



**RFP for
Engineering Consultant Services for Power Generation System Master Plan Project**

Addendum #1 - Revision 1 (Dated 10/6/2026)

Notice is hereby given that Request for Proposal Documents have been revised as follows (changes noted in red):

I. STATEMENT OF WORK

D. Deliverables / Reports

The Anticipated Major Project Milestones table has been updated, specifically the date for Task 3.1 and Tasks 6 and 7 have been updated consistent with this Addendum.

ANTICIPATED MAJOR PROJECT MILESTONES

Event	Date
Project Kickoff	January 2027
Task 2 Data Collection and Review	February 2027
Task 2.1 Project Assumptions and Constraints	February 2027
Task 2.2 Project Condition and Risk Assessment Review	March 2027
Task 3.1 Air Regulations Future Projection	~~June~~ May 2027
Task 3.2 Screening of Technologies and Alternatives	May 2027
Task 3.3 Alternatives Evaluation Criteria and Approach	May 2027
Task 3.4 Develop Preliminary Alternatives	June 2027
Task 3.5 Refined Alternatives Analysis	July 2027
Task 4 PGS Capital Project Roadmap	August 2027
Task 5 PGS Master Plan Report	October 2027
Task 6 ~~Optional Services~~ Flare Capacity Assessment and Recommendations	~~TBD~~ April 2027
Task 7 Optional Services	TBD

EXHIBIT E – SCOPE OF WORK

I. CONSULTANT SERVICES

Task 6: Flare Capacity Assessment and Recommendations is added, and Task 6: Optional Services is modified to be Task 7.

Task 6: Flare Capacity Assessment and Recommendations

CONSULTANT shall work with the DISTRICT to identify flare capacity constraints and requirements. CONSULTANT and DISTRICT will determine if any immediate steps can be taken to improve flare capacity, what minor and major improvements are required to meet flaring capacity requirements. As part of the initial steps, CONSULTANT shall assist with flare troubleshooting/tuning – and work with DISTRICT to identify solutions to existing operational problems with the flares. CONSULTANT shall explore options to return “old” flare capacity to historical levels and determine if a new flare is required to meet capacity needs. A flare expert is required to address this work. At least two three-hour site visits are expected in completing this work.

Task 6 Deliverable:

- **Flare Capacity Technical Memorandum.** The CONSULTANT shall summarize the issues with the existing flares, completed and needed modifications as well as capital project requirements to achieve required flaring capacity. The technical memorandum shall include a required timeline to complete the projects and descriptions of anticipated capacity addition by repair/project.

Task 67: Optional Services

Optional services, if warranted, will be negotiated at a future date at the discretion of the DISTRICT. CONSULTANT shall include optional services they are prepared to complete in their proposal and level of effort estimate, emphasizing their expertise in addressing the scope. Optional services may include additional engineering services identified during the course of this project. At the discretion of the DISTRICT, the following services may be considered, but are not limited to:

- ~~A. Flare troubleshooting/tuning – work to identify solutions to existing operational problems with the flares. Additionally, explore options to return “old” flare capacity to historical levels and determine if a new flare is required to meet capacity needs. Flare expert required to address work.~~
- A. Gas conditioning system tuning/expansion assessment. Gas conditioning system expert required to address work.

- B. PGS-1 electrical conductors condition assessment/remaining useful life assessment
- C. Low Pressure Gas Header redundant pipeline economic assessment

...

II. PROJECT SCHEDULE COMPLETION MILESTONES

Project Kick-off	January 2027
Task 2: Data Collection and Review	February 2027
Task 2.1: Project Assumptions and Constraints	February 2027
Task 2.2: District Condition and Risk Assessment Review	March 2027
Task 3.1: Air Regulations Future Projection	May 2027
Task 3.2: Screening of Technologies and Alternatives	May 2027
Task 3.3: Alternatives Evaluation Criteria and Approach	May 2027
Task 3.4: Develop Preliminary Alternatives	June 2027
Task 3.5: Refined Alternatives Analysis	July 2027
Task 4: PGS Capital Project Roadmap	August 2027
Task 5: PGS Master Plan Report	October 2027
Task 6: Flare Capacity Assessment and Recommendations	April 2027
Task 7: Optional Services	TBD

Pre-Proposal Questions & Answers - Revision 1 (Dated 10/05/2026)

1. **Question:** Exhibit A requests a task-by-task labor-hour estimate and states that the selected proposer will provide associated costs upon request. However, Contract Equity Form P-040 asks for a “Bid/Proposal Amount,” and the draft agreement’s Exhibit B specifies reimbursement of actual labor costs plus overhead, subconsultant markup, and approved expenses. Please confirm whether any dollar amount or rate sheet should be included in the initial proposal and how proposers should complete the “Bid/Proposal Amount” field on Form P-040.

Following selection, how will the fee and maximum cost ceiling be negotiated and determined? Would the District accept a task-based lump sum fee, which would be our preference, or alternatively, an hourly, time-and-materials agreement with a negotiated fully burdened rate sheet and a not-to-exceed amount, in lieu of the actual-cost reimbursement structure in Exhibit B?

If so, will the District issue revised compensation language by addendum? If neither is acceptable, please confirm that the Exhibit B cost-reimbursement structure is mandatory.

District Response: Proposals will be assessed based on the level of effort (i.e., labor hours estimate) provided. The fee and not-to-exceed cost ceiling will be negotiated with the selected firm. The fee will be based on the level of effort (i.e., labor hours estimate) combined with hourly rates for each job classification. The Exhibit B format is required for the contract, not the proposal.

For the Contract Equity forms estimated proposal values are needed for that form.

2. **Question:** Requesting confirmation that the power demands and effects on gas production resulting from the upcoming changes to the nutrient removal requirements will be provided, and determining these are excluded from the scope of this project?

District Response: Yes, these values will be determined by a separate, ongoing project.

3. **Question:** Requesting confirmation that the critical power and digestion heat demands will be provided, and determining these are excluded from the scope of this project?

District Response: Yes, these values will be provided by the District. Sensitivity analyses may involve some estimate of a range of these parameters.

4. **Question:** In Exhibit E Scope of Work, under Task 1.1: Meetings and Workshops, on page 5, the RFP states:

The following key meetings are anticipated:

...

Management Briefings: Two management briefings will be planned for the project. One briefing will seek input from management, one month or more before the Task 3.4 Develop Preliminary Alternatives, to get buyoff on alternatives and their analyses. The second briefing will be to present draft final findings and recommendations for management input one month or more before the Task 3.5 Refined alternatives Analysis. Input will be incorporated into Task 4 Capital Project Roadmap and Task 5 final report. Meetings shall be held in person at the Main Wastewater Treatment Plant. Anticipate two (2) 1.5-hour meetings.

A) Is the District asking the consultant to seek buyoff on alternatives and analyses one month prior to the beginning of “Task 3.4 Develop Preliminary Alternatives” during which the alternatives will be developed and analyzed?

District Response: Yes.

B) Additionally, is the District asking the consultant to present draft final findings one month prior to the beginning of “Task 3.5 Refined alternatives Analysis” during which the alternatives will be refined for inclusion in the Draft Final Findings?

District Response: Yes.

5. **Question:** Optional Service C - PGS-1 Electrical Conductor Condition Assessment: Can the District provide additional clarity on the scope of this optional service? Will EBMUD electrician be available to support facility / unit access? How many days on-site are anticipated for review?

District Response: Scope to be recommended by the consultant. The facility recently had a catastrophic failure of one of the original conductors serving PGS-1. Each engine has its own set of conductors, so the plant is currently limited to up to two engines operating at a time. The conductor will be repaired shortly. The intent of this task is to provide insight into what remaining life we can expect from those conductors and some initial recommendations for rehabilitation and replacement timelines. Optional tasks are put forward to indicate what topics the District is considering, and the determination of whether to move forward with such tasks, and the precise scope of work of each task will be negotiated after selection.

6. **Question:** Optional Services A - Does the District have documented flare capacity testing, derate history, and venting event records to quantify the compliance risk driving Task 6A?

District Response: The District will share any and all available data with the selected consultant relevant to this task with the selected consultant. Optional tasks are put forward to indicate what topics the District is considering, and the determination of whether to move forward with such tasks, and the precise scope of work of each task will be negotiated after selection.

7. **Question:** What granularity of historical power generation, plant load, gas production, and heat demand data is available, and in what format? Is 15-minute or hourly interval data available for modeling?

District Response: EBMUD utilizes a database historian to log and manage tracked data. Gas flows are tracked roughly every 30 seconds, and power approximately every 30 seconds to 1 minute. 15-minute or hourly interval data can be provided. Heat demand data isn't directly tracked. Related flow data is tracked, but is not regularly used to determine heat demand.

8. **Question:** Per Jan 2025 Electrical Resiliency Master Plan, has EBMUD requested and received the Preliminary Engineering Studies for new 12kV feeds from PG&E and Port of Oakland, or 115 kV feed from PG&E?

District Response: The District has elected not to move forward with either the new 12 kV feed or the 115 kV due to cost and infeasibility concerns.

9. **Question:** The RFP body lists Task 3.1 for June 2027, but Exhibit E lists May 2027. Which date governs? Should the air regulation projection finish before technology screening (Task 3.2, May)?

District Response: May 2027 is the intended milestone. The Task 3.1 Air Regulations Projection output – if needed by other tasks – should be completed in advance of those tasks. The final negotiated contract with the selected firm will govern the schedule of the project.

10. **Question:** How many business days does EBMUD anticipate to review each draft TM, and how many draft/final cycles are expected?

District Response: The District requires a minimum of ten business days for deliverable reviews. One draft/final cycle is expected.

11. **Question:** How should we coordinate with the Dewatering Building (likely 2029) and the Nutrient Option 1/2 site layouts? Are site footprints reserved for PGS?

District Response: The District will provide any necessary space constraints due to other projects during the work of the PGS Master Plan. No site footprints are currently reserved for PGS. The intent of the PGS Master Plan in part is to identify space available for any new facilities.

12. **Question:** Is Task 2.2 a desktop review of existing condition data only, or does EBMUD expect new field inspection or testing?

District Response: The task is primarily a desktop review of existing condition data. Consultants shall budget for site visits and testing if they recommend such activities to provide value to the project.

13. **Question:** Where do the Electrical Resiliency Master Plan items stand: the PG&E preliminary engineering studies for 12 kV or 115 kV new feed, and Port of Oakland preliminary engineering study for 12 kV new feed, the new diesel standby generation, and the load shed work? Should the PGS alternatives assume a specific Wastewater Electrical Resiliency Master Plan portfolio option? (i.e. among the 4 portfolio alternatives discussed in the master plan)

District Response: The District has elected not to move forward with either the new 12 kV feed or the 115 kV due to cost and infeasibility concerns. The new diesel standby generator project is beginning design now. The load shed implementation is in progress. The District will provide direction to the selected consultant regarding near term future conditions relevant to PGS.

Mandatory Site Walk Attendee List

09/22/2026 – PGS Master Plan Mandatory Site Walk

Attendees:

Name	Company
Tom Chapman	Brown and Caldwell
Kimberly Nguyen	Brown and Caldwell
Zoe Maisel	Brown and Caldwell
Ted Couch	Jacobs
Yousef Nouri	Jacobs
Cameron Clark	Jacobs
Ryan Doyle	GHD
Jack Sutton	GHD
Hassan Modaresi	GHD
Rion Merlo	Hazen and Sawyer
James Ferro	Hazen and Sawyer
Mayur Patel	Hazen and Sawyer
Antonia (Toni) Wearmouth	Biogas Engineering
Ted Wheeler	Biogas Engineering
Justin Grissom	Burns and McDonnell
Jimmy Knights	Burns and McDonnell
Phil Giori	Black and Veatch
Randy Fiorucci	Black and Veatch
Brandon Yee	Yei Engineers
Timothy Le	Yei Engineers