

**RETURN BIDS TO:**  
**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**  
Bid Receiving Public Works & Government Services  
Canada/Réception des soumissions Travaux publics et  
Services gouvernementaux Canada  
1713 Bedford Row  
Halifax, N.S./Halifax, (N.E.)  
B3J 1T3  
Halifax  
Bid Fax: (902) 496-5016

**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**  
Atlantic Region Acquisitions/Région de l'Atlantique  
Acquisitions  
1713 Bedford Row  
Halifax, N.S./Halifax, (N.E.)  
B3J 3C9  
Halifax  
Nova Scot

<b>Title - Sujet</b> SWING BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EB144-150508/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 003
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> EB144-15-0508	<b>Date</b> 2014-09-18
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$PWA-115-5118	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> PWA-4-72016 (115)	<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 2014-10-06</b>	
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Allen (PWA), Tanya	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> pwa115
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (902) 496-5142 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (902) 496-5016
<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>

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EB144-150508/A

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

EB144-15-0508

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

003

File No. - N° du dossier

PWA-4-72016

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

pwa115

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

## Questions and Answers

---

**Q6** Is it possible to get a copy of the reports referenced in clause 2.1 and clause 4.1 on page 2 of 61?

**A6** *Yes, these reports will be included as part of an Amendment 002.*

**Q7** Clause 6.1.1.5, states that one of the objectives is to achieve a structure that is "Aesthetically pleasing and harmonious with its environment". Also, clause 8.2.1 states "PCA would like to have aesthetically pleasing architectural features incorporated into the bridge design...". Is there a requirement to have an Architect on board?

**A7** *There is no requirement for an architect identified within the RFP. The proponent may make this determination.*

**Q8** Regarding clause 8.5 Material Testing and Engineering Work: Is the cost of this work covered under the "Other Additional Services" as described in Appendix C – Price Proposal Form?

**A8** Yes

**Q9** Clause 8.8.1 Environmental: Are there background studies available in support of the CEAA requirements or should primary investigations be included in the schedule and cost.

**A9** *The primary investigations should be included in the schedule and cost.*

**Q10** Regarding clause 1.9.4 "Acceptance of Project Deliverables" of the Description of Services on page 23 in which PWGSC acceptances do not prohibit rejection of work, which is determined to be unsatisfactory at later stages of review. The described scenario is beyond the control of the Consultant, and cannot be reasonably anticipated or estimated in nature, scope, or magnitude at this time. We suggest that Parks Canada provide a specified contingency allowance to address this possible scenario, or preferably, request that this clause be removed.

**A10** *This clause is specific to consultant errors or omissions within the original project scope which were not identified during earlier stages of the PWGSC review.*

**Q11** Regarding clause 5.2 associated with revisions and amendment of the construction documents, at consultants cost, to bring the cost of the work within the limits stipulated. The described scenario is beyond the control of the Consultant, and cannot be reasonably anticipated or estimated in nature, scope, or magnitude for estimating purposes. We suggest that bidders carrying an all-encompassing contingency to cover this eventuality is unproductive and of no cost advantage to Parks Canada. We suggest that Parks Canada provide a specified contingency allowance to address this possible scenario, or preferably, remove this requirement from the Consultant's scope.

**A11** *Delete the following clause from RS5.2*

*Revise and amend, at your cost, the construction documents to bring the cost of the work within the limits stipulated.*

*Replace with the following:*

*Revise and amend the construction documents to bring the cost of the work within the limits stipulated.*

**Q12** We refer to clauses that require the project to tender within a fixed stipulated project budget, or measures will need to be taken to redesign for price reduction in a re-bid. Please advise what the construction budget is for the project.

**A12** *The budget will be determined based on a number of factors as per PD2. 2.2 Cost.*

**Q13** Page 9 of 61, section 8.2 part H describes the use of materials that meet NSTIR standards – can the NSTIR specification book (or partial sections) be implemented for this project?

**A13** *The NSTIR specifications are one of many reference standards identified and to be incorporated into the bridge design.*

**Q14** Page 10 of 61, Section 8.3, conceptualize bridge design options – are 3D renderings required?

**A14** *If deemed necessary by the proponent but not a stated requirement.*

**Q15** Regarding clause 4.4 Deliverables, please clarify the number of submissions/deliverables i.e. 33%,50%,66%,99% and 100% (final submission)?

**A15** *Clause 4.4 Deliverables is modified as follows:*

**DELETE:**

*1. Deliverables shall occur in three stages. Completeness of the project development shall reflect the stage of submission: 50%, 99% or 100%. The consultant team shall prepare and submit deliverables for the first two stages as well as the 100% construction documents (drawings and specifications) for review and approval by the Departmental Representative. Revise as required by the Departmental Representative. Resubmit for acceptance. The construction documents will be updated at each stage and will serve as benchmarks to monitor progress of the project.*

*2. Deliverables are similar at 50% and 99% stages; completeness of the project development shall reflect the stage of a submission.*

**INSERT:**

*1. Deliverables shall occur in four stages. Completeness of the project development shall reflect the stage of submission: 33%, 66%, 99% or 100%(Final submission). The consultant team shall prepare and submit deliverables for the first three stages as well as the 100% construction documents (drawings and specifications) for review and approval by the Departmental Representative. Revise as required by the Departmental Representative. Resubmit for acceptance. The construction documents will be updated at each stage and will serve as benchmarks to monitor progress of the project.*

*2. Deliverables are similar at 33%, 66%, 99% and 100% stages; completeness of the project development shall reflect the stage of a submission.*

**Q16** Are any drawings of the existing bridge or canal available to bidders?

**A16** *Drawings are included in the report included with Amendment 002 and the most recent construction drawings from the deck replacement project completed will be posted for information purposes.*

**Q17a** Is the consultant expected to produce detailed demolition or erection plans as part of the final bridge tender package?

**A17a** *The consultant will be responsible to produce detailed demolition drawings and review the contractors erection drawings.*

**Q17b** If not, is the consultant expected to produce as-built information regarding the existing structures to be provided to potential bidders?

**A17b** *Yes, the consultant will be required to produce as-built drawings regarding the existing structures.*

**Q18a** Section RS 2 of the RFP indicate that the deliverable Concept Design Report has two stages consisting of Stage 1 –Preliminary Concept Design and Stage 2 – Concept Design We note that RS 2 indicates that 2 design options are to be considered (each contemplating both single or double lane configurations) along with 2 implementation scenarios utilizing a new alignment adjacent to the existing structure or construction at the current bridge location. This result in a total of 8 potential concept design option to be considered assuming that the differing alignments may result in differing spans. Based on the working of notes 2 and 3 of section 2.5 it appears that all of the above noted concepts will be considered in Stage 1 with the “selected preliminary concept option” being considered further during Stage 2. Please clarify if the selected preliminary option is to be “selected” by PWGSC based on recommendations from the consultant?

**A18a** *Yes, the preliminary option going forward will be selected by PWGSC. That option must be prepared for both one lane and two lane alternatives during the Stage II Concept Design.*

**Q18b** Additionally, are class C cost estimates to be completed for all 8 preliminary design concepts or only for the selected concept option (understanding that both single and double lane costing is to be completed for the selected concept)? Wording elsewhere in the RFP seems to suggest that both design options (and both land configurations) are to be Class C cost estimated completed.

**A18b** *Yes, RS2 Design Concept Clause 2.5 Deliverables- Concept Design Reports, Stage 1 - Preliminary Concept Design is to be amended as follows:*

**DELETE:**

- a. *Prepare conceptual design of the superstructure as defined above. For both options provide:*
  - i. *Preliminary drawing showing concept options. Concept drawings are to:*
    - 1) *be sufficiently developed to reflect the character of the proposed superstructure system, extent of work required on center pier, abutments and adjacent impacted areas;*
    - 2) *demonstrate the type of bridge system being proposed.*

**INSERT:**

- a. *Prepare conceptual design of the superstructure as defined above. For each option and alignment scenario provide:*
  - i. *Preliminary drawing showing concept options. Concept drawings are to:*
    - 1) *be sufficiently developed to reflect the character of the proposed superstructure system, extent of work required on center pier, abutments and adjacent impacted areas;*
    - 2) *demonstrate the type of bridge system being proposed.*
    - 3) *include Class C cost estimates*

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME.