



RETURN PROPOSALS TO:

Parks Canada Agency Bid Receiving Unit
National Contracting Services

Bid Fax: 1-855-983-1808

Bid Email: soumissionsami-bidsrpc@pc.gc.ca

This is the only acceptable email address for responses to the proposal solicitation. Proposals 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 proposal documents will not be accepted.

**REVISION 001 TO A
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL**

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
Calgary, AB

Title: Rogers Pass Staff Housing Design - Glacier National Park	
Solicitation No.: 5P468-23-0126/A	Date: September 14, 2023
Amendment No.: 001	
Client Reference No.:	

Solicitation Closes: At: 2:00 PM On: September 21, 2023	Time Zone: MDT
--	--------------------------

F.O.B.: Plant: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: Jen Maheu	
Telephone No.: 587-432-8458	Fax No.: 1-855-983-1808
Email Address: jennifer.maheu@pc.gc.ca	
Destination of Goods, Services, and Construction: See Herein	

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 001

This amendment is raised to distribute the participants list and minutes from the bidders' conference on September 7, 2023 and distribute questions and answers.

A. BIDDERS' CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Vendor	Representative's Name(s)
Reimagine Architects	Kevin Mullin
Ace Architecture	Bryan Gartner Ty McCulloch
Number 10 Architectural Group	Robert Halliday
WSP	Jordan Taylor Taylor
Diamond Schmitt Architects	Greg Colucci Don Schmitt Jennifer Carbone Georgia Papworth
Sturgess Architecture	Blake Costley Kevin Harrison
cbstudioarchitecture	Heather Cameron Christopher Brett
Metafor Architecture Inc.	Jeff Lyness David Leonard
NORR	Alex Klassen Tiffany Whitnack
KDW Architecture and Stephenson Engineering	Lawrence McSorley
Dialog Design	Kate Coninx Matthew Parks
Finlayson Bonet	Kyle Shick

B. MINUTES

Contracting Overview

Proposal documents must be submitted to bid receiving email or fax on cover page of RFP only; they cannot be submitted directly to the Contracting Authority

Submission 1 – Technical Evaluation

- Team Identification - Appendix A
- Declaration/Certifications Form - completed and signed - form provided in Appendix B
- Proposal - one (1) electronic copy
- Front page of RFP
- Front page(s) of any solicitation amendment

Notes:

- There is a page limit of 30 pages for the Rated Requirements
- Submission Requirements and Evaluation (SRE) section in Appendix E outlines the mandatory requirements and rated requirements
- Please review the SRE section for further details

- Proponents **must** achieve a minimum Technical Rating of sixty (60) points out of the hundred (100) points in order to have their price proposal submission evaluated

Submission 2 – Price

- Pricing must be submitted on the Appendix C – Price Proposal Form contained in the RFP

Project Overview

- Project overview by Project Authority
 - o Project brief outlines project details
 - o Objective is to build a new apartment building in Rogers Pass
 - o Support critical functions related to highway Operations
 - o Current buildings were built in 1960's and at end of life cycle
 - o Current housing accommodates 40 staff - new building to house same number of staff
 - o Scope includes:
 - pre-design, including confirming functional requirements
 - Conduct options analysis to build business case
 - Conceptual design development based on
- Optional services
 - o Design tender package
 - o Current assumption is modular construction most feasible option
 - o Design-build identified as preferred approach based on modular build considerations
 - o Consultant to develop design tender package for Design-Build public tender
- Project location
 - o Understanding of the unique project location considerations critical to the submission and resulting conceptual design.
 - o Building will be located at Rogers pass summit, in PCA maintenance compound (east side of highway)
 - o Challenging terrain and weather
 - o Location is most challenging component
 - o Construction season very limited and access not guaranteed
 - o Modular construction – based on recent construction in the area, whole construction seasons can be lost due to delays.
 - o June to Oct approx. construction season for exterior work
- Other constraints of RP:
 - o Snowfall – avg of 10m snowfall each year
 - o 200 avalanches per year on either side (restricts site access)
 - o Access and snow management onsite are challenging
 - o Working within National Historic Site and a National Park – resulting environmental, Cultural Resource and Archaeological considerations
 - o FCSAP registered site – contamination issues that need to be considered
 - o Working Operations compound (busy site)
 - o Constrained by Trans Canada Highway, CP railway and avalanche paths

C. QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Q1 During our review, we noticed a range of figures indicating the possible value of the contract. In particular, Appendix D, Page 9, mentions construction costs of \$23 million, while Page 4 of the same appendix points to a value of \$25 million. Additionally, the RFP provided by PCA references a construction contract value of \$7,500,000 or more.

A1 Page 4 - \$25M is a typo, should read \$23M. The reference to \$7,500,000 is for the rated requirements section. For the rated requirements, at a high level, the intent is for consultants to highlight to PCA that they have appropriate previous experience and have undertaken and successfully completed similar projects.

Q2 Where will the Government of Canada staff working on this project be located?

A2 PCA/GC staff working on this project are primary located in Revelstoke, BC and Banff, AB

Q3 Page 22 of the proposal states that "an acceptable format (typical) for submission of the team identification information is provided in Appendix A." Does that mean we can add disciplines to this form or we should only complete the form as is and not list any other disciplines we may include on our team?

A3 Please add other/additional disciplines as required. Section 3.1.2 Consultant Team Identification indicates the "The consultant team is suggested to include...".

Q4 Can you please indicate the location of design meetings and the expectations regarding in-person and virtual meetings throughout all phases of the scope of work?

A4 Most design meetings can be conducted virtually. During the required services it is expected, at a minimum, to have a virtual meeting on a biweekly basis between Parks Canada team and the Consultant team. It is expected that the consultant (and required/key team members) will attend in-person meetings at reasonable milestones. For simplicity, the consultant can expect 3 in-person meetings, to be held in Revelstoke, BC, for this scope of work (required services only).

Q5 The project delivery approach is described as Design- Build, which would typically include a contractor as part of the team. However, the documents seem to describe a Design-Bid- Build approach. Can you please clarify.

A5 Although it is written like a Design-Bid-Build, PCA is asking the consultant to develop the Design-Build package, support reviews and monitor construction over the life of the project

Q6 Item 2.3.6. outlines an impact assessment to be performed. Is this being provided by Parks Canada and will it be provided prior to pre-design.

A6 An impact assessment will be completed by Parks Canada as the project progresses and the Consultant must incorporate/address the mitigation measures that are identified within the impact assessment.

Q7 Description of staff to be using the facility and is it intended for year round use?

A7 Occupants using the facility are PCA staff. Primary related to highway maintenance and operation however there will be PCA staff living in this facility that work in any PCA function in MRGNP (Asset Management/Maintenance, Visitor Experience, Resource Conservation, Avalanche Control, Law Enforcement, etc.). Year-round use is required.

Q8 Site F has an existing building. Is this building intended for demolition and to be included in project cost and analysis, regardless of final site.

A8 - Figure 3 shows the "Project Site – Potential Building Location Options". Site F is therefore, one of many potential Building Location Options. The Project Brief outlines the Scope of Work, including the requirements of a Siting Analysis and Options Analysis. If, after the Pre-Design Stage, Siting Analysis and Options Analysis, Site F is the recommended and preferred option, then additional investigation, planning, and costing will be required to demolition and rebuilt the structure currently in that location.

Q9 In section 3.2.3 of the RFP, included in the required information is “the relationship between this commission and any earlier studies completed for PCA” how should this be supplied in the submission if the firm has not completed any previous studies for PCA?

A9 No earlier studies were provided by PCA so this bullet does not apply.

Q10 Is it just the prime consultant who needs to be registered in British Columbia?

A10 All consultants who are providing their signatures, stamps, authorizations, approvals or are Engineer/Architects of Record for the project must be registered to practice in British Columbia.

Q11 Does the complement of subconsultants also require registration in British Columbia?

A11 See A10.

Q12 Is there a prototype design you wish to work from already developed?

A12 No.

Q13 How big of a structure do you envision and how many resident units are to be contained and describe any supporting spaces such as dining, lounge, storage, etc. Is a program plan already in place?

A13 Please refer to the Project Brief.

Q14 Is there an LEED requirements for the project?

A14 The project is not required to meet LEED requirements. Please refer to the Project Brief – Section PD 8 Sustainable Development.

Q15 Is there a site already selected, or are we looking at alternative sites in the process?

A15 Please refer to the Project Brief.

Q16 Do you have any survey and Geotech information from the site if already accepted?

A16 Some preliminary site survey, geotechnical and environmental information will be made available to the successful consultant however it is possible that additional information will be required prior to construction.

Q17 Is there a construction budget established for this project?

A17 Please refer to the Project Brief and A1.

Q18 How will you go about selecting appropriate contractor for the design-build component?

A18 The required services of this RFP are pre-design and conceptual design. From there the optional services may be engaged to develop the design-build tender package which will go to public tender for design-build construction services. The successful design-build contractor will use the conceptual design and tender package to form the basis of their detailed design and construction. The successful consultant on this RFP would act as our shadow consultant in later stages of the project should the optional services be initiated.

Q19 Following the previous question, so the successful component to this RFP, would they be disqualified from the design build RFP because they would be your shadow or bridging consultant?

A19 Correct. The design-build will be administered through PSPC and would not allow for the successful consultant on this RFP to also perform construction services.

Q20 If we were to be shadow consultant for the design-build phase, how do we identify costs? Is that kind of a good time and material basis because we don't really know what schedule they would be putting forward?

A20 Proponents should review the information found within the RFP to develop an estimate of these optional services. If the assumptions (e.g. proposed schedule, timelines, construction costs and scope of services) within the RFP change when Parks Canada seeks to pursue the optional services with the

Solicitation No.:
5P468-22-0126A

Amendment No.:
001

Contracting Authority:
Jen Maheu

Ver.02.08.21

Client Reference No.:

Title:
Rogers Pass Staff Housing Design - Glacier National Park

successful Proponent, Parks Canada will at that time request and review a revised proposal and amend the contract accordingly.

Q21 There's reference to commissioning specialist and we're just wondering if there's a standard that we'd be using. Will ASHRAE Guidelines be used for commissioning?

A21 As part of the optional services, the Consultant will be responsible for reviewing the commissioning plans from the Contractor. Parks Canada will be soliciting services for a third party commissioning agent.

Q22 So just to clarify, if you did engage us for the development of design build package, the expectation is that we'd be putting out that package and then an entire team of contractors or consultants, architect, everything would be bidding on that design build package. That's the approach?

A22 Correct, we've outlined that required services to conceptual design and the contractor would use that as the basis of their design-build package.

ALL OTHER TERMS & CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.