



TENDER AMENDMENT

RETURN BIDS TO:

Parks Canada Agency
Mailroom
30 Victoria street
Gatineau, Quebec, J8X 0B3

The referenced document is hereby amended: unless otherwise indicated, all other terms and conditions of the contract remain the same.

Issuing Office:

Parks Canada Agency
Mailroom
30 Victoria street
Gatineau, Quebec, J8X 0B3

MODIFICATION D'APPEL D'OFFRES

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À :

Agence Parcs Canada
Salleducourier
30 rue Victoria
Gatineau (Quebec) J8X 0B3

Ce document est par la présente révisé; sauf indication contraire, les modalités de l'invitation demeurent les mêmes.

Bureau de distribution :

Agence Parcs Canada
Salleducourier
30 rue Victoria
Gatineau (Quebec) J8X 0B3

Title: Niagara Shoreline Protection - Fort Mississauga National Historic Site		
Solicitation No.: / N° de l'invitation : 5P201-18-0034/A	Amendment No.: / N° de modification de l'invitation : 001	Date: June 15, 2018 Date : 15 juin 2018
GETS Reference No.: / N° de référence de SEAG : PW-18-00828520		
Solicitation Closes: / L'invitation prend fin :		
At: 02:00 PM	On: June 21, 2018	Time Zone: Eastern Daylight Time (EDT)
À : 14h00	Le : 21 juin 2018	Fuseau horaire : Heure avancée de l'est (HAE)
Address Inquiries to: / Adresser toute demande de renseignements à : Nicole Levesque-Welch		
Telephone No.: / N° de téléphone : 819-420-9868	Fax No.: / N° de télécopieur :	Email Address: / Courriel : nicole.levesque-welch@pc.gc.ca
TO BE COMPLETED BY THE BIDDER (type or print) À ÊTRE COMPLÉTER PAR LE SOUMISSIONNAIRE (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)		
Vendor/Firm Name – Nom du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur		
Address - Adresse		
Name of person authorized to sign on behalf of the Vendor/Firm Nom de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur		
Title - Titre		
Signature		Date



AMENDMENT 001

This amendment is being raised to respond to questions and post the site visit attendance sheet for solicitation 5P201-18-0034/A:

A. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

On the 7th of June an optional site visit was conducted on the site of the intended work. The following question were asked during the visit:

- Q1. The location for documentation for the project is identified as Quebec. Is it possible to have a closer location for the tender documents?
- A1. Due to the location of the Contracting Officer, the bids must be submitted to the bid receiving unit noted in the solicitation document.
- Q2. Will the wood that is currently on site need to be removed by the contractor as part of the project?
- A2. Fallen trees are to be removed by contractor.
- Q3. The drawings are not quite clear as to what trees are to be removed and which trees are to be protected. Could additional detail be added to the drawings to better identify which trees are staying and which are to be removed to allow for the work.
- A3. Request for tree removal will be assessed on a case by case basis by the Departmental Representative prior to construction.
- Q4. If trees are to remain will the required protection extend to the drip edge of the canopy or will they be able to use the space closer to the trunk?
- A4. Although the preference would be to work outside of the drip-line, if the work requires working within the drip-line of a tree, which has been identified to be protected, Departmental Representative will evaluate on a case by case basis.
- Q5. Could we have additional details on silt control requirements and environmental protection requirements? There are Federal and Provincial regulations so which ones will apply to this installation?
- A5. If there is a conflict, the more stringent regulatory requirements are applicable. Silt control by silt curtains is not anticipated to be required for the in-water work since there is no in-water excavation, and placed armour and filter rock materials should be clean and free of sediments. Sediment and erosion control measures are required for soils disturbed or stored on site as part of the work, and for core and aggregate materials placed in the work (e.g., proper use of geotextile, clean aggregates with minimum fines). Please also refer to appendix document, PCA BPM Works In and Around Waterbodies.
- Q6. Have the DFO permits been obtained for this project?
- A6. Yes, DFO has responded via e-mail to departmental's request for review and below is an excerpt of the response.

...If construction starts before July 15 (no earlier than July 1) a qualified biologist should carry out a visual inspection of the entire construction area prior to works to look for evidence of spawning activity. Should spawning activity be observed, construction should not occur until July 15...

...Provided that your plans are implemented in the manner, and during the timeframe, described, the Program has determined that your proposal will not result in serious harm to fish or prohibited effects on listed aquatic species at risk. As such, an authorization under the Fisheries Act or a permit under the Species at Risk Act is not required...



- Q7. In regard to the rubble fill, the specifications indicates that there is a requirement for related shops to be stamped by an engineer. Could we have an indication of what documents would be required for this type of installation?
- A7. Sealed shop drawings are not required for this project, assuming that no changes are proposed from the construction drawings. However, submittals are still required for all surveys before, during and after the work in CAD format, as well as other product data and photos.
- Q8. The drawings indicate that there is a 1-2 ton armour stone, two courses high for a total width of 1.67m. This appears to be mismatch. Please confirm required weight and thickness.
- A8. The nominal thickness of the armour stone layer is 1.67 m, and it is related to the assumed stone density, shape and layer placement. The important issue is that the stones in the armour and filter layers are to be placed in a random interlocked fashion to achieve a void space between the units (e.g., ~34% by volume). The voids increase the nominal thicknesses of the layers but allow dissipation of wave energy.
- It will not be allowed to place the rocks in a cubed, uniform or stepped fashion. Armour and filter stones that are too thin will be rejected (i.e., Section 35 31 23.13 2.1.4/5 "Quarried rock with greatest dimension of each stone not to exceed two (2) times least dimension."
- Q9. Can larger stone be used to obtain the required dimensions and performance?
- A9. Stone size limits are defined in the specifications. While larger units may occasionally be permitted, the general intent is that the requested 'well graded range' of stone weights will produce a relatively uniform layer thickness. A supplier will be encouraged to sort materials at the source and arrange appropriate deliveries to achieve the specs and drawings.
- Q10. The specifications and drawings indicate that inspection of the stone will be conducted at the start and midpoint of the project. It also states however that there may be additional inspections required as required. What condition would require additional inspections as this would cause delays in the project?
- A10. The placed rock materials will be visually monitored by the Departmental Representative, which could include sampling stone dimensions to estimate unit weights. If stones are estimated to be out of the size range, or poorly graded in placement, the DP may reject materials and/or require additional testing.
- Q11. The finish date for the project is September 2018. Is this date firm due to site conditions or environmental requirements or is this date more flexible?
- A11. If site conditions or unforeseen issues delay the work, the Contractor may submit a request for an extension of time to the Departmental Representative for consideration.
- Q12. There is an existing issue on site that the proximity of some of the trees will impede the ability of the larger equipment needed for the work to operate. Is there a possibility of mechanically removing the tree to a safer location and then returning it to the original location at the conclusion of the work?
- A12. Refer to Q4; Departmental Representative to consider tree removal on a case by case basis.
- Q13. Are there any issues or concerns regarding the control or blocking of the road during the construction?
- A13. Contractor will be required after award to submit to the Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake a traffic plan for approval and will be required to apply for and encroachment permit.
- Q14. The specifications indicate a requirement for a trailer to be provided on site. Given the already tight condition or the site is this a requirement or are there other options that would have less impact on the already crowded site?
- A14. While it is appreciated that there is limited space at the site, there is a requirement for minimum secure accommodation to store, maintain and access documents on-site for the duration of the project. PCA will be able to provide site meeting accommodations at their nearby office.



- Q15. Will the golf course continue to leave the green (hole) closest to the work site open during the work?
- A15. Yes, the course will continue to operate but will monitor the site to ensure that the operation does not impact the work.
- Q16. There are some concerns related to the sizes of the proposed rip-rap. Is there possibility that these could be adjusted to make the installation easier?
- A16. Please see responses to Q8, 9 and 10.

B. SITE VISIT ATTENDANCE SHEET

See DSP 2 – 5P201-18-0034 folder for document.

All other terms and conditions remain the same.