



**Request for Proposal (RFP) for Nutrients Master Plan Update
Addendum No. 1
March 18, 2025**

To prospective proposers under RFP for Nutrients Master Plan Update, notice is hereby given that the RFP for Nutrients Master Plan Update has been revised as set forth below and has provided a response to questions received from prospective proposers.

RFP Revisions

The following items describe revisions to the RFP. In the case of conflicting information, the information included in this addendum supersedes information within the original RFP.

1. On Page 3, the date for “Interviews” has been revised to May 12, 2025 through May 16, 2025. Interviews will be conducted in person at a location announced to the selected proposers. The interview location may be either the Main Wastewater Treatment Plant (2020 Wake Ave., Oakland, CA 94607) or the Administration Building (375 Eleventh St., Oakland, CA 94607).
2. On Page 3, the “Deadline for Proposers to Submit Questions and Clarifications to the District” has been extended to Wednesday, April 9, 2025. A second and final addendum will be issued by or before Wednesday, April 16, 2025 to respond to any received questions, if necessary.
3. On Page A-8, the first sentence of the “References” section is revised to the following: Three (3) to five (5) references **MUST** be included for the relevant experiences listed for each **key personnel (i.e., key team member)**.

Questions and Answers

The following items document questions and answers received by prospective proposers. Questions may have been modified to remove identifying information. Answers are responses from the East Bay Municipal Utility District (District). Answers are provided in a blue font.

1. **Question:** Were secondary influent and return activated sludge control valves included as part of the original design of the reactors?

Answer: Yes, these were part of the original design/project (SD-120).

2. **Question:** Are there any pictures of the secondary clarifiers and the channels?

Answer: Pictures of the secondary clarifiers and secondary effluent channels are not

included with the RFP. Reference drawings were included with the RFP as Exhibit G (see Document G.3 Reference Drawings on the District's RFP website). This information shows plan and profile views of secondary clarifiers and is believed to be sufficient for proposal purposes.

3. **Question:** Are firms allowed to submit resumes for all team members, not just key personnel?

Answer: Yes, firms are allowed to submit resumes for all team members. If firms submit resumes for all team members, then the selection committee may include this information in their assessment of the proposer's expertise, experience, and qualifications (e.g., see Evaluation Criteria B.1 and B.3 on Page 5 of the RFP). Each submitted resume, including resumes for team members not identified as key personnel, shall be a maximum of two 8.5" by 11" pages per person and shall include information listed in Item 11 (Resumes) of Exhibit A's "Required Documentation and Submittals" (see Page A-8 of the RFP).

4. **Question:** The Water Environment Federation's Residuals and Biosolids and Innovations in Treatment Technology (RBITT) conference is from May 6 through May 9 in Baltimore, Maryland. This may be a conflict for nutrient removal process engineering subject matter experts. Is there flexibility for the interview dates to be moved such that interviews will not overlap with RBITT?

Answer: The District recognizes the probability for nutrient removal subject matter experts to have a conflict with the original interview dates (May 5 through May 9, 2025). This conflict is an oversight, which will be addressed by moving interview dates to the following week (May 12 through May 16, 2025). See Item 1 under the "RFP Revisions" section of this addendum for confirmation on the revised interview dates.

5. **Question:** At the pre-proposal meeting, we heard that the District needs 24 hours to confirm proposal submission have been received. Please confirm we interpreted this correctly as it means proposals should be submitted 24 hours earlier than the deadline if we want confirmation before they are due.

Answer: The proposals are due April 25, 2025 at 12:00 pm. If your firm desires confirmation that the proposal was received, we recommend you submit the proposal at least 24 hours before the deadline. Submitting 24 hours before the deadline provides the District with sufficient time to receive the proposal, confirm the ability to download and view the proposal, and to send a response to the respective proposer documenting receipt of the proposal.

6. **Question:** The RFP states that the max file size is 25MB, and that anything over this limit will need to be emailed separately. Would it be acceptable to submit our proposal via a file transfer link?

Answer: Submission via a file transfer link is acceptable; however, the proposer is solely responsible for ensuring the District is able to download file(s) submitted via a transfer

link. The District shall not be responsible for any issues related to accessing files via a transfer link. If using a transfer link, the RFP response date/time will be acknowledged at the time the District successfully downloads the file(s). The District recommends submitting files as email attachments.

7. **Question:** Can we get a list of attendees from the pre-proposal conference/site walk?

Answer: A list of attendees from the pre-proposal conference and site walk have been included with this addendum as an attachment.

8. **Question:** Will the selected Master Plan consultant be conflicted out of pursuing the design of recommended CIP projects?

Answer: No.

9. **Question:** The 3rd Watershed Permit has a milestone of April 1, 2025 to identify compliance alternatives dischargers intend to consider. Has EBMUD submitted to the Regional Board on this milestone, and if so, which alternatives were identified?

Answer: The District plans to submit the information shown below to the Regional Board in the Bay Area Clean Water Agencies (BACWA) group annual report. This submission should not necessarily limit or guide the approach or ideas submitted in proposals. The information below is presented in a question (Q) and answer (A) format. The District input information (A) into a form from BACWA where questions (Q) were asked. The information below is subject to change and may not necessarily reflect the final response from the District; however, it is provided so proposers can discern what the District currently believes is feasible for preliminary alternatives.

(Q) Is the District an early actor?

(A) Yes

(Q) Which of the following best describes the projects for early actor?

(A) Optimization of existing infrastructure

(Q) Describe project(s) that have been completed or are in progress, including a status update on the implementation of each project. Keep descriptions brief and avoid abbreviations and acronyms.

(A) EBMUD has been developing a full-scale biological nutrient removal (BNR) process since 2020, utilizing the existing treatment facilities at the Main Wastewater Treatment Plant. This pilot project operates during the dry season to test and maximize total inorganic nitrogen (TIN) removal by adjusting the secondary treatment process parameters. The pilot project has used increasingly large portions of the secondary treatment process over the years. Over the last two years, the pilot project utilized 50% of the secondary treatment process consistently and piloted 75% for two months in 2024. Additional pilot testing will continue into the future.

The BNR pilot project has reduced the annual average dry season TIN loads in 2023 and 2024 from the 2019-2023 average load listed in Table F-4 of the Nutrients Watershed Permit, Order R2-2024-0013. The listed 2019-2023 average load was 8,900 kg/day. The 2023 and 2024 average loads were 6,900 and 7,700 kg/day, respectively. As the pilot project expands and continues the average TIN loads are expected to drop further.

(Q) Will the completed or ongoing projects result in compliance?

(A) Unsure

(Q) Provide more details regarding the applicable project(s) that are still under consideration.

(A) Initial results from the BNR pilot study indicate that achieving nutrient goals is possible, but there will be no redundancy in the system. To address this and the possibility that the BNR pilot will not meet nutrient goals, an Alternatives Analysis is being undertaken concurrently with the pilot project.

The District anticipates exploring two types of preliminary alternatives: Traditional Treatment Infrastructure and Optimization of Existing Infrastructure. The District prepared a RFP from nutrient removal experts to support the District in completing the alternatives analysis. As part of this project, the preliminary alternatives will be refined before performing subsequent technical analysis and selection of a compliance pathway. The alternatives analysis will be completed in parallel to the BNR pilot. Results/findings from each project will complement the other.

Traditional Treatment Infrastructure: Preliminary alternatives that may be considered include options for capacity addition (i.e., adding new reactors for redundancy), intensification (e.g., hydrocyclone-based wasting to improve settling), split treatment, secondary process conversion, and sidestream treatment. Preliminary alternatives may also consider a combination of these options. Resource recovery via sidestream algal treatment is another solution that may be considered. This would require piloting to evaluate nitrogen recovery as an option instead of nitrogen removal.

Optimization of Existing Infrastructure: Options to enhance the current pilot BNR performance and capacity by adjusting the solids retention time (SRT) and other operational changes are being considered. The piloting of this alternative has been ongoing before the release of the 2024 Nutrients Watershed Permit and significant nitrogen reduction has already been demonstrated for part of the dry weather season.

10. **Question:** Can you please confirm that the projected design year condition that should be considered for upgrade alternative evaluations is 2025?

Answer: The District is currently completing an internal flow and loading projections task. Therefore, the design year condition that should be considered for the alternatives analysis completed through this project is not finalized. The District anticipates a 30-year planning horizon for this project; Design conditions for master planning will likely be based on flow and loading projections for 2055.

11. **Question:** RFP page A-8 (PDF page 21) notes that “references MUST be included for the relevant experiences listed for each person.” Can you please confirm that references are required only for Key Personnel listed in our team organization chart, and that additional team members listed who will support the project do not also need to provide references for their relevant experience?

Answer: Yes, references are only required for Key Personnel listed in the team organization chart. See Item 3 under the “RFP Revisions” section of this addendum for clarity and confirmation on reference requirements.

THIS ADDENDUM MUST BE SUBMITTED WITH THE PROPOSAL.


Maxwell Armenta
Associate Civil Engineer

Pre-Proposal Conference and Site Walk Attendee List

Full Name	Company Name	Email	Conference Attendance	Site Walk Attendance
Maxwell Armenta	EBMUD	maxwell.armenta@ebmud.com	In person	In person
Darren Garza	EBMUD	darren.garza@ebmud.com	In person	In person
Kaitlin McGovern-Zhou	Hazen	kmcgovern@hazenandsawyer.com	In person	
Steven Kessler	Hazen	skessler@hazenandsawyer.com	In person	
Rion Merlo	Hazen	rmerlo@hazenandsawyer.com	In person	
Joe Huang	AECOM	joe.huang@aecom.com	In person	In person
Catalina Alvarado	AECOM	catalina.alvarado-claro@aecom.com	In person	In person
Sarah Schoepflin	AECOM	sarah.schoepflin@aecom.com	In person	In person
Cory Lancaster	Jacobs	cory.lancaster@jacobs.com	In person	In person
Matt Noesen	Jacobs	matt.noesen@jacobs.com	In person	In person
Katy Solem	Carollo	ksolem@carollo.com	In person	In person
Linda Sawyer	Brown and Caldwell	lsawyer@brwnald.com	In person	In person
Andrew Gharagozian	Carollo	agharagozian@carollo.com	In person	In person
Kyle Leonard	Carollo	kleonard@carollo.com	In person	In person
Leslie Knapp	Brown and Caldwell	lknapp@brwnald.com	In person	
Harpreet Rai	Woodard Curran	harpreet.ra@woodardcurran.com	In person	In person
Sara Sadreddini	Black & Veatch	sadreddinis@bv.com	In person	In person
Craig Lichty	Black & Veatch	lichtyc@bv.com	In person	In person
Matthew Hoeft	EBMUD	matthew.hoeft@ebmud.com	Virtual	
Beverly Johnson	EBMUD	beverly.johnson@ebmud.com	Virtual	
Susan Dennis	Jacobs	susan.dennis@jacobs.com	Virtual	
Simon Baker	AECOM	simon.baker@aecom.com	Virtual	
Jackie Odonoghue	AECOM	jacqueline.odonoghue@aecom.com	Virtual	
Scott Wheatley	AECOM	scott.wheatley@aecom.com	Virtual	
Morgan Lecour	Jacobs	morgan.lecour@jacobs.com	Virtual	
Jessica Mamos	Hazen and Sawyer	jmamos@hazenandsawyer.com	Virtual	