



**RETURN BIDS TO:**

**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**

Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux  
Canada  
Place Bonaventure,  
800 rue de la Gauchetière Ouest  
Voir aux présentes - See herein  
Montréal  
Québec  
H5A 1L6  
FAX pour soumissions: (514) 496-3822

**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**

Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada  
Place Bonaventure,  
800 rue de la Gauchetière Ouest  
Voir aux présentes - See herein  
Montréal  
Québec  
H5A 1L6

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Réhabilitation dépotoir Sambault	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EF928-172441/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 020
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> EF928-17-2441	<b>Date</b> 2017-09-19
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$MTC-035-14403	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> MTC-7-40019 (035)	<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 2017-09-22</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> Lussier, Joël	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> mtc035
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (514) 496-3862 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> ( ) -
<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> <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/ de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

This solicitation amendment 020 is raised for the following changes:

**Q78** Considering the present bid deposit date, and the uncertainty regarding the bid evaluation period, the compliance with the commissioning (6 months) and the operation (12 months) periods before March 2020 does not allow the required flexibility in the work schedule to reflect reality. Therefore, can the end of work date be postponed in order to allow design and construction periods appropriate with the project complexity?

**A78** : The end of project date remains March 31<sup>st</sup> 2020.

**Q79.** Since there will be 124 wells to consider for the installation of the geomembrane, would it be possible to adjust the quantity in article A.2.5.3 - Connections and joints for pipes and infrastructures for 124 instead of 67?

**A79** : The quantity in article A.2.5.3 of the price table must be modified for 139 units instead of 67 units.

**Q80.** Can we consider using excavated material from trenches for supply or discharge lines or from the building for grading before final capping or these materials will be have to be disposed off-site according to requirements in articles A.4.1 and A.4.2 of the price table?

**A80.** Excavated materials from the Work can be reused for grading purposes if they meet the requirements of the technical specifications for this activity, notably those specified in section 23. Excavated materials that cannot be reused will have to be managed in compliance with regulations and the requirements of the technical specifications, notably those of section 3.

**Q81.** There is no information regarding the number of wells to be decommissioned and the work required for well sealing and decommissioning in article B.1.2.10 of the price table. Would it be possible to have more information?

**A81.** As mentioned in article 9.3.7.2 of section 9, « the existing monitoring wells listed in Appendix 1-7 must be decommissioned at the expense of the Contractor in accordance with the Water Withdrawal and Protection Regulation (article 20) ». The location and depth of the wells to be decommissioned are specified in Appendix 1-7.

**Q82.** In answer 45 of amendment 11, it is indicated that « periodic items related to the running-in period and the operation of the system will be paid on a monthly basis ... ». In amendment 13, the addition of a contract clauses of service related to parts C, D and E mention a single payment. What type of payment should we consider for parts C, D and E of the price table?

**A82.** Canada will pay the Contractor upon completion and delivery of the Work in accordance with payment provisions of the Contract, all on a monthly basis.

**Q83.** In article 21.3.3.13.1 of the technical specifications, it is mentioned that the building must include an intrusion alarm system. Please confirm that an audible alarm is acceptable. If not, please confirm that the cellular coverage is adequate on site.

**A83.** Article 21.3.3.13.1 must be completed by the following sentence : « The intrusion alarm system will have to be connected to a central station. The Contractor is responsible for the verification of the communication mode for this system. »

**Q84. Our understanding of this methodology is that all materials or waste excavated during the grading, cleaning, ditch excavation, building construction or other can be disposed of in the cells during grading and surface preparation, before installation of the geotextile. Is that correct?**

**A84.** Please refer to answer of question Q80.

**Q85. In relation to our previous question, to what do the excess waste material mentioned in item A.4.1 of the price table « Loading, transport and disposal of excess waste and residual materials on site » correspond to? The quantity presented in the price table could be less in reality and some bidders could take the guess to estimate a lower value and thus reduce the total cost. To ensure fairness between bidders would it be possible to remove this item and manage these waste material the same way as that of the contaminated soils mentioned in section 3.1.1.3 of the technical specifications?**

**A85.** Considering the site history, it is anticipated that a certain amount of waste material from excavation work may not be reusable for grading or backfilling in the context of the Work according to their nature, dimension or characteristics. Item A.4.1 thus remains on the price table. To estimate their unit price for this item, bidders all have access to the same information. Bidders remain responsible for their interpretation of this information and must manage risks associated to this interpretation.

**Q86. Can you specify the type of dangerous goods in excess to be disposed of in order to determine the corresponding price for item A.4.2 of the price table? If not, could this item be removed and could these excess dangerous goods be managed in the same way as that of the contaminated soils mentioned in section 3.1.1.3 of the technical specification?**

**A86.** For bidding purposes, excess dangerous goods indicated at item A.4.2 of the price table can be considered as "leachable mater" as defined in Article 3 of the Regulation Respecting Hazardous Materials (Q-2, r 32) of the Environment Quality Act (R.S.Q., c. (Q-2). If, during the work, dangerous goods of another nature are encountered, their management will be covered by a Change Request if necessary, in accordance with article GC6.4.2 « Price Determination Following Completion of Changes » from the Standard Acquisition Clauses and Conditions (SACC) of the PWGSC available online ([buyandsell.gc.ca/policy-and-guidelines/standard-acquisitionclauses-and-conditions-manual](http://buyandsell.gc.ca/policy-and-guidelines/standard-acquisitionclauses-and-conditions-manual)).

**Q87. The provincial criteria indicated for the mercury mention values of 0,0009 and 0,0016 ug/L respectively for chronic and acute effects for protection of aquatic life. The discharge criteria after treatment is therefore indicated as a value of 0,0009 ug/L. This value is extremely low, even lower than the detection limit that a high resolution equipment can attain. Also, when considering MDDELCC surface water quality criteria for Quebec ([http://www.mddelcc.gouv.qc.ca/eau/criteres\\_eau/details.asp?code=S0309](http://www.mddelcc.gouv.qc.ca/eau/criteres_eau/details.asp?code=S0309)), we realize that the recommended values are  $9,1 \times 10^{-4}$  mg/L (that is 0,91 ug/L) and thus a 1000 times higher. It seems there is a unit mistake in the table presented in appendix 39.1.**

**Could you confirm that the criteria to respect for mercury and if there is a mistake, that the CWQG of the CCME, more restrictive, would therefore be the criteria to consider. This important last minute element will take us an additional week before bid deposit to reevaluate our treatment models and consumables cost estimates during operation period.**

**A87.** The MDDELCC surface water quality criteria indicated for mercury for chronic and acute effects in appendix 39-1 (0,0009 and 0,0016 µg/L) have been reviewed for the following values : 0,91 µg/L and 1,6 µg/L. The applicable discharge criteria has therefore been also changed to correspond to the most restrictive value, that is the Canadian water quality guideline for the protection of aquatic life of 0,026 µg/L (the modified version of appendix 39.1 will soon be available for download on the [buyandsell.gc.ca](http://buyandsell.gc.ca) website).

**Q88. It is specified that water levels in pumping wells and observation wells for operational monitoring will have to be measured manually (piezometric survey) on a weekly basis. For quality control purposes of automatic systems, we understand the necessity of these operations. However, considering that these wells will be equipped for continuous measurement of water levels, it seems sufficient to us that manual measurements be on a monthly basis, which would also correspond to the frequency for submittal of operation reports. Could this frequency be adjusted?**

**A88.** If, following the running-in period, the Contractor can demonstrate that the weekly frequency for water level measurements is not required for monitoring, the Client may review the frequency if he considers it appropriate.

**\*\*\* All other terms and conditions of the original solicitation remain unchanged \*\*\***