REGIONAL DISTRICT OF NANAIMO

20-053 Nanoose Bay Pollution Control Centre Secondary Treatment Upgrade Preliminary and Detailed Design Engineering Services and Construction Services

Addendum 3
Issued: October 22, 2020

This addendum shall be read in conjunction with and considered as an integral part of the Request for Tender. Revisions supersede the information contained in the original Tender or previously issued Addendum. No consideration will be allowed for any extras due to any Vendor not being familiar with the contents of this Addendum. All other terms and conditions remain the same.

Compiled Questions & Answers:

Q14: The RFP contains three areas where deliverables are discussed:

1. **Section 4 (Deliverables and Outcomes)**
2. **Appendix A (Key Engineering Milestones)**
3. **Appendix B (Project Milestone Guidelines)**

For the preliminary design phase Section 4 and Appendix B do have some similarities, but Appendix B has some additional guidelines for deliverables. Confirm that Section 4 is the basis for developing a work breakdown structure, and deliverables from Appendix B will only be included where relevant to the project scope.
A14: Confirmed. Section 4 is the basis for developing a WBS along with deliverables from Appendix B where relevant. Appendix B is a general guideline document for all projects, and not all deliverables will be relevant for each project. Appendix A was included for information only to provide expectations for overall project flow.

Q15: The EIS scope is generally informed by the Information Requirements Table (IRT) provided by the Ministry of Environment as a response to a preliminary application for registration under the MWR. Please confirm whether an IRT is available or what the basis for developing an EIS scope of services would be for this assignment. The EIS could be a significant portion of the overall preliminary design effort, depending on the scope of work required.?
A15: The EIS is to meet the requirements of MWR Division 3 sections 19 and 20 for the facility and receiving environment including development of a receiving environment monitoring program. Field execution of the monitoring program will be by others. It is the RDN's expectation that bidders are familiar and experienced with performing EIS, and that, paired with familiarity with the site's environmental sensitivity and proximity to neighbours, have sufficient knowledge to understand the expected level of effort.

Q16: For participation in the workshops to be facilitated by the RDN, please define how many and/or which discipline personnel are required. Confirm that the workshop must be on-site.
A16: The project manager, the process mechanical lead, the EI&C lead, and the design lead are required for both the Process Hazard Analysis and the operability/maintainability workshops. A Microsoft Teams video meeting would be adequate, presence on site is not mandatory.

Q17: In Addendum 2, the RDN has indicated that technical scoring criteria for the proposal submissions is provided in bullet form in Section 8 of the RFP. However, Section 8 does not provide a basis on how technical scoring will be performed. Please provide the scoring criteria / percentages allocated for each major part of Section 8 so we can better understand how the RDN will evaluate the technical portion of the proposals. Can you also provide the formula that will be used to allocate a score for the financial portion of the proposals.
A17: Financial Scoring:
Each phase (preliminary design, detailed design, construction services) will be awarded one third of the 40 points based on comparison to the low bid for each phase:

$$Points_{\ preliminary} = \frac{40}{3}\frac{Price_{low\ bid,preliminary}}{Price_{bid,preliminary}}$$

$$Points_{\ detailed} = \frac{40}{3}\frac{Price_{low\ bid,detailed}}{Price_{bid,detailed}}$$

$$Points_{\ construction} = \frac{40}{3}\frac{Price_{low\ bid,construction}}{Price_{bid,construction}}$$

Technical Scoring:
Technical scoring will be made by lump sum consensus of the bidders ability to provide suitable technical information as requested in bullet form in section 8 of the RFP.

Q18: Confirm the effluent quality objectives for the completed plant. Is it sufficient to meet the WSER regulation and MWR regulation for marine outfall in non-embayed water? Confirm that any tertiary treatment (disinfection, filtration, nutrient removal, etc.) would be considered additional scope.
A18: The effluent quality objectives for the preliminary and detailed design is to meet the WSER and MWR regulations for a marine outfall in non-embayed water.

Per section 3 of the RFP, an expansion plan and layout is required for future tertiary treatment.

Q19: In Addendum 2, the RDN has indicated that on-site solids processing is a future requirement. Please clarify the meaning of solids processing in this case? Is the RDN's intent to exclude thickening, dewatering and digestion from the proposed as-built works? In accordance with the process selection, AECOM would recommend thickening of waste activated sludge before trucking off-site.
A19: The intention of future "solids processing" in the RFP refers to digestion and dewatering. Thickening and storing the sludge as required such that frequency of sludge transport to FCPCC remains comparable is within the design scope.

Please note that there will be no further extensions made to the RFP deadline stated in Addendum #1.

End of Addendum 3