



CITY OF ATLANTA

Kasim Reed
Mayor

SUITE 1900
55 TRINITY AVENUE, SW
ATLANTA, GA 30303
(404) 330-6204 Fax: (404) 658-7705
Internet Home Page: www.atlantaga.gov

DEPARTMENT OF PROCUREMENT
Adam L. Smith, Esq., CPPO, CPPB, CPPM, CPP,
CIPC, CISCC, CIGPM
Chief Procurement Officer
asmith@atlantaga.gov

January 7, 2016

Dear Potential Proponents:

Re: FC-8188, RM Clayton WRC Nutrient Harvesting Design-Build Project

Attached is one (1) copy of **Addendum Number 5**, which is hereby made a part of the above-referenced project.

For additional information, please contact Ms. Jill Watkins, Contract Administrator, at (404) 865-8703 or by email at jewatkins@atlantaga.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Adam L. Smith".

Adam L. Smith

ALS/jew



ADDENDUM NO. 5

This Addendum No. 5 forms a part of the Request for Proposals ("RFP") and modifies the original solicitation package and any prior Addenda as noted below and is issued to incorporate the following:

1. Revised due date: **Wednesday, January 13, 2016 @ 2:00 P.M. EST.**
2. Attachment No. 7: Response to Questions (7 Questions).

The Proposal due date HAS been modified and Proposals are due on Wednesday, January 13, 2016 and should be time stamped in no later than 2:00 P.M. EST and delivered to the address listed below:

Adam L. Smith, Esq., CPPO, CPPB, CPPM, CPP,
CIPC, CISCC, CIGPM
Chief Procurement Officer
Department of Procurement
55 Trinity Avenue, S. W.
City Hall South, Suite 1900
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

****All other pertinent information is to remain unchanged****

**FC-8188, RM Clayton WRC Nutrient Harvesting
Design-Build Project
Addendum No. 5
January 7, 2016
Page 3**

Acknowledgment of Addendum No. 5

Proponents must sign below and return this form with Proposal to the Department of Procurement, 55 Trinity Avenue, City Hall South, Suite 1900, Atlanta, Georgia 30303 as acknowledgment of receipt of this Addendum.

This is to acknowledge receipt of Addendum No. 5 for **FC-8188, RM Clayton WRC Nutrient Harvesting Design-Build Project** on this the _____ day of _____, 20__.

Legal Company Name of Proponent

Signature of Authorized Representative

Printed Name

Title

Date

ATTACHMENT NO. 7

Response to Questions (7)

ATTACHMENT NO. 7
Response to Questions (7 Questions)

1. Question

RFP Part 1, 33. – Conflict of Interest (page 10 of 11). Please provide a listing of those design consultants, or other firms that performed preliminary work leading up the issuance of this RFP, as well as those firms who have provided other related services to the City, who are not permitted to participate in this pursuit.

Answer

The list of entities that are not permitted to participate in this RFP as per Part1, Paragraph 33, Conflict of Interest, includes but is not limited to BGR.

2. Question

Will firms who have performed on the project's previous initial planning, waste stream and/or pilot studies; and/or engineering efforts, including assistance with the preparation of the subject project's RFP, be eligible to be part of a Design-Build team that can provide a Design-Build Proposal for this project? Specifically, can BGR—or individual joint venture members of BGR—be part of a Design-Build Team (whether as a Prime or as a Sub consultant) and not be in violation of the City's Conflict of Interest Statement as listed on **Pages 10 and 11 of Part 1 of the RFP?**

Answer

Refer to Question 1.

3. Question

Can the City provide a listing of the firms that have previously provided services or are slated to provide services for the City that are related to this Project? We request this information to ensure that we are not in violation of the Conflict of Interest Requirements listed in Paragraph 33 of Part 1 of the subject RFP.

Answer

Refer to Question 1.

4. Question

We request that the City enter into the Services Agreement for the Maintenance/By-Product Disposal directly with the Design-Builder's proposed nominated subcontractor for such services, rather than with the Design-Builder, and deleting all references to this as a requirement for Design-Builder in the Design-Build Contract Documents. This would allow the City to obtain a more cost-effective proposal for those services as it would avoid additional costs that the Design-Builder would have to incur in holding this long-term subcontract and allow the City direct access to the provider of those services, simplifying the process for all parties. Please indicate if proposals using this approach will be accepted by the City.

Answer

The City will consider approving a Service Agreement for by-product management and maintenance as required in the By-Product Management and Maintenance Plans (as more particularly described in the RFP and Section 1.2 of the Scope of Work) with an approved subcontractor under the Agreement in lieu of the Design-Builder, pursuant to the following conditions:

- 1) The Design-Builder shall recommend for the City's approval a subcontractor as the Service Provider that meets all of the requirements, experience and ability to provide the required Services.
- 2) The City has the right to approve or reject in its sole discretion any recommended Subcontractor for the Services.
- 3) A service agreement shall be executed by the Design-Builder or an approved Subcontractor as a condition of Final Acceptance of the Nutrient Harvesting System, as further described in Section 1.2 of the Scope of Work.
- 4) The City approves the final terms and conditions to be incorporated in the final Agreement relating to the Service Agreement, as described above, prior to and as a condition of award of the Project.

5. Question

It is apparent to us that Black & Veatch and Gresham Smith are conflicted out due to their involvement in preparation of the procurement. Are there any other firms that are conflicted out of this procurement?

Answer

See response to Question 1.

6. Question

How long are the proponents required to hold their pricing?

Answer

The RFP document is silent to the length of days a Proponent must hold their prices and in this regard, the RFP will remain unchanged.

7. Question

We request that the City approve the CNP Airprex equipment as an alternate to the equipment identified in the RFP documents.

Answer

The RFP document does not limit Proponents to the equipment cited. Therefore, all proposals submitted with equipment which meets the specifications outlined in the RFP document are acceptable for review.