

August 19, 2024

**POLK COUNTY, A POLITICAL SUBDIVISION OF
THE STATE OF FLORIDA**

ADDENDUM # 2

**RFP 24-552, Engineering Services for Improvements to the Northwest and
Southwest Regional Wastewater Treatment Facilities**

This addendum is issued to clarify, add to, revise and/or delete items of the Bid Document for this work. This Addendum is a part of the RFP Document and acknowledgment of its receipt shall be noted on the Addendum.

Contained within this addendum: Revisions, Questions and answers.

The Bid Receiving Date has been extended one (1) week. The revised Bid Receiving Date is Wednesday, August 28, 2024, prior to 2:00 p.m.

Respectfully,

Ari Goldstein

Ari Goldstein

Senior Procurement Analyst

Procurement Division

**This Addendum sheet should be signed and submitted with your
bid submittal. This is the only acknowledgment required.**

Signature: _____

Printed Name: _____

Title: _____

Company: _____

RFP 24-552, Engineering Services for Improvements to the Northwest and Southwest Regional Wastewater Treatment Facilities

Addendum #2

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 1: For the proposals, does the County want one overall proposal for both projects or one proposal for each project?

Answer 1: Proposers should submit one proposal for this RFP. Proposers may identify the specific project(s) they are interested in under Tab 2, Approach to Project, however, information submitted under Tab 2 should focus on the overall approach to the project as described in the Scope of Services section of this RFP. Following submittal of the proposals, the selection committee will score the proposals and create a single ranking. This ranking will be used to elevate proposers to interviews. Following the interviews, the selection committee will create two separate rankings for the two projects listed in the RFP.

Question 2: Are record drawings available for the two facilities?

Answer 2: Record drawings will be made available during design.

Question 3: It was discussed at the pre-proposal meeting that separate approach sections for each facility may be desired. Could you confirm that two separate approaches are desired and confirm the number of pages for each facility's approach?

Answer 3: Refer to Question and Answer 1 above.

Question 4: Can we put the Project Schedule in an Appendix?

Answer 4: A proposed project schedule should be included in the firm's proposal under Tab 2, Approach to Project.

Question 5: Can we reuse the Survey Questionnaires from RFP 23-618 proposal response without having to go back to the client again?

Answer 5: Yes, as long as the project referenced in the previous RFP's survey is identified in Tab 3 as one of the firm's recent projects for this RFP.

Question 6: Can you provide record drawings for both the SW and NW WWTPs?

Answer 6: Refer to Question and Answer 2 above.

Question 7: For the Performance Surveys, is it ok to include a client contact who we worked with on the project while they were at the company at the time, but is now with a different employer?

Answer 7: No. The survey will need to be completed by a representative of the company for which work was completed.

Question 8: Please provide existing yard piping, hydraulic profile, structural, mechanical and electrical drawings for the clarifiers and filters at each facility.

Answer 8: More detailed information on the facilities will be made available during design.

Question 9: Would the County consider extending the due date for proposals one week?

Answer 9: Yes. Please see the revised submittal date on page 1 of this addendum.

Question 10: The PCU Biosolids Dewatering Alternatives Report (Hazen 2022), recommends relocating the screw presses from the NERWWTF to the NWRWWTF. The report indicates that PCU staff would likely support the relocation provided all the moving parts associated with screw presses are replaced. Further, there is reference to FKC developing a proposal for refurbishing the screw presses.

- a. What were FKC's estimated costs for refurbishment?
- b. Would the County be willing to share FKC's proposal?
- c. Considering the estimated costs for refurbishment, has there been any change in the County's strategy for biosolids dewatering at the NWRWWTF?

Answer 10: PCU has not solicited a proposal from FKC for these services. PCU has not changed its strategy for biosolids dewatering at the NWRWWTF.

Question 11: Does the County still wish to retain the existing mobile dewatering facilities as a back-up to the permanent biosolids dewatering facilities at the SWRWWTF and NWRWWTF?

Answer 11: PCU will consider keeping the mobile dewatering facilities in operation based on condition of the facilities and the cost of operation.

Question 12: An alternative delivery method such as Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) was briefly mentioned in the pre-proposal meeting as a strategy to compress the delivery schedule.

- a. Has the County pre-qualified CMAR contractors for delivery of utilities projects?

Answer 12: No. The method for procuring construction services will be determined during the preliminary design phase.

Question 13: What is the scope of the electrical improvements planned for the SWRWWTF?

Answer 13: The exact scope of electrical improvements at the SWRWWTF will be determined during design. This may include design and construction of a new electrical building to house Motor Control Centers (MCCs) and other equipment necessary for the proposed improvements.