



Oconee County Board of Commissioners

Addendum 1

DATE: April 29, 2022

TO: All Prospective Bidders/Offerors

FROM: Procurement Officer

RE: Addendum 1, RFQP# 22-04-014 ISO Fire Hydrant Flow Testing & Inspection Services

The following changes are to be incorporated into the solicitation documents dated **April 8, 2022**. All those receiving this addendum should modify their documents to show the below described changes.

1. Answers to questions received prior to the deadline of 5:00 pm on April 22, 2022.

All questions shall be directed to the Owner Contact, Jessica Ellis, Procurement Officer via email to ocbids@oconee.ga.us.

1. Answers to questions received prior to the deadline of 5:00 pm on April 22, 2022.

Q1: Did we need to dechlorinate the water flushed from the hydrants?

A1: No.

Q2: Is a list of hydrant information available which includes the County asset ID number and basic locations, or will this information need to be collected by the Contractor prior to beginning inspections? Understanding that this information is only being used to load database and generate driving directions to verify that all hydrants are being inspected.

A2: This information should not have to be collected for approximately 98% of the hydrants. The County has a GIS data base for fire hydrants and will provide this to the awarded contractor.

Q3: Due to the size of the County system, flow testing 100% of an estimated 2700 hydrants in year one could be very difficult to do properly without creating a large number of system issues and water quality issues. Due to the average time needed to flow test and properly clear water lines, would the County be open to other options for flow testing a percentage of hydrants each year over the 5-year period instead of all in one year? We feel this would be much less disruptive to the County's system and customers.

A3: The County will take this into consideration and is open to suggestions.

Q4: RFQP addresses use of data loggers to collect data during flow testing operation. Could you clarify what information you are wanting collected so that we can have a better understanding of where/how data collectors would need to be placed to collect proper information.

A4: The County has hydrant data loggers that record pressures. It is unlikely that this will be requested of the contractor, but the County would like to keep options available.

Q5: What is considered a system disruption? All efforts will be made to minimize any disruptions, but if water clarity (dirty water) issues arise from flow testing would these be considered system disruptions and be handled by the County?

A5: If this issue arises, the County will handle it.

Q6: Does the County expect a warranty? If so the paint system they requested can't be warranted, no coatings reps will warranty with this process.

A6: The paint system has to be equal to or better than what is being requested in the solicitation documents. The contractor is expected to warranty this work.

Q7: Is the County open to a different process than requested? This process they ask for won't last a year before seeing failure...would be a waste of money not to do them correctly.

A7: The County is open to suggestions. Depending on what firms qualify the best, alternate means and methods may be specifically explained during the interview process.

Q8: Is there a specific reason for just using spray paint cans to prime and top coat? We will use the V7400 series by Rust-oleum, this coating is the "Fire Hydrant" coating system recommended by Rust-Oleum. It is an oil based coating system, and by nature will outlast waterborne coatings.

A8: The specification in the RFQP is the minimum. The County is open to anything that is equivalent or better. The County does prefer an oil based coating system for initial painting.

Q9: Is the County open to other coatings product than what is listed in the RFQP? If so we would Strongly recommend Flynt paint coatings system. This product is used and spec'd in 90% of the towns in Texas.

A9: The County is open to alternative coating products. Depending on what firms qualify the best, alternate means and methods may be specifically explained during the interview process.

Q10: Does the County want the glass bead on entire hydrant? FYI, by using the Flynt paint this process could be eliminated on barrels of hydrants...we recommend just doing the bonnets do to the fact that they will be color coated for GPM. This will not only give FD visibility, it would also help in seeing the color code for GPM. The reflective bead we use can enhance the actual color of bonnet.

A10: It is unlikely that glass beads will be required. If the County chooses this option, only the bonnets would need glass beads. Bands or tape may also be used for bonnets.

Q11: Can we mobilize for painting per 600 -800 unit minimum? This is to avoid mobilizing multiple times, this will also save Oconee County paying multiple mobilization charges?

A11: The County doesn't see an issue with this.

Q12: What is the interval of time between painting of hydrants? It is not clear how often the hydrants will be painted.

A12: A minimum of twice within the 5 year cycle and as needed.

Q13: Contractor needs to provide electronic pressure data loggers that continuously collect data during the hydrant testing. What type of loggers are needed?

A13: It is very unlikely that the contractor will need to use electronic data loggers. That being said, the County uses Dickson PR325 loggers.

Q14: Lubricate hydrant as necessary to ensure ease of operation – some hydrants aren't able to lubricate operating threads without disassembly required. Will that be expected of the contractor?

A14: No. In the case of any major disassembly or disruption, the County will handle it.

END OF ADDENDUM 1