



**RETURN BIDS TO:**

**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**

Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions -  
TPSGC

11 Laurier St./11 rue Laurier

Place du Portage, Phase III

Core 0B2 / Noyau 0B2

Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5

**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**

Construction Services Division/Division des services de  
construction

140 O'Connor Street

140, rue O'Connor

Ontario

Ottawa

K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> CM - Request for Qualification	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EH900-201608/B	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 002
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> 20201608	<b>Date</b> 2020-09-24
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$SFG-362-79040	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> fg362.EH900-201608	<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 2020-10-27</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> Kelly, Jessica	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> fg362
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (873) - ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> ( ) -
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	

**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> Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur	
<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>

## Request for Qualification

### Amendment 002

Amendment 002 is raised to:

- A. Amend Article 3.2.3 Point-Rated Technical Criteria, R1 Project Experience;
- B. Amend Scale 1, Experience of the Respondent;
- C. Amend Annex C Escalation Calculation; and
- D. Provide answers to enquiries from industry.

-----

#### A. **Amend Article 3.2.3 Point-Rated Technical Criteria, R1 Project Experience**

DELETE Article 1(a) in its entirety and REPLACE with the following:

1. Project Relevance:

(a) Identify projects as follows:

- i. Provide the name, location and description of two (2) Structural Projects Completed after December 31, 2004 or is Underway with a Construction Value of at least \$175,000,000.00 (applicable taxes excluded).
- ii. Provide the name, location and description of two (2) Heritage Projects Completed after December 31, 2004 or is Underway with a Construction Value of at least \$125,000,000.00 (applicable taxes excluded).
- iii. Provide the name, location and description of two (2) Complex Projects Completed after December 31, 2004 or is Underway with a Construction Value of at least \$300,000,000.00 (applicable taxes excluded) implemented by either a Design-Build, Construction Manager or Public-Private-Partnership project delivery methodology.

If more than two projects are identified for each (i), (ii) and (iii) listed above, only the first two projects of each will be evaluated. The same project should not be submitted for more than one category (Structural Project, Heritage Project, Complex Project). If the same project is identified in multiple categories, only the project in the category listed first in the description above (i, ii, iii) will be evaluated.

**B. Amend Scale 1, Experience of the Respondent**

DELETE Scale 1 in its entirety and REPLACE with the following:

The evaluation information in each of the grid cells below are specifically associated with each R1 criterion (i.e. R1 1 to R1 3). Respondent's Response information should clearly and directly respond to each R1 criterion in the context of the evaluation information presented in the grid cells of Scale 1.							
Scale 1	0%	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%	Available Points
R1.1 a)	Does not meet minimum characteristics of a structural, heritage or complex project, completed before December 31, 2004 and construction value <\$125M for a heritage project or <\$175M for a structural project or <\$300M for a complex project	Meets minimum characteristics of structural, heritage or complex project, completed after December 31, 2004 or is Underway and Construction cost is > \$300M but is ≤ \$350M for a complex project or > \$175M but ≤ \$225M for a structural project or > \$125M but ≤ \$175M for a heritage project	Meets minimum characteristics of structural, heritage or complex project, completed after December 31, 2004 or is Underway and Construction cost is > \$350M but ≤ \$400M for a complex project or > \$225M but ≤ \$275M for a structural project or > \$175M but ≤ \$225M for a heritage project	Meets minimum characteristics of structural, heritage or complex project, completed after December 31, 2004 or is Underway and Construction cost is > \$400M but ≤ \$475M for a complex project or > \$275M but ≤ \$350M for a structural project or > \$225M but ≤ \$300M for a heritage project	Meets minimum characteristics of structural, heritage or complex project, completed after December 31, 2004 or is Underway and Construction cost is > \$475M but ≤ \$600M for a complex project or > \$350M but ≤ \$450M for a structural project or > \$300M but ≤ \$400M for a heritage project	Meets minimum characteristics of structural, heritage or complex project, completed after December 31, 2004 or is Underway and Construction cost is > \$600M for a complex project or > \$450M for a structural project or > \$400M for a heritage project	15 points per project; Total: 90 points
R1.1 b)	Does not meet minimum characteristics of a structural, heritage or complex project, completed before December 31, 2004 and construction value <\$125M for a heritage project or <\$175M for a structural project or <\$300M for a complex project	Relevant services provided in less than three specific roles	Relevant services provided in three or four specific roles	Relevant services provided in five specific roles	Relevant services provided in six specific roles	Relevant services provided in seven or more specific roles	10 points per project; Total: 60 points
R1.1 c)	Does not meet minimum characteristics of a structural, heritage or complex project, completed before December 31, 2004 and construction value <\$125M for a heritage project or <\$175M for a structural project or <\$300M for a complex project	Extent of CM services exceeds 50% in two stages of the project	Extent of CM services exceeds 50% in three stages of the project	Extent of CM services exceeds 75% in two or three stages of the project	Extent of CM services exceeds 75% in four or five stages of the project	Extent of CM services exceeds 75% in all stages of the project	10 points per project; Total: 60 points

Scale 1	The evaluation information in each of the grid cells below are specifically associated with each R1 criterion (i.e. R1 1 to R1 3). Respondent's Response information should clearly and directly respond to each R1 criterion in the context of the evaluation information presented in the grid cells of Scale 1.						
	0%	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%	Available Points
R1.2 a)	Does not meet minimum characteristics of a structural, heritage or complex project, completed before December 31, 2004 and construction value <\$125M for a heritage project or <\$175M for a structural project or <\$300M for a complex project	Very poor explanation of variances, mitigation strategy and its success between initial and final / current construction cost	Weak explanation of variances, mitigation strategy and its success between initial and final / current construction cost	Adequate explanation of variances, mitigation strategy and its success between initial and final / current construction cost is adequate	Good explanation of variances, mitigation strategy and its success between initial and final / current construction cost is good	Very good explanation of variances, mitigation strategy and its success between initial and final / current construction cost	12 points per project; Total: 72 points
R1.2 b)	Does not meet minimum characteristics of a structural, heritage or complex project, completed before December 31, 2004 and construction value <\$125M for a heritage project or <\$175M for a structural project or <\$300M for complex project	Extremely poor or insufficient explanation of variances, mitigation strategy and its success between original and actual dates of completion	Weak explanation of variances, mitigation strategy and its success between original and actual dates of completion	Adequate explanation of variances, mitigation strategy and its success between original and actual dates of completion	Good explanation of variances, mitigation strategy and its success between original and actual dates of completion	Very good explanation of variances, mitigation strategy and its success between original and actual dates of completion	12 points per project; Total: 72 points
R1.2 c)	Does not meet minimum characteristics of a structural, heritage or complex project, completed before December 31, 2004 and construction value <\$125M for a heritage project or <\$175M for a structural project or <\$300M for a complex project	Poor claim/dispute management services provided, poor or no mitigation strategies, evaluation rationale and conclusions, limited capability to meet performance requirement	Weak claim/dispute management services provided, limited mitigation strategies, evaluation rationale and conclusions, limited capability to meet performance requirement	Acceptable claim/dispute management services provided, some mitigation strategies, evaluation rationale and conclusions, should ensure adequate results	Good claim/dispute management services provided, good mitigation strategies, evaluation rationale and conclusions, should ensure good results	Very good claim/dispute management services provided, excellent or proactive mitigation strategies, evaluation rationale and conclusions, should ensure very good results	12 points per project; Total: 72 points
R1.3 a)	Does not meet minimum characteristics of a structural, heritage or complex project, completed before December 31, 2004 and construction value <\$125M for a heritage project or <\$175M for a structural project or <\$300M for a complex project	Process and methodology provided for only one of the five aspects with some process details	Process and methodology provided for two of the five aspects with process details per aspect	Process and methodology provided for three of the five aspects with process details per aspect	Process and methodology provided for four of the five aspects with process details per aspect	Process and methodology provided for all five aspects with process details per aspect	15 points per project; Total: 90 points

**C. Amend Annex C Escalation Calculation**

DELETE Annex C in its entirety and REPLACE with the following:

**Escalation Calculation - 2019 Value of Construction Costs**

Years from 2020	Year	Example* Construction Cost	StatsCan Escalation Values %	Annual Escalation	Cumulative Escalated Value	Cumulative Escalation
	2002		3.2			
	2003		3.1			
	2004		7.1			
-15	2005	\$ 75,747,311	3.8	\$ 2,878,398	\$ 78,625,708	3.8%
-14	2006		6.4	\$ 5,032,045	\$ 83,657,754	10.4%
-13	2007		5.6	\$ 4,684,834	\$ 88,342,588	16.6%
-12	2008		8.7	\$ 7,685,805	\$ 96,028,393	26.8%
-11	2009		-1.6	-\$ 1,536,454	\$ 94,491,939	24.7%
-10	2010		4.7	\$ 4,441,121	\$ 98,933,060	30.6%
-9	2011		5.4	\$ 5,342,385	\$ 104,275,445	37.7%
-8	2012		1.4	\$ 1,459,856	\$ 105,735,301	39.6%
-7	2013		-0.5	-\$ 528,677	\$ 105,206,625	38.9%
-6	2014		1.7	\$ 1,788,513	\$ 106,995,137	41.3%
-5	2015		1.6	\$ 1,711,922	\$ 108,707,060	43.5%
-4	2016		1.1	\$ 1,195,778	\$ 109,902,837	45.1%
-3	2017		3.1	\$ 3,406,988	\$ 113,309,825	49.6%
-2	2018		7.0	\$ 7,931,688	\$ 121,241,513	60.1%
-1	2019		3.1	\$ 3,758,487	\$ 125,000,000	65.0%

Years from 2020	Year	Example* Construction Cost	StatsCan Escalation Values %	Annual Escalation	Cumulative Escalated Value	Cumulative Escalation
	2002		3.2			
	2003		3.1			
	2004		7.1			
-15	2005	\$ 106,046,235	3.8	\$ 4,029,757	\$ 110,075,992	45.3%
-14	2006		6.4	\$ 7,044,863	\$ 117,120,855	54.6%
-13	2007		5.6	\$ 6,558,768	\$ 123,679,623	63.3%
-12	2008		8.7	\$ 10,760,127	\$ 134,439,751	77.5%
-11	2009		-1.6	-\$ 2,151,036	\$ 132,288,715	74.6%
-10	2010		4.7	\$ 6,217,570	\$ 138,506,284	82.9%
-9	2011		5.4	\$ 7,479,339	\$ 145,985,623	92.7%
-8	2012		1.4	\$ 2,043,799	\$ 148,029,422	95.4%
-7	2013		-0.5	-\$ 740,147	\$ 147,289,275	94.4%
-6	2014		1.7	\$ 2,503,918	\$ 149,793,193	97.8%
-5	2015		1.6	\$ 2,396,691	\$ 152,189,884	100.9%
-4	2016		1.1	\$ 1,674,089	\$ 153,863,973	103.1%
-3	2017		3.1	\$ 4,769,783	\$ 158,633,756	109.4%
-2	2018		7.0	\$ 11,104,363	\$ 169,738,119	124.1%
-1	2019		3.1	\$ 5,261,882	\$ 175,000,000	131.0%

Years from 2020	Year	Example* Construction Cost	StatsCan Escalation Values %	Annual Escalation	Cumulative Escalated Value	Cumulative Escalation
	2002		3.2			
	2003		3.1			
	2004		7.1			
-15	2005	\$ 181,793,546	3.8	\$ 6,908,155	\$ 188,701,700	3.8%
-14	2006		6.4	\$ 12,076,909	\$ 200,778,609	10.4%
-13	2007		5.6	\$ 11,243,602	\$ 212,022,211	16.6%
-12	2008		8.7	\$ 18,445,932	\$ 230,468,144	26.8%
-11	2009		-1.6	-\$ 3,687,490	\$ 226,780,653	24.7%
-10	2010		4.7	\$ 10,658,691	\$ 237,439,344	30.6%
-9	2011		5.4	\$ 12,821,725	\$ 250,261,068	37.7%
-8	2012		1.4	\$ 3,503,655	\$ 253,764,723	39.6%
-7	2013		-0.5	-\$ 1,268,824	\$ 252,495,900	38.9%
-6	2014		1.7	\$ 4,292,430	\$ 256,788,330	41.3%
-5	2015		1.6	\$ 4,108,613	\$ 260,896,943	43.5%
-4	2016		1.1	\$ 2,869,866	\$ 263,766,810	45.1%
-3	2017		3.1	\$ 8,176,771	\$ 271,943,581	49.6%
-2	2018		7.0	\$ 19,036,051	\$ 290,979,632	60.1%
-1	2019		3.1	\$ 9,020,369	\$ 300,000,000	65.0%

Non-Residential Building Construction Price Index escalation for Ottawa

<http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/>

\* Example: Assumes project completion after December 2004

**D. Provide Answers to Enquiries from Industry**

No.	Question	Answer
2.	For the two (2) Heritage Projects required under 1. a) ii. of R1 Project Experience, we kindly request that the minimum Construction Value be reduced to \$125M in order to demonstrate the full breadth of the Respondent's relevant experience.	Please see item A. above amending Construction Values and related revisions to Scale 1 and Annex C.
3.	Would a linear infrastructure project that is integrated and contiguous (eg. stations, stops, track, tunnels, etc.) be considered to meet the requirement of 3.2.3 R1.1(a) iii. for a Complex Project?	No. A project with multiple, diverse sites will not be accepted. The representative project is to be in one physical location, similar to the SCC project identified in RFQ Annex A

**ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME**