

RETURN BIDS TO:
RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:
Bid Receiving Public Works and Government
Services Canada/Réception des soumissions Travaux
publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Room 100,
167 Lombard Ave.
Winnipeg
Manitoba
R3B 0T6
Bid Fax: (204) 983-0338

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 -
Western Region
Room 100,
167 Lombard Ave.
Winnipeg
Manitoba
R3B 0T6

Title - Sujet Engineering Services, SALD Safety R	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation ET025-150005/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 002
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client PWGSC-ET025-150005	Date 2014-08-12
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$PWZ-014-9047	
File No. - N° de dossier PWZ-4-37041 (014)	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2014-08-19	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Central Daylight Saving Time CDT
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: Fagan, Mike	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur pwz014
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (204) 983-6103 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (204) 983-7796
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

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

ET025-150005/A

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

002

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

pwz014

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

PWGSC-ET025-150005

File No. - N° du dossier

PWZ-4-37041

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

This Amendment #002 is raised to amend Request for Proposal ET025-150005/A as follows:

Part A: Questions and Answers

Part B: Revisions to the Terms of Reference

Part A: Questions and Answers

Q1: What is the extent of the mechanical and electrical review anticipated for the study? The RFP terms of reference do not elaborate on this requirement, but the CDA 2007 guideline, section 6.8 on page 74, outlines typical requirements. However, as this is a low floor structure and the curtains will not be operable in the spring and during summer high flow events, these systems are likely considered to be of lower critically than similar components in a conventional dam structure. Should we exclude or include this review in the study? If the answer is positive, then we assume that a site review of the existing equipment condition, in combination with a review of maintenance records and observation of operation will suffice. There will likely be insufficient existing information available to back calculate the existing hoists and supporting frame capacities, nor is it a reasonable requirement at this stage.

A1: The Dam Safety Review is a systematic review and evaluation of all aspects of design, construction, operation & maintenance, processes and other systems affecting a dam's safety including the dam safety management system including previous comprehensive inspection reports. The level of detail in the Dam Safety Review should be sufficient either to demonstrate that the dam meets dam safety requirements or to identify areas where conformance cannot be demonstrated and future investigation or action is needed.

Q2: Based on the site visit, we understand that the principal structures to be reviewed are the dam structure, lock structure, and earth filled approaches to the bridge. It is understood that the bridge structure is not part of the study.

A1: Correct.

Q3: What aspects of the lock needs to be reviewed, is a stability analysis of the lock as a water-retaining structure being requested, or simply a review of the condition and functionality of lock components, gates, hydraulics, etc? Again, being a low flow structure, the lock would potentially be considered of lower criticality than that of a water retaining structure provided in a conventional dam.

A1: Refer to response in Q1.

Q4: Are the earthen approaches to the bridge to be included in the review, and if so to what level of investigation? Based on discussions on site regarding the maximum elevations on the river experienced in the 1997 flood, it appears that the river had inundated the lower portions of these structures by approximately 1 to 1.5 meters at the base of the bridge, roughly to the top of the fence around the maintenance shops and parking area in the photos, but it appears that the bridge approaches would have largely been untouched.

A1: Refer to response in Q1.

Q5: It is understood that item 1.1.5, TASK 4B on page 9 of 21 of the TOR should be identified as an optional work only in the proposal and not priced in the base bid, if this work is later deemed necessary it will be negotiated as a separate work item, as additional scope to the study.

A5: See Part B: Revisions to the Terms of Reference. Delete section 1.5.5 for this RFP.

Q6: It is understood that although there will likely be duplicate information provided under items 3.2.2. "Achievements of Key Sub-consultants and Specialists on Projects" and 3.2.3. "Achievements of Key Personnel on Projects", page 21 of 25 of the requirements for the RFP submission structure, this redundancy is anticipated by PWGSC and the information should be provided in both sections.

A6: Proponent is recommended to comply with specified requirements as stated. As well, see Part B: Revisions to the Terms of Reference.

Q7: In item 3.2.4, page 21 of 25 of the requirements for the RFP submission structure, last bullet in the list, what is inferred by "The Client User's philosophies and values"? We understand that this statement refers to the proponent's familiarity with PWGSC value statements and policies that are reference upfront in the "Supplementary Instructions to Proponents", section S16 of the RFP document, is this correct?

A7: Yes, this statement refers to PWGSC value statements but it is not referenced upfront in section SI6.

Q8: On page 21 of 25 of the RFP, Section 3.2.4, the proponent's are asked to provide 'the functional and technical requirement' of the project? What is meant by "functional requirements" of the project? Is it intended that the proponents provide a brief description of our understanding of the purpose/function of the lock and dam with respect to how the control structure is currently operated throughout the year, in turn identifying potential critical events that need to be considered in the review?

A8: Proponent is to interpret accordingly as specified in the ToR.

Q9: Can we receive additional information on the required electrical scope of work?

A9: No. However, if the proponent makes reference to this addendum, there will be a list of documentation that is made available for viewing. Please contact Mike Fagan via e-mail.

Q10: Is a structural analysis required for the camere-style curtains?

A10: Refer to response in Q1 and required services outlined in the TOR.

Q11: Is the weight of the bridge known/indicated on the construction drawings, or will we be required to determine this based on the provided drawings?

A11: Refer to response in Q1.

Q12: Are we to include task 4B (hydrotechnical study) in our submitted price, or will this be considered an extra to the contract if it is required?

A12: This task will be deleted. Refer to Part B: Revisions to the Terms of Reference.

Q13: PD 1.5.2 indicates that no further condition inspection is required. RS 3.1.3 requires the submission of an inspection report detailing the results of a condition assessment. Please clarify if a condition inspection is required.

A13: An inspection on the asset condition will be required. PD 1.5.2.1 clause has been revised. Refer to Part B: Revisions to the Terms of Reference.

Q14: Are the documents noted in 1.8.1.3, .3 and .4 actually available now or will they be provided after award?

A14: The documents are available for viewing. For arrangement, please contact the supply officer, Mike Fagan.

Q15: Something seems to be missing as the review and approval requirements are not noted: "2.3.1 General" - .1 In Addition to the review procedures outlined in the P&S document the Consultant shall ensure that the reports will undergo the following review and approval.

A15: This clause has been revised. Refer to Part B: Revisions to the Terms of Reference.

Q16: It would not be our intent to provide incorrect work but there is normally a time limit over which this applies. Can this be changed?

A16: No. The time limit applies to the duration of the specified contract period.

Q17: Section 2.2.1 discusses that consultant team roles, including surveying, Section 3.1.6 describes the Dam Safety Review report including: .3.8.3 Drawings. 1 site drawings, and .2 "as-found" drawings. Please clarify how much survey information PWGSC expects the consultant to collect, and how to represent these on drawings.

Given our phone tag and your hand off to other PMs, when can we expect clarification by email, or addendum?

Will PWGSC send out the addenda to prospective bidders, or must we track this on the procurement site?

A17: All surveying efforts are to be determined by the required services that are specified in the ToR. All enquiries will be addressed in the form of an amendment that will be posted on the 'Buy and Sell'.

Q18: In section 1.5.2 (TOR) you gave the purposes of the site visit and indicated no inspection to be expected (just a site visit and staff interview), however, you indicated in section 3.1.3 (TOR) the inspection report contents as deliverable such as a detailed inspection is to be done. Does this deliverable still to be submitted to PWGSC as is or only could contain main elements resultant from the site visit and staff interview regardless what is indicated in section 3.1.3?

A18: Proponent is to interpret the requirement as specified.

Q19: The RFP is confusing as to how it defines 'Specialists' and 'Key Personnel'. Section SRE 3.1.2 indicates that the lead engineer for each discipline is considered a "specialist". For each specialist the RFP requires a description of maximum three projects including the same information required for the projects submitted by the proponent firm. This information seems to be tailored towards the proponent and not individual people (i.e "names of key personnel responsible for project delivery", "project schedule control and management"). Under section SRE 3.2.3, the information required is more along the lines of what we would expect to provide for people (ie "professional accreditation", "relevant experience"). Other PWGSC proposals have required the sort of information listed under 3.2.3 for the specialists.

It would appear to us that either,

- 1) The information to be supplied for the "specialists" is not what PWGSC intended , or
- 2)The lead engineers for each discipline should be considered "key personnel" and not "specialists, or
- 3)We have misunderstood PWGSC's intention ,and you do only want three projects for each person, without the professional details in section 3.2.3.

A19: See Part B: Revisions to the Terms of Reference. This clause has been replaced with the following: 'Key Consultants/Sub Consultants/Specialists'.

Q20: Is an analysis required for the lock gate?

A20: Refer to response in Q1.

Part B: Revisions to the RFP and TOR

1. Refer to RFP – Page 8 of 25

Replace 'II. Key Sub Consultants / Specialists:' with the following:

'II. Key Consultant/Sub-Consultant and/or Specialists:'

2. Refer to RFP – Page 21 of 25

Replace '3.2.2 Achievements of Key Sub-consultants and Specialists on Projects' with the following:

'3.2.2 Achievements of Key Consultants, Sub-consultants and Specialists on Projects'

3. Refer to TOR – Page 9 of 21

Delete 'Section 1.5.5 Task 4B – Perform Hydrotechnical Study (Optional Work)'.

4. Refer to TOR – Page 16 of 21

Delete clause 2.3.1.1 and replace with the following:

'2.3.1.1 In addition to the review procedures outlined in the P&S document, the Consultant shall ensure that the reports will undergo an internal review and approval of the report submissions by PWGSC.

5. Refer to TOR – Section 1.8 – Page 14 of 21 - Add clause 1.8.1.5

All listed documentation for the manuals, drawings and recent inspection reports are made available for viewing at the PWGSC office on 167 Lombard Avenue, Winnipeg, MB. For arrangement for viewing, please contact the supply officer, Mike Fagan via e-mail.

6. Refer to TOR – Delete clause 1.5.2.1 and replace with the following clause:

'1.5.2.1 - PWGSC has undertaken dam and bridge inspections of SALD at regular intervals.

END OF AMENDMENT # 002