

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS NO. 23-024
Addendum No. 2**

Dewatering Polymer for Greater Nanaimo Pollution Control Centre

Issued: Monday, June 5, 2023

Closing Date & Time: on or before 3:00 PM Pacific Time on June 30, 2023

This addendum shall be read in conjunction with and considered as an integral part of the Request for Proposals. Revisions supersede the information contained in the original Request for Proposals. No consideration will be allowed for any extras due to any Proponent not being familiar with the contents of this Addendum. All other terms and conditions remain the same.

Addendum:

Questions and Answers

This following is a compilation of questions received from possible proponents up to 1:00 pm on June 5, 2023, and the answers to these questions

Q1

We would like to send in the jar testing report which was submitted previously when an RFP for supply of dewatering polymer was issued in 2021.

A1

We would recommend jar testing again due to the variations in sludge characteristics at GNPCC over the last 2 years.

Q2

The Jar Test Report from Appendix B shows settling time as the method for checking flocculant performance, but that is typically not the method used to monitor flocculant performance, as properly conditioned centrifuge solids tend not to settle well. By design they are intended to be very strong in order to hold their shape within the centrifuge (like marbles in a glass of water), and the only time they settle well is when the floc is extremely under-dosed with flocculant and the particle size is small enough to allow them to mesh. Most industry testing for centrifuges use free drainage tests (10s, 30s, 60s) as the most accurate for centrifuge dewatering as a higher drainage with less floc breakthrough tends to show drier cake and less floc in the centrate. Since test methods themselves are subjective (a blender shows higher dosages, a pour-test show lower dosages), using a percentage difference from the incumbent (15% higher dosage, 15% lower dosage) tends to give an idea of how the product will perform and helps reduce the impact of differing test methods. Are we able to change this test report to improve the results for the RDN, or is it a little late for that at this point?

A2

This template is only a reference or sample. Please feel free to provide the parameters you would be looking to adjust the polymer. Ideally, to determine polymer dosage, one would start with a range of polymer dosages to evaluate their effectiveness. Typically, you would test multiple dosages, such as 1 mg/L, 2 mg/L, 5 mg/L, etc. The amount of polymer needed/dosage would vary based on the volume of water being treated and the desired concentration. Please provide the pictures of the concentrations of polymer and tests showcased or conducted.

If Free Drainage Test results could be added to pictorial report, it would help us assess the product's capabilities. However, as you are also aware, the Free Drainage Test can vary greatly when performed by separate entities and therefore, wouldn't be a proper comparison of products.

To ensure test results are easy to follow, please document the jar test results with pictorial representation. Please also ensure the report is easy to follow. Preference will be provided to test reports with multiple photos.

Q3

In section 5.6, Proof of Concept, can you clarify what "the Supplier is unable to resolve the issue to the RDN's satisfaction" means? In other tenders we have seen municipalities allow Suppliers to run multiple different products when the tender calls for one to be specified, which is outside of the scope requested. Will the RDN allow multiple products to be run, and if so how should we bid our material accordingly? Specifically, should we bid our least expensive polymer in the hopes it will work but with the understanding that we will be allowed multiple opportunities and multiple polymers to solve the problem, or is each Supplier only allowed one product to test?

A3

Due to the resources needed to perform operational trials with multiple polymers from each supplier, the RFP process was structured to allow suppliers to identify only one polymer to meet the RDN's requirements (both from a technical and financial perspective). This one polymer would also be used in the operational trial and the trial results and price would be used to determine the technical and financial evaluation score.

To respond to this RFP, suppliers would need to identify their most optimal polymer from both a technical and financial perspective.

Following the trials, the preferred polymer will be used in the wastewater treatment process at GNPCC for up to an additional 3 weeks. Section 5.6 only applies if the polymer loses its effectiveness and efficiency during the period following operational trials and prior to contract award.

Substituting polymers is permitted during the agreement under the condition 18 (ii) of the Supply Agreement. Product substitution must be approved by the RDN and result in improvements to performance. The new product must also be provided at the same unit price.

Tender Addendum:

Please see correction to contract language below:

RFP Section 5.7 (ii) Product Performance (page 12) and Supply Agreement Section 18 (ii) (page 40)

Replace

Any Product substitution suggested by the incumbent supplier will perform equal to and/or better than the initial full-scale evaluation or baseline performance. Additionally, any product substitution will be formally pre-approved by the RDN and supplied **and** the unit price in effect at the time of contract issuance.

With

Any Product substitution suggested by the incumbent supplier will perform equal to and/or better than the initial full-scale evaluation or baseline performance. Additionally, any product substitution will be formally pre-approved by the RDN and supplied **at** the unit price in effect at the time of contract issuance

End of Addendum No. 2