

Request for Proposals for Environmental Services for Community Development Block Grant – Disaster Recovery (CDBG-DR) Program

Responses to Written Inquiries From Proposers

Published: June 7, 2019

The following questions were submitted to the LHC concerning the above-referenced Request for Proposals, published on May 24, 2019.

1. What is the anticipated annual value of this contract?

Response: An annual value has not yet been determined. The value of contract will be estimated on best cost and work approach for the projects within the CDBG Flood programs.

2. Is there an incumbent for this contract? If so, who is the incumbent?

Response: There is no incumbent for this contract.

3. D. Insurance Requirements, Item 5 Cyber Security: This insurance requirement is not typical for these scopes of work and/or professional services. Would you consider removing this requirement?

Response: The insurance requirements included in the RFP are those required by the State Office of Risk Management (ORM). A request for additional guidance has been made to ORM concerning this question, but a response has not yet been provided. These provisions will be negotiated upon the awarding of a contract to the successful proposer.

4. D. Insurance Requirements, Item 5 Cyber Security: Cyber policies are not written on an “occurrence” basis – they are written with an annual limit. So the wording at item 5. Cyber Liability “Per occurrence of \$1M” is not an accurate reflection of how these policies are structured. Please consider rewording this requirement.

Response: The insurance requirements included in the RFP are those required by the State Office of Risk Management (ORM). A request for additional guidance has been made to ORM

concerning this question, but a response has not yet been provided. These provisions will be negotiated upon the awarding of a contract to the successful proposer.

5. **D. Insurance Requirements, Item 7 Other Insurance Provisions: Item 7 indicates that GL, Auto and Cyber coverages are to be endorsed to include LHC as additional insureds. Just like on professional liability, additional insured status is not available on Cyber policies. Please consider removing the requirement of the cyber policy requiring LHC to be named as additional insured.**

Response: The insurance requirements included in the RFP are those required by the State Office of Risk Management (ORM). A request for additional guidance has been made to ORM concerning this question, but a response has not yet been provided. These provisions will be negotiated upon the awarding of a contract to the successful proposer.

6. **Is there a dollar amount or budget set aside for this contract?**

Response: Please see response to Question #1, above.

7. **Has this RFP be awarded in the past and if so who was selected last time? If previously awarded please provide a copy of the winning RFP submittal. Is there information on sites completed in the past regarding geographic location and/or services rendered for each site?**

Response: This RFP has not been advertised or awarded in the past.

8. **Is there a list or estimated number of sites to be investigated? Are there percentages by parish or regions identified by LHC? Will sites be released in batches per geographic area and what is the average number per area?**

Response: There 51 FEMA impacted parishes that are eligible for the programs encompassed under this RFP. Current estimates of properties are between 350-500 single family, or mixed unit developments. The properties will be assigned to the RFP contractor once they have passed the quality check by the program and have met title requirements.

9. **Will each site require a Phase I ESA, Part 58 Checklist, 8-step Process, Lead Risk Assessment, Lead Clearance Test, and Asbestos Survey? Or will some sites only require certain services? What are the percentages of services required for sites?**

Response: What will be necessary for each site will be dependent upon the results of inspections and analyses performed during the site visit (e.g., LBP isn't anticipated in homes built after 1978).



10. Part III. Scope of Services, B. Tasks and Services, IV. Asbestos Evaluation and Mitigation: Will units/family structures be occupied by tenants at the time of the surveys?

Response: No, units/family structures will not be occupied at the time of the surveys.

11. Part III. Scope of Services, B. Tasks and Services, IV. Asbestos Evaluation and Mitigation: For pricing purposes is there an estimated number of samples that should be used to provide the cost estimate for the asbestos/lead surveys?

Response: Proposers should provide their best determination as to what would be the most appropriate approach for the project type described in the RFP.

12. How big is the average building (SF), how many floors, and how many room per building? This is required to provide a cost for the asbestos and lead surveys.

Response: Typical structures will be 2-3 bedroom single family ground floor structures averaging 1100-1500 sq ft.

13. Part III. Scope of Services, B. Tasks and Services, IV. Asbestos Evaluation and Mitigation: Does LHC define a thorough asbestos inspection as using destructive methods to take asbestos samples and will repairs be required of the sample locations (i.e. roofing samples, pipes in walls, etc.)?

Response: Yes.

14. Part V. Proposal Response Format, E. Proposed Staff Qualifications: How does LHC define on-site availability?

Response. On-site availability is specific to meetings at the Quail location as needed.

15. Are there any restrictions prohibiting a Contractor from bidding this project as a prime contractor and submitting a separate bid with another contractor as a team?

Response: No, there is no prohibition against submitting both a bid as a prime contractor and submitting a separate bid with another contractor as a team. However, proposers are advised to familiarize themselves with the state laws and federal rules governing CDBG-DR funding concerning conflicts of interest.

16. How many LHC Board of Director Meetings should we assume for pricing purposes?

Response: Meetings are held monthly. It is not anticipated that selected proposers would be required to attend monthly meetings, but should be prepared to do so if requested. These meetings will be as required by the Executive Director or the Board

17. Will the Contractor be responsible for covering the cost of public notifications or will the publication cost will be paid by LHC. If the Contractor is to pay, please indicate the number of characters that should be used for pricing purposes?

Response: For 8-step notices, costs paid by the contractor would be reimbursable under the contract. LHC typically handles publishing the FONSI/NOI notices internally.

18. How many days will the Contractor have to complete all of the reports for issuance of access agreement?

Response: Proposers should indicate this in the timeline submitted in the work plan, as this will be a factor considered in scoring each deliverable being requested.

19. The following requested tasks/services are considered out of scope additional services for a Phase I ESA based on the ASTM Standard. Will a general statement that there is the potential for the following to be present based on the site visit suffice or are we to wait until a lead and asbestos survey is completed and include the results in the PI-ESA report?

- a. Asbestos Containing Building Materials (ACBM),
- b. Lead-Based Paint association with building and surrounding areas adjacent to structure,
- c. Mold, (As there is no separate pricing for a mold survey, how are we to make a statement concerning mold?)
- d. Threatened and Endangered Species from USFWS and LDWF (This will be covered during the NEPA review)

Response: The test should be used to finalize the comprehensive review and be evidenced in the record along with a mitigation plan/abatement necessary for the state to make a determination of “finding of no significant impact”.

20. The above listed services are outside the scope of the ASTM E1527-13 / AAI and E1528 Transaction Screen. As the contractor, we can make statements related to the potential presence of these things on this list, but only an asbestos or lead? Release would be identified in the Phase I ESA report as an REC. With our submittal, should we assume surveys / testing / reporting should be conducted for these for the items listed?

Response: Yes.

21. In the Statutory Checklist for 24 CFR Part 58.5 section #10. Explosive and Flammable Hazards – Map * Acceptable separation distance analysis would also be necessary if any element of this nature (e.g. AST) is identified. Mitigation would also be required. What extent will we need to go with the mitigation? Would this be considered beyond the scope and design will be based on a negotiated additional cost?

Response: Proposers should provide their recommended approach for the extent to which mitigation will be addressed, if at all, and provide the price point at which any such additional costs would be charged to the contract, dependent upon the level of mitigation required.

22. In the Statutory Checklist for 24 CFR Part 58.5 section #11. Noise Abatement and Control – map *DNL calculator analysis is required but airport and railroad maps are included as supporting information. Where noise is in the unacceptable range additional studies and mitigation would also be required. What extent will we need to go with the mitigation? Would this be considered beyond the scope and design will be based on a negotiated additional cost?

Response: Proposers should provide their plan to address the mitigation to the extent that any noise exceedances are sufficiently minimized, This isn't typically beyond the scope but depending on the level of mitigation required (e.g., a noise wall vs. dual pain windows) it may have to be negotiated as an additional cost.

23. Is a Louisiana State Contractors License required?

Response: Proposers must determine whether they meet and are current with the necessary licensing requirements for the scope of work provided in the RFP.

24. Will an EDR be sufficient to complete the “Examine municipal or parish planning files” or will an additional assessment of local municipality/parish files be required?

Response: Whether an EDR will be sufficient to complete this deliverable will have to be determined on a case-by-case basis.

25. Does LHC have internal specifications for the task “Examine chain of title for Environmental Liens”?

Response: No, LHC does not have internal specifications.

26. Will additional analysis beyond publically available information be required for the assessment of Lead in Drinking Water and Sole Source Aquifer Determination from EPA?

Response: The EPA determination and guidance for both would be sufficient.

27. Is Mold testing required or will a statement on the likeliness of there being Mold present suffice?

Response: A statement on the likeliness of there being mold present will be sufficient.

28. Is Radon sampling required, Or will LHC allow a general statement of what the average radon levels are for that area (as found in the EDR reports)?

Response: The LHC will allow a general statement of what the average radon levels are for the area as found in the EDR reports. They may be captured and covered within the vapor encroachment analysis, but this cannot be stated as certain.

29. Will information available via the National Wetlands Inventory website will be sufficient for wetland determination?

Response: Information will be available via the National Wetlands Inventory website will be sufficient for wetland determination only in cases where no historical wetlands have been observed. USACE determinations are required for all other wetland or floodplain situations.

30. Does LHC have internal guidance or standards pertaining to the Mercury Poisoning or Debris Flow assessments?

Response: No, the LHC does not have internal guidance or standards pertaining to Mercury Poisoning or Debris Flow assessments. The prevailing EPA guidance or standards should be used.

31. Is Earthquake Hazard Vapor Encroachment Analysis a typo and should we consider as two separate items (Earthquake Hazard and Vapor Encroachment Analysis)?

Response: Yes, please excuse the typographical error. Earthquake Hazard and Vapor Encroachment Analysis should be considered as two separate items.