

**MOHAWK COUNCIL OF AKWESASNE
KAWEHNOKE DISTRICT**

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

ADDENDUM NO. 2 TO RFP DOCUMENTS

Consisting of 1 Pages

This addendum is issued to respond to questions received.

1. *Section 5.1 of the ToR notes the preparation of three tendering documents. Can the First Nation please confirm if the expectation is to develop and issue three separate tender packages and therefore administer three contracts? Alternatively, are the three RBC systems to be tendered under one contract? This will have a large impact on the financial considerations of the tendering, construction and warranty phases.*
MCA Response: Due to funding restrictions, it is anticipated that each system will be tendered separately, across multiple years, so three separate tendering packages will be required.
2. *Can the First Nation confirm if a preferred RBC supplier has already been selected or if it is within the scope of work to coordinate and evaluate alternative RBC suppliers?*
MCA Response: No RBC suppliers have been selected; it is the proponents' responsibility to coordinate / evaluate / recommend alternative RBC suppliers.
3. *Are there any First Nation owned accommodations in Mohawks of Akwesasne First Nation that will be available long term for a resident inspector?*
MCA Response: No, accommodations can be secured in the City of Cornwall, for a full-time inspector, or proponent to indicate whether cost saving could be had by doing periodic inspections (every two weeks or at certain project milestones) during construction.
4. *Can the timeline for applicable reference projects be extended to include projects completed more than 10 years ago?*
MCA Response: MCA will accept references for completed projects beyond the 10-year period to a 15 year period.
5. *Can the questions deadline be extended by 1-week and can the proposal deadline be extended by 2-weeks?*
MCA Response: See addendum No.1 issued May 26, 2026.
6. *What is the preferred communication method for the proposed SCADA system between the sites (i.e. cellular, radio, or fibre)?*
MCA Response: MCA has no preference; secure communication method can be discussed / reviewed with successful proponent, a fibre network is available to service at all locations.
7. *The RFP indicates that the SCADA is to be monitored from a remote location, where would this be located?*
MCA Response: Cornwall Island Water Treatment plant is preferred, but the Block 97 WTP / Reservoir may be considered as well, can be discuss in design phase.

8. *The condition assessment (EVB Engineering) is described as "DRAFT" in the RFP. Will the final version be available to proponents prior to submission, or only to the selected consultant? This affects how proponents scope the conceptual design phase.*
MCA Response: No, final version is awaiting installation of flow monitoring devices and will be available to successful proponents when completed.
9. *Has MCA completed any flow monitoring or metering at the three RBC sites? If so, can that data be shared? The RFP references design flows from original equipment (30, 50, and 200 m³/day) but the Hannah assessment suggests the AMS system may be receiving flows beyond its original design basis due to added buildings.*
MCA Response: Flow Monitoring is to be completed as part of the building assessment, MCA is awaiting installation of these units to confirm actual usage flows, it is anticipated that this will be completed in late summer of 2026, and will be forwarded to successful proponent.
10. *The RFP requires a 20-year population projection for each service area. Does MCA have an existing community growth plan, land use plan, or population forecast that proponents should be designing to? Access to this prior to submission would allow for more accurate scoping of the design flows and facility sizing.*
MCA Response: Yes, it can be shared with the successful proponent. Proponents should assume similar or 25% increase in original flow design for this submission.
11. *The Arena RBC services the arena and MCA is "considering" extending service to houses along Phillip Hoppes Memorial Road. Is that collection system extension in scope for this design, or out of scope?*
MCA Response: No that is out of scope, the existing RBC was originally designed for flows on Phillip Hoppes Memorial Road, so a check for future expansion should be included in design phase.
12. *For Block 97 upgrades specifically, can MCA clarify what the expected upgrade scope is? The condition assessment covers Arena and AMS only — is there a separate condition assessment or scope definition document for Block 97? With the scope of work involve replacement of the two RBC systems for the "Arena" and for the "School", is there a maximum allowable service interruption duration? Also, is there a preferred month for the installation?*
MCA Response: For the Block 97 RBC Proponent to review assessment and recommend upgrades from Hannah report in the RFP appendix dated 2024, which included assessment for that Block 97 RBC. There currently are no maximum allowable service interruptions, interruptions should be keep to a minimum where feasible to allow continued services. The preferred months for replacement of the AMS would be during summer months while school is out, and Arena would be preferred in the Fall.
13. *Same for the upgrade at Block 97.*
MCA Response: Same response as above, this work can be completed at any time.
14. *With the 20-yr population growth plan, the existing system is unlikely be sufficient. Will a parallel system be acceptable which involve a new (larger) building for larger RBC (or other technologies) for the systems involved? The old unit and equipment can either refurbish or demolish. This concept can apply to all three systems.*
MCA Response: Yes, a parallel system is preferred to minimize service disruption, and after replacement the old RBC should be demolished and remove from site.
15. *Provisional Items: The \$40K geotechnical allowance — is this intended to cover all three sites, or per site? Given two new buildings and potential new collection system routing, this may be insufficient and proponents should understand the intent before pricing.*

MCA Response: MCA will procure Geotechnical Services from local vendors and past along report when completed to successful proponent, please use \$40K as place holder for this submission.

16. *Similarly for the \$40K I&I allowance — is this expected to cover all three collection systems, or is it targeted at a specific system?*

MCA Response: Please use as place holder for this submission, MCA may deem it is not require for this task, or may procure a CCTV vendor separatelty.

17. *Tendering & Construction Phase: The RFP states three separate tender packages will be issued. Will all three be tendered simultaneously, or sequentially? This significantly affects the CA staffing and schedule.*

MCA Response: See response to Question 1 above, if available funding becomes available MCA may reconsider sequencing.

18. *The RFP indicates the construction phase services are conditional on design phase performance and may be re-tendered. Can MCA confirm whether construction phase fees should be included in the proposal cost submission, or only design phase fees?*

MCA Response: Yes, construction phase fees should be included in the proposal submission.

19. *Regulatory & Approvals: Will MCA be engaging directly with ISC on funding approvals, or is the consultant expected to manage the ISC submission process? The PIPM requirements suggest ISC review at multiple milestones.*

MCA Response: MCA requests proponent to help in the ISC submission process, and providing documentation (Monthly Reports, Field Observations Reports) during construction to satisfy ISC requirements.

20. *Proposal Requirements: Section 6.3.2 asks for the project team — should subconsultant CVs be included in the proposal, and do they count toward any page limits?*

MCA Response: Yes, sub-consultants can include the CVs in the proposal, The CVs will not count toward page count limits.

21. *Can MCA confirm whether the cost form in Appendix B should price all phases (design through warranty) as a single lump sum, or broken out by phase?*

MCA Response: MCA would like it to be broken out into each phase; design, tendering and construction administration, and warranty phases.

I have read Addendum No. 2 and have included it in my Bid.

Consultant Signature

Date

-- END OF ADDENDUM NO. 2 --

Thursday, May 28, 2026