

NEW JERSEY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES USEPA BROWNFIELD ASSESSMENT GRANT (FY22)
(Reference RFP #2022-RFP-133)

ADDENDUM #1

The following constitutes an Addendum, which can be a Clarification and/or Modification to the above-referenced solicitation. This Addendum is divided as follows:

- Part 1: Answers to Questions Submitted
- Part 2: Additions, Deletions, Clarifications and Modifications to the RFP

Part 1: Answers to Questions Submitted		
No.	Question	Answer
1.	Can you please provide any information regarding who the incumbent/incumbents are for this contract?	Please be advised 2021-RFP-IPM-133 was awarded to Brownfield Redevelopment Solutions (BRS)
2.	Is this contract in relation to the \$6.5M that the EPA has awarded for New Jersey Brownfield Cleanup work?	NJEDA was awarded a \$2M Brownfields Assessment Grant for States and Tribes by the USEPA for FY2022. The \$6.5M figure was for the entire of State of NJ in FY2022 (other USEPA Brownfields grant recipients included Camden Redevelopment Agency, Township of Hamilton, and the City of Asbury Park).
3.	Page 1, Event Schedule We respectfully request a two-week extension for the Proposal Submission Date.	The Authority will not extend this proposal.
4.	Page 13, Section 1.4 If a firm does not currently have a PSQS on file with the Real Estate Division of the NJEDA, is it acceptable to submit the PSQS prior to the RFP deadline to be considered for an award?	Yes
5.	Page 18, Section 3.1 Please provide a time estimate for meetings held under Task 1.	Activities to be conducted under this task include hosting a kick-off meeting with the NJEDA team, coordinating project status meetings with NJEDA and USEPA (as needed, at a minimum quarterly), and holding bi-weekly virtual

		<p>meetings with NJEDA to report out on progress and identifying any potential issues with implementation of the USEPA grant. It is estimated that the meetings will generally be approximately one hour.</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>Page 18, Section 3.2 Please provide an estimate of how many meetings are anticipated on an annual basis for Task 2.</p> <p>Please provide a time estimate for meetings held under Task 2.</p>	<p>While the specific deliverables will depend on the sites selected, for the purpose of this RFP, responders shall include the following deliverables and associated estimated quantities over the performance period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder Meetings (Quantity: approx. 40) • Flyers/signs produced for each meeting (Quantity: Approx.60 flyers/signs x approx. 40 meetings) • Meeting Minutes (Quantity: approx. 40) <p>Community outreach meetings will be held on an as-needed basis and generally last approximately 90-minutes. In addition to the vendor(s) selected for Task 2 (Conduct Community Outreach), Project-specific Task Order Requests (TORs) under Tasks 3, 4, and 5 may be issued requesting participation in community outreach meetings to present technical aspects of the project to the public.</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Page 25, Section 3.13 Are the Selection Criteria listed in order of significance and/or is there any assigned weight, or points, assigned to each item listed?</p>	<p>Please review RFP Section 3.13 as to selection criteria and how applicants will be evaluated and judged. Also directed to review RFP Section 6.7 as to the evaluation criteria. The following evaluation criteria categories, not necessarily listed in order of significance,</p>

		<p>will be used to evaluate Proposals received in response to this RFP. The evaluation criteria categories may be used to develop more detailed evaluation criteria to be used in the evaluation process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel • Experience of entity • Ability of the entity to complete the Scope of Work based on its Technical Proposal • Pricing
8.	<p>Page 30, Section III We would like to confirm there are not specific Key Team Member roles identified in the RFP. It is our understanding that the proposer will identify key team members and then submit the required information about that key team member. Please confirm that this is the correct interpretation.</p>	<p>Please refer to the applicable sections of the RFP and the Fee Schedule.</p>
9.	<p>Page 47, Section 6.7.1 Is there any assigned weight, or points, assigned to each item listed?</p> <p>Please clarify the difference between Selection Criteria in Section 3.13 and Evaluation Criteria in Section 6.7.1.</p>	<p>Please see response to Question 7.</p>
10.	<p>Attachment, Fee Schedule If able, please provide descriptions (ex., education and years of experience) for each Position/Title listed.</p>	<p>Please review the requirements of the RFP and the Fee Schedule.</p>
11.	<p>Attachment, Fee Schedule Please confirm that costs for equipment and materials do not need to be submitted as part of the RFP response.</p>	<p>The RFP specifies that NJEDA will utilize Task Order Requests (TORs) to solicit pricing for individual projects from the pool of contracted vendors. The costs for equipment and materials will be submitted as part of the TOR process and not as part of this RFP response.</p>

12.	<p>Attachment, Fee Schedule</p> <p>Please confirm that if a contract is awarded, costs incurred for equipment and materials to complete a project can be invoiced to the Authority.</p>	See response to question 11.
13.	<p>Attachment, Fee Schedule</p> <p>Please confirm that the Fee/Costs should be for the full 5 years of the contract (3 year initial term and 2 potential 1 year options).</p>	Confirmed
14.	<p>Section 1.1 PURPOSE AND INTENT, page 5</p> <p>Does the NJEDA intend to award contracts to 5 firms to complete all 5 tasks, and if not, how will the tasks be split between the qualified firms?</p>	Not necessarily – Please refer to RFP Section 3.11 Task Order Request (TOR) Process
15.	<p><u>Section 1.2.1.1 EXCEPTIONS TO THE AUTHORITY'S CONTRACT FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES, page 7</u></p> <p><u>Question/Exception:</u></p> <p>Since professional liability insurance policies will not provide an upfront defense for claims and since claims submitted to a professional liability insurance policy must be negligence-based in order to be compensable, would the Authority consider making a few revisions to the indemnification language included in Section 6 of the Exhibit A Contract form in order to make this indemnity provision insurable? For instance, could the first paragraph of Section 6 be revised to strike “defend” and “protect,” could “negligent” be inserted before “act, error, or omission,” and could “reimburse” be inserted to replace “, at its own expense, appear, defend and pay”? The provision would then be modified as follows:</p> <p>“The Vendor shall defend, indemnify, protect and hold harmless the State of New Jersey and the Authority, and its officers, agents, servants and employees from and against any and all suits, claims, demands, losses or damages of any kind arising out of or claimed to arise out of any negligent act, error, or omission on the part of the Vendor, its officers, agents, servants, employees and subcontractors in the performance of services under this Contract. The Vendor shall reimburse , at its own expense, appear, defend and pay all charges for attorneys and all costs and other expenses arising from such suit or claim or incurred in connection therewith. If any judgment shall be rendered against the State of New Jersey and the Authority or its officers, agents, servants, and employees for which indemnification is provided under this Section 6, the Vendor shall, at its own expense, satisfy and discharge the same.”</p>	Respectfully, the NJEDA is not willing to consider or accept the requested modifications.

<p>16.</p>	<p><u>Section 4.2.2 FEE SCHEDULE, page 32</u> Please provide more details for what NJEDA requires for Line Item FEE FOR SERVICES: RFP SECTION 3.1 – Task 1 - Program Management and Reporting. Is the Fee requested Cost per Year or Cost Per Project Site or something different?</p>	<p>Activities to be conducted under this task include hosting a kick-off meeting with the NJEDA team, coordinating project status meetings with NJEDA and USEPA (as needed, at a minimum quarterly), and holding bi-weekly virtual meetings with NJEDA to report out on progress and identifying any potential issues with implementation of the USEPA grant. It is estimated that the meetings will generally be approximately one hour. The program management and reporting task should be estimated on a per year basis over the performance period, with program set up occurring in year one and routine management support occurring in the subsequent years.</p>
<p>17.</p>	<p><u>Section 4.2.2 FEE SCHEDULE, page 32</u> Please provide more details for what NJEDA requires for Line Item FEE FOR SERVICES: RFP SECTION 3.2 – Task 2 - Conduct Community Outreach. Is the Fee requested Cost per Year or Cost per Project Site or something different?</p>	<p>While the specific deliverables will depend on the sites selected, for the purpose of this bid, bidders shall include the following deliverables and associated the estimated quantities over the performance period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder Meetings (Quantity: approx. 40) • Flyers/signs produced for each meeting (Quantity: Approx.60 flyers/signs x approx. 40 meetings) • Meeting Minutes (Quantity: approx. 40) <p>Community outreach meetings will be held on an as-needed basis and generally last approximately 90-minutes. In addition to the vendor(s)</p>

		selected for Task 2 (Conduct Community Outreach), Project-specific Task Order Requests (TORs) under Tasks 3, 4, and 5 may be issued requesting participation in community outreach meetings to present technical aspects of the project to the public.
18.	Are respondents to 2022-RFP-133–Professional Environmental Services (USEPA Brownfields Assessment Grant FY22 required to be one of the following New Jersey certified Women-Owned Business Enterprise, Minority-Owned Business Enterprise, Veteran Owned Enterprise, or Disabled Veteran Owned Business Enterprise?	<p>Please review RFP Section 3.13 as to selection criteria and how applicants will be evaluated and judged. Also directed to review RFP Section 6.7 as to the evaluation criteria. The following evaluation criteria categories, not necessarily listed in order of significance, will be used to evaluate Proposals received in response to this RFP. The evaluation criteria categories may be used to develop more detailed evaluation criteria to be used in the evaluation process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel • Experience of entity • Ability of the entity to complete the Scope of Work based on its Technical Proposal • Pricing

Part 2: Additions, Deletions, Clarifications & Modifications to the RFP

No.	Description	Clarification/Modification
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		

