

ADDENDUM # 2

**CITY OF TORRANCE
3031 Torrance Blvd.
Torrance, CA 90503**

RFP NO. B2021-04

RFP for Design Build Fuel System at Torrance Municipal Airport

ADDENDUM # 2 - Issued 03/25/21

THE FOLLOWING CHANGES ARE HEREBY INCORPORATED INTO AND MADE A MANDATORY PART OF SUBJECT RFP:

CLARIFY: The Proposal Due Date remains on **Monday, April 5, 2021 by 3:00 PM** in the Office of the City Clerk, 3031 Torrance Blvd., Torrance, CA 90503. **NO FAXED PROPOSALS ACCEPTED.**

Below are questions raised during the RFP preparation period with answers in bold:

1. This is advertised as a Design Build project which means there should be a great deal of latitude given to what can be proposed by the bidder / General Contractor. And yet these specifications are very proscriptive and in several instances contradict the very answers and guidance your office provided on the last RFP effort.

It is the intent of the city to provide guidelines as to the required overall design, for example tank size, tank location, and configuration of piping system for the generator and fuel dispenser. The city is not detailing any specific manufacturer, material, installation means or methods. As long as the parameters that have been provided by the city are met then the contractor is free to provide a scope detailing their design and installation methods of the requested system.

2. This is further amplified with the statement that the "RFP is as descriptive (meaning proscriptive) as possible". This seems to limit or eliminate the innovative ideas and the installation experience of those of us who install these systems on a regular basis and know what works, meets the codes, and is most cost effective. This appears to be the case in the current Torrance RFP.

The city is requiring that the contractor have the experience necessary to build a compliant system as long as the minimum guidelines are met as described in the answer above. All means and methods are at the discretion of the contractor.

3. There are Confusing and somewhat conflicting and out of date statements regarding Vapor Recovery, (see below).
One statement in the new RFP references a Balanced system / another references re-using the Heath Tank that was to be removed and eliminated on the last RFP. Another statement references the Hirt Burner which the airport will definitely not want to have an open flame in that vicinity. Additionally, there are rather strict Executive Orders from the State of California regarding these two un-needed and unnecessary systems that are separate and distinct for each and will make the new system more expensive and more difficult to maintain.

All city vehicles are ORVR compatible therefore the new system will be required to be built meeting the same ORVR standards. No Phase II vapor recovery will be required.

4. The State has not defined Remote Dispensing (Distance from the tank to the dispenser), we do not know if SCAQMD has defined a Remote (Distance), however the true concern is the allowable percentage of PHASE II emissions, not the length of the pipe itself. This is called PHASE II Vapor Return Efficiency, at the state level the requirement is 95% PHASE II Vapor Return Efficiency. Our system safely achieves that standard without the need for either of these units.

All city vehicles are ORVR compatible therefore the new system will be required to be built meeting the same ORVR standards. No Phase II vapor recovery will be required.

5. If this is a design/build project being issued to professional design engineers and installers, why is the City telling us how to build the system and build it wrong?

The city is not detailing any specific manufacturer, material, installation means or methods. As long as the parameters that have been provided by the city are met then the contractor is free to provide a scope detailing their design and installation methods of the requested system.

6. Are we or are we not to dispose of the unneeded Heath Tank as was directed in the first RFP?

The Healy tank is no longer required as all vehicles are ORVR compatible.

7. Why does the City wish to re-use or install a useless and open-flame Hirt Burner on this RFP and did not need or require it on the first RFP. Does the City know that under the Code, a "balanced system" does not require the Hirt Burner to be part of the installation.

All city vehicles are ORVR compatible and a Hirt system will not be required.

8. Does the City have a specific size and manufacturer in mind for the double walled piping that will run from the tank and across the driveway to the "future Generator Location" or do they expect the design / builder to select and specify?

It has been determined that the existing generator can handle the load of the future EOC and no new generator will be needed (Ref: page 19 RFP2021-04).

**REFERENCE POINTS TO QUESTIONS ABOVE AS SHOWN IN THE RFP
SEE: RFP for Design Build Fuel System PAGE 15**

SEE stated intent that this RFP is to be as descriptive as possible **PAGE 15**

SEE: Cost includes all required permit fees through the Torrance Fire, Planning, Building Departments and the SCAQMD **PAGE 15**

9. PHASE VII DISPENSER - conflict in specifications. Provide and Install all new gasoline (balance) hoses and nozzle and breakaway (with balance system Hirt Burner not required. City must have gained approval for balance vapor recovery). PAGE 18

All city vehicles are ORVR compatible, and the system will not require Phase II vapor recovery.

10. PHASE VIII DISPENSER SYSTEM PIPING "2" steel pipe from the tank, above ground to the new dispenser pan PAGE 18 -

Yes

11. PHASE XIV TANK REMOVAL Make AQMD rule #1166 notification PAGE 21 –

Yes

12. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION “The City would like the Heath Tank (above ground vapor recovery tank) to be incorporated into the new system PAGE 23 when on the last RFP it was to be removed and eliminated??

This is not required because all city vehicles are ORVR compatible.

13. “There should be room to place the Hirt burner 20” from the Unleaded vent PAGE 23 (not needed)

Correct, the hirt burner 20” is not needed.

SUMMARY:

We are seeking clarification and answers to why, if we are the engineer and designers, on a design /build contract and must submit new conceptual drawings for the City to evaluate, why are we being asked to design something we know to be conflicting and not at a current standard being used in the industry?

The city recognizes there was conflicting information in the RFP documents related to the Healy system and a Hirt system. The Healy system and Hirt system are not required for this above ground tank installation and shall not be included in your proposal. The 15,000-gallon tank is not listed as an approved size in the uniform fire code (max size is 12,000 gallon) however local fire authorities do have the ability to issue an exception if certain parameters are met. The city strives to provide some level of minimum requirements for every design build project. The purpose of listing this job as design build is so the contractor is responsible for any issues related to compliance and equipment meeting regulatory guidelines as well as to detail expectations for a better means of comparing competitive bid proposals to meet the minimum requirements. It is the intent of the city to provide guidelines as to the required overall design. The city is not detailing any specific manufacturer, material, installation means or methods. As long as the parameters that have been provided by the city are met then the contractor is free to provide a scope detailing their design and installation methods of the requested system.

Please return this addendum with your bid proposal. Failure to acknowledge addenda and submit it with your proposal may render the proposal non-responsive and cause it to be rejected. I hereby acknowledge receipt of this addendum.

Name of Company

Address

City State Zip Code