

**MOHAWK COUNCIL OF AKWESASNE
KAWEHNOKE DISTRICT**

**RFP FOR PROJECT 26-1005A
DIHE WATER AND WASTEWATER – RBC
REPLACEMENT AND UPGRADES PROJECT**

ADDENDUM NO. 4 TO RFP DOCUMENTS

Consisting of 4 Pages

This addendum is issued to respond to questions received.

- 1. Will this project be submitted to ISC through a Project Approval Request for construction funding (or has already been submitted), or does the First Nation intend to fund the construction of the replacements/upgrades? If a Project Approval Request is needed, please confirm if the Service Provider is expected to prepare this document.*

MCA Response: Yes, successful proponent is expected to help prepare the funding application documents and background information for submission.

- 2. A topographical survey drawing is listed under Section 5.2.9. Is a full topographic survey of the project sites to be included in the base scope of the project, or is topographic survey information available?*

MCA Response: AMS topo survey is available, Arena topo survey is only the as-built document, if a Topo is required MCA will procure one and send it to successful proponent.

- 3. It is noted that population projections based on current values must be included in the Conceptual Design Report. Can the Project Team provide clarification as to what will be provided as a basis for population projections, and what scope is expected from the Service Provider?*

MCA Response: MCA expects a cursory review to be conducted to confirm sizing of the new RBC Replacements.

- 4. Can more details be provided on the scope of the Receiving Water Assessment? Would the Project Team consider an allowance for this item?*

MCA Response: Previous sampling testing and results will be shared with successful proponent to confirm treatment method is meeting required ministry standards.

- 5. For the raw sewage quality characterization, how many sampling events are required?*

MCA Response: estimate for two sampling events, this may be removed, as past testing results may prove this to be unwarranted.

- 6. To assist in building a schedule, does the Project Team expect to tender the three projects at the same time or is there a sequence in which we can expect the projects to be tendered?*

MCA Response: We would expect the worst RBC replacement first; Arena RBC, then AMS RBC, then Block 97 Upgrades.

- 7. The Cost Form indicates 2400 hours of resident inspection. Is this for the project as a whole, or is 2400 hours of resident inspection needed for each of the three sites (total of 7200 hours)?*

MCA Response: Use 2400hr total for all three sites as a whole for this submission, as this requirement may be reduced from full time inspection to only full-time during milestone installations.

8. *Are three separate Conceptual Design Reports expected (one for each site) or one report detailing the design of all three systems?*

MCA Response: One report will suffice for all three locations.

9. *It is noted in Section 5.2.5.1/5.3.2 that EA reports were completed when the RBC systems were constructed, and revised MCA EAs are expected as part of detailed design. Can more detail be provided on the scope of the environmental assessment and what is to be included?*

MCA Response: MCA environmental sector will be completing this task in-house. Any relevant information will be shared with the successful proponent.

10. *Under Section 5.5.2 Project Meetings, it states that 14 meetings are estimated including kickoff and commissioning, but a final inspection and commissioning meeting is listed separately. Is this to be included in the 14? Is it expected that systems will each require their own commissioning meeting and one-year warranty inspection, or could any be assumed to be combined?*

MCA Response: The 14 meetings should include kick off meeting only and Commissioning should be a separate meeting/inspection, and the warranty inspection is separate from the meetings.

11. *Under Section 5.4.3.2, Operational Manual and As-Built Drawings (Construction Phase) are listed under mandatory detailed design deliverables. Please confirm if these items should be included in the construction phase deliverables instead.*

MCA Response: Yes, they should be included in close-out documentation for the project.

12. *Section 5.4.3.5.2 states that the USB should include videos of the installation and operation of equipment to supplement the information. Is producing these videos the responsibility of the contractor or the Service Provider?*

MCA Response: The installation contractor should be responsible, but this may be waived or picked up in specifications for tender.

13. *How often is the sludge removed from the RBCs? How many trucks do you remove per hauling per facility? Where does the sludge get hauled to? Is there a service agreement in place for sludge hauling?*

MCA Response: Approximate twice a year for both AMS and Arena RBCs, it may be once a quarter for the Block 97 RBC. As service agreement is had with haulers to pump and deliver to Moose Creek Landfill site.

14. *The answer to Q15 in Addendum 2 indicates that MCA will procure geotechnical services. Should consultants be carrying costs to assist procurement and coordination with third-party work for geotechnical?*

MCA Response: No, MCA will procure the Geotechnical Consultant. If proponent expects associated costs in follow-up, include in design costing.

15. *Can a copy of the PIPM be provided?*

MCA Response: Can be shared with successful Proponent, but can also be found online at the ISC website.

16. *Where should costs for procurement and coordination with third-party subconsultants be carried in the Cost Form?*

MCA Response: Proponent should carry coordination with subconsultants in design cost.

17. *With respect to treatment options analysis, RFP mentions on Page 23 that "Investigation of all feasible methods of wastewater treatment..." Is it the expectation that the Consultant will complete a comprehensive treatment technology review (e.g., RBC, SBR, MBR, etc.), or is the intent to re-confirm RBC as the desired technology and review various RBC supplier equipment to select the preferred vendor?*

MCA Response: The intent is to review existing technology, and recommend / confirm RBC is preferred solution for the existing site and operational continuity.

18. *To help consultant provide more accurate costing, can MCA confirm the anticipated/ assumed timelines for tendering of the three packages? For example, should we assume staggered tendering process with 1 year gap?*

MCA Response: Assume staggered tendering process with 1 year gap on the AMS and Arena RBCs, upgrade work Block 97 can be tendered at anytime upon funding availability.

19. *What is the expected timeline or potential gap between the end of design (tender ready) and start of construction due to Indigenous Services Canada delays in capital funding approval? 2-3 years? To clarify, currently there is no guarantee the capital funding will ever be approved?*

MCA Response: It is MCA expectation that design is carried out in 2026, and put out to tender in 2027 at least one of the RBCs and then the next RBC following one year apart. MCA understands the delays in the ISC funding process, but is willing to work with successful proponent if schedules start to slip due to funding delays. MCA would like to initiate the funding process as soon as possible after awarding to get initial feedback from ISC.

20. *Under Construction Phase section of the RFP, there is a reference to "To provide commissioning and reporting services in accordance with Public Works and Government Services Canada — Client Service Team for Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada's Project Implementation Procedures Manual (PIPM)" but this document appears to be out of date/obsolete. Has it been replaced with the "First Nations and Aboriginal Communities Project Management Manual (PMM)"? Please provide the correct reference document or a link to the correct version. If the PMM is the correct one, this document does not require Third-party commissioning services. In addition to the Third-party requirement (or not), who is responsible for the commissioning plan, testing and verification reports, and as what stage is the documentation required?*

MCA Response: The consultant is expected to carry out the commissioning for these projects per the updated PMM, which can be found on the ISC website. If the website is outdated, MCA will reach out ISC to obtain the newest version and share with the successful proponent.

21. *There is a bridge toll to cross onto the island and back. How do we handle the expenses from this toll? Are there assigned toll passes given to the successful proponent to waive the toll costs for the duration of the project? or the tolls are recorded and reimbursed by MCA in the respective billing period?*

MCA Response: The consultant is to carry these cost in the site visit, and meeting costs.

I have read Addendum No. 4 and have included it in my Bid.

Consultant Signature

Date

-- END OF ADDENDUM NO. 4 --

Friday June 5th, 2026