

Request for Proposal – Addendum #1

For

Third Depot Dam – Archaeological Assessment and Cultural Heritage Evaluation

In the Quinte Conservation Watershed



Addendum Posted:

June 25, 2026

Addendum #1

This addendum has been issued prior to the closing date to provide revisions, clarification or supplemental terms or conditions. All revisions, clarifications or supplemental terms or conditions forms part of the request for proposal and amends the original request for proposal documents.

The effects of this addendum shall be included in the proposal price.

All submitted proposals are required to acknowledge in a prominent location that ALL addendums have been fully accounted for.

Questions & Answers

Q1. Can you please confirm that the project area for the CHER is limited to the Main Dam, Spillway, and Saddle Dam, as illustrated in Figure 1 of the RFP?

A1. With the understanding that only a higher water level is a concern when completing a Stage 1 analysis as outlined in this RFP, the extents of this project can be defined as the Main Dam, Spillway, Saddle Dam and access roads per the attached updated Figure 2.1 and 2.2. None of the proposed dam configurations are expected to raise the water levels in the Headpond.

Q2. Is stakeholder engagement anticipated as part of the CHER scope? If so, could you please provide additional details regarding the anticipated scope, including the types of stakeholders to be engaged and the level of consultation expected?

A2. Stakeholder & Indigenous engagement should be carried to an extent as deemed necessary by the Consultant. Quinte Conservation has an active community liaison list as defined by the Conservation Ontario Environmental Assessment guideline. The persons and agencies on the list may be contacted by the Consultant to gain further insight into the project area as required for Stage 1 analysis.

Q3. Could you please confirm the project area for the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment? Does Figure 2 of the RFP represent the archaeological study area, or should the archaeological assessment be limited to the Main Dam, Spillway, and Saddle Dam, plus an appropriate buffer? To accurately scope and budget the archaeological work, we would appreciate mapping that identifies the full project area, including all potential areas of impact and any temporary property requirements, such as access roads, staging/laydown areas, construction compounds, or other associated works.

A3. With the understanding that only a higher water level is a concern when completing a Stage 1 analysis as outlined in this RFP, the extents of this project can be defined as the Main Dam, Spillway, Saddle Dam and access roads per the attached updated Figure 2.1 and 2.2. None of the proposed dam configurations are expected to raise the water levels in the Headpond.

Q4. Could you please confirm whether Indigenous engagement is anticipated as part of either the CHER and/or the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment scope?

A4. Stakeholder & Indigenous engagement should be carried to an extent as deemed necessary by the Consultant. Quinte Conservation has an active community liaison list as defined by the Conservation Ontario Environmental Assessment guideline. The persons and agencies on the list may be contacted by the Consultant to gain further insight into the project area as required for Stage 1 analysis.

Q5. Has the project area been subject to a Cultural Heritage Report: Existing Conditions and Preliminary Impact Assessment (or equivalent study, such as a Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment) to screen for protected or potential built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes?

A5. We are not aware of any previous studies

Q6. Has it been considered whether the project area will require a marine archaeological assessment.

A6. Quinte Conservation has completed the “Criteria for Evaluating Marine Archaeological Potential” from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport. At this time it was determined that a Marine Archaeological Study is not required.

Background:

Add “The access road is expected to need an upgrade. While the full scope is not known it could involve rounding out corners, modifying existing grades and road widening. Account for a 100m buffer on either side of the roadway”.

Figure 2.0

Delete Figure 2.0 and replace with Figure 2.1 and 2.2