

**Alaska Department of
Environmental Conservation
Division of Air Quality**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL 180000001
State Implementation Plan Development and
Technical Support
AMENDMENT 1**

Date of Issue: July 26, 2017

Amendment 1 to State Implementation Plan Development and Technical Support serves to respond to inquiries and amend language in the RFP.

This amendment includes responses to inquiries received from proposers. The inquiries and responses begin on page 2 and end on page 5 of this Amendment. Sections 5.03 Deliverables, Section 5.04, and 7.01 Evaluation of Proposals contain amended language and begin on page 6 and end on page 7. This Amendment is hereby made part of the RFP and is a total of 7 pages.

Issued by:
Laurel Shoop, Procurement Specialist I
907-465-5037

Item 1: Below are the inquiries from proposers received by DEC. Following each inquiry is the DEC response.

Inquiry 1: Does a certification from a state and/or federal agency constitute acceptable “evidence of [MBE or WBE] certification” to be submitted with the proposal as stated in Sec. 2.13, p. 13?

Response 1: The State will accept certifications for MBE/WBE consistent with the certifications accepted by the EPA.

Inquiry 2: Will the ADEC grant the 5% preference for a bid team which includes a certified MBE/WBE subcontractor?

Response 2: No, the preference is only based on the qualifications of the prime contractor submitting a proposal.

Inquiry 3: Sections 3.01 and 3.10 both state that “The contract resulting from this RFP will be a Firm Fixed Price...”. Section 3.11.01 states the bidder’s “...proposed price shall be a fixed price for actual services rendered for the performance and completion of the deliverables identified...”. Section 6.05 states that “The Offeror shall submit Appendix F...and it shall include all costs as a Fully Burdened Rate...”. Based on this, we plan to fill out the Cost Proposal-Experience Worksheets, Labor Costs – Tab d worksheet with the fully burdened hourly labor rates for each key named member of our project team, including key named members of our proposed subcontractor’s team. Similarly, fully burdened hourly labor rates would be entered for additional staff lumped by job title (Associate, Researcher, Support Staff, etc.). This means that we would simply enter zeros in the Labor Over Head Rate, Labor G&A Rate, and Project/Task Fee columns of Cost Form – Tab c. Please let us know if this is acceptable or if a different approach to completing the Cost Proposal-Experience Worksheets is required. We do not believe that bare (unloaded) labor rates need to be provided for a Firm Fixed Price contract.

Response 3: The language in sections 3.01 and 3.11 specify the type of contract as a Firm Fixed Price contract, and the rates proposed as Fully Burdened Rates. This means all rates proposed are fully burdened and must contain all associated costs. In Appendix F, we require the rates proposed be broken down into the various fields and tabs as provided. This will allow DEC the ability to review the detail within the fully burdened rates. Therefore you will need to enter the actual proposed amounts in each of the Labor Over Head Rate, Labor G&A Rate, Project Task/Fee columns rather than entering a zero. Entering a zero in the Cost Form, Tab c will result in the proposal being found non-responsive.

Inquiry 4: Discrepancies exist between the mandatory minimum number of years of experience listed in Sec. 5.04 and those listed in Tab b of Appendix F for the following three areas - please indicate the correct mandatory minimum number of years required for each of these:

Amendment 1

RFP 180000001 State Implementation Plan Development and Technical Support

- a. Emission Inventory/SIP Development - Preparing stationary source emission inventories
- b. Emission Inventory/SIP Development - experience developing various SIP documents
- c. Experience with EPA MOVES model

Response 4: The minimum years of experience are stated correctly in Appendix F, Tab b. The language in section 5.04 is amended within Item 2 of the RFP amendment (see pages 6).

Inquiry 5: Section 2.13 Application of Preferences: The RFP does not indicate if the 5% preference for MBEs/WBEs would be applied to only prime contractors, or might be applied to subcontractors. We assume that the preference would only be applied if the prime contractor is the MBE/WBE; is that correct?

Response 5: See the response to Inquiry 2.

Inquiry 6: Section 5.03.03 (ME) Task 3: There are two Task 3s. Should these be Task 3 (Regional Haze: International Transport) and Task 4 (Region Haze: Emission Inventory), while changing the current Task 4 to Tsk 5 (Idle-Reduction program, quantifying emission benefits)?

Response 6: The correct titles for each task are listed below and amended within Item 2 of the RFP amendment (see page 6):

Task 1: Regional Haze Regulatory Analysis/Approach Development

Task 2: Regional Haze Ambient Data Analysis

Task 3: Regional Haze: International Transport

Task 4: Regional Haze: Emission Inventory

Task 5: Idle-Reduction program, quantifying emission benefits

Inquiry 7: Section 5.04 (ME) Experience and Qualifications and Personnel: The last paragraph under “Staff and Personnel” requests “...3 reference names and phone numbers for similar projects the Offeror’s firm has completed.” If a prime contractor engages a subcontractor, then does ADEC require 3 references for the prime contractor only, or does ADEC require 3 references for the prime and 3 references for each subcontractor?

Response 7: The 3 references should be for the prime contractor only, unless a subcontractor is being used to meet minimum qualification requirements. If a subcontractor is needed to meet minimum qualifications of a specific category, then 3 references should be included for the subcontractor. If the prime contractor can meet all the minimum qualifications, references are not needed for a subcontractor.

Amendment 1

RFP 180000001 State Implementation Plan Development and Technical Support

Inquiry 8: 5.01(h) and 5.04 (ME) Experience and Qualifications and Personnel: The SOW requests that the contractor provide I/M program evaluation support; however, both the Fairbanks and Anchorage I/M programs have been suspended. Therefore, could ADEC please provide more specific information regarding what kind of support this contract will require if these programs are no longer operating?

Response 8: The I/M programs have been suspended for Anchorage and Fairbanks with regards to carbon monoxide, however they are still committed contingency measures and must be reinstated should either community fail to meet their maintenance requirements. In addition, Fairbanks PM2.5 nonattainment area is currently undergoing its Best Available Control Measure Analysis (BACM), vehicles are a contributing source. An I/M program has not been ruled out as a possible control measure for PM2.5 or its precursor NOx. Should an I/M program or a quasi-program be BACM, then this contract would support efforts in implementing that program. Finally, as mentioned, Butte in the Matsu area is close to nonattainment. Should they become a nonattainment area within the life of the contract, it is conceivable that an I/M program would have to be evaluated for that community as well under the Reasonable Available Control Measure (RACM) requirements.

Inquiry 9: Section 5.03 Deliverables (pp. 26-28) lists two Task 3s, under 5.03.03 and 5.03.04, followed by Task 4 (5.03.05). The text preceding the list refers to completing four tasks, and the Evaluation Criteria in Section 7.01, as well as several other areas (including the cost spreadsheets), refer to Tasks 1-4. Please clarify the task numbering and tasks.

Response 9: Please see response 6, and note there are 5 tasks. Only the first 4 tasks are included in Appendix F and are for cost proposal scoring purposes. All 5 tasks need to be included in the narrative of the technical proposal. The table in subsection 7.01 Evaluation of Proposals is amended within Item 2 of the RFP amendment (see pages 6 through 7).

Inquiry 10: Section 5.04 Experience (p. 29) begins with “The following is a list of positions,” but no list of positions is provided.

Response 10: The “list of positions” in section 5.04 refers to the following:

Firm

Project Manager(s)

Project Team – individuals to be associated with each of the listed areas (Emission Inventory/SIP Development, Experience with EPA MOVES Model, Experience Evaluating Vehicle Control Strategies, Transportation Planning, Strategic Planning and Negotiation)

Inquiry 11: The Evaluation Criteria table in Section 7.01 refers in the first column to

Amendment 1

RFP 180000001 State Implementation Plan Development and Technical Support

RFP Sections 5.03.01-.05, but the second column includes Potential Future Deliverables, which is Section 5.03.06. Please clarify which sections are included in the technical evaluation criteria, and the level of detail required to address the FY18 Tasks versus the Potential Future Deliverables (5.03.06).

Response 11: All sections 5.03.01 through 5.03.06 are included in the technical evaluation criteria, an updated table in section 7.01 is provided within Item 2 herein. The level of detail should be sufficient to provide a quality proposal that demonstrates expertise and a sound approach. It is up to proposers to decide the level and quality of detail provided in its proposal.

Inquiry 12: In the third paragraph under 5.03 Deliverables on p. 26, it states “covering the second implementation period of 2018-2028.” Please confirm that this should instead state 2018-2021.

Response 12: The third paragraph in section 5.03 Deliverables is amended within Item 2 of the RFP amendment (see page 6).

Inquiry 13: Please confirm (or clarify) that the primary sections required for the Technical Proposal are as follows:

- ☐ 6.04 Cover Letter, which will include the Appendix E Debarment form
- ☐ 5.03 Deliverables, which will include understanding of the tasks and the scope of work (and Potential Future Deliverables, if required)
- ☐ 5.04 Experience and Qualifications and Personnel, which will include a management plan and Tabs a and b from Appendix F Worksheets (For ease of presentation, resumes may be placed in an appendix.)

Response 13: The sections that are required to be included in the technical proposal are the Cover Letter, noted in section 6.04; responses to each ME criteria noted in section 5.03 and its subsections; responses to the ME criteria noted in section 5.04; and the required submittals within Appendix F. Section 5.03.06 is noted as an E criteria, which means it is not required within the technical proposal, but is evaluated. If a proposal does not include section 5.03.06 it will receive a score of zero for that section.

Item 2: Language within the RFP that is hereby amended, either in part or whole, is noted below.

The third paragraph in Section 5.03 Deliverables is hereby amended to read as follows:

5.03 Deliverables

“The Contractor shall, for purposes of this RFP, perform the following Tasks identified for the technical support and development of the Regional Haze SIP to meet the requirements for the periodic comprehensive revision that is due to EPA by July 31, 2021, and the Anti-Idling Program. Identify, very specifically, the level of detail and effort proposed and needed to accomplish each task and subtask(s) below.”

The heading for subsection 5.03.04 is hereby amended as follows:

“5.03.04 (ME) FY18 Task 4: Regional Haze: Emission Inventory”

The heading for subsection 5.03.05 is hereby amended as follows:

“5.03.05 (ME) FY18 Task 5: Idle-Reduction program, quantifying emission benefits”

Within the subsection entitled Experience in Section 5.04, the bullets under 2. Emission Inventory/SIP Development are hereby amended to read as follows:

- “3 years experience in preparing mobile, non-road, and area source emission inventories”
- “3 years experience in analyzing and evaluating air pollution control strategies for mobile, non-road, and area sources”
- “3 years experience in preparing stationary source emission inventories”
- “3 years experience running emission, dispersion, photochemical grid, and/or statistical model – specific experience using MCIP, SMOKE, and CMAQ models should be emphasized.”
- “3 years experience running dispersion models for stationary sources”
- “3 years experience developing various SIP documents”

Within the subsection entitled Experience in Section 5.04, the bullet under 3. Experience with EPA Moves Model is hereby amended to read as follows:

- “3 years experience with the MOVES model. Include all experience with the model; experience using the model for cold weather climates is preferred. Experience with SMOKE/MOVES is also desired.”

The technical proposal evaluation table in Section **7.01 Evaluation of Proposals** is hereby amended as follows:

“

RFP Section	Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria	Points
5.03.01-.06	FY18 Tasks 1-5 and Potential Future Deliverables	
	Understanding of the Tasks	10
	Methodology of Tasks	20
	Management of Tasks	10
5.04	Experience, Qualifications and Personnel	
	Quality and Relevance	20

”