CITY OF COLUMBUS
BID WAIVER INFORMATION FORM

TO ACCOMPANY LEGISLATION WHICH WAIVES ANY PROVISIONS OF COLUMBUS CITY CODES CHAPTER 329
(PLEASE LIMIT YOUR RESPONSE TO THIS SHEET)

1. Reasons for waiving City Code bid procedure:

    [ ]   emergency breakdown causing unplanned need

    [ ]   item to be purchased is of a perishable nature

    [ ]   need to extend and existing contract

    [ ]   there is not enough time to obtain formal bids to satisfy need

    [ ]   non-price error on either the bidder's or the City's part in the bid proposal

    [ ]   a new law or regulation requires immediate compliance

    [X]   other   Nature of commodity warrants limited competitive bidding

2. Detailed explanation of reason (must be completed by division):

    The Hap Cremean Water Plant is in the process of preparing to undertake a series of concurrent pilot-scale demonstration studies designed to improve treatment for disinfection byproduct precursors, primarily dissolved organic compounds. This project is being undertaken by Burgess & Niple, Inc. with Montgomery Watson Harza as subconsultant. Among other engineering responsibilities, the consultant team was contracted to perform an evaluation of methods of optimizing the existing treatment processes at the Hap Cremean Water Plant.

    One of the purposes of the upcoming pilot-scale demonstration studies is to evaluate the performance of the processes being demonstrated at the pilot-scale level against optimized existing conventional treatment. A series of bench-scale jar tests were performed by the consultant, in concert with City of Columbus employees, to determine chemical feed rates that best optimize the existing system using chemicals currently used at the Hap Cremean Water Plant. Following this, a second phase of testing was conducted to evaluate alternate chemicals. Among the jar tests performed as part of this second phase were a series of coagulant-aid polymers.

    In order to have a wide variety of polymers to evaluate, the consultant contacted the following polymer suppliers by telephone to obtain samples for this study. Each supplier was asked to provide as many samples as they could for consideration. The lead time for conducting the study was short, and some suppliers did not respond.

    Ashland, Inc. (Praestol Series) – (877) 234-3177
      Steve Karakas (Local Sales Representative – Tidewater Products) (419) 297-1008
      Isabelle – (419) 534-9870

    Bonded Chemicals Inc. – Brett McMillen (614) 777-9240

    Call Max, Inc. (EC 460, 470 Series) – Melanie Thompson (800) 369-2922

    Kemira Water (Superfloc Series) – Bethany (785) 842-7424
      Paul Besenti, (Local Sales Representative) (216) 533-1053

    Nalco (Calgon) – Shayne Hare (513) 772-5300

    Pristine Water Solutions – Tony Malone (800) 562-1537; (847) 689-1100

    SNF – Eric Butler (Polydine, Inc.) (313) 506-5755
      Scott Ramey (912) 884-3366, ext. 716

A total of twenty polymers were made available by the suppliers at the time of testing and were used in the jar test evaluation. These included:

Clarifloc C308	Superfloc C572	Praestol K110L
Clarifloc C309	Superfloc C573	Praestol K111L
Clarifloc C318	Superfloc C577	Praestol 186K
Clarifloc C338	Superfloc C587	Praestol 186KH
Clarifloc C349	Superfloc C591	Praestol 187K
Clarifloc C379		Praestol 187KH
		Praestol 188K
		Praestol 189K
		Praestol 193K

Each coagulant-aid polymer was dosed at the same nominal dose based on commercially available strength. Each coagulant-aid polymer was evaluated against current treatment practices to determine the best-performing polymers with respect to reduction in turbidity and UV_{254} absorbance. These two parameters indirectly indicate disinfection byproduct formation potential.

Based on this analysis, two polymers (Praestol 189K and Superfloc C577) exhibited the lowest settled-water UV_{254} and turbidity. Even though both coagulant-aid polymers were effective, Superfloc C577 was selected for further testing because it exhibited the lowest settled-water turbidity value. This is believed to have a stronger correlation to disinfection byproduct formation potential. The selected coagulant-aid polymer was then tested at a variety of dose rates along with a variety of alum (coagulant) dose rates. This test resulted in identification of an optimal coagulant dose in combination with an optimal coagulant-aid polymer dose.

Based on the findings from this phase of bench-scale tests, the consultant recommended that either of the two best performing polymers should next be evaluated at full-scale to further verify the performance of a coagulant-aid. The full-scale testing is to be performed on one-half of the overall plant production.

Schedule for this project is critical. The coagulant-aid polymer system is proposed to be tested at full-scale in mid-December through mid-January, immediately prior to start-up of the two pilot-scale demonstration studies and subsequent additional bench-scale testing. If this proves to be successful, the use of a coagulant-aid polymer is proposed to be continued through a period of up to one year, concurrent with the pilot-scale demonstration studies.

The contract with the consultant provides for some chemical purchase equivalent to one month's usage at full-scale and half the average plant production. The City needs to purchase polymer for any period of study beyond this initial month of operation.

Approval for bid waiver is requested to enable the balance of the pilot-scale demonstration studies to proceed without delaying the schedule associated with those studies.

---

3. Informal procedure used:

   [ ] telephone quotations

   [X] written quotations

   [ ] negotiations

---

4. Informal bids received and prices for each:

   Informal bids have been received for each of the following two coagulant-aid polymers:

   Tidewater Products, Inc. (City of Columbus Contract Compliance No. 341884164)
   Product: Praestol 189K

Informal Bid: $ 0.85, per pound

Bonded Chemicals, Inc. (City of Columbus Contract Compliance No. 611162384)
Product: Superfloc C577
Informal Bid $ 0.819, per pound

---

5.   If lowest bid was not accepted, explain criteria for award:

ORDINANCE #:

APPROVED BY: *Authorized Approval on Corresponding Legislative File*

DATE: