

Highfield Dam, Final Design and Rehabilitation Engineering Services
Solicitation 01R11-150205/A
Questions during Tender Period/Answers

- 1) Is there a formula for the escalation rate to be applied to pricing for work after March 31, 2016 or should the escalation of the rates be included/omitted from the budget price?

Answer: There is no provision for price escalation. Bidders are required to bid fixed fees for the required services stated in Appendix C - Price Proposal Form Part 1 and Part 2.

- 2) Pg. 25, 3.5.3.2.5.1 states that "During the construction phase" "Provide all site office facilities, sanitary facilities and safety management provision for the consultant's resident engineering staff" – these facilities are typically provided by the prime contractor on site. Please confirm that these facilities can be provided as part of the Prime Contractor's scope of work and deleted from the RFP.

Answer: The Terms of Reference will be modified so that AAFC will provide such site facilities, with the exception of testing device storage (such as concrete testing equipment or nuclear density testing equipment) which will remain the responsibility of the consultant.

- 3) The geotechnical site investigations outlined in the Terms of Reference explicitly include investigation of the potential borrow and spoil sites; the Pre-Design report suggests that it would be of value to confirm geotechnical conditions and assess slaking potential of the rock material along the East Low Level conduit alignment. Should the slaking potential be included as part of the geotechnical investigations?

Answer: The geotechnical investigation portion of the RFP is focused on confirming suitable borrow and waste areas and does not address foundation questions. It is the opinion of AAFC that any geotechnical work required to confirm the assumptions made in the pre-design report should be identified as part of the final design activities. The February 19th amendment provides additional details on existing geotechnical information. This information should give an indication of how much foundation assessment needs to be carried out.

- 4) Should proponents include geotechnical site investigations of the RM road in their estimates?

Answer: If a geotechnical investigation should be undertaken to confirm assumptions made during the pre-design for the RM road raise design then it should be included as part of the final design services for that design package.

- 5) There was discussions at the site meeting in regards to the availability of sufficient and suitable borrow material within lands owned by AAFC. Can AAFC confirm that if there is a shortfall in the quantity of suitable borrow material within lands owned by AAFC, all required efforts to procure material outside of lands owned by AAFC be considered a change in scope?

Answer: Borrow material investigation should be confined to lands owned by AAFC and should include a minimum of 5 holes/test pits. The location of the holes shall be based on a review of all available background material. The consultant will be responsible for locating all utilities.

- 6) Are there any legal land survey requirements (SLS or CLS requirements)?

Answer: A legal survey will not be required to be conducted by the consultant however the consultant shall **identify** any legal survey requirements.

- 7) There is a 30 page limit on this proposal. Appendix A "Team identification Format" does not allow for submission of resumes that are normally kept on file. Can we submit resumes in a separate Appendix and not have it count against the 30 pages?

Answer: No. All pages submitted are part of the maximum number of pages allowed, with the exception of information covered under SRE 2.2.

- 8) Can we submit our standard Fee Schedule with Appendix C instead of the form where you need to list the name of the employee and the position? People change all the time especially when some of the tasks will not happen for a year.

Answer: The General Condition GC 3.8 - Provision of Staff addresses situations where the consultant may encounter a change to staff originally assigned to a specific contract. <https://buyandsell.gc.ca/policy-and-guidelines/standard-acquisition-clauses-and-conditions-manual/5/R/R1220D/3>

- 9) Can Projects profiles be included in a separate Appendix and not be counted against the 30 page total?

Answer: No. The 30 page maximum is for all pages in the proposal submission excluding items noted in SRE 2.2.

- 10) The TOR are detailed in regards to deliverables, tasks and milestone dates. The RFP seems to request that we regurgitate a lot of this information where it says "Information that should be supplied". Will we be docked points if we do not regurgitate this information but make reference to the TOR?

Answer: Proposals will be assessed as outlined in the Submission Requirements and Evaluation (SRE 3).

- 11) SRE, Section 2.2 Proposal Format. This clause states there is a 30 page maximum on the proposal submission (excluding indicated documents), does this include information that is included in proposal appendices such as: personnel resumes, related project summaries, schedules, certificates of authorization, etc. or does it apply to the main body of the proposal only?

Answer: All pages submitted are part of the maximum number of pages allowed with the exception of information covered under SRE 2.2

12) Reference: Terms of Reference document, Section 1.4 Schedule. Regarding the assumed start date of Mar.5, 2015: is this the anticipated contract award date for the Consultant?

Answer: No - the schedule will be subject to adjustment commensurate with the actual contract award date

13) Will AAFC accept a delay in deliverables (day for day) if there is a delay in contract award?

Answer: Yes, the schedule will be subject to adjustment commensurate with the actual contract award date

14) Section 2.2.3 Deliverables. What duration does AAFC require for review of submissions (Design Brief, 66% Construction Documents, etc.)?

Answer: As per 2.9.4.1 (Technical and Functional Reviews) - the consultant should allow a two (2) week turnaround time for AAFC review/comments.

15) Is AAFC willing to skip one of the submissions (66% or 99% Construction Documents) in order to maintain schedule?

Answer: No

16) Section 2.4 Geotechnical Investigation. Can AAFC better define the scope of the geotechnical investigation as far as areas to be investigated or number of test holes required?

Answer: AAFC requires a minimum of 5 test holes.

17) Is AAFC willing to price this item as "cost reimbursable" as its scope largely depends on the findings of the first few test holes?

Answer: All proposed costs for geotechnical investigation should be included in Appendix C – Price Proposal Form.

18) Does AAFC have existing plans or electronic maps for Consultant use and marking with test hole locations (once completed) for the Geotechnical report?

Answer: Review the amendment released on February 19, 2015 which provided the existing testhole information.

19) Is AAFC willing to price negotiations with land owners on a T&M basis as this is also very difficult to estimate as lump sum? Would it not make more sense for AAFC to negotiate test holes on land owner property directly since AAFC will potentially have the direct contract with land owners for use of land for borrow and/or waste areas?

Response: AAFC has provided all existing geotechnical information and has now confined the borrow area investigation to Canada-owned lands.

20) Are costs for required geo-technical lab testing covered under the R.S. 2.7 and R.S. 3.3 allowances (\$40K and \$50K respectively) for "laboratory material testing"?

Answer: No, those costs are associated with testing during construction. Review 2.4.2 Scope and Activities – Geotechnical which outlines minimum testing requirements for the Geotechnical investigation. These laboratory tests are to be included in Appendix C, RS 2.4.

21) Section 2.5 Tender Services. Does AAFC intend to use 1 construction tender document for 2015 construction and 1 construction tender document for 2016 construction?

Answer: No. As outlined in the ToR, the intent is to have individual tender packages created for each design component. Each tender package will be advertised individually.