

RETURN BIDS TO:
RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:
Regional Manager/Real Property Con
Ontario Region, Tendering Office
12th Floor, 4900 Yonge Street
Toronto, Ontario
M2N 6A6
Ontario

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.

Vendor/Firm Name and Address
**Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur**

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution
Regional Manager/Real Property Contracting/PWGSC
Ontario Region, Tendering Office
12th Floor, 4900 Yonge Street
Toronto, Ontario
M2N 6A6
Ontario

Title - Sujet ITS, Tolling, Electrical & Lighting	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation T8032-130006/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 002
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client T8032-130006	Date 2014-07-03
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$PWL-027-1925	
File No. - N° de dossier PWL-3-36078 (027)	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2014-07-15	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Jackson, Dahlia	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur pwl027
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (416) 512-5918 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (416) 512-5862
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: Detroit River International Crossing Windsor, Ontario Detroit, Michigan	

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	

Amendment No. 002

This amendment is being raised to provide responses to Requests for Clarification.

REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION

- Q1. Regarding the Price Table (Appendix C of the RFP), please clarify how the pricing of item 2.3 should be undertaken. Is this lump sum line item to include all consultant time efforts associated with stakeholder consultations for both items 2.1 and 2.2 of the preparatory studies only, or for the entire project? Are expenses to also be included in this lump sum item, or is it all to be accounted for under item 8.1? Please confirm for our understanding.
- A1. Please refer to Appendix D – Price Proposal Form, article 5.1.2.3. Item 8.1 covers Incidental Costs and Travel Expenses related to items 2.1 to 2.3.
- Q2. In Section S18.2 it indicates that Deloitte, as Canada's project advisor for the DRIC project, is not permitted to submit a response to this RFP. Please confirm therefore that any sub-consultants to the Deloitte project advisory team are also included in this conflict of interest statement, and presuming so, which firms are they?
- A2. The only firm that is precluded from submitting a proposal in response to this RFP is Deloitte.
- Q3. With the view that a submission may wish to introduce additional "other specialist" in their proposal, and so that such specialist rates need not be unduly blended with more routine staff rates, how could this item be presented to allow for this possibility, also, including any hours effort stipulations.
- A3. Other Specialists are paid under items 8.4 and 8.5. Both these items are paid on the basis of Limitation of Expenditures.
- Q4. Given that Canada has stipulated the hours for the preliminary design, and consultants are therefore not party to estimating this effort versus what will be the actual ultimate level of effort, is this pricing table overall more intended as an evaluation tool, and hence, not to be considered as a fixed means of managing staff time and effort?
- A4. In Appendix D – Price Proposal Form, the Price Table Column 5 is titled Total Estimated Quantity. The total cost indicated in the Price Table will be used in the evaluation process.
- Q5. It is our understanding that the ITS, Tolling Systems, Electrical Systems, and Lighting project for the New Champlain Bridge Crossing was awarded in November 2013 for a contract value of \$1,094,217.08 (as indicated on the buyandsell.gc.ca website). The scope of the DRIC project would appear to be in many ways larger in scope and more complex considering it is a major twoport border crossing operation with all the

associated significant international complexities, and hence more stakeholders too, etc. As such, how relevant is the estimated contract value of \$750,000 to \$900,000 (as noted in the project notice), or will proposals be expected to possibly exceed this range, and if so, will they still be considered?

- A5. All compliant proposals will be evaluated. The Estimated Contract Value indicated in the Project Notice is not used in the evaluation process.
- Q6. The Price Table provided in Appendix C of the RFP includes a fixed number of hours for individual roles under the preliminary design phase. Are these hours noted for evaluation purposes only?
- A6. In Appendix D – Price Proposal Form, the Price Table Column 5 is titled Total Estimated Quantity.
- Q7. How will the actual amount of effort required to complete a task, when determined, be approved? Will the Total project cost, at the end of the Price Table, still be fixed?
- A7. Please refer to Appendix D – Price Proposal Form, article 5.1.7.
- Q8. What is roughly the anticipated order of preliminary design required (i.e. 10%, 20%, 30%, etc.), especially given the Class B cost estimate requirement?
- A8. 10%.
- Q9. Given that 35% of the Technical evaluation marks are focused only on the Experts, yet for example the percentage of hours allocated for such roles in the pricing table (<20%) is significantly less compared to all other staff roles (80%), how will the balance of the complete team be evaluated and scored as well? After all, there is only 5% for the project organization, which would seemingly be the only other source for points in this regard. Please clarify.
- A9. Only the Project Manager and Other Key Persons assigned to the project are evaluated.
- Q10. Will the deliverables of this project be integrated with other procurement and project specific output specifications for the overall DRIC P3 RFQ/RFP call for the bridge, plaza, buildings and approach roads? Or, will the ITS deliverables of this assignment be tendered separately?
- A10. The deliverables of this contract will be integrated into the procurement documentation, including project specific output specifications, for the overall DRIC P3 RFQ/RFP.
- Q11. Will the successful proponent team be optionally considered as the “go to” Team for the technical oversight work of the P3 contract design and deployment phase for the ITS, tolling, electrical and lighting elements?

-
- A11. The successful proponent will be retained through to financial close of the DRIC P3 RFQ/RFP and may be requested to provide technical assistance during the request for proposal phase.
- Q12. In as much as the "Cost Estimating Specialist" is listed in the price table, how would "other specialist" be accounted for the in the price table?
- A12. The need for Other Specialists may be may be determined during the duration of the Contract. Simply provide a Firm Mark-Up value.

All other terms and conditions of the solicitation remain the same.