



**RETURN BIDS TO:**  
**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**  
Public Works and Government Services / Travaux  
publics et services gouvernementaux  
Kingston Procurement  
Des Acquisitions Kingston  
86 Clarence Street, 2nd floor  
Kingston  
Ontario  
K7L 1X3  
Bid Fax: (613) 545-8067

**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 / Travaux  
publics et services gouvernementaux  
Kingston Procurement  
Des Acquisitions Kingston  
86 Clarence Street, 2nd floor  
Kingston  
Ontario  
K7L 1X3

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Environmental Investigations Stony	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EN438-188001/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 003
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> EN438-18-8001	<b>Date</b> 2018-06-07
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$KIN-615-7490	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> KIN-8-50002 (615)	<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 2018-06-14</b>	
<b>Time Zone</b> Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT	
<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> Denbeigh, Andrew	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> kin615
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (613) 484-1586 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (613) 545-8067
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b> Public Service and Procurement Canada 340 Albert Street, 10th Floor OTTAWA ON K1A 0S5 Attention: Anthony Gariano	

**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/</b> <b>de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

---

## **Amendment 003 to Solicitation EN438-188001/A – Environmental Investigations Stony Point First Nations, Ontario**

The purpose of this amendment is to:

- 1. Post questions received from Suppliers and their respective answers; and**
  - 2. Amend the solicitation as required.**
- 

1.

### **Question 1:**

ANNEX “G” – POINT RATED TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA, sections 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 2.4 reference work being done on “First Nation Land”. This term has a different definition to different stakeholders and there are differing legal opinions on who owns parts of Canada, particularly in remote areas and where treaties are not well defined. Furthermore, depending on the definition, there may be very few relevant projects in Canada that fulfill the required scope of work on “First Nation Land”. It is understood that there are significant cultural Aboriginal considerations related to this project which need to be addressed. Would Canada consider changing the requirement from “work being done on First Nation Land” to “work involving significant Aboriginal Considerations” or equivalent? This would likely allow more companies to bid and in our opinion would better address the issue being scored.

### **Answer 1:**

No.

### **Question 2:**

Re: ANNEX “F” – MANDATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA, g), AND ANNEX “G” – POINT RATED TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA, 1.3.

Can bidders use 1 combined human health and ecological risk assessor to meet Mandatory Criterion g) and two separate risk assessors (an Ecological Risk Assessor and a Human Health Risk Assessor) to meet point rated criterion 1.3?

### **Answer 2:**

Yes.

### **Question 3:**

ANNEX “G” – POINT RATED TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA, criterion 2.8, states “5 points per project that involved metals/energetics contamination in soil/sediment or energetics contamination in groundwater.” Does this mean 5 points per project that involved metals or energetics contamination in soil or sediment or energetics contamination in groundwater? Please clarify how the points will be awarded.

### **Answer 3:**

We will award 5 points for each project that involved metals or energetics contamination in soil or sediment. We will award 5 points for each project that involved energetics contamination in groundwater. The maximum points awarded for each project will be 5 points. So if a project had metals or energetics contamination in soil or sediment it would receive 5 points. If that same project also had energetics contamination in groundwater it would still only receive 5 points. If another project had energetics

contamination in groundwater but did not have metals or energetics contamination in soil or sediment it would receive 5 points.

**Question 4:**

ANNEX "G" – POINT RATED TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA, criterion 1.3, A., is very specific and very few projects, if any, would meet the combination of criteria as stipulated. Could this criteria be reworded to something like "5 points for each project where the proposed Risk Assessment Specialist assessed the consumption of food in accordance with Health Canada guidelines and frameworks in relation to Aboriginal stakeholders."? Note that it is very uncommon to develop site specific remediation criteria related to consumption of food.

**Answer 4:**

The risk assessment project(s) on First Nation land is/are to have included quantitative assessment of consumption of food items as an exposure pathway and development of site specific human health remediation criteria (site specific target levels (SSTLs) for human health). The SSTLs for human health do not need to have been derived for protection of the consumption of food items exposure pathway specifically. For example, unacceptable risks may not have been identified for this exposure pathway, or unacceptable risks identified for this exposure pathway may have been risk managed.

**Question 5:**

Can we assume that the bulk of archaeological services for this assignment would be desktop with some fieldwork, though the rate table indicates roughly ten days of work per year for the senior archaeologist? Would the proponent be planning to investigate a few relatively small areas per year? Or is this more to develop a type of master plan for the whole area for clearing contaminated areas?

**Answer 5:**

The bulk of the archaeological services will be field work to support the sampling and subsurface investigation activities.

**Question 6:**

Re: ANNEX "F" – MANDATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA, "The Bidder must propose a Senior Environmental Field Technician licensed in Canada, with a minimum of 10 years' experience carrying out ESA field investigations or other equivalent experience acceptable to Canada.

There is no governing body that licenses Field Technicians in Canada, therefore it is difficult to provide evidence that a field technician is licensed to practice Environmental Fieldwork in Canada. To meet this "licensing requirement" does PWGSC want proponents to propose an Engineer, Geologist or Certified Engineering Technologist to act as a Senior Environmental Field Technician even though this is generally not the role an Engineer, Geologist or Certified Engineering Technologist would play on a project?

Any guidance on addressing this mandatory requirement would be much appreciated.

**Answer 6:**

The licensing requirement will be removed, but the 10 years' experience remains part of the requirement. Please see revision 2C below.

**Question 7:**

There seems to be an inconsistency in ANNEX "G" – POINT RATED TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA between Section 3 (page 57) and 3.5 (Risk Registry Evaluation Criteria on page 59). The third bullet under Section 3 on page 57 asks for only two major risks per category to be identified and how they will be mitigated, however the evaluation criteria on page 59 provides scores for the number of overall risks identified and mitigated (i.e. maximum points for all likely risks to be identified and mitigated). Could you please clarify how the risk registry will be evaluated?

**Answer 7:**

The wording of the solicitation is hereby amended to remove the word "two". Please see revision 2B below.

**Question 8:**

ANNEX "B" – BASIS OF PAYMENT, Pricing Basis "B" - Boreholes and Installation of Piezometers, requests a cost per meter for drillers, equipment, soil sampling, installing piezometers purging wells, management, etc. To do this, assumptions will need to be made such as number of wells drilled at a time, driller already on site, depth do groundwater, etc. Not all consultants' assumptions will match so you will be comparing apples to oranges. Can PSPC provide the assumptions to base this pricing table on? Alternatively, is it acceptable to provide our assumptions or will this be considered putting conditions on our bid? Will invoices be based on actual driller costs with invoices provided or the per meter cost provided?

**Answer 8:**

The solicitation is hereby amended to provide sufficient details for pricing in Pricing Basis "B". Please see revision 2D below.

**Question 9:**

Re: ANNEX "B" – BASIS OF PAYMENT, Pricing Basis C and D. Prices are requested for various groups of compounds (i.e. PFAS, metals, etc.) In some cases the parameter list is provided (i.e. metals) and in some cases it is not (i.e. PFAS). In addition, in some cases the criteria/test method is provided (i.e. petroleum hydrocarbons – CCME) and in some cases it is not (i.e. PCBs which has different test methods for CCME or MOECC jurisdiction).

a) Should we assume all test methods should follow CCME or will testing in accordance with MOECC also be required, which in some cases will be a separate analysis?

b) Can you please provide the chemical parameters to be analyzed in each group of compounds?

**Answer 9:**

Please provide only the cost for the parameters indicated in Annex B. Laboratory method detection limits are to be below applicable environmental quality criteria.

**Question 10:**

Re: PART 2 – BIDDER INSTRUCTIONS, Article 2.7 – Mandatory Site Visit (page 8). Please confirm that it was mandatory for a representative of each prime consultant bidding this opportunity to have attended the Mandatory Site Visit that took place on May 25, 2018.

---

**Answer 10:**

It is mandatory that the Bidder or a representative of the Bidder have attended the Mandatory Site Visit.

---

**2A**

**Refer:** ANNEX "J" – ABORIGINAL PARTICIPATION COMPONENT  
**Delete:** "Toll Free (855) 386-5731 or Terese.Bressete@KettlePoint.org  
**Insert:**

**Current Contact Information for Four Winds Community Employment Services:**

**Terese.Bressette@kettlepoint.org** - **Manager**  
**Alice.Shortt@kettlepoint.org** - **Employment Consultant**  
**Julie.Monkhouse@kettlepoint.org** - **Resource & Information**

**Tel: 519-786-6780 Fax: 519-786-3114**  
**Four Winds Community Employment Services**  
**9156 Tecumseh Lane**  
**Kettle Point ON N0N 1J1**

**2B**

**Refer:** ANNEX "G" – POINT RATED TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA, 3 – TEAM APPROACH AND MANAGEMENT SERVICES

**Delete:** "- A risk register that includes two major risks per service category (i.e., Category 1 – Phase 2 or 3 ESA, Category 2 – DQRA and ERA, and Category 3 – ROE and RAP) and proposed mitigation measures;"

**Insert:** "- A risk register that includes major risks per service category (i.e., Category 1 – Phase 2 or 3 ESA, Category 2 – DQRA and ERA, and Category 3 – ROE and RAP) and proposed mitigation measures;"

**2C**

**Refer:** ANNEX "A" – STATEMENT OF WORK

**Delete:** 8.7 SENIOR ENVIRONMENTAL FIELD TECHNICIAN: must be an Environmental Field Technician licensed in Canada, with a minimum of 10 years' experience carrying out ESA field investigations or other equivalent experience acceptable to Canada.

**Insert:** 8.7 SENIOR ENVIRONMENTAL FIELD TECHNICIAN: must be an Environmental Field Technician, with a minimum of 10 years' experience carrying out ESA field investigations or other equivalent experience acceptable to Canada.

**2D**

**Refer:** ANNEX "B" – BASIS OF PAYMENT, Pricing Basis "B", BOREHOLES AND INSTALLATION OF PIEZOMETERS

**Delete:** In its entirety

**Insert:**

**Pricing Basis "B", BOREHOLES AND INSTALLATION OF PIEZOMETERS**

DESCRIPTION	Estimated annual usage	cost per meter Year 1	cost per meter Year 2	Estimate d Call-ins per year	Year 1 Call-in Rates	Year 2 Call-in Rates
BOREHOLES IN OVERBURDEN (Sand, Clay, etc.) SOIL (including drilling technician's labour, equipment, soil sampling and management, supplies can be claimed as disbursements)	5	\$	\$	1	\$	\$
BOREHOLES IN BEDROCK (including drilling technician's labour, equipment, soil sampling and management, supplies can be claimed as disbursements)	5	\$	\$	1	\$	\$
TEST PITs	10	\$	\$	1	\$	\$
DESCRIPTION	Estimated annual usage	cost each Year 1	cost each Year 2	Estimate d Call-ins per year	Year 1 Call-in Rates	Year 2 Call-in Rates
INSTALLATION OF PIEZOMETERS (UP TO 3M LENGTH) - (including equipment, drilling technician's labour, installing and purging, water sampling and management, supplies can be claimed as disbursements)	1	\$	\$	1	\$	\$
INSTALLATION OF PIEZOMETERS (>3M TO 7M LENGTH) - (including equipment, drilling technician's labour, installing and purging, water sampling and management, supplies can be claimed as disbursements)	8	\$	\$	1	\$	\$
INSTALLATION OF PIEZOMETERS (>7M TO 12M LENGTH) - (including equipment, drilling technician's labour, installing and purging, water sampling and management, supplies can be claimed as disbursements)	1	\$	\$	1	\$	\$

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation  
EN438-188001/A  
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client  
EN438-18-8001

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.  
003  
File No. - N° du dossier  
KIN-8-50002

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur  
kin615  
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

---

**2E (Amendment to request a soft copy of the bid)**

**Refer: PART 3 – BID PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS, 3.1 Bid Preparation Instructions**

**Delete:** Canada requests that Bidders provide their bid in separately bound sections as follows:  
Section I: Technical Bid (4 hard copies)  
Section II: Financial Bid (1 hard copy)  
Section III: Certifications (1 hard copy)

**Insert:** Canada requests that Bidders provide their bid in separately bound sections as follows:  
Section I: Technical Bid (4 hard copies and 1 soft copy on USB key, in PDF format)  
Section II: Financial Bid (1 hard copy and 1 soft copy on USB key, in PDF or Excel format)  
Section III: Certifications (1 hard copy and 1 soft copy on USB key)

If there is a discrepancy between the wording of the soft copy and the hard copy, the wording of the hard copy will have priority over the wording of the soft copy.

---

**ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED**