



RETURN BIDS TO:

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

Bid Receiving Public Works and Government
Services Canada/Réception des soumissions Travaux
publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
800 Burrard Street, Room 219
800, rue Burrard, pièce 219
Vancouver, BC V6Z 0B9
Bid Fax: (604) 775-7526

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

LE PRÉSENT DOCUMENT COMPORTE UNE
EXIGENCE RELATIVE À LA SÉCURITÉ.

Vendor/Firm Name and Address

Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution

Public Works and Government Services Canada - Pacific
Region
219 - 800 Burrard Street
800, rue Burrard, pièce 219
Vancouver, BC V6Z 0B9

Title - Sujet SERVICES D'ÉVALUATION DES RISQUES S	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EZ897-191436/B	Amendment No. - N° modif. 003
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client EZ897-191436	Date 2019-06-27
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$VAN-582-8598	
File No. - N° de dossier VAN-9-42022 (582)	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2019-07-08	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Pacific Daylight Saving Time PDT
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Lee, Hilda	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur van582
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (604) 764-6053 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (604) 775-7526
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	

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

This amendment 003 is raised to incorporate the following information into Solicitation No. EZ897-191436/B.

1) Questions and Answers

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q1. Annex H (in Section H.1) states “References must be a third party currently employed with the client company...” If the person has moved from one federal department to another, is that person an acceptable reference? (e.g. from PWGSC to ECCC, or from F&OC to ISC)

A1. No.

Q2. The Key Personnel form in Annex H requests a description of “Services and Achievements of Key Personnel on projects over career”. Projects meeting various criteria (i.e. work in the Yukon, at relevant Types of Sites, working with relevant Primary Contaminants, and working with CCME standards) are requested on the bottom of this form. Are the projects on the Key Personnel form included in the 5-year limit described at the bottom of Page 45? The bottom of Page 45, Annex H, Section H.1 states “A project does not have to be completed at the time of tender, but only those components worked on within the last 5 years....may be considered for evaluation purposes.”

A2. As per the RFP, a project is defined as being within the last 5 years.

Q3. Are “spaces” included in the 1000 character limitation for the “Services and Achievements of Key Personnel on projects over career” on the Key Personnel form in Annex H?

A3. No.

Q4. Annex A- Statement of work refers to Highway maintenance camps (where workers reside on site) as a qualifying Type of Site (TOS). Can PSPC clarify why they are requesting only camps with current residents? Any risk assessment conducted at this type of site would consider various human health receptors; including construction workers, recreational users, and First Nations use in the analysis (or could be included if applicable). We understand that there are many maintenance camps along the Alaska Highway, including former sites which have similar or more complex contamination issues than some of the maintenance camps with current residents.

A4. Camps must have residents for two reasons: (i) the receptors are different (eg residential receptors) and (ii) demonstrates the Bidder has performed work on a site with residents.

-
- Q5.** On the Corporate Capability Project template in Annex H, the “Description of Work” includes the statement: “(primary purpose was site Characterization, Risk Assessment or Remediation).” Can PSPC clarify if the intent was to include Site Characterization and Remediation within this risk assessment RFP?
- A5. No, only risk Assessment is considered an appropriate primary purpose.
- Q6.** Regarding the “Company Performance Evaluation” section of the Corporate Capability Project template in Annex H, we anticipate there could be differences in scoring that could occur between PSPC and non-PSPC references which would have a potentially large impact on the overall technical scores. Some clients who are not familiar with the template and scoring system could be hesitant to give a top Superior score for “uncommon level of service.” Are there any additional instructions (to those provided at the bottom of the template) that we should provide to non-PSPC clients to standardize the scoring?
- A6. No additional instructions are provided. PSPC retains the right to confirm with References the scoring provided, and if there is a discrepancy between the Reference and the Submission, that criteria may receive a score of 0.
- Q7.** On the Corporate Capability Project template in Annex H, the “Number of Key Personnel” provides full marks for greater than four Key Personnel involved in the same project. Given the scope of assignments under this SOA, it would be unusual and inefficient to include multiple Senior Project Managers in addition to the Program Manager and CSAP Expert. Therefore, Bidders would not be able to achieve the top score of over four key personnel. Was it PSPC's intent that Key Personnel includes Key Positions Personnel and Back-up Personnel when considering the history of teams working together?
- A7. As per the RFP, Key Personnel do not include Key Positions or Backup Personnel.
- Q8.** On the Key Personnel Qualifications template in Annex H, the “Key Personnel Experience” projects request only the Reference Name & Number. Would PSPC also like us to include the Client name?
- A8. “Reference Name” is the name of the individual that is the Client.
- Q9.** Regarding the Key Personnel Qualifications template in Annex H, for each “Key Personnel Experience” area, are only projects that meet the criteria outlined under Project Relevancy Evaluation in the Corporate Capability Project template in Annex H allowed? For instance, could

the proponent include a risk assessment project on a military site in the Northwest Territories for "Key Personnel Experience on working at a relevant Type of Site"?

A9. Key Personnel Project experience must meet the definition of a "project", including Technical Services. Project Relevancy does not define a project.

Q10. Regarding the Key Personnel Qualifications template in Annex H, for the Program Manager's "Key Personnel Experience" projects, is it PSPC's intention that the projects examples are individual projects that have been part of the portfolio of projects overseen by the Program Manager, or is PSPC looking for only the programs to be listed?

A10. Program Manager's project experience is for individual projects that have been part of the portfolio of projects overseen by the Program Manager.

Q11. On page 45, Annex H, the RFP states that if references cannot be contacted by PWGSC, the relevant criteria will not be considered. Given that the evaluation period is during the summer months when many people are either on vacation or out of the office for field work, could PSPC notify the proponent if they are unable to contact the reference so that we may contact our reference via other methods (personal email/home phone) to notify them, or be given an opportunity to nominate an alternative reference?

A11. If PSPC cannot contact a Reference they may, at their sole discretion, contact the Bidder for an alternate Reference.

Q12. Does the Expert CSAP that is required on the bidders team need to be a Risk Based Standards Approved Professional?

A12. Yes, the CSAP must be Risk Based Standards to be relevant.

Q13. In the Statement of Work, it defines the roles rather than the work. Will key personnel listed as Sr Env Project Manager potentially score full points related to PM experience, based on their experience as project managers on projects that involved Investigation and were going towards future Risk Assessment but had not yet reached that stage? Or must they have managed RA projects where RA was completed? Also, must they have expertise in RA or simply expertise in project management?

A13. Must have managed risk assessment projects.

Q14. "Equivalent professional associations are also appropriate".

a. Does a person who is a P.Eng. in Ontario qualify?

b. Does a Qualified Professional in Risk Assessment in Ontario qualify?

A14. "Equivalency" refers to Limited Licensees or equivalent in the identified college/association.

Q15. For the Project Relevancy Evaluation, do non-RA projects score the same as RA projects, all other things being equal?

A15. A "project" is defined as being relevant to the Statement of Work and Required Services. The Description of Work must indicate the project is a risk assessment. Non-risk assessment projects are not considered projects for evaluation purposes and will receive a score of 0.

Q16. Annex H, Corporate Capability Template, between page 53 and 54: Is the expectation that the Corporate Capability project examples and scores be completed by the bidder, and the client reference acknowledges the information and scores presented? Is the Client Reference required to verify all of the project details to confirm its applicability for a Corporate Capability project, including details such as Number of Key Personnel, Value of Consulting Work, etc.?

A16. As per the RFP, the Client reference must complete the Corporate Capability form.

Q17. Annex H, Corporate Capability Template, between page 53 and 54: Are Corporate Capability project details related to "Design", "Quality of Results", "Management", "Time", and "Cost" included on the form and acknowledged by the client reference? Does the bidder and client reference fill in the score for each category on the form?

A17. As per the RFP, the Client reference must complete the Corporate Capability form.

Q18. Annex H, Corporate Capability Template, between page 53 and 54: Is the score on the Corporate Capability Template expected to be in increments as shown on the form (ie. four potential score responses per category) or can the scores be given any number within the full range for that category? It would seem that differentiating between bidders would benefit from having any value within the range for each category.

A18. As per the RFP, one box must be selected.

Q19. Annex H, H.1, Technical Evaluation, Evaluation Procedures, page 45: The RFP indicates that references must be a third party currently employed with the client company. If the Corporate Capability project is within the last 5 years, but the client reference has moved to a new company, can this project still be included?

A19. As per the RFP, References must be currently employed with the client company.

- Q20.** Annex H, Key Personnel Template, between page 53 and 54: How will the 10 points for each Key Personnel writeup be allocated? Confirm that the Key Personnel are targeting project managers, and there is no requirement to specifically identify technical specialists (toxicologists, aquatic biologists, human health specialists, hydrogeologists, etc) who may play a part in a HHERA project.
- A20. As per the RFP, the Generic Evaluation Table will be used. Key Personnel also include technical specialists.
- Q21.** Annex H, Key Personnel Template, between page 53 and 54: Do the "Number of Key Personnel" on the Corporate Capability template reflect those individuals who are completing the Key Personnel writeups? As most of the Key Personnel are expected to be Senior Environmental Project Managers, it would be unusual and unlikely to have multiple Project Managers on a single project. Or alternatively, do the "Number of Key Personnel" on the Corporate Capability template represent the "profiles of Key Positions Personnel" as outlined on Page 48 as part of the Management of Services?
- A21. As per the RFP, Key Personnel do not include Key Positions or Backup Personnel.
- Q22.** Annex H, Key Personnel Template, between page 53 and 54: How are "Years of Relevant Experience" scored for the Key Personnel? For example, if a Senior – Environmental Project Manager has the minimum 10 years required experience, would they get full points?
- A22. As per the RFP, the Generic Evaluation Table will be used.
- Q23.** Annex H, H.1, Technical Evaluation, Evaluation Procedures, page 45: Does the requirement that a project be within the last 5 years apply to both the Corporate Capability projects as well as the Key Personnel projects?
- A23. As per the RFP, a project is defined as being within the last 5 years.
- Q24.** Are there any details required to be included for the Key Personnel projects other than "Name & Technical Services", "Location" and "Reference Name and Number"?
- A24. No.
- Q25.** Annex H, Key Personnel Template, between page 53 and 54: If a Key Personnel has experience working in the Yukon on a site characterization and/or remediation project that does not have a risk assessment component within the last 5 years, will that example be awarded any points?
- A25. No, as per the RFP these examples do not meet the definition of a "project".

-
- Q26.** Annex H, H.1, Technical Evaluation, Achievements of Key Personnel on Projects, Page 47: Can a Key Personnel be named on more than one submission?
- A26. Yes, but as per the RFP they must be available to work on PSPC projects.
- Q27.** Annex H, Key Personnel Template, between page 53 and 54: If a client reference for a Key Personnel project example no longer works at the client company, can that project still be included?
- A27. The project may be used, but an alternate reference must be provided.
- Q28.** Annex H, H.1, Technical Evaluation, Evaluation Procedures, page 45: The RFP indicates that "Reference information must be provided. References must be a third party currently employed with the client company, be independent of the Bidder, and be knowledgeable on the project.". The phrasing of "third party" and "client company" suggests that the references can not be PWGSC staff. Can references be PWGSC staff?
- A28. Yes, a reference may be a PWGSC staff.
- Q29.** Annex A, General Procedures, page 30: The RFP indicates that "Specializations do not include subcontractors" – please define what a subcontractor is (i.e., is a subcontractor the same as a subconsultant, or is a subcontractor an organization like a drilling contractor or analytical laboratory)?
- A29. Subcontractor is a company hired by the Contractor, including subconsultants.
- Q30.** Annex E, page 38: Is a "Bidder" the prime consultant leading the bid (only) or, in cases where a team is being led by one firm (not in a joint venture), is the bidder the team?
- A30. See definition of Bidder in 2003 Standard Instructions.
- Q31.** Can a bidder, pursuant to Part 5, Sec. 5.1.1.1 (3)(ii) of the RFP, submit a single bid as a "Joint Venture" (C) comprised of two (2) companies with a current joint venture/shareholder relationship of 51% aboriginal (A) and 49% non-aboriginal business ownership (B). (A+B=C) Can the corporate project experience requirement be considered to be that of the Joint Venture (C) whether derived from company A or B or a combination of both?
- A31. For Solicitation No.: EZ897-191436/B, an aboriginal business and a non-aboriginal business(es) can submit a single bid as a "Joint Venture" as long as the aboriginal business(es) has at least 51% ownership and control of the joint venture. Corporate experience from both companies A and B will be considered if companies A and B form a Joint Venture.

-
- Q32.** References were made to changes and amendments to some of forms included in the RFP. Will these amended forms, together with written questions and answers, be posted as an addendum notice on the Canada Public Works and Government Services buyandsell website?
- A32. The revised Corporate Capability Form and Key Personnel Form have already been posted on Buy and Sell as an amendment 002. All written questions and answers will be posted as an addendum notice on buyandsell website.
- Q33.** In Annex H, Achievement of Bidders on Projects, would PSPC consider extending the project component completion date from 5 years to 10 years?
- A33. No, as per the RFP, a project is defined as being within the last 5 years.
- Q34.** Refer to the Corporate Capability Template (located in the RFP between pages 53 and 54) in Annex H. Please confirm that "Primary Contaminants" are contaminants confirmed by analysis as exceedences and were consequently addressed as part of the Risk Assessment, and were not addressed by other remedial approaches (i.e., excavation)?
- A34. Primary Contaminants are those Contaminants (not Potential Contaminants) included in a Risk Assessment.
- Q35.** Refer to the Corporate Capability Template (located in the RFP between pages 53 and 54) in Annex H. At the bidders meeting, PWGSC indicated that multiple risk assessed sites (each site located in a different/independent physical location) that had been grouped under a single Task Authorization could be treated as separate "Projects" or "Project Sites" and could each have a separate Corporate Capability Project submission. Please confirm this interpretation is correct.
- A35. Correct, assuming PWGSC reference concurs they are considered separate projects. Each project must have had a standalone Risk Assessment performed.
- Q36.** Refer to the Corporate Capability Template (located in the RFP between pages 53 and 54) in Annex H. At the bidder's meeting, PWGSC indicated that the five Corporate Capability Projects submitted for evaluation must be Projects that were carried out under contract directly with the Bidder team "lead consultant" where the team includes two or more consultants. Please confirm this interpretation is correct.
- A36. See definition of Bidder in 2003 Standard Instructions.
- Q37.** Refer to the Corporate Capability Template (located in the RFP between pages 53 and 54) in Annex H. At the bidders meeting, PWGSC indicated that the Client Reference for the five Corporate Capability Projects can't have left the employ of the Project's client (i.e., Client References must have access to records about the Project). Please confirm this in writing – and clarify that in the case where references have left organizations, the bidders can approach the "senior manager" of that person.

-
- A37. As per the RFP " References must be a third party currently employed with the client company, be independent of the Bidder, and be knowledgeable on the project."
- Q38.** Refer to the Corporate Capability Template (located in the RFP between pages 53 and 54) in Annex H. At the bidders meeting, PWGSC indicated that a "superior" rating by a Client Reference would need written backup confirmation such as a commendation email to be accepted by PWGSC. Can you confirm that for every "superior" rating given on these forms, PWGSC will be requesting this written backup confirmation from the Client Reference?
- A38. As per the RFP " Superior = exceptional and uncommon level of service, must have demonstrable examples of commendation". As per the RFP, Reference may be checked.
- Q39.** Refer to the Key Personnel Template (located in the RFP between pages 53 and 54) in Annex H. At the bidders meeting, PWGSC clarified at one point in discussions that bidders must not name Intermediate and Junior personnel – only Experts and Seniors. However, at a different point in discussions, PWGSC indicated that a Junior could be included in the Management Services section of the proposal if it was for a particular or new specialization under "Key Positions"? Please clarify this point.
- A39. As per the Basis of Payment form, Intermediate and Junior Categories do not have named personnel. Bidders may submit any personnel in Key Positions, including Intermediates and Juniors.
- Q40.** Refer to the Key Personnel Template (located in the RFP between pages 53 and 54) in Annex H. At the bidders meeting, PWGSC indicated that the six Senior Environmental Project Managers can include technical specialists (i.e., risk assessors). Please confirm this interpretation is correct. For those technical specialists who are included as key personnel, confirm to what extent the "Project Management" requirements outlined in Annex A (page 28) will be used as part of the evaluation score for that technical specialist.
- A40. Yes, the Project Manager Specialization includes technical specialists. As per the RFP, the Generic Evaluation Table will be used, and no one requirement would necessarily count more than any other. However, as per the RFP, must have experience relative to Technical Services.
- Q41.** Refer to the Key Personnel Template (located in the RFP between pages 53 and 54) in Annex H. For the Key Personnel Experience on the template, the term "Technical Services" is used – please confirm that the services described should include Project Management?
- A41. As per the RFP, Technical Services are relative to Risk Assessment. The Project Manager Specialization is expected to have technical expertise in Risk Assessment, and are not pur project managers.
- Q42.** Refer to the Key Personnel Template (located in the RFP between pages 53 and 54) in Annex H. Please confirm that the Key Personnel Experience for individuals can be Projects that the key

personnel individual was involved in directly, but does not necessarily need to have been Projects that were contracted to the Bidder team "lead consultant".

- A42. As per the RFP, Key Personnel experience is irrespective "of their past association with the current Bidder firm."
- Q43.** Refer to the Key Personnel Template (located in the RFP between pages 53 and 54) in Annex H. Please confirm that the Key Personnel Experience for individuals can be Projects that are types of sites listed in Annex A (page 26) as not considered relevant (i.e., mine sites, lighthouses, etc).
- A43. As per the RFP, Types of Sites does not define a project. However, some criteria require an example project to be a relevant Type of Site.
- Q44.** Refer to the Key Personnel Template (located in the RFP between pages 53 and 54) in Annex H. Is there any guidance on the required timespan of projects identified as Key Personnel?
- A44. As per the RFP, a project is defined as being within the last 5 years.
- Q45.** Refer to the Key Personnel Template (located in the RFP between pages 53 and 54) in Annex H. Please confirm that the Key Personnel Experience for individuals must specifically be related to risk assessment as per Annex A.
- A45. As per the RFP "All Requirements and Technical Evaluations, including projects, experience, and services (including roles and responsibilities), are with respect to the Statement of Work."
- Q46.** Refer to page 31, Under "Resource Categories and Specializations". The definition of Expert is "minimum 20 years relevant experience except for ten years relevant experience for Contaminated Sites Approved Professional (CSAP) Specialization". Does this mean that CSAPs only require ten years of experience or does it mean that CSAP's need to have been an Approved Professional for ten years?
- A46. Minimum 10 years relevant experience means at least 10 years total relevant experience.
- Q47.** Refer to Annex A Statement of Work. In reference to the Types of Sites (page 26), please confirm that Highway Maintenance Camps (where workers reside on site) can include temporary residences that may not be occupied all year long. Please also confirm whether a Highway Maintenance Camp that had residences at some point in the past 5 years or was evaluated to include a future residential scenario in the HHRA would be considered acceptable (i.e., full points for site type).
- A47. Workers must reside on site of sufficient duration that they would be considered residents for risk assessment purposes. Future residential scenarios do not meet the definition of "workers residing on site".

-
- Q48.** Refer to Annex H Evaluation Criteria and Basis of Selection. Does the maximum number of pages (17) (H.1 Technical Evaluation, page 45) include a title page, table of contents and cover letter or can these be submitted and not be counted towards the 17 page maximum.
- A48. As per the RFP, the 17 page count is for the Achievements of Bidders, Achievements of Key Personnel, and Management of Services. All other pages are not counted or considered.
- Q49.** Can the Certificate of Insurance statement be amended to read: "I certify that the above policies were issued by insurers in the course of their Insurance business in Canada, are currently in force and include the applicable insurance coverage's stated on page 2 of this Certificate of Insurance, including advance notice of cancellation."?
- A49. Consistent with other sections in Annex F – Insurance Requirement, the Certificate of Insurance statement is amended as below: "I certify that the above policies were issued by insurers in the course of their Insurance business in Canada, are currently in force and include the applicable insurance coverage's stated on page 2 of this Certificate of Insurance, including advance notice of cancellation or any changes in coverage."
- Q50.** We note under Annex A (Page 31 of 56) of the RFP that the Bidder must be a Qualified Professional and, in addition to the typical accreditation groups, PWGSC has indicated "Equivalent professional associations are also appropriate". Under previous RFPs (2017 - Remediation, 2016 Risk Assessment) PWGSC has accepted the ECO Canada EP designation for specific categories (e.g., Senior Qualified Professional). ECO Canada is a recognized, Federally-funded organization with a robust accreditation process overseen by the Canadian Environmental Certification Approvals Board (CECAB). ECO Canada also has a code of ethics, and the ability to require both professional development and disciplinary actions. Given this, will you accept the EP designation for the Senior Program Manager and/or Senior Project Manager categories?
- A50. No, as per the RFP, only the associations identified are considered Qualified Professionals.
- Q51.** Under the definition of a "Project" it is indicated that: "The Project does not have to be completed, but only those components worked on within the last 5 years may be considered for evaluation purposes". Specifically for E.3 Technical Submission Part 3: Personnel Sample Projects - We respectfully request that the timeline be extended so that components worked on within the last 10 years (or more) be considered for evaluation purposes. The rationale for this is that a person's qualifications, skills, and experience are based on a career-long project history and the value gained from projects extends well past the most recent 5 years. The extension to 10 years also serves to level the evaluation field for persons who may not have been on the most recent Risk SOA. A ten year window for personnel experience would also align more closely with the 'career' duration recognized in the Services and Achievements of Key Personnel on projects over career Section of the personnel form.
- A51. No, as per the RFP, only projects within the last 5 years are considered.

Q52. Could you provide more details as to the field work to be done and the locations involved? Our understanding is that the work on site would be primarily additional characterization work (Phase III type). Is that correct? If so, we understand that other activities, such as remediation, ecological inventories, etc., could require the assignment of specific tasks and personnel to a given project (i.e., for a particular TA).

A52. The field work to be performed is relative to the Technical Services.

Q53. Could you be more specific regarding the equipment that could be required on site?

A53. Methods and means are up to the Contractor.

Q54. Could you give us a few examples of typical projects to come, and an approximate timeline for carrying out the work?

A54. The types of projects are described in the Statement of Work. This Contract is good for up to 3 years.

Q55. Our understanding is that the total envelope is \$20M (RFSO -A and -B) and that Aboriginal bidders cannot expect to receive more than \$200K. Is that correct? Also, could you specify how the contracts are allocated, if more than one Aboriginal bidder qualifies? Is it that the second-to-last bidder for RFSO-A (e.g. the fourth, if five companies qualify) also gets a \$200K reduction so that that amount can be allocated to the Aboriginal company?

A55. Yes, Aboriginal bidders cannot receive more than \$200,000 of work. Only one Aboriginal contract will be awarded, and the \$200,000 will be removed from the last bidder.

Q56. As regards the minimum work guarantee, we understand that even if no TA is issued to a qualified company during the three-year contract period, that company will receive 5% of the contract amount. Is that correct? If not, please clarify.

A56. Correct, assuming the reason for no work awarded is solely the fault of Canada.

Q57. Technical evaluation (projects): would it be possible to amend certain criteria, which seem exaggeratedly exclusive? Reduce the amounts associated with the cost criterion for each project. For consulting services (i.e., essentially fees, not field costs), the brackets indicated seem completely disproportionate (0 points if <100K, 2.5 points if 250K–500K, 5 points if >500K); PCBs, PCDDs and PCDFs are all part of the same family (chlorinated hydrocarbons, as defined in Annex A) and their assessment is based on the same principles (toxic equivalents). In this context, a project involving PCDDs/PCDFs should be worth as many points as a project involving PCBs. Would it be possible to add PCDDs/PCDFs to the list of contaminants worth the most points in the RFP form?

A57. See Revised Corporate Capability form. PCDDs/PCDFs are not considered for Project Relevancy as they are not contaminants PSPC regularly encounters.

Q58. Technical evaluation (key personnel): our understanding is that a key individual can be designated for a single role only, and that replacements cannot be included on the initial key personnel list. This requirement greatly penalizes highly specialized bidders that have a relatively small team. Would it be possible to amend this requirement and allow senior personnel to be identified as key for two levels of responsibility (i.e., both expert and senior or an expert's or senior's replacement)?

A58. No, the intent is that Bidders have a breadth and depth of resources.

Q59. Could you clarify the meaning of "CSAP" [expert contaminated sites approved professional] (page 33)? Is the qualification based on experience acquired on any type of contaminated site (federal, provincial not limited to BC/Yukon) or must this experience have been acquired in BC/Yukon or on federal sites specifically?

A59. As per the RFP, CSAP is a Contaminated Sites Approved Professional, which is an organization mandated through the BC provincial government.

Q60. We understand that professionals who are registered/licensed in another province (e.g. the Ordre des ingénieurs du Québec) are also qualified. However, professional bodies, associations, etc., don't cover all relevant professions in the context of risk assessment. Will someone with a PhD in a relevant field (e.g. toxicology), who has 20 years of experience in risk evaluation and contaminated sites be recognized as expert and/or senior personnel?

A60. No, Qualified Professionals must be a member of one of the organizations identified in the RFP, which are all registered in BC or the Yukon.

Q61. Does key personnel necessarily need to be a professional registered in BC?

A61. Yes.

Q62. Can I propose a different "Senior" rate for Environmental Program Manager and Environmental Project Manager?

A62. No, as per the RFP, only one rate per Category is allowed.

Q63. Regarding the Corporate Capability form, must the Description of Work identify the project as being a Contaminated Sites Risk Assessment project?

A63. Yes.

Q64. Regarding the Corporate Capability form, if PFAS is a Potential Contaminant of Concern, but not a Contaminant of Concern, can PFAS be identified as a Primary Contaminant.

A64. No.

Q65. Regarding the Corporate Capability form, does the Value of Consulting Work include taxes?

A65. Yes.

Q66. Is the Contractor responsible for hiring drillers? Are we allowed to mark-up subcontractors?

A66. Yes Contractors are responsible for hiring drillers. No mark-up is allowed for any disbursements.

Q67. Regarding the Corporate Capability form, if a site is located in BC but is operated and managed as if it is in the Yukon, is the Location considered Yukon?

A67. No, Location is the common definition of the word regarding the physical location.

Q68. Will a request for an extension to the Closing Date of the Solicitation be considered?

A68. No. Almost all of these Questions and Answers were addressed during the Bidder's Conference. Furthermore, none of the Answers substantially changes the Solicitation such that additional time to complete the Bid is required. The only significant changes to the Solicitation are the revised Corporate Capability Form and the Key Personnel Form, both of which were issued as Amendment #2 on 2019Jun17.

All other terms and conditions remain the same.