

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
Bid Fax: (819) 997-9776

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
Consultant Services Division/Division des services
d'experts-conseils
11 Laurier St./11 Rue Laurier
3C2, Place du Portage
Phase III
Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet EAST BLOCK REHABILITATION	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EP747-141835/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 002
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20141835	Date 2014-02-12
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$FE-175-64590	
File No. - N° de dossier fe175.EP747-141835	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2014-03-17	
Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT	
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: Lohnes, Melissa	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur fe175
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-6097 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-3160
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	

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 issued to respond to the following questions:

QUESTION 1:

In accordance with architectural Canadian Handbook of Practice, the reference throughout the RFP document to “inspections” is not typically performed by an architect (see attached). Throughout the RS section of the RFP (RS1, 1.1.5, 1.2.1 Deliverables, 1.2.2 Field Investigation, 1.2.4.8 Investigation and Testing Program etc...). If PWGSC requires “inspections” could you provide greater detail as to what this entails. If not, I would request that this term be reserved for construction or other specialists with this capability and to revise the term to “review” per an architect’s normal scope of services.

RESPONSE 1:

The definition of “inspection” referenced in the “Canadian Handbook of Practice for Architects” applies to inspection of construction. The inspections referenced throughout RS1 to RS4 and RS10 are not associated with construction. Rather, “inspection” referenced throughout these sections is considered “close examination” of the existing building components to assess existing building conditions.

Furthermore, the following sections are hereby amended:

RS 6.2.4.8

Delete the following:

“Through effective and timely communications, the RSR shall arrange for the Consultant to undertake periodic inspections with respect to the progress of the work. The RSR shall further coordinate all inspections with Authorities Having Jurisdiction to review/inspect the construction work at appropriate times and shall advise the Consultant, PWGSC DR, the CMA, and the PMSS of such inspections.”

Replace with:

“Through effective and timely communications, the RSR shall arrange for the Consultant to undertake periodic review with respect to the progress of the work. The RSR shall further coordinate all inspections with Authorities Having Jurisdiction to review/inspect the construction work at appropriate times and shall advise the Consultant, PWGSC DR, the CMA, and the PMSS of such inspections.”

PA 1.7 (g)

Delete the following:

“Ensure the Consultant’s team including sub-consultants provides adequate site inspection services and attend all required meetings.”

Replace with:

“Ensure the Consultant’s team including sub-consultants provides adequate site review services and attend all required meetings.”

RS 6.2.4.1

Delete the following:

“The RSR shall keep a daily log of such inspections and shall issue a weekly written report to the Consultant, for distribution to the Project Team. The RSR shall make available any other reports or surveys as may be requested by the PWGSC DR or PMSS through the Consultant.”

Replace with:

“The RSR shall keep a daily log of such reviews and shall issue a weekly written report to the Consultant, for distribution to the Project Team. The RSR shall make available any other reports or surveys as may be requested by the PWGSC DR or PMSS through the Consultant.”

QUESTION 2:

Are the ventilation tunnels that are visible along the escarpment part of this scope of services?

RESPONSE 2:

No.

QUESTION 3:

RS7 7.1.1, you reference a Schematic Design Update to an existing approved construction budget. Could you provide this budget?

RESPONSE 3:

The existing approved construction budget referenced in RS7, 7.1.1 is the indicative cost estimate presented in the Project Brief.

QUESTION 4:

Can a required and rated sub consultant (not a prime consultant) act as an individual entity in one team and as a joint venture entity with a different sub consultant of the same discipline in another team?

RESPONSE 4:

Yes.

QUESTION 5:

- a) If a consultant only has Reliability clearance, can they be considered for this contract?
- b) Can Secret or Top Secret clearance from another government department or country be transferred / recognized by CISD to meet this security requirement?

RESPONSE 5:

- a) No, they must meet the mandatory requirement of Secret level clearance at the date of bid closing in accordance with Supplementary Instructions to Proponents SI6, Supplementary Conditions SC1, SRE 3.1.6, and Appendix E, SRCL.
- b) The company's CSO must contact CISD to determine if this is possible.

QUESTION 6:

SRE3 – Submission for Requirements and Evaluation – With regards to the above noted project, PWGSC has set the limit for project experience to 15 years. The last major upgrade to the East Block was completed in late 1997 – early 1998 (16 years). Given the complexity of this project, of work on Parliament Hill in general and the length of time between these major PPD projects and the similarity / pertinence of the 1997 project, we would ask that PWGSC revisit the 15 year limitation.

RESPONSE 6:

PWGSC will not be adjusting this criteria.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS SHALL REMAIN THE SAME.