Department of Public Works
Engineering Division
Robert F. Phillips, P.E., City Engineer

City-County Building, Room 115
210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
Madison, Wisconsin 53703
Phone: (608) 266-4751
Fax: (608) 264-9275
engineering@cityofmadison.com
www.cityofmadison.com/engineering

Deputy City Engineer
Gregory T. Fries, P.E.

Deputy Division Manager
Kathleen M. Cryan

Principal Engineer 2
Christopher J. Petykowski, P.E.
John S. Fahrney, P.E.

Principal Engineer 1
Christina M. Bachmann, P.E.
Mark D. Moder, P.E.
Janet Schmidt, P.E.
James M. Wolfe, P.E.

Facilities & Sustainability
Bryan Cooper, Principal Architect

Mapping Section Manager
Eric T. Pederson, P.S.

Financial Manager
Steven B. Danner-Rivers

December 3, 2020

CLARIFICATIONS TO RFP FOR PLANNING & DESIGN SERVICES FOR TRUAX LIFT STATION L.S. #16 (2701 ANDERSON ST)

GENERAL QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q. Has a condition assessment or preliminary engineering report already been performed demonstrating the need for the project?

A. No preliminary engineering report has been completed. MMSD operates and maintains the lift station for the City of Madison. The station condition was determine by MMSD to be in need of upgrade to bring the station up to modern standards.

Q. Drawing in the RFP appear to be a rehabilitation project from 1983. Are the original record drawings from 1942 construction available?

A. The original drawings are not available. The drawings in the RFP are the oldest drawings that we have for this station

Q. Is there existing flow meter data or history that will be provided?

A. Daily pump run times data can be provided to the Consultant to determine flow data.

Q. The average daily flow is stated in the RFP to be 36,000 gpd, please confirm this number. If confirmed, why are the pumps 1,000 gpm? Is there really a peaking factor of 40?

A. The 36,000 gpd flow stated in the RFP is not correct and is a typo. Based on monthly pump run times for 2020, the correct average daily flow was found to be 542,000 gpd. Due to the proximity of the drainage area to the Dane County Airport, the City does not anticipate significant flow increases due to development in the future but the Consultant shall be responsible for investigating the drainage area and providing their own analysis.

Q. Are there peaks that demonstrate the need for 1000 gpm pumps or are the pumps sized to accommodate the velocity needs of the force main?

A. The pumps are sized for flow peaks. The flow quantity is stated in the RFP is not accurate and has been clarified above.

Q. Are the existing pumps variable speed? Do the new pumps need to be variable speed?

A. The pumps are not variable speed pumps. The pumps would not be required to be variable speed but they could be as long as they are in line with MMSD standards.

Q. Is the City open to using submersible pumps in a new wet well structure?

A. Yes, we would be open to submersible pumps.

Q. Should assumptions be made, based on the RFP schedule, that no capacity changes will occur that would trigger engineering report preparation for WDNR review, classifying work as "maintenance"?

A. The City would anticipate a WDNR review is necessary. However, the Consultant would be required to investigate whether or not that is the case during design. With the extent of work proposed with the project, the lift station will need to be permitted.

Q. The pump spec sheet does not indicate the age of the existing Fairbanks Morse pumps. How old are the existing pumps?

A. The existing Fairbanks Morse pumps are approximately 21 years old. Existing pump model is B5423, Pump Serial Number K3P1056372/0

Q. Should the assumption be made that there is to be no work performed on the force main?

A. Yes, no work is anticipated to be done on the existing force main

Q. Should consideration be given to looking at lesser pumping capacity, smaller force main, in the interest of saving money long term?

A. No force main work is anticipated. This basin has an extensive amount of clearwater infiltration despite our reduction efforts with lining and rehabilitation projects. While we do not want to rule out downsizing of pumps, we do want to make sure that we have adequate capacity during rain events and high groundwater table conditions. Historical pump run time data during rain events and wet summers (such as 2018) is available for the design of the lift station.

Q. Is the new emergency generator to be installed inside of a building or an outside waterproof housing with sound attenuation?

A. There is no requirement for the generator to be placed inside of a building and can be located outside in a waterproof housing with surrounding fencing.

Q. Does the City or MMSD have existing controls integration preferences? Is this just communication for output of data and alarms or does the lift station also receive external controls for operational management?

A. The pumping facility will receive external control for operation via radio telemetry.

Q. Does the City or MMSD have standard controls integration from other lift stations?

A. Yes, this information will be provided during the detailed design phase of the project.

Q. The RFP mentions "surge protection equipment". Does this mean electrical service surge protection or radio antenna surge protection or hydraulic surge protection in the force main?

A. Electrical surge protection shall be included as part of the project. The selected Consultant will need to determine whether hydraulic surge protection is necessary.

Q. Is there some intention to study the cost benefit between renovation or removal of the existing lift station building, dry well, and wet well? If so, should pricing ranges be provided for renovation or removal? How and when will the decision be made between renovation or removal?

A. Yes there is intention for the Consultant to explore whether the existing facilities can be renovated to current standards or whether they need to be completely rebuilt. Ultimately, the City is relying on the Consultant to provide options and recommendations on which rehabilitation method is best from a cost, constructability, and maintenance/operation factors.

Q. The RFP states the preliminary report is due on or before January 22, 2021. Is this for review of recommendations of flow data/capacity and renovation or removal?

A. Yes, this preliminary report should state what the Consultant has found through the design process so far and present options and recommendations on what the Consultant finds to be the best route forward. The City and MMSD will review the report and determine how to

move forward based on the options and recommendations presented in the report.

Q. Is there anticipated to be a scheduled review and comments following 75% submission?
   A. The Consultant should anticipate a 1.5 week review of the 75% submission before receiving comments from the City and MMSD.

Q. Are the existing bar screen and comminutor in the wet well still operational? Are they needed? Do they need to be replaced?
   A. The existing bar screen and comminutor are no longer being used at this facility.

Q. Is there currently screening provided or is there intentions to incorporate screening into improvements?
   A. No screenings are intended to be provided with the improvements.

Q. The RFP mentions that MMSD will be involved with the project. Who at MMSD will be or has been on the team.
   A. Historically, Dave Lundy, MMSD Electrical Construction Manager, has been the lead contact for reviewing all plans, specs, submittals, and onsite inspection of lift station electrical systems.

Q. Does a hard copy of the proposal need to be submitted or is an electronic submission only acceptable?
   A. An electronic only submission is acceptable and due to the ongoing COVID pandemic, it is the preferred method.