



RETURN BIDS TO:

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions -
TPSGC

11 Laurier/11,rue Laurier
Place du Portage, Phase III
Core 0B2 / Noyau 0B2
Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5
Bid Fax: (819) 997-9776

**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

THIS PROCUREMENT CONTAINS A SECURITY
REQUIREMENT

Vendor/Firm Name and Address

Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution

Parliamentary Precinct Division/Acquisitions de la Cité
parlementaire
222 Queen Street / 222, rue Queen
Ottawa
Ontario
K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet PPB A&E - Integrated Campus	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EP750-182231/B	Amendment No. - N° modif. 006
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client EP750-182231	Date 2018-09-20
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$PPS-021-26904	
File No. - N° de dossier 021pps.EP750-182231	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2018-09-27	
Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT	
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Bennett, Adrian	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 021pps
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (613) 990-3849 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX () -
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: PWGSC / TPSGC Operations - Parliament Hill Opérations - Terrain Colline Parlementaire Wellington St, Ottawa K1A0A6	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Delivery Required - Livraison exigée	Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée
Vendor/Firm Name and Address Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur	
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/ de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)	
Signature	Date

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 006

This Amendment will be presented in two parts as follows:

- 1. Questions and Responses**
- 2. Revisions to the Request For Proposal**

PART ONE: QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Question 1:

Are expenses (venue, A/V, security, printing of fliers, online and offline advertising, webcasting, staging, etc.) to be included in this proposal related to the Public Information Session (1) and the Planning Summits (3) or would these be defined within the engagement plan (given design and scope choices made by the client)?

Response 1:

Room rental, hospitality and equipment will be supplied by PWGSC. All other costs associated with the implementation of the Public Engagement Plan are included in the fixed fee for Stream 1.

Question 2:

Are you able to provide a copy of the following document: "Final Report 2006 Update to the Long Term Vision and Plan for the Parliamentary Precinct: Strategic Environmental Assessment" – (2006) prepared by Jacques Whitford.

Response 2:

A copy of the document can be obtained from the Contracting Authority.

Question 3:

Can a Terms of Reference be provided for the Strategic Environmental Assessment. This would include the disciplines that need to be covered (Natural Heritage? Urban Ecology/Forestry? Hydrology? Aquatic Habitat? Toxicology? Air Quality?... How broad is the scope and what is the level of detail (i.e. seasonal field surveys for vegetation and wildlife, tree inventories, etc... or is this all from existing documentation to assess the proposed changes?). As for the timing on this: if this is for the preferred option, it suggests the assessment can't be undertaken until the preferred option has been identified?

Response 3:

A Terms of Reference is not available. Interested bidders are encouraged to review the websites provided below for information on process and requirements. The Consultant will rely on existing available documentation to complete the SEA.

<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-15.21/>

<https://www.canada.ca/en/environmental-assessment-agency/programs/strategic-environmental-assessment/cabinet-directive-environmental-assessment-policy-plan-program-proposals.html>

With respect to timing, the Consultant will provide input and review throughout the process of developing options but the final report will be completed for the preferred option only.

Question 4:

Can a firm be part of more than one team?

Response 4:

Refer to Amendment 4, response to question 2.

Question 5:

Please confirm that it is OK to include a sub-consultant who is in the process of obtaining Secret Security status (both personal and firm), but has not yet received final confirmation from Canada.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 006

Response 5:

The requirements for security clearances vary however, a number of Proponent/Sub-consultant/Specialists/Key Discipline Individuals require clearances before Contract Award as per Section SRE3.1.5. It should be noted that Canada will not delay the award of the contract to allow the Proponent, any subconsultant, or personnel to meet the required security requirement. It is up to the Proponent to determine whether the required clearances can be secured before Contract Award.

Question 6:

Will you consider extending the window for experience in Stream 1 projects to 15 years (not 10)? Or perhaps granting partial marks for a project that is slightly over the 10-year mark without disqualifying the entire project?

Response 6:

The requirement remains unchanged. See Part 2 amendment for an adjustment to the mandatory experience under 3.1.6.2.

Question 7:

In section RT1, you ask that the key individuals demonstrate direct involvement in projects under RP1-5 in order to achieve full marks – We would like to put forward key individuals who are most specialized in their fields, most expert in the areas necessary to deliver the different types of projects that this proposal identifies to the highest standards, which means that they probably would not have been involved in RP1 and 2 and 3 in equally meaningful ways, but more likely to have been deeply involved in one or another. Would you consider amending this requirement?

Response 7:

The requirement remains unchanged.

Question 8:

Please advise whether there are any restrictions on bids from consultants already working on projects located within the "Main Study Area" (as per Appendix B). If there are restrictions, please indicate which streams these are limited to, and which members of the current RFP consultant team are affected?

Response 8:

Due to the vast number of contracts awarded in the last ten years for various projects both completed and underway in the Parliamentary Precinct, the experience acquired by a Proponent who is providing or has provided the goods and services to Canada in the Parliamentary Precinct (or similar goods or services) will not, in of itself, be considered by Canada as conferring an unfair advantage or creating a conflict of interest. The Proponent remains however subject to the criteria established in R1410T GI25. As a result of their involvement in the project, the parties named below, their employees, and any of their subcontractors, advisors, consultants or representatives engaged in respect of this project and any person controlled by, that controls or that is under common control with the Ineligible Party (each an Ineligible Party's affiliate) are not eligible to participate as a Proponent Team member or advisor to the Proponent:

- MHPM Project Managers Inc.
- Tiree Facility Solutions Inc.
- Colliers Project Leaders

This list is not necessarily exhaustive and Proponents who are in doubt about a particular situation should contact the Contracting Authority before bid closing.

Question 9:

Regarding 3.1.6, criteria no 6: Please clarify "integration of land-uses and patterns".

Response 9:

The Proponent must demonstrate that the project submitted for evaluation included the integration of a mix of land uses and built-form patterns within the study area.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 006

Question 10:

Regarding 3.1.6, criteria 11: Does a masterplan for a private client such as a project management firm, including large public properties (existing and new streets, roads, buildings) qualify for this criteria? We ask because large portion of public land developments are often prepared by private organization (either through a management contract or through a competition in a DBMF format, for example). In fact, most extensive planning exercises are conducted this way.

Response 10:

The Proponent must demonstrate that the project was completed on behalf of an institutional client. Canada does not have sufficient information to qualify the above noted scenario as meeting this mandatory experience criteria. Additional clarification is provided in Amendment 5.

Question 11:

Regarding 3.1.7, criteria 3: is a 75 % completed project substantially complete? We assume the term "substantially complete" is not intended to refer to the legally defined term in the Ontario Lein act.

Response 11:

"Substantially complete" shall refer to a project having received a certificate of Substantial Performance as defined in the PWGSC Standard Acquisitions Clauses General Conditions GC 1.1.4
<https://buyandsell.gc.ca/policy-and-guidelines/standard-acquisition-clauses-and-conditions-manual/5/R/R2810D/15#substantial-performance>.

Question 12:

Regarding 3.1.7, criteria 5: We suggest that a provincial government authority be acceptable for this criteria. This is because the number of projects that have been realized by the federal government, qualifying for all of the criteria listed are very limited.

Response 12:

No change to this requirement.

Question 13:

Regarding 3.1.8, Criteria 6, same question as 3.1.6, criteria 11 [Question 10].

Response 13:

The mandatory project must have been undertaken by the Proponent or one of his Key Subconsultants/Specialists, as Prime Consultant to the Owner, as per 3.1.8, 2.

Question 14:

Regarding 3.2.2, same question as 3.1.7. [Question 11]

Response 14:

No change to this requirement. The rated requirement for Stream 2 in Section 3.2.2 does not require the reference projects to be strictly related to the federal government, therefore, projects completed on behalf of provincial governments are eligible.

Question 15:

Regarding criteria asking that projects must have been completed within 10 years. Given the nature of the work there are actually a very small number of projects similar in scope and nature completed in Canada in the past 10 years. Excessively restrictive criteria will mean that we are unable to promote projects that are pertinent to the work and of value to Canada – and may potentially eliminate viable teams from consideration. We understand that it is pertinent to ask for recent expertise and up-to-date knowledge for the services asked. But we should also be able to present projects with no time limits, providing that the team who did them is still within the firm and contributing to the actual proposal (very easy to measure by a % of the team question). It is irrelevant to exclude older projects that have been realized and today demonstrate, sometimes better than recent ones, their quality, long-term service and

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 006

sustainability and proven durability. Significant successful public places, adopted by the public over the years and heritage buildings saved from demolition by their redesign strategies are priceless: So is the experience of teams who did them. We request PWGSC to rethink its strategy for evaluating the proposal on this criteria.

Response 15:

See response to Question 6.

Question 16:

Regarding addendum 3 Response 14. The response implies that every consulting firm must be licenced by OAA or APEO. This is not possible for a variety of specialists such as public engagement consultant. Please confirm the intent is that the designers are licenced when provincial law would normally require so.

Response 16:

Confirmed.

Question 17:

Based on our review and the development of our proposal, we have a question :

3.3.2 RP5: Achievements of Key Sub-Consultants and/or Specialists on Projects relevant to Stream 2 and 3

It is mentioned that project no.1 must be related to the construction of an asset for residential housing. Given the nature of this mandate, we find it odd that the residential aspect is being considered, could you please validate and/or clarify this point.

Response 17:

This is due to a discrepancy in the translation from English to French. See Part 2 amendment for correction to French version of RFP only.

Question 18:

With reference to Appendix C – Price Proposal Form, hourly rates table:

We are finding the grouping of all the various disciplines is challenging to find a blended hourly rate that everyone can accept. Can PSPC consider revising the hourly rates sheet to allow for smaller groups of disciplines?

Response 18:

The Other Specialized Services in Appendix C have been grouped into two categories: Licensed versus Non-Licensed professionals, which are deemed sufficient to provide appropriate blended rates for these categories.

Question 19:

The list of specialists requested are not all on the bid form. Is this intentional or an omission? The missing individuals as follows:

STREAM 2

Promotion and Public Relations

Seismic and Base Isolation

Shadow/Wind Studies

Building Science

Cultural Anthropology

STREAM 3

P3

Facility Management

Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 006

Energy Management and Control Systems
Commissioning
Information Management/Information Technology
Accessibility

Response 19:

This is not an omission. Other specialists than those specifically named in the Price Proposal Form may be obtained using the mechanism described in section RS 2.3.30 of the Project Brief.

Question 20:

Regarding 3.2.2 RP2

The Project Brief states “the intent of this stream is largely focused on the provision of planning/pre-project studies (i.e. pre-design services)” however the scoring appears to be strongly biased towards built projects – noting for example “project has reached substantial completion” and “Projects should preferably include the full scope of Basic Services described in the required services” and “project has been recognised for excellence in design”. We would like to present a study as one of our projects, based the statement in the Project Brief – but it appears that it will have points deducted because it is not a built project. Is this the case?

Response 20:

Yes, a reference project that consists only of a study will not score as favourably as a project which has reached Substantial Completion, as per the RFP.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AMENDMENT 006

PART TWO: REVISIONS TO THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)

THE RFP IS HEREBY AMENDED TO REFLECT THE FOLLOWING REVISIONS:

1. At Submission Requirements and Evaluation 3.1.6 Stream 1 (Master Planning) Mandatory Experience, Item 2:

DELETE :

Project was completed within the last 10 years (between January 2008 and December 2017)

INSERT:

Project was completed after January 2008.

2. At Submission Requirements and Evaluation 3.3.2 RP5 Achievements of Key Sub-Consultants and/or Specialists on Projects relevant to Stream 2 and 3 (French version only):

DELETE :

doit être lié à la construction d'une installation abritant des logements;

INSERT:

doit être un projet à caractère immobilier (et non un ouvrage d'art ou ouvrage principalement d'ingénierie);

3. At Project Brief, Annex D Category of Personnel Definitions, Other Specialty Services, Disciplines :

DELETE:

Cost Specialist (Note 2, 3)

INSERT:

Cost Specialist (Note 2, 4)