



PFAS Treatment Technique Study

RFP # 23-01

ADDENDUM No. 3

February 13, 2023

Any and all changes to the Request for Proposal are valid only if they are included by written addendum to all potential respondents, which will be emailed prior to the proposal due date. Each respondent must acknowledge receipt of any addenda by indicating in its proposal. Each respondent, by acknowledging receipt of addenda, is responsible for the contents of the addenda and any changes to the bid therein. Failure to acknowledge receipt of addenda may cause the submittal to be rejected. If any language or figures contained in this addendum are in conflict with the original document, this addendum shall prevail.

This addendum consists of the following:

1. Addendum Number Three (3) is attached and consists of a total of six (6) pages including this cover sheet.

Please contact me at 847-866-2971 or johngonzalez@cityofevanston.org with any further questions or comments.

Sincerely,

John Gonzalez
Purchasing Specialist

PFAS Treatment Technique Study

RFP # 23-01

ADDENDUM No. 3

February 13, 2023

This addendum forms a part of RFP #23-01 and modifies these documents. This addendum consists of the following:

Questions:

1. **Question:** Work under this Agreement could contribute to provide much-needed help in protecting public health throughout the region. The ability to publish findings is particularly important to the mission of our teaming partners, who publish peer-reviewed work to assist in the development of public health protections from PFAS. Under what conditions (e.g., omission of any references to the city of Evanston, alternative approaches for protecting Evanston's anonymity, or other acceptable arrangements) has (in the past) and/or would (in the future) the City grant written approval for the use of data and results for such purposes?

Context – RFP provision 5(H) states that Consultant shall not publish, transfer, license or, except in connection with carrying out obligations under this Agreement, use or reuse all or any part of such reports and other documents, including working pages, without the prior written approval of City, provided, however, that Consultant may retain copies of the same for Consultant's own general reference.

Response: The consultant would have to receive written approval from the City of Evanston prior to publishing findings.

2. **Question:** Would Evanston be willing to allow additional technologies to be pilot tested as long as they are included within the budget?

Response: It is up to the consultant to determine if additional technologies to be pilot tested would be beneficial and within the budget for this project.

3. **Question:** Does the City of Evanston's Water Plant have the footprint available for onsite pilot testing of these technologies? Are there any footprint constraints?

Response: The City of Evanston Water Plant does have the footprint available for onsite pilot testing of these technologies. There should not be any footprint constraints.

4. **Question:** The RFP indicates that the contract term desired is for a period of two years. Does the City of Evanston anticipate a minimum duration that the Pilot tests are operated for?

Response: The City of Evanston does not anticipate a minimum duration that the Pilot tests are operated for. It will be up to the consultant to determine the appropriate operation duration for each Pilot test.

5. **Question:** Considering that the Final Addendum will be issued on February 17th, 2023, and it could have an impact on the proposal and cost estimate, and the RFP submission due date is February 28th, 2023, will the City consider extending the RFP submission due date?

Response: The City will not consider extending the RFP submission due date.

6. **Question:** Do you have any updated PFAS data? Can any other water quality data, including TOC, pH, dissolved & suspended solids, be provided?

Response: Updated PFAS data is located here:
<https://www.cityofevanston.org/government/departments/public-works/public-outreach/historical-pfsa-results>

TOC data is attached. Other water quality data can be located here:
<https://www.cityofevanston.org/government/departments/public-works/plans/consumer-confidence-report>

7. **Question:** Dr. Detlef Knappe of North Carolina State University, who is one of the leading experts on adsorptive removal of PFAS. He told us that recent studies conducted by his laboratory indicated that Fluorosorb, a modified clay product, was very promising in terms of performance and cost compared to GAC and IX materials. Could Fluorosorb be included in the testing?

Response: It will be up to the Consultant to determine if additional treatment techniques are included with their proposal and remain within the project budget.

8. **Question:** Can the City of Evanston clarify the treatment goal? Reporting limit? Health advisory? Non-detect? One option is that we could evaluate different levels for comparison.

Response: Non-detect

9. **Question:** The reported levels of PFOA & PFOS are very near the detection limit for most commercial laboratories (generally on the order of 2 ng/L). This can make evaluation of test data very challenging. Can we spike the samples, particularly for the RSSCT test? Adsorptive models can generally give effective results with moderate contaminant spiking.

Response: It will be up to the Consultant to determine the appropriate pilot testing methods that will be included in the proposal.

10. Question: Does the City of Evanston have specific GAC or IX resin materials that they would specifically like tested?

Response: No

11. Question: We have been envisioning conducting pilot testing at the Evanston water plant by constructing a side stream after filtration, but prior to disinfection. This would allow for the test to use a large quantity of water (which may be necessary since the concentrations are so low), eliminate costs and risks involved with shipping water, and eliminate disposal costs of water. Can you confirm if this would be acceptable?

Response: The Consultant should include their methods in the proposal to be evaluated by City of Evanston staff.

12. Question: The EPA has indicated that Powdered Activated Carbon (PAC) is generally not as efficient or as economical as GAC (or IX) even at high doses (see [pfas_drinking_water_treatment_technology_options_fact_sheet_04182019.pdf](#) (epa.gov)). Can we do laboratory testing for PAC to rule it out?

Response: The Consultant should include their methods in the proposal to be evaluated by City of Evanston staff.

13. Question: Membranes should achieve good treatment but generate a significant concentrate stream. Managing the concentrate stream would likely disqualify membranes as an effective treatment. Could we, therefore, conduct laboratory testing on the membranes to quantify the concentrate and determine if it should be ruled out?

Response: The Consultant should include their methods in the proposal to be evaluated by City of Evanston staff.

14. Question: We are considering a laboratory to conduct the RSSCT testing that has its own analytical capability. The data has been used for published research but is not certified. Could the data from the RSSCT portion be from a non-certified laboratory? We could provide QA or conduct periodic split samples with a certified lab?

Response: Evanston requires the PFAS samples to be run in a certified lab using EPA methods. If the consultant would like to propose additional testing in a research laboratory the consultant should include it in their response.

15. Question: Does Evanston have a specific list of PFAS to analyze for? There were 7 species in the RFP. Would there be a more extensive list of analytes?

Response: The City of Evanston has detected the following PFAS in the drinking water: Perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS) and Perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA)

16. Question: Method 533 is mentioned in the proposal. Could we use EPA method 537.1, as this does appear to be more available via commercial laboratories? We could use an expanded analyte list that encompasses the 533 analytes.

Response: Method 533 or method 537.1 can be used to analyze Perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS) and Perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA).

17. Question: We are assuming the conceptual design will be 30%. Please confirm.

Response: Conceptual design should include a feasible general layout of primary components of the proposed system(s), and identification of related modifications to existing systems that will be needed.

18. Question: We would like, for costing purposes, to assume up to three feasible options. Is this satisfactory?

Response: No

19. Question: If we can demonstrate early in the project that some technologies have practical limitations, would we have the flexibility to eliminate those technologies thereby possibly saving time and money.

Response: It will be up to the Consultant to determine the appropriate pilot testing methods that will be included in the proposal.

20. Question: My subcontractor is not a W/M/EBE-certified firm. Will the subcontracted amount count towards the 25% goal?

Response: No, Only the portion of the contract performed by a certified firm will count toward the city's 25% goal (use Exhibit G) . All Subcontractor's (certified and non-certified) performing tasks should be listed on the Fee Breakdown Table.

Attachments:

TOC Data

Note: Acknowledgment of this Addendum is required in the Submittal.

TOC Data 2022

Date	Finished ppm	Raw ppm
1/5/2022	1.62	1.75
4/1/2022	1.59	1.90
7/6/2022	1.93	2.07
10/5/2022	1.83	2.00

AVG 1.74 1.93
MIN 1.59 1.75
MAX 1.93 2.07

TOC Data 2021

Date	Finished ppm	Raw ppm
1/6/2021	1.67	1.94
4/6/2021	1.77	1.95
7/1/2021	1.69	1.98
10/11/2021	1.91	2.33

AVG 1.76 2.05
MIN 1.67 1.94
MAX 1.91 2.33

TOC Data 2020

Date	Finished ppm	Raw ppm
1/9/2020	1.93	1.93
4/1/2020	1.55	1.76
7/1/2020	1.73	1.91
10/1/2020	1.65	1.82

AVG 1.72 1.86
MIN 1.55 1.79
MAX 1.93 1.93

TOC Data 2019

Date	Finished ppm	Raw ppm
1/8/2019	1.44	1.73
4/4/2019	1.68	1.81
7/2/2019	1.94	2.15
10/7/2019	1.83	2.00

AVG 1.72 1.92
MIN 1.44 1.73
MAX 1.94 2.15

TOC Data 2018

Date	Finished ppm	Raw ppm
1/4/2018	1.69	2.09
4/5/2018	1.58	1.84
7/5/2018	1.60	1.80
10/4/2018	1.69	1.81

AVG 1.64 1.89
MIN 1.58 1.80
MAX 1.69 2.09