



# **Township of Muskoka Lakes**

## **Request for Proposal**

**P-2025-34**

## **Road Needs Study**

---

**ADDENDUM # 1**

**April 25, 2025**

---

The following addendum shall now form part of the request for proposal documents and amends the applicable information contained in the original request for proposal documents.

All other information contained in the original request for proposal documents remains unchanged.

## P-2025-34 ADDENDUM # 1

April 25, 2025

---

### Clarification:

Answers to questions as submitted are provided below in **bold**.

1. *RFP section 3.4, item 4, requires a “detailed 15-year capital plan with identified project types and costs based on a system wide level of service basis at various condition benchmarks,” We are curious what the expectation is on this? Will we be running multiple scenarios of 15 year plans based on the “various condition benchmarks”? Preparing the long term plans take significant effort so understanding how many scenarios are expected would be helpful. Are these plans to be tailored to annual budget forecasts or solely based on need and the level of service/condition benchmarks (to set budgets)?*

**A: The intent is to have the consultant identify the recommended treatments based on the condition rating thresholds (or condition benchmarks) for each road segment. An example is using recommended PCI thresholds for major life cycle events such as reconstruct, rehab, resurface, etc. In addition to major life cycle events, the Township would like to see recommendations for preservation strategies throughout the lifecycle within the plan. The plans are to be solely based on needs and the level of service/condition benchmarks with some consideration towards having the capital budget spread or equalized between years with the goal of avoiding large variations in capital budget requirements between years.**

2. *RFP section 3.4, item 5, requires development of road asset policies for the following:*

*Develop a policy, based on relevant established standards or best practices, that provides guidance for the design of Township roads. The Township has standard road cross sections/design standards. Are you looking for something more?*

**A: The intent is to have a review of the current design standards, and the recommended typical road cross sections identified in the Township’s 2023 Transportation Master Plan, with the end goal of having recommendations from the successful consultant for inclusion in a future policy**

*Develop a policy, based on relevant established standards or best practices, that provides guidance on increasing the level of service of an existing road (ie. From Gravel to Surface Treatment) or similarly decreasing the level of service of an existing road (i.e. from asphalt to gravel). What is the intent on this policy?*

**A: The intent is to have a review of the current level of service of the road (based on the surface type) and recommended level of service of the road based on established standards and best practices including considerations of roadside environment and traffic volume.**

*Develop a policy, based on relevant established standards or best practices, for municipal use for lifecycle events of typical asphalt, surface treated and gravel surface roads. The policy should include common lifecycle assumptions, lifecycle road rehabilitation or maintenance methods, when they should be applied, financial costs, and expected condition improvement results. Is this referring to recommended maintenance between major rehabs?*

**A: Yes, please provide consideration and recommendations through the lens of asset management with considerations of full lifecycle costs.**

3. This RFP section also requires a “cost benefit analysis of methods of rehabilitation of semi-urban roads that are currently surface treatment that incorporates full lifecycle costs of various levels of rehabilitation. This analysis should provide various options including ongoing funding required to perform different levels of rehabilitation across the semi-urban road networks.” Can you please clarify what the Township is expecting for the Cost Benefit Analysis portion of this? Similar to above, the number of options to be reviewed would be helpful to develop an appropriate work plan and fee.

**A: The intent is to provide a cost benefit analysis on maintaining status quo of surface treatment of lower volume semi-urban roads versus hot mix asphalt paving these roads. Analysis should include funding required for each scenario.**

4. RFP section 3.4, item 6, bullet 3 notes the prioritized recommendations for rehabilitation, repair, or replacement shall incorporate risk, value and level of service for the roads system. Can you please clarify what the expectation is for this?

**A: The intent is to have the consultant prepare prioritization of the recommended work based on best practices, established standards and good engineering judgement. The decision matrix for prioritization will be developed by the Consultant with input from the Township prior to finalization but is expected to include considerations such as:**

- **Risk - evaluation of consequence of failure (based on traffic volumes, functional classification, MMS Classification) and likelihood of failure (based on condition and surface type)**
- **Value: best value based on traffic volumes, number of road users, lifecycle considerations, expected maintenance costs**
- **Level of Service: Condition rating with considerations of road classification, traffic volumes.**

---

### Directions to Bidders

The Bidder shall:

1. Sign and date this Addendum in the space provided below and submit this Addendum to the Owner in the same submission as the Request for Proposal.
2. Enter this Addendum number on the Proposal Form (page 11 of the proposal document)

---

Signature of Bidder

Date