

COUNTY OF FRESNO

ADDENDUM NUMBER: ONE (1)

RFP NUMBER: 910-5352

HVAC CHEMICAL TREATMENT SERVICES

May 29, 2015

PURCHASING USE
ssj

G:\PUBLIC\RFP\FY 2014-15\910-5352 HVAC CHEMICAL
TREATMENT SERVICES\910-5352 ADD 1.DOC

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 JUNE 11, 2015.

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: **Gary E. Cornuelle**, phone (559) 600-7110,
e-mail CountyPurchasing@co.fresno.ca.us.

**NOTE THE ATTACHED ADDITIONS, DELETIONS AND/OR CHANGES TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL NUMBER: 910-5352 AND INCLUDE THEM IN YOUR RESPONSE. PLEASE
SIGN AND RETURN THIS ADDENDUM WITH YOUR PROPOSAL.**

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF ADDENDUM NUMBER ONE (1) TO RFP 910-5352

COMPANY NAME: _____
(PRINT)

SIGNATURE: _____

NAME & TITLE: _____
(PRINT)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q1. Evaluation Criteria (p. 14)

A. Will there be any scoring of bids?

A. Yes

B. If so, what will the scoring ranges be?

B. This information is not published until the tentative award notice is sent out and by request only.

C. What will the individual scoring components be (such as cost, experience etc.)?

C. Please see page 41-42 of the RFP

Q2. Selection process (p. 15)

A. Will the “evaluation team” be assisted by a consultant?

A. Yes

a. If so, who will the consultant be?

a. Eric Andersen

B. What are the County’s criteria for hiring a Consultant?

B. Experience with Water Treatment Chemicals

a. Has any vendor or ex-vendor had input into the preparation of the RFP?

a. No

b. Will any vendor or ex-vendor have input on the selection committee?

b. No

C. How will the evaluators know how to assess the bids and the substantive responses of bidders such as those relating to experience, the required executive summary under Section 3.2 at p. 33?

C. Each evaluator brings their unique experience to evaluating these proposals.

Q3. Rights of Ownership (p. 18)

A. Who owns the formulas designated in the RFP at Exhibit 1?

A. Formulas shown are templates for comparison only. Each bidder will prepare their own formulation with a description of the reasons for their formulation as noted in the RFP.

B. If a bidder proposes alternate formulas or components, will the County claim ownership of those formulas?

B. No.

Q4. Selection Committee (p. 20)

A. How does this Committee which may possibly include “community representatives from advisory boards” differ from the committee described at p. 15 of the RFP?

A. The evaluation committee will be made up from County Staff with the consultant providing feedback on the technical chemical specs.

B. Will the Consultant who prepared the RFP be on the selection committee?

B. No

Q5. Contract Negotiation (p. 20). The County indicates that it will prepare and negotiate a contract with the selected vendor.

A. Does this permit the County to negotiate the prices of the products; or

A. No

B. the service costs that a bidder has bid?

B. No

C. Are the product costs and service costs bidders bid intended to be guaranteed?

C. Yes, for 3 years if possible. Please indicate how long you can hold your prices firm.

D. Will there be discussion and/or negotiations relating to post 180 day cost guarantee?

D. No

E. Vendor Local Preference (p. 21). Why does this not apply to this RFP?

E. Board of Supervisors direction, only on Requests for Quotation for Product

F. What percent of County bids do not allow for local preference?

F. No statistical records are kept on that

Q6. At page 22, the County has addressed the walk through and the requirement for a bidder to “have examined the site of work before bidding and shall be responsible for having acquired full knowledge of the job and of all the problems affecting it.”

A. Is the walk through on May 22, 2015 mandatory for a bidder?

A. No

B. If not will access to the County facilities which is the subject of the RFP be given to bidders before the bid? If yes, please explain the circumstances and how that would work.

B. There is a site visit right after the vendor conference.

C. If a bidder does not attend the May 22, 2015 walk through, how can a bidder satisfy the site examination before bidding?

C. Shall be responsible for having acquired full knowledge of the job and of all the problems affecting it.

D. If a vendor bids this RFP without going to the walk, will you determine if they obtained information from County employees?, the incumbent?, Consultant?, previous Consultant?, or another bidder?

D. No

E. If a bidder does not attend the May 22, 2015 walk through, will that impact the evaluation of the bidder's bid?

E. No

F. What are the County's criteria for allowing a sub-contractor?

F. Please list any subcontractor on your proposal, and they need to be properly licensed.

Many of the remaining questions relate to the "Scope of Work" section of the RFP at p. 23 et seq.

Q1. Section 1.2.2 requires the Contractor to conduct an initial water treatment analysis of each building and to make recommendations.

A. How is a bidder expected to bid and make an assessment without knowing the County's current assessment of the condition of the County's equipment which received water treatment and is the subject of this RFP?

A. Please re-read the RFP

a. What are the current averages for condenser approach?

a. Not applicable to the RFP

b. Under what operating load conditions?

b. Not applicable to the RFP

c. Supply us with condenser approach history.

c. Not applicable to the RFP

d. Can the boiler at JJC & the old UMC be inspected?

d. No

e. Can we get insurance and/or other inspection reports?

e. No

f. Please supply boiler stack and boiler water temperature records.

f. No

- Q2. The County has stated that there will be a one day site visit (p. 32). Will the bidders receive at the time of walk or shortly thereafter and well before bids:**
- A. At least a 3 year history of all County maintenance records; cleaning records; expenditures; reports; diaries; any video scopes and/or Eddy Current documents of equipment; correspondence; documents on replacements or repairs (collectively “records”) of all the equipment (condensers, evaporators, steam/hot water boilers and cooling towers including but not limited to condensers re-tubing etc. (collectively “equipment”) to be inspected and which is the subject of this RFP? All HVAC inspection reports, in-house and outside entities. Any reports by outside contractors related to the failed water treatment program and any recommendations to alter or change the County’s water treatment program.**
 - A. No**
 - B. Does the County maintain such records?**
 - B. Yes**
 - C. Does the County even intend to disclose the maintenance history of the equipment?**
 - C. No**
 - D. Will bidders be responsible for the existing condition of County equipment? Sight unseen?**
 - D. No**
 - E. How can a water treatment vendor be responsible for the conditions of the County’s HVAC waterside conditions when the County dictates the formulas to be used?**
 - E. Formulas shown are templates for comparison only. Each bidder will prepare their own formulation with a description of the reasons for their formulation as noted in the RFP.**
 - F. How can a water treatment vendor be responsible for the conditions of the County’s HVAC waterside conditions when the County dictates the products parameters to be maintained?**
 - F. The waterside conditions indicated represent the conditions required in the opinion of the consultant. If the contractor awarded the contract has a different opinion of the required system conditions, this can be presented in the initial system assessment along with the reasons for the difference of opinion and will be reviewed by the County with the other items in the assessment report.**
 - G. Will Don Osborne be held accountable?**
 - G. Not applicable to the RFP**
 - H. Will Consolidated Water Technologies, Inc., be held accountable?**
 - H. Not applicable to the RFP**
 - I. Will World Laboratories Limited or their blenders be held accountable?**
 - I. Not applicable to the RFP**

- Q3. In Section 1.3, the County states that “the County has included specifications of water treatment chemicals that shall be the standard for the Ongoing Treatment of all Chemically Treated HVAC Systems. These products have been proved to achieve all performance criteria safely and effectively while maintaining reasonable budget control.”**
- A. On what basis does the County make the claims regarding effective treatment while maintaining reasonable budget control? ***
- A. Not applicable to the RFP*
- B. What budget (maintenance, energy, outside contractor repair/replacement, cleaning) to which the County is referring?**
- B. Not applicable to the RFP*
- C. Have there been any studies to support the County’s claims in Section 1.3 quoted above? Any assessments? Reports? Cost analysis? Corrosion coupons? Bio testing? Legionella testing? etc. (collectively “assessment documents”).**
- C. Not applicable to the RFP*
- D. If the answer to 7.C is yes, will those assessment documents be made available to bidders and if so when?**
- D. Not applicable to the RFP*
- E. If the items in 7.C do not exist, what then is the basis for the County claim?**
- E. Not applicable to the RFP*
- F. For clarity, with respect to the questions in this item 7, Bidders are entitled to have timely and complete answers inasmuch as the County is specifying certain formulas in Exhibit 1 indicating a stated preference.**
- a. In addition your reference pg 13 (exhibit 1&2) clearly indicates your lack of any openness to entertain formulas that have been proven successful well over thirty (30) years locally, instead the failed chemistry of the past eight (8) years keeps marching on!**
- a. The RFP as written clearly indicates the formulations noted are samples. The awarded contractor will be able to use their own formulations provided that they provide clear descriptions of the reasons for their formulations. Water treatment is a mix of science (the chemistry of water treatment) and art (the individual range of required water chemistry as well as what specific treatment chemical formulations required to reach that water chemistry). The RFP is written to allow flexibility for each contractor to provide their own formulations as well as standard water chemistry for all bidders to provide comparable formula volumes.*

Q4. In Section 1.3 of the RFP, the County also states that “Alternates can be substituted, but must include a description of the reason for the substitution. The County will review the proposed substitution at submission and provide a review to accept or reject the proposed substitution.”

A. On what basis will the County provide a review?

A. The County’s consultant will review the proposed formulations as well as the reasons for the contractor specific formulation.

B. How will the County evaluate a substitution?

B. See above.

C. Who will conduct the review and evaluation?

C. See above.

D. Will the County consider the results of any substitution which are used at non-County facilities?

D. See above.

E. Has the County determined what an acceptable reason for a substitution is or what is not? If so, please explain.

E. The substitution responses shall be based on the way the proposed formulations provide the required levels of water conditioning.

Q5. At Section 1.9.1.1, the County has specified “chemical minimums.”

A. Why did the County do that?

A. standards to which to provide the chemicals as a basis of providing comparable bids.

B. What is the basis for specifying minimums?

B. The consultant provided the indicated minimums.

C. The County has specified Molybdenum in section 1.9.1.3.

a. Why?

a. Not applicable to the RFP

b. Does the County consider this a contaminant?

b. Not applicable to the RFP

c. Has the County evaluated any environmental impact from using this contaminant?

c. Not applicable to the RFP

d. Does the County realize the recommended levels for molybdenum are to track the inhibitor with a heavy metal offering no scale and/or corrosion inhibition?

d. Not applicable to the RFP

- e. Does the County realize that low levels of molybdenum can cause localized pitting, having no other value because their formulas cannot be accurately tracked with any active ingredient?**
e. Not applicable to the RFP
 - f. Your boiler formulas are not those used in all locations, how are they proven?**
f. Not applicable to the RFP
 - g. Are the vendors obligated to deliver products to point of use?**
g. Not applicable to the RFP
- Q6. In Section 1.15.1 the County requires “bi-annual Legionella” tests for each Cooling Tower.**
 - A. Has the County tested for Legionella in the past 3 years?**
A. Not applicable to the RFP
 - B. If yes, will the County provide the results and if so when?**
B. Not applicable to the RFP
 - C. If no, why has the County not tested for Legionella?**
C. Not applicable to the RFP
- Q7. In section 2.1 the County requires bidders to be properly licensed.**
 - A. Will the County require a DPR Business license and local QAL for the service personnel?**
A. The RFP does state the required licenses.
 - B. The RFP requires the use of Morpholine (ex. 2). Will the County require a DEA permit or equivalent?**
B. The RFP does state the required licenses.
 - C. Why does not the County simply state the licenses it will require?**
C. The RFP does state the required licenses.
- Q8. Section 3.3 (p. 34) requires the bidder to have a C-55 license from the Contractors’ State License Board. However, there is also a reference to “water filtration” and a C-35. Will water filtration be required under the scope of work and in which section of the RFP can that be found?**
A8. Any water filtration required will be determined from the initial assessment report by the contractor.
- Q9. Section 3.3 also refers to bidders having a CWT Certification. CWT Certifications are issued to individuals not organizations. Will you clarify this? In addition, AWT is a voluntary trade organization with no legal regulatory jurisdiction; will this be explained in an addendum?**
A9. Please refer to the RFP

Q10. In Section, 3.7, there is a reference to cost as a component of the bid. Will the County give any points or extra consideration in the bid evaluation process for the lowest cost bid? And should the points be awarded with the lowest bidder getting max points and each other bidder getting a lower point total based on the percentage that they are higher or is this going to be another arbitrary decision?

A10. Cost is one factor in reviewing the proposals.

Q11. Section 3 on “Proposal Organization” does not provide any weighting for the components. Will there be any weighting? If so, what are the weightings?

A11. The County does not provide the evaluation tool or it's components until after a tentative award is made.

Q12. Exhibit 1 sets forth specific formulas.

A12. Exhibit 1 clearly states that the formulas are samples only.

A. Numerous constituents listed therein have weights specified to three decimals. Given that manufacturers provide ranges for the broad ingredients, how can a bidder guaranty a weight within 3 decimals?

A. See Above. This question is not relevant to the bid.

B. Why is the County specifying distinct formulas rather than just having a performance based specification?

B. See Above. This question is not relevant to the bid.

C. Who (what lab) will perform the analysis on the vendors formulas?

C. See Above. This question is not relevant to the bid.

D. Who (company) will review the formulas manufacturer?

D. See Above. This question is not relevant to the bid.

Q13. Pages 41 and 42 set forth the “Award Criteria.” Again, the County gives no weighting to any of the criteria or does not explain any evaluating process in addition to the criteria. Is there any weighting? Is each criteria the same? Will points be assigned?

A13. The County does not provide the evaluation tool or it's components until after a tentative award is made.

Q14. A complete audited inventory is required to prepare a bid to this RFP. We are obviously looking for a comprehensive inventory of products on hand.

A14. The County of Fresno understands there will be an inventory of product. Bidders are to bid to an annual usage.

Q15. Information regarding the last three (3) years of the County's water treatment chemical procurement which is the subject of this RFP and consisting of the following:

A. The pounds/gallons of each product used;

A. Not applicable to the RFP

B. The total dollars spent for these products;

B. Not applicable to the RFP

C. Purchase orders; and, Delivery records and location of deliveries.

C. Not applicable to the RFP

Q16. In addition to the above, we would ask you to ask the County Consultant how the cost proposal was prepared which evidently was based on the same product formulas and use rates from the Don Osborne prepared 2014 RFP 910-5268.

A16. Not applicable to the RFP

Q17. We were informed that the County is in process of revamping the boilers and auxillary equipment at the county jail:

A. Is this correct?

A. Not applicable to the RFP

B. Has the Consulting architect/engineers been selected?

B. Not applicable to the RFP

C. Who are the Consulting architect/engineers?

C. Not applicable to the RFP

Q18. It appeared that there was a representative from the County Legal Counsel present at the facilities walk, was this the case?

A19. Not applicable to the RFP

Q20. Are you going to answer the technical questions posed for the 2015 RFP?

A20. The County of Fresno is answering the questions

Q21. Is Mr. Don Osborne or any of his associates going to be involved in answering 2015 RFP questions?

A21. No

Q22. Who is going to answer our questions for the 2015 RFP?

A22. The County of Fresno

Q23. What are their qualifications?

A23. The County of Fresno

Q24. Is any sub Consultant not made available to the bidders going to be involved in answering any questions?

A24. The County of Fresno's consultant will answer through the Purchasing Department

Q25. Is any sub Consultant going to be involved in evaluating and/or advising on the selection of the vendor for the 2015 RFP 910-5352?

A25. *No*

A. Who are they?

A. *See answer above*

Q26. Will submitted bids be open for review?

A26. *No, submitted proposals will not be available for review by competing vendors*

Q27. Will this be a prevailing wage job?

A27. *Yes*

Q28. Does paperwork need to be submitted (such as copies of checks) to the County for review showing the prevailing wages paid to employees?

A28. *Yes*

| | | |
|------------------|---------|--|
| Refer to page 27 | 1.9.2.7 | 103 |
| Refer to page 26 | 1.9.1.7 | the industry standard for cooling water 10^5 (1000,000) |
| Refer to page 26 | 1.9.1.4 | SiO ₂ 8 to 12 ppm above city water 150 ppm SiO ₂ in the tower water is Usually the industry standard |

No question stated above.