

RFP-26-09

**WATER METERING UPGRADES
ADDENDUM #1**



TOWN OF AMHERST



Water Metering Upgrades

ADDENDUM #1

- Q1. Sections 35.3 and 42.1 request experience with similar AMI or AMR projects and three municipal references. Could the Town clarify whether references from U.S. deployments will be accepted, or whether proponents must provide Canadian references using the same proposed metering and communications system?

For solutions using AMI on licensed spectrum, does the Town require a successful Canadian deployment?

- R1. References from Canadian or U.S. municipal water utility deployments will be accepted, provided they demonstrate experience with projects of similar size, scope, and complexity. References are not required to use the identical metering or communications system proposed; however, proponents should clearly identify the technologies used and explain the relevance of each reference project to the proposed solution.

A successful Canadian deployment is not a mandatory requirement for a solution using licensed spectrum. Proponents shall demonstrate that the proposed solution complies with all applicable Canadian regulatory requirements, including Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada requirements.

Canadian experience, Atlantic Canadian experience, and demonstrated local or regional support resources may be considered as part of the evaluation.

- Q2. Section 1.2 requires proponents to have a minimum of 20,000 meters in active service but does not identify where those meters must be located. Given that Atlantic Canadian experience is included in the evaluation criteria, are the 20,000 meters required to be installed and active in Atlantic Canada?

- R2. No. The minimum of 20,000 meters in active service is not restricted to Atlantic Canada. Proponents may demonstrate active installations located in Canada or the United States.

Atlantic Canadian experience is not a mandatory requirement; however, it may be considered under the evaluation criteria in Section 35.3.



Q3. Section 1.2 requires a minimum of five years of experience, while Section 35.3 considers Atlantic Canadian experience and local support. Are both the manufacturer and its local representative expected to have at least five years of experience supplying and supporting municipal water metering projects in Atlantic Canada?

If either party does not meet this requirement, would the proposal be considered non-compliant or would it only affect the evaluation score?

R3. The requirement in Section 1.2 applies to the proponent submitting the proposal. The Town does not require both the manufacturer and any local representative to independently demonstrate five years of experience specifically within Atlantic Canada.

Atlantic Canadian experience and the availability of local or regional support resources are evaluation considerations under Section 35.3 and are not mandatory submission requirements. A proposal will not be deemed non-compliant solely because a manufacturer or local representative lacks five years of Atlantic Canadian experience. The extent of relevant experience and support capability may, however, affect the evaluation score.

Q4. Section 34.4 asks proponents to identify their proposed network architecture and coverage requirements. Has the Town completed a preliminary signal propagation or coverage study? If so, can it be shared with proponents?

If not, will the Town provide a list or map of meter locations, along with potential collector locations, so proponents can complete their own propagation study and determine the required number of collectors or gateways?

R4. The Town has not completed a signal propagation study, radio-frequency coverage assessment, or communications network design for this project.

The Town will not provide detailed customer account information or meter location data, during the procurement process.

Potential collector locations could include 14 McCully Street Public Works Garage), 98 Victoria Street (Town Hall), 389 Willow Street (Water Reservoirs), and 185 Church Street (Amherst Stadium).

Following award, the Town will work with the successful proponent during implementation planning to refine the network design, collector locations, and deployment strategy.



Q5. Could the Town identify its current billing software, including the version and preferred method of integration?

R5. The Town currently uses AutoRead to collect and manage meter reading information. Meter reading data is subsequently transferred into the Town's SAP system, which is used for billing and customer account management.

Q6. As the RFP identifies AMR, AMI, and hybrid systems as acceptable solutions, may proponents submit more than one system option, each with separate pricing and implementation details?

R6. Yes. Proponents may submit alternative solutions, including AMR, AMI, or hybrid approaches, provided each option is clearly identified and includes separate pricing, implementation details, assumptions, and supporting documentation.

For evaluation purposes, proponents should identify their recommended solution and provide enough detail for the Town to evaluate each alternative independently. The Town reserves the right to evaluate one or more proposed options and select the solution offering the best overall value.

Q7. Section 34.3 specifies ultrasonic water meters. Would the Town consider a solid-state, non-mechanical electromagnetic residential water meter in sizes from 5/8 inch to 1 inch as an equivalent alternative, provided it meets or exceeds all applicable RFP requirements?

R7. No. The Town intends to standardize on ultrasonic metering technology for all residential meter sizes identified in Section 34.3. Proposed meters shall use ultrasonic measuring technology and comply with all other applicable requirements of the RFP.

Q8. The RFP includes Attachment A, which references the Atlantic Standard Terms and Conditions, but does not include a project-specific form of agreement. Will the Town provide a draft contract or agreement during the procurement process?

If a project-specific agreement is anticipated, will its terms be subject to discussion and finalization with the successful proponent following award, consistent with Section 19.3?

R8. The Town does not intend to issue a project-specific draft agreement during the procurement process.

As stated in Section 19.3, selection of a proposal initiates negotiation, clarification, and formal agreement preparation. The RFP, Attachment A, the



successful proposal, and all issued addenda will form the basis of the resulting agreement.

Project-specific terms may be discussed and finalized with the successful proponent following award. No change to a mandatory RFP requirement or material term will be binding unless approved in writing by the Town as part of the final agreement.

- Q9. Please confirm whether the unit prices, infrastructure pricing, software pricing, and annual recurring costs submitted in Schedules A through D are expected to remain firm only for the proposal-validity period, or for any portion of the anticipated five-year phased implementation period.

If pricing is expected to remain in effect beyond the initial 90-day proposal-validity period, what price-hold duration and escalation mechanism will apply to future meter, endpoint, communications, software, or service purchases?

- R9. Pricing submitted in response to this RFP shall remain valid for the proposal-validity period identified in Section 7.1. The Town is not requiring proponents to guarantee pricing for the full five-year implementation period.