Addendum No. 1

Subject: RFP to PROFESSIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING SERVICES FOR GEOTECHNICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENTS

Due: April 23, 2018 at 3:00 PM

Location: Various Schools

This Addendum, dated April 10, 2018, shall modify and become part of the RFP Proposal. Any items not mentioned herein, or affected by, shall remain strictly in accordance with the original document.

The District will accept Proposals no later than 3:00pm on Monday, April 23, 2018.

New Addition to the RFP submittal requirements.

All Proposers should include an electronic thumb drive/CD copy of the “Final Master Copy” of the proposal document. This is in addition to all required paper copies outlined in the RFP.

**Question #1.**
What is the required laboratory turn-around time for analytical samples. Is it 10 business days at the laboratory with the assumption that the results of the analytical data is provided, in preliminary form, to the School District within 15 business days?

**Answer #1.**
All responders should provide pricing for all analytical sample turnaround times as ten (10) business days. All results are to be reported to the School District upon receipt from the Laboratory.

**Question #2.**
Regarding the Labor Category, Item 8 - is the UMR certified tank inspector a typo? Should the PADEP designation be IUM as indicated in the enclosed summary of PADEP certification categories for storage tanks?

**Answer #2.**
Replace the URM certification reference with the correct reference to IUM Certification.

**Question #3.**
With regard to the Sample Contract for Environmental Consulting Services for Geotechnical and Environmental Site Assessments, specifically page 59, regarding Environmental Liability/Contractor’s Pollution Insurance, can you please confirm, as has been done in the past, that the School District will accept a claims made policy. The Sample Contract now states "... At its sole discretion, the School
District may accept a claims made policy with a "tail" of 3 years after the date of final payment by the School District. If the School District decides to accept such a claims made policy, this decision will be indicated in the RFP/RFQ, Addendum or the RFP/RFQ, Questions and Answers."

**Answer #3.**
Yes, the District will accept a claims made policy with a tail.

**Question #4.**
Can a consulting firm submit a response to the RFP as a prime or lead consultant and also be included in a separate response submittal as a subcontractor to a different prime or lead consulting firm?

**Answer #4.**
Yes.

**Question #5.**
Is it possible for you to provide a list of the incumbent(s) to this contract?

**Answer #5.**
Batta Environmental, Kleinfelder and KEM Partners.

**Question #6.**
Attachments A through G are required to be submitted for all businesses responding to this RFP. Which of these attachments, if any, are required to be submitted for proposed subcontractors?

**Answer #6.**
Subcontractors required submittals could be applicable for all attachments except A and H.

**Question #7.**
What does Attachment H (Fee Schedule) Section B. 9. Collection of Phase 1 Data apply to?

**Answer #7.**
This line item can be deleted.

**Question #8.**
Based on the all inclusive pricing schedule for Compliance Monitoring Class A Operator, Class B Operator, Class C Operator, is it the intent of the School District to outsource their Class A, B & C Operator services?

**Answer #8.**
Yes.

**Question #9.**
What unit applies to the Class A, B & C Operator line items?

**Answer #9.**
Hourly.

**Question #10.**
Section 6.0, Tab 3, asks for three (minimum) client references. In Section 8.0, Evaluation Criteria, it states the level of client satisfaction determined from supplied references (5 minimum). How many client references does the School District wish to review in each proposal?

**Answer #10.**
Three (3).

**Question #11.**
Section 6.0, Tab 1, states that Attachment F (Acceptance of Terms and Conditions of the Contract) should be included in the cover letter. Tab 7 also includes a requirement to provide a signed and sealed Attachment F. Should Attachment F be included in Tab 1 and Tab 7, or just in Tab 7?
Answer #11.
Include with the Cover Letter.

Question #12.
Section 6.0, Tab 2, “sample reports” are requested. Would the School District Philadelphia expand on this requirement, such as to the number of reports wanted, the type (Geotechnical or ESA) of reports sought, and if paper or electronic copies on CD should be provided?
Answer #12.
One of each would be acceptable. Electronic copies would also be acceptable.

Question #13.
Was the contract awarded previously? If so, can the names of the incumbent firms be provided?
Answer #13.
Yes, contracts were awarded to Batta Environmental, Kleinfelder and KEM Partners.

Question #14.
If the contract was awarded previously, what has been the annual value of the services provided under the contract?
Answer #14.
The current budget for this contract is $625,000. There is no guarantee or value of award to any one vendor or groups of vendors.

Question #15.
Does the SDP intend to award this contract to multiple firms?
Answer #15.
Yes, if it is found to be in the best interest of the District.

Question #16.
Will preparation of specific scopes of work and cost estimates be required prior to beginning individual projects scheduled for completion as part of the contract? If so, can this work be charged based upon the unit rate schedule to be provided as part of the RFP response?
Answer #16.
There is the potential for some projects, assignments or work orders to require cost estimates and “Scope of Work” details. The District does not pay for the associated cost for these preparations.

Question #17.
Do prevailing wage rates apply for non-professional services?
When is union labor needed for the subcontractors?
Does prevailing wage apply?
Answer #17.
In general, this is a Professional Services Contract. For some long duration projects, it may become necessary for sub-contractors to utilize union labor. This can be resolved between all parties on a case by case basis.

Question #18.
Was the duration of the expiring contract 4 years?
Answer #18.
No, the previously contract was for 1 year with an additional 1 year renewal option.
**Question #19**
How many USTs were removed or installed during the expiring contract?

**Answer #19**
Approximately 5 per year.

**Question #20**
How many Phase I were conducted over the last contract term?

**Answer #20**
Approximately 15-20 per year.

**Question #21**
There are 3 levels of Phase II investigations defined in the RFQ. How many of each of these were performed over the expiring contract?

**Answer #21**
The various types of projects and assignments are hard to predict. No amount of work is guaranteed.

**Question #22**
Does the district have a preventative maintenance or infrastructure plan for tanks?

**Answer #22**
Yes.

**Question #23**
The tasks in the RFQ appear to be more weighted to environmental than geotechnical. Approximately how much of the contract work falls under true geotechnical services for the expiring contract?

**Answer #23**
The various types of projects and assignments are hard to predict. No amount of work is guaranteed.

**Question #24**
Can you clarify the services that the school district is requesting for the final item in the all inclusive pricing schedule of Attachment H?

**Answer #24**
This Compliance Monitoring with Chapter 245.436 regarding Regulated Tanks services of the PA DEP Regulations are currently under contract, therefore the District is unclear as to what clarification with the regulation and/or all inclusive pricing is being requested. Here is a link to the regulation.
http://www.dep.pa.gov/Business/Land/Tanks/Underground-Storage-Tanks/Pages/UST-Operators.aspx

**END OF ADDENDUM NO. 1**