



286-2024A ADDENDUM 2

QUALIFYING TUNNELING CONTRACTORS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE RUTLAND TRUNK SEWER – FERRY ROAD COMBINED SEWER RELIEF – CONTRACT 6

URGENT

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

ISSUED: June 27, 2024
BY: Michel Levreault
TELEPHONE NO. 204-954-6927

**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: B7.1 (d) to read: Installation of approximately 1,960 m of 2400 mm Reinforced Concrete Trunk land drainage sewer, primarily by trenchless (microtunneling) methods but including up to 250 m of open trench sewer near the Assiniboine River where the depth of cover is believed to be too shallow for tunneling. *Alternatives to open trench installation for the 250 m section near the river are being investigated to minimize the impact on mature trees and existing community recreation facilities. This may include the construction of a 2400 mm tunnel at reduced TBM face pressure and repair of settlement or the construction of a twin 1800 mm tunnel.*

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Q1: Based on our assessment of the information provided, we believe that several other non-micro tunnelling trenchless techniques can be employed to successfully construct the project. Would alternative non-microtunneling trenchless methods be accepted for this project?
- A1: The tunneling methodology for this work shall be a microtunneling pipe jacking method as stated in the RFQ. Either Slurry Pressure Balance (SPB) or Earth Pressure Balance (EPB) methods would be acceptable. Other tunneling techniques using conventional shielded TBM with flood/PRV doors and/or non-watertight lining support systems (such as steel rib and wooden lagging set behind the TBM) are considered to pose an unacceptable level of risk to the project and are therefore prohibited. The use of concrete lining segments is also not acceptable due to the low gradient constraint.
- Q2: We do not have a 2400 mm TBM, but we have an XXXX mm TBM, what is the largest size that would be accepted?
- A2: A maximum nominal 2700 mm tunnel with outside diameter not exceeding 3,300 mm would be accepted. Increasing the tunnel diameter would require lowering of already flat slope to better accommodate the Ness Avenue interference crossing and maintain clearance from other infrastructure under crossings.

[End of Addendum]