

**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

<b>Title - Sujet</b> EAST BLOCK REHABILITATION	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EP747-141835/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 008
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> 20141835	<b>Date</b> 2014-03-06
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$FE-175-64590	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> fe175.EP747-141835	<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 2014-03-20</b>	
<b>Time Zone</b> Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT	
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Lohnes, Melissa	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> fe175
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 956-6097 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (819) 956-3160
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	

**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 issued to respond to the following questions:**

**QUESTION 39:**

The deliverable 1.2.4.6 d) Inspection that is part of the Pre-Design Report requires 'Marked-up drawings indicating results of the stone survey, documenting the condition of each individual stone'.

Does the definition of the tactile inspection as indicated in paragraph b) of this section include a sounding of the stone? What kind of equipment will PWGSC be providing for the inspection including the stone survey?

**RESPONSE 39:**

The tactile inspection of the building envelope will include sounding of the stone. PWGSC will provide equipment necessary to access the building envelope such as scaffolding, cranes, lifts, etc.. Any required testing equipment will be the responsibility of the Consultant.

Refer to the response to Question 30, Amendment 005.

**QUESTION 40:**

RS6, 6.1.6 f), requires archeological recording. Is this a requirement where we need to solicit proposals from archeologists on our teams? If so, are there any reports indicating what may be buried around the foundations and in particular within the courtyard?

**RESPONSE 40:**

Archeological recording is no longer required. Delete RS6, 6.1.6 f).

**QUESTION 41:**

Further to amd 005 Q&A 25, and PD 2.3.3.: item D indicates "*Work related to the Swing Move Plans*".

Could you please elaborate or clarify the scope of this item?

**RESPONSE 41:**

This work will be limited to coordination with PWGSC, the CMA, and other project stakeholders to develop and document the swing move plans required to implement this project. This will require the Consultant to produce the swing move plans detailing the sequence of occupant moves required to execute the project as described in the RS sections.

**QUESTION 42:**

With reference to RS6.2 Resident Site Services, clause R1230D GC 5.12 Terms of Payment and Appendix G Work plan

It appears that unlike other PWGSC RFP's the requirement for resident site services is a part of the fixed percentage fee. With reference to RS 6.2 the consultant is to provide "*daily Resident Site Services*". According to RS 6.2.3, there are four individuals listed that make up the resident site services team that "*...are required to be on site during construction to the degree required to deliver the required services*"

- a) it is unclear how we should bid this portion of work. Does PWGSC expect the four individuals to be on site every day?
- b) does PWGSC expect a resident site office to be paid for by the Consultant in accordance with Terms of Payment?
- c) due to the risks associated with a heritage building located on Parliament Hill, the risks of unknown level of construction expertise that may be procured and the amount of unknown conditions that could arise, could a prescriptive description be provided in RS6 resident site services that could be reflected in bidders' appendix G work plan?
- d) To ensure fair and balanced bidding process and understanding of the level of effort, we would alternatively recommend that per previous PWGSC RFP's the RSR services be based on as required hourly rates.

**RESPONSE 42:**

- a) PWGSC is expecting the Proponent to demonstrate an understanding of the nature of this building envelope rehabilitation work by identifying and presenting appropriate and reasonable resourcing levels for the required individuals.
- b) PWGSC will provide a conditioned site office including furniture for the RSR's. The Consultant will be required to supply all required business tools (computers, printers, phones, etc.).
- c) See response (a) above.
- d) The requirements of RS6 will remain unchanged. See response (a) above.

**QUESTION 43:**

When filling in Appendix G, Resource Work Plan, we understand that we are to enter the names of key personnel and their level of effort for each RS.

We also note that for a project of this scale and duration, there will be non-key support personnel of various levels of seniority, involved in such work as producing documents for each RS. The numbers of such support staff will be significant, and over the eight-year duration, firms may need to reassign some support personnel, some may leave firms while new hires join. Therefore, would it be acceptable for us to also add categories of support personnel to the Resource Work Plan without showing names at this time?

This is an approach we use, considered satisfactory in developing matrices of level of effort for other Federal proposals.

**RESPONSE 43:**

It would be acceptable to add categories of support personnel to the Resource Work Plan without showing names at this time. However, all Key Personnel as defined in the RFP are to be named in the Resource Work Plan.

**QUESTION 44:**

With reference to amendment 6 question and answer #37 the response to the question regarding who is responsible for costs for translations answers the question by referring one to Appendix C, Price Proposal Form, Disbursements where it reads:

(for) "*Bilingual documents (beyond services/ deliverables stated in project brief), Allowance: \$100,000*"

What bilingual documents if any, does PWGSC see as being part of the services/ deliverables stated in the project brief and therefore not covered by this allowance

**RESPONSE 44:**

All documents to be published for tendering purposes are to be in both official languages. The cost for translation of these documents will be covered under the identified allowance. The Consultant will however be responsible for Quality Control for this translation and for ensuring the accuracy of the translated documents.

All other project documents may be produced in the language of choice of the Consultant. However, the Consultant must be capable of receiving documents and responding to documents in both official languages. Similarly, during presentations, the Consultant must be capable to receive questions and to provide responses in both official languages. PWGSC will not cover any cost associated with translation to meet these requirements.

**QUESTION 45:**

We note that in Amendment 005, there is the option that Structural and Seismic Engineers can be either:

- Two separate sub-consultants, whose achievements will be valued in SRE 3.2 as 10 points
- One combined Structural / Seismic Consultant, whose achievements will be valued in SRE 3.2 as 10 points

We seek clarification about the maximum number of projects to be shown.

Is PWGSC looking for a maximum of two Structural and two Seismic projects to be described, for a total of four, or a maximum of two projects in total covering both Structural and Seismic combined?

In Amendment 004, replacement Table 3.4.1, we note that for the Proponent and for each sub-consultant except Structural and Seismic, it is clear that 5 points is anticipated for each project. By extension, it would appear that for the 10 Structural / Seismic combined, or 5 points each if they are separate, a maximum of two projects is anticipated.

**RESPONSE 45:**

A maximum of two projects will be accepted to demonstrate the achievements of the Structural Engineer / Seismic Engineer Specialist whether they be from two individual sub-consultants (I.E. one sub-consultant representing Structural achievements and the other Seismic achievements) or from the same sub-consultant (I.E. one sub-consultant representing both Structural and Seismic achievements).

**ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS SHALL REMAIN THE SAME.**