

**MOHAWK COUNCIL OF AKWESASNE
KAWEHNOKE DISTRICT**

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

ADDENDUM NO. 5 TO RFP DOCUMENTS

Consisting of 2 Pages

This addendum is issued to respond to questions received.

1. *Could you please clarify the professional designation requirements for the project team? Specifically, which roles (e.g., Project Manager, discipline leads, all technical staff) are required to hold a P.Eng. designation?*

MCA Response: Designers should hold a P.Eng. designation and stamp final drawings, technical team and project managers are not required to hold P.Eng Designation.

2. *Is it acceptable for a single team member to fulfill multiple roles on the project?*

MCA Response: Yes.

3. *Please confirm the expected level of detail for the WWTP as-built deliverables, whether final drawings are to be prepared based on contractor redlines, or if full inspection and measurements of all site items are required.*

MCA Response: Proponent to confirm contractor redline markup and revised CAD file to suit Redline markup and submit to owner for their project records.

4. *Please confirm that no exterior upgrades or modifications are anticipated to the existing RBC system building at the Block 97 development.*

MCA Response: None are expected at this time, if something is observed during investigation, a Change order for design can be issued.

5. *Follow-up to Addendum No. 4, Question 2: Will the proponent be required to support with scoping and/or coordinating with the third-party surveyor?*

MCA Response: No, MCA will initiate and procure Topo survey, if requested / required by proponent.

6. *Section 5.2.8 outlines provisional items and cash allowances for the Geotechnical Investigation, Sanitary Sewer Inflow and Infiltration Assessment, and Archaeological Review. Could further details be provided regarding the scope of these services, the expected level of detail, and timing considerations?*

MCA Response: A geotechnical investigation will be procured by MCA if requested by successful proponent to complete design task. The Sanitary Inflow and Infiltration Assessment, if necessary, will be procured with outside vendors procured by MCA (CCTV of existing system). Archaeological Review is not expected to be required for this project as the sites were previously disturbed. The identified allowances are placeholders for MCA's internal project budgeting, if proponent requires time to review any documentation they can bill time against allowance allotment.

Further Clarification of Addendum No4 Question 17.

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

Addition clarification: This review should review alternative treatment methods and be included in the design report complete with rough Class D Cost estimates. MCA is willing to work with the successful proponent on this review task.

I have read Addendum No. 5 and have included it in my Bid.

Consultant Signature

Date

-- END OF ADDENDUM NO. 5 --

Thursday June 11th, 2026