

**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> NORTHWEST BRIDGE RECONSTRUCTION	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EA011-150877/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 004
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> EA011-15-0877	<b>Date</b> 2014-09-23
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$PWA-122-5120	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> PWA-4-72027 (122)	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2014-09-30</b>	<b>Time Zone</b> Fuseau horaire Atlantic Daylight Saving Time ADT
<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> Chinye (PWA), Chukwudi	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> pwa122
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (902) 496-5476 ( )	<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 (type or print)</b> <b>Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/ de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

---

Due to the technical nature of this amendment, it will ONLY be available in English.

Amendment 004 is raised to answer the following questions and incorporate the following change:

**IN PD 2: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION (CONTINUED)**

**2.3 SCHEDULE**

**Delete in its entirety**

**Insert as follows**

Design and tender documents complete: 31 March, 2015

**Question 1.** Does PWGSC expect the Consultant to provide the tender issue contract documents and drawings in both French and English or will PWGSC provide the translation?

**Answer to Question 1:** Tender issue contract documents and drawings will be English only documents

**Question 2.** Referring to the WBS required in Section 3.2.2 and Section 5 of "Doing Business", to what level should the work plan be broken down?

**Answer to Question 2:** Consultant should know the level of breakdown they require to manage the work. In fact, the way they choose to break the work down will be part of our evaluation of their ability to manage the work

**Question 3.** The RPF makes numerous references to "widening and realigning of the approaches". Is it the desire of PWGSC to do so in a manner that will require a larger or alternative footprint. If so have discussions with the appropriate landowners taken place. Also, please define practical limits on the approach length so that the consultant can determine the commercial implication under the requested lump sum bid.

**Answer to Question 3:** The requirement for widening and/or realignment of the approaches is one that will be established during the design. Once again, this is the Consultant's work. No discussions have been held with landowners. None can occur until the Consultant completes the design work required to do so in a meaningful way.

**Question 4.** With reference to RS1. 1.2. 1. Cost Management Specialist or sub consultant, it is assumed this provision can be provided through our in house project execution and financial controls department, please clarify.

**Answer to Question 4:** The Proponent should propose how they plan to provide these services, and what will be included by way of cost management. This also is part of the proposal evaluation process

**Question 5.** PD5.10.3&4 has any pre planning discussion or consultation taken place with the DFO? If so, please provide contacts and meeting minutes.

**Answer to Question 5:** Only tentative contact has been established. Until the option analysis of various design layouts then detailed consultation would be required.

**Question 6.** Please provide a date of award so a schedule can be developed to achieve the Completion of Tender Docs (March 15, 2015) dateline.

**Answer to Question 6:** Estimated award date is Mid-October 2014

**Question 7.** Please clarify that is the intent of PWGSC to fully complete the Detailed Design (to 100%) prior to the release of the Tender Drawings and Documents.

**Answer to Question 7:** Yes, it is the intent of PWGSC to fully complete the Detailed Design (to 100%) prior to the release of the Tender Drawings and Documents.

**Question 8.** Has consideration been given to developing the design with the aid of a road safety auditing process? This process reviews the design at various stages (preliminary, detailed and upon completion of construction) and recommends measures to eliminate or mitigate any safety concerns. The road safety auditing process considers all road users including vulnerable road users. Please clarify if PWGSC wish this process to be included in the proposed schedule.

**Answer to Question 8:** A road safety auditing process is not a requirement of this request. If a Proponent wishes to offer this as an added service, the cost and schedule implications should be clearly indicated in the submission. Costs for this should not be part of the Lump sum pricing in the Price Form.

**Question 9.** PD5.2.5 specifies that the road geometrics shall be in accordance with Transportation Association of Canada whilst PD5.2.7 specifies NL DOTW standard. Please confirm if a discrepancy occurs what standard will take precedence?

**Answer to Question 9:** Most stringent would apply.

**Question 10.** There are a number of references similar to "provide support to PWGSC in their development of a Detailed Environmental Impact Analysis", however it does not clearly state what support is required. Section PD 1, Clause 1.2.3 on Page 2 of the Project Brief indicates environmental investigations were completed by others. There is no mention of terrestrial or fisheries services required in Section PD 7 on Page 16 of the Project Brief. Please define what services PWGSC require as support

**Answer to question 10:** The specific environmental services required by PWGSC will not be known until a design has been completed. However, it is anticipated that several permits will likely be required (section PA 1.1.3 – DFO Serious Harm NPA Approval, Provincial Registration, etc). It is expected that the consultant shall provide all necessary information (e.g. geo-technical reports, plans, drawings, proposed activities and associated mitigations, etc). to PWGSC to aid in the development of a project description that can be used to obtain relevant permits and approvals.

**Question 11)** Please confirm that there four different levels of project planning documentation: 1) Work Breakdown Structure; 2) Project Master Plan; 3) Proposed Major Milestone Schedule; 4) Cash Flow Projection; and 5) Detailed Project Schedule?

**Answer to Question 11:** Confirmed.

**Question 12)** In our RSFA, we were only required to identify a limited number of individuals, we presume we can use staff not identified in the RFSA.

**Answer to Question 12:** Yes. The Consultant proposal will list the core prequalified required people.

**Question 13)** In order to provide a level of effort we need to understand which site evaluations and planning and environmental studies that may be required by PWGSC to fulfill CEAA 2012 obligations as requested in RS 2.6.3.

**Answer to Question 13:** It is expected that the consultant shall provide all necessary information to PWGSC to aid in the development of a project description that can be used to obtain permits and approvals identified by PWGSC as necessary for project completion.

**Question 14)** Does the entire proposal have to be less than 20 pages? Are the letter, introduction, integrity provisions and declarations/certifications included in the 20 pages?

**Answer to Question 14:** This is clearly defined in the Solicitation. The 20 pages do not include the items you have inquired about.

**Question 15)** Page 16 under time based fees for Resident Site Services, it stipulates that "Travel Time and/or expenses will not be reimbursed separately" and something about "Normal Hours v Shift Hours". Does this mean PWGSC is seeking an all inclusive hourly rate for resident services that includes everything from professional time (given a P. Eng. is spec'd), meals, accommodation, incidentals, truck, mileage, OT premium - in a single hourly rate?

**Answer to Question 15:** Yes. All inclusive rates as specified in the RFP

**Question 16)** PD2 s. 2.2 states Construction Budget is \$5,000,000. Please clarify that engineering is above and beyond that budget.

**Answer to Question 16:** Yes. engineering is above and beyond that budget

**Question 17)** Has PWGSC already established contact with stakeholders (e.g., Terra Nova Golf and Fishers in the area)? and is there information available today about stated concerns?

**Answer to Question 17:** Only tentative contact has been established. Until the option analysis of various design layouts then detailed consultation would be required.

**Question 18)** RFP stipulates review periods (RS1 through RS4) are frequent and typically 10 days in duration. Can PWGSC reflect on the review intervals from a frequency and duration perspective to assist in achieving the March 15, 2015 target date for Design and tender documents complete.

**Answer to Question 18:** Review periods will be as stipulated

**Question 19)** Will PWGSC accept alternates to P.Eng with 10 years experience for resident site representative so long as adequate support is demonstrated?

**Answer to Question 19.**No, PWGSC will not accept alternates to P.Eng with 10 years experience for resident site representative.

**Question 20** Objective PD 5.3.6 refers to application for approval under the Navigation Protection Act but it is understood that this waterway is not listed in the Act, so application is not mandatory. Would PWGSC require the application even if not required under the Act?

**Answer to question 20:** It is correct that the waterway is not listed in the Act. However, it is the proponents decision if they want to opt in to the Act. If required, PWGSC will expect the consultant to provide the necessary information to obtain the approval

**Question 21:** Pg.5, PD5 Project Objectives, 5.1.2.2 States "Field layout of selected alignment and identification of all private lands required for the construction of the western approaches suitable for the purpose of acquisition by the Province of Newfoundland ". Is preparation of land acquisition plans, stamped by NLS, within the scope of work for this project? Is the surveyor required to have a Canada Lands Certificate?

**Answer to Question 21:** It is expected all the lands required for the realignment will be on Federal Parks Canada Land and legal survey not required. Survey to Federal Government standards and layers will be required.

**Question 22:** pg. 27, RS2 Design Concept, 2.3.3 states the requirement to complete a detailed hydrographic survey of the Northwest River which may affect or be affected by construction. At a minimum survey the river and floodplain 500 m upstream and 500 m downstream of the existing bridge. Can you confirm minimum extent of river to be surveyed is 500 m upstream and 500 m downstream? Is the intent to require hydrographic survey of the Northwest River to include the minimum survey (500 m upstream and 500 m downstream) or only to the extent that may affect or be affected by construction?

**Answer to Question 22:** It is expected the construction will not impact beyond these limits upstream or down.

**Question 23.** Pg. 7, PD5 Project Objectives, 5.1.3.9.9 states " Conduct a hydraulic investigation for the design of the new structure. Investigation may require model studies. Submit a detailed hydrotechnical report and assessment." Has hydraulic modelling been completed previously for the existing bridge and if so can the information be provided? Is there documentation of water elevation at the bridge for extreme events which can be provided?

**Answer to Question 23:** There is no modelling for the old bridge. There is a stream gauge on this river and data available through a NL Provincial Government website.

**Question 24:.** Are bilingual project documents required?

**Answer to Question 24:** No, Project documents will be English Only

**Question 25.** It is implied that a temporary detour and bridge could be required for this project, at least for the alignment option where the new bridge is to be constructed on the existing alignment. If

PWGSC selects this arrangement, is the Consultant expected to provide design services and project documents for the temporary detour and bridge under the terms of this Contract? Is the cost for construction of the temporary detour included in the \$5,000,000 budget?

**Answer to Question 25:** Yes

**Question 26.** The design reference vehicle to be used is CL-625-ONT. Normally this requirement only applies for bridges to be constructed in Ontario. Should the design reference vehicle be CL-625?

**Answer to Question 26:** Yes, the design reference vehicle will be CL-625.

**Question 27.** CAN/CSA-S6, Canadian Highway Bridge Design Code, is stipulated as the primary standard to be used for design of the bridge, and there are indications that National Building Code of Canada and AASHTO Standard Specifications for Highway Bridges and Interim Specifications may be required. With respect to design of bridges, is it correct to say that CAN/CSA-S6 will govern, other than in cases where it does not apply?

**Answer to Question 27:** Yes. CAN/CSA-S6 will govern, other than in cases where it does not apply

**Question 28.** PD Project Objectives, 5.2 Design Criteria, 4.5 says that weathering steel is to be considered. The bridge is located less than 500m from the coastal shoreline. Current normal practice is not to use uncoated weathering steel in locations in close proximity to the coast. Should uncoated and/or coated weathering steel be considered?

**Answer to Question 28:** Yes.

**Question 29:.** The project is stated to be an environmentally sensitive undertaking. Are there any special requirements to be considered with respect to roadway and bridge deck drainage, e.g. is it necessary to control drainage and direct it to settling pond or are there other measures required?

**Answer to Question 29:** No.

**Question 30.** There does not seem to be specific mention of an initial project meeting. Would it be correct to assume that one of the two additional site meetings during design, identified in PA1 Project Administration, 2.3.2.7, could be a start-up meeting? Otherwise, is it planned to have a project start-up meeting?

**Answer to Question 30:** Yes

**Question 31.** It is understood that the hydraulic design for this bridge is to be in accordance with TAC *Guide to Bridge Hydraulics*. CHBDC stipulates that, "Scour calculations shall be prepared for all potentially critical conditions, including maximum depth of flow, maximum velocity, and extreme ice conditions." Have there been any reported/known issues of scour at the site? Have there been any reported/known issues of ice forces, buildup or jams at the site?

**Answer to Question 31:** To Be determined by Designer.

**Question 32:** What is the importance category for this bridge; lifeline, emergency-route, or other bridge?

**Answer to Question 32:** To Be determined by Designer.

**Question 33:** Can we clear trees for drill access.

**Answer to Question 33:** Have to be approved by Parks Canada .

**Question 34** Are clearances covered by others or do we need to have them done.

**Answer to Question 34:** Need to apply for clearances.

**Question 35:** Are there limits to the hours available to work.

**Answer to Question 35:** Need to inform Parks Canada of the hours required.

**Question 36:** Is travel time (professional fees while travelling) for RS1 through RS4 considered a disbursement?

**Answer to Question 36:** No, travel time (professional fees while travelling) for RS1 through RS4 shall be included in the fees required to deliver the consultant services and shall not be reimbursed separately. Review clause R1230D (2012-07-16), GC 5 - Terms of Payment, section GC5.12 for disbursement description and definition.

**Question 37:** Could you please clarify : is travel and expenses mean travel time and travel expenses

**Answer to Question 37:** No, travel time and travel expenses does not mean travel and expenses. Travel time and travel expenses shall be included in the fees required to deliver the consultant services and shall not be reimbursed separately as described in response to question 36 above. However project related travel and accommodation additional to that specified in the Project Brief shall be reimbursed in accordance with current National Joint Council (NJC) Travel Directive . Review clause R1230D (2012-07-16), GC 5 - Terms of Payment, section GC5.12 for disbursement description and definition .

All Other Terms and Conditions Remain the Same.

## APPENDIX B - PRICE PROPOSAL FORM

Delete in its entirety  
Insert as follows

INSTRUCTIONS: Complete this Price Proposal Form and submit in a **separate sealed envelope** with the Name of Proponent, Name of Project, PWGSC Solicitation Number, and the words "PRICE PROPOSAL FORM" typed on the outside of the envelope. Price Proposals are not to include Applicable Taxes.

PROPOSERS SHALL NOT ALTER THIS FORM

**Project Title:** Northwest River Bridge Reconstruction – Terra Nova National Park, NL

**Name of Proponent:**

---

The following will form part of the evaluation process:

---

### REQUIRED SERVICES

**Fixed Fee** (R1230D (2012-07-16), GC 5 - Terms of Payment)

SERVICES	FIXED FEE
<b>Required Services</b>	
RS1 – Analysis of Project Requirements	\$.....
RS2 – Design Concept	\$.....
RS3 – Design Development	<u>\$.....</u>
RS4 – Construction Documents	<u>\$.....</u>
<b>MAXIMUM FIXED FEES (Required Services-This Award)</b>	<b><u>\$..... (A)</u></b>



---

**The following will NOT form part of the evaluation process**

---

Canada may accept or reject any of the following fees, disbursements and/or hourly rates. Canada reserves the right to negotiate on these fees, disbursements and/or hourly rates.

**DISBURSEMENTS**

**At cost without allowance for mark-up or profit, supported by invoices/receipts - see clause R1230D (2012-07-16), GC 5 - Terms of Payment, section GC5.12**

**Disbursements:**

Disbursements RS1 – RS4	\$20,000.00
-------------------------	-------------

<b>MAXIMUM AMOUNT FOR DISBURSEMENTS</b>	<b>\$20,000.00</b>
---	--------------------

---

**The following will form part of the evaluation process:**

---

**APPENDIX B - PRICE PROPOSAL FORM (CONT'D)**

Canada may accept or reject any of the following fees, disbursements and/or hourly rates. Canada reserves the right to negotiate on these fees, disbursements and/or hourly rates.

**OPTIONAL SERVICES**

**Optional Services** (NOTE: PWGSC is under no obligation to award any or all of the following services.)

RS5 – Tender Call, Bid Evaluations & Construction

Contract Award Recommendations \$.....

RS6 – Non-Resident Services During Construction

(based on an 80 week Construction period) \$.....

RS8 – Warranty Review \$.....

**MAXIMUM FIXED FEES (Optional Services)** \$..... (B)

**Time Based Fees** (R1230D (2012-07-16), GC 5 - Terms of Payment)

<b>IDENTIFY SERVICE i.e. Resident Site Services *</b>	<b>ESTIMATED HOURS</b> Column A	<b>HOURLY RATES**</b> Column B	<b>TIME BASED FEE</b> Columns AxB
RS7 – Resident Construction Services based on 60 hours per week X 80 weeks	4,800	\$.....	\$.....
<b>MAXIMUM TIME BASED FEES (Optional Services)</b>			<b>\$.....(C)</b>

\*Payment will be based on actual hours spent. Travel time and/or expenses will not be reimbursed separately.

\*\* All inclusive hourly rate is applicable to both normal working hours and any other shift work as required.

**TOTAL FEE FOR OPTIONAL SERVICES** \$..... (B)+(C)

---

**TOTAL COST OF SERVICES FOR PROPOSAL EVALUATION PURPOSES**

Total Fee for Required Services (RS1, 2, 3, 4)	\$..... (A)
Total Fee for Optional Services (RS5, 6, 7, 8)	\$..... (B)+(C)
<b>Total Evaluated Fee</b>	<b>\$.....</b>

---

---

**The following will NOT form part of the evaluation process**

---

Canada may accept or reject any of the following fees, disbursements and/or hourly rates. Canada reserves the right to negotiate on these fees, disbursements and/or hourly rates.

**DISBURSEMENTS**

**At cost without allowance for mark-up or profit, supported by invoices/receipts - see clause R1230D (2012-07-16), GC 5 - Terms of Payment, section GC5.12**

**Disbursements:**

Disbursements RS5 – RS8	\$100,000.00
<b>MAXIMUM AMOUNT FOR DISBURSEMENTS</b>	<b>\$100,000.00</b>

\*Note: These disbursement amounts for RS 5-8 will only be utilized if the Optional Services 5-8 are utilized.

**END OF PRICE PROPOSAL FORM**

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