

Onondaga County, Department Of Water Environment Protection  
Harbor Brook Treatment Wetlands (CSO 018)  
Pilot Disinfection Project  
RFP 17-3330-005

Addendum No. 1

The Standard Onondaga County Engineering Agreement (08-11-2016) has been updated and can be found at <http://www.ongov.net/wep/rfp.html>

The following summarizes the Harbor Brook Treatment Wetlands Pilot Disinfection Project pre-proposal meeting held on 4/19/17 at the Metropolitan Syracuse Wastewater Treatment Plant.

1. Introduction

The purpose of this request for proposals is to obtain a firm to provide professional services for investigation, evaluation, and implementation of a pilot disinfection system at Harbor Brook Treatment Wetlands (HBTW) at CSO 018. The pilot disinfection system would then be used for evaluation and implementation of a long term disinfection system at Harbor Brook Treatment Wetlands (HBTW) at CSO 018.

2. Key Dates

The schedule of events set out is the best estimate of the schedule that will be followed.

Final Date for Submission of Questions:	04/26/17
Addendum Answering all Questions Issued by County:	05/01/17 (Posted on our website)
Proposal Submission Deadline:	05/16/17
Expected Award Date:	06/08/17
Expected Contract Start Date:	07/01/17

3. Submission of Proposals

Sealed proposals, (one [1] original, one [1] copy and one [1] electronic copy), shall be submitted to the Department of Water Environment Protection (WEP), 650 Hiawatha Boulevard West, Syracuse, New York 13204-1194 not later than May 16, 2017, 3:00 p.m. EST. Note: Packages not containing the required number of copies will be rejected.

4. Submittals of Questions Process

During the period between the earliest notice of the RFP to vendors and the contract award, no County employee can accept oral, written, or electronic contact from vendors regarding the procurement, except as authorized in Section 4 of the RFP. All proposals will remain sealed until after the submission deadline. Questions must be submitted in writing to: Mary Gates

5. Scope of Work (7 of RFP)

WEP is soliciting proposals for technical services relating to investigation, evaluation, and implementation of a pilot disinfection system at HBTW. The facility has been operating since the

second quarter of 2015. The County is seeking alternatives to, recommendations for, and implementation of both a pilot and long term system upgrades for a disinfection process in order to achieve the required fecal coliform level at the effluent of the treatment system. The pilot disinfection system would then be used for evaluation and implementation of a long term disinfection system at HBTW. The project will also include various site and facility upgrades as outlined below. The successful proposer is required to meet the MWBE requirement of 30%. This Request for Proposal (RFP) includes the scope of the project, required Consultant services, project schedule, proposal requirements, and evaluation criteria.

6. Costing Proposal

Include your pricing proposal for Pilot Disinfection Project. Include any and all costs associated with any additional services you will provide to Onondaga County.

7. Important Documents

Appendix A-K, and new Appendix L-Q

8. Questions and Responses:

a) Q: How is 30% MWBE requirement broken down? What % is M? What % is W?

A: Individual M and W goals are not set, but rather an overall WMBE percentage requirement, please see section 1.7.1 Paragraph 2 from the RFP as copied below:

Onondaga County requires all respondents to this RFP for professional services: 1) to be a certified MWBE prime contractor, or 2) to subcontract services and/or purchase supplies from an MWBE partner (or MWBE partners) sufficient so that not less than 30% of the total value of the work and supplies purchased by the County from your company, or, if such 30% requirement is unattainable, to submit a written explanation for why the 30% requirement is unattainable, along with a description of any attempted efforts to meet the 30% requirement. The County will consider M/WBE contractors that have applied for New York State Certification. Onondaga County will consider on a case by case basis City of Syracuse or other M/WBE certifications your company has attained.

b) Q: Which appendices contain the Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Manuals?

A: The O&M's have been added to the website as additional Appendices L and M.

c) Q: Has the Velasko Road detention basin ever flooded before or come close?

A: Storm Flows associated with a rain event that started on June 30, 2015 caused flooding conditions throughout the facility.

d) Q: Has a team already been assembled for proposal review?

A: No this will be done after proposals are submitted.

e) Q: Has the County ever considered using KMnO4?

A: The County considered several options for disinfection, information about the considerations can be found in a Memorandum titled “CSO 018 Constructed Wetlands – Preliminary Disinfection Options” Dated October 11, 2016 by CH2M. The memo is now included as Appendix O.

f) Q: Is there disinfection of any other CSO effluents?

A: Yes at the Midland and Hiawatha Regional Treatment Facilities (RTF), these facilities chlorinate and de-chlorinate.

g) Q: Does the County use sodium hypochlorite for all disinfection points?

A: Information about the RTFs is answered above, information about the Counties WWTPs is located on our website here: <http://www.ongov.net/wep/we19.html>

h) Q: Has a chlorine demand analysis been performed on the wetland influent?

A: No.

i) Q: Is the disinfection under Consent Order?

A: No

j) Q: What are acceptable Total Residual Chlorine (TRC) limits for the downstream process?

A: The TRC limit is part of the SPDES permit which is located here:

[http://static.ongov.net/WEP/Metro\\_WWTP/Post-TMDL\\_ModifiedPermit\\_NY0027081-METRO\\_2014-06-04\\_Signed.pdf](http://static.ongov.net/WEP/Metro_WWTP/Post-TMDL_ModifiedPermit_NY0027081-METRO_2014-06-04_Signed.pdf) , the draft permit that is now out for public comment is also included as Appendix N.

Additionally information about the considerations and disinfection Protocol can be found in a Memorandum titled “CSO 018 Chlorine Disinfection Pilot Protocol” Dated November 3, 2016 by CH2M. The memo is now included as Appendix P and discusses application rates that are appropriate to prevent any adverse impact to the wetland plants and biota.

k) Q: Please expand on Section 7.8.1. additional upgrades:

A: Additional items that need evaluation of and recommendation for upgrade at HBTW facility shall include the following items, further explanation provide original text in italics:

- *Evaluation of the outfall (Manhole 18 / 19) and recommendations for alterations to correct challenges associated with surcharging, flow conditions, and flow metering.*

Below is a partial list for why the county would like to evaluate of the outfall (Manhole 18 / 19) and seeks recommendations for alterations to correct challenges associated with surcharging, flow conditions, and flow metering. In the existing condition bypass flow from the Harbor Brook Interceptor Sewer (HBIS) flows into MH18/19, if Harbor Brook is elevated (which it is during rain events) the backflow preventer at the outfall of the facility does not allow water to flow into Harbor Brook and the bypass flow enters wetland cell 3. This bypass flow creates issues with metering, the treatment process, and reporting. The rock overflow between wetland cell 3 and harbor brook was installed in a manner that when harbor brook is elevated it can flow into wetland cell 3, which is not preferred, the county would like to consider options to remedy this situation including modifying the outfall and rock check dam. The existing groundwater and standing water in MH 18/19 can cause issues where the meters are confused by stagnant or swirling flows. Stagnant water and swirling flows creates

monitoring data that is hard to interpret. If metering equipment, meter locations, or structural changes could be made to remedy this situation the county would like to consider improvements.

- *Evaluation of potential structural or hydrological changes to improve the wetlands treatment capability and/or lower efforts associated with maintenance.*

The County is looking for the consultant to evaluate and recommend structural, operational, or hydraulic improvements that could improve the treatment of COS and the capacity of the wetland. Additionally as wetland species are desired at the facility the county is seeking recommendations for improvements or management strategies that would act as biological controls for plant species (ie phragmites) that are not desired and are difficult and costly to control.

- *Evaluation of options and recommendation for replanting or replacing floating island 3 located in cell 1.*

Floating island 3 does not have well established vegetation and replanting is desired. The floating island system and soil media that the plants are meant to grow in are the suspected reason for causing this issue. The County is asking the consultant to evaluate the floating islands, provide recommendations for improvements, and include those improvements in the construction documents.

- *Evaluation of the existing meter locations, communications, connections, and recommendations and implementation of upgrades to be included in construction documents.*

During operation of the facility the county has observed that some of the existing metering locations are not the best due to either stagnant water or loss of communication issues. The county would like the consultant to evaluate the existing meter locations and suggest changes that might help with metering. The county would like the consultant to investigate ways to improve communications to eliminate loss of communication issues.

- *Site upgrades that include but are not limited to better access between the upper and lower portions of the facility, and better control of public access.*

It would be good to be able to drive from one part of the facility to the other without having to exit and reenter the facility. Additionally the public has gained access to the site by driving around existing access control gates and bollards onto the lawn at the facility. For these reason the county is seeking the consultant to include site improvements at the facility.

- *Buildings and/or enclosures for the long term disinfection system and electronic controls.*

The county would like the long term disinfection system and controls in a building or enclosure.

• *Evaluation of SanSep wash down sprays, recommendation for modifications for wash down sprays to increase effectiveness including but not limited to a new larger water service and/or mechanical pump to increase water pressure.*

The existing wash down sprays do not sufficiently clean the screens after an event and have to be manually washed after every rain event.

- l) Q: What is the water pressure at the grit and floatables?  
A: Information about the existing wash down sprays is included in the Operations and Maintenance Manuals now included with the appendices.
- m) Q: RFP states there will be “sampling by others”. Who else will be sampling?  
A: RFP No. 17-3330-002 - Harbor Brook Pilot Treatment Wetlands (CSO 018) Monitoring and Reporting Services has been awarded to CH2M, to understand the scope of work that RFP is currently posted on WEPs RFP webpage.
- n) Q: Ever consider using a flapgate at Manhole 18/19 as a potential solution for the outfall challenges?  
A: We have considered a few solutions for the Manhole 18/19 conditions, but we are seeking recommendations from the consultant. Additionally a trickle of groundwater from wetland cell 3 discharges to Harbor Brook, WEP has considered and is implementing changes to the outfall to address the groundwater trickle. A Memorandum titled “CSO 018 – Outfall Adjustment Options” Dated April 4, 2017 by CH2M is now included as Appendix Q.
- o) Q: Is there a standard way of running the 3 cells?  
A: Yes, WEP is running the cells of the treatment wetlands in series. Meaning from the grit and floatables facility water flows into cell 1, then cell 2, and then cell 3.
- p) Q: The project schedule on page 29 shows the Final Engineering BOD Report due in December 2019. I’m assuming that this should be December of 2018.  
A: Please amend the RFP to reflect a The Final Engineering BOD Report schedule date of December of 2018.
- q) Q: Please clarify the intent of the “Maintenance of Equipment” requirement in paragraph 7.7.1 on page 17. Does the County believe that additional flow monitoring equipment will need to be installed?  
A: The County expects that additional flow monitoring equipment will be needed for the pilot system. As such then the maintenance of the equipment is part of this project.
- r) Q: Can’t the pilot liquid sodium hypo addition be flow paced using the existing ISCO area/velocity flow meter presently installed in Manhole 4A?  
A: The existing flow monitor located in MH4A contains an ISCO 2150 sensor that provides velocity, level, and flow. All data from this sensor is manually downloaded from the device using a laptop, this monitor is not connected to the counties SCADA system. This flow monitor is part of the existing monitoring the system and is not currently used for system control. For the pilot disinfection system if a flow monitor is needed to control the disinfection system the county would prefer to have a new standalone system to control of the disinfection system rather than

modify the existing system. The final disinfection system will need to have a complete integration of all of the existing and proposed flow monitoring and operation systems.

- s) Q: Maintenance and calibration for both the pilot and permanent disinfection system equipment are required monthly. For how long after installation of the disinfection systems will maintenance of this equipment be required by the consultant?  
A: For the duration of the project until substantial completion/ beneficial occupancy of the final system, please see section 8. Project Schedule.
- t) Q: "Monitoring" requirement in paragraph 7.7.2 on page 17. If sampling will be performed by others, then what will the consultant be required to do for monitoring or sampling?  
A: Flow Monitoring, disinfection system monitoring, and associated equipment that is installed for the disinfection system will be included in this project. The sampling and existing flow monitoring equipment will be maintained and reported under a separate contract.
- u) Q: The RFP doesn't mention survey or boring needs. Does WEP anticipate needing an updated survey of the facility and borings to complete this work? If so, how many borings should be assumed?  
A: If the consultant thinks that a survey, beyond the existing asbuilt survey, is needed to perform this work then that should be included in the proposal. If the consultant thinks that borings would be needed to perform this work then that should be included in the proposal.
- v) Section 7.2 mentions "interested government agencies" for the kickoff meeting attendees. Does that mean City of Syracuse? DEC? Other?  
A: Interested government agencies is meant to convey at a minimum the DEC, in addition potentially the Army Corp of Engineers, and the City of Syracuse if they are interested in attending.
- w) Q: Sections 7.5 and 7.8.1 mention a final "facilities plan" as part of the deliverable. Can you clarify what is meant by "facilities plan?"  
A: Modify the existing RFP to read as follows:  
"7.5 Draft Engineering Report  
The Engineer shall prepare a draft report summarizing the background information, the alternatives, the evaluation of each, and the final recommendation. The Engineer will provide tables summarizing the feasibility, constructability, effectiveness, scheduling, and all associated costs. The Engineer shall submit three (3) copies and one (1) electronic Adobe PDF format copy of the Draft Engineering Report for review and comment."  
  
" 7.8.1 Paragraph 2  
The Engineer shall submit three (3) copies and one (1) electronic Adobe PDF format copy of the Final Engineering Report for review and comment."
- x) Q: Section 7.11.2 mentions job meetings during construction. What frequency should be assumed? Weekly? Biweekly?

A: Assume Biweekly construction phase job meetings.

- y) Q: Section 7.11.12 notes the engineer to provide the equipment manufacturer O&Ms. Does this mean the engineer will develop? Or does this mean the engineer is to distribute the approved copies to WEP? Typically we put this on the contractor for provide 4 hard copies and not the engineer. Please clarify.

A: It will be the contractor's responsibility to provide O&M manuals, the Engineer is to assure that the contractor provides the O&Ms and the information contained in the O&Ms is accurate.

- z) Q: Since this is over multiple years, do we need to disclose or discuss wage rate increase amounts in the proposal at all?

A: Yes, per section 7.14 Costing Proposal subsection is copied below.

7.14.3 Provide details of price components, including hours and allocation of skilled staff and sub-consultants. Also, if necessary, include details on any increases (actual dollar amount, not percentage) in wage rates on an annual basis for the term of the contract.

- aa) Q: We are requesting a 2 week extension on the CSO 018 Disinfection RFP. With the CSO 029/067 RFP being on the streets at the same time, pursuing both with a tight timeline for the CSO 018 is a challenge. Any additional time that could be granted for the CSO 018 RFP would be appreciated.

A: The request for an extension or changing the due date is denied.

**ONONDAGA COUNTY, DEPARTMENT OF WATER ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION  
RFP, Harbor Brook Treatment Wetlands (CSO 018), Pilot Disinfection Project  
RFP NUMBER 17-3330-005  
Pre-Proposal Meeting**

**Date:** April 19, 2017      **Time:** 2:00 PM

**Location:** Metropolitan Syracuse Wastewater Treatment Plant, Administration Building

	<b>Print Name</b>	<b>Company / Email</b>	<b>Signature</b>
1	<u>Adam K. Woodburn</u>	<u>WEP adamwoodburn@ongov.net</u>	<u></u>
2	<u>CHRIS SOMERLOT</u>	<u>BROWN AND CALDWELL CSomerlot@brwncauld.com</u>	<u></u>
3	<u>John Ravelle</u>	<u>Chazen Companies Javelle@chazencompanies.com</u>	<u></u>
4	<u>Lily Maio</u>	<u>OBG elizabeth.maio@obg.com</u>	<u></u>
5	<u>Mark Greene</u>	<u>OBG mark.greene@obg.com</u>	<u></u>
6	<u>RICH DEGUIDA</u>	<u>RDEGUIDA@MRB6ROUP.COM</u>	<u></u>
7	<u>TOM BOCK</u>	<u>BEVADT ASSOCIATES, P.C. jdebarbieri@prudenteng.com</u>	<u></u>
8	<u>John DeBarbieri</u>	<u>Prudent Engineering (MRE/DBE)</u>	<u></u>



ONONDAGA COUNTY, DEPARTMENT OF WATER ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION  
RFP, Harbor Brook Treatment Wetlands (CSO 018), Pilot Disinfection Project  
RFP NUMBER 17-3330-002  
Pre-Proposal Meeting

Date: April 19, 2017 Time: 2:00 PM

Location: Metropolitan Syracuse Wastewater Treatment Plant, Administration Building

	Print Name	Company / Email	Signature
9	<u>Cynthia Zatuarnicki</u>	<u>CH2M / cynthia.zatuarnicki@ch2m.com</u>	<u>Cynthia Zatuarnicki</u>
10	_____	_____	_____
11	_____	_____	_____
12	_____	_____	_____
13	_____	_____	_____
14	_____	_____	_____
15	_____	_____	_____
16	_____	_____	_____