



RETURN BIDS TO:

Parks Canada Agency Bid Receiving Unit
National Contracting Services

Bid Fax: 1-877-558-2349

Bid Email:

soumissionsami-bidsrpc@pc.gc.ca

This is the only acceptable email address for responses to the bid solicitation. Bids submitted by email directly to the Contracting Authority or to any other email address will not be accepted.

The maximum email file size is 15 megabytes. The Parks Canada Agency (PCA) is not responsible for any transmission errors. Emails with links to bid documents will not be accepted.

**REVISION 003 TO A
INVITATION TO TENDER**

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

Issuing Office:

Parks Canada Agency
National Contracting Services
Quebec City, QC

Title: Replacement of Lower Brewers Swing Bridge, Rideau Canal National Historic Site	
Solicitation No.: 5P468-21-0068/A	Date: 2021-12-24
Amendment No.: 003	
Client Reference No.: 2154	
GETS Reference No.: PW-21-00976861	

Solicitation Closes: At: 2:00 PM On: 2022-01-11	Time Zone: EST – HNE
--	--------------------------------

F.O.B.: Plant: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: Pierre-Alexandre Simard	
Telephone No.: (819) 665-9674	Fax No.: 1-877-558-2349
Email Address: pierre-alexandre.simard@pc.gc.ca	
Destination of Goods, Services, and Construction: See Herein – Voir aux présentes	

TO BE COMPLETED BY THE BIDDER

Vendor/ Firm Name:	
Address:	
Telephone No.:	Fax No.:
Name of person authorized to sign on behalf of the Vendor/ Firm (type or print):	
Signature:	Date:

Amendment 003

This amendment is raised to:

- a. Share site visit attendees;
- b. Clarify an aspect of the specifications;
- c. Distribute answers from questions we received.

a. Share site visit attendees

Companies	Representative(s)
Clearwater Structures Inc.	Derrick Mularchuk
Louis W. Bray Construction Limited	James Dineen and Stan Keys
Construction FGK	Joel Lacroix or Karl Lacroix
LCI (Landform Civil)	Madhav Raithatha
Willis Kerr Contracting Ltd.	Robert Brooker
R.W. Tomlinson Limited	Colin Lunitz and Bradley Hornbeck
1468792 Ontario Inc. o/a GDB Constructeurs	Alec Davis
Looby Construction	
Construction Demathieu & Bard (CDB) Inc.	Warren Branton

b. Clarify an aspect of the specifications

The following sentence is deleted:

Section 31 23 10 EXCAVATING, TRENCHING, AND BACKFILLING Sub-section 3.9 Fill Types and Compaction

1. Use fill types as indicated on the drawings. Compaction shall be as per Departmental Representative.

And replaced with the following:

1. Use fill types as indicated on the drawings and compact as indicated in the contract documents.

c. Questions and Answers

Q1. Would bridge rehabilitation projects be considered equivalent to a “bridge replacement” under requirement M1, as described in the “Appendix 3- Qualification Form (Submission1)”?

A1. In the requirement M1 the following is deleted:

M1 The Offeror, or the Offeror's proposed bridge subcontractor, must have successfully completing 3 bridge replacement projects with a tender value over \$1.5 Million within 10 years from the ITT closing date.

And replaced with the following:

M1 The Offeror, or the Offeror's proposed bridge subcontractor, must have successfully completing 3 bridge replacement and/or rehabilitation projects that include full superstructure replacement with a tender value over \$1.5 Million within 10 years from the ITT closing date.

Q2. Please advise if there are seasonal half load restrictions on the detour route as shown on drawing C2.

A2. Yes, the detour route roads are subject to seasonal half load restrictions.

Q3. There is a 10 tonnes Max Weight sign about 220m west of the Lower Brewers Swing Bridge. Is this Max Weight sign referring to the Lower Brewers Swing Bridge or to the Bridge/Dam structure at an old Hydro station, approximately 100m west of the Lower Brewers Swing Bridge?

A3. The 10 tonnes posting sign located west of the bridge was referring to the swing bridge not the concrete fixed bridge. The fixed bridge has no posting and can carry full highway traffic loading.

Q4. In bid section 31 63 19 for micropiles, portion 1.4.14 references geotechnical bond design strength lists the differing values for 1.4.14.1 and 1.4.14.2 but with the same description. please clarify which is the correct number, or if a term was written incorrectly.

A4. MICROPILES Section 31 63 19, page 3 of 20, sub-section 1.4.14 GEOTECHNICAL BOND DESIGN STRENGTH

The following sentence is deleted:

“.2 $\phi_g g = 0.4$ for compression loading.”

And replaced with:

“.2 $\phi_g g = 0.4$ for tension loading.”

Q5. Please clarify that only one pre-production anchor test is to be included, and that no other proof or performance testing are required.

A5. One pre-production (sacrificial) test pile in tension is required per the specification:
MICROPILES Section 31 63 19, page 12 of 20, sub-section 3.6.5 VERIFICATION TEST QUANTITIES AND LOCATION

.1 One (1) sacrificial verification test pile (tension) shall be constructed in conformance with the approved Working Drawings.

.2 Verification test pile(s) shall be installed at the locations proposed by the Contractor and approved by the Engineer. Test piles are to be located such that their installation and performance is representative of production piles, and in locations that will not interfere with production pile installation. For the purpose of pricing, it should be assumed that the test pile will be located on the east side of the bridge contained within the area of the proposed wing walls.”

Q6. Please clarify for the pre-production if this can be tested against the temporary casing in tension only, or if reaction anchors are also required to be installed.

A6. The pre-production anchor shall not be tested against the temporary casing. There are methods described in ASTM D3689 that do not require reaction piles. Also consider in the Specification Section 31 63 19 MICROPILES, Part 3 – EXECUTION

.5 “Pile Load Tests

.1 Perform verification and proof testing of piles at the locations specified herein or designated by the Engineer. Perform compression load testing in accord with ASTM D1143 and tension load testing in accord with ASTM D3689, except as modified herein.”

Q7. Will Parks Canada please clarify the minimum requirement for the Successful Completion of 5 Micropile Projects? Can you confirm that five projects having a total of 100 micropiles of similar capacity is sufficient and the requirement is not that each project is required to have 100 micropiles of similar capacity?

A7. The intent of the requirement is that a specialist contractor has completed at least 5 micropiles projects within 5 years having a total (totaling) at least 100 micropiles of similar capacity as stated in Sub-section 1.3 of Section 31 63 19, page 1 of 20:

“.1 The micropile Contractor shall be experienced in the construction and load testing of micropiles and have successfully constructed at least five (5) projects in the last five (5) years involving construction totaling at least 100 micropiles of similar capacity to those required in these plans and specifications.”

Q8. Reviewing the drawings quickly, and some of the minimum lengths listed, the micropiles appears to have a ~35.3m overrun if you included the Estimated Average Length from bottom of pile cap to top of rock (m), plus the 1.5m minimum casing plunge length. Note that this does not include any additional bonding length requirements as may be required. Additionally, section 31 63 19 item 1.14.1.1 references for pricing to be in units of (m), but does not clarify if this length includes any portion of the anchor into the pilecap/abutment, or the bond length into rock. Please clarify.

A8. MICROPILES Section 31 63 19, page 10 of 20, sub-section 1.14.1.1 PAYMENT
The following sentence is added:

“The extension of the pile into the footing, bond length, and uncased length are not included in the estimated quantity shown on the unit price table. The units shown in the unit price table reflect the estimated length of pile between the underside of the footing to the top of rock elevation along the alignment of the pile itself. The remaining length of pile should be estimated based on the Micropile Contractors previous design experience and accounted for in the unit price.”

Q9. Please clarify for micropiles in the east abutment to run through the existing foundation if the pay length is increased to account for footings on top of the existing canal wall to remain at elevation 93.600m

A9. The payment for the piles contained within the east footing located above the existing canal wall will be paid based on the actual length encountered in the field, from the underside of footing which sits on the existing canal wall at elevation 93.600 m to the top of rock. Bidders should note that the pile data table located at the top of drawing S6 shows an estimated pile length from underside of footing to top of bedrock for the east abutment footing of 9.5m and this estimated length does not represent the length of pile from the “upper footing” shown in Section D/S6. When estimating the length required, bidders should account for the extra length to the upper footing.

Q10. Please clarify for the two micropiles on the 1H:3V batter are to have their top plate on top of the old canal wall, because the blue location may be limited on install method.

A10. The top plate of the piles in question (1H:3V East Abutment Footing) will be located in the “upper footing” (see section D on Drawing S6). The measurement for payment will start at the 93.600 m elevation (underside of new footing) regardless of where the canal wall is found to be. Note that the limits of the existing canal wall that is shown under the new abutment are not known at this time as there are no drawings showing the existing substructure.

- Q11.** We assume unit price table item 3 Common excavation includes excavation for the roadway, parking and shoulder. Does it include structural excavation as shown on drawing C6 and excavation for frost tapers as shown on drawing C5?
- A11.** No, item 3 Common excavation does not include structural excavation as shown on drawing C6 and excavation for frost tapers as shown on drawing C5. The payment for "Excavation for foundations, backfill, and frost tapers, and Structure Backfill" is to be accounted for in Section 02 41 23 Selective Site Demolition.
- Q12.** Is there an existing flag pole at the south of the east abutment. Should this be salvaged and reinstalled? Is there a specific footing detail?
- A12.** Yes, the existing flagpole and C channels shall be salvaged and reinstalled. There is no specific footing detail. The work should be priced to allow for a footing detail matching the "Typical Post" Detail 2 shown on drawing C7. Should the existing footing be deeper than the 1.8m shown, the cost may be revisited.
- Q13.** A note on drawing C4 states "reinstate existing stop sign gate. Refer to structural drawings for details". We could not find this detail on the S drawings?
- A13.** The existing gates are to be salvaged and re-used on a wooden post separate from the north west wingwall. The wooden post shall match in kind the post holding the wig wag in the south east quadrant and the footing for the post holding the wig wag shall be as per the "Typical Post" Detail 2 shown on drawing C7.
- Q14.** Is it possible to advise on the approximate estimated weight of the existing bridge?
- A14.** Parks Canada has provided the existing superstructure drawings for estimating purposes. The existing superstructure weighs less than the new structure.

ALL OTHER TERMS & CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED