



ADDENDUM # 2

April 16, 2026

Questions concerning Tender: **STEW-2026-02 – Water Plant Design**

Question - Please confirm that the following is required in the scope. Well Installation: Drilling two new test wells with a blow test completed on each. Based on these results, one well will be selected for conversion into the final production well.

Answer – Yes, as a 2nd water source is required, proponents should included the the cost of drilling two wells. Should only one well need to be drilled, than a credit could be applied for the second drilling, should it be deemed not required.

Question - Please confirm that the following is required in the scope. New Well: A Step-Test followed by a 72-hour pumping test. This includes 3 water quality sampling at set intervals [e.g., every 36 hours] and monitoring of 1–2 selected adjacent wells at the same frequency.

Answer – Yes, this should be included.

Question - Please confirm that the following is required in the scope. Existing Well (PW21-01): A 72-hour pumping test will be conducted to confirm the required system flow rate.

Answer – Yes, a 72 hour test should be included.

Question - Please confirm that the following is required in the scope. GUDI Assessment: Completion of Step 1 and Step 2 assessments for the new well to ensure long-term regulatory compliance.

Answer – Yes, please assume that a GUID assessment will be required, however if it is determined that the well water source does not require a GUID assessment, then a credit can be applied. All proponents should build in the cost for the assessment.

Question – It is understood that testing of PW21-01 resulted in a confirmed long-term sustainable yield of 2.44 MLD and NSECC approved maximum pumping rate of 2.17MLD , but that this was limited by the ability to pump larger volumes during testing. If additional testing demonstrates that this well cannot sustainably produce a higher yield, would the Town intend to abandon/modify this well, or resort to additional wells in the area to meet future demand? Does the cost for drilling a potential 3rd well to achieve the long term maximum raw water design flow need to be carried in the engineering proposal?

295 George Street, P.O. Box 8
Stewiacke, NS, B0N 2J0
Telephone: 902-639-2231
Email: procurement@stewiacke.net



Answer - Based on the information that the Town has received well PW21-01 should be sufficient for use as the first primary water source. The towns intent is to seek a 2nd usable source. If it is determined that well PW21-01 cannot be utilized, the Town and the selected proponent can discuss options together.

Question - The RFP states that the proposal response is not to exceed 20 pages. Does this include forms and appendices?

Answer – Each proponent can submit the forms plus 20 pages of additional information.

Question – The RFP states that the Technical Proposal sections will be:

Section I. Project Experience and References

Section II. Team Composition

Section III. Management of Project Specific Risk

Section IV. Schedule of Work

Section V. Pricing Schedule

Pg. 6 contradicts this by stating that Pricing should be separate. Can Section V be separate?

Answer – Yes Section V can be separate.

Question – Insurance requirements are indicated as required following execution of an agreement but Page 9 – Mandatory Criteria indicates insurance certificates are required at proposal submission. Please clarify.

Answer – The Town is agreeable that the successful proponent can submit the required insurance at award. Should the top ranked / selected proponent not be able to provide the required insurance within 1 week of award notice, then the proponents bid shall be disqualified and the award will be given to the proponent ranked next highest in scoring.

Question – The table of sections for Evaluation Criteria differ from the Sections listed on Pg. 7. Please clarify which should be followed.

295 George Street, P.O. Box 8
Stewiacke, NS, B0N 2J0
Telephone: 902-639-2231
Email: procurement@stewiacke.net



Evaluation Criteria

The following criteria will be used to select the successful proponent. A minimum qualifying score of XX points is required at Subtotal A for the proposal to be given further consideration.

Criterion	Maximum Point Value	Proposal Score
<i>Technical Evaluation</i>		
Proposed Approach / Project Understanding	30	
Team Composition / Technical Ability	25	
Reference Projects	10	
Risk Management	5	
Proposal Technical Evaluation Qualification Score	70	
Subtotal A – Minimum Qualifying Score		Min. 50
<i>Costing Evaluation</i>		
Pricing Response	20	
<i>Schedule Evaluation</i>		
Schedule Response	10	
Total Proposal Score	100	

Answer – Please use the scoring as describe in the chart.

Evaluation Criteria

The following criteria will be used to select the successful proponent. A minimum qualifying score of XX points is required at Subtotal A for the proposal to be given further consideration.

Criterion	Maximum Point Value	Proposal Score
<i>Technical Evaluation</i>		
Proposed Approach / Project Understanding	30	
Team Composition / Technical Ability	25	
Reference Projects	10	
Risk Management	5	
Proposal Technical Evaluation Qualification Score	70	
Subtotal A – Minimum Qualifying Score		Min. 50
<i>Costing Evaluation</i>		
Pricing Response	20	
<i>Schedule Evaluation</i>		
Schedule Response	10	
Total Proposal Score	100	

Question – Proposed Approach isn't listed on Pg. 7 for the sections to be listed? Can this be included as a subsection under Section I. Project Experience and References? Or is this intended to be included under Section II. Team Composition?

Answer – The Town has no preference. You may use your discretion, as long as you include "Project Approach".

Question – The proposed approach evaluation indicates that 5 points are allocated to "operational costs/requirements (ex. waste disposal options) included?" – projected O&M costs are typically developed in conjunction with and following detailed design. Is the intent here for the proponents to present O&M costs in the proposal, prior to any design development, or simply to acknowledge that part of the scope of work will be to develop projected O&M costs during detailed design?

295 George Street, P.O. Box 8
Stewiacke, NS, B0N 2J0
Telephone: 902-639-2231
Email: procurement@stewiacke.net



Answer – It is simply to acknowledge that part of the scope of work will be to develop projected O&M costs during detailed design.

Question – Is the intention that Reference Projects are included as a subsection under Section I as per the list on Pg. 7, or should they be included under Team Composition / Technical Ability as per Pg. 9.

Answer – Please include reference projects under Team Composition / technical Ability as per Page 9.

Question - The design criteria listed in in Scope of Work – General Information lists the max day factor as 1.50 – we note that the Atlantic Canada Water Supply Guidelines lists the typical MDF as 2.0 for the future population (>3000), and higher (2.25 – 2.5) for the current population. Should this be modified?

Answer – Yes, please use the Atlantic Canada Water Supply Guidelines.

Question - Please confirm if drilling costs for the secondary backup well(s) are to be included in the proponent's cost?

Answer – Yes, the cost for the secondary back up well(s) are to be included.

Question – It is noted that hydrological modelling is part of the design scope – confirm if existing water models are available.

Answer – The Town has provided all information that it has on well PW21-01.

Question – The future population growth to 5100 will have significant effects on distribution flows and pressures, this expansion should be developed in accordance with a working hydraulic model. Please confirm that the modelling requested as part of this scope is limited to the supply of treated water from the WTP to the existing water tower only.

Answer – No, the modeling is not limited to the supply of treated water from the WTP to the existing water tower only. The design shall take into account the existing water towers and any new towers required as per your recommended design.

Question – The pre-design identifies the basis of technology for the new WTP, is this to be used or alternatives developed and proposed by proponents in their proposals? if the pre-design selection is to be used, does the requirement to demonstrate these characteristics hold or does that only apply to alternative proposed technology? To our knowledge, the pre-design selected process of greensand + nanofiltration supply for the target parameters based on groundwater is not in use in any Atlantic Canadian municipality for drinking water treatment.

Answer – A green sand filtration system was recommended by WSP engineering.

295 George Street, P.O. Box 8
Stewiacke, NS, B0N 2J0
Telephone: 902-639-2231
Email: procurement@stewiacke.net



Question – Confirm that evaluation and expansion (if necessary) of the sewer system, including collection and treatment, is not included in this scope (where connection to tie into the existing sewer system is listed as a potential design component)

Answer – The sewer system is not included in this design. The Town will design and build a 3rd lagoon at a later date.

Question – The scope includes construction services for an undefined level of future construction duration. Can the Town clarify the amount (hours) of onsite inspection required during construction?

Answer – I would suggest weekly site meeting / inspections throughout the project.

Question - Is the Declaration of Contract Intentions a form? If so, please provide this to fill out.

Answer – No, it is not a form. Your overall response and bid package is your declaration of contract intentions.

295 George Street, P.O. Box 8
Stewiacke, NS, B0N 2J0
Telephone: 902-639-2231
Email: procurement@stewiacke.net

