

---

**November 22, 2022**

**TO:** All Proposers under Request for Proposal (RFP) No. 22-500630

**FROM:** Department of Purchasing and Contracting, DeKalb County, Georgia

**ADDENDUM NO. 4**

Request for Proposal (RFP) No. 22-500630 Design and Engineering Services During Construction for Snapfinger Advanced Wastewater Treatment Facility Expansion - Phase 3A Project is hereby amended as follows:

- A. It is **Mandatory** that proposers acknowledge Addendum No. 4.
- B. **Modification to the Request for Proposal.**
  - 1. **REQUIRED CHECK LIST.** Delete in its entirety. Replace with **(Revised November 22, 2022) REQUIRED CHECK LIST.**
  - 2. **ATTACHMENT A SCOPE OF WORK.** Delete in its entirety. Replace with **(Revised November 22, 2022) ATTACHMENT A – SCOPE OF WORK.**
- C. We have received questions pertaining to this Request for Proposals. The questions and their resulting answers appear below:
  - 1. Question: The RFP under Section V.C it states “For information regarding the pre-proposal conference and site visit, please contact Michelle Butler at (404) 687 - 3581 or [mnbutler@dekalbcountyga.gov](mailto:mnbutler@dekalbcountyga.gov).” Can we obtain additional information about the site visit and how to schedule one if available?  
  
Answer: There will not be a site visit for this solicitation.
  - 2. Question: Section I. Introduction of RFP indicates that the proposal to include "evaluation only of potential improvements to reduce quantity and improve quality of sludge ..." (page 4 of 22). However, Attachment A of Section II. Scope of Work states that the proposal to include "evaluation of alternatives, followed by design, permitting and engineering services during construction with the dewatering improvements that include sludge dryers and a dewatered sludge storage building." (page 5 of 25). Is the cost proposal to include fees for design, permitting and engineering services during construction for dewatering improvements that include sludge dryers and a dewatered sludge storage building?

---

Answer: The scope of work has been revised. Please refer to the above listed Modification to the Request for Proposal, No. 2.

3. Question: Is a site visit allowed to capture a drone video of the facilities for 3D modeling?

Answer: No. Please refer to Question and Answer No. 1.

4. Question: Will emergency overflow be required for the IPS? Prior Phase 3 documents show “Emergency Overflow for Future ISCS” connection at elevation 720.00. Will this be required for this project? Please provide flow values and invert elevations for each of these streams if available.

Answer: No. Emergency overflow will not be required for the IPS.

No. The ISCS indicated on the Phase 3 documents (e.g., Dwg. G-s00.07, NOTE, 1st bullet) was not constructed.

5. Question: Prior Phase 3 documents indicate the ILS to be located at the site of the existing Tertiary Sand Filters. For the purposes of design, should it be assumed that Tertiary Sand Filters and building will be decommissioned demolished ahead of construction of the proposed IPS?

Answer: The existing tertiary sand filters will be decommissioned but not demolished. Phase 3A design is to include demolition of all existing facilities necessary to construct Phase 3A facilities.

6. Question: The following facilities were called out to be demolished ahead of or a part of Phase 3. Should the respondent assume these facilities are demoed for this project?

4. DEMOLISH OR PREPARE FOR MODIFICATION ALL FACILITIES AND APPURTENANCES CONFLICTING WITH PHASE 3 CONSTRUCTION INCLUDING THE FOLLOWING:
- A. EXISTING ORIGINAL HEADWORKS
  - B. NITRIFICATION CLARIFIER 12A
  - C. TERTIARY FILTERS
  - D. ELECTRICAL FACILITIES
  - E. PROCESS PIPING
  - F. PLANT UTILITY PIPING
  - G. STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEMS
  - H. DISINFECTION & CHEMICAL SYSTEMS
  - I. ROADWAY AND PAVING

Answer: No facilities will be demolished beyond what has already been demolished to construct Phase 2. Phase 3A design is to include demolition of all existing facilities necessary to construct Phase 3A facilities.

7. Question: Confirm no flow metering or monitoring is required as part of this project for the IPS influent flows. Appears to be two FIT into headworks.

Answer: There are two flow meters, one on each main, feeding the Phase 2 headworks. Phase 3A is to include influent flow metering as stated in the (Revised November 22, 2022) Attachment A, Scope of Work, Description of Phase 3A Facilities, Influent Pump Station (IPS). Please refer to the above listed Modification to the Request for Proposal, No. 2.

8. Question: Phase 3, S-s01.09 indicates presence of rock and deep foundation design at the originally proposed location of the Influent Lift Station. Could the County provide this Geotechnical Report?

Answer: The only geotechnical information that is available is in Exhibit 1 - Reference Document (B.1 - Phase 2, Volume 3, Reference Information).

9. Question: Should the respondent assume N+1 for current flows and provide for expansion to 2035 flows within the same IPS footprint/Primary Structure? Please confirm.

TABLE 6.1		
BASIS OF PROCESS DESIGN		
Snapfinger AWTF		
Item	Design Year 2020	Design Year 2035
INFLUENT LIFT STATION		
Pumping capacity, mgd	100	129

Answer: Flow rates are defined in RFP.I.A para. "Flow Rates". Yes, for proposal submission nominally the 2035 flow rates are to be used with n+1, however capacity of Phase 2 facilities must be considered along with ability for flow equalization. Specific design flow rates are to be recommended by the Engineer during design as part of the IPS PDR, considering all factors. For example, flow equalization is being planned within the collection system in addition to the on-site equalization tank. Also, flow projections are being revised.

- 
10. Question: Were the stormwater management features on the site designed for post Phase 3 construction?

Answer: The Engineer shall be responsible for review of the existing stormwater drainage and pond treatment capacities and design of needed stormwater and pond improvements to accommodate the Phase 3A facilities.

11. Question: Is the intent to intercept the two existing 42" lines to headworks or provide a new connection to the 54" line which were fitted with a plug. Note conflicts with 42" Nitrification Clarifiers 12A.

Answer: Specific pipe sizes and connection points shall be determined by Engineer during design.

12. Question: Confirm only coarse screening desired at the new IPS as defined in the DDR.

Answer: Yes. Grit removal and fine screening are provided at the Phase 2 headworks facility

13. Question: Are we to assume the plant has adequate generator capacity for the new pump station, or should this investigation be included in the scope of work?

Answer: The plant has two, electrical feeds to the plant that have different origins. Electrical generator for the new IPS is not required.

14. Question: Will the County agree to the following addition in Article V (A), Accuracy of the Work: The standard of care for the Consultant's performance of services under this Contract will be the care and skill ordinarily used by members of Consultant's profession practicing under similar conditions at the same time and in the same locality. The consultant shall be responsible for the accuracy of the Work and shall correct any error and/or omission made by the Contractor in any phase of the Work under this Agreement.

Answer: No.

15. Question: Will the County agree to change the first sentence of In Article V. (C) to "All documents, including drawings, estimates and specifications, first created in the performance of services"?

Answer: Yes, we will change the first sentence of Article V. (C) to "All documents, including drawings, estimates and specifications, first created in the performance of services".

- 
16. Question: With the change in Georgia law regarding the enforceability of indemnity obligation pursuant to O.C.G.A. § 13-8-2, in Article V (H), will the County agree consistent with the statute that, “Consultant shall indemnify and hold the County harmless for damages, losses and expenses, including reasonable attorney’s fees, to the extent caused by the negligence, recklessness or intentionally wrongful conduct of the Consultant or anyone employed or utilized by the Consultant in the performance of this Agreement.”?

Answer: The current indemnification provision included within the sample contract is compliant with OCGA §13-8-2.

17. Question: Please confirm the LSBE Reference and Release Form has been removed from this solicitation.

Answer: Yes. the LSBE Reference and Release Form has been removed from this solicitation.

18. Question: Please confirm that the third project element is for an evaluation only and does not require the scope or the engineering fees to be included in this proposal for the design, permitting and engineering services during construction for dewatering improvements that includes sludge dryers and a dewatered sludge storage building. The current RFP document appears to have the following discrepancy:

- On page 3 of the PDF (RFP Introduction), the third project element is listed as “3) evaluation only of potential improvements to reduce quantity and improve quality of sludge, including sludge from proposed new primary clarifiers that goes to landfill.
- On page 27 of the PDF (Attachment A: Scope of Work), the text reads as follows: “Note that Engineer’s response to the RFP shall consider that Engineer complete the Project (including evaluation of alternatives, followed by design, permitting and engineering services during construction) with dewatering improvements that includes sludge dryers and a dewatered sludge storage building.

Answer: Please refer to Question and Answer No. 2.

19. Question: We were not clear if the ‘three complete WAS handling system alternatives’ are the three items listed below, or if DeKalb is looking at No Action, Major Refurbishment and then evaluation of three replacement alternatives (total of 5 options).

Engineer shall perform a condition assessment and capacity evaluation of the existing WAS handling facilities and evaluate, at minimum, the following three alternatives:

1. “No Action” Alternative with Minor Refurbishment: existing facilities to remain in operation with little or no refurbishment (e.g., minor instrument additions/modifications to enhance operation, replacement of a few major equipment items like pumps).
2. Major Refurbishment: existing facilities to remain in operation with major refurbishment (e.g., complete overhaul of tanks, replacement of multiple major equipment items).
3. Replacement: build replacement process, addressing redundancy and future flows. Submit PDR to include evaluation of minimum three complete WAS handling system alternatives. Alternative evaluation is subject to approval of County and may include: odor control selection, sludge thickening, sludge blending, thickened sludge storage, blended/thickened sludge pump type selection (e.g., progressive cavity, rotary lobe), equipment quantities addressing redundancy and future flows. Note that Engineer’s response to the RFP shall consider that Engineer shall complete the Project (including evaluation of alternatives, followed by design, permitting and engineering services during construction) with replacement of WAS handling as the selected alternative.

Answer: Provide No Action, Major Refurbishment and then evaluation of three replacement alternatives (total of 5 options).

20. Question: In the cost form, there is no separate line for detailed design of dryers and building. And although the RFP language reads that responders can make assumptions that deviate, and discusses adders/deducts in the cost proposal form, there are no lines for adders/deducts on the form.

3. Responders are required to submit their costs on Attachment B, *Cost Proposal Form*.

**Responder shall not alter the cost proposal form.**

4. Proposers must submit Cost Proposal Form information for:
- a. Part One: Design Phase
  - b. Part Two: Bid Phase
  - c. Part Three: Construction Phase
  - d. Part Four: Post-Construction Phase

Do not include any assumptions and clarifications within the Cost Proposal. Assumptions and clarifications must be listed in the Responder’s Technical Proposal. Assumptions and clarifications that deviate from the requirements of this RFP, Exhibit 2 - Guide Specifications, and the latest version of the DeKalb County Department of Watershed Management Design Standards Manual will not be accepted as part of the base proposal Total Project Fee, but will be allowed as defined in Attachment B, *Cost Proposal Form* for adders/deducts.



---

Answer: References to adders/deducts have been removed from the solicitation

21. Question: For the Project Personnel section, is “Engineer” referring to the Prime firm? And are you requesting 2 separate organizational charts, a firm and staff chart?

**7. Project Personnel**

The composition, organization, and management of the Project Team must be described in two separate subsections.

**a. Engineer/other firms:**

- 1) Identify other firms (such as Subconsultants and Subcontractors) included on the Project Team, along with the Engineer, and describe the scope of Engineer's and each firm's services and responsibilities during each of the four parts of the Project. The firm serving as Engineer must be clearly identified.
- 2) Provide organizational charts showing the reporting relationships and responsibilities of Engineer and other firms included on the Project Team and describe Engineer's approach to the management of such firms.

**b. Key Personnel**

- 1) Identify all Key Personnel (and their firm affiliations and physical office locations) on the Project Team and describe their specific responsibilities during each of the four Parts of the Project.
- 2) Provide organizational charts during each of the four parts of the Project showing the reporting relationships and responsibilities of all Key Personnel (along with their firm affiliations) and describe Engineer's approach to the management of such Key Personnel.
- 3) Indicate the commitment of all Key Personnel in terms of an estimated percentage of time during each Part of the Project.
- 4) Provide resumes for all Key Personnel in Appendix B, Resumes  
Resumes must be limited to two pages per individual and include:
  - a) Academic and professional qualifications

Answer: The “Engineer” is the entity who holds the contract. Yes, firm and staff charts are requested.

22. Question: We would like to Request a site visit

Answer: Please refer to Question and Answer No. 1.

23. Question: For Attachment D, Contractor References form, is this for the entire team (Prime and Subconsultants)?

---

Answer: Only reference forms for the prime are required. Reference forms for the subconsultants are not required.

24. Question: Do we get 10 point for any LSBE-DeKalb sub we add, regardless of the total percentage of work? ... does it matter the percentage of the required 20% LSBE that the certified LSBE-DeKalb firm provides? For examples, we have multiple subs, if the LSBE-MSA sub preforms 14% and the LSBE-DeKalb performs 6%, do we still get the fill 10 points since we have a LSBE -DeKlab sub on the team?

Answer: No. Pro-rated points shall be granted where a mixture of LSBE-DeKalb and LSBE-MSA firms are utilized. Utilization of each firm shall be based upon the terms of the qualified sealed solicitation.

Please refer to Attachment G - DeKalb First LSBE Information with Exhibits 1-2 located within the solicitation.

25. Question: We wanted to confirm that DeKalb still wishes to retain the Dewatered Sludge Storage Building (DSSB) in the design, despite that the design is based on a drying facility now. A typical drying facility might only include sludge storage silos. That said, we have completed drying projects in which our client wished to include a DSBB to be used in the case of dryer outage.

Answer: Please refer to Question and Answer No. 2. The County is open to ideas from the Engineer as indicated in the statement, "Alternative evaluation is subject to approval by County and may include:...".

26. Question: Our understanding of the current process at Snapfinger is that thickened WAS from the gravity thickeners is transferred to the sludge conditioning tank, where lime is added for sludge conditioning. The implementation of centrifuge dewatering has eliminated the need for lime addition. However lime addition provides alkalinity (via the sidestream) that supports nitrification in the aeration basins. Should we assume that the new WAS handling system design will not include lime dosing to the solids stream and if so, should we assume that a new lime system for the liquid stream process should be included as part of this project?

Answer: The new WAS handling system design will not include lime. A new lime system for the liquid stream process is not included as part of this project.

27. Question: With the introduction of primary clarifiers, anaerobic digestion would typically be provided. (Primary sludge digests well, whereas WAS does not.) Therefore, should we anticipate including anaerobic digestion as part of this project? Also, if so, should we anticipate that a significant portion of the dryer fuel requirements may be met with biogas?



---

Answer: Anaerobic digestion is not included as part of this project. However, anaerobic digestion may be considered for a future phase. Phase 3A design shall not preclude the use of future anaerobic digesters.

28. Question: We recently attended the LSBE Mandatory Pre-bid meeting today at 2pm, however we did not attend the Mandatory Pre-Proposal Conference meeting on August 8th. We did have a teaming partner in mind for this bid, although my question is can we still Bid as a prime since we did not attend the August 8th meeting?

Answer: Interested responders are required to attend and participate in the Mandatory Pre-Proposal Conference. Proposals received from firms who did not attend the Mandatory Pre-Proposal Conference will be deemed non-responsive.

29. Question: Our current certification is LSBE – MSA. Is there a certification that takes into consideration that our owner is and has been a resident of Dekalb County for over 30 years? Our physical office is in Fulton County but due to Covid-19 for the past 2 years we have been working remotely. Please advise.

Answer: No. DeKalb County has two (2) LSBE certification designations: LSBE - DeKalb and LSBE - DeKalb MSA. A company can submit new information regarding their business location and address upon the expiration of their certification and during their recertification period. "

30. Question: Is there an LSBE meeting scheduled for today August 10, 2022, at 3:00 pm? I had it on my schedule to attend but the links are for a past meeting or future meeting.

Answer: Yes. Mandatory DeKalb First LSBE Meetings: (Bidders must attend 1 meeting on either of the dates listed.)

July 27, 2022, August 3, 2022, August 10, 2022, or August 17, 2022 (Meetings are held at 10:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m. EST) Video Conference: Utilize the link supplied on our webpage labeled "DeKalb First LSBE Video Meeting"

Please refer to (page 1) of the solicitation RFP No. 22-500630.

31. Question: I am the Business Development Manager Wood Automation / CEC Controls Company. I represent North America but concentrate on the Southeast (Florida & Georgia). I would like to reach out to all the Plan Holders / General Contractors for the Snapfinger Advanced Wastewater Treatment Facility Expansion Project and provided them with CEC Controls capabilities for Process Water.

---

Answer: This solicitation does not have a plan holders list. However, the Pre-Proposal Attendance Sheet can be downloaded from the DeKalb County Website at <http://www.dekalbcountyga.gov/formalbids.com>.

32. Question: Can you provide me with a list of companies that have expressed interest in bidding for this project? I would greatly appreciate it.

Answer: Yes. Please refer to Question and Answer No. 31.

- D. It is the responsibility of each proposer to ensure that he is aware of all addenda issued under this RFP. It is **MANDATORY** that this addendum be signed and returned with the proposal submittal. You may call Willie Moon, Senior Procurement Agent, at (404) 371-7021 or send an email to [wmoon@dekalbcountyga.gov](mailto:wmoon@dekalbcountyga.gov) before the proposals are due to confirm the number of addenda issued.
- E. All other conditions remain in full force and effect.

---

Willie Moon  
Senior Procurement Agent  
Department of Purchasing and Contracting

---

---

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

The above Addendum No. 4 is hereby acknowledged:

---

(NAME OF PROPOSAL)

---

(Signature)

---

(Title)