CONTRACT NUMBER:	CON26-0191
CONTRACT TITLE:	DELEM DRIVE SANITARY PUMPSTATION AND INTERSECTION UPGRADE
ADDENDUM NUMBER.:	2
ADDENDUM ISSUE DATE:	2026-NOVEMBER-6

Proponents are advised that Addendum No. **2** to *Contract* **CON26-0191** is hereby issued by the *Owner*. This addendum shall form part of the *Contract Documents* and is to be read, interpreted and coordinated with all other parts. The following revisions supersede the information contained in the original *Contract Documents* and preceding addendums. The cost of all *Work* herein shall be included in the Unit Prices tendered in the *Schedule of Quantities and Prices*. Bidders are to reference receipt of Addendum #2 in their submission.

ADDITIONS, REVISIONS, AND CLARIFICATIONS

1. Signed and sealed IFT drawings (R1-XXXX-000 through R1-XXXX-604: 29 Sheets) are issued through this addendum. A revised Schedule 2 List of Contract Drawings will be issued in the next addendum.

2. BC Hydro Drawing 500-U07-09382 is issued through this addendum.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Q11: Please clarify the generator supply, section 26 05 00 Clause 1.5 identifies owner supply, payment item 26-1.4 includes supply, installation, and commissioning. If the generator is owner supplied, please provide a timeline for delivery of the generator.

A11: The generator is to be supplied by the Contractor.

Q12: Owner- supplied pumpstation - if possible, please provide, the final materials supply scope, shop drawings and supply timeline for the owner supplied package.

A12: The Owner supplied packaged pump station is shown on Drawing Number 25-101 of the Tender Drawings. Concrete and reinforcing shown on this drawing are for illustrative purposes only and are the Contractor's responsibility. The packaged pump station is available for the Contractor immediately upon project award and can be picked-up from the City of Langford's yard at 2416 Luxton Road. Handling of the packaged pump station to be in accordance with the HANDLING PROCEDURES FOR FIBREGLASS PUMP STATIONS document.

Q13: Please confirm the PBX/Owner programmer fees including the 5 days of witness testing and commissioning are paid by the owner, contractor scope to be coordination and sub trade attendance.

A13: Yes, PBX will be retained directly by the Owner.

Q14: Please confirm if the temporary sheet piling may remain in place and comment on any approval criteria, if the sheet plies are to be removed, please provide clarification on the backfill requirements surrounding the wet well structure, the geotechnical report references cellular concrete backfill in the sequencing plan.

A14: The sheet piles may remain in place, with portions removed as required to provide a minimum of 300 mm clearance from any piping, conduits, concrete slabs and the finished ground surface. Cellular concrete backfill is not required. Backfill is to be in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations, as outlined on the Backfill Recommendations for Barski FRP Vertical Pump Stations document.

Q15: Are there any approved discharge locations for dewatering or discharge permits applied for or is this scope a requirement of the contractor?

A15: Guidance regarding dewatering discharge is provided in section 7.1.1 of the Construction Environmental Management Plan. Discharge locations including sediment control measures and energy dissipation are the responsibility of the Contractor.

Q16: Can you please define the contractor's responsibility for post construction settlement of new fill over peatmoss including any monitoring, acceptance criteria, and remedial work during the maintenance period?

A16: The pump station is located in an area which has been preloaded. The Contractor will not be responsible for remediation within the maintenance period assuming all works are installed and testing has been completed in accordance with the contract drawings and specifications, and as directed by the site engineer during construction.

Q17: Can we please confirm the pile layout for the pump station kiosk and generator slab? The drawing from WSP Geotech report dated 25-08-12 (Shown on left) shows 8 piles. The in the tender set does not show the pile layout. Please confirm.

A17: The tender drawings are correct with no piles for the kiosk and generator pad. The geotech report was based on a different location.

Q18: How many USB drives are needed? Does each envelope require its own drive or is it one total? There is a little bit of a discrepancy in the documents

A18: One for each envelope please.

Q19: Do the cover page and table of contents count towards the overall page limit count? Also are appendices counted towards the total page count?

A19: There is no total page count, just a count for each section. You can add whatever you like in the appendices, but they may not be reviewed.

Q20: Item 34.17 requires the Contractor to "Coordinate with and Assist MoTT with Installation and Testing of MoTT Supplied Traffic Controller." Could the City please provide the specific scope of the "assistance" required? Specifically, is the Contractor expected to provide civil/backfill labor, electrical hookups, or specialized equipment (e.g., crane/boom truck) to assist the Ministry, or is this limited strictly to site access and scheduling coordination?

A20: This is a common procedure with the Ministry. If contractors are unaware of how it works, we would suggest hiring a sub-consultant who has this experience. Electrical Maintenance Contractors are listed on the MoTT website.

Q21: Will the MoTT Supplied Traffic Controller be delivered directly to the project site by the Ministry, or is the Contractor responsible for picking it up from a Ministry yard? If pickup is required, please specify the location.

A21: This is a common procedure with the Ministry. If contractors are unaware of how it works, we would suggest hiring a sub-consultant who has this experience. Electrical Maintenance Contractors are listed on the MoTT website.

Q22: Item 34.19 requires the Contractor to "Coordinate DMS Board removal with MoTT." Please clarify if the physical de-installation, rigging, and transport of the DMS board are to be executed by MoTT crews, or if the Contractor is responsible for the physical removal and salvage delivery.

A22: For the purposes of this procurement, the assumption is that MoTT crews will complete all the work required. The successful contractor is only to provide access for the MoTT crews as per GC 1.44 Other Contractor, GC 1.45 Other Work and 6.0 OTHER CONTRACTORS. If additional support is required by the contractor above and beyond controlling the site, coordination and providing safe access, then that shall be dealt with through a change order.

Q23: If the Contractor is responsible for the physical removal of the DMS board, please provide the structural details/weight of the board and specify the final drop-off location for the salvaged asset.

A23: N/A. See response A22.

Q24: Section 3.3 of the NRFP requires six (6) reference projects completed within the last five (5) years using the same project team proposed for this project. With the number of projects required and the relatively short timeframe, could the Owner consider revising this requirement to allow proponents to demonstrate relevant corporate experience on similar projects, rather than limiting the references solely to the proposed project team?

A24: It's not a pass/fail and we would expect that the pumpstation and highway projects could be different teams; however, the higher points will be provided to to references using the project team assigned to this project.

Q25: Can the City confirm if a baseline dewatering volume/rate or hydrogeological assessment is available to mitigate the financial risk associated with the "Dewatering Lump Sum" item (Item 1.05)?

A25: No additional information is available at this time.

Q26: Electrical Site Plan Notes (Sheet E101) state that BC Hydro and Rogers telecommunication design coordination is actively "in progress at time of submission". Because third-party design approvals present a primary schedule risk, when does the City anticipate finalized designs from BC Hydro and Rogers will be issued via Addendum?

A26: BC Hydro Drawing 500-U07-09382 is issued through this addendum. Telus and Rogers relocations are still in progress. Contractors are to assume that they need to make the site available for those crews similar to the response in A22.

Q27: NRFP Section 4.1.6 states that the finalized contract will include a provision establishing that no additional payments or time extensions will be claimable for subsurface/place of work conditions that were "reasonably foreseeable". Given that the WSP Geotechnical Report is explicitly categorized as "Reference Information" and not part of the Contract Documents (per Section 4.2.5), will the City clarify what baseline parameters contractors should assume for "foreseeable" soil stability and rock density to prevent future claims disputes?

A27: Contractors have been provided all the information we have. While the reference information is not a contract document, reasonable assumptions can be made. If conditions are found that differ materially from the reports and what is visually available on site, then that will be dealt with by change order on a case by case basis.

Q28: Civil Drawing Sheet C2 dimensions the Kiosk and Genset Concrete Slab footprint as 4.5m x 7.0m. However, Structural Drawing Sheet S1.0 (Detail 1) marks the slab dimensions as 4.5m x 4.5m (4500 x 4500) for the structural layout. Please clarify the true physical dimensions required for the cast-in-place concrete foundation.

A28: This interpretation of the drawings is incorrect. Wetwell slab is 4.5x4.5 where the Kiosk and Genset Concrete slab is correctly labelled on the structural drawings as 4.5m x 7.0m and references detail 3 on sheet S1.0.

Q29: Structural Drawing S1.0 (Detail 2) requires a Concrete Curb (900mm high x 600mm wide) around the wet well perimeter. This curb is missing from the Division 3 Pricing Schedule for Site 1. Should the cost of this structural curb be integrated into Item 3.02 ("Wet Well Foundation and Piles"), or will a separate line item be added?

A29: It is incidental to item 3.02.

Q30: Civil Plan/Profile drawings Sheet C201 and Sheet C202 explicitly dictate the installation of two new 1050mm Ø sanitary sewer manholes: SMH 1 and SMH 2. However, these do not appear on the SOQ. Will these be added to the scope?

A30: These will be added to the SOQ in the next addendum.

Q31: Environmental Protection Note #2 on Sheet C1 states: "Contractor to conform to Langford Watercourse and Drainage Regulation Bylaws... Any required permits to be obtained by Contractor prior to construction." However, the project is scheduled to execute on December 23, 2026, immediately preceding the winter shutdown period. Has the City or Waypoint Environmental already secured the primary watercourse/drainage approvals, or is the contractor expected to navigate the initial environmental permitting process post-award?

A31: Please review the Construction Environmental Management Plan provided in the reference documents. There are no permits needed for the project unless the contractor deviates from the guidance provided in that report.

Q32: Sheet C3 indicates that sheet piles are to be designed by the contractor for the wet well excavation. Given the site footprint and geotechnical conditions, can the City confirm if a slide rail shoring system would be considered an acceptable alternative to driven sheet piles, provided it is engineered and stamped?

A32: Approved alternates will not be considered during the procurement process. Contractors can suggest alternates in their proposal submission which could be implemented during the negotiation period.

Q33: Regarding the connection to the existing 300mm PVC sewer/manhole, could you please clarify the configuration of the existing lining? Specifically, will the existing stub reach far enough outside the manhole structure to allow for our tie-in connection without risking damage to the internal lining system during excavation and installation?

A33: No additional information will be provided on this at this time.

Q34: Railing/handrail is indicated and detailed on drawing sheet R1-XXXX-104, but there is no corresponding line item included in the Schedule of Quantities. Could you please clarify if this railing is to be included in the contract scope of work?

A34: The railing will be added to the SOQ in the next addendum.