

AMENDMENT # 3

The Item listed below will be part of the contract, will form and include in the Terms of Reference document. Please consider the associate work, time, resources and cost when submitting the bid.

1. SECTION: 1.2 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

DELETE:

1.2.1 NEEDS & GOALS

ADD:

1.2.1 NEED & GOALS

- .1 PCA wishes to establish a “Badlands Scenic Viewpoint Parkway” within the East Block of the relatively new Grasslands National Park (Approximately 12.3 KM) and upgrade the Rock Creek campground access road (Approximately 2.4 KM). Particularly, the design and construction of the Badlands Scenic Viewpoint Parkway and associated features intends to create a scenic, vehicle accessible program that will have broad appeal to new and current visitors. Public Works Government Services Canada (PWGSC) requires the services of a Consultant to prepare design options with cost estimates, complete the detailed design of the preferred option, prepare a construction tender package with Class A Cost Estimate and provide non-Resident and Resident engineering services during construction.
 - .1 See Figure 1 Regional Setting GNP (general location of the two blocks to GNP)
 - .2 See Figure 3 for General Corridor for the Badlands Scenic Viewpoint Parkway (BSVP)
 - .3 See Figure 3 Badlands Viewpoints Proposed Road Alignment Map Sept'15 (Proposed Parkway and potential location of Viewpoints)
 - .4 See Figure 4 Conceptual layout of the Viewpoints along the Badlands Scenic Viewpoint Parkway.

2. SECTION: 1.2 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

DELETE:

1.2.3 EXISTING CONDITIONS

- .3 The “Million Dollar View” Parkway will be closed to the Public during the Winter months.

ADD:

1.2.3 EXISTING CONDITIONS

.3 The “Badlands Scenic Viewpoint” Parkway may be closed to the Public during the winter months.

3. SECTION: 1.2 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

ADD:

1.2.4 CONSTRAINTS AND CHALLENGES

.11 The Badlands Scenic Viewpoint Parkway design must comply with the concept provided through a separate Landscape Architectural process, except where deviations are approved.

.12 The project scope must include quality landscape architecture design to ensure that the parkway and associated features (i.e. viewpoint pull-offs, parking, pathways to viewpoints, toilet and shade features, etc.) complements the landscape and the overall experience, while minimizing disturbance to sightlines and viewsapes.

.13 The project must consider within its design conclusions the simultaneous development of the Rock Creek Campground and Day Use Area in the very adjacent region, and how to access and complement that development.

4. SECTION: 1.3 SUMMARY OF DESIGN WORK

ADD:

1.3.1 GENERAL

.9 As with above, design must consider the ongoing, simultaneous development of the Rock Creek Campground in the adjacent area.

.10 A concept plan for the Badlands Scenic Viewpoint Parkway will be provided.

5. SECTION: 1.3 SUMMARY OF DESIGN WORK

DELETE:

1.3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL/SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

.1 Sustainability

ADD:

1.3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL/SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

.1 Sustainability

- .1 Minimize impact on terrain, vegetation and cultural features.
- .2 Maximize the salvage and re-use of existing materials, as well as current road alignment when appropriate.
- .3 Reduce existing instances of erosion and disturbance of important habitats like wetlands;
- .4 Ensure measures to capture and/or slow run off from the roadway (particularly salt and sand) into stream and lakes exist or are created.
- .4 Reduce the encroachment of non-native species along the roadway.
- .5 Develop a reasoned approach to clearing or rehabilitating vegetation as appropriate to minimize the need for salt application, improve sight lines.
- .6 Reduce potential for wildlife collisions and conserve habitat where possible.
- .7 Develop opportunities for improving stream flow (culvert improvement and/or replacement).

.2 Environmental Assessment

- .1 PCA has established Critical Habitat areas and Emergency Order for the Protection of the Greater Sage Grouse area within GNP.
- .2 Any proposed waste/unsuitable disposal areas within the National Park must be approved by PCA.
- .3 Any proposed borrow sources for embankment material must be approved by PCA.
- .4 No burying or burning of brush is permitted within the National Park.
- .5 The Consultant will monitor the Environmental Impact Analysis (EIA) prepared by others of proposed design options and identify appropriate mitigation measures with Cost estimates.

6. SECTION: 1.4 OBJECTIVES

DELETE:

1.4.1 GENERAL GOALS

ADD:

1.4.1 GENERAL GOALS

- .1 Achieve an efficient, enduring, sustainable and economically viable project, appropriate for its use and place, through leadership and integration of innovation and technical excellence in the course of the life cycle for the new construction. Meet (at minimum) the following design objectives:

- .1 Respect the natural environment and the historic context of the site;
- .2 Meet or exceed the requirements of current Codes, Standards and guidelines.
- .3 Fully integrates all components and systems including civil, transportation, geotechnical, landscape architecture and structural design.
- .4 Provide an integrated design and construction process involving:
 - .1 Interdisciplinary collaboration, including all stakeholders as may be identified, design professionals, constructors and authorities having jurisdiction.
 - .2 The agreed upon design principles and decision making protocols.
- .5 Consider the User Department's changing needs and future uses to create solutions that are flexible and that are able to evolve over time;
- .6 Design for ease of maintenance with systems that can be accessed and easily repaired and/or replaced during the roads' life cycle;
- .7 Ensure good quality design to generate savings in subsequent operation and maintenance costs;
- .8 Design to resilience to severe weather (minimum standard those roads are 'rain' proof to enable access regardless of summer moisture levels; applies to BVS East Block.

7. SECTION: 1.5 SUMMARY OF SERVICES AND QUALIFICATIONS

DELETE:

1.5.1 GENERAL

- .1 Goals – Surveys

ADD:

1.5.1 GENERAL

- .1 Goals – Surveys

- .1 A LIDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) survey of a general corridor for the “Badlands Scenic Viewpoint” parkway will be performed by others and the information will be provided to the Consultant in digital format (ASCII and ACAD) for use in preparing design options for the Parkway.
- .2 The Consultant is to conduct additional ground surveys based on the preferred roadway centreline option to ensure more accurate x-sections and quantity take-offs can be created during the Detailed Design Phase and preparation of tender documents and Class A Cost Estimate. For the BSVP, the Consultant is to conduct a review of the parkway concept and perform any additional ground surveys on confirming, or proposing alternatives to, the parkway concept provided.
- .3 Enough ground points are to be surveyed such that a Digital Terrain Model (DTM) can be created with appropriate break lines and from there accurate one (0.5) m contour interval drawing(s) can be produced with existing drainage patterns clearly defined as well as the existing road top and any other manmade features such as signs, utilities, culverts, bridges, retaining walls etc.

8. SECTION: FIGURES

DELETE:

FIGURES

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| 1. Figure 1 | Regional Setting for Grasslands National Park |
| 2. Figure 2 | General Corridor for Million Dollar View Parkway, GNP, Saskatchewan |
| 3. Figure 3 | South Portion of the Million Dollar View Parkway, GNP |
| 4. Figure 4 | Conceptual Layouts of Viewpoints along the Million Dollar View Parkway |

ADD:

FIGURES

1. Figure 1 Regional Setting GNP
2. Figure 3 for General Corridor for the Badlands Scenic Viewpoint Parkway (BSVP)
3. Figure 3 Badlands Viewpoints Proposed Road Alignment Map Sept'15
4. Figure 4 Conceptual layouts of the Viewpoints along the Badlands Scenic Viewpoint Parkway.

CLARIFICATION

Q1. Please provide Figure 5 – samples of the conceptual layout of the viewpoints.

Response:

Please see Amendment # 3

Q2. Please furnish Key Plan showing the locations of the East Block of GNP in Southern Saskatchewan.

Response:

Please see Amendment # 3

Q3. Please clarify the length of the subject Parkway and if provide a plan of the project limits.

Response:

Approximately 12.3 km of a scenic driving road as replacement of the current two track, prairie vehicle trail to be designed for cars, light trucks and RV units.

Q4. How old are the available Contour CAD files?

Response:

Currently we are conducting a LiDAR survey through a separate contract. We will provide the most updated Contour CAD files to the successful consultant.

Q5. Please confirm scope of the Environmental Impact Analysis.

Response:

EIA is being provided by PCA.

Q6. Please confirm if the proposed road is to be paved or gravel.

Response:

Paved

Q7. Please confirm scope for Landscape Architect.

Response:

Landscape Architect to provide parking lot area and viewpoints details and specifications for construction.

Q8. Are there any borrow sources available in GNP? If yes, please provide a map of the locations.

Response:

Not known, none from the Park.

Q9. Is there a site in GNP to which the clearing and grubbing is to be hauled? If yes, please provide a map showing these site(s)?

Response:

No brush or clearing is expected, waste soil will need to be dealt with on site.

Q10. If we include the following documents as Appendices would they count towards the 40 page limits?

- Resumes of specialist and key personnel
- Workers Compensation documents

Response:

Yes, Resumes of specialist and key personnel are part of the proposal submission documents.

No, Workers compensation documents are not part of the proposal submission Documents.

Q11. What is the anticipated award date?

Response:

Typically, if there are no complications, the award will be within 30 – 45 days after bid closing.

Q12. Please clarify the proposal submission address, is it in Regina or Winnipeg?

- Department of Public Works and Government Services Canada
201-1800 11th Ave, Regina
OR
- PWGSC Western Region
Room 100, 167 Lombard Ave, Winnipeg

Response:

The proposal submission must be sent to the PWGSC Winnipeg address as noted on the front page of the Request for Proposal document.

Q13. Are the viewpoints to be pull-off areas or just stops on the road to let people out of the bus?

Response:

This is to be designed by landscape Architect within project.

Q14. Also the issue of visual screening for people down in the badlands hiking. Is that a consideration for the location of the viewpoints?

Response:

No, only the parking lot and viewpoints.

Q15. Will the road be expected to act as a fire break?

Response:

No

Q16. Does the park still harvest seed for land restoration from the plateau at viewpoint 4?

Response:

Not to be considered in this proposal.

Q17. Is there existing information on endangered species in this area (ferruginous hawks are known to nest there)

Response:

Yes - The following are the Species At Risk that could be found in the East Block:

1. Long-billed Curlew
2. Northern Leopard Frog
3. Greater Short-horned Lizard
4. Sprague's Pipit
5. Loggerhead Shrike

It can also be noted that Sprague's pipit, northern leopard frog and greater sage grouse have proposed critical habitat occurring within the project areas in the East Block. One historical occurrence of a provincially listed species, tufted hymenopappus (*Hymenopappus filifolius* var. *polycephalus*), does occur within the project footprint. This species is a perennial herb with a stout crown and taproot and occurs in hills, prairies, sands, and clay areas (Flora of N.Am., 2015a). It is provincially listed as S3 (uncommon) and has a secure global status (G5) (NatureServe, 2015a). Rocky mountain juniper (*Juniperus scopulorum*) is a provincially protected species that has a historic occurrence near the project site. This species is a single stemmed tree (rarely multistemmed) that has spreading to ascending branches and can be found on rocky soils, slopes, and eroded hillsides (Flora of N.Am., 2015b). It is provincially listed as S1 (rare) and has a secure global status (G5) (NatureServe, 2015b).

Q18. Has the area been surveyed for archeological sites/fossil sites or will this be part of consultant's responsibility?

Response:

PCA will assist with the information we have and since archaeology is extensive will be throughout the project.

Q19. Will we be expected to conserve the artifacts that are located at Zahurski's point?

Response:

PCA will provide this service.

Q20. Will we be responsible for liaison with the First Nations and Metis communities or is that being done by another agency?

Response:

PCA will be responsible for Liaison with First Nations.

Q21. The timing for the project is not sufficient to complete a full season of field assessment (frequency of visits being in the spring/summer/fall) and then prepare the environmental assessment with regulatory review. What has been completed to date that could be used to achieve timelines in TOR.

Response:

PCA is completing the EIA through a separate contract; the consultant will review the EIA, monitor, and recommend additional work if required.

Q22. Please provide Key Plan showing the locations of the East Block of GNP in Southern Saskatchewan.

Response:

Please see Amendment # 3 for updated Figures.

Q23. Regarding the Million Dollar Parkway, could PWGSC please provide precise descriptions of the start and end points of the design corridor? ie) I attached the figures provided on the Merx web-site for ease of reference. It would appear Figure 3 contains the entire scope of work, from "Point A" to the "Turnaround" (which would correspond to the \$5.3M available for construction). However, Figure 2 seems to suggest the project is much longer.

Response:

Please see Amendment # 3 for updated Figures.

- Q24.** Regarding the upgrade of other existing roads, could PWGSC please provide precise descriptions (to the extent practical) of the locations and start and end points of these other existing roads?

Response:

Please see Amendment # 3

- Q25.** Commentary: After reading the TOR, RFP and other documents, it would appear we would only need to undertake detailed topographic survey of the preferred alignment. However, we are not sure if we might need to provide legal survey services for property acquisition or staking of the new highway Right of Way, or other legal property adjustments. Regarding survey: Can it be assumed that all construction works would be on federally owned properties to the extent that we would not need a Legal Surveyor on our team? If it is expected to need a legal surveyor, could PWGSC please describe the expected scope of work for legal survey?

Response:

Legal survey is not likely as current work is being completed on Federal land.

- Q26.** Will the proposed road be paved, or shall it be designed and built as a gravel road and remain as a gravel road for the foreseeable future?

Response:

Paved

- Q27.** Page 3 of the Terms of Reference, 1.2.1.4 refers to “Figure 5 for samples of the conceptual layout of the Viewpoints.” – This figure does not appear to be provided within the documents. Please provide image. Additionally, Figure 3 indicates four (4) potential

viewpoint locations. Please clarify if the intent is to create one viewpoint at each location, or one viewpoint at one of the four locations.

Response:

Please see Amendment # 3 for updated Figures.

Pull off viewpoint nodes and parking to host 3 – 10 vehicles (cars, RVs, light trucks) at one time at 6 – 10 scenic locations. Pull offs to contain typical site furnishings such as parking curbstops, vehicle bollards, interpretive panels, viewing telescopes, rest benches, shade and wind structures, orientation signage and trailhead features.

Q28. Page 3 of the Terms of Reference, 1.2.1.1 states “and upgrade other existing roads within the East Block of GNP”. Please provide further information on extent of work, and approximate lengths of work required, for example: reconstruction, drainage improvements, widening, etc.

Response:

Please see Amendment # 3.

Upgrade other existing roads: Approximately 2.4 km Rock Creek campground access road.

Q29. Page 14 of the Terms of Reference, 2.3.3.3 requires an Environmental Impact Analysis (EIA). It is our understanding there are potentially multiple different levels of EIA's. While a basic EIA is possible, it could likely be difficult to complete a detailed EIA within the suggested timeline. Please confirm whether a basic or detailed EIA is required.

Response:

PCA is completing the EIA through a separate contract; the consultant will review the EIA, monitor, and recommend additional work if required.

Q30. Page 16 of the RFP (Appendix C) requests an hourly rate for “Resident Construction Services”, where it is indicated that “Payment will be based on actual hours spent. Travel time and/or expenses will not be reimbursed separately”. We are requesting clarification on the term “hours spent”, and how compensation will be made. Does the term “hours

spent” imply any time on-site within the Park for each team member working on this project? Or is this intended to be representative only of the Resident Engineer’s time on site? Our understanding is that, at times, there may be a resident engineer, a survey crew, material testers, and potentially other team members on site, and we are trying to clarify the terms on which compensation is made. Additionally, the statement indicates that travel time will not be reimbursed separately, and therefore it’s our understanding that compensation would only be made during time on site. Please confirm the intent, and provide clarification.

Response:

For Resident Construction Services (Resident Engineer’s) payment will be made based on a Daily basis during the construction period. All other members on site are part of the fixed fee contract.

- Q31.** Page 24 of the RFP (Section 3.2.6) indicates that the proponents should describe their ability of how the ‘response times’ will be met. Response times are not described or discussed in any other location of the RFP or TOR. Please indicate what response times are required for this project.

Response:

Please see Appendix E General Procedures & Standards.

- Q32.** Please provide the geotechnical report that was previously completed. This information will allow us to properly scope the environmental work that is required.

Response:

We have not completed any geotechnical work previously on the Badlands Scenic Viewpoint Road. The Landscape Architect (currently under contract) had a geotechnical engineer accompany him as he devised a preferred road alignment. The road engineer consultant will receive the completed Environmental Impact Analysis report (Parks Canada format) as well as the approved Landscape Architecture (LA) concept plan.

Q33. Is there more information of the preferred road – design vehicle, design speed, raised or at-grade, width – one lane, two lanes, one lane with lay bys, type – gravel, paved, and paving ready?

Response:

We are proposing a scenic driving road within the context of native, wild prairie. We're seriously considering a one way road with pull-offs but bidders should be prepared to design a two way road. We're proposing vehicle speed at 20 km/h, preferably at grade, multi-modal (will accommodate bicycles as well as cars, light trucks, RVs), and a sealed surface that provides a rain proof road (i.e. three season).

Q34. What geotechnical information is currently available?

Response:

None at this time.

Q35. The route passes through very sensitive lands, what environmental and heritage studies have been completed at this location in advance of the route location being determined?

Response:

EGE Engineering/Summit Environmental have been contracted to prepare an Environmental Impact Analysis (EIA) according to the Parks Canada standards and guidelines.

Parks Canada (PCA) has received the first draft of this EIA and has provided feedback. There will be follow up work regarding the cultural resources portion of the EIA. Based upon the proposed Badlands Scenic Viewpoint Road (BVSr) alignment provided by the Landscape Architect, an archaeologist will be hired to evaluate that route, including the use of test plots. This additional cultural information and recommended mitigations will be added to the EIA as an amendment.

Q36. Who completed the studies? Parks Canada? Consultant?

Response:

See the response of Q # 35.

Parks Canada has a review team that includes the project manager, an EIA specialist at the site and EIA specialists within our national office. This contract was managed through PWGSC.

Q37. We would like to have copies of all the environmental and heritage studies completed to date on this route to provide a lot more background information.

Response:

PCA will be providing the full EIA document, as well as the approved landscape architecture concept plan for the Badlands Scenic Viewpoint Road to the successful Consultant.

Q38. Have constraints maps been prepared for the route? If so, we would like a copy to review.

Response:

As part of the EIA exercise, the consultant is providing map(s) that will indicate the area where development can occur without impact to heritage resources, and then outline the required mitigations for work that may be performed outside of those areas. This EIA and accompanying maps will be provided to the Landscape Architect prior to finalizing the preferred road alignment.

Q39. What internal Parks Canada environmental assessment processes have been undertaken with respect to this route?

Response:

See answer to question #1. There is only one process, and that is PCA process. We have contracted an outside consultant to perform the work on our behalf.

Q40. Has the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency been involved in this process and if so, when and what was the outcome?

Response:

PCA, as a Federal Government Agency, has implemented its own environmental review process that complies with the CEAA legislation.

This PCA process has been utilized by the EIA consultant, under the guidance of the PCA EIA review team.

Q41. When did the planning for this route begin?

Response:

The earliest planning began in 2004 with internal resources and informal consultation with neighbors and stakeholders. The general concept has been approved in the current Grasslands National Park Management Plan (2010). Implementation of informal access along the historic two track vehicle trail occurred following the approval of the Park Management Plan.

Planning involving outside, professional expertise began this summer, 2015, securing a Landscape Architecture firm to assist Parks Canada in developing the scenic viewpoint road 'program' as well as development of the concept.

Q42. To date, what mitigation measures does Park Canada anticipate implementing for the protection of the Greater Sage Grouse?

Response:

All mitigations, including those involving the Greater Sage Grouse, will be outlined in the complete EIA. The project area does not fall within the Emergency Order for the Protection of the Greater Sage Grouse (EPO) but does fall within portions of its Critical Habitat.

Q43. What is the reason for one field visit to be conducted in the autumn months? Typically we would recommend that an area with rich biodiversity would have a three-season visit to capture the biodiversity of the spring and summer flora and fauna as well as the fall migration (birds, reptiles etc)?

Response:

The consultant site visit for the EIA occurred during the early summer months. Additionally, they have been provided all species data relevant to the project, which represents multiple years of data collection.

Q44. Does Parks Canada expect an archaeology field assessment to be included in this proposal?

Response:

No. PCA will be performing an archaeology field assessment through another means and that information will be appended to the EIA.

Q45. What alternative routes were considered?

Response:

Essentially none, the proposed road alignment mimics the historically used two track vehicle trail that previous land owners, neighbors and friends used to access the scenic highlights of this region. As the scenic viewpoints remain the same, the general corridor remains the same.

We are attempting to focus the intensive development along the far eastern periphery of the East Block, thereby maintaining the wilderness aspect of the other lands.

Lastly, the most cost effective place to place this road is along the upland grasslands. Much of the adjacent topography is extremely rugged full of relief – part of the very attraction of the place.

Q46. What alternative means of visitor conveyance were considered?

Response:

We had explored other options such as wagon rides, guided vehicles and self-guided golf carts. We believe that the development of the road delivers the best opportunity to reach a greater number of visitors and a broader range of visitor types.

Q47. Has the impact to the visitor experience of those hiking in the valley been considered if their site lines include tour buses on the ridge?

Response:

This is one of several parameters that the Landscape Architect is considering when planning the preferred road alignment.

Currently, the design principle for the road alignment is to plan pull offs back from the edge, and pulls the road away from the horizon from time to time.

At the appropriate design stage, PCA plans to mimic vehicle traffic on the proposed road, and hike the opposite side of the Rock Creek valley, to evaluate sight line impacts.

Q48. Can you clarify the number of kilometers of roadway to be designed, including the “upgrade of other roads” referred to in section 1.2.1 of the TOR.

Response:

Please see Amendment # 3

Q49. Figure 5 referred to in section 1.2.1 of the TOR appear to be missing from the available documents on the website. This is the conceptual layout of the viewpoints.

Response:

Please see Amendment # 3

Q50. Can you confirm the minimum qualifications of the Cost Estimator required for this work?

Response:

The estimator has to be certified to work in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Q51. Can you confirm the design methodology for the pavement design (i.e AASHTO or other)?

Response:

The design to confirm to TAC (Transportation association of Canada) the pavement structure can be to AASHTO or provincial methodologies used.

Q52. Will view-shed analysis be required to precisely determine the location of the viewpoints?

Response:

View-shed analysis will not be required. It will be completed during the concept planning stage with the landscape architecture firm currently under contract with Parks Canada.

Q53. Are there standards for the viewpoint design that specify parking requirements, trash bins, washrooms etc.?

Response:

All of these requirements will be provided within the concept plan that will be given to the successful consultant. These specific parking/waste/washroom/etc. requirements will be approved by the Parks Canada review team, to meet PCA standards.

End of Amendment # 3