

**RETURN BIDS TO:**  
**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**  
Bid Receiving Public Works and Government  
Services Canada/Réception des soumissions Travaux  
publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada  
800 Burrard Street, 2nd floor  
800, rue Burrard, 2e étage  
Vancouver  
British Columbia  
V6Z 0B9  
Bid Fax: (604) 775-9381

## 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 -  
Pacific Region  
800 Burrard Street, 12th floor  
800, rue Burrard, 12e étage  
Vancouver  
British C  
V6Z 0B9

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Concrete Fiberglass Rearing Ponds	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> F1700-130411/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 003
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b>	<b>Date</b> 2013-12-11
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$PWY-005-7139	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> PWY-3-36199 (005)	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2013-12-17</b>	<b>Time Zone</b> Fuseau horaire Pacific Standard Time PST
<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> Pillay, Sal (PWY)	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> pwy005
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (604) 775-9386 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (604) 775-6633
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b> DFO - Robertson Creek Hatchery - Port Alberni, BC	

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 (type or print)</b> <b>Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/ de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

**ADDENDUM NO. 3****11th December 2013****Robertson Creek Hatchery  
Port Alberni, BC****The following changes/clarifications in the tender documents are effective immediately.  
This Addendum will form part of the Tender/Contract Documents.**

In Addendum 1, it states unequivocally that a 100% solids epoxy system will NOT be accepted as an approved equivalent. Addendum 2 then states the opposite for the non-fish rearing holding zone.

**Q1)** Could you clarify the reason for the ambiguity?

**A1)** During the tour of the ponds it was suggested that we would not need the full resurfacing system, in this case the FRP system, in the "non-holding/rearing" area of the raceways. This is consistent with past practice to reduce the costs associated with filling and making smooth areas where adult fish are only in transition. It was also brought up at the time that there is a percentage of "excessively rough" surface in the "non-holding/rearing" area that would need some degree of filling. We suggested approximately 20% of the "non-holding/rearing" area would need some resurfacing. It was based on this understanding that we came up with the epoxy based system as described in Addendum 2. The epoxy coats are designed to prevent further degradation of the concrete by isolating it from the water. This has proven cost effective at all hatcheries where we have adjusted the scope of the resurfacing to not resurface (fill) areas where fish are not held or reared.

-----

**Q2)** What is the reasoning for using an inferior coating in this area when it is the area that is in most need of protection offered by the fiberglass liner?

**A2)** The epoxy resurfacing and coating system is in no way considered inferior to fiberglass liners in terms of long term performance. The primary reason for specifying the epoxy coats is cost. The 20% filler area is being specified to reduce the excessive surface roughness and treat spalled concrete.

-----

In Addendum 2, changes were made to the procedure of the application of the fiberglass liner to cover over and around the separate channels instead of terminating within 6 inches from the top.

**Q3)** What is the reasoning for this step?

The walls are sectioned, so the need to prevent environmental water penetration is moot due to the effective bleed off provided by the stop channels. These same stop channels allow water to penetrate the full height of submersion when the tanks are full regardless of the system used.) Section C3012 of Contract No. F1700-120411 states the procedures and materials necessary to properly line cement rearing ponds for extended use with these considerations in mind.

**A3)** Whether the sectioning of the walls is effective in providing bleed-off is highly arguable. The distance between section breaks is, in our opinion, too far to provide equal or even adequate bleed off of pressure throughout the structure.

-----

**Q4)** If the application now calls for the liner to cover over the separate channels, what is your recommended procedure to cover over and onto the non fish rearing/ holding zone now that that area has a requirement to have a primer painted on it? (Incompatibility between systems)

**A4)** There is no real incompatibility between the systems. Site decisions will be made where the instructions cause an overlap of systems. The most likely scenario will see the epoxy coatings wrap over the walls where the systems overlap at the transition wall between the holding/non-holding zones.

As a separate note, we could simply allow that the FRP resurfacing shall be installed as specified in Section C3012, 3.3 INSTALLATION. This section describes termination details. Once this has been completed the 2 coat epoxy system can be applied up to the FRP termination points. This would be the lower cost alternative to wrapping the tops of walls with the full FRP system. NOTE: This is probably the best option

-----  
**Q5)** If the application now calls for the liner to cover over the separate channels, what procedure is advised to prevent/eliminate corner lift on the outside top edges?

**A5)** Outside top edges would be finished in accordance with the specification, Section C3012, 3.3 INSTALLATION. Only the termination point would be moved.

-----  
**Q6)** Have you considered that covering the tops would render them too slippery to walk on thus possibly requiring an anti-skid surface procedure?

**A6)** If these ponds require non-skid finishes this can be accomplished by broadcasting aluminum oxide or walnut shell aggregate specifically manufactured for this purpose. Hatchery staff did not raise these concerns. Note, we used walnut shell rolled in to the finish coats at Conuma Hatchery since they expressed the operational requirement at the time of pre-bid viewing.

-----  
**Q7)** As per addendum is it the intention to wrap the FRP around the tops of the perimeter concrete or only the internal tops. Also it only mentions the color for the finish of the Epoxy not the FRP. To match to the Epoxy color would cost more than a standard color.

**A7)** The intention is to make the tops of the walls waterproof. So that the liner does not detach from the concrete. We usually do all of the walls so that there is less chance of future problems arising. The colour need not match perfectly.

-----  
**Q8)** When will the minutes of the site meeting along with the changes to the tender be published?

**A8)** Issued on Buy and Sell as Amendment 02, December 5th 2013.

-----  
**Q9)** Could PW please consider adding separate pricing for alternate methods of coating concrete as even the consultants at site meeting stated Fibreglass would be more expensive than Epoxy Coating.

**A9)** No Alternate pricing methods allowed. We have found that fiber glass liners have been less expensive than the two layer epoxy liners.

**Q10)** At previous sites we had unlimited access to site (not buildings} Are the hours of work in the tender in stone. There will be equipment that need monitoring 24/7.

**A10)** Access to site is at the discretion of the Hatchery Manager. The hours noted in the tender documents are a guide.  
-----

**Q11.** As per the Addendum 2 for the Robertson Creek Hatchery project there will be a section of the non-rearing area of the tanks that are to be filled and coated with epoxy. The addendum does not list the Cloverdale NSP system that I submitted to you last week, which as mentioned before was an approved system for previous work in this location. I have sent all supporting documents and case histories for qualification of this job, should you require them again I would be happy to send them to you again. We have a proven track record as documented and would like to be accepted as an approved alternate for this job. As was the last tender written as a closed spec, listing minimal suppliers which will not only run the cost up as applicators have no choice but to use one system, but we are also a Canadian Supplier and Manufacturer and would like to be accepted for use on our infrastructure.

**A11.** The NSP systems is an approved alternate.

Any change to the system that is currently "approved" will not change the contractors responsibility for the product that he uses and the responsibility will be for the 5 years as in the specifications. The product could only be used in the non fish holding/rearing area. Not in the fish rearing/holding area. Which must be fiberglass lined as in the specifications.

**End of Addendum No. 3**