

**RETURN BIDS TO:**  
**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**  
Bid Receiving Public Works and Government  
Services Canada/Réception des soumissions  
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux  
Canada  
800 Burrard Street, Room 219  
800, rue Burrard, pièce 219  
Vancouver  
British Columbia  
V6Z 0B9  
Bid Fax: (604) 775-9381

**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 -  
Pacific Region  
800 Burrard Street, Room 219  
800, rue Burrard, pièce 219  
Vancouver  
British C  
V6Z 0B9

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Remediation Consulting Services TAC	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EZ897-160027/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 002
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b>	<b>Date</b> 2015-05-08
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$PWY-015-7506	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> PWY-5-38006 (015)	<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 2015-06-08</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> Chan (PWY), Scarlett	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> pwy015
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (604) 775-9382 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (604) 775-6633
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b> PWGSC - Various Locations - Various, BC & YT	

**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

EZ897-160027/A

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

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

002

File No. - N° du dossier

PWY-5-38006

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

pw015

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

---

## **Solicitation Amendment 002**

This solicitation amendment is raised to address suppliers' questions and to amend the Request for Proposal document.

All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

**End**

---

## Questions and Answers

**Question 1.** Which organisations qualify as “relevant professional associations”? A.Sc.T? Certified Environmental Professional?

**Answer:** The relevant accreditation depends on the role and responsibility. For example, the Senior Qualified Professional-Geotechnical Engineer must be a Professional Engineer. A partial list of relevant accreditations include: Professional Geoscientist/Geoscientist In Training (PGeo, GeoL, GIT) Professional Engineer/Engineer In Training (PEng, EngL, EIT) Professional Agrologist/Articling Agrologist (PAg, AAg) Registered Professional Biologist/Biologist In Training (RPBio, BIT) Professional Chemist/Chemist In Training (PChem, CIT) Technician/Technologist In Training (RBTech, PTech, AScT, CTech, TT) Environmental Professional/Environmental Professional in Training (EP, EPt) Project Management Professional (PMP)

**Question 2.** Part 5 – Certifications: Section 2.1 of states “If the Bidder has proposed any individual who is not an employee of the Bidder ... to submit his/her résumé to Canada.”, and in Section 2.2 “The Bidder certifies that all the information provided in the résumés...”. Please confirm that resumes are not required as part of the submission.

**Answer:** Information provided in D.2.3 Technical Submission Part 3: Core Team Qualifications and Experience, and in D.2.5 Technical Submission Part 4: Core Team Sample Projects are the equivalent of resumes and subject to Part 5. Separate resumes are not required as part of the Proposal Submission.

**Question 3.** We note in the submission requirements that no CVs have been requested for any staff. Please confirm whether CVs can be included and whether there is a page limit.

**Answer:** Separate CVs are not to be included. As per D.1.2, the page limit for the Proposal Technical Submission is 24 pages.

**Question 4.** Part 2- A.2.3.3 health and safety (page 26 of 50) – “prepare and implement site specific health and safety plan for consultants”. Please clarify this statement as it implies acting as prime for other consultants. Typically, on smaller projects a consultant will act as prime for sub-contractors under its direction. On large projects, PWGSC has required the remediation Contractor to act as prime, with consultants having their own site specific H&S plans. We have not come across a PWGSC project or any other project where we have been asked to prepare and implement H&S plans for other consultants.

**Answer:** A.2.3.3 refers to a Consultant preparing and implementing a site-specific Health and Safety Plan for that Consultant. The Consultant is also required to include sub-consultants retained by the Consultant in the Consultant’s site-specific Health and Safety Plan. If PWGSC retains more than one Consultant on a Remediation Construction site, then each Consultant is responsible for their own site-specific Health and Safety Plan. However, Consultants are subject to the Prime Contractors site-specific Health and Safety Plan, and multiple Consultants on a

---

Remediation Construction site are required to coordinate and cooperate with respect to health and safety.

**Question 5.** Part 2- A.2.4.5 Geotechnical Monitoring- (page 27 of 50) – Are the items listed the only ones being considered? For example what about backfilling assessment?

**Answer:** A.2 Scope of Services is not comprehensive, as the note “Other associated services may also be requested”. In addition, backfilling assessment would be considered part of “Independent geotechnical assessment”.

**Question 6.** Part 2- A.3 Categories of Work- (page 28 of 50) – What happens if a named individual under one category attains the requirements to move into another category during the term of the contract? Can the Consultant request that staff to be included under a different category?

**Answer:** Reclassifying an individual is addressed in Addendum #1, B.5 Addition of Resources and Categories.

**Question 7.** Part 2- B.3 Travel and Living Expenses- (page 32 of 50) – In regard to inclusion of travel charges in the hourly rate structure for trips within a 50 km radius of the worksite and PWGSC office, please clarify if exceptions can be applied when the project is of a long duration. For projects lasting several months, the travel related costs for team members can become substantial.

**Answer:** Exceptions are not generally applied, as local travel is considered part of overhead. Extraordinary circumstances may be considered on a case by case basis.

**Question 8.** Part 2- B.4 (g) (page 32 of 50) – Plotter and printing charges are considered as non-allowable expenses. This is understandable if the printing is associated with deliverables such as technical reports. What if PWGSC, for their own specific requirements, requests printing of a large quantity of figures/reports or printing of large sized drawings requiring a plotter?

**Answer:** As per the note at the end of B.4 “Extraordinary field supplies and internal equipment charges may be allowed on a case by case basis with prior approval from the Authorized Client.”.

**Question 9.** Part 2- D.1.1- definitions (page 38 of 50) – please provide a definition for “expert”

**Answer:** “Expert” is defined in A.3 Categories of Work, and is used in B.1 Labour Rates as a Resource Category.

**Question 10.** Part 2- D.2.4.1 (page 42 of 50) – It is a requirement that the bidder should demonstrate that they have the “necessary project experience to cover all components of the work required as described in statement of work”. We would like clarification regarding how to address situations when the bidder submitting a particular project has been limited in the range of services it can provide to a client (compared to those listed in the statement of work). In some projects, a client’s specific teaming arrangements have resulted in several consultants being engaged for a limited range of services compared to what they may be fully capable of providing on that project.

---

**Answer:** A Proponent may only submit Project experience that the Proponent was involved with or had responsibility for. The Proponent should choose Projects that best meet the descriptions in Table D.3.1 Generic Evaluation.

**Question 11.** Please provide a list of accepted professional designations; further, are all accepted designations given the same scoring consideration?

**Answer:** Refer to Answer for Question 2.

**Question 12.** If two individuals are identified in the senior category (where a minimum of 10 years of experience is required), one with 18 years and one with 12 years of experience, will they receive the same scoring consideration in regards to years of experience?

**Answer:** Not necessarily because as per D.3.1 Scoring Criteria the criterion are rated on even numbers. The experience would have to be significantly different to change to a higher rating (eg to go from “8 Fully Satisfactory” to “10 Strong”) by itself. However, additional years of experience may contribute to a higher rating.

**Question 13.** Can the same project used by an individual core team member also be used as a corporate experience project?

**Answer:** Yes.

**Question 14.** It appears that additional resources for Intermediate and Junior, up to a maximum of 6 and 6, respectively, are to be identified and named under Technical Submission Part 2; however, the core team members for Intermediate and Junior categories remain unnamed under Technical Submission Part 3. Please confirm if this is correct.

**Answer:** Correct, D.2.2 Technical Submission Part 2: Additional Resources requires Intermediate and Junior personnel to be identified, but D.2.3 Technical Submission part 3: Core Team Qualifications and Experience do not require Intermediate and Junior personnel to be identified. Additional Resources, including Intermediate and Junior personnel, also do not need to be named in B.1 Labour Rates.

**Question 15.** Under Section 5 (2.2) it states that “ The Bidder certifies that all information provided in the resumes...”, but nowhere else in the document asks for resumes to be submitted. If they are needed, please specify which team members (core, additional, or both) require resumes, and the length or format that they must follow.

**Answer:** Refer to Answer for Question 2.

**Question 16.** The statement “All price proposals which are greater than 25% above the average price will be set aside...”. Please confirm that this only relates to the “Total Evaluated Financial Bid Price”, and not individual resource category rates.

**Answer:** Correct, the average price is based on the Total Evaluated Financial Bid Price.

**The following sections in the Request for Proposal document will be amended.**

Page 9 of 50, Part 4 Evaluation Procedures and Basis of Selection, section 2:

Delete: 2.2.1 (d) in its entirety

Insert: 2.2.1 (d) have a price within 125% of the average of all technically passing bid prices.

Page 47 of 50, Annex D, D.5 Basis of Selection - Highest Combined Rating of Technical Merit and Price:

Delete: 1.d. in its entirety

Insert: 1.d. have a price within 125% of the average of all technically passing bid prices.

Page 48 of 50, D.6 Example Basis of Selection:

Delete: Note 2 in its entirety

Insert: Note 2: Bidder 4 had a price above 25% of the average of all responsive proposals meeting the minimum weighted points for the Total Evaluated Financial Bid Price  $(\$105 + \$95 + \$160) / 3 \times 125\% = \$150$  and thus was given no further consideration.

Delete: Note 4 in its entirety

Note 4: Total Financial Score =  $(\$95 / \text{Bid Evaluated Price}) \times 100\% \times 10\%$