



RFP 05-2024
Design-Build Reconstruction of Structure No. 21 and Structure No. 36
ADDENDUM 5, issued June 17, 2024

ADDENDUM 5 – RFP 05-2024

ISSUED 6/17/2024

Summary: Below, the questions and answers in response to RFP 05-2024 is as follows:

Question Number	Question	Response
9	There are many deliverables with this project and therefore we are requesting a 2 week extension	A 2 week extension will be provided. Revised closing date is July 11, 2024 at 2:00pm.
10	Can the Township provide any as-built records of the two structures? It is not practical to re-use the existing abutments if there is no record of as-builts.	The Township is not in possession of any as-built records. If it is not practical to re-use the existing abutments, the proposal should indicate an alternative.
11	Can the Township provide any geotechnical information regarding the two structures? If not, is the design-Builder liable for unforeseen ground conditions?	Geotechnical investigations have not been completed. The Proponent should determine if required.
12	Is the Township looking to have this complete by end of the year? Or are they looking for a design (2024) and construction during the (2025) construction in-water window. This understanding assist us in designing the two structures.	Timing to be determined by the Proponent and could be included in the proposal.
13	Has any discussions with the conservation authority or MNRF been had about creek obstructions?. Closure of the watercourse is permitted or are they expecting water to continue during construction. Is this a sensitive watercourse and disturbance to the creek bottom is out of the question? This will play a role in deciding construction	No discussions have occurred.



RFP 05-2024
Design-Build Reconstruction of Structure No. 21 and Structure No. 36
ADDENDUM 5, issued June 17, 2024

	methodology and cost with each potential solution.	
14	The RFP outlines that Township wants a semi integral abutment. This suggests that a superstructure will extend over and beyond the line of the abutments which is only possible when casting a concrete deck into the replacement solution. Can other options utilizing conventional simply supported or expansion joints be presented?	Council is open to alternative options.
15	The RFP outlines an 8inch deck thickness with 2% cross fall. With the span of these bridges being so small, ponding water will not likely be a factor and therefore could a flat deck with deck drains be utilized?	Council is open to alternative options.
16	Page 4 of 15 "... Township or designated representative, shall supervise, direct, and approve all work included herein ..." Please delete "shall supervise, direct" as this is the responsibility of the Design-Build contractor	The designated representative will be determined prior to the project award.
17	Page 11 of 15 " Liability/Insurance, Design-Build Proposal will include a copy of the following. Please be advised that the 'Township of Amaranth' will not be a named insurer at the time of RFP submission, however will be added when the Policy is Updated after project award.	Noted.