



ADDENDUM NUMBER ONE
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)

DATE: April 1, 2019
TO: ALL PROPOSERS OF RECORD
FROM: LYN MAJESKI, PURCHASING MANAGER
RFP FOR: CHLORINATION SYSTEM FOR OAK RIDGE OUTDOOR POOL

This Addendum forms a part of and modifies the RFP for the above item that needs to be received by April 8, 2019 at 2:00 p.m. (local time) at the City of Oak Ridge. Central Services Complex, 100 Woodbury Lane, Oak Ridge, Tennessee.

ITEM 1 – Questions/Statements from Potential Proposers:

1. **Question:**

Are site visits for design and installation considerations allowed in advance of the bid submittal?

Response:

Yes.

2. **Question:**

There are only a couple of manufacturers that produce equipment capable of meeting the capacity requirements of the outdoor pool with regard to Available Chlorine. "Brand X" produces erosion feeders and "Brand Y" produces spray feeders. By excluding erosion feeders, you are essentially left with (1) brand/option and no leverage. Erosion feeders are generally recognized as being more reliable and requiring far less maintenance than spray feeders. They are utilized at major waterparks and aquatic centers. What are the reasons for excluding Erosion feeders?

Response:

You may submit a proposal on an alternate feeder system as per the requirements of the bid.

3. **Question:**

By converting to Calcium Hypochlorite, I would conservatively estimate the City to realize an increase of chlorine cost by a factor of 8-10 times over gas depending on actual price of Calcium Hypochlorite. It would seem that the best value for the City would be to consider the cost of the chemical as the primary determining factor in who is awarded the bid and the feeder equipment/installation as secondary based on its relative insignificance in the overall cost of conversion. Additionally, the feeder equipment is tied to its particular brand of chemical in order to retain its NSF/ANSI rating. By focusing on a particular brand or design of equipment, the City could lose its ability to negotiate a favorable chemical price. Does the price of chemical have any bearing on the award of the bid? See cost comparisons below.

Response:

For the purpose of this RFP, we are only seeking proposals for the chemical feeder system plus installation for the specs listed in the proposal package.

3 Common Aquatics Chlorine Options - Cost Comparison:

Elemental Chlorine (Gas): \$0.465/LB x 2000 LBS/Week x 16 Weeks = \$14,800/Season

(Pros: Most Economical; Cons: Extremely Hazardous, Requires Risk Management Plan and Security, Some pH adjustment possible)

Sodium Hypochlorite (Liquid): \$1.70/GAL x 1600 GALS/Week x 16 Weeks = \$43,500/Season

(Pros: Offers the best overall value for the City, can be housed in existing chlorine building and out of view of guests, inexpensive storage and feed pumps are all that is required to convert, no chemical handling; Cons: Product degrades, some pH adjustment likely required).

Calcium Hypochlorite (Solid): \$2.50/LB x 3000 LBS/Week x 16 Weeks = \$120,000/Season

(Pros: Requires minimal pH adjustment, offers improved stability over liquid, requires daily chemical handling (50# Pails); Cons: Most expensive chemical, complex and expensive feed system, would be installed in plain view of guests and potentially unsightly).

******* Acknowledge receipt of this Addendum with your Proposal *******

If you have already submitted your bid you may acknowledge receipt by email to lmajeski@oakridgetn.gov