



**RETURN BIDS TO:**

**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**

Bid Receiving Public Works and Government  
Services Canada/Réception des soumissions Travaux  
publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada  
Pacific Region

**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**

**Vendor/Firm Name and Address**

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

**Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution**

Major Projects - Pacific / Projets majeurs - Pacifique  
1230 Government Street, Suite 401  
1230, rue Government, bureau 401 -  
Victoria  
British C  
V8W 3X4

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Geotechnical Support Services	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EZ897-221705/A	<b>Date</b> 2022-04-25
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> EZ897-221705	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 002
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> FAR-1-44131 (007)	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$FAR-007-8356	
<b>Date of Original Request for Standing Offer</b> 2022-03-10 <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 Daylight Saving Time PDT <b>on - le 2022-05-03</b> Heure Avancée du Pacifique HAP	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Chan(far007), Scarlett	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> far007
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (604) 369-7853 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> ( ) -
<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>	
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	
<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>		

---

## REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)

### GEOTECHINCAL SUPPORT SERVICES

Faro Mine Remediation Project (FMRP)  
Faro Mine Complex, Yukon Territory

---

Amendment No. 002 is raised to:

- A. Provide answers to questions received (Q2 – Q4);
  - B. Amend Part 9 – Submission Requirements and Evaluation, SRE2;
    1. Section 2.5 Specific Requirements for Offer Format
  - C. Amend Part 9 – Submission Requirements and Evaluation, SRE3.
    1. Section 3.3.2 Team Approach / Management of Services
    2. Section 3.2.4 Personnel Expertise and Experience
    3. Section 3.2.5 Hypothetical Project – Design Philosophy / Approach / Methodology
- 

#### A. ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS RECEIVED (Q2 – Q4)

**Question 2: Please clarify what you mean by “in-house personnel” under 3.2.2.1 Team Approach / Management of Services?**

**Answer 2:** The requirement for "in-house personnel" has been removed. Please refer to the revision to SRE 3 Submission Requirements and Evaluation below.

**Question 3: It is our understanding that the successful bidder for this assignment will not be expected to take the role of the Engineer of Record for the existing dam structures, yet the Hypothetical Project implies that this may not be the case. Please confirm that the successful proponent will not be expected to assume the role of the EOR for the existing structures.**

**Answer 3:** The EOR reference has been removed from the hypothetical project scenario. Please refer to the revision to SRE 3 Submission Requirements and Evaluation below.

**Question 4: The RFSO states in Section 2.5 Specific Requirement of Offer Format, that the maximum page limit for the Rated Requirements is 30, excluding:**

- Covering letter
- Cover page
- Tab/Dividers used to solely identify the sections of the offer, provided they are free of all other text and/or graphics
- Table of Contents
- Declaration/Certifications Form (Appendix A)
- Integrity Provisions –Required Documentation
- Front page of the Request for Standing Offer document
- Front page of revision(s) to the Request

This list does not include Resumes. Given the short page limit and the average length of the five requested resumes being approximately two pages, would it be possible to have the resumes excluded from the page limit as well?

**Answer 4:** The maximum page limit for the Rated Requirements has been changed to 40. Please refer to the revision to SRE 2 Offer Requirements below.



## **B. AMEND PART 9 – SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION, SRE2**

### **B.1 Amend 2.5 Specific Requirements for Offer Format**

**DELETE Section 2.5 in its entirety and REPLACE with the following:**

#### **2.5 Specific Requirements for Offer Format**

The maximum number of pages (including text and graphics) to be submitted for the Rated Requirements under SRE 3.2 is **forty (40)** pages.

The following are not part of the page limitation mentioned above;

- Covering letter
- Cover page
- Tab/Dividers used to solely identify the sections of the offer, provided they are free of all other text and/or graphics
- Table of Contents
- Declaration/Certifications Form (Appendix A)
- Integrity Provisions –Required Documentation
- Front page of the Request for Standing Offer document
- Front page of revision(s) to the Request for Standing Offer document
- Price Offer Form (Appendix B)

***Consequence of non-compliance: any pages which extend beyond the above page limitation and any other attachments will be extracted from the offer and will not be forwarded to the PWGSC Evaluation Board members for evaluation.***



## C. AMEND PART 9 – SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION, SRE 3

### C.1 Amend 3.2.2 Team Approach / Management of Services

**DELETE R3.2.2.1 in its entirety and REPLACE with the following:**

**R3.2.2.1** – Describe your team organizational structure to deliver the Required Services under any Call-up, to perform the services in a cohesive and integrated manner and to ensure adequate capacity to fulfill all Required Services. This organizational structure should include:

1. The lead organization (Prime Consultant) and any partner organizations of the Offeror;
2. Supporting sub-contractors, partners and/or resources internal to the lead organization;
3. Defined roles of each organization in delivering the Required Services;
4. Size of team (corporate capacity) the Offeror could draw from to provide the Required Services,
5. Availability of capacity and contingency personnel (e.g. back-ups, surge capacity, etc.); and
6. Availability of personnel with professional certification/designation appropriate to their roles.

Pts Available	0	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%	Score
10	Submitted insufficient information or did not submit information that could be evaluated.	Offeror demonstrates a poor understanding and approach to describing and organizing their team structure.	Offeror demonstrates a weak understanding and approach to describing and organizing their team structure.	Offeror demonstrates an adequate understanding and approach to describing and organizing their team structure.	Offeror demonstrates a good understanding and approach to describing and organizing their team structure.	Offeror demonstrates a very good understanding and approach to describing and organizing their team structure.	



## C.2 Amend 3.2.4 Personnel Expertise and Experience

**DELETE point 1. of Section 3.2.4 in its entirety and REPLACE with the following:**

1. *What we are looking for:*

A demonstration that the Consultant Team has the appropriate Personnel with the capability and applicable certification for their respective field of expertise, capacity (provide the names of the back-up personnel) and expertise to provide services for the Categories of Personnel listed below.

Criterion and Category of Personnel	Requested Number of Personnel CVs in Proposal
3.2.4.1 Project Manager	1
3.2.4.2 Senior Dam Safety Engineer	1
3.2.4.3 Senior Rock Mechanics Engineer	1
3.2.4.4 Senior Hydrotechnical Engineer	1
3.2.4.5 Senior Hydrogeologist / Senior Hydrogeological	1



---

### C.3 Amend 3.2.5 Hypothetical Project – Design Philosophy / Approach / Methodology

**DELETE the Section titled “*Hypothetical Project Scenario*” and REPLACE with the following:**

#### **HYPOTHETICAL PROJECT**

##### **Scenario**

The Environmental Monitoring Services consultant regularly collects samples from three piezometers located along an earthen dam at the Faro Mine Site. This dam was classified as Significant in the most recent Dam Safety Review (DSR) completed two years ago. It was inspected last summer by your team and at the time there were no major concerns or new developments.

It is May and the piezometer levels recorded (and submitted to Canada and the Geotechnical Monitoring Consultant regularly for information and review) have trended upwards, as is expected at this time of year due to snowmelt. However, the most recent set of piezometer levels, taken four days ago, show abnormally high water levels in two of the piezometers and more than expected levels in the third piezometer. Standing water levels upstream of the dam are also rising, and at current trends could rise beyond maximum recommended operating levels within 30 days. There is still significant snowpack in upstream watersheds and it is anticipated that water levels will continue to rise for several more weeks.

Upon seeing these results, representatives from PSPC and CIRNAC have called you to provide advice regarding next steps on investigating these readings.

In 5 pages or less (included in the 40 page count as outlined in 2.5 Specific Requirements for Offer Format), outline a work plan for delivery under the SOA, including details on the proposed sequence of work to get from review of existing conditions to completed tender documents.

Identify the major items to be evaluated and any key issues that may arise. Identify any assumptions made. Identify key deliverables, required decision points if any, key work breakdown structure tasks, and key parties involved both in the Offeror's organization and external to the Offeror.

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

