



**RETURN BIDS TO:**  
**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**  
Public Works and Government Services Canada  
ATB Place North Tower  
10025 Jasper Ave./10025 ave. Jasper  
5th floor/5e étage  
Edmonton  
Alberta  
T5J 1S6  
Bid Fax: (780) 497-3510

**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  
ATB Place North Tower  
10025 Jasper Ave./10025 ave Jasper  
5th floor/5e étage  
Edmonton  
Alberta  
T5J 1S6

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Norman Wells Wharf Repair	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EP922-172291/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 005
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> DFO EP922-172291	<b>Date</b> 2017-02-13
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$PWU-023-10950	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> PWU-6-39280 (023)	<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 2017-02-23</b>	
<b>Time Zone</b> Fuseau horaire Mountain Standard Time MST	
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> Specified Herein - Précisé dans les présentes	
<b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Taylor (RPC), Ian	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> pww023
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (780) 566-9487 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (780) 497-3510
<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> Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur	
<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> (type or print) <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>

1. Clarification regarding Commissioning Services:

At page 6 of 17 of the TOR, General Services list the following:

- .1 Structural Engineering;
- .2 Marine Engineering;
- .2 Environmental Specialist;
- .3 Geotechnical Engineer;
- .4 Schedule Management Specialist;
- .5 Risk Management Specialist;
- .6 Waste Management Specialist;
- .7 Quantity Surveyor with marine works experience.

There is no indication of Commissioning.

Yet, at page 7 of 17 the table of Anticipated Milestone Dates refer to Commissioning Completion and Acceptance due by Nov 30, 2017, as do the Required Services at many locations.

The project consists primarily of sheet-piles and granular backfill. There is no electrical or mechanical equipment. I fail to understand what there might be to commission... Thus, are commissioning services actually required?

- A. Yes, commissioning services are required as set out in the TOR and GP&S to ensure project is designed and built according to OPR (owner's project requirements) and ready for use.
2. Regarding the Price Proposal Form, under Required Services. Please clarify how the fixed fee for Design Service is to include up to 16 tender packages.
  - A. Only 1 (one) tender package will be required. Additional tender packages would be required if various elements of the work were being tendered separately.
3. Regarding the Proposal Form, under Total Cost of Services. Can you explain if and how the Total Evaluated Fee differs from the Total Fee for Required Services?
  - A. These are the same.
4. Option 1: Construction cost \$1.17 million but 2015/2016 study says 4 million. Is DOT saying that the study construction cost estimate is incorrect or that the options suggested in the study are invalid. These are the same options as option 1 in the TOR.
  - A. We need to try and design the project to work within the allocated budget.
5. The design needs to be tailored to the project budget. What is the overall budget with respect to construction, and with respect to design?
  - A. We can't disclose the budget for design as this is a competitive process, the cost estimate for construction is included in the TOR.
6. Is info/analysis available to assess the ice loading?
  - A. Not that we are aware of
7. Is a detailed topo survey/base mapping ( above and below water line) available?
  - A. Not that we are aware of
8. Is there any geotechnical information available( boreholes, analysis , road structure etc.)?
  - A. Not that we are aware of
9. Are there reliable as-built records available ( sheet pile depth etc.)?
  - A. Not that we are aware of
10. What previous environmental studies have been undertaken?
  - A. Not that we are aware of
11. Are there any hydraulics/ river studies?
  - A. Not that we am aware of
12. Can you please define a waste management specialist.

---

A. Not required, A Waste Management specialist ensures that waste is handled and diverted correctly, that waste audits are carried out etc., as per applicable codes and standards, see the NMS Section 01 74 21.”

- The RFP asks for an

13. Electrical

A. Not required

14. Mechanical

A. Not required

15. Architect

A. Not required

16. Upon review of the Proposal Document 3.1.2 of the RFP (Page 24 of 45) states that the;

*“consultant team to be identified must include the following:*

*Proponent (Prime Consultant) – Professional Civil Engineer with experience in wharf construction*

*Key Sub-Consultants / Specialists – Structural Engineer, Mechanical Engineer, Electrical Engineer, Commissioning Specialist, Cost Estimating Specialist, Architect”*

Whereas 1.4.1 of the Terms of Reference states that:

*“The prime consultant will provide a full consulting team and will include the following consultant services and specialties:*

- 1. Prime Consultant Engineering Services*
  - 1. Structural Engineering;*
  - 2. Marine Engineering;*
- 2. Environmental Specialist;*
- 3. Geotechnical Engineer;*
- 4. Schedule Management Specialist;*
- 5. Risk Management Specialist;*
- 6. Waste Management Specialist;*
- 7. Quantity Surveyor with marine works experience.”*

Firstly, are these two lists correct and that the proponents are expected to include staff to fulfill all of these roles?

- A. The staff who will be evaluated in 3.1.2 of the RFP are Proponent (Prime Consultant) – Professional Civil Engineer with experience in wharf construction

*Key Sub-Consultants / Specialists – Structural Engineer, Commissioning Specialist, Cost Estimating Specialist,”*

*From the TOR article 1.4.1 Environmental specialist and waste management specialist are not required.*

*The balance of team members as noted in the TOR are not evaluated, but are required to perform the project.*

17. Secondly, If the proponent does not propose to include one of these team members as they will have no input into the proponents proposal for these works, will the proponent be marked down?

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation  
EP922-172291/A  
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client  
DFO EP922-172291

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.  
005  
File No. - N° du dossier  
PWU-6-39280

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur  
pwu023  
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

---

A. The proponent will be evaluated on the team members listed in 3.1.2 of the RFP.

18. Finally, can you please expand on what is expected from a commissioning engineer for the replacement structure?

A. See answer for Q. 1