

74-2025 ADDENDUM 1

PROFESSIONAL CONSULTING SERVICES FOR CONDITION ASSESSMENT OF THE PRIMARY LINE OF DEFENCE

URGENT

**PLEASE FORWARD THIS DOCUMENT TO
WHOEVER IS IN POSSESSION OF THE
BID/PROPOSAL**

ISSUED: June 12, 2025
BY: Andrew Ziegler
TELEPHONE NO. 204 986-8687

**THIS ADDENDUM SHALL BE INCORPORATED
INTO THE BID/PROPOSAL AND SHALL FORM
A PART OF THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS**

Template Version: Add 2024-02-01

Please note the following and attached changes, corrections, additions, deletions, information and/or instructions in connection with the Bid/Proposal, and be governed accordingly. Failure to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum in Paragraph 10 of Form A: Bid/Proposal may render your Bid/Proposal non-responsive.

PART B – BIDDING PROCEDURES

Revise: B10.3 to read: Submit the experience and qualifications of the Key Personnel assigned to the Project identified in B10.2 for projects of similar complexity, scope and value. Include educational background and degrees, professional recognition, job title, years of experience in current position, years of experience in design and years of experience with existing employer. Roles of each of the Key Personnel in the Project should be identified in the organizational chart referred to in B10.1.1.

PART D – SUPPLEMENTAL CONDITIONS

Revise: D4.6(b) to read: Secure utility locates or otherwise identify the location of any subsurface works.

Revise: D4.6(c) to read: Undertake a field program including site reconnaissance and visual inspections (photos and notes) to document the PLD and assist with the condition assessment.

Revise: D4.7.6 to read: Known sections of the PLD to be considered for further investigation which can include recommendations for either permanent remediation options or a temporary dike raise plan to address site specific conditions.

- a) D'Arcy Dr north of U of M Southwood Lands (from the U of M Southwood lands to Abinojii Mikanah)
- b) Between Abinojii Mikanah and Adamar Rd (includes the entire length of PLD between Abinojii Mikanah and Adamar Rd)
- c) Access Rd behind the St. Boniface Hospital (only includes the retaining walls at the St. Boniface Hospital [49.885056, -97.125809])
- d) Between Waterfront Dr and Higgins Av with consideration given to re-alignment options (includes the section of PLD from roughly Waterfront Dr and Heaton Ave to Higgins Ave and Acores St)
- e) Parallel to Avondale Rd between Des Meurons St and Egerton Rd (includes the entire length of PLD between Des Meurons St and Egerton Rd)
- f) Tie-in points with rail embankments where the potential for seepage may exist including the following general locations:
 - ii. Portage Ave near Empress St E
 - iii. Wellington Cres between Renfrew St and Lindsay St
 - iv. Between Osborne St and Mulvey Ave E to Queen Elizabeth Way (Main st)

- v. To the east of Mayfair Ave and Queen Elizabeth Way (Main St)
- vi. To the east of Main St along Fort Gibraltar Trail
- vii. Waterfront Dr near Lombard Ave
- viii. Tache Ave near Darveau St
- ix. Between St Joseph St near Darveau St to Provencher Blvd
- x. Archibald St near Messier St
- xi. Archibald St near Mission St
- xii. Archibald St to the south of Elmwood Rd
- xiii. Higgins Ave near Point Douglas Ave
- xiv. The Bergen Cut Off to the south of Kildonan Dr and Essar Ave

Add: D4.7.4 (j) A class 5 cost estimate for the conceptual remediation design.

Add: D4.9.1(c) (i) The following list summarizes the City's current understanding of locations where private property may impact site access. The successful proponent must review the entire length of the PLD to confirm all locations where private property exists and seek permission for site access.

- i. All affected properties within the Van Hull neighborhood between the intersection of St. Mary's Rd. with Redview Dr and 1976 St Mary's Rd (previously Normand Ave)
- ii. The PLD within the University of Manitoba Lands
- iii. 440 River Rd (St Amant Centre)
- iv. The section of PLD between Abinojii Mikanah and Adamar RD (parallel to Plaza Dr)
- v. The PLD behind properties on Victoria Cres/ROW
- vi. 56 Dunkirk Drive (Winnipeg Canoe Club Golf Course – Leased City Property)
- vii. The CN Railway between Osborne St and Main St
- viii. The CN Railway between St Joseph St and Provencher Blvd
- ix. 442 Scotia St (Marymound)
- x. 60 Whellams Ln
- xi. All affected properties within the River Ridge/ Rivergrove neighborhood between Ridgecrest Ave and Fernbank Ave.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q1: Do we only need to list the information for the Key Personnel identified in B10.2, or do we need to list additional people as well (principals-in-charge, consultants' representative, etc.)?

A1: See revision to B10.3 above. The proponent only needs to list the information for the key personnel identified in B10.2.

Q2: Can you please clarify the submission requirements for experience of Key Personnel?

A2: There are no minimum requirements.

Q3: Do we need to include public engagement staff/scope in the RFP submission?

A3: No, we do not anticipate public engagement as a part of this project.

Q4: Can you please clarify what field activities are to be included in D4.6 (Data Collection, Review and Initial Risk Assessment) and D4.7 (Geotechnical Investigation and Assessment Allowance)? Specifically, we are wondering about PLD inspections and survey/bathymetric work.

A4: See revision to D4.6(c) above. Surveys will not be included under D4.6, but will be required under D4.7. Also under D4.7, bathymetric work may be required as per the site reconnaissance.

Q5: Does the City intend to provide the most current PLD profile to the successful proponent to help define priority areas / areas of interest or concern? Will the City be providing information on City of Winnipeg infrastructure assets (i.e., watermains, culverts, etc.) in the vicinity of the PLD as well? Would the City be able to provide this information during the proposal stage?

A5: The City can provide a LiDAR DEM along the PLD as well as PLD maps that include a centreline profile of the PLD and a cut of all WWD GIS data along the PLD once the project is awarded. Raw LiDAR data is currently publicly available on the City's open data portal.

Q6: D4.5.1 states "Meet with Stakeholders and Identify the general strategy for completing the project." Who are these stakeholders? City of Winnipeg only or others too? Can they be identified?

A6: Yes, City of Winnipeg stakeholders from the Land Drainage and Flood Protection Branch, Design and Construction Branch, Waterways, and Public Works Department.

Q7: D4.5.2. What is the length of PLD to be inspected? In reference to the PLD map provided in Appendix A, what is the total length of PLD the City is asking to be inspected?

A7: The total length of the PLD is 117.7km. The level of detail for inspections required will vary greatly depending on location. For most sections where there is minimal risk to the geotechnical stability of the PLD we are asking for confirmation.

Q8: Can the City provide a list of known private properties that they expect to impact site access (D4.5.3) or obstructions/non approved structures (D4.9.1(c))?

A8: D4.9.1(c)(i) has been included above to provide a list of sites based on the City's current understanding of where site access may be impacted by private property. The successful proponent must confirm through their own thorough review.

Q9: Can the City provide a summary breakdown of the different types of PLD reaches (i.e., roads, parks, private vs public, etc.)?

A9: The City does not have this information available. Bidders can find this information through publicly available maps.

Q10: D4.5.3: What is the difference between the "general site investigation" cited in D4.5.3 vs the "site reconnaissance" cited in D4.6(c)? Is D4.5.3 "general site investigation" intended to be desktop only with D4.6(c) "site reconnaissance" intended to be on the site?

A10: The general site investigation under D4.5.3 can be a desktop review supplemented by field visits only if required. D4.6(c) will include on site inspections.

Q11: D4.6(a)(iii): "Existing city report and drawings (assume up to 20 reports) to be provided..." Can the City provide additional details on what these reports are or what sites they encompass? Would these reports be limited to the sites cited in D4.7.6 or include others?

A11: These are any past reports for City infrastructure on or near the PLD that the successful proponent may find helpful with the risk assessment and priority ranking. These are not limited to those listed under D4.7.6.

Q12: D4.6(b) "Secure utility locates for any subsurface works." Is this considered separate task outside of D4.7 Geotechnical Investigations which would require utility locates for drilling programs? Would this task be excluded from the \$450k allowance for D4.7?

A12: See revision above. The intention of D4.6(b) was to identify any potentially at-risk infrastructure in any higher risk areas, which is primarily a desktop exercise. For example, a gas line or watermain that is running through a section of the PLD that has a low factor of safety. Utility locates would still be required for any drilling programs the successful consultant proposes, but that would be part of the Geotech allowance.

Q13: D4.6(f) "Summary report of at-risk areas to be investigated further under D4.7." Clarification, the number of sites to be investigated from the list of known sites in D4.7 could potentially increase as a result of this summary report correct?

A13: Correct.

Q14: D4.7.4 Geotechnical Investigation and Reports for each site. How many total sites should we assume for investigation and reporting for the purposes of divvying up the \$450k allowance? We have 5 known sites in D4.7.6 (Sites (a) through (e)) in addition an undetermined number of railway tie ins (Sites (f)).

A14: The scope of work will vary for each site identified with total length, site access etc... We cannot provide a definitive number of sites to be investigated under D4.7. Hourly rates and the level of effort required for each site will determine the number of sites investigated under D4.7. That ultimately will come from the successful proponent after they do the initial investigation. We would expect a scope of work at that time.

Q15: D4.7.5 Conceptual remediation plan. Is a cost estimate required for the conceptual remediation plans at each site? If so, what class of estimate?

A15: A class 5 cost estimate is to be provided. A clause has been included under D4.7.4 above.

Q16: D4.7.6 Known Sections. Can the City confirm the extents of Sites (a) through (f)?

A16: General descriptions of the sites listed under D4.7.6 have been provided under an amended clause above.

Q17: D4.9.1(d) Summary of the geotechnical assessments and potential rehab work. Is this a condensed summary of the reporting from D4.7 Geotechnical Investigations and Assessment Allowance?

A17: Yes