of the RFP, (2) incorporate Revisions to the Submission Requirements and Evaluation section of the RFP and (3) provide responses to Requests for Clarification.

(1) PROJECT BRIEF REVISIONS

(i) Project Description (PD), PD 5 Review Engineer and Consultant Team, 5.5 (*This change applies to the English version of the RFP only*)

Delete: In its entirety

Insert: PD 5.5 The Lead Engineer assigned to this project **should** be co-located with the majority of the Consulting team carrying out the work under this Project Brief.

(ii) Description of Services, Required Services (RS), RS 1.3 Site Inspection, 1. Field Inspection and Records, (a)(v)

Delete: In its entirety

Insert: (v) A detailed mechanical **and electrical** inspection, to verify condition, reliability and functionality of the components of the dam, including but not limited to:

(1) Hydraulic log lifter and back-up manual winches.

(2) Radial-arm 'fishbelly' taintor gates and operating machinery.

(3) Electrical wiring and installations are to be reviewed and inspected to assess code compliance, including but not limited to limit switches, control panels, MCC controls, electrical motors and wiring, including amperage testing of motors (including measuring rush current on motors at start-up), and gate and gain heaters.

(iii) Description of Services, Required Services (RS), RS 1.3 Site Inspection, 1. Field Inspection and Records, (a)(ix)

Delete: In its entirety

Insert: (ix) Plans, drawings, and photographs as appropriate shall be prepared to document the location, type, and extent of deterioration and/or problem areas. The Consultant shall identify the probable cause or causes of such deterioration (e.g. freeze thaw action, ice damage, seepage, alkali-silica reaction, settlement, etc.). Mechanical **and electrical** deficiencies are also to be documented on the plans and drawings, with supporting photographs.

(2) SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION (SRE) REVISIONS

(i) SRE 2.2 Specific Requirements for Proposal Format

Delete: In its entirety

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

- (1) Covering letter;
- (2) Front page of the RFP;
- (3) Front page of solicitation amendment(s) to the RFP, if any;
- (4) Consultant Team Identification (Appendix A);
- (5) Declaration/Certifications Form (Appendix B);
- (6) Price Proposal Form (Appendix C);
- (7) Code of Conduct Certification (Appendix B - Annex BB);
- (8) **Table of Contents; and**
- (9) **Tabs/Page Dividers (provided they are free of text and graphics)**

(ii) SRE 3 Submission Requirements and Evaluation, 3.2 Rated Requirements, 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)

(iii) SRE 3 Submission Requirements and Evaluation, 3.2 Rated Requirements, 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 **Whites Portage Dam** 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 **Whites Portage Dam** 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 six (6) sites with target dates for major project milestones and deliverables only.**

(iv) SRE 3 Submission Requirements and Evaluation, 3.2 Rated Requirements, 3.2.6 Management of Services, (1)

Delete: In its entirety

Insert:

- (1) Describe how the Proponent will set up, organize and manage all resources (i.e. Prime Consultant, the Joint-Venture Consultant(s)(as applicable), the Sub-consultants and other key personnel) to form a project team capable of effectively providing all the required services and deliverables, addressing all issues and constraints, and meeting all the challenges of the project. **As mentioned in PD 5.5, the Lead Engineer assigned to this project should be co-located with the majority of the Consulting team carrying out the work under this Project Brief.**

(v) SRE 3 Submission Requirements and Evaluation, 3.3 Evaluation and Rating, 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: In its entirety

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

(vi) SRE 3 Submission Requirements and Evaluation, 3.3 Evaluation and Rating, 3.3.1 Evaluation Table - SRE 3.2.5 Scope of Services

Delete: 2 (ii) A Project Work Breakdown Structure (PWBS) for EACH DAM SITE

3 A Project Schedule for EACH DAM SITE

Insert: 2 (ii) A Project Work Breakdown Structure (PWBS) for WHITES PORTAGE DAM

3 A Project Schedule for WHITES PORTAGE DAM

(vii) SRE 3 Submission Requirements and Evaluation, 3.3 Evaluation and Rating, 3.3.3 Generic Evaluation Table

Delete: In its entirety

Insert:

PWGSC Evaluation Board members will evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the Proponent's response to the evaluation criteria and will rate each criterion with even numbers (0, 2, 4, 6, 8 or 10) using the generic evaluation table below:

	INADEQUATE	WEAK	ADEQUATE	FULLY SATISFACTORY	STRONG
0 point	2 points	4 points	6 points	8 points	10 points
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 an excellent understanding of the requirements.
	Weaknesses cannot be corrected	Generally doubtful that weaknesses can be corrected	Weaknesses can be corrected	No significant weaknesses	No apparent weaknesses
	Proponent do not possess qualifications and experience	Proponent lacks qualifications and experience	Proponent has an acceptable level of 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 most 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 requirement	Sample projects generally not related to this requirement	Sample projects generally related to this requirement	Sample projects directly related to this requirement	Leads in sample projects directly related to this requirement
	Extremely poor, insufficient to meet performance requirements	Little capability to meet performance requirements	Acceptable capability, should ensure adequate results	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 sixty (60) points out of the hundred (100) points available as specified above.

No further consideration will be given to proponents not achieving the pass mark of sixty (60) points.

(3) REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION

- Q1. Would we be able to increase the page limitation to 55 pages instead of 40 pages?
- A1. The maximum number of pages is increased to forty-five (45) pages.
- Q2. On page 29 of the English version of the RFP, it says that the Lead Engineer needs to be co-located with the majority of the consulting team. Is this a mandatory requirement? There is no weight factor in the evaluation table for it.
- A2. Please refer to Revisions (1)(i) and (2)(iv) above. The requirement is not mandatory, but it will be evaluated as part of SRE 3.2.6.
- Q3. 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 the proposal contain one PWBS/schedule for a typical site that would be supplemented by a summary schedule showing only the main key activities for the other six sites in the appendices. Any differences could be mentioned in the text. This would allow us to optimize the use of available pages.
- A3. Please refer to Revisions (2)(iii) and (2)(vi) above. The references to EACH DAM SITE are being replaced with WHITES PORTAGE DAM only.
- Q4. For SRE 3.3 Evaluation and Rating SRE 3.3.1 Evaluation Table (Pages 74 and 75)
Each Weight factor for each SRE section adds up to exactly 1 Point per section.
Then in section SRE 3.3.2 Evaluation and Rating (table Page 76) the weight factors for each SRE section range from 1 point to 2.5 points to equal a total of 10 points.
Can you please issue a new SRE 3.3.1 Evaluation Table with the proper weight factors for each SRE Item to reflect the weight factors in SRE 3.3.2.
- A4. SRE 3.3.1 Evaluation Table identifies the Weight Factor to be applied to each individual 'sub-requirement' for each individual Rated Requirement. For example, for SRE 3.2.1 - Proponents are to describe past accomplishments, achievements and experience. SRE 3.2.1.(2)

items 'i - v' identifies what is to be described/provided. The Evaluation Table at SRE 3.3.1 further shows the Weight assigned to items 'i - v' that are to be provided under SRE 3.2.1.(2).

Each Rated Requirement 'sub-requirement' (items 'i - v' in the example above) will be evaluated with even numbers using the Generic Evaluation Table in SRE 3.3.3.

The total Rating calculated for the respective Rated Requirement is then multiplied by the Weight Factor identified in the Evaluation and Rating Table in SRE 3.3.2, which then becomes the Weighted Rating contributing to the overall Technical Rating.

Example:

1) SRE3.3.2 EVALUATION TABLE

SRE 3.2.1	Weight Factor	Eval. *	
2 (i)	0.3	8	2.4
2(ii)	0.25	6	1.5
2 (iii)	0.2	4	0.8
2 (iv)	0.15	8	1.2
2 (v)	0.1	10	1
Total Rating			6.9

* Evaluated score using SRE 3.3.3 Generic Evaluation Table even numbers

2) SRE3.3.2 EVALUATION AND RATING

Criterion	Weight Factor	Rating	Weighted Rating
SRE 3.2.1 Achievements of Proponent on Projects	1.0	6.9	6.9
SRE 3.2.2 Expertise and Experience of Lead Engineer	1.5	0 - 10	0 - 15
SRE 3.2.3 Expertise and Experience of Key sub-Consultant and/or Specialists	2.5	0 - 10	0 - 25
SRE 3.2.4 Understanding of the Project	1.5	0 - 10	0 - 15
SRE 3.2.5 Scope of Services	1.5	0 - 10	0 - 15
SRE 3.2.6 Management of Services	1.0	0 - 10	0 - 10
SRE 3.2.7 Approach / Methodology	1.0	0 - 10	0 - 10
Technical Rating	10.0		0 - 100

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE RFP REMAIN THE SAME.