

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

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 DOCUMENT CONTAINS A SECURITY
REQUIREMENT /
CE DOCUMENT CONTIENT UNE EXIGENCE
EN MATIÈRE DE SÉCURITÉ.

Vendor/Firm Name and Address

**Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur**

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution

Construction Services Division/Division des services de
construction
11 Laurier St./11 Rue Laurier
3C2, Place du Portage
Phase III
Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet Macdonald-Cartier Br. Rehab.	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EP731-141814/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 007
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20141814	Date 2014-02-06
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$\$FG-345-64316	
File No. - N° de dossier fg345.EP731-141814	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2014-02-12	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Standard Time EST
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Nealon, Shawn	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur fg345
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-3391 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-8335
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: Pont Macdonald-Cartier Bridge, Ottawa, Ontario / Gatineau, Quebec	

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 IS RAISED TO ANSWER QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY POTENTIAL BIDDERS AND ISSUE ADDENDUM NO. 3

QUESTION # 5

We are requesting an additional walk through of the site. After reviewing the drawings and further discussions with our steel and jacking subcontractors there are concerns with the conditions of the existing steel and pier concrete which requires a second look.

As you are aware the day of the pretender site visit it was extremely cold and there wasn't a lot of time spent reviewing the site. If there are constructability issues with the design it would be in the owner best interest to know pretender.

RESPONSE

Second optional site visit

Date: Thursday, February 6th, 2014

Time: 1:00 pm

Location: At the Quebec abutment near the entrance to the abutment

Safety: It is mandatory that all persons attending the site visit have the proper safety attire. Safety footwear, hard hats, vests and glasses are required. Bidders personnel/individuals who do not have the proper safety attire will be denied access to the site.

Other: No question will be answered during this second optional site visit.

QUESTION # 6

1) Bearings:

1a) Between section "05 65 00" of the Specifications and drawings A1 to A27, the description is different for designating the same laminated bearings, which makes reading the documents difficult and leads to confusion. Can this be clarified? For example, does the term "Nouveaux appareils d'appui laminés et de type élastomérique" in the Specifications [see French version] correspond to the term "élastomère fretté" in the Drawings? Does the term "Nouveaux appareils d'appui laminés, de type élastomérique et conçus pour offrir une protection contre les secousses sismiques" in the [French] Specifications correspond only to "appareils d'appui sismique en élastomères frettés" in the drawings, or does it also correspond to "élastomère fretté" in general?

RESPONSE: Refer to Addendum No.2

1b) At the Gatineau and Ottawa abutments, it appears that the details in drawings A1 to A27 show that the work to repair the bankseats and beams will result in a vertical clearance for installing the new bearings equal in thickness to the existing bearings to be replaced. However, item 1.5.1 of section "05 65 00" of the Specifications indicates that "[t]he dimensions specified on the contract drawings are given as an indication," which suggests that the thickness of the "new seismic elastomeric laminated bearings" specified in Drawing A27 may be altered. Please clarify whether the thicknesses of the new bearings can be different from those of the bearings shown in Drawing A27.

RESPONSE:

Refer to Addendum No.2

1c) If the answer to Question 1b), above, requires that the bearings be built to the thickness specified, can we use materials that are not indicated in standard "CAN/CSA S6"? We checked the data specified for the "new seismic elastomeric laminated bearings," and we note that it is not possible to design laminated bearings that meet all of the criteria in standard S6. However, it is possible to do so using materials acceptable per standard "AASHTO Standard Specifications for Highway Bridges" (see section "05 65 00", item 1.3.1.1).

RESPONSE:

Refer to Addendum No.2

1d) At item 1.8, "Testing," of section "05 65 00" of the Specifications, paragraphs .2 et .3 are identical. Is this correct?

RESPONSE:

Refer to Addendum No.2

2) Joints:

2a) At item 1.5.8 of section "07 95 13" of the Specifications, it is stated "Overall dimensions and cross-fall to match as-built dimensions and cross-fall on the bridge as determined by field survey." This seems to explain the lack of information in the project drawings. In addition, drawings S01 and S45 seem to illustrate very complex deck geometry, with numerous changes in slope and several splices between the work phases. For bidding purposes, could we have more information on the locations of the slope changes? Our fatigue testing results specified design rules for the slope changes and field splices that require specific support beam arrangements. It is therefore important to know where the slope changes occur to estimate those joints correctly.

ANSWER:

Bid as per plans and specification. Overall dimensions and cross-fall to match existing as-built dimensions and cross-fall on the bridge as determined by field survey. For bid purposes see Contract Drawings and Historical Documents (Annex C) for existing geometry and deck cross-fall.

2b) On Drawing S46, in the "Table of Design Requirements," the "J" data shown are according to the joint's total gap. However, this value "J" includes the width of each of the joint's separation beams, which is not specified. The joint separation beams we will propose are not necessarily the same width as those shown in Drawing S46. Is it possible to obtain values that do not include the width of the separation beams? For example, could you give us the gap values for each of the 5 seals? We will thus be able to add the width of our separation beams to obtain value "J" for the joints we will propose in our bid.

RESPONSE:

Refer to Addendum No.2

QUESTION # 7

1. Would there be a soils report available for this project in particular for the area where the screw piles are to be installed?

RESPONSE:

Bid as per plans and specification. There is no available report in the area of the screw piles.

2. The tender documents note that the catwalk steel is to be galvanized, but it does not indicate that the screw piles are to be galvanized would you please clarify.

RESPONSE:

Bid as per plans and specification. Refer to section 31 62 26 19 at part 2 subsection 2.1.2.

QUESTION # 8

1. For article 04 - Access to Work – Pier Concrete Repairs, would it be possible to have the dimensions of the piers.

RESPONSE:

Bid as per plans and specification. Refer to the Historical Documents (Annex C) for pier dimensions.

2. For articles 14 to 17 – Partial depth concrete removal, the plans and specification are indicating estimated quantities for each item.

We would like to confirm if these areas are located in one area or multiple ones.

For example, for article 17 – Deck soffit, do we have to plan for the 825 m2 repairs to be conducted in one area or in multiple ones? This will have an important impact on the price. If in multiple areas, would you be able to provide more details?

In order to provide the best price, we are considering a reasonable amount of repairs (10 units).

RESPONSE:

Bid as per plans and specification. Refer to the additional historical drawing below:

- a. PWGSC – Drawing UD1 - Macdonald-Cartier Bridge, Comprehensive Detailed Inspection, Underside Deck Conditions I, December 2011
- b. PWGSC – Drawing UD2 - Macdonald-Cartier Bridge, Comprehensive Detailed Inspection, Underside Deck Conditions II, December 2011
- c. PWGSC – Drawing UD3 - Macdonald-Cartier Bridge, Comprehensive Detailed Inspection, Underside Deck Conditions III, December 2011
- d. PWGSC – Drawing UD4 - Macdonald-Cartier Bridge, Comprehensive Detailed Inspection, Underside Deck Conditions IV, December 2011
- e. PWGSC – Drawing UD5 - Macdonald-Cartier Bridge, Comprehensive Detailed Inspection, Underside Deck Conditions V, December 2011
- f. PWGSC – Drawing UD6 - Macdonald-Cartier Bridge, Comprehensive Detailed Inspection, Underside Deck Conditions VI, December 2011

-
- g. PWGSC – Drawing UD7 - Macdonald-Cartier Bridge, Comprehensive Detailed Inspection, Underside Deck Conditions VII, December 2011
 - h. PWGSC – Drawing UD8 - Macdonald-Cartier Bridge, Comprehensive Detailed Inspection, U/S Deck at South Approach, December 2011
 - i. PWGSC – Drawing UD9 - Macdonald-Cartier Bridge, Comprehensive Detailed Inspection, U/S Deck at North Approach, December 2011
-

3. For article 35 - Pier 2 Void - Concrete Repair, could you provide details of the pier and of the underwater works.

RESPONSE:

Bid as per plans and specification. Refer to the additional historical drawing below:

- a. PWGSC – Drawing AB1 – Macdonald-Cartier Bridge, Comprehensive Detailed Inspection, North Abutment, November 2011
 - b. PWGSC – Drawing AB2 – Macdonald-Cartier Bridge, Comprehensive Detailed Inspection, South Abutment, November 2011
 - c. PWGSC – Drawing P1 – Macdonald-Cartier Bridge, Comprehensive Detailed Inspection, Pier No. 1, December 2011
 - d. PWGSC – Drawing P2 – Macdonald-Cartier Bridge, Comprehensive Detailed Inspection, Pier No. 2, December 2011
 - e. PWGSC – Drawing P3 – Macdonald-Cartier Bridge, Comprehensive Detailed Inspection, Pier No. 3, December 2011
 - f. PWGSC – Drawing P4 – Macdonald-Cartier Bridge, Comprehensive Detailed Inspection, Pier No. 4, December 2011
-

QUESTION # 9

Contractors located in Quebec are asking me for prices for the jerseys required for the project.

I would like to bid using jerseys recognized by the Ministère des Transports du Québec. For this purpose, I'm including the standardized drawings.

The jerseys specified on the plans are as per the Ontario standard. Can I bid using an equivalent product?

(Include as a reference the file attached by the applicant – Dessins normalises.pdf)

RESPONSE:

Refer to Addendum No. 2

QUESTION # 10

Following our analysis of item 50 – screw piles for the Macdonald-Cartier rehabilitation project, would it be possible to get information on the type of soil?

RESPONSE:

Bid as per plans and specification. There is no available report in the area of the screw piles.

QUESTION # 11

Drawing S24

On the view : Typical cantilever floorbeam elevation, there is a new L 127 x 89 x 13 x 680lg and we do not see any note, section or detail showing if it has holes on the other leg and what is the other parts connecting to the L. Would you be kind to give more precision.

RESPONSE:

Bid as per plans and specification. Refer to details provided on Drawing S24 – Structural Steel III. There are no holes in or other components connected to the outstanding leg of the stiffening angle.

QUESTION # 12

Just a small query in regard to drawings E9 and E11, note4

This states that a loop of 500m is required for structure movement should this be 500mm

RESPONSE:

See Addendum No. 2

QUESTION # 13

1. I would to Visit the site next Tuesday February 4, anytime after 9:30 am would work for me. Reason for this request is that I have a steel and jacking sub –contractor that would like to walk through the site.

RESPONSE:

A second optional site visit is being organized on February 6, 2014 stating at 1:00 pm. Meeting point will be at the Quebec Abutment.

2. Is there a Geotechnical Report available for this project, in particular for the area of the Screw piles and the Rock Face Stabilization.

RESPONSE:

Bid as per plans and specification. There is no available report in the area of the screw piles. Refer to the additional historical report entitled “GEOTECHNICAL ASSESSMENT AND INPUT TO DESIGN WIDENING OF ABUTMENT FOOTING AND STEM OTTAWA ABUTMENT – MACDONALD CARTIER BRIDGE, OTTAWA, ONTARIO, 2013 for the area where the rock face stabilization is required.

QUESTION # 14

1. Can you confirm the estimated quantities for the unit price items 29, 30, 31, 32 and 33 as there are required in cubic meter. For example, the estimated quantity for item 30 is 102m3 of repairs. If we assume a depth of 150 mm of concrete this would represent roughly 7500 ft2 of repairs on the piers only. This seems high? Should this be in square meter?

RESPONSE:

Bid as per plans and specification.

2. Can you provide a report for the underwater works that would have been prepared by a specialized firm as the information provide in the plans and specification is insufficient to submit a bid for this work.

RESPONSE:

Refer to Addendum No. 2

QUESTION # 15

Looking at the pricing schedule I do not see any spot for the electrical work and was wondering how you wanted this work presented.

RESPONSE:

Bid as per plans and spec. Refer to Appendix 1 – combined price form. LUMP SUM - The Lump Sum Amount designates Work to which a Lump Sum Arrangement applies.

(a) Work included in the Lump Sum Amount represents all work not included in the unit price table.

QUESTION # 16

Section 05 65 20 1.4.2 1 and 2.

Sets criteria for previous experience, ARDY Rigging along with our Specialist Engineering sources are completing high profile work in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. Unfortunately these structures do not meet the same size as the structure in this project, even as the complexity of our projects does. Is there an opportunity to have our experienced accessed prior to bid closing.

Our company scope of work is jacking and we believe we are well suited to the jacking scope of work.

RESPONSE:

Bid as per plans and specification.

QUESTION # 17

NOT APPLICABLE

QUESTION # 18

Can you please confirm the interrupting capacity for each of the panels the reason I ask is because:
In the spec it calls for "250 V panel boards: bus and breakers rated for **22,000 A** symmetrical interrupting capacity"

On the single line the description calls for "New distribution panel no. PD3 , PD3A, PD5A 120/240V 100A, 3 wires, 8 circuits, **IRC 14KA**, NEMA 3R. Also under that description the breakers call for BREAKER 15A 1P IRC **10KA**, 120V

RESPONSE:

Refer to addendum No. 3.

QUESTION # 19

Article 1.6.4 of section 01 14 00 states that no in-water work/activity must occur during the period of March 15 to July 15. Can a barge be used during this time in order to proceed with repair works?

You can reformulate the question if you feel it is not clear. Are you banning in-water work activities to be done at pier 2 or all in-water work as well as work from a barge. The use of a small pleasure craft is permitted during this period so this is the reason why we are asking why the use of a barge would not be permitted?

RESPONSE:

Bid as per plans and specification. No in-water work/activity must occur during this period. The use of a barge is permissible during this period. Refer to section 01 35 43, item 1.7 regarding environmental restrictions.

QUESTION # 20

Extension of bid closing date

RESPONSE:

To be determined

QUESTION # 21

For plan C18, detail 45, there is no detail on the type of steel to be used for the sidewalk. Could you specify the type of reinforcing to be used and the dimensions.

Response: Refer to addendum No. 3.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EP731-141814/A

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

007

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

fg345

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

20141814

File No. - N° du dossier

fg345EP731-141814

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

ADDEMDUM NO. 3

ADDENDUM No. 3

Project Number R.005066.506

The following changes in the bid documents are effective immediately. This addendum will form part of the contract documents.

PLANS

- 1 Drawing C18
 - .1 Detail 45 – Concrete sidewalk and/or slab: The steel reinforcing bar shown on the detail to be identified as following: « Dowels 15Mx1000 @ 300mm c/c, anchored to concrete on one side and with an open sleeve on the other side at the expansion joint. »
 - .2 Detail 45 – Concrete sidewalk and/or slab: The top left corner of the sidewalk to be rounded with a radius of 40mm.
 - .3 Detail 50 – Concrete median slab: The steel reinforcing bar shown on the detail to be identified as following: « Anchor dowels 15Mx1000 @ 300mm c/c, to concrete on one side and with an open sleeve on the other side at the expansion joint. »

SPECIFICATIONS

- 1 Section 26 24 16.01 – Panelboards breaker type
Article 2.1.3: Replace this article by the following text: 250V panelboards, bus rated for 14 000A symmetrical min. interrupting capacity, breakers rated for 10 000A symmetrical interrupting capacity.