



RETURN BIDS TO:
RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:
Regional Manager/Real Property
Contracting/PWGSC
Ontario Region, Tendering Office
12th Floor, 4900 Yonge Street
Toronto, Ontario
M2N 6A6
Ontario

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
Regional Manager/Real Property Contracting/PWGSC
Ontario Region, Tendering Office
12th Floor, 4900 Yonge Street
Toronto, Ontario
M2N 6A6
Ontario

Title - Sujet Brighton Road Swing Bridge	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EQ754-170012/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 003
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client R.059792.204	Date 2016-07-05
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$PWL-035-2161	
File No. - N° de dossier PWL-6-39002 (035)	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2016-07-12	
Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT	
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Woodhall, Lauren	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur pwl035
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (416) 512-5873 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (416) 512-5862
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: PWGSC-TPSGC Joseph Shepard Building 32 4900 Yonge Street Toronto, ON M2N 6A6	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Delivery Required - Livraison exigée	Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée
Vendor/Firm Name and Address Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur	
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/ de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)	
Signature	Date

Solicitation Amendment 003

This amendment is raised to respond to proponent questions and to incorporate changes to the following section of the RFP: Submission Requirements and Evaluation (SRE).

Revisions to Request for Proposal

(i) Reference: Submission Requirements and Evaluation (SRE), 3.1 Mandatory Requirements, 3.1.2 Consultant Team Identification, article e)

Proponents are hereby instructed to:

Delete: In its entirety.

Insert: The Civil/Structural Engineer, the Mechanical Engineer and the Electrical/Controls Engineer who as Senior Team Leaders will supervise and lead each discipline must be senior Engineers with a minimum 15 years of experience in movable bridge (swing, bascule or vertical lift) inspection, analysis, design and construction projects. Within the 15 years of experience, 5 years of the experience must be with steel swing bridges, preferably truss swing bridges.

Questions and Answers

- Q2. With Reference to page 57, 58 and 59, and specifically, Section 3.1.2 (b) and (e), and Section 3.2.1 (b), would PWGSC consider it acceptable for a Specialist Structural Sub-Consultant with (15) years of experience in swing, bascule, and moveable bridges to be engaged on this project responsible for the design of the swing bridge? This member would not be the main proponent for the proposal.
- A2. The criteria remains as listed.
- Q3. How would the RFP response need to be structured and how would the response be scored by PWGSC if a specialist sub-consultant were to be engaged by the main proponent?

-
- A3. The response will not be scored differently if a specialist sub-consultant were to be engaged by the main proponent.
- Q4. Under Section 2.1 – Project Overview, it is indicated that the bridge will be rehabilitated or replaced. Is this intended to give the option to the proponent to simply rehabilitate the bridge? Or is this merely a typo?
- A4. Rehabilitation of the bridge is not an option. Potential proponents are only to consider replacement of the bridge and rehabilitation or replacement of the existing canal shore walls.
- Q5. Within CSA S6, there are various requirements for the bridge design depending on the level of service that the bridge provides. What will the seismic classification for this bridge be?
- A5. It will be the selected Proponent's responsibility to determine the level of service that the bridge provides and to establish the seismic classification for the bridge.
- Q6. It is indicated that the budget allowance for the project is \$8 million. With consideration given to the widening of the bridge to suit pedestrian traffic, the potential abutment replacement, temporary bridge installation, canal rehabilitation and mechanical/electrical operations of the swing bridge, we would expect that this project budget will be greatly exceeded? Was this budget allowance provided with the expectation of certain aspects not being carried out or is there an alternative understanding of the project scope with the \$8 million budget allowance?
- A6. The listed \$8 Million is only an indicative value for the estimated construction cost.
- Q7. Can the Re-Capitalization Report prepared by McCormick Rankin be provided to interested proponents?
- A7. The McCormick Rankin Re-Capitalization report does not relate to the current scope of work. As such, it will not be released.
- Q8. Under page 52, it is identified that a resident inspector is required, can PWGSC please provide the expected hours required per week for the inspector to ensure that all proponents are providing pricing on the same hours?
- A8. The resident inspector is expected to provide services for an average of 44 hours per week during the anticipated construction period.
- Q9. On Page 52, it is outlined that the Consultant shall continue to provide inspection, trouble shooting, problem solving and construction warranty review/assistance on an as-needed basis. Can PWGSC please provide further information on the expected involvement by the Consultant?
- A9. Refer to Appendix C – Price Proposal Form.
- Q10. On Page 58, 3.1.2 e). This requirement seems to be very restrictive with few able to meet the requirement. Please consider, "... must be senior engineers with a minimum of 15 years of

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.
EQ754-170012/A
N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.
R.059792.204

N° de la modif - Amd. No.
Amd 003
File No. - N° du dossier
PWL-6-39002

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID
pwl035
N° CCC / CCC No. / N° VME - FMS

experience in movable bridge (swing, bascule or vertical lift) inspection, analysis, design and construction projects. Within the 15 years' experience, 5 years of the experience must be with steel swing bridges, preferably truss swing bridges."

A10. The requirement has been amended, see above.

Q11. Page 58. 3.1.2 c), iv). Our team's Senior Team Leaders are licensed in a variety of States but not in Ontario. We intend to meet the Ontario professional licensing requirements by utilizing administrative team leaders. They would be Ontario registered professional mechanical, electrical and structural engineers who do not have the experience required in 3.1.2 e). They would be responsible for the oversight and quality assurance of those specialists who meet the requirements of 3.1.2 e). Is that an acceptable solution?

A11. Potential proponents must ensure that the submission clearly indicates how it Senior Team Leaders and Engineering Team Members intend to meet the Ontario professional licensing requirements.

Q12. Will PWGSC consider extending the closing date by one (1) week to July 19th?

A12. The closing date is maintained at July 12, 2016 at 14:00 EDT.

All other terms and conditions of the solicitation remain the same.