COUNTY OF FRESNO

ADDENDUM NUMBER: ONE (1)

RFP NUMBER: 910-5401

HVAC CHEMICAL TREATMENT SERVICES

Issue Date: December 30, 2015

IMPORTANT: SUBMIT PROPOSAL IN SEALED PACKAGE WITH PROPOSAL NUMBER, CLOSING DATE AND BUYER'S NAME MARKED CLEARLY ON THE OUTSIDE TO:

COUNTY OF FRESNO, PURCHASING 4525 EAST HAMILTON AVENUE, 2nd Floor FRESNO. CA 93702-4599

CLOSING DATE OF PROPOSAL WILL BE AT 2:00 P.M., ON JANUARY 20, 2016.

PROPOSALS WILL BE CONSIDERED LATE WHEN THE OFFICIAL PURCHASING TIME CLOCK READS 2:00 P.M.

All proposal information will be available for review after contract award.

Clarification of specifications is to be directed to: **Nick Chin, phone (559) 600-7113 or** e-mail <u>CountyPurchasing@co.fresno.ca.us</u>.

NOTE THE FOLLOWING AND ATTACHED ADDITIONS, DELETIONS AND/OR CHANGES TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL NUMBER: 910-5401 AND INCLUDE THEM IN YOUR RESPONSE. PLEASE SIGN IN BLUE INK AND RETURN THIS ADDENDUM WITH YOUR PROPOSAL.

The Bid Closing has been moved to January 20, 2016 at 2:00P.M.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF ADDENDUM NUMBER One (1) TO RFP 910-5401

COMPANY NAME: —	
OOMI / (IVI IV/ (IVIE.	(PRINT)
SIGNATURE (In Blue Ink):	
NAME & TITLE:	
	(PRINT)
Purchasing Use: NC:ssj	ORG/Requisition: 8935 / 1321601087

December 30, 2015

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Does the subject RFP awarded contractor need to hold all required licenses and permits to supply chemical products and related services including the qualification to make recommendations to the use of their supplied products?
- The awarded contractor will need to have a C-55 license or a C-36 license with a demonstrated 5 year A1. experience in water treatment.
- Q2. Can a sub-contractor for the awarded contractor of subject RFP hold any of the required licenses and/or permits for the primary contractor?
- A specialty contractor cannot contract for work outside of their classification even if they are going to A2. subcontract that work to another licensee who does hold the classification. The only classification that may do that is the B – General Building contractor.
- Q3. Is the County going to grade the references based on your written parameters? "The references need to have HVAC facilities similar to County of Fresno facilities"
- A3. Yes, see clarifications below.
- Will Ammonia evaporative condensers be allowed as references in place of shell and tube Q4. condensers and open cooling towers?
- No exception is taken to using the above system as a reference for condenser/cooling tower experience. A4.
- Q5. Packing houses (cold storage facilities) are not comfort cooling (AC) type facilities. Are noncomfort cooling type systems going to be allowed as references? Make-up waters without high silica levels do not simulate the waters at your facilities use.
 - No exception is taken to using the non-comfort systems as a reference for experience as long as they
- A5. match the system types that are being serviced for Fresno County (closed loop hot and cold water systems, open cooling tower systems, and steam systems).
- Q6. Are facilities using non-silica stressed waters going to be allowed as references? Neither Northern nor Southern California references have similar make-up water characteristics to Fresno.
- A6. No exception is taken to using non-silica stressed waters as a reference for experience.
- Even though the chemicals that have been used by the County for the past eight (8) years to treat Q7. their open cooling condenser water have been a complete failure, review the excessive maintenance, cleaning, repair, replacement and energy cost over the last eight (8) years, will this be taken into account when evaluating the current chemical formulas?
- A7.
- Q8. Will the review team compare these conditions?
- A8. No.
- How did your Consultant come to the conclusion that these formulas were successful considering the aforementioned failures?
- A9. Not applicable to this RFP.
- Q10. Has your Consultant been informed about the plate & frame exchanger located at the north end of the cooling tower at the Main Jail supplying cooling for the Co-Gen facilities in that it is in process to be descaled because of poor water treatment?
- A10. Not applicable to this RFP.

Addendum No. One (1)

Request for Proposal Number: 910-5401

December 30, 2015

Q11. This towers tower fill had to be replaced, has the County Consultant been made aware of these water treatment product failures?

The County has no one qualified to evaluate a water treatment formula, therefore the only way to evaluate a successful formula is through local references with similar AC type systems using local make-up supply water.

Page 3

- A11. Not applicable to this RFP.
- Q12. How are you going to grade pricing? Please elaborate.
- A12. Respondents will be evaluated on the basis of their responses to all questions and requirements in this RFP and product cost. Price is only one factor in evaluating proposals. RFP's are not based solely on the lowest bid.
- Q13. Lowest price gets highest point total?
- A13. Respondents will be evaluated on the basis of their responses to all questions and requirements in this RFP and product cost. Price is only one factor in evaluating proposals. RFP's are not based solely on the lowest bid. Scoring is based on each evaluator's overall evaluation of each proposal.
- Q14. Higher bids calculated as a percentage of their bid, off the lowest price?
- A14. Percentages are not used to compare bids.
- Q15. If a vendors bid cost to the County is twice as high as the lowest bid will they get ½ the allotted points?
- A15. Respondents will be evaluated on the basis of their responses to all questions and requirements in this RFP and product cost. Price is only one factor in evaluating proposals. RFP's are not based solely on the lowest bid. Scoring is based on each evaluator's overall evaluation of each proposal.
- Q16. Is calculating points for cost going to be subjecting [sic]?
- A16. Respondents will be evaluated on the basis of their responses to all questions and requirements in this RFP and product cost. Price is only one factor in evaluating proposals. RFP's are not based solely on the lowest bid. Scoring is based on each evaluator's overall evaluation of each proposal.
- Q17. Will the County allow extra points for point of use delivery of products? Currently County employees move chemicals, costing County employees time and the County money.
- A17. No.
- Q18. Will Health and Safety issues be taken into consideration moving chemicals around?
- A18. Yes, health and safety issues will be taken into consideration when moving chemicals.
- Q19. Will County employee & staff water treatment training records carried out over the past two (2) years be made available to vendors bidding this RFP?
- A19. No.
- Q20. Since there are "no" County employees nor consultants involved in the RFP that we are aware of, that would be considered water treatment experts, has your consultant used other outside consultants to help prepare this project?
- A20. No.
- Q21. If so, please list each of them and their qualifications.
- A21. Not applicable.

- Q22. Since we will again offer alternates, since at least three (3) of the currently used products the past three (3) years have so dismally failed how will non water treatment experts evaluate our alternates?
- A22. Our HVAC consultant will review the proposed alternates and provide the evaluation team with an analysis/recommendation.
- Q23. Will our local references, using these alternate products locally, be accepted to qualify our alternates?
- A23. No, references will not be used to qualify alternatives. Our HVAC consultant will review the proposed alternates and provide the evaluation team with an analysis/recommendation.
- Q24. If the County has properly vetted the vendors and the RFP clearly illustrates what the vendors must do for the County, why would price not be the primary deciding factor?
- A24. Respondents will be evaluated on the basis of their responses to all questions and requirements in this RFP and product cost. The County shall be the sole judge in the ranking process and reserves the right to reject any or all bids. False, incomplete or unresponsive statements in connection with this proposal may be sufficient cause for its rejection. RFP's are not based solely on the lowest bid.
- Q25. If we are, for the third time the low responsive/responsible bidder, please tell us here and now what other criteria will we need to be the successful vendor?
- A25. Refer to the award criteria on pages 39-40 of this RFP and the evaluation criteria on page 14 of this RFP.
- Q26. Why is the County of Fresno allowed to have confidentiality yet the vendors trade secret and/or proprietary information is not protected and kept confidential by the County?
- A26. Refer to the Trade Secret Acknowledgement on pages 5-6 of this RFP. Information properly submitted as "Trade Secrets" as defined and in conformance with Section 6254.7 of the California Government Code are deemed not to be public record.
- Q27. How can a vendor calculate the cost of a performance bond for RFP 910- 5401?
- A27. A performance bond is not required for this RFP.
- Q28. Is this (Bond) just another arbitrary decision the County can use to pick and choose which companies they will burden with this cost?
- A28. A performance bond is not required for this RFP.
- Q29. Have you had a performance bond for any of the past eight (8) years for Consolidated Water Technologies?
- A29. Not applicable to this RFP.
- Q30. If so, have you collected on that bond for the cost to the County for condenser cleanings, condenser re-tubing, tower cleanings, tower fill replacement, added maintenance for the poor water treatment program?
- A30. Not applicable to this RFP.
- Q31. Has the County collected for the excessive energy costs directly related to the current water treatment program?
- A31. Not applicable to this RFP.

Addendum No. One (1) Page 5

Request for Proposal Number: 910-5401

- Q32. We noted in the last RFP, your selected vendor did not list their subs on the provided forms, is this going to be required this time?
- A32. If a subcontractor is proposed, complete identification of the subcontractor and his tasks should be provided. The primary contractor is not relieved of any responsibility by virtue of using a subcontractor.
 - A specialty contractor cannot contract for work outside of their classification even if they are going to subcontract that work to another licensee who does hold the classification. The only classification that may do that is the B General Building contractor.
- Q33. Is the blender of products, not blended by the bidder, considered a sub-contractor?
- A33. No.
- Q34. Will these blenders need to be listed and identified since the County is so concerned about meeting their listed formula specifications?
- A34. No.
- Q35. If the primary vendor is using a sub-contractor to perform part of and/or all of their services, will these sub-contractors need to be listed?
- A35. A specialty contractor cannot contract for work outside of their classification even if they are going to subcontract that work to another licensee who does hold the classification. The only classification that may do that is the B General Building contractor.
 - If a subcontractor is proposed, complete identification of the subcontractor and his tasks should be provided. The primary contractor is not relieved of any responsibility by virtue of using a subcontractor.
- Q36. Will you make available the criteria for judging this RFP, including points allowed for each point category?
- A36. Refer to the award criteria on pages 39-40 of this RFP and the evaluation criteria on page 14 of this RFP. Point allocation will not be made available at this time. County policy is to not release that information until a tentative award notice has been released.
- Q37. If not, why not?
- A37. See response to Question #36.
- Q38. We will need the experience/expertise/qualifications of the evaluating team members, based on our past experience with this process with the County where the highest cost RFP's were given the highest points. Acknowledging a vendor that did not have the proper licenses still the evaluation team gave this vendor maximum points. Vendor's references did not meet the County of Fresno criteria got high points anyway. Is there any way to vet these evaluating team members so their personal animosity towards SJC, Inc. is not part of this process?
- A38. Not applicable to this RFP.
- Q39. Will the County of Fresno be offering a cap that exceeds the successful vendor's bid price?
- A39. No.
- Q40. What will this cap be?
- A40. Not applicable to this RFP.
- Q41. Why not cap this RFP at the vendor bid price?
- A41. Not applicable to this RFP.
- Q42. Page 23; 3. Chemicals; this statement is not true, the current formulas are "not" achieving effective performance unless scaled condensers and towers are considered by the County of Fresno as acceptable. Will the County clarify how they determine success?
- A42. Not applicable to this RFP.

- Q43. Who within the County is qualified to visit a blending facility and determine the efficacy of the raw materials being inventoried by the vendor?
- A43. Not applicable to this RFP.
- Q44. How does having particular raw materials on premises prove the constituents of a formula?
- A44. It does not prove formula constituents. Not relevant to this RFP.
- Q45. As asked and not answered, which laboratory is going to be performing and verifying tests on the supplied formulas?
- A45. This information will be provided to the awarded contractor upon request.
- Q46. Who is going to interpret the laboratories test results?
- A46. The County.
- Q47. Has the County checked their current vendors cooling water treatment product through an independent laboratory?
- A47. Not applicable to this RFP.
- Q48. Your incumbent changed their primary cooling water formula a little over a year ago but kept the same formula identification, in addition the new formula has a significant amount of precipitate at the bottom of the pails & drums, has this been analyzed to see which active ingredients are precipitating out of solution?
- A48. Not applicable to this RFP.
- Q49. Who performed the laboratory formula testing?
- A49. Not applicable to this RFP.
- Q50. Was there any disciplinary action taking against your current vendor for these formula problems?
- A50. Not applicable to this RFP.
- Q51. Why would this not disqualify the incumbent's formulas?
- A51. Not applicable to this RFP.
- Q52. Which active ingredient precipitated out of their formula?
- A52. Not applicable to this RFP.
- Q53. Will you please submit to us in a timely manner, your last three (3) annual reports summarizing the number of hours provided for each facilities listed in the RFP 910-5401.
- A53. No.
- Q54. Page 24, item 8.2; we, through our two (2) FOIA requests received many analysis reports, prepared by your current vendor and did not find many of the tests required under item 8.2, are you requiring more testing by the next vendor then you are currently getting?
- A54. Not applicable to this RFP. Refer to the Scope of Work in this RFP for any testing requirements.
- Q55. Why? Is this because of the failures of the current water treatment program?
- A55. Not applicable to this RFP.
- Q56. Is this just another way to add time and cost to the vendors RFP response?
- A56. Not applicable to this RFP.

- Q57. Page 25, 9.1.3; molybdenum is a heavy metal and being increasingly regulated throughout the USA, its only purpose is to trace the County formulated product because the current vendor and anyone using these formulas cannot directly track their inhibitors, will the County allow a vendor to track their inhibitor using a single test of an active ingredient?
 - Our test takes about a $\frac{1}{4}$ of the time to perform and is based on a direct test for an active ingredient.
- A57. If a contractor is awarded the contract, no exception is taken to presenting information on a proposed test to verify concentration of the molybdate anti-corrosion active ingredient.
- Q58. Considering that most of the new vendors are not local with little local experience, will have little or no local references similar to Fresno County and now be burdened with the County formulas, can the County vet their local experience with the specified formulas?
- A58. Not applicable to this RFP.
- Q59. Page 25, 9.1.4, Downtown Fresno make-up water conductivity ≈ 350-400 microseimens and 30-40 ppm SiO2 at 12 ppm Silica increase allowed in the cooling tower this would allow for ≈ 1.4 cycles (using 30 in the Make-Up & 42 in the tower). At 400 microseimens conductivity in the tower Make-Up (1.4 x 400 = 560 microseimens in the tower water) We can agree where the <2500 microseimens comes from 3.0 cycles x 350 microseimens ≈ 1,050 microseimens in the tower is <2500. Would you explain the plus 12 ppm SiO2 for the cooling tower is maximum allowable SiO2?
- A59. This was to address issues of silica deposition that have been seen in other sites in Fresno that have lower levels of concentration of silica in the source water. Silica deposition is complex and is dependent on the chemistry of the water in a cooling tower besides the concentration of silica, especially PH and the concentration of Mg and Ca ions. Site specific cycles of concentration needs to be addressed in the initial survey by the awarded contractor based on the tower chemistry.
- Q60. Page 25, 9.1.7., confusing, what is the 103?
- A60. It should be 10³; note the 1,000 in parenthesis next to it.
- Q61. Is it 103? (this is industry standard for closed loop systems)
- A61. See response to Question #60.
- Q62. 105 (100,000) is industry standard for open cooling towers, is the County of Fresno interested in following the ASHRAE188-2015 protocol established by New York State after the Legionella outbreak in NY City?
- A62. OSHA guidelines have a limit of 10³ (1,000) CFU / mL. This is the source of the standard.
- Q63. If so, will there be an addendum to this affect?
- A63. No, an addendum will not be issued on this.
- Q64. Will the County supply the vendors with each chiller manufacturers published design approach criteria?
- A64. The awarded contractor will be given all manufacturer's literature on hand.
- Q65. Will the County or their consultant provide the vendors with the formulation determining the condenser approach that is acceptable to the County?
- A65. No.
- Q66. Page 25, 9.3.9;, these calculations may differ for each steam boiler, however, the most critical is the steam boilers at the Jail, 30 parts SiO2 in the feed- water to 150 ppm SiO2 (boiler limits = 5 cycles so at 300 feed water conductivity ÷ into 3000 = 10 cycles), 10 cycles x 30 ppm of SiO2 = 300 ppm SiO2. What do you want here?
- A66. Actual water treatment requirements are to be based on the survey to be done by the awarded contractor. If the awarded contractor wants to propose an alternate proposal for a specific site, it shall be included in the initial County survey.

Addendum No. One (1) Page 8

Request for Proposal Number: 910-5401

- Q67. Will you provide the past two (2) years data showing stack and boiler water temperatures?
- A67. No.
- Q68. Are there boiler manufacturers suggested ratios? What are they?
- A68. Any manufacturers suggested ratios will be in factory literature held by the County. Boiler manufacturer's literature will be made available to the awarded contractor.
- Q69. We need the formula or criteria use [sic] that will satisfy the County in calculating these temperatures ratios.
- A69. No.
- Q70. Will you submit to us the certified sampling protocol for Legionella sampling?
- A70. The OSHA Water Sampling Protocol can be found at:

 https://www.osha.gov/dts/osta/otm/legionnaires/sampling.html The CDC Sampling Procedure and Potential Sampling Sites can be found at: http://www.cdc.gov/legionella/health-depts/inv-tools-cluster/environmental-inv-tools.html
- Q71. Why is analyzing tower make-up temperature prior to sampling for Legionella testing required?
- A71. Higher temperature source water is an indicator of a possible source of Legionella if it becomes a recurrent problem at a specific tower.
- Q72. There is no certification for water sampling for Legionella testing, there is a protocol and there are elite certified laboratories that do the testing. Is the County going to address this issue?
- A72. Refer to OSHA for the water sampling method
- Q73. Will the County submit this license criteria for our review?
- A73. No.
- Q74. Based on your requirement for estimated chemical use rates we take issue in that calculating the percent molybdate in your formulas and maintaining the residuals called out (1.0 2.0 ppm) the feed rate of our chemicals will be significantly lower, should we add more water and dilute our more concentrated formulas to meet your formulated products use rates?
- A74. The product formulas are clearly indicated to be a sample for reference. Use amounts of your product to provide specified levels.
- Q75. Will SJC, Inc. get credit for supplying more concentrated products, being allowed to use lower chemical use quantities to calculate our costs?
- A75. Respondents will be evaluated on the basis of their responses to all questions and requirements in this RFP and product cost. The County shall be the sole judge in the ranking process and reserves the right to reject any or all bids. False, incomplete or unresponsive statements in connection with this proposal may be sufficient cause for its rejection.
- Q76. Will you use our chemical use rates instead of your own to calculate costs if we cap those estimated pounds for condenser water treatment and cap the annual costs?
- A76. No.
- Q77. Will vendors have a change to pull water samples during the site visit?
- A77. No, vendors will not be allowed to pull water samples during the site visit.
- Q78. Will a C-20 License meet the requirements for this RFP?
- A78. No, a C-55 or a C-36 with 5 years of demonstrated water treatment experience is required.
- Q79. Is a pesticide applicator license required?
- A79. No, a pesticide applicator license is not required.

- Q80. Would you like recommendations for water treatment equipment included in the proposals?
- A80. No, the awarded contractor will submit all recommendations with the Initial Assessment.
- Q81. Is there an opportunity to bid chemical and non-chemical products for the condenser?
- A81. Yes, alternatives can be proposed. Provide a detailed explanation of the alternative(s) and the formulations for the alternative(s).
- Q82. What is the evaluation process for the formulations?
- A82. Our HVAC consultant will review the proposed alternates and provide the evaluation team with an analysis/recommendation.
- Q83. Is there a regulatory process as far as discharge?
- A83. This question is unclear.
- Q84. Who currently has the contract for these services?
- A84. Consolidated Water Technologies has the current contract and San Joaquin Chemicals, Inc. provides the services at the Jail on a blanket purchase order.
- Q85. Will there be County staff on site at each location?
- A85. Yes, County staff will be on site.
- Q86. If an opportunity is noticed for equipment/system upgrades, what is the process for implementing them?
- A86. The awarded contractor will submit all recommendations with the Initial Assessment.
- Q87. Who will be handling the chemicals?
- A87. The awarded contractor will deliver the chemicals to the designated areas.
- Q88. If chemicals are delivered, will there be County Staff to receive it?
- A88. Yes, County staff will be on site.
- Q89. Do you have to be present at the vendor conference to bid on the RFP?
- A89. No, the vendor conference was not mandatory.
- Q90. When is the expected start date of the contract?
- A90. When the Notice to Proceed is issued.
- Q91. Will there be an escort/County Staff available when delivering chemicals or will vendors be given a key to the various locations?
- A91. Yes, County staff will be on site.
- Q92. Are the personnel the same at all of the sites?
- A92. No, the County staff assigned to the specific site will be given once the notice to proceed is issued.
- Q93. Can we have access to all County locations during the Site Visit or after the site visit?
- A93. No, vendors will be shown only the UMC, Jail, and Juvenile Justice Campus (JJC) locations on the site visit. No site visits will be allowed after the conclusion of the site visit on December 11th, 2015.