



**RETURN BIDS TO:**

**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**

Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions

-> TPSGC

10th Floor, 4900 Yonge Street /

10e étage, 4900 rue Yonge

Toronto

Ontario

M2N 6A6

**Revision to a Request for a Standing Offer**

**Révision à une demande d'offre à commandes**

Departmental Individual Standing Offer (DISO)

Offre à commandes individuelle du département(OCID)

The referenced document is hereby revised; unless otherwise indicated, all other terms and conditions of the Offer remain the same.

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

**Comments - Commentaires**

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS A SECURITY REQUIREMENT.

**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

Ontario Region

10th Floor, 4900 Yonge Street

Toronto

Ontario

M2N 6A6

<b>Title - Sujet</b> LaSalle Causeway Bridge Engineering	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EQ754-201337/A	<b>Date</b> 2019-11-28
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> EQ754-201337	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 002
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> PWL-9-42060 (034)	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$PWL-034-2496	
<b>Date of Original Request for Standing Offer</b> 2019-10-21	
<b>Date de la demande de l'offre à commandes originale</b>	
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2020-01-07</b>	
<b>Time Zone</b> <b>Fuseau horaire</b> Eastern Standard Time EST	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Somaratna, Chinthaka	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> pwl034
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (416) 305-7369 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (416) 952-1257
<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>	
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b> Lasalle Causeway Lift Bridge Kingston, ON	
<b>Security - Sécurité</b> This revision does not change the security requirements of the Offer. Cette révision ne change pas les besoins en matière de sécurité de la présente offre.	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

<b>Acknowledgement copy required</b>	<b>Yes - Oui</b>	<b>No - Non</b>
<b>Accusé de réception requis</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The Offeror hereby acknowledges this revision to its Offer.</b> <b>Le proposant constate, par la présente, cette révision à son offre.</b>		
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of offeror. (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du proposant. (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)		
<b>For the Minister - Pour le Ministre</b>		

### **Amendment No. 002**

This amendment is being raised to provide a response to Request for Clarification.

Q1. Section 3.2.3 Past Experience; Subsection 2 (e) requires that the proponent list senior personnel and project personnel who were involved as part of the project team and their respective responsibilities. Can PWGSC please confirm if the proponent should state if the project being showcased was part of a PWGSC Standing Offer, and for projects completed under a Standing Offer that the proponent should specifically list who the Consultant's Standing Offer Manager and Call-Up Team Leader was for those completed assignments (per AA.1.1.2.1 and AA 1.1.2.2 respectively).

R1. If the projects showcased by the Proponent were completed under a previous Standing Offer with PWGSC, the Standing Offer Manager and Call-Up Team Leader should be mentioned if they are still in employment by the Proponent, are part of the management of services for this standing offer, and their abilities have been demonstrated in the previous Standing Offer. PWGSC reserves the right to verify all information presented by the Proponent pertaining to projects under previous Standing Offers.

-----

Q2. Section 3.2.5 Project Personnel Expertise and Experience; Subsection 2 requires the proponent provide a (c.v.) for a Senior Bridge Technologist. Could PWGSC please clarify the duties required of this individual. Will the standing offer require the services of a CAD, or is this person required to perform supervision of construction activities, or is the intent to have an individual with a combination of both?

R2. The Senior Bridge Technologist is expected to support the Senior Personnel in all pertinent engineering activities under this standing offer. Preparing tender documents, participating in design development and delivery of design drawings, as well as construction and contract administration are examples of where a Senior Technologist can be expected to perform within the Required Services of this Standing Offer.

-----

Q3. The Required Services (RS) section outlines the services required under this Standing Offer. RS1.1 specifically lists the BRIDGE DESIGN GENERAL REQUIREMENTS. RS1.1.1 refers to Door Hardware, RS1.1.2 refers to Epoxy Coating, and RS1.1.3 refers to Painting, RS1.1.4 refers to Sealants, and RS1.1.5 refers to Asbestos Abatement.

Can PWGSC please clarify if there are other RS required under BRIDGE DESIGN GENERAL REQUIREMENTS? Such as Review, Principles, Quality, and Regulations listed under RS1.2 CIVIL DESIGN.

N° de l'invitation - Sollicitation No.  
EQ754-201337/A

N° de la modif - Amd. No.  
002

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID  
pwl034

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.  
EQ754-201337

File No. - N° du dossier  
PWL-9-42060

N° CCC / CCC No. / N° VME - FMS

---

R3. RS 1.2 to RS 1.4 inclusively refers to regulations governing the design of elements that are part of the asset but are not bridge related. The site includes a heritage building, a control room, wharfs and marine structures.

-----

Q4. Within section 3.2.3, the RFSO mentions "Past project experience from entities other than the Proponent will not be considered in the evaluation unless these entities form part of a joint venture Proponent". Would it be acceptable to use projects completed by Key Personnel employed by the Proponent that was completed while at another firm? Please confirm that it is acceptable to use past project experience led/completed by Key Personnel while at a previous firm, but is currently employed by the Proponent.

R4. The past experience of the Proponent is evaluated separately from the Senior Personnel and Project Personnel Experience. The Proponent must not include the projects from other Proponents in the Past Experience to be evaluated in SRE section 3.2.3

Key Personnel will be evaluated in SRE sections 3.2.4 Senior Personnel Expertise and Experience and 3.2.5 Project Personnel Expertise and Experience. It is acceptable to use projects completed by the Senior and Project personnel employed by the Proponent that was completed while at another firm. Eligible projects for senior and project personnel will be accepted up to a completion year of 2009

-----

Q5. Within section 3.2.3, the RFSO mentions "Past project experience from entities other than the Proponent will not be considered in the evaluation unless these entities form part of a joint venture Proponent". Would it be acceptable to use projects completed by a firm acquired by the Proponent? Please confirm that it is acceptable to use past project experience led/completed by a firm that has been legally and fully acquired by the Proponent.

R5. If the acquired firm is operating as a separate legal entity, it would not be permitted to use their completed projects for SRE Section 3.2.3. In GI 1 Definition, the Proponent "means the person or entity (or, in the case of a joint venture, the persons or entities) submitting a proposal to provide services under a call-up resulting from a standing offer. It does not include the parent, subsidiaries or other affiliates of the Proponent, or its sub-consultants." Therefore, only the Proponent's experience, can be used for SRE Section 3.2.3.

-----

Q6. On Page 61 of 107, the content under RS1.1 to RS1.4 appears to be not relevant to the LaSalle Causeway RFSO? Please confirm.

R6. Please see R4.

**All other terms and conditions of the solicitation remain the same.**