

Addendum #1

Request for Proposal

For

Third Depot Dam – Hydrologic Analysis

In the Quinte Conservation Watershed



Addendum Posted:

October 23, 2025

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

- 1. The RFP document states: "IDF (1/3 of the way between the 0.1% AEP and PMF)" Is there already Probable Maximum Precipitation (PMP) values established for the study site? Is the proponent expected to develop a PMP hydrograph, and if so, is a statistical approach (Hershfield) considered appropriate?***

Answer: The PMP and PMP hydrograph from the HATCH 2013 Dam Hazard Classification can be used for this project.

As a separate item, the RfP asks to provide the preliminary dam classification and associated IDF based on the suspected incremental losses anticipated for each dam configuration.

- 2. The RFP document states: "Provide a preliminary dam classification and associated IDF based on the suspected incremental losses" Is the proponent expected to conduct dam break modelling?***

Answer: A dam break analysis is not required under this project. The purpose of the preliminary dam classification is to compare whether the different dam configurations have different hazard potential classifications, this assessment should be completed as a high-level desktop analysis.

- 3. The RFP document states: "Map showing the flow results for each AEP at each location of interest" Is the proponent expected to map the continuous flood area over the study site, from 3rd depot to Napanee River at Springside Dam? If so, is a previous hydraulic model available?***

Mapping is no longer part of this project. Delete the "Maps" scope of work and any associated verbiage.

- 4. What would be the preferred hydrologic/hydraulic model by QCA for the subject RFP?***

Answer: There is a slight preference to the HEC-HMS model platform since it is open source and Quinte Conservation staff are familiar with the platform. Model platform selection should be justified based on its ability to produce the project objectives and working within any known limitations and constraints of the modelling platforms. Different modelling platforms can be used for the different purposes (ex. One platform could be used for event-based simulations, and a different platform may be better suited for long-term, continuous modelling). Inputs and

outputs from the model must be clearly presented in the final reports for review, interpretation, and documentation. Model files must be submitted as part of the project deliverables.

- 5. Please provide a schematic of the existing GAWSWER model “Moira, Salmon & Napanee River” developed in 2000 by Schroeter & Associates, as well as a copy of the report Moira River Integrated Flood Forecast System (MRIFFS), Final Technical Report, 2000.**

Answer: This information will be provided to the successful consultant.

- 6. Please provide a figure showing the extent and details (resolution, collection date, etc.) of bathymetry data available?**

Answer: Bathymetry has been captured in the deeper extents of the main lake body. This is bounded by the dams to the south, the eastern and western shores up to the narrow channel next to the Canadian Pacific Railway. This information will become available to the successful consultant. Shoreline topographic information and bathymetry are being captured this fall and will become available to the successful consultant. The stage-storage curve for the dam will also be made available.

- 7. Will QCA be providing information for water crossings for modelling and mapping? Specifically: bridge type/culvert material and shape, invert elevation, lowest chord elevation/obvert, and location of measurement.**

Answer: Based on the project scope this information should not be needed. However, it is available in the 2024 Second Depot Dam Safety Review by Ahydtech.

- 8. The RFP states “For each EA Dam configuration option, provide general information on the geometry, elevations, location, construction, and operating range that will be used throughout the project.” Will this information be provided by QCA for the purpose of modelling?**

Answer: This information is contained in the background section of the RFP. If there are more specific details required, they can be discussed post contract award.

- 9. Does QCA has stage-storage curves for the lakes and hydraulic structures on the Napanee River (if so, which ones)? Will QCA be providing stage-discharge curves for each of the EA Dam configuration options.**

Answer: Quinte Conservation can provide the following stage-discharge curves for the existing structures:

- i. 3rd Depot Lake – 2004 Dam Safety Review, International Acres
- ii. 2nd Depot Lake – 2003 Dam Safety Review, International Acres and 2024 Dam Safety Review, Ahydtech
- iii. Bellrock Dam – 2004 Dam Safety Review, International Acres

- iv. Colebrook Dam - 2004 Dam Safety Review, International Acres and 2023 Dam Safety Review, Hatch
- v. Springside Dam (Napanee) – 2009 Dam Safety Review, Hatch

Stage-discharge curves for the dam configuration options will not be provided by QC. These should be developed by the consulting engineer based on the dam configuration details.

10. Is this proposal to be bid as lump sum or cost reimbursable?

Answer: This project is be bid as lump sum.

11. Could QC confirm that for the case where dam structures are removed (EA Option B) that the requirement to provide a preliminary HPC would be “not be applicable”?

Answer: An HPC is not required for option 2a.

12. Could QC clarify what a flow change station is in the context of this project? It is mentioned under Maps where a “table indicating flow change stations” is to be provided.

Answer: A flow station is simply the computed flow at the following locations: Third Depot Lake outlet, the outlet of Second Depot Lake, the inlet and outlet of First Depot Lake, Depot Creek at Bellrock Road, Napanee River at Petworth Road, Napanee River at Colebrook Road, Napanee River in Yarker at County Road 6, Napanee River in Camden East at County Road 4, Napanee River in Newburgh at Main Street, Napanee River at Highway 401, Napanee River at Springside Dam.

13. Could QC clarify what hydrologic net benefit refers to in the context of this project? It is mentioned under Final Report and Deliverables where the proponent is to determine and document “which EA dam configurations provide a hydrologic net benefit, net neutral, or net negative outcome....”.

Based on the results of the hydrologic analysis, the consultant should determine how the different dam configurations may provide benefits/drawbacks for flood management on Depot Creek and the Napanee River, drought – low flow augmentation, hazard potential/dam break impacts etc.

14. Could QC confirm if digital mapping figure outputs are required for each of combination of the five (5) hydrologic scenarios and seven (7) EA configurations?

Answer: Yes

15. Can the meetings listed within the RFP be conducted virtually via Microsoft Teams?

Answer: The project team meetings can be conducted virtually.

Schedule

The tender closing date is revised to Thursday, November 13, 2025 @ 12pm.