



## 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, B.C.  
Vancouver  
British Columbia  
V6Z 0B9  
Bid Fax: (604) 775-9381

## 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 -  
Pacific Region  
800 Burrard Street, Room 219  
800, rue Burrard, pièce 219  
Vancouver, B.C.  
V6Z 0B9  
British C

<b>Title - Sujet</b> EGD Multi-Disciplinary Eng. DISO Offre à commandes individuelle et ministérielle pour des services d'ingénierie m	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EZ899-211308/A	<b>Date</b> 2021-01-16
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b>	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 001
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> TPV-0-43120 (019)	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$TPV-019-8902	
<b>Date of Original Request for Standing Offer</b> 2021-01-07 <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> Pacific Standard Time PST <b>on - le 2021-02-23</b> Heure Normale du Pacifique HNP	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Ngan, Ken (TPV)	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> tpv019
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (604) 671-0219 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (604) 775-6633
<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>	
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b> PWGSC - Various Locations, Esquimalt Graving Dock - Victoria, BC	
<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>Accusé de réception requis</b>	<b>Yes - Oui</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>No - Non</b> <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>		

---

This Solicitation Amendment 001 is raised to incorporate responses to questions received.

**All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.**

---

Q1.) Section 3.2.4. is asking for seven senior engineer resumes (one per discipline). Section 3.2.5 is unclear. Can you clarify which resumes are required?

A1.) The number in brackets is an error. The text should read: “*Submit a maximum of **eight (8)** c.v.'s of project personnel which will perform the majority of the work resulting from the individual Call-ups, up to two (2) for each of the seven (7) major disciplines (civil, structural, mechanical, electrical, environmental, marine, geotechnical) within the Consultant Team;*”. The bidder must provide eight (8) resumes for project personnel with no more than 2 resumes per discipline (for example, resumes for: 2 civil, 2 structural, 2 electrical, 2 environmental = 8 resumes; OR, 1 civil, 2 structural, 2 mechanical, 1 electrical, 2 environmental = 8 resumes).

Q2.) From Team ID form: “*Note: Marine, Mechanical, and Geotechnical are expected to have a minor role in the work and therefore are not part of the technical assessment, but are included in the price proposal as a contingency that can be accounted for in order to obtain unit prices for call-up calculation.*” Are the resumes for Marine, Mechanical, and Geotechnical not part of the technical assessment under SRE 3.2.4 and 3.2.5? Are these resumes required?

A2.) This is an error. The resumes for Marine, Mechanical, and Geotechnical are required in SRE 3.2.4 and optional in 3.2.5, and they will be evaluated.  
Please omit the following statement on the Team Identification form in Appendix D: “*Note: Marine, Mechanical, and Geotechnical are expected to have a minor role in the work and therefore are not part of the technical assessment, but are included in the price proposal as a contingency that can be accounted for in order to obtain unit prices for call-up calculation.*”

Q3.) The maximum number of pages (including text and graphics) to be submitted for the Rated Requirements under SRE 3.2 is thirty (30) pages. Are resumes part of the page limitation? If so, please consider removing/extending the page limitation.

A3.) Yes this includes resumes. The page limit will be increased to thirty five (35) pages.

Q4.) Section 3.2.3 a) How do you define Local for Marine, Mechanical, and Geotechnical? Please confirm if the previous projects are to be local to Victoria area or local to British Columbia?

A4.) Local projects are defined as those on the British Columbia coast.

Q5.) Section 3.2.3 a) Do the four major engineering disciplines required here include Marine, Mechanical, and Geotechnical?

A5.) Yes, the four (4) major engineering disciplines can consist of any four (4) of the seven (7) major disciplines (civil, structural, mechanical, electrical, environmental, marine, geotechnical)

Q6.) The RFSO invites “consulting firms with Multi-Disciplinary Engineering Services expertise in ports and marine terminals to submit offers for Standing Offers”.

Para 3.2.4.2 under “**Rated Requirements**” requests that the Proponent provide “(1) c.v. for each of the seven (7) major disciplines (civil, structural, mechanical, electrical, environmental, marine, geotechnical)” for Senior Personnel, and Para 3.2.4.2 under “**Rated Requirements**” requests that the Proponent provide “eight (10) c.v.'s of project personnel which will perform the majority of the work resulting from the individual Call-ups, up to two (2) for each of the seven (7) major disciplines (civil, structural, mechanical, electrical, environmental, marine, geotechnical)” for Project Personnel.

However, Appendix B notes: “Marine, Mechanical, and Geotechnical are expected to have a minor role in the work and therefore are not part of the technical assessment, but are included in the price proposal as a contingency that can be accounted for in order to obtain unit prices for call-up calculation.”

Based on the above, please clarify if the scope includes Marine, Mechanical, and Geotechnical disciplines (which are typically critical for work on marine terminals), and confirm whether or not the c.v.'s and experience submitted for Marine, Mechanical and Geotechnical Personnel will be evaluated as part of the technical assessment.

A6.) The note in Appendix B is an error. The resumes for Marine, Mechanical, and Geotechnical are required in SRE 3.2.4 and optional in 3.2.5, and they will be evaluated.

Please omit the following statement on the Team Identification form in Appendix D: “Note: Marine, Mechanical, and Geotechnical are expected to have a minor role in the work and therefore are not part of the technical assessment, but are included in the price proposal as a contingency that can be accounted for in order to obtain unit prices for call-up calculation.”

Q7.) The RFSO requests that proponents respond to the “Hypothetical Project” described on PDF pages 85-86. The hypothetical project (relocating an existing 2-storey modular office building) involves building engineering and fire engineering scope. It seems inappropriate to use this as the subject of the hypothetical project, because the past experience requirement (at Para 3.2.3.2(b) on PDF page 83) says “This request for proposals does not include buildings or other architectural work which is not relevant to typical ports like the EGD”, so building engineering is specifically excluded from the RFSO scope. Please clarify this requirement.

A7.) Assume that the existing modular building is completely reusable at the new site and ignore potential architectural issues. It is expected that the Proponent will utilize relevant disciplines mentioned in this RFSO to provide a viable solution to the proposed hypothetical project within an active marine port such as EGD.

Q8.) Para 3.2.4.2 requests that the Proponent submit “a maximum of **eight (10)** c.v.'s of project personnel which will perform the majority of the work resulting from the individual Call-ups, up to two (2) for each of the seven (7) major disciplines (civil, structural, mechanical, electrical, environmental, marine, geotechnical)”. Please clarify if eight (8) or ten (10) c.v.'s can be submitted.

A8.) The number in brackets is an error, the text should read: “Submit a maximum of **eight (8)** c.v.'s of project personnel which will perform the majority of the work resulting from the individual Call-ups, up to two (2) for each of the seven (7) major disciplines (civil, structural, mechanical, electrical, environmental, marine, geotechnical) within the Consultant Team;”.

Q9.) Please confirm the following header should read 3.2.5 Project Personnel Expertise and Experience (**Intermediate** Engineer and/Senior Technician) rather than 3.2.5 Project Personnel Expertise and Experience (**Immediate** Engineer and/Senior Technician)?

A9.) This is a typo. Should read “Intermediate”.

Q10.) Appendix C, 2.0 Environmental Engineering; this section requires hourly rates for a Senior Engineer and Intermediate Engineer, which are defined to be P.Eng.; however, environmental staff often do not have this qualification. Would an RP.Bio or other be a suitable alternate qualification?

A10.) Yes, RP.Bio would be acceptable. Any professional accreditation is an acceptable qualification.