



CITY OF LYONS, GEORGIA

Request for Proposals (RFP)

**Best Value Selection Design Build Services for
Wastewater Treatment System
Upgrades and Expansion
Lyons, Georgia**

Return Submittal No Later Than: Wednesday, December 5, 2018 @ 2:00 pm, local time.

ADDENDUM NO. 3

DATE: November 30, 2018

ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF THIS ADDENDUM BY INSERTING ITS NUMBER IN THE BID FORM; FAILURE TO DO SO MAY SUBJECT BONA FIDE BIDDER TO DISQUALIFICATION. THIS ADDENDUM FORMS A PART OF THE PROJECT DOCUMENTS; IT MODIFIES THEM AS FOLLOWS:

1. Question: Does the City have an approved Antidegradation Review for expansion of the North Plant? This usually comes before the EID, but it is not mentioned in the RFP.

Answer: Please find attached the EPD approval letter for the Antidegradation Review for the North Plant.

2. Question: Please confirm if Part 5 Revisions/Deviations/Clarifications/Exceptions is to be included in the 30 page limit.

Answer: Please include any and all revisions, deviations or exceptions and any clarifications in Part 5 of the Proposal. Please include these in the 30 page limit.

3. Question: Please confirm if Part 6 Firm fixed Price, Insurance Certificates and supporting information, and Bid bond are all to be included in the 30 page limit.

Answer: Please include the Cost Proposal Form (attachment G) in the 30 page limit. The Insurance

Certificates and supporting information, and Bonds do not count toward the 30 page limit.

4. Question: We were unable to locate Form F-4 Statement of Compliance with Owner security, safety, substance abuse, & non-smoking policies, for inclusion in Appendix A of our Proposal. Please advise where we can find this form.

Answer: Please disregard Form F-4 Statement of Compliance with Owner security, safety, substance abuse, & non-smoking policies. This form is not in the RFP and will not be included in your Proposal.

5. Question: Page 17 of the RFP describes Compliance Form F-4 as “Statement of compliance with Owner security, safety, substance abuse, & non-smoking policies”. Form F-4 provided with the RFP is the Immigration and Security Form (Georgia Security and Immigration Compliance Act Affidavit AKA E-Verify). Am I correct in assuming that the E-Verify form is the correct document to include in the proposal?

Answer: Please include the Immigration and Security Forms, listed as Form F-1, on pages F-2, F-3 and F-4 in the Proposal. Also include the Conflict of Interest Statement, listed as Form F-2, on page F-5 in the Proposal. And include the Non-Collusion Affidavit, listed as Form F-3, on page F-6 in the Proposal. Please disregard the requirements for the Statement of Compliance with Owner security, safety, substance abuse, & non-smoking policies, listed as Form F-4.

6. Question: In attempting to prepare the final proposal documents we didn't see where the GEFA related/required forms including Davis Bacon wage determination and the goal for MBE/WBE participation were included in the RFP. Can you please advise were they are and if we are just missing them?

Answer: The GEFA required forms including Davis Bacon wage determination and the goal for MBE/WBE participation were not included in the RFP. The Design Build Teams shall be responsible for any and all required GEFA forms during the course of the work. These forms and wage rates are not required to be submitted in the Proposal.

7. Question: Has the City responded to the Compliance Schedule deadlines for Ammonia and Total Residual Chlorine outlined in the existing NPDES permit for the East Plant? The 6 month and 12 month milestone dates have passed and the 18 month milestone is rapidly approaching. If no response has been offered by the City or their previous engineer at the time these plans were due, we may need to address that with the EPD immediately.

Answer: At this time, it is not known if the Compliance Schedule deadlines for Ammonia and Total Residual Chlorine outlined in the existing NPDES permit for the East Plant have been filed. These documents, if filed, will be available to the selected Design Build Team. If they have not been filed, the City will address these issues.

8. Question: One of the borings on the Geotech report references wood chips 13ft deep. Does the City have any knowledge as to what this land was used for or any information that would describe the history and lead to why there would be organics that deep. This is atypical unless the site has some history.

Answer: The City has no knowledge or information as to the organics in the existing Geotechnical Report. The Design Build Team should allow for additional Geotechnical Investigations in their Proposal and design if there are any questions or issues with the Geotechnical Report provided in the Hofstadter Specifications dated 2017.

9. Question: Alkalinity was listed as 140 in the RFP documents. An onsite unofficial test was conducted and alkalinity to be found at 100. Was the 140 based on any testing? Please provide an influent alkalinity as the basis for all proposals if different from 140.

Answer: The City has not performed any testing in regards to alkalinity. The alkalinity referred to in this question is a design influent loading that Hofstadter and Associates used in their DDR. Each Design Build Team shall be responsible for their own determination as to the alkalinity basis for their design.

10. Question: The addendum requested an exclusions page. Do you still want a full copy of a marked-up contract?

Answer: Addendum #2 requested that any deviations or exclusions shall be included in the Proposal. This includes any technical or administrative deviations. A full copy of a marked-up contract is not required to be included in the Proposal. If the Design Build Team has many deviations to the contract and they want to show these markups, then it is acceptable to provide a full copy of their proposed changes to the contract. If there are no deviations to the Contract, the City shall assume that the Design Build Team will sign that Contract, as is, if selected.

11. Question: During proprietary meetings it was mentioned that we had 30 months to build project and then performance testing would take place. Current documents provided for performance testing to be six months and be included in the 30 months leaving only around 22 months for all design and construction. This would be extremely tight and may end up being cost prohibitive for the Owner. Please clarify.

Answer: The Design Build Teams shall provide in their Proposal a schedule to complete the Work. Please identify how long it will take to design, construct and performance test the completed facility. The Evaluation Criteria for the Proposals has been established in the RFP. The Design Build Teams shall decide the required time and cost for their project. The RFP has set a goal for the entire project to be completed in 30 months. If the Design Build Team wants more time, this shall be stated in the deviation pages.

12. Question: The RFP states that the performance test must include a winter and a summer. If the project finished in October or November this could be interpreted as having a 10 month performance test which would be cost prohibitive for the Owner. Please clarify.

Answer: The RFP states that the performance test shall be a minimum of 180 consecutive days. This performance test period is established to provide a basis for the Design Build Team to enter a price for this work in the Cost Proposal Form (Division Three). The Owner may or may not include this price when awarding the project. If the Design Build Team wants to propose a deviation to this requirement, such as proposing a non-continuous 3 month winter performance test and a 3 month summer performance test, then state it in the deviation pages.

13. Question: Indemnity provisions conflict between RFQ (and possibly the RFP) and General Conditions. We suggest that the General Conditions prevail. Please make sure all the terms and conditions for all Contract Documents match or identify the General Conditions as prevailing.

Answer: If there are specific indemnity provisions that conflict and cause problems for the Design Builder, please be specific and include these in the deviations page. The RFP was written specifically for this project. The General Conditions and Contract Agreement are standard DBIA documents. The City will choose the indemnity provisions that best suit their interests.

14. Question: Notwithstanding other provisions in RFQ, RFP, and General Conditions, please confirm we can rely on DMR data provided. There are clauses elsewhere where Owner disclaims accuracy of Technical Data.

Answer: The Design Build Teams can rely on the DMR data provided.

15. Question: Part 3.1 of the RFP, General, indicates that the individual responsible for the commissioning of the Project shall be a Class I or Class II Certified Operator. Part 3.3 of the RFP, Roles and Responsibilities indicates that final adjustments to equipment are to be made “at the end of the thirty-day operating period”. However, Part 1.6 of Attachment E-Performance Testing indicates that each system “shall be placed in service and undergo an operating test period under normal service conditions...the minimum time for the operating test period shall be 180 consecutive days...”. Please clarify the requirements for performance testing/commissioning of the Plant. While 30-day operational test durations are routine, longer periods are not typical. A 180-day performance testing/commissioning period would add a significant cost to the project given the requirement to have this process overseen by a Class I or II Certified Operator.

Answer: The Design Builder shall be responsible for training the Owner on operating the completed facility. The 30 day operating test will be done. The 180 day performance test is established (see question #12) in case the selected Design Builder constructs a facility unfamiliar to the City operations staff and the City elects to have the new facility performance tested to prove it can meet permit and to provide assistance so the City operations staff knows how to properly operate the plant. We understand the cost of a 180 day performance test supervised by a Class I or II Certified Operator will be significant and this is the reason why we want a separate price in the Cost Proposal Form for these services.

16. Question: Please advise if the City of Lyons will waive Building Permit Fee’s if a permit is required.

Answer: If a building permit fee is required then the Design Builder shall be responsible for these fees.

17. Question: Is the design build team required to provide any resident field inspection services for the project? If so, how many hours per week during construction?

Answer: Yes. The Design Build Team shall be responsible for providing inspection services to meet Quality Control procedures. These procedures shall be provided in the Proposal. The Design Builder is responsible for managing the construction of the project, including quality control and quality assurance to the City. The City will oversee the Design Builder to make sure the project is being constructed according to the approved design.

18. Question: During Proprietary Meetings a request was made to provide as-built information on the work recently completed at the North Plant. During preproposal visit, the work did not appear to match the contract drawings. Please provide as-builts including pipe sizes, types, and invert elevations.

Answer: As-built Drawings of the pipeline work will be available to the selected Design Build Team. These Drawings will not be available before the Proposal is due.

19. The City is in the process of obtaining the Wetlands Delineation Study by Southeastern Environmental Associates. If obtained, the City will provide to the selected Design Build Team. If this Wetlands Delineation cannot be obtained, the Design Builder is responsible for providing a Wetlands Delineation.



GEORGIA

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DIVISION

Richard E. Dunn, Director

Watershed Protection Branch
2 Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive
Suite 1152, East Tower
Atlanta, Georgia 30334
404-463-1511

May 22, 2017

Mr. Jason Hall, City Manager
City of Lyons
161 NE Broad Street
Lyons, GA 30436

RE: GEFA Loan No. CW 2016-005
North Water Pollution Control Plant (WPCP)
Expansion to 1.5 MGD
NPDES Permit No. GA0033391
Antidegradation Review (ADR)
EPD # 2016-245
(Toombs County)

Dear Mr. Hall:

We have completed our review of the revised Antidegradation Review for the proposed expansion project. We hereby concur with the document.

Should you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact Benoit Causee of my staff at 404-463-4958 or benoit.causee@dnr.ga.gov.

Sincerely,

Gigi Steele, Manager
Municipal Permitting Unit
Wastewater Regulatory Program

cc: Mr. Hayes Hofstadter, Hofstadter & Associates, Inc. (hayeshof@gmail.com)
Mr. John Fry, P.E., Hofstadter & Associates, Inc. (john.hofstadter@gmail.com)