



ALEX VUCINIC
Manager of Purchasing

Elaine Castellan
Purchasing Supervisor

(519) 255-6272
TELEPHONE NUMBER

ADDENDUM NO. 2
SANDWICH SOUTH MASTER SERVICING STUDY AND LITTLE RIVER WATERSHED FLOOD PLAIN MAPPING
RFP NO. 46-19

March 29, 2019

This addendum amends and forms part of the Proposal Documents. The Proponent shall insert the addendum behind the cover page of the Proposal Documents.

QUESTIONS/ANSWERS:

Question #1:

Requirements and Deliverables of the Contract, 6.2.1.1: Please clarify the extent of municipal drains requiring the creation of floodplain mapping beyond the Little River Drain. Should we assume all municipal drains within the Little River watershed requires official floodplain mapping as per federal and provincial guidelines?

Answer: Yes, assume that all open channel municipal drains within the Little River Watershed require floodplain mapping.

Question #2:

Requirements and Deliverables of the Contract, 6.2.1.2: Please clarify if the City of Windsor is planning on providing the awarded proponent access to the hydrology model developed as part of the Upper Little River Master Plan to use for the initial hydrology of the Little River Watershed. Access to this model would speed the hydrology modelling component of the project.

Answer: Yes, access to the model, which is in PCSWMM, will be provided to the successful proponent.

Question #3:

Can the City clarify the existing planning controls in place for the subject lands? The RFP references the East Pelton Secondary Plan and the County Road 42 Secondary Plan lands (which overlap in some areas, but do not cover the entirety of the study area identified within the RFP). Can the City provide a clear map showing the study area? Also, can the City confirm that the study area will only include those lands located within lands subject to the approved Pelton Area Secondary Plan and County Road 42 Secondary Plan?

Answer: Planning Controls currently in force in the study area include:

- City of Windsor Official Plan
 - East Pelton Secondary Plan
 - County Road 42 Secondary Plan (adopted, subject to LPAT appeal)
- Airport Master Plan

- Consolidated Regulatory By-law 8600
- Town of Tecumseh (former Town of Sandwich South) By-law 85-18

Question #4:

The RFP references the East Pelton Secondary Plan and the County Road 42 Secondary Plan lands (which overlap in some areas, but do not cover the entirety of the study area identified within the RFP). Can the City provide a clear map showing the study area?

Answer: A Study Area Map has been attached as part of this addendum.

Question #5:

Can the City confirm that the study area will only include those lands located within lands subject to the approved East Pelton Area Secondary Plan and County Road 42 Secondary Plan?

Answer: The study area is larger than just the East Pelton Secondary Plan area and the County Road 42 Secondary Plan area. See attached Study Area Map.

Question #6:

Can the City provide clarification/level of detail required for the Transportation Network Servicing requirements (i.e. requirement for ‘functional design’)? Would this consist of cross sections, recommendations for intersection operations (roundabout vs. signalization) etc.?

Answer: The Functional Design includes analysis that would be sufficient to complete the remaining tasks and confidently identify right-of-way / property requirements to accommodate the recommended design. At a Master Plan level, it is also required that any capacity impacts to the existing road network and proposed mitigation be identified.

Question #7:

Can the City provide an approximate delivery schedule for the above noted project?

Answer: Based on consultation with Industry the overall project is estimated to require 2 years for completion following the award of contract. Special consideration will be given to submissions which demonstrate the ability to expedite approvals for an initial phase of the residential development planned for the area south of Baseline Road between 7th & 8th Concession Roads.

Question #8:

Water Supply Servicing: Can it be assumed that EnWin/WUC has sufficient water conveyance capacity available to service the annexed lands at the borders of its service area and its evaluation is not part of the scope of work.

Answer: Correct

Question #9:

Water Supply Servicing: Will EnWin/WUC provide the location of their water feeder mains where sufficient conveyance capacity and residual pressure exists to support the annexed lands and its service area, and its evaluation is not part of the scope of work.

Answer: Correct

Question #10:

Water Supply Servicing: Can it be assumed that EnWin/WUC has sufficient treatment capacity available to service the annexed lands and its evaluation is not part of the scope of work.

Answer: Correct

Question #11:

Water Supply Servicing: Can it be assumed that storage and booster pumping facilities will not be required within the annexed lands to service the annexed lands and/or meet the requirements of the Windsor water supply system objectives, and that, its evaluation is not part of the scope of work.

Answer: Correct

Question #12:

Water Supply Servicing: Will EnWin/WUC provide boundary condition parameters to facilitate the evaluation of a proposed water distribution system within the subject service area of the annexed lands that conforms to MOCP guidelines.

Answer: Yes, modelled parameters will be provided. If field verified results are required then flow testing would be necessary at an additional cost.

Question #13:

Floodplain Mapping: Can you confirm the extents of the required floodplain mapping or approximately what length of channel requires mapping?

Answer: The City requires floodplain mapping to be completed for the Little River Watershed. This includes the length of Little River with the model taken to a sufficient outlet, as well as all open channel municipal drains within the watershed.

Question #14:

Floodplain Mapping: Is there a preferred hydrologic and hydraulic model software for the subject study?

Answer: The hydrologic model for this study must meet the requirements set out in the technical guidelines for flood hazard mapping and provide a relatively seamless transition/input into to the hydraulic model. The hydraulic model must be a HEC-RAS model.

Question #15:

Floodplain Mapping: Approximately how many river crossings (culverts and bridges) exist along the study area? Is the information for these crossings (material, dimensions, elevations, etc.) available or is additional surveying required?

Answer: The proposal should account for sufficient time to complete the required field reconnaissance, which is expected to include surveys to validate available information on any structures in the field, as well as to account for any new structures not previously account for in previous studies. Significant field time is anticipated as part of this study.

Question #16:

Floodplain Mapping: The RFP asks for updated existing flood plain mapping and appropriate measures to reduce/manage existing flood risks. Completely new mapping is also requested based on proposed land use to be used as a guideline. Does the proposed guideline mapping include proposed infrastructure (i.e. roads, etc.) or appropriate flood remediation measures for proposed development?

Answer: Flood plain mapping related to the undeveloped area should account for proposed infrastructure as best as practically possible. Such information would be obtained from the best available information at the time of this study, which may include supporting documents released along with the RFP (EAs, Secondary Plans, etc.).

Question #17:

Floodplain Mapping: Is there preference between a 1-dimensional or 2-dimensional hydraulic model for the flood plain mapping?

Answer: It is expected that the flood plain mapping be completed using a 1-D steady state hydraulic model using HEC-RAS in order to meet the flood plain mapping requirements of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry. Full 2-D modeling shall not be completed as part of this study. However, there may be consideration for a coupled 1-D/2-D steady state model as a result of flows that are expected to spill banks in the undeveloped areas where wide defined flood plains do not exist. This type of coupled model must be completed in compliance with the relevant flood hazard mapping guidelines and have sufficient documented rationale to support its use. A coupled model would require the 1-D steady state model to define the flood plain with the linked 2-D model defining the spill area. Proposals should consider the suitability of their proposed modeling approach with respect to technical standards for flood plain mapping.

Except for the contents of this addendum, all other terms and conditions of this proposal remain the same.

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 2

Yours truly,

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF WINDSOR

Elaine Castellan

Elaine Castellan
Purchasing Supervisor

EC/jm

ADDENDUM NO. 2
SANDWICH SOUTH MASTER SERVICING STUDY AND LITTLE RIVER WATERSHED FLOOD PLAIN MAPPING
RFP NO. 46-19

March 29, 2019

I hereby acknowledge receipt of Addendum No. 2 to the RFP No. 46-19 (6 pages).

The information contained therein is hereby noted and account of same will be taken in our proposal cost.

This information was received on the _____ day of _____, 20_____.

Signature

Name (Printed)

Company Name

***NOTE: You are required to acknowledge this addendum with your proposal submission.**

**PLEASE FAX BACK TO (519) 255-9891 OR E-MAIL @ purchasing@citywindsor.ca SIGNED
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT SHEET ASAP**

Attn: Purchasing Department

Sandwich South Master Servicing Report & Little River Watershed Flood Plain Mapping Proposal No. 46-19

