

**RETURN BIDS TO:**  
**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**  
**Public Works and Government Services Canada**  
**Telus Plaza North/Plaza Telus Nord**  
**10025 Jasper Ave./10025 ave. Jaspe**  
**5th floor/5e étage**  
**Edmonton**  
**Alberta**  
**T5J 1S6**  
**Bid Fax: (780) 497-3510**

## **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**  
**Telus Plaza North/Plaza Telus Nord**  
**10025 Jasper Ave./10025 ave. Jasper**  
**5th floor/5e étage**  
**Edmonton**  
**Alberta**  
**T5J 1S6**

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Consultant - Agronomy Bldg Repairs	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> E0209-140619/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 003
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> AAFC-E0209-140619	<b>Date</b> 2013-10-25
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$PWU-909-9952	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> PWU-3-36168 (909)	<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 2013-11-04</b>	<b>Time Zone</b> <b>Fuseau horaire</b> Mountain Standard Time MST
<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> Mayhew (RPC), Sylvia	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> pwu909
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (780) 497-3645 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (780) 497-3510
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b> PWGSC on behalf of Agriculture and Agri-Foods Canada, Lethbridge Research Center, Lethbridge, AB	

**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>

---

This amendment is raised to provide the following clarifications:

**Question 1:**

Meetings: How many design meetings should the consultants allow for?

**Answer 1:**

Four (4) Meetings - Start-up, Design, 50%, and 99%

**Question 2:**

Design submissions:

Can PWGSC confirm the number of design submissions as 50% & 99%? GP&S standard refers to more.

**Answer 2:**

As noted in Section 1.1.2.3 of the Terms of Reference, "In the case of a conflict between the two documents, the requirements of the TOR override the GP&S Document." The number of submissions is stated in Section 2.3 of the TOR: 50% complete Construction Documents, and 99% complete Construction Documents.

**Question 3:**

Option #1 & Option#2

As the scope of work is different for Option #1 & #2, can PWGSC please confirm which option will be used to prepare design documents.

**Answer 3:**

The Terms of Reference states in Section 1.2.1.3: "The design will be for repairing and redeveloping the existing building, following the recommended modifications as identified in the 'Fire Damages Report'". Subsequently, the Fire Damages Report states in Section 4.0 Conclusion: "It is our recommendation that Option B: Install a Firewall to separate the north wing (fire damaged wing) from the remainder of the building, to rectify the life safety concerns." Thus, Option B is to be followed.

**Question 4:****Civil Engineering.**

What known civil engineering work is required for the project. Preparing a fee for an unknown scope of work is not a normal contractual practice.

**Answer 4:**

1. Our Terms of Reference states in section 1.5.1.1: “The prime consultant will provide a full consulting team including the following consultant services and specialties as required”. Civil Engineering is listed like other disciplines, but the phrase “as required” is meant to leave the selection up to the discretion of the prime consultant, so a civil engineer may not be required for the recommended solution. It is acceptable to delete Civil Engineer from the list of sub-consultants in Section 1.5.1.1.

**Question 5:****Cost Estimator.**

How many cost estimates are required? The RFP documents (GP&S Standard) refers to a Class D, C, B & A – this may be excessive for a project with a budget of \$405,000.

**Answer 5:**

As noted in Section 1.1.2.3 of the Terms of Reference, “In the case of a conflict between the two documents, the requirements of the TOR override the GP&S Document.” The number of cost estimates is stated in Section 2.3.3 of the TOR: a Class “B” Estimate at 50% complete Construction Documents, and a Class “A” Estimate at 99% complete Construction Documents.

**Question 6:****Commissioning Specialist.**

The RFP documents refer to an in-depth commissioning process that would normally be conducted on a significantly larger project. Please confirm that PWGSC requires a commissioning specialist. Note: commissioning service is indicated as NOT IN CONTRACT (FUTURE PHASE). Recommendation:

1. basic commissioning of mech and elec item by each discipline – no enhanced commissioning specialist services.
2. Preparation of NMS Commissioning standard specifications
3. Delete requirement for Commissioning Specialist

**Answer 6:**

Although a Commissioning Specialist is noted in the TOR’s Section 1.5.1.1 to be provided “as required”, in Section 2.6 Commissioning Service, the requirement for a Specialist is not stated. Thus, it is acceptable to delete Commissioning Specialist from the list of sub-consultants in Section 1.5.1.1. The recommendation noted here is acceptable.

**End of Amendment.**