



**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL  
FOR  
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR  
THE MUNICIPAL CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT  
FOR  
THE CONFEDERATION DRIVE RIVER CROSSING  
CONTRACT # 21-PW-020**

**Addendum No. 1 – November 2, 2021**

**TO ALL Recipients of RFP # 21-PW-020**

The following changes, additions, and/or deletions are hereby made a part of the Request for Proposal Documents for the “***Professional Services for the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment for the Confederation Drive River Crossing 21-PW-020***”, as fully and completely as if the same were fully set forth therein:

***QUESTION #1 – As part of the structure renewal options is rehabilitation to be considered? If yes, does the Town require the design consultant to complete a structural evaluation/detailed condition survey to verify the rehabilitation design or is the design to be assumed based on past inspection data only?***

Answer: The Town is interested in replacement options with either a new vehicular or new pedestrian bridge.

***QUESTION #2 - Does the Town require a geotechnical investigation or topographic survey to confirm the replacement design options and ultimately the preferred option?***

Answer: If proponents responding to this RFP are of the opinion that a geotechnical investigation and topographic survey are relevant pre-engineering exercises for the scope of work, then those proposed efforts should be included in their proposal.

***QUESTION #3 - Would the Town please consider allowing soft copy emailed submissions rather than hard copy submissions, given the reduced ability to access offices/Covid restrictions in place in some offices? If not, would the Town consider granting a one week extension to allow for arranging printing and couriering documents?***

Answer: Soft copy emailed submissions will not be accepted. In order for the Town to maintain its schedule for this work, no extension will be granted.

**QUESTION #4** - Does the Town have an anticipated completion date for the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process? As per page 7 of RFP, is it the intent for the design portion to start in 2022 with construction 2023?

Answer: Town Council will consider the MCEA report no later than June 30, 2022. As per page 7 of the RFP document, the Town's intention is to replace the structure in 2022. Following Council consideration in June 2022, the Town will issue an RFP to complete the design, prepare construction drawings as well as specifications for the work.

**QUESTION #5** - On page 2 of 21 the RFP states, "Your proposal should include a demonstrated understanding of the scope and particulars of the assignment. It is recommended that your submission not exceed fifteen (15) single-sided letter size pages, minimum 11-point font, including spreadsheets, which can be submitted in 11" x 17" format. Attachments such as resumes and workplan sheets will not be included in the page count". Can the respondents assume that "workplan sheets" are understood to mean a spreadsheet or spreadsheets that illustrate the work plan tasks and level of effort by individual team members?

Answer: Yes

**QUESTION #6 (two parts)** - On page 8 of 21 the RFP states that, "The consultant is required to identify in their submission the EA Schedule that they believe the project to fall under. The Town believes this project is classified as a Schedule B. Consultants should base their proposal on a process similar to a Schedule B Environmental Assessment. Should the applicable schedule be determined to be otherwise through the conduct of the assessment suitable adjustments to the work plan will be made?" On this basis, can the Town confirm that all respondents are requested to provide an approach, methodology, work plan, schedule, and level of effort that corresponds to the completion of a Schedule B EA?

Answer: Yes

Can the Town further confirm that, if during the course of work it is determined that a Schedule C has been triggered, that the additional work plan, schedule, and level of effort would be addressed as a scope change at that time?

Answer: Yes

**QUESTION #7** - If all respondents are to provide an approach, methodology, work plan, schedule, and level of effort that corresponds to the completion of a Schedule B EA (not a Schedule C EA), shall respondents all understand that the Town is nonetheless requesting additional design work including the completion of the identification and evaluation of alternative designs (conceptual designs) that would implement the preferred solution (i.e. the general, Schedule B EA solution), the identification of a recommended design, and sufficient design work so as to provide accurate submissions to the various approval agencies and for the purpose of preparing a class C estimate.

Answer: Yes

**QUESTION #8** - On page 6 of 21 the RFP states, "this completed report shall furthermore be considered by Council no later than November 22, 2021." We do understand that the Recommendation of Award of the assignment is to be made by the municipality on November 22, 2021. We also note that on page 7 of 21 the RFP states that, "Upon completion the MCEA and assuming the preferred outcome is the "replacement" of the structure, it would be the Town's intention to replace the structure commencing in 2022. The Town will issue a RFP to complete the design, prepare drawings, and specifications for the work". Given the expedited schedule that the Town is pursuing, so that there a common understanding amongst the respondents as to the Town's timing, can the Town provide a target date for the giving of official notice of completion of the EA?

Answer: Town Council will consider the MCEA report no later than June 30, 2022. Official notice of completion of the EA shall be filed following Council's endorsement.

**QUESTION #9** - If a public engagement event is held, and if the event is to be held in person (pending the province and municipality's COVID policies), can the respondents assume that such an event can be held in a municipal facility at no cost to the respondent?

Answer: Yes

**QUESTION #10** - Has the Town's anticipated budget envelope for this consulting assignment been identified in any municipal budget document or other document that is available to the public or that has been available at any time? If so, can the Town share this dollar amount to the respondents at this time?

Answer: \$75,000 was budgeted in the 2021 Capital Budget for the Confederation Bridge MCEA.

**QUESTION #11** - Does the town possess any geotechnical studies of this site or of the vicinity (such as a geotechnical study associated with another nearby structure), that can be shared with respondents at this time?

Answer: The Town does not have any relevant geotechnical studies in close proximity to the subject site. If in the opinion of the proponent a Geotechnical Investigation is relevant and required to inform a decision, then those proposed efforts should be included in their proposal.

**QUESTION #12** - Given the scope of work and coordination required with specialty subconsultants, would the Town consider an extension to the submission deadline?

Answer: In order for the Town to maintain its schedule for this work, no extension will be granted

**QUESTION #13 (two parts)** - Please confirm our understanding of the Financial component: Will bids submitted that are lower than the average price lose points in the same manner that bids submitted that are higher than the average price?

Answer: Yes

Can you also confirm if the financial component is worth 30 points or 50 points?

Answer: 30 points

**QUESTION #14** - Does the Town have any existing geotechnical data or boreholes within the study area that can be shared with bidders?

Answer: The Town does not have any relevant geotechnical studies in close proximity to the subject site. If in the opinion of the proponent a Geotechnical Investigation is relevant and required to inform a decision, then those proposed efforts should be included in their proposal.

**QUESTION #15** - Based on the requirements of the Class EA process, our understanding is that the following specialty subconsultants will be required. Please confirm:

- a. Geotechnical / Hydrogeological
- b. Cultural Heritage Evaluation
- c. Archaeological Stage 1
- d. Topographic and Legal Survey
- e. Natural Environment – Existing Conditions and Impact Assessment
- f. Hydraulic Assessment

Answer: Proponents responding to this RFP should identify all subconsultants and the investigative works they will be performing that would be required for a Schedule B (Phase 1-2) Municipal Class EA.

**QUESTION #16** - The RFP states that the Town believes this project is classified as a Schedule B (Phase 1 & 2) MCEA. However, on page 10 it states that the final deliverable for this assignment should meet the requirements of a Schedule C (Phase 1 to 3). Can the Town please confirm that their intent is for the Consultant to identify Design Concepts and complete a full evaluation in accordance with Phase 3 of the MCEA process? If yes, does the Town want two Public Information Centres?

Answer: Deliverables for the assignment should meet the requirements of a Schedule B (Phase 1 to 2).

**QUESTION #17** - We note that on page 7 of 21 of the RFP states, "The Current historical status of the bridge is unknown and will need to be incorporated into any future design decisions." In Ontario it is the responsibility of the municipality to evaluate heritage resources including bridges that are not federally owned. We also note that the site is in the vicinity of the Rideau Canal which necessitates the involvement of Parks Canada. On this basis, our team has identified that the review agencies, in reviewing the EA, will require an evaluation of heritage values of the bridge and its landscape by completion of a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER). A CHER is a study to determine if a site or structure has cultural heritage value in relation to provincial legislation and provincial and local heritage policies. Please confirm that a CHER report is required as part of this assignment.

Answer: Yes, a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) will be required by the successful proponent.

**QUESTION #18** - If the Town advises that a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) is required, and if that CHER report should recommend that additional cultural heritage work is required by the Province such as a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) as part of the EA (and not deferred until the detailed design stage), can respondents assume that the additional cultural heritage work would be administered as a scope change to this assignment?

Answer: Yes

---

All Request for Proposal holders shall acknowledge receipt and acceptance of this Addendum No. 1 by signing within the space provided and submitting the signed Addendum with the final proposal. Proposals submitted without this addendum may be considered incomplete.

Receipt acknowledged and conditions agreed to this \_\_\_\_\_ day of November 2021.

---

Tender Holder

---

SIGNATURE

Paul McMunn, C.E.T.  
Director of Public Works and Utilities  
Town of Smiths Falls  
Phone: 613-283-4124 Ext 1152