

774-2025 ADDENDUM 1

PROFESSIONAL CONSULTING SERVICES FOR RAPID TRANSIT DOWNTOWN CORRIDORS PRELIMINARY DESIGN

URGENT

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

ISSUED: November 14, 2025
BY: Caleb Olfert P.Eng.
TELEPHONE NO. 204 430-8038

**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: B2.1 to read: The Submission Deadline is **12:00 p.m. (noon)** Winnipeg time, **December 19, 2025**.

Revise: B10.1(v) to read: "construction delivery and show planning experience through the construction phase of transportation projects of similar size and complexity, particularly demonstrating experience and history of the Proponent and subconsultants **with alternative project delivery methods. For reference see the City of Winnipeg Project Management Manual Appendix C: Alternative Project Delivery Methodology Analysis Technical Memorandum.**

PART D – SUPPLEMENTAL CONDITIONS

Revise: D5.1(e)(iv)(i) to read: Further to D5.1(e)(iv), the proponent, should include as part of their project team an **appraiser with Accredited Appraiser Canadian Institute (AACI) commercial appraisal designation** to evaluate expected costs associated with property acquisition (including damages and/or injurious affection) to support the Class 3 estimate. Fees associated with appraiser assessments of required properties will be negotiated with the Consulting Contract Administrator and paid for from the Cash Allowance.

Revise: D6.1(e) to read: "Downtown Corridors" means the project area defined by the following limits: Portage Avenue from **Maryland Street** to Main Street, and Main Street from **Marion Street** to Sutherland Avenue.

PART E – SPECIFICATIONS

Revise: E10.3 to read: The Design Consultant may opt to initiate the Utilities Management Program **in the Conceptual or Functional Design Stage, rather than waiting until the Preliminary Design Stage**, if deemed to be warranted by the Project Team.

Revise: E15.3 to read: Conduct fatigue analysis for rail bridges and structures inside the VIA rail station **(limited to the supporting structure for Union Station Tracks 1 and 2)** to confirm suitability to be reused for the proposed transit loading and identify any needs for strengthening and rehabilitation.

Revise: E16.1 to read: The selected Preliminary Alignment Option will be constricted by current right-of-way alignments, available clearances, and structural capacity of the existing bridges on Main Street over the Red River (**Norwood** Bridges), over the Assiniboine River (Main Street Bridges), CN rail bridge at the VIA Rail Station, and existing rail overpasses (CN Rail bridges over Main Street, over York Avenue, over William Stephenson Way, over Pioneer Avenue, and CPKC bridge at the Higgins Avenue underpass). To achieve the goals of the Preliminary Study, the vehicular and rail bridges may require widening and realignment, and the existing retaining walls associated with each structure may also need excavation and reconstruction.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q1: Are there drawings available for the following existing structures

- CN/VIA at Union Station;
- CN over Main Street, Assiniboine River, York Avenue, William Stephenson Way, Pioneer Avenue;
- CPKC over Main Street; and,
- Main Street and Norwood Street bridges.

A1: The City has as-built drawings for existing rail bridges:

- CN at Main Street
- CPKC over Main Street near Higgins Avenue; and,
- CN over York Avenue at Main Street.

The City has as-built drawings for the following City owned structures:

- Main Street Bridge over the Assiniboine River; and,
- Norwood Bridge over the Red River.

These drawings will be made available to the successful proponent upon award of contract. For information, a request has also been made to the rail companies for as-built drawings of the remaining structures noted in the question.

Q2: E16.4 requires design to CAN/CSA-S6 and the Busway Planning and Design Manual; the Busway Manual Section 8.1 Structures requires design to AASHTO. Please clarify design guide priority for structures.

A2: For load rating of existing bridges and structural design of new structures shall be according to the CAN/CSA-S6.

Q3: In E16.4, F-7 identifies a design loading for LRT. Is it right to assume this is the required loading? There is concern that this loading is outdated and will not be applicable for future LRT.

A3: If it is expected that design loadings for LRT are expected to change in the future, or that current design reference standards are outdated, the Design Consultant shall provide a design loading recommendation with input from City Staff as part of developing the Basis of Design Memo in the Conceptual Design Phase.

Q4: Which structures require load rating (e.g., Main Street over the Assiniboine River and Norwood Bridge over the Red River)? We are assuming the CN structures do not, aside from work on CN/VIA structure.

A4: Structures requiring load rating will depend on the recommended alignment. As a minimum load rating is required for Main Street and Norwood City bridges and the VIA Rail bridge/structures intended to support the proposed loading from Union Station Track 1 and Track 2. If the recommended alignment requires further load rating for other structures, the scope to complete these assessments will be negotiated with the Design Consultant and paid for out of the Cash Allowance.

Q5: RFP clause B9.5 states that budget estimates are to be provided for a number of investigations and other activities, and that these budget estimates are not to be included in the evaluated fee. Can you confirm if this means that fees (and disbursements up to 5%) for these scope items could be additional to the \$5.25M budget stated in D5.3?

A5: Correct. These items are in addition to the \$5.25M budget stated in D5.3 and includes administrative disbursements of up to 5%. For clarity, these investigations are intended to mean those services which require external contractors/sub-contractors to carry out required investigative work. Bidders are to provide estimates for these services, but they will not be part of the overall proposal fee evaluation.

Q6: In Clause E15.1, the clause refers to inspection and condition assessment (including OSIM Level 2 report) of "all" existing structures. Can the City confirm if this includes the three CN rail bridges (over Main St, over Assiniboine River, and over York Ave) as CN may not permit this activity to take place, especially if the project does not affect those structures?

A6: The level of inspection and condition assessment depends on the impact of the proposed route on the structure;

- Main Street & Norwood Bridges: full structure to be inspected as the new route will utilize them.
- York Avenue Underpass: the new route may have impact on the existing retaining walls

The remaining structures may be subjected to widening or modifications if impacted by the proposed alignment, then the assessment/inspection is to cover that affected section. If widening or modifications are recommended in the conceptual/functional design phases, the scope to complete these assessments will be negotiated with the Design Consultant and paid for out of the Cash Allowance. Early conversations have taken place with CP, CN, and Via Rail with notification of future inspection and condition assessment as part of the preliminary design study.

Q7: B9.6 references the Cash Allowance is for a few things including E9 utility assessments. However, E9.7 says this work is tied to Type 2 Disbursements according to B9.5. This appears to be contradictory.

A7: The expenses associated with obtaining utility investigation services completed by a 3rd party contractor shall be estimated in the fees table as a Type 2 Disbursement and will not be part of the proposals evaluated fee. The Design Consultant effort to complete the remaining scope of work defined in E9 shall be included in the bidder's evaluated fees.

Q8: E11.3 references Type 2 Disbursements but E11.4 says vaults and duct banks are part of the Cash Allowance. However, B9.6 does not list E11.4 as part of the Cash Allowance.

A8: Similar to Question 9 above, the expenses associated with obtaining utility investigation services completed by a 3rd party contractor shall be estimated in the fees table as a Type 2 Disbursement and will not be part of the proposals evaluated fee. The Design Consultant effort to complete the remaining scope of work defined in E11 shall be included in the bidder's evaluated fees.

Q9: E16.6 and E16.7 both mention a Value Engineering (VE) session. Is there more information on this VE session? Is this VE session supposed to be for all scope of work for the entire project or only bridge structures which is what E16 is describing as there is no mention of VE anywhere else in this document. If there is to be a VE session, is this internal to the Consultant, or should it include the City, or should it be part of a true VE session where an outside consulting firm and a contractor are in the room providing feedback? Please confirm if a VE session is required, and if so please provide additional information on what scope should be included in it.

A9: The value engineering session is intended to be for bridge structures only (not all scope of work for the entire project) and is intended to be internal to the Design Consultant Team.

Q10: RFP clause B10.2.1 requests separate reference project information for proponents and subconsultants. Can the City confirm the intent is to receive at least three reference projects (clause B10.1) for each subconsultant?

A10: Correct. The intent is to receive at least three reference projects for each subconsultant.