



**RETURN BIDS TO :**

**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS :**

RCMP-GRC  
 Bid Receiving/Réception des sousmissions  
 Attention: Jordan McKenna  
 Mail StopéArrêt postal 15  
 73 chemin Leikin Drive,  
 Ottawa, ON K1A 0R2

**AMENDMENT TO THE INVITATION TO TENDER**

**Royal Canadian Mounted Police**

We hereby offer to sell to Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada, in accordance with the terms and conditions set out herein, referred to herein or attached hereto, the goods, services and construction listed herein and on any attached sheets at the price(s) set out therefore.

**MODIFICATION À L'APPEL D'OFFRES**

**Gendarmerie royale du Canada**

Nous offrons par la présente de vendre à Sa Majesté I Reine du chef du Canada, aux conditions énoncées ou incluses par référence dans la présente et aux annexes ci-jointes, les biens, services et construction énumérés ici sur toute feuille ci-annexée, au(x) prix indiqué(s).

Comments – Commentaries

**Vendor/Firm Name and Address**

**Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur**

Telephone No. – No de téléphone:

( )

Facsimile No. – No de télécopieur:

( )

<b>Title-Sujet</b> Architectural and Engineering Design Services – Jasper Detachment		
<b>Solicitation No. – No. de l'invitation</b> 201802443	<b>Amend. – Modif.</b> No. : 2	<b>Date</b> Jan. 30 <sup>th</sup> , 2018 / 30 janvier, 2018
<b>Client Reference No. - No. de Référence du Client</b> 201802443		
<b>GETS Reference No. – No de Référence du SEAG</b> PW-17-00809544		
<b>Solicitation Closes – L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at – à 2:00 P.M. EST</b> <b>on – February 1<sup>st</sup>, 2018., 1 fevrier, 2018</b>		
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> Destination		
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toute questions à :</b> Jordan McKenna		
<b>Telephone No. - No de telephone</b> 613-843-5518	<b>Fax:</b> 613-825-50082	
<b>Destination of Goods - Destinations des biens:</b> <b>See Herein</b>		
<b>Instructions : See Herein / Voir aux présentes</b>		
<b>Delivery Required – Livraison exigée:</b> <b>See Herein</b>		
<b>Name and Title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm.</b> <b>Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur</b>		

---

**Amendment No. 2**

Architectural and Engineering Design Services – Jasper Detachment  
**SOLICITATION NO. : 201802443**  
2018

Date: January 30th,  
2018

---

Amendment #2 has been issued to **make changes to the tender document and respond to questions as follows.**

---

**THE FOLLOWING CHANGES IN THE TENDER DOCUMENTS ARE EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY.**

**Within APPENDIX F – SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS, EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND BASIS OF SELECTION**

Section G4 – Evaluation and Rating

**DELETE:**

G.4.1.1 Technical Rating – Table 1

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Weight Factor</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Weighted Rating (Score)</b>
R1 - Achievements of Proponent on Projects	2.0	0 - 10	0 - 20
R2 - Achievements of Consultant Team Key sub-consultant firms / Specialists on Projects	2.0	0 - 10	0 - 10
R3 - Achievements of Key Personnel on Projects	1.0	0 - 10	0 - 10
R4 - Understanding of the Project	1.0	0 - 10	0 - 15
R5 - Scope of Services	1.5	0 - 10	0 - 15
R6 - Management of Services	1.5	0 - 10	0 - 15
R7 - Design Philosophy / Approach / Methodology	1.5	0 - 10	0 - 15
Technical Rating	10.0		0 - 100

**INSERT:**

G.4.1.1 Technical Rating – Table 1

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Weight Factor</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Weighted Rating (Score)</b>
R1 - Achievements of Proponent on Projects	2.0	0 - 10	0 - 20
R2 - Achievements of Consultant Team Key sub-consultant firms / Specialists on Projects	1.0	0 - 10	0 - 10
R3 - Achievements of Key Personnel on Projects	1.0	0 - 10	0 - 10
R4 - Understanding of the Project	1.5	0 - 10	0 - 15
R5 - Scope of Services	1.5	0 - 10	0 - 15
R6 - Management of Services	1.5	0 - 10	0 - 15
R7 - Design Philosophy / Approach / Methodology	1.5	0 - 10	0 - 15
Technical Rating	10.0		0 - 100

**Questions and Answer Part 2**

Q1) I just have a question with regards to the RFP for the Jasper detachment RFP I am compiling at team for this proposal and noticed that there are three separate places in the RFP that list the required consultants, can you confirm which consultants will need to be utilized for the evaluation. Page 19 (of the RFP)

1. Architectural
2. Interior design
3. Structural engineering
4. Mechanical Engineering
5. Electrical Engineering
  
6. Landscape Architecture
  
7. Building Components and Connectivity

Page 91 (Consultant Team Identification)

1. Architec
2. Structural engineering
3. Mechanical Engineering
4. Electrical Engineering

Page 105 (Mandatory Requirements)

1. Architect (Proponent)

2. Civil engineering (Sub-Consultant)
3. Mechanical engineering (Sub-Consultant)
4. Electrical engineering (Sub-Consultant)
5. Structural engineering (Sub-Consultant)
  
6. Commissioning specialist (Sub-Consultant)

A1) There are several team members necessary to complete the project. Some may not be evaluated as part of the RFP process. Where others may just need to be identified/named.

The evaluation will be based on the team outlined in the Mandatory requirements in G.2 (Page 105).

Q2) Does Appendix H have to be submitted for each project shown in rated requirement 1 and 2 or can the information requested be shown within each project?

A2) Will accept the information if its within the rated requirement section, or attached as appendix H. There is no requirement that Appendix H must be used.

Q3) Appendix A 2.2.8.4.2 notes that "Furniture and Equipment will NOT be contracted as part of the project." 2.1.1.2.4 indicates "Achieve - Effective and efficient office landscape furniture layout plan": is existing detachment furniture to be relocated? For the purposes of developing the layout plan, will an inventory of existing detachment furniture be provided to the successful proponent? Is inventorying the existing furniture part of the proponent's scope?

A3) The existing furniture will NOT be relocated. It is the intent for the Consultant to show a generalized new furniture layout plan so infrastructure can be located appropriately, under this contract.

Q4) There are references to peer review under Appendix A 2.5.1, 3.1.2.2, 3.1.2.3 among others, including "peer review reports" (3.1.2.2): are these reviews and reports internal to the architect and to each sub-consultant or is consultation expected with external firms in each discipline in order to produce the reports?

A4) The peer review report would be an internal document between the Architect and Sub consultants to enforce quality control.

Q5) Appendix A 4.1.1.1 This is not a service that architects provide, nor is it insurable under our professional liability insurance.

A5) Delete paragraph 4.1.1.1

Q6) For your consideration: Appendix A 4.2.1 The recording of construction site meetings was traditionally done by the professional as they had better access to office support. All General Contractors today employ often proprietary project management software that tracks and integrates progress and submissions with meeting records. Site personnel (PM, superintendent, project coordinator) are as well equipped and proficient electronically as the professionals. Furthermore, the construction site meetings are chaired by the General Contractor except for the start-up meeting. For these reasons we suggest that the GC is best suited to document and record the issues and decisions of their meetings.

A7) The A&E consultant is to maintain the meeting minutes for construction. However, we may delegate this task at a later date to the GC if that is determined to be the most efficient means of accomplishing this task.

Q8) Appendix B Price Proposal Form: "Part B - Disbursements:" begins with "Estimated 10 additional trips" as well as "additional printing and couriers". Instruction item 5 refers to travel and living expenses being incorporated into Part A. Should this also include base courier and printing costs?

A8) Yes

Q9) As the 'Estimated 10 additional trips' are captured under disbursements, will the consultants' additional travel time be billed according to the time based fees (Part C) or should the Disbursements for 10 additional trips include travel time?

A9) The 10 additional trips should include cost for travel time.

Q10) Is the project to be LEED certified to any degree?

A10) No

Q11) We have received proposals from two distinct structural engineers. In each case they have indicated an additional fee of approximately 15% - 20% of their base fee if the results of the geotechnical testing indicate that a structural slab is required. A fair bit of additional design work is required for a structural slab (which is also more expensive to build than a slab on grade/strip footings solution).

For your consideration: is there any way to allow for this in the submission of the fixed fee? If not at time of submission, would it be possible for the RCMP to advise bidders of a common baseline, i.e. structural slab, with a possible contract amendment for credit if soil conditions permit a simple slab on grade solution?

A11) Further information cannot be provided at this point. Please bid per Spec. to the best of your knowledge.

Q12) Appendix 1 Attachment A states "The Project Schedule will be maintained by the Consultant, for RCMP Departmental Representative approval, as a deliverable under this contract. This attachment will not be amended in the contract."

A12) It simply means that the schedule is a general guideline and may be subject to change, but will not be officially amended within the contract.

Q13) I'm writing to ask about the weight factors and weighted ratings in section G.4 Evaluation and Rating of the RCMP Jasper Detachment proposal. The Weight Factors don't add up to 10, but to 10.5. Additionally, R2 and R4's Weighted Rating (Score) doesn't seem to be calculated correctly.

A13) Please see Amended table above

Q14) Concerning Addendum #1 we'd like to request that the 25% above/below the average price proposal be revised to a more realistic 50% or taken out all together because for a small project such as this 25% could amount to relatively small pricing differential of less than \$300K,, which according the RCMP's pro-rated methodology of assigning points to the fee means that a firm could be disqualified even though they score approximately 7 out of 10 on their pricing submission

A14) This section has been removed, per Amendment 1

Q15) Concerning Addendum 1 and the disqualification of proponents that submit fees 25% above/below the average price. Please confirm that fees below the 25% average will not be included in the calculation for establishing fees above the 25% average. It would not be fair to have low ball fees have a bearing on higher more realistic fee's

A15) section has been removed, per Amendment 1

Q16) Further to Addendum 1, and the disqualification of proponents that submit fees 25% above/below the average price, please disclose what has been budgeted for Prime Consulting Services for this project as we believe it to be material to all proponents endeavoring to submit compliant bids for this assignment, given the very restrictive pricing criteria.

A16) This section has been removed, per Amendment 1

Q17) Is it possible to know where the site is?

A17) The site is located within the Town limits of Jasper. An address will not be published until a successful bidder has been declared.

**ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME.**

**END**