

	Question	Answer
5.	A 4 week schedule (Appendix A Section 9 of RFP) is likely insufficient for consecutive development of three to five MIKE 3 models. Will EC accept proposals with a modeling schedule that exceeds the proposed 4 week timeline, which will also extend the project timeline past March 31, 2014 end date?	We will endeavour to have the project completed by the due date of March 31, 2015. That being said, we hope to have the contract awarded approximately one month ahead of the proposed schedule allowing us some flexibility with the timeline.
6.	<p>Appendix A, P2 of 4, Section 4.0: One could imagine a range of failure scenarios for each WS, with a range of possible occurrence frequency and severity. There are references to evaluating the scenario which is “the most frequent scenario” and/or “the greatest risk to receiving waters”.</p> <p>i. Does EC have a preferred screening framework, a priori of modelling, for how the modelled failure scenario would be identified given that the most frequent scenario may not necessarily be the one posing the most risk to receiving waters?</p> <p>ii. Does EC envisage the failure modes to be described as time-varying pulses of discharge, or may the simplification of an elevated stationary discharge condition (flow and/or loads) be assumed for the scoping of the model task?</p>	<p>i. For failure scenario, once wastewater treatment plant assessment is completed, the contractor and EC would agree upon the appropriate bacterial failure scenario prior to modelling. The viral tracer would be modelled based on normal operations.</p> <p>ii. Case-specific depending on wastewater treatment plant and collection system in question.</p>
7.	<p>Appendix A, P3 of 4, Section 7.0e:</p> <p>i. In the context of outfall modelling, the near field typically refers to the region for which plume momentum is significant relative to the receiving water, which tends to terminate reasonably close to the outfall. The intended use of this term in regard to the drogue tracking appears to refer to distances less or more than one tidal excursion from the outfall. Please confirm.</p> <p>ii. The intended linkage, if any, between the drogue releases and the modelling is unclear. Is the intent to use the drogue measurements as</p>	<p>i. Yes, the focus is on less than one tidal excursion.</p> <p>ii. The resulting drogue tracks are to qualitatively validate the model results.</p>

	<p>supplementary information or to specifically validate the hydrodynamic model for each site?</p> <p>iii. No constraints are provided regarding the prevailing metocean conditions for which the drogue measurements are to be taken. Kindly comment on whether EC has in mind to target neap, mean or spring tides. Further whether any constraints on met conditions during the sampling should be imposed.</p>	<p>iii. Generally, peak tide states are targeted.</p>
8.	<p>Appendix A, P3 of 4, Section 7.0f:</p> <p>i. Please provide an indication of the order of magnitude of discharge rate (m³/s) and coliform count that are anticipated for the outfalls in question.</p> <p>ii. Please confirm the meaning of “normal tide ranges as well as peak tide states”. Does this mean normal / large ranges over a daily cycle or is it suggesting a normal fortnightly cycle vs. one with an unusually large spring tidal range?</p>	<p>i. This will be up to the contractor to determine as part of the technical assessment of the wastewater treatment plant.</p> <p>ii. Large spring tidal ranges should be considered.</p>
9.	<p>Appendix A, P3 of 4, Section 7.0g:</p> <p>i. Based on other comments in Annex 2, it is assumed that two effluent components would be tracked, one being fecal coliform (with a temperature-dependant linear decay) and one being a tracer representing the viral contamination (without decay). Please confirm.</p>	<p>i. A fecal coliform contamination with decay and a viral contamination tracer also with a decay (which would be provided by EC).</p>
10.	<p>Appendix A, P3 of 4, Section 9.0:</p> <p>i. Table states that a draft report must be produced for each WWTP collection system and presented to EC. Presumably these can all be rolled into a single document – please confirm.</p>	<p>i. Correct however all information pertaining to a single site must be contained within one continuous section in the final report.</p>
11.	<p>Appendix A, Annex 2, P23 of 23:</p> <p>i. Please clarify first bullet point – is this an input or an output to the model? Is it correct that “within plume” implies a request for hydrodynamic conditions inside the plume?</p>	<p>i. No this does not imply “inside the plume” but rather at the boundary of the modelled area.</p>

	ii. Seventh bullet pt suggests multiple failure conditions. Please clarify if this text or main text (which suggests a single failure condition to be modelled) prevails.	ii. Contractor will need to determine which mode of failure is most appropriate to be modelled. Bullet provides guidance as to appropriate fecal coliform concentration that may be used for representative failure modes.
12.	In MERX there is a record of an almost identical project awarded in 2012 (RFP K8F13-11-0010). Can you provide the resulting report(s) from the previous study and also provide the final amount paid for that study (including any extras)?	Due to Intellectual Property rights of previous contract, EC cannot provide resulting report. The contract amount: \$117,852.00.
13.	Are you aware if any of the data required for the identified sites has already been collected by Environment Canada either independently or under separate contracts already awarded?	EC has limited data for some of the sites which will be provided to the successful proponent following initial meeting.
14.	Clarification of Section 2 in Appendix "B" (Offer of Services) and the number of sites to perform over the period of the contract.	<p>There are a total of 4 pages for the "Offer of Services" (Appendix B) package. The first 2 pages are the terms & conditions. The next two pages is a spreadsheet breakdown by the fiscal year of the regular & optional locations to perform the work and the cost for each location. You will need to complete and submit the 4 pages as part of the financial proposal.</p> <p><u>Note:</u> The Appendix B spreadsheet should state that FY 2015/16 and FY 2016/17 are option year 1 & 2.</p> <p>You can also reference in the RFP, Appendix A (Statement of Work) page 1 of 4, item 1.0 Title, for the regular & optional locations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) FY 2014/15 (Initial year) = 3 sites + 2 optional sites b) FY 2015/16 (Option year 1) = 3 sites + 3 optional sites c) FY 2016/17 (Option year 2) = 2 sites + 2 optional sites