



St. Johns River Water Management District

Michael A. Register, P.E., Executive Director

525 Community College Parkway S.E. • Palm Bay, FL 32909 • 321-984-4940 • www.sjrwmd.com

DATE: August 1, 2023

TO: Prospective Respondents

FROM: Amy Lucey, Senior Procurement Specialist

SUBJECT: Addendum #1 to Request for Qualifications, # 39002, Lake Jesup Nutrient Reduction Design.

As a result of inquiries, the following clarifications/changes are provided for your information. Please make all appropriate changes to your bid documents. Note: changes are reflected with original language shown with strike-through and new language is underlined.

- Q1: RFQ Attachment A - What was the project life used in developing the long-term (present costs) economic analysis for the bioactivated media project referenced in the third paragraph on page 48 (Attachment A)?
- A1: 50 years was the project life used.
- Q2: What discount rate was used for Attachment A?
- A2: It is unknown what discount rate was used.
- Q3: We would ask that a 50-year project life be considered in making economic comparisons of proposed technologies—such as used by SFWMD for their long-term projects
- A3: Please see answer A1.
- Q4 RFQ Page 48 (Attachment A) - last sentence of the last paragraph of the Introduction: “The treatment process may not alter water quality such that concentrations for any parameter (except N and P) are outside historical concentrations for the lake.” What if the processes increase DO and reduce TSS--both of which would be beneficial. Would this be acceptable?
- A4: Technologies that lead to an improvement in water quality would be acceptable, so long as State water quality criteria are met.
- Q5: RFQ Page 49 (Attachment A) - Table 1: Lake Jessup Nutrient Concentrations. Are these average values? What type of samples were taken? If grab samples, are they diurnal samples? What is the “n” value (number of data points)? What are the standard deviations? Could the table be expanded to show TSS and alkalinity?
- A5: These are average values of monthly grab samples taken from 1995-2022. TSS is 30.74 mg/L and alkalinity is 74 mg/L. Please see table below:

Row Labels	Average	STDEV
BOD	5.901	1.947158
DO	8.974	2.219712
NH4-D	0.020	0.020096
NH4-T	0.038	0.050962
NOx-D	0.014	0.028451
NOx-T	0.017	0.039949
pH-Field	8.683	0.747603
PO4-D	0.016	0.020917
PO4-T	0.038	0.030657
TKN-D	0.989	0.321885
TKN-T	2.637	1.219728
TP-D	0.024	0.036848
TP-T	0.146	0.05183
Water Temp	23.663	5.528
TSS	30.743	17.811
Alkalinity	74.052	13.10485

Q6: RFQ Page 49 (Attachment A) - Table 1: Of the TKN-T how much is as dissolved organic nitrogen and how much is recalcitrant dissolved organic nitrogen (rDON)?

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29136599/>

A6: We don't have this information at present.

Q7: If pilot testing shows some additional land is needed to meet removal requirements, would this be available? If not, if the proposed technology shows an economic advantage based upon a 50-year present cost analysis, could the removal requirements be adjusted to ensure the most cost-effective technology is applied?

A7: Only 9.7 acres are available. This is not a minimum qualification, but the technology will be considered under evaluation criteria.

Q8: RFQ Page 1 states a performance warranty is required for the nutrient removal technology. (a) What would be the form of such a warranty? Many nutrient removal processes are quite capable of removing the quantities of nutrients required in the RFQ. However, their removal efficiencies are influenced by factors such as weather and variable water quality and it is for all practical purposes impossible (or certainly financially unwise) to provide a performance warranty for such a system. Consequently, many very qualified firms are not going to respond to the RFQ.

A8: This is not a minimum qualification but will be considered under evaluation criteria.

Q9: Why is the District requiring a performance warranty and thereby eliminating consideration of many potential treatment systems that can achieve the removal requirements under most conditions?

A9: See response above

Q10: Would the nutrient removals of a full-scale 10 MGD system that has been in operation for over thirteen years with a proven track record, be considered by the District without having to assume the unreasonable burden of a performance guarantee?

A10: See response above.

Q11: If the design engineer must provide a performance warranty, it would seem necessary for that engineer to also be the contracted operator, or at least have access to monitoring and assessing operational compliance if the operation is by others. What is the District's position on this?

A11: The warranty is of the proposed technology and is not a minimum qualification.

Q12: RFQ Page 1 states that "[m]edia-based approaches are preferred. "Media-based" is not defined within the RFQ. Its meaning is therefore ambiguous, and a firm submitting based on what it considers a "media-based" treatment system runs the risk of being disqualified or receiving a lower score by the District if the District does not agree that the treatment system is "media-based." The District's decision can be challenged in a legal setting. (a) Will the District provide a clear and unambiguous definition of "Media-Based Systems" with respect to this RFQ?

A12: Media-based system refers to a system that utilizes media to remove or reduce levels of nutrients.

Q13: Why are "media-based" systems preferred over other treatment systems, especially when other treatment systems may offer equal or better performance and have a lower life-cycle cost than a "media-based" system?

A13: Based on the Lake Jesup Wetland Treatment System Alternative Analysis (CDM, 2022), Exhibit A, the District has reason to believe that media-based systems will be able to meet the specifications described in this advertisement. However, the District has elected to eliminate the preference for "media-based" systems specified in the solicitation. We will retain the related questions in the Proposed Technology Form to better understand the proposed technology.

This solicitation is for design services only and the District reserves the right to reject the technology recommended by the successful respondent. The District shall have final approval of any technology proposed in design.

Corrections: Page 1: The statement that "Media-Based approaches are preferred" has been deleted.

Attachments:

Page1 revised addendum 1

NOTE: The Proposal Due Date remains 2:00 p.m., **Tuesday, August 22, 2023**

Please acknowledge receipt of this Addendum on the SUBMITTAL FORM provided in the proposal package.

If you have any questions, please e-mail me at alucey@sjrwmd.com.

**THE GOVERNING BOARD OF THE
ST. JOHNS RIVER WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
LAKE JESUP NUTRIENT REDUCTION DESIGN
REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS 39002**

The Governing Board of the St. Johns River Water Management District (the “District”) requests that interested parties respond to the solicitation below by 2:00 p.m., August 22, 2023. Further information is available through DemandStar at *Demandstar.com* [(800) 711-1712], Vendor Registry at *Vendorregistry.com*, or the District’s website at *sjrwmd.com*. Solicitation packages may be obtained from DemandStar, Vendor Registry, or the District by calling or emailing Amy Lucey, Senior Procurement Specialist, at 321-409-2156 or *ALucey@sjrwmd.com*. Responses will be opened at the Palm Bay Service Center, 525 Community College Parkway SE, Palm Bay, FL 32909.

Description of Requested Services:

The District desires to enter into an agreement with an engineering firm licensed to do business in the state of Florida, which has Professional Engineers licensed in the state of Florida. The purpose of the Lake Jesup Nutrient Removal Design project is to design a nutrient removal technology that cost-effectively removes total nitrogen (TN) and total phosphorus (TP) from Lake Jesup. This project will assist in furthering water quality improvements in the Lake Jesup Basin within the Middle St. Johns River Basin (MSJRB).

The design should be a full-scale treatment technology system on the District’s Alternative 3 site that will remove TN and TP at rates at or above 50,000 and 5,000 pounds/year, respectively. The technology must be well established, been used in full-scale projects, and have demonstrated efficacy and a performance warranty. ~~Media-based approaches are preferred.~~

The preliminary budget for the requested services is approximately \$250,000. The District will coordinate with the Consultant to develop a list of deliverables and the final Statement of Work during the negotiation and contract development process. Work under the resulting contract will be authorized through Work Orders and may include:

- Site assessment and review of existing information;
- Bench top/pilot study technology evaluation of nutrient reducing media;
- 30% and 60% engineering drawings and permitting; This project will assist in furthering water quality improvements in the Lake Jesup Basin within the Middle St. Johns River Basin (MSJRB). ~~Media-based approaches are preferred.~~
- Final construction drawings and sampling and monitoring plan; and
- Bidding assistance and construction support services.*

** Funds for construction of the project have not yet been identified. Therefore, the funding for construction-related Work Orders is not included within the preliminary budget for the requested services. Additional funding may be allocated to the contract in the future for construction-related Work Orders.*