



STEVEN M. CLOUSE WRC BIOSOLIDS SYSTEM UPGRADES (RFQ)
Solicitation No. PS-00139

ADDENDUM NO. 3
October 12, 2022

To Respondent of Record:

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS

1. **Question: Please confirm if we are permitted one 11x17 where warranted (referenced on pg. 15 item B.5) in addition to one 11x17 for the Schedule (referenced on pg. 33 item 2). If there is no additional 11x17, is it required that the one 11x17 be used for the schedule?**

Response: Up to two (2) pages of 11"x17" Exhibit may be used only for detailed project schedule as requested on pg. 33, item 2. Each 11 x17" page counts as one page. Refer to the Changes to the RFQ section.

2. **Question: On Attachment I, Project Charters and Maps, First Table showing Total Projected Biosolids (pg 27): The note implies Current (year 2022) RAW/UNPROCESSED Projected DRY Solids Loading is 455 Dry Tons/Day and the Cake Generated is 75 WET Tons/Day. This doesn't align with traditional mass balancing for an anaerobic digester's volatile solid reduction. Can you please clarify?**

Response: The table showing biosolids quantities has been revised. Refer to #3 of the Changes to the RFQ section.

3. **Question: On Attachment I, Components Evaluation Summary: We respectfully request context in and around the LOF, COF, Core Risk scoring, classification, ratings, determinations and conclusions.**

Response: Field visits were conducted to assess the condition of major biosolids equipment. Business Risk Exposure (BRE) tool developed by the Water Environment Research Foundation (WERF) was used to assess the failure risk associated with the equipment. A Likelihood of Failure (LOF) score based on condition, capacity, reliability, maintainability, availability weighing factors was assigned to each major equipment based on operator input and visible condition of the equipment. A Consequence of Failure (COF) score based on environmental, financial/economic, social/community/organizational weighing factors was assigned to the equipment based on Consulting Engineer's judgement. This data was then input into the BRE tool to determine the Core Risk Criticality Classification. That equipment with "High" Core Risk Criticality Classification would need to be prioritized for replacement/upgrade/rehabilitation. Conversely, the equipment with "Low" Core Risk Criticality Classification would not be as urgent but may need to be considered for replacement/upgrade/rehabilitation. For some equipment, a "High" score was artificially assigned per SAWS request.

4. **Question: On Attachment I, Proposed Centralized Biosolids Facilities Map (page 30): The RFQ indicates to supply the new building with 2 new screen presses, 2 new dewatering centrifuges, and 5 thickening centrifuges, with space for 3 future thickening and 3 future dewatering centrifuges with dimensions 60'x65'. Are we to assume this configuration (both quantity, type and phasing) is SAWS specific baseline path forward?**

Response: The configuration is the "proposed" configuration included in the Master Plan for planning purposes. The selected Consultant will perform an evaluation during design to confirm the configuration, and may propose and recommend an alternative configuration.

5. **Question: On Attachment I, Proposed Centralized Biosolids Facilities Map (page 30): The maps indicates two storage cake silos of dimensions 40'L x 30'W x 30'H. Are we to assume this configuration is SAWS specific baseline path forward?**

Response: Refer to the response to Question 4.

6. **Question: On Part IV.B.5. (Pg 16): Is the one allowable 11"x17" specified for the Detailed Project Schedule or in addition to the Project Schedule? Will the 11 x 17 count as one page or two?**

Response: Refer to the response to Question 1.

7. **Question: Given the construction complexity for this project, who is providing "day-in/day-out" construction management (e.g., on-site, point of contact for the Contractor) and daily construction observation?**

Response: SAWS will provide an Inspector for construction inspections during construction.

8. **Question: Regarding 11X17s referenced in Attachment II table (PDF page 35); if an 11X17 is utilized, does it count as 2, 8.5X11 pages?**

Response: Refer to the response to Question 1.

9. **Question: Maximum allowable page count is 29 per Item B.3, on PDF page 17; however, by totaling the pages on Attachment II table (PDF pages 33-36), the pages limit is 23. Which is correct?**

Response: Refer to the Changes to the RFQ section.

10. **Question: Item B.3 on PDF page 17, states the Cover Page does not count toward the page limit, but we are also required to number each page starting with the cover letter. These two requirements seem to possibly be in conflict. Could SAWS expand or clarify the requirements?**

Response: The cover page does not need to be numbered. SAWS' understanding of a cover page is typically the first page of the proposal with solicitation name, solicitation number, firm name, etc. A cover letter, which is optional, if included, would need to be numbered.

CHANGES TO THE RFQ

1. IV. Submitting a Response, B.3. RFQ page 15. REMOVE and REPLACE in its entirety.

Responses are limited to a maximum of twenty nine (29) pages per proposal. Required forms do not count toward the page limit. Required forms are the Submittal Response Checklist, Respondent Questionnaire, W-9 form, Insurance requirements, Good Faith Effort Plan, SCTRCA Certificates and the Conflict of Interest Questionnaire. The cover page and tabs do not count towards the page limit. Number each page starting with the cover letter, including text charts and graphic images.

2. IV. Submitting a Response, B.3. RFQ page 15. REMOVE and REPLACE in its entirety.

Responses should be clear, concise, and complete. They should be submitted using an 8 ½” by 11” portrait format (up to two pages of 11” by 17” Exhibit for detailed project schedule will be permitted, and will count towards the twenty nine (29) page limit).

3. Page 27, Attachment 1, Project Charters and Maps, Steven M. Clouse WRC Total Projected Biosolids, remove both tables and replace with revised tables:

Steven M. Clouse WRC Total Projected Biosolids⁽¹⁾

Year	Projected Raw Solids Loading		Projected Dewatered Solids Loading	
	wet lbs/day	wet tons/day	dry lbs/day	dry tons/day
2022	910,789	455	149,906	75
2025	991,096	496	163,123	82
2030	1,071,496	536	176,356	88
2035	1,151,489	576	189,522	95
2040	1,231,952	616	202,757	101
2050	1,409,952	705	232,063	116

(1) Total projected biosolids include the biosolids transferred from Leon Creek WRC (and the biosolids that flows from Medi Creek WRC to Leon Creek WRC headworks).

Projections of Leon Creek WRC Biosolids Transfer to Steven M. Clouse WRC

Year	Total Projected Solids Transfer Loading (wet lbs/day)	Total Projected Solids Transfer Loading (wet tons/day)
2022	74,278	37
2025	78,094	39
2030	84,387	42
2035	90,641	45
2040	96,922	48
2050	110,820	55

The information in the remainder of Attachment 1, remains unchanged.

CLARIFICATIONS

1. Evaluation Criteria forms *will* count toward the 29-page count. The discrepancies on page limit have been addressed within this Addendum. Please note that the page count in the Non-Mandatory Pre-Submittal Conference differs and is incorrect.

END OF ADDENDUM 3

This addendum is four (4) pages in its entirety.

10/12/2022

