



RETURN PROPOSALS TO:

Parks Canada Agency Bid Receiving Unit
National Contracting Services

Proposal Fax: 1-855-983-1808

Proposal Email:

soumissionsami-bidsrpc@pc.gc.ca

This is the only acceptable email address for responses to the Request for Proposal. 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. Parks Canada Agency (PCA) is not responsible for any transmission errors. Emails with links to proposal documents will not be accepted.

**REVISION 006 TO A
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)**

Proposal To: Parks Canada Agency

We hereby offer to sell to His Majesty the King in right of Canada, in accordance with the terms and conditions set out herein, referred to herein or attached hereto, the goods, services, and construction listed herein and on any attached sheets at the price(s) set out therefor.

Proposition à: l'Agence Parcs Canada

Nous offrons par la présente de vendre à Sa Majesté le Roi du Chef du Canada, aux conditions énoncées ou incluses par référence dans la présente at aux annexes ci-jointes, les biens, services et travaux de construction énumérés ici et sur toute feuille ci-annexée, au(x) prix indiqué(s).

Comments - Commentaires

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution

**Parks Canada Agency
Cornwall, Ontario K6H 6S2**

Title-Sujet Landons Bay Learn-to-Hub Project, Thousand Islands National Park, ON		
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation 5P468-23-0088/A		Date: November 09, 2023
Amendment No. - N° de modification : 006		
Client Ref. No. – N° de réf du client 2324		
Solicitation Closes – L'invitation prend fin :		
at – à 2:00 PM	on – le November 23, 2023	Time Zone - Fuseau horaire EST - HNE
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Address Inquiries to: - Adresser toute demande de renseignements à : Sheldon Lalonde sheldon.lalonde@pc.gc.ca		
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (343) 585-3836		Fax No. – N° de FAX 1-855-983-1808
Destination of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination des biens, services et construction: See Herein – Voir aux présentes		
TO BE COMPLETED BY THE BIDDER À COMPLÉTER PAR LE SOUMISSIONNAIRE		
<hr/> Vendor/Firm Name – Nom du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur <hr/>		
<hr/> Address - Adresse <hr/>		
<hr/> Name of person authorized to sign on behalf of the Vendor/Firm Nom de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur <hr/>		
<hr/> Title - Titre <hr/>		
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone: _____		
E-mail Address – Adresse E-mail:: _____		
<hr/> Signature		<hr/> Date

Amendment 006

This amendment is raised to provide the following:

- A. To extend the solicitation closing date;
- B. Questions or request for clarification
- C. Questions and Answers;

A. Solicitation Closing Date

The closing date for RFP 5P468-23-0088/A is extended from **November 16, 2023** to **November 23, 2023 at 2:00pm EST**.

B. Questions or request for clarification

Replace “**SI3 QUESTIONS OR REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION**” in it’s entirety with the following:

SI3 QUESTIONS OR REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION

Questions or requests for clarification during the solicitation period must be submitted in writing to the Contracting Authority named on the RFP - Page 1 as early as possible. Enquiries should be received no later than ten (10) business days prior to the closing date identified on the front page of the Request for Proposal. Enquiries received after that date may not be answered prior to the closing date of the solicitation.

C. Questions and Answers

Questions	Responses
<p>6-1 According to Amendment 4, fees for all the specialists listed in Table 1 are to be included, however based on the scope of work described in Appendix D, there is no clear scope of work for many of the listed specialists.</p> <p>a. 1 - Please provide a clear scope of work for each of the specialists in Table 1. This will allow for fairness in the bidding process by providing the same information to all proponents and therefore avoiding the need for each proponent to 'guess' the required scope of work.</p> <p>b. 2 - Please reconsider allowing for an extension of the submission deadline of at least 3 weeks subsequent to the scope clarifications in order to allow time to coordinate all the required specialists.</p>	<p>a. The proponent is to make assumptions to include design fees pertaining to the envisioned learn-to hub as described in the conceptual plans which is essentially a multi use building, including site utilities, landscape, hardscape and a playground.</p> <p>Refer to the revised <u>Table 1 - Summary of Proposal Requirements - Team Identification Format and Specialists</u> for which the proponent can either opt to include fees in the Team Identification Format section, if internal expertise exists, or include fees in the Specialist section if internal expertise is not available.</p> <p>For example, lighting plan to be based on Appendix D Sow requirements, where ecological, dark sky, and security aspects of lighting are considered. Should the proponent has this expertise internally, to include their fees. If not, to include in sub-consultant fees. Same goes for other expertise, i.e. Traffic Engineering, etc.</p>

<p>6-2 The commissioning questions were still not clarified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Commissioning scope (both 4.3.10 and 5.3.10) – please clarify scope regarding defining, establishing and verifying archives. b. Commissioning scope (both 4.3.10) – please clarify bullet 3. Which building is this in relation to? 	<p>b. review amendments.</p> <p>In sections 4.3.10 and 5.3.10, the intent is for the consultant to present a preliminary, high-level plan for commissioning of the site with the understanding that the plan will be refined as the design evolves. The commissioning plan will include an archival process for project details (i.e. closeout binder).</p>
<p>6-3 Question 2-6 was not properly responded to – the firm was asking if Project Sheets for the Code/Regulatory Consultant are required as part of the proposal submission, and the response provided does not address the question.</p>	<p>Refer to RFP Section 3.2.3 where Key personnel are listed. These are the individuals for which proponent is to present sample projects.</p> <p>Note: This response replaces response 2-6.</p>
<p>6-4 Parts b) and c) of our question 4-6 were not responded to.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o To expand on 4-6 b: Upon review of the list of specialist consultants provided in Table 1, the following specialists do not have any scope outlined in Appendix D and therefore cannot be priced without additional information about the scope provided by PCA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Municipal Engineering ▪ Environmental Engineering & Specialists ▪ Acoustic Consultant ▪ Energy Modeling o To expand on 4-6 c: Given that it was just clarified that 15 specialists need to be included in the Price Proposal and an amendment 14 pages long was issued that will need to be reviewed and incorporated by all consultants into the proposals, the submission date of November 9th is not achievable. Please reconsider the request for an additional 2-3 week extension (voiced by many proponents) to allow sufficient time for all proponents to reach out to the 15 specialist consultant groups for pricing and review and incorporate the 14 pages of amendment responses, in order for proponents to provide comprehensive proposal responses. 	<p>Refer to revised <u>Table 1 - Summary of Proposal Requirements - Team Identification Format and Specialists.</u></p>
<p>6-5 Table #1 includes both a 'National and Provincial Codes and Regulatory Analyst' under Appendix A key consultants, and 'Code Specialist' separately under specialist consultants. Can you please confirm that these two roles are supposed to actually be one role, under key consultants (removed from specialist consultant list)? If they are meant to be two separate roles, please clearly define the scope for each consultant.</p>	<p>Refer to revised <u>Table 1 - Summary of Proposal Requirements - Team Identification Format and Specialists.</u></p> <p>Review amendments</p>

<p>6-6 Per our questions in Amendment #2, most specialists that could be categorized under 'Environmental Engineering and Specialists' cannot be carried by Architects due to limitations of liability – such as Hazardous Materials Consultant, Geotechnical, Surveyors, etc – essentially any consultant related to the existing conditions of the site is the responsibility of the owner. As such, please confirm that the Environmental Engineering and Specialists will actually be carried by Parks Canada and remove them from the Appendix A and Table #1?</p>	<p>Refer to revised <u>Table 1 - Summary of Proposal Requirements - Team Identification Format and Specialists.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Review amendments
<p>6-7 Per Amendment #2, Q&A #7, a sustainability consultant is required – please provided an updated Table #1 and Appendix A to include this specialist.</p>	<p>See revised <u>Table 1 - Summary of Proposal Requirements - Team Identification Format and Specialists.</u> Energy Modelling (Including simulations and demonstration of sustainability goals / Energy Budget.</p>
<p>6-8 Question 5-7: 'The exact percentage will be determined after contract award' – this cannot be priced. As travel disbursements are not reimbursable (to be included in proponent's Fixed Fees), a % of site meetings vs virtual meetings need to be clearly defined for all proponents to price fairly.</p>	<p>For purposes of pricing, please assume 50% of meetings to take place remotely.</p>

ALL OTHER TERMS & CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED