



PW-RFP-001-2026
Request for Proposal
(Engineering Services – Bridge Inspections)

Addendum No. 2
(to the Request for Proposal Document)

The Request for Proposal (RFP) is modified as set forth in this Addendum. The original RFP Documents and any previously issued addenda remain in full force and effect, except as modified by this Addendum, which is hereby made part of the RFP. Respondents shall take this Addendum into consideration when preparing and submitting its Proposal.

1. Questions and Answers

The following questions and answers are provided as information to clarify questions raised about the Request for Proposal.

1.1 **Question:** Will a traffic study be required or does the City have existing traffic data at the Firstbrooke Line Bridge?

Answer: The City does not currently have recent or continuous traffic count data specific to the Firstbrooke Line Bridge.

As part of the Schedule B MCEA, the City expects that traffic, access, and detour implications will be appropriately assessed to support the evaluation of alternatives, including potential rehabilitation, replacement, or stop-up and closure. This may reasonably include short-duration traffic counts or other proportionate data collection methods, as determined necessary by the Consultant, to quantify existing usage and inform comparative analysis.

The level of traffic assessment should be commensurate with the rural context of the roadway and the purpose of the EA, rather than a full standalone traffic study. Any recommended data collection or analysis should be included within the proponent's proposed scope and fee for the Schedule B review.

1.2 **Question:** Is the City anticipating for the Consultant to retain a Geotechnical Firm for Firstbrooke Line Bridge during this stage of the project or during detailed design (under separate scope of work)?

Answer: At this stage of the project, the City is not anticipating a full geotechnical investigation to be undertaken. The intent of the Schedule B Municipal Class Environmental Assessment is to support alternative evaluation and decision-making at a planning level. Any geotechnical work beyond a high-level desktop review would be expected to occur during a subsequent detailed design phase, under a separate scope of work.

1.3 **Question:** During which stage of the MCEA would the City prefer the Public Information Session (PIS) to be held? Is the PIS intending to present the different options or only the preferred option?

Answer: The City's preference is for the Public Information Session to occur during the alternative's evaluation phase of the Schedule B MCEA process. The intent of the PIS is to present the problem or opportunity, outline the range of reasonable alternatives being considered, and receive public and stakeholder input prior to finalizing a preferred solution.

1.4 **Question:** Task 5 identifies "preparation of final report", we assume that this refers to the Project File to be prepared and submitted to the Ministry for comments. Is there any additional deliverables that the City would like to see ahead of the final report, such as a preliminary design report?

Answer: Task 5 refers primarily to the preparation of a complete Schedule B Project File suitable for filing and public posting in accordance with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process. The City is not specifically requesting a preliminary report at this stage. However, proponents may include interim technical memoranda, draft evaluation matrices, or similar supporting documentation within their methodology if it assists in decision-making or Council reporting. Any such items should be clearly identified in the proposal

1.5 **Question:** Is the City anticipating for the Consultant to retain an OLS to determine property limits?

Answer: The City is not anticipating that an OLS will be retained during this stage of the project. Identification of property limits and right-of-way constraints may be completed using existing mapping, title information, and available municipal records. Should more detailed property delineation be required in the future, this would be addressed during detailed design under a separate scope.

1.6 **Question:** Is the City anticipating for the Consultant to perform a hydrology/hydraulic study for Firstbrooke Line Bridge during this stage of the project or during detailed design (under separate scope of work)?

Answer: The City is not anticipating a full hydrology or hydraulic study to be completed as part of this Schedule B MCEA assignment. At this stage, a high-level review of watercourse considerations, flood risks, and drainage implications is considered sufficient to inform the evaluation of alternatives. Detailed hydrologic or hydraulic modeling, if required, would be expected to occur during detailed design under a separate scope of work.

“Original Signed By”

Mitch McCrank, CET, PMP
Director of Transportation Services

Issued: February 4th, 2026

CITY OF TEMISKAMING SHORES
P.O. Box 2050
Haileybury, ON
P0J 1K0