



Corporate Finance
Department
Materials Management
Division

453-2008 ADDENDUM 1

REQUEST for QUALIFICATIONS from PRIVATE SECTOR TEAMS for the DESIGN, BUILD, FINANCING & MAINTENANCE of the DISRAELI BRIDGES PROJECT

URGENT

**PLEASE FORWARD THIS DOCUMENT TO
WHOEVER IS IN POSSESSION OF THE
REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS**

ISSUED: September 18, 2008
BY: Henry S. Hunter, P. Eng.
TELEPHONE NO. (204) 986-2538

**THIS ADDENDUM SHALL BE INCORPORATED
INTO THE REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS**

Template Version: A20070419

Please note the following and attached changes, corrections, additions, deletions, information and/or instructions in connection with the Request for Qualifications, and be governed accordingly. Respondents should acknowledge receipt of this Addendum in Paragraph 8 of Form A.

Revise **4.3** to read:

4.3 Eligibility Criteria

Any Respondent whose submission does not meet the eligibility criteria described below shall be considered ineligible and shall be automatically rejected:

- The submission must be received at the place indicated in this RFQ by the Submission Deadline.

Any other error or omission respecting the submission, including errors or omissions with respect to Form A: Request for Qualification Application, will not result in rejection of the submission, provided that the Respondent rectifies such error or omission at the request of and to the satisfaction of the Evaluation Committee within a maximum of three Business Days from such request.

Revise **5.6 Submission Requirements and Format** by adding as a final paragraph:

Form A: Request for Qualification Application may be signed in counterparts.

The following are a series of questions and answers arising from the Information Meeting and Site Tour on September 4, 2008:

Q1. Is the paint on the girders lead based?

Response:

Yes, all the paint is lead based so we'd be looking at 100% containment during blasting and surface preparation. With the proposed zinc metalizing system, we will require surface preparation to an SP10 finish (near white metal). These requirements will be set out further in the performance specs that will accompany the RFP. Construction platforms and full containment would be a likely requirement.

Q2. That large diameter pipe (South side of last pier on South side of Red River); is it a water or a sewer main?

Response:

The existing pipe is a feeder main, which has recently been abandoned. The existing pipe will be removed as part of the work. The City's original plan was to relocate the feeder main to an under river crossing using directional drilling, separate from the Disraeli rehabilitation works. Due to the extent of the previously identified contamination along the bank adjacent to Rover Avenue, it opens up a whole liability issue if we run the feeder main either under or through the contaminated material. The City is currently assessing viable options and it is possible that the feeder main may be reinstalled on the bridge as part of the proposed rehabilitation. This decision will be clarified in the upcoming RFP.

Q3. Are the existing conduits beneath the sidewalks all utilized?

Response:

They are utilized at this time. The City has an agreement with MTS to have them remove their service from the bridge prior to construction. MTS service is in the PVC/FRP conduit under the east sidewalk. There are also steel conduits suspended directly beneath both sidewalks that house Manitoba Hydro's electrical service. There is no formal agreement with Manitoba Hydro to have these removed prior to construction. There is also an underground conduit located approximately 8 feet from the east face of the overpass piers that will have to be relocated prior to construction. The City will negotiate the relocation of these electrical services directly with Manitoba Hydro. We anticipate that the existing utilities on the bridge will request accommodation on the new/rehabilitated bridge and these requirements will have to be incorporated into the design. We are currently conducting a topographic survey of the entire site and intend to provide a base plan locating all utilities with the RFP.

Q4. Are there any services running through the bottom (of the Red River beneath the Bridge)?

Response:

There is a gas line to the east of the existing ROW, but it should not be impacted by the anticipated rehabilitation works. The pedestals that are visible on the bank just north of the Rover Avenue abutment are monitoring wells that were installed as part of the environmental assessment. The City's preliminary refurbishment plan is based on not touching the water with the objective of avoiding the need for Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) approvals.

Q5. Are you aware if there is any asbestos in any of these pipes?

Response:

Not as far as we know, but we'll have to check. The abandoned feeder main is a 500mm steel pipe that, to our knowledge, does not contain asbestos. We will check with the Water and Waste department to confirm. This information will be included with the RFP.

Q6. Have you done any testing of the girders or foundations? These areas look ok, except for the surface rust that we see?

Response:

The steel girders have been exposed to deicing salts from the roadway, particularly at expansion joints and along the sidewalk cantilevers. We have conducted physical measurements and magnetic particle testing on some of the girders as part of the condition assessment and found that there is minimal loss of steel section and no evidence of fatigue cracks. The results are available in the background information to the RFQ provided to registered bidders.

Q7. There's a steel plate there on the side of the bridge. What is that?

Response:

The steel plate is to prevent people walking along the bottom flange of the girders to access the river piers.

Q8. Are there formal agreements for the land under the on-ramp and to the West side of the bridge?

Response:

City right-of-ways beneath the overpass that are currently being used by local business for access and parking will be turned over to the contractor for the duration of the project. The City will coordinate alternate access and parking for the businesses.

Q9. What about the mural painted on the abutment?

Response:

Based on the anticipated repairs to the piers and abutments, we likely won't be able to keep the mural. The City will be looking at public art outside the DBFM component of the project.

Q10. You have accepted the barrier separation between vehicles and pedestrians on this bridge (Redwood), but you don't want to see that on the other one? (Disraeli)

Response:

Due to geometric constraints that limit shy distance, an open style traffic barrier was installed on the Redwood Bridge. On the Disraeli we'd be expecting more of a solid concrete "Jersey" barrier.

Q11. Is the railing on the Redwood Bridge what you'd be looking for on Disraeli? Is there a standard railing acceptable to the City?

Response:

This is standard. We may want a step up from this to include an additional rail and an opening for enhanced wheelchair accessibility. Our conceptual design report provides additional information regarding possible architectural treatments.

Q12. Will the bridges that will take the overflow meet the requirements for any kind of trucking, or will the trucking that would have to go over the Disraeli have to go somewhere else?

Response:

Both the Louise and Redwood bridges meet the legal height restrictions. Over-height vehicles would have to find an alternate route.

Q13. I understand you are putting the responsibility for the whole traffic flow on the contractor?

Response:

We're looking for the contractor to provide a traffic management plan based on their proposed new bridge and/or rehabilitation scheme, whether it be full closure or staged construction. We are developing one now as well, using the full closure as a worst-case scenario. The City is looking for the least disruptive and cost effective traffic management plan.

Q14. If our traffic management plan required signal changes would the City work with us to implement those?

Response:

Yes, they'd have to. The City's Traffic Signals Branch would get involved.

Q15. Will Manitoba Hydro be prepared to pay for the remediation of the contaminated soils?

Response:

The contractor will be expected to carry out the remediation and charge back the City as part of the contract price. The City will deal with Manitoba Hydro to recover the remediation costs.

Q16. Who is responsible for coordination with Manitoba Hydro in respect of existing site contamination?

Response:

It will be for the Contractor to work with Manitoba Hydro and Manitoba Conservation to develop and obtain approval for its design, construction and resulting remediation plans. The City will participate as necessary, coordinating these processes, and will be responsible for recovery from Manitoba Hydro of the remediation costs resulting.

Q17. How would you plan to evaluate closure time and business impact?

Response:

We are presently developing the RFP and, as part of the evaluation criteria there will be significant value given to closure time.

Q18. Which evaluation criteria will be used to select a preferred proponent in the RFP stage:

- 1) lowest NPV costs?
- 2) best value? Which criteria?
- 3) other?

Response:

The evaluation criteria for the RFP are in development, but the City will be looking for the best value and the best balance, considering the options of new, refurbished or a combination. All will be taken into account.

Q19. On the Risk Matrix in the RFQ there are a number of Environmental risks/responsibilities that are allocated to the Private Sector. Should these not be shared?

Response:

These issues will be considered in the development of Risk Matrix for inclusion in the RFP and can be discussed as part of the DBFM Agreement confidential meetings.

Q20. The contractor is responsible for stakeholder consultation on traffic management. What does the City expect?

Response:

Mainly communication, talking to local businesses and residents, finding out how they will be impacted and planning mitigative measures in consultation with those affected.

Q21. Is it entirely necessary to have the roadwork included in the project or would it not be a viable consideration that the City be responsible for the roadwork as part of their normal operations? Would you look at separating that?

Response:

The City has always envisioned the project as including bridgework and roadworks.

Q22. You say that you are preparing a traffic management plan and that the contractor must provide a traffic management plan. Please clarify.

Response:

We are looking at a traffic management plan as the advisory team and there will be some physical improvements that will have to be in place before the contractor has the job. If there is a requirement for a turning lane or signal optimization for example, we will have those completed next summer. The preliminary design report to accompany the RFP will include a preliminary traffic management plan, as a model. It will be up to the contractor to build on or modify that model to develop its own traffic management plan which results in the least disruption possible for the City's traveling public and affected businesses.

Q23. Who is on the evaluation team?

Response:

The team will include City staff: Henry Hunter, Bill Ebenspanger, Iain Day, Jason Ruby, assisted where appropriate by its professional advisors Deloitte/MMM, Dillon, Earth Tech, the City Legal Department and the legal team from Aikins & Co.

Q24. What will be the turnaround time on the evaluation?

Response:

We intend to complete the evaluations before November 2008.

Q25. Who will get interviews and when will we know if we are being interviewed?

Response:

The City cannot determine at this time whether an interview with any Respondent would be required. The purpose of an interview would be for clarification or explanation of aspects of their submission. Based on the current schedule for RFQ submission, if meetings are required, the intention is that they will be held on October 21, 2008 in Winnipeg.

Q26. What constitutes an innovative idea?

Response:

Aspects such as:

- Offering something new and different from the preliminary design, financing model, etc;
- Something we have not considered;
- Brings a new proposal to the table;
- Add value to the project;
- Maintain preliminary design but enhance quality;
- Complete the project ahead of schedule;
- Lessen impact on traffic;
- Use of new, but proven technology.