CITY RESPONSES TO RFQ QUESTIONS

1. Will the cover page and TOC be included in the page limit?

   These items may be excluded from/not counted toward the 30-page (15-sheet) limit.

2. Do we need resumes and firm information for any subconsultants?

   Please provide subconsultant information indicating their scope of service for this grant, and a description of relative experience, which will be counted toward the sheet limit. ***However, individual resumes for both the submitting firm and any subconsultants will not be counted toward the page limitation***.

3. May we velo bind the proposal in lieu of comb-binding?

   The City will accept velo binding.

4. Please clarify if the Cost Proposal page limit is one double-sided sheet.

   Due to the itemized unit rates being requested per the responses below, two double-sided sheets (up to 4 pages total) may be submitted for the cost proposal.

5. Does the City have a preferred method for costing activities that have yet to be scoped? For example, the scope of a phase II assessment cannot be reliably determined until a phase I for the property has been completed.

   Proposers should not guess lump-sum costs for unknown site conditions; instead, proposers should submit an itemized cost estimate built from standardized fixed-unit prices and binding hourly/equipment rate schedules using the baseline deliverable counts and Phase II assumptions provided in Questions 6 and 7 below. The total QEP allocation under this grant is currently **$288,300**

(subject to potential grant budget adjustments if needed as funds are utilized). Once a consultant is selected, individual site scopes and not-to-exceed task orders will be issued using these binding unit and hourly rates as properties are prioritized and Phase I findings define the required work.

6. The RFQ states that the City plans to complete "at least three site assessments and cleanup plans," while the Cooperative Agreement anticipates five Phase I and II environmental site assessments and three site-specific cleanup plans/ABCAs. Should consultants base their cost proposal on five Phase I/II ESAs and three cleanup plans/ABCAs?

   Please base the cost estimates on the Cooperative Agreement's specific deliverable count:

   - Conducting 5 Phase I and II environmental site assessments,
   - Remediating 2 brownfield site(s) (include QEP oversight/engineering hourly rates only; physical remediation construction costs will be scoped separately),
   - Holding 5 community meetings,
   - Developing 3 site-specific cleanup plans/analysis of brownfield cleanup alternatives,
   - Developing 1 overall plan for revitalization,
   - Developing reuse strategies for 4 priority sites, and
   - Submitting 20 quarterly reports.

7. For proposal-costing purposes, does the City have an assumed level of effort for Phase II ESAs, such as approximate number/depth of borings, groundwater monitoring wells, soil/tailing samples, groundwater samples, analytical suites, and investigation-derived waste management?

   In order for the City to compare qualifications, consultants may rely on a hypothetical Phase II baseline as follows:

   a. ***Subsurface & Tailings Investigation:*** *Twelve (12) shallow soil/tailings borings or hand-auger/test-pit locations per site to an average depth of 5 to 10 feet below ground surface (bgs) to*

*delineate tailings thickness and native soil contact. For costing purposes, assume groundwater monitoring wells are **not** required on every site—include two (2) temporary or permanent 2-inch groundwater monitoring wells (to ~20 feet bgs) on **two (2) of the five Phase II sites** (4 wells total across the program).*

b. ***Field Screening & Sample Collection:** Field screening using a portable X-Ray Fluorescence (XRF) analyzer during boring/test-pit logging, plus twenty (20) discrete soil/tailings laboratory samples per site (100 samples across 5 sites) and one (1) groundwater sample per installed well (4 groundwater samples total), plus required QAPP quality control samples (duplicates/blanks).*
c. ***Analytical Suites:** California Title 22 (CAM 17) Metals (EPA Methods 6010/6020 and 7471 for mercury) on all soil/tailings and groundwater samples. For costing consistency, assume a targeted subset of samples (e.g., 4 soil samples and 1 groundwater sample per site) is also analyzed for TPH-g/d/mo (EPA 8015) and VOCs/SVOCs (EPA 8260/8270) to screen for incidental historical commercial/industrial uses.*
d. ***Investigation-Derived Waste (IDW):** Containerization in 55-gallon DOT-approved drums, composite waste characterization sampling, and off-site disposal of excess cuttings and purge water (assume 2 drums per site, 10 drums total).*
e. ***Deliverables:** Site-Specific QAPP Addendum (or Sampling and Analysis Plan) and a Phase II ESA Report with conceptual site model and tailings volume/lateral extent estimates.*

*Proposers must provide itemized unit rates for each line item above (including daily XRF rental, per-foot/per-day drilling or hand-augering, per-well installation, per-sample lab analysis, and per-drum IDW disposal). Actual site scopes will be tailored to each property's Phase I findings and billed using these binding unit rates within the **$288,300** QEP budget ceiling.*

8. Does the City expect fixed estimates for defined quantities of Phase I, Phase II, ABCA, HERA, cleanup oversight, and other services? If not, as the precise site-specific scopes are not provided, should the cost proposal present budgetary task allowances/not-to-exceed amounts totaling $288,300?

No. Proposers should not submit lump-sum budgetary 'allowances' arbitrarily totaling $288,300. Submitting generic task allowances prevents the City from comparing true unit pricing and cost efficiency across firm proposals.

Instead, to establish transparent, apples-to-apples pricing while preserving flexibility for site-specific conditions, proposers should structure their cost proposal as follows:

a. ***Fixed Unit Prices for Standard Deliverables:*** *Provide fixed per-unit costs for predictable tasks—specifically per Phase I ESA, Generic/Programmatic QAPP, per Site-Specific QAPP Addendum, and per ABCA / Cleanup Plan—multiplied by the baseline quantities identified in Question 6 (5 Phase I ESAs, 5 Phase II ESAs, 3 ABCAs, etc.).*
b. ***Itemized Unit-Rate Estimate for Phase II ESAs:*** *Provide an itemized cost estimate for the five (5) Phase II ESAs using the standardized baseline scope in Question 7, supported by binding unit rates (e.g., per-foot drilling/hand-augering, daily XRF rental, per-well installation, per-sample lab analysis, and per-drum IDW disposal).*
c. ***Binding Rate Schedule for Variable/As-Needed Services (HERA, Cleanup Oversight, Community Outreach, Grant Support):*** *Because services such as Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessments (HERAs), remedial design, and cleanup oversight depend heavily on Phase II findings and regulatory agency (DTSC/Regional Water Board) requirements, proposers should provide their binding hourly labor rate schedule by classification and standard equipment/subcontractor unit rates rather than arbitrary lump-sum allowances. Proposers may include an illustrative hourly allocation for grant reporting and community outreach support based on the RFQ scope.*

All individual task orders issued under the resulting contract will be priced using the proposer's binding fixed unit fees and hourly/equipment

rate schedules, capped at the total QEP Cooperative Agreement budget of $288,300 (*subject to potential grant budget amendments if approved).*

9. Is the selected consultant expected to prepare the complete QAPP from the beginning? The Cooperative Agreement requires the QAPP to be submitted no more than 180 days after the September 23, 2026 grant award, which appears to create a relatively short turnaround after the anticipated January 15, 2027 contract effective date.

   According to our EPA grant officer, there is some flexibility to the deadline if communicated to the EPA in advance with a documented need for additional time. The City has a prior QAPP approved for a prior grant, which we can share with the selected QEP, but the EPA project officer cautions that there have been updated QAPP standards since that approval. For proposal-costing purposes, proposers should price preparation of a complete Generic/Programmatic QAPP compliant with current EPA standards

10. Given the time it took me to respond to these questions and the Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays, please note the change in schedule including an extension of the due date:

    a. Issue Date: November 4, 2026

    b. Submitting Inquiries: November 20, 2026

    c. RFQ Submittal Deadline: December 15, 2026

    d. Interview Date if needed: Week of January 4, 2027

    e. Anticipated Selection Approval Date: January 26, 2027

    f. Contract Effective Date: February 1, 2027