



## **Request for Proposals for Environmental Services**

### ***Responses to Written Inquiries from Proposers***

**Published: November 29, 2023**

**\*\*\*All proposers are encouraged to review Addendum #1 to this RFP for Environmental Services for key changes to the RFP which include a new submission deadline for proposals, an updated “Tasks and Services” section, and an updated Deliverable Costs table. These changes supersede the original RFP and will replace the relevant sections outlined in the Addendum.\*\*\***

The following questions were submitted to the LHC concerning the above-referenced Request for Proposals for Environmental Services, originally published on November 8, 2023.

1. Page 12, No. 9 – Will the contractor be responsible for obtaining the chain-of-title and/or liens documentation or just reviewing?

**Answer: Environmental liens should be researched and provided although chain of title or liens of any other nature would be provided through the developer or their attorney.**

2. Page 12, No. 19 – How does LHC anticipate mercury poisoning to be identified? Sampling? Of soils? Groundwater? In water supply? Or based on history of property?

**Answer: The identification of potential for Mercury to be present in soils, groundwater, or water supply should be based on the history of the property (i.e., past use) or environmental database searches for possible contamination incidents.**

3. Page 13, No. 14 – Is distance to Saline Bayou the only required mapping?

**Answer: Saline Bayou is currently the only federally identified wild and scenic water body in LA so it is the only required resource to map the distance to/from the project site. State listed wild and scenic water bodies can also be mapped although they aren't required to be unless impacts are anticipated to them.**

4. Will reimbursement for public notice and/or permit fees be considered a change order request?

**Answer: The fees are typically considered as a component of the record compilation process and billed as a component of the documentation they produce.**

5. Page 17, Section B – Mentions the Joint Venture (JV), does the JV need to show experience or can the members of the JV show experience?

**Answer: If submitting as a JV provide evidence of the qualifications as a whole and identify where each JV members' focus and strengths would most likely be utilized.**

6. Section III – Scope of Services, B – Tasks and Services – I. Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) – Can the LHC provide the anticipated quantities of Phase 1 ESAs expected to be performed under this solicitation and resulting contract?

**Answer: Quantities of services needed will depend on the amount of funding received by LHC and number of awards issued over the duration of the contract.**

7. Section III – Scope of Services, B – Tasks and Services – III. Lead Testing Services – Can the LHC provide the anticipated quantities of LBP Risk Assessments and LBP clearance exams/certifications to be performed under this solicitation and resulting contract?

**Answer: See answer to Question #6.**

8. Section III – Scope of Services, B – Tasks and Services – IV. Asbestos Evaluation and Mitigation – Can the LHC provide the anticipated quantities of ACM surveys, reports, and mitigation plans to be performed under this solicitation and resulting contract?

**Answer: See answer to Question #6.**

9. Section V – Proposal Response Format, H. Cost Proposal, Deliverable Costs (*table*) – Costs per report. Can the LHC provide their planning estimates for the quantities of deliverables for each line item for which costs were requested on this table?

**Answer: See answer to Question #6.**

10. Section V – Proposal Response Format, H. Cost Proposal, Deliverable Costs (*table*) – Row 3 – “NEPA Assessment and Phase I ESA for 24 CFR Part 58.5 for Acquisition, New Construction, or Projects Involving Both Acquisition and Rehabilitation.” Does the LHC consider new construction to be categorically excluded under 24 CFR 58.25 (a)(4)(i)?

**Answer: NO.**

11. Section V – Proposal Response Format, H. Cost Proposal, Deliverable Costs (*table*) – Row 3 – “NEPA Assessment and Phase I ESA for 24 CFR Part 58.5 for Acquisition, New Construction, or Projects Involving Both Acquisition and Rehabilitation.” When the RFP references “acquisition” does the LHC intend to require an EA or an EIS?

**Answer: Projects with acquisition only activities are required to be assessed at the environmental assessment level of HUD review. An EIS would not be required unless there's a finding of significant impact associated with the site intended to be acquired.**

12. Section V – Proposal Response Format, H. Cost Proposal, Deliverable Costs (*table*) – “Cultural Resources Survey” can the LHC provide an average size of the impact area to be surveyed?

**Answer: NO, the areas of potential effect (APE) are typically determined once a site location is known. Additionally, depending on the location and tribes with interests, the APE could be further defined based on what a particular tribe(s) requests or provides within their standard operating procedures (SOP).**

13. Section V – Proposal Response Format, H. Cost Proposal, Deliverable Costs (*table*) – “Cultural Resources Survey” What type of survey is the LHC anticipating utilizing with this line item (i.e. utilizing an archaeologist to excavate/screen areas of concern; conducting a neighborhood architectural survey; or similar)?

**Answer: Whatever the site dictates is necessary unless otherwise specified by the requesting SHPO or TPHO entity.**

14. Section V – Proposal Response Format, H. Cost Proposal, Deliverable Costs (*table*) – “Cultural Resources Survey” Is it the LHC’s intent to utilize this line item for a specific parcel of land or for a larger geographic area such as a neighborhood?

**Answer: Approximate your response based on a singular parcel of land although the number of potential sites is not known at this juncture.**

15. Section V – Proposal Response Format, H. Cost Proposal, Deliverable Costs (*table*) – “Section 106 Assessments” – Is it the LHC’s intent to conduct Section 106 assessments under an approved Programmatic Agreement or initiate a full consultation with SHPO for each site?

**Answer: LHC does intend to utilize a PA when possible based on the protocol stipulated within a given PA.**

16. Section V – Proposal Response Format, H. Cost Proposal, Deliverable Costs (*table*) – “Contamination and Toxic Substances – Phase II ESA, or Risk Evaluation and Corrective Action Plan” – Can the LHC please provide some parameters for development of a cost for this line item? In order to cost this line item, the Respondent would require information such as the size of the parcel/area of concern, constituents or contaminants of concern, media of impact (soil, groundwater, vapor intrusion), depth of contamination, etc. Does the LHC perhaps want a T&M rate schedule for likely personnel for this line item? How would the LHC prefer to handle subcontractor services associated with development of a Phase II ESA (i.e. drilling companies to install monitoring wells, soil borings and for analytical laboratories and surveyors)?

**Answer: Project specifications will vary depending on applications received and awards issued over the duration of the contract.**

17. Section V – Proposal Response Format, H. Cost Proposal, Deliverable Costs (*table*) – Final section of the table that addresses LBP and Asbestos – The table states “for the following deliverables,

provide average cost per housing unit. A unit could be a single-family structure, or a unit within a multifamily structure.” If conducting these LBP or ACM surveys on a multifamily structure, how would the LHC like to address common areas such as lobbies, hallways, mail rooms, gathering rooms, etc.?

**Answer: Please see Addendum #1 to the RFP for Environmental Services that is posted on the LHC website. The Deliverable Costs table has been updated and will supersede the original costs table. In the case of a multifamily structure, the cost should be inclusive of common areas such as lobbies, hallways, mail rooms, gathering rooms, etc.**

18. What is the overall anticipated value of the contract?

**Answer: No overall contract value has been determined as it would depend on the federal funding appropriations received over the duration of the contract.**

19. Section III, Part B. Subsection I, page 11-12:

- a. Please clarify the standard (ex. ASTM 1527-21) to which the Phase I ESA scope of services item should be considered. Sub-item (3.) in this part references only ASTM 1528.

**Answer: ASTM E1527-21 is the standard practice to be utilized for Phase I Environmental Site Assessments.**

20. Section III, Part B, Subsection I, line item 21

- a. Are Earthquake Hazards and Vapor Encroachment Analysis intended to be separate line items?

**Answer: Yes, Earthquake Hazards and Vapor Encroachment Analysis should be separate line items.**

21. Section III, Part B, Subsection III (Lead testing Services), line item A

- a. Sections states that the inspector should provide a proposed Mitigation and O&M plan if lead is found. However, creation of a full Operations and Maintenance Plan is not included in descriptions of expected deliverables per Section V. with “mitigation methods”.

**Answer: The expected deliverable should include the O&M plan if applicable.**

22. Section V, Part H

- a. Included within the Table is it the agency’s intention for proposers to include Unit Costs for those items included other the section described as “Additional Deliverables that may trigger based on NEPA Assessment.”?

**Answer: Provide the cost of Additional Deliverables as the cost per each report in which the deliverable is triggered.**