



TOWN OF OXFORD
Service Renewal to Support Community Growth Project – Phase 1

Tender #2026-05-02-TOO

Addendum No. 2

TOWN OF OXFORD 105 Lower Main Street
Oxford, NS
B0M 1P0
P.O. Box 338

Dated: July 10, 2026
Oxford, N.S.

1. Precedence: This Addendum forms an integral part of the Bid Documents covering all aspects of this Project and is to be read in conjunction therewith. Should points arise which are at variance, this Addendum shall take precedence.
2. Purpose: The Purpose of this Addendum is to add to, clarify and/or to amend the Tender Documents.
3. Content: The Addendum comprises **4** pages of text (including this page) and attachments.
4. Acknowledge this Addendum in Appendix E, Proposal Declaration Form, Tender #2026-05-02-TOO.

1. Can the Town consider a 2-week extension to the submission deadline?

As indicated in Addendum 1, the closing date has been extended to Friday, July 24, 2026.

2. The RFP indicates that 10% of fees will be withheld from payment until milestones are met. This is not typical of a professional services agreement and we assume that this is a carryover from a construction contract agreement where statutory holdbacks are mandatory. Please confirm if this holdback clause will be applicable to the agreement for this project.

Section 8.1 of the RFP document is amended as follows:

8.1 Payment and Holdbacks

Payment will be made monthly against invoices reflecting work completed in the prior month based on project progress noted in the response to this RFP. For Task 6 (Construction Administration and Site Services), ten percent (10%) of the Task 6 fee shall be allocated for project closeout and released only upon the Town's written acceptance of: (i) record drawings, (ii) the Commissioning and Start-Up Report, (iii) resolution or documented disposition of all deficiencies identified at substantial performance, and (iv) all required NSECC and NSDPW closeout submissions. Monthly invoices shall be accompanied by a brief progress narrative. The Town will process invoices within thirty (30) days of receipt.

3. Task 2 is the design of confirmed scope, and Task 5 is also detailed design but includes tender documents. These two tasks cover the same scope of work except Task 5 includes Class B cost estimates and tendering process. Can the Town please clarify where the design content and scope should fall, or if it should be duplicated in both sections?

Task 5 specifies the expected content of document submittals. Design content and scope belong in Task 2.

4. Section 1.2 – Project Background, Section 3.3.1 – Existing Infrastructure Assessment, and Section 3.3.2 state that pricing for “any off-site sanitary design” needs to be provided. Can the Town please clarify the limits of “any off-site sanitary design”? Will this be limited to the extents noted in Section 3.3.2 for Lift Station Near Main Street and Scotiabank, Sanitary Forcemain Replacement, and Gravity Sanitary Sewer?

Yes, proponents can consider this the limits of required sanitary design.

5. Can the Town clarify the intentions around tendering of construction work? Should we assume the new lift station, forcemain and watermain crossing the highway (Task 2) would be in one tender package, and the off-site watermain extensions and sanitary upgrades (Task 3) be tendered separately?

The intent would be to tender all work as a single construction package. If delivery schedules, funding, permitting, or other factors outside of the proponent's control make it necessary to split the tender packages, the Town will accept a proposed change order for reasonable fees to do so, subject to Town Approval prior to commencing additional work to prepare a second tender set.

6. In Section 2.1 – Project Objectives it notes that one objective is to generate preliminary sizing and specifications for a replacement water reservoir at the Pugwash Road location however, the Section 3 – Scope of Services does not include specifications or design for a water reservoir. Can the Town please confirm that all design and specifications for a new Pugwash Road Reservoir are excluded from this RFP?

The reservoir is to be modelled as ground-mounted; proponents should not consider or model an elevated tower. The hydraulic model will establish maximum and minimum operating elevation, operating volume, and approximate footprint/diameter.

This RFP does not include detailed design, material specifications, tender documents or construction oversight for a reservoir, which will be solicited under a separate RFP based on the model recommendations and funding availability.

The appropriate type will follow from the operating volume and elevation results and will be determined as part of the separate reservoir RFP.

7. Can the Town indicate the hardware and software platform of the Town's existing SCADA network (e.g., VTScada, Wonderware, Allen-Bradley, Modicon)?
8. Can the Town clarify the existing telemetry/communication method used between the Town's remote lift stations and the master SCADA server (e.g., cellular, licensed radio, 900MHz radio, hardwired Ethernet)?
9. Does the Town have a preferred or incumbent System Integrator for modifying the master SCADA server, or is the successful contractor expected to provide a third-party integrator?

Response for questions 7, 8 and 9: *The SCADA software is VTScada. The existing controllers are older Control Microsystem which are due to be updated. Preferred PLC options for this project are Allen Bradley Micro 850 or Compactlogix depending on size of system, but proponents can recommend alternates with rationale. The existing communication method is Modbus RTU/serial over GE radios with no plans to upgrade in the near term.*

10. Does the Town have standardized, preferred manufacturers for the required ultrasonic level transmitters, backup floats, and discharge header flow meters?

The consultant will prepare a design and specification that describes the components to be supplied and installed by a contractor when the work is tendered. The Town does not intend to specify the manufacturer, but prefers Flygt Floats, Siemens or ABB flow meters, and Endress+Hauser or Ashcroft submersible level transducers.

11. Does the Town have a preferred manufacturer for Variable Frequency Drives (VFDs) and motor control equipment?

The town has Eaton VFDs for the Wellfield and prefers Allen Bradley for up to 20hp and Eaton for over 20hp.

12. Does the Town have a preferred generator manufacturer, and what is the preferred fuel source for the standby generator (e.g., diesel, natural gas, propane)?

No, the Town does not have a preferred generator. The proponent will provide recommendations on fuel type based on lowest expected lifecycle cost, maintenance and accessibility. The Town would like to have Modbus TCP or Ethernet/IP communication for the generator that includes fuel level in communication feedback if possible.

13. The RFP mandates "noise suppression equipment" for the generator. Is there a specific decibel (dBA) target at the property line that the design must achieve?

The Town will accept recommendations on the need for, type and maximum noise level based on the location of the generator and surrounding residences and businesses from the proponent.

14. Are there any specific local Nova Scotia Power contacts or Town-specific electrical service coordination procedures we should be aware of for this area?

No, expect standard coordination with the Nova Scotia Power area manager and inspector.

15. Aside from the mandated ACWWA guidelines, does the Town have any specific internal electrical installation standards or general preferred equipment vendors that should be designed around?

The Town does not have any Town-specific internal electrical specifications or preferred vendors, but preliminary designs will be provided to operations staff for an opportunity to comment. All electrical connections and wiring are expected to be installed with explosion-proof / hazardous location requirements that consider corrosion and gases generated at lift stations. Electrical design is expected to meet ACWWA and current CEC requirements.

16. On page 14 of the RFP, the top bullet says that reference projects are not included in the page count and a maximum of 3 project sheets. Further down the page, Section B relevant project experience (max 2 pages) asks to describe up to three relevant completed projects demonstrating the team's experience. Can you please clarify if we are to submit 3 project references as appendices and then use the 2 pages in section B to describe 3 additional projects?

Section B (maximum 2 pages) is the only location for project experience content and is where evaluation scoring will occur. Supplementary project reference sheets (maximum 1 page per project, maximum 3 sheets) are not required and, if submitted, will not be considered as additional value beyond what is presented in Section B.

17. Could the Town please provide a copy of the professional services contract proposed to be used on this project? Or indicate if an industry standard agreement such as ACEC document 36 is intended to be used?

The Town intends to use the ACEC standard form of agreement for professional services as the base contract, with supplementary conditions incorporating the terms summarized in Section 8 of the RFP. Where the supplementary conditions and the ACEC standard form conflict, the supplementary conditions will take precedence. The form of agreement including supplementary conditions will be provided to the Preferred Proponent during contract negotiations, as indicated in Section 8.

18. Would the Town consider removal of Section 8.1 of the "Contract Terms Summary" requiring 10% holdback for various phases of the work? While holdbacks are standard practice in construction contracts it is not typical to include a holdback on professional services contracts. Holdbacks protect against unfinished or defective physical work, because professional services do not include physical work a holdback does not typically apply. Professional performance is already governed by contractual obligations, professional standards of care, and errors-and-omissions insurance. Imposing a holdback increases costs while providing limited additional protection to the municipality.

This is amended under Item 2 of this addendum.