



TOWN OF OXFORD
Service Renewal to Support Community Growth Project – Phase 2

RFP #2026-09-01-TOO

Addendum No. 1

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

Dated: September 25, 2026
Oxford, N.S.

1. Precedence: This Addendum forms an integral part of the RFP 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 RFP Documents.
3. Content: The Addendum comprises **8** pages of text (including this page) and attachments.
4. Acknowledge this Addendum in Appendix A, Proposal Declaration Form, RFP #2026-09-01-TOO.

1. Could the Town confirm the official proposal closing date? The cover identifies September 29, 2026, while Section 9.1 identifies September 30, 2026.

The proposal closing date is amended to Wednesday, October 7, 2026 at 2:00 pm.

2. Could the Town provide a corrected evaluation table for page 18? The technical criteria total 60 points rather than 70, the financial criterion is shown as 40 points rather than 30, and the scoring guidance for Criterion C extends to 35 points although the criterion is identified as 30 points.

The guidance for section C should read “Strong, project-specific responses: 25–30”. The first paragraph of Section 7 should read “...achieving a Technical score of 42 or more points out of 60”. The financial header should read “FINANCIAL SUBMISSION (40 points total)”

3. Could the Town provide the Climate Change Adaptation Risk Assessment and Climate Hazard Analysis referenced in the Proposal Declaration Form?

Documents are included with this addendum.

4. The RFP identifies several interim milestones and a target IFT date of March 31, 2027. Is there flexibility in the interim milestones and/or final completion dates to accommodate an alternative workplan approach, provided the overall project objectives are maintained?

There is flexibility in the workplan. The key elements to address are

- a) class C cost estimate for December 18. This is to support anticipated funding calls.*
- b) ability to issue and award tender to complete project in 2027, subject to funding.*

Alternative workplans, including a change in IFT date will not be penalized provided a clear rationale for meeting goal b) will not be penalized in points. Criterion D guidance in the scoring table is amended accordingly.

5. Has the Town established a maximum budget for design and/or construction phase fees?

No, but surface works and storm works are subject to funding constraints under the Federation of Canadian Municipalities Green Municipal Fund “Adaptation in Action” funding stream. Water utilities are funded through the municipal water utility. Proponents whose work plan can demonstrate an understanding of the impact of these administrative constraints on the design process are preferred.

6. In Section 7, could the Town clarify how the distribution of construction phase rates will be determined from the technical submissions (e.g., anticipated duration, number of site visits, or level of effort)? This would help proponents understand what is being priced and align submissions with the Town's expectations.

For financial evaluation only, the Town will apply each Proponent's Task 6 rates to the common evaluation quantities in the table below. These quantities are notional. They do not represent the Town's estimate of required effort, do not commit the Town to procure that level of service, and do not limit the level of service the Engineer of Record determines is necessary. The Town's clarified position on construction inspection follows the table.

Note that density testing of backfill and road base have been combined into one line.

Item	Unit	Evaluation Quantity
Engineer of Record	hours	40
Design support engineer/technologist	hours	80
CAD technician (IFC revisions and record drawings)	hours	40

Construction inspector, full day	days	30
Construction inspector, half day	half days	20
Nuclear density testing (backfill or granular)	call-outs	20
Proctor compaction test	tests	6
Asphalt core / Marshall test	tests	4

*Evaluated Task 6 Fee = Σ (Proponent's rate $\times$ Evaluation Quantity). **The Total Evaluated Fee is the sum of the Task 1–5 lump sums and the Evaluated Task 6 Fee.***

Note re: Construction inspection. The Town does not expect full-time resident inspection for the duration of construction. The Town expects risk-based oversight:

- *Inspection presence should be concentrated on critical activities. These include:*
 - *live tie-ins to existing water and sanitary mains;*
 - *storm outfall and backflow prevention installation at Black River;*
 - *trench backfill and compaction;*
 - *LID subbase, media, and underdrain installation;*
 - *permeable pavement base preparation;*
 - *pressure testing and disinfection;*
 - *paving.*
- *Lower-risk activities may be verified through scheduled site reviews, testing results, photographic records, and contractor documentation.*

The actual level of inspection will be determined by the Engineer of Record, consistent with the oversight approach described in the Proponent's Technical Submission. It will be confirmed with the Town at the pre-construction meeting.

*Section 3.6 invites Proponents to describe their approach, but it is the Engineer of Record's professional responsibility to be satisfied that construction conforms to the design before certifying it. If, in the Proponent's professional judgment, the Town's stated approach would not allow the Engineer of Record to certify the work, the Proponent shall say so in the Technical Submission and describe the minimum oversight it considers necessary. **This will not be scored negatively.***

7. **Sanitary sewer replacement:** For proposal pricing, please confirm whether the base design should assume complete sanitary sewer replacement and CCTV investigation or whether the complete sanitary sewer replacement should be represented as a provisional item.

The base design should assume complete sanitary sewer replacement is part of the scope. The CCTV investigation will determine whether this cost is necessary for construction.

8. **CCTV scope:** Please confirm the required CCTV inspection limits and who is responsible for cleaning/flushing, flow control, traffic control, and addressing inaccessible sewer sections.

CCTV scope will be from the manhole at Main Street and Water Street to the manhole at Main Street and Duke Street. Traffic control is the responsibility of the proponent or their subcontractor. It is anticipated that this work will be done by a local subcontractor, though proponents with their own inspection equipment may propose alternate approaches.

9. Utility records:

- Please confirm what record information, GIS mapping, and asset inventory data is available for the Town's underground water, sanitary and storm infrastructure.

There are GIS files for Town owned utilities. These are indicative only, are not to survey grade, and contain no elevation information. Shape files are issued with this addendum solely as an aid to preparing the proposal, not as a declaration of as-built conditions. The Town does not warrant the accuracy of the information in these shape files and proponents are responsible for confirming as required during the design process, particularly at tie-in locations.

- Who is responsible for coordinating with utility owners?

During design, the engineer is required to coordinate questions and resolutions with third-party utility owners and involve the Town in those discussions. The Town will rely on the engineer to scope the design tender to include utility coordination as required during construction.

- If pipe invert records are unavailable, please confirm whether traffic control should be included for survey crews to obtain the inverts for daytime or nighttime work?

Traffic control is the responsibility of the proponent. The Town has no opinion on the time of collection, but work will be subject to coordination with NS Department of Public Works.

10. Water-network modelling: Please confirm whether water-model updates or calibration, hydrant-flow testing, or system-wide hydraulic analysis are required, or whether the design may rely on the Phase 1 modelling supplied by the Town.

Pipe sizing for the water system will rely entirely on water modelling from Phase 1 which is anticipated to be completed shortly. There is no flow testing or hydraulic modelling included in this scope. This amends RFP Section 3.3.2 which stated, "The replacement watermain shall be designed to achieve minimum residual pressures and fire flows required for the land uses served, including fire protection for the commercial and civic uses along the Main Street corridor."

11. Stormwater Analysis:

- Are there previous drainage studies for the project corridor that can be provided?

No, there are no previous drainage studies.

- Does the Town have a preferred modelling platform for stormwater analysis?

No, any SWMM5 based platform is acceptable. Accessibility after the project is desirable (e.g., open-source compatible platforms are preferred but not mandatory).

- The RFP indicates that climate-adjusted flood level assessments and hydraulic modelling of river systems are not required. However, can the Town clarify the required extent and level of overland-flow analysis and whether two-dimensional surface-flow modelling is expected?

1-D dual drainage (major/minor) modelling is sufficient. The Town does not expect detailed 2D overland flow modelling.

12. Green infrastructure/LID scope: For the rain gardens and permeable pavement, please clarify the following:

- Who will be responsible for ongoing maintenance of the green infrastructure?

Town public works.

- Should the base scope include a follow-up inspection after one full growing cycle?

Yes, please include a follow up inspection. A short inspection memo with recommendations on maintenance or plant replacement is sufficient.

- Beyond incorporating rain gardens and permeable pavement, are there specific runoff reduction, water quality treatment, infiltration, or impervious area reduction targets required to satisfy funding objectives?

No, the funding objectives are high-level: climate change readiness and inclusion of nature-based solutions. The Town will rely on the proponent to recommend appropriate technologies and approaches, including those provided in the conceptual section.

13. Roadworks: Please confirm whether any existing asphalt cores or borehole information is available for the project area.

There are no cores or borehole data available.

14. Survey: Is the intent to provide calculated/confirmed boundaries of the ROW or will property mapping be sufficient?

Property mapping from GeoNOVA will be sufficient for project layout. Legal survey is outside of scope. The Proponent shall identify any design element within 0.6 m of the mapped property line; legal survey at those locations, if required, will be authorized by change order.

15. Does the Town have any as-built drawings and/or GIS mapping of the existing infrastructure on Main Street? Access to this information would help us better understand the layout and complexity of the existing system during our review.

Shape files are included with this addendum. Proponents should rely on site survey for utility tie in locations.

16. Is it the Town's intent for this project to include the design of a new storm sewer outfall to the Black River, or is the intent to provide backflow prevention at the existing outfall? Could you also confirm the location of the existing outfall?

A new outfall is expected to be required to meet design size specifications. Approximate outfall location is on the northwest side of the bridge on Main Street on the west bank of the river. The Proponent's Task 4 permitting scope and schedule shall account for provincial and, if required, federal approvals for the new outfall.

The Town acknowledges this schedule risk. Proponents shall scope level of effort based on an assumption of permitting being completed prior to the 2027 fisheries window, and construction being completed before its close.

17. The project objectives reference resurfacing Main Street from Hanlon Street to the "extents of Phase 1 paving at Oxford Frozen Foods." Could the Town confirm the exact location of these paving limits? Additionally, can you confirm whether this portion of the project is intended to be limited to roadway resurfacing only, or if it will include buried utilities, curb and sidewalk work, or streetscape improvements?

These paving limits are limited to resurfacing. All underground work, full depth road reconstruction, and LID features end at Hanlon. The exact location of the paving limits will be coordinated with Phase 1 work, but for the purposes of scoping and drawing counts, proponents can assume the scope ends at the driveway of 4852 Main Street (Highway 321).

18. Please use the amended Appendix A declaration form in the submittal.

19. Attachments:

GIS Shape files (zip package) – if your organization screens zip files through email security, contact Matt Delorme (mdelorme@aimnetwork.ca 902-691-4883) to arrange and alternate method of transfer.

Climate Change Adaptation Risk Assessment

Climate Hazard Analysis

Appendix A Proposal Declaration Form

This Proposal Declaration must be executed by the Proponent and included with the Technical Submission. By executing this Declaration, the Proponent agrees to all terms and conditions of this RFP.

TO: Town of Oxford, Attention: Linda Cloney, CAO

RE: RFP 2026-09-01-TOO Service Renewal to Support Community Growth Project Phase 2: Main Street Renewal

The undersigned Proponent, having carefully reviewed this RFP including all appendices and any addenda issued, hereby declares as follows:

- The Proponent has the legal capacity to enter into a contract and to fulfill all obligations under this RFP.
- This proposal has been prepared without collusion or fraud, and the Proponent has not communicated or agreed with any other Proponent regarding pricing or proposal content.
- The Proponent and all key team members have reviewed all background documents provided in this RFP, including the Climate Change Adaptation Risk Assessment and the Climate Hazard Analysis provided in Addendum 1.
- The Proponent acknowledges receipt of all addenda issued as of the submission deadline. Addenda acknowledged (list by number):

- The Proponent declares the following actual or potential conflicts of interest (if none, state 'None'):

- The Proponent agrees that this proposal will remain valid and irrevocable for a period of ninety (90) days from the submission deadline.
- The Proponent authorizes the Town to conduct reference checks and background inquiries as it deems appropriate.

Signed this _____ day of _____, 2026

Name of Firm:

Authorized Signatory Name:

Signature:

Title:

Address:

Telephone:

Email:
