

## Questions regarding the Request for Qualifications

- 1) Should respondents assume that all (16) Phase II ESAs target 1) Vassar Coating site (211 Sherman St. – 0.95 acre); 2) former City of Bad Axe Dump (Thompson Rd – 10 acres); and 3) Brown City former dairy bottling facility/bus garage, in an iterative process?
  - a) No
- 2) If the answer to question #1 is “no”, can you provide property addresses, lot size, and building sizes for properties under consideration for Brownfields assessments so respondents may better estimate LOE for Phase I ESAs, Phase II ESAs, and Hazardous Materials Assessments, as well as to derive an informed estimate of the number of environmental samples and building materials that may be collected as part of Phase II ESAs and HMAs. Alternatively, since selection and prioritizing sites is part of the work scope, may the TCEDC prefer to provide a generic work scope (including number of samples/medium, analytical parameters, etc.) for the estimated (16) Phase II ESAs and provide an assumed number of samples for the (6) Hazardous Materials Assessments to allow an apples-to-apples comparison across respondents?
  - a) No, but to elaborate further. The MI Green Thumb Coalition receives requests from various private and public bodies regarding blighted properties that they are hoping to restore and economically develop. These organizations complete forms that detail basic information about the property, what is being requested and give authorization to access the properties. After the forms are reviewed by MI Green Thumb, the request is sent to the EPA to verify that the property meets the Brownfield definition. After that, we will send out our request to our contractor regarding the work to be completed. Most of the properties will follow this procedure. After approval of our agreement with our contractor, we will meet and discuss the information requested on these blank forms and procedures to follow in further detail.
- 3) Does the TCEDC have a preferred fee structure for the program or is it the preference of TCEDC to have respondents propose the structure per reference under “Type of Contract” on Page 4 of the RFP?
  - a) As part of the request for qualifications, the EDC is looking to the bidding contractors to propose their fee schedule and with estimated values for the different types of reporting and work to be done.
- 4) Similarly, will TCEDC provide an assumed schedule for the number of Phase I ESAs, Phase II ESAs, Hazardous Materials Assessments, and Cleanup Plans for each of Years 1-4? This will allow for apples-to-apples comparison across respondents capturing cost escalation over the life of the contract. It is understood the QAPP will be prepared in 2024/2025 with annual updates.
  - a) The schedule for the projects is based on when we receive the requests for assistance. It can be generally assumed that the reports will be fairly evenly distributed over the four years, but with a heavier distribution early on, as groups are waiting to make their requests at the beginning of this grant.

- 5) Is TCEDC willing to define community engagement and provide an assumed scenario (e.g., frequency, advertising, community meeting(s), preparation of a presentation, distribution of information, community polling/survey) to allow apples-to-apples comparison across respondents?
  - a) The MI Green Thumb Coalition community engagement via a public meeting regarding a brownfield project is not a regular occurrence, but an occasional meeting may be necessary around a project of public interest to explain to the stakeholders the goals of the project and explain the process to be done. Such a task may include advertising, community meeting(s), preparation of a presentation, distribution of information, community polling/survey. Such projects may occur 1 or 2 times a year. After the initial awarding to the contractor, and going through the initial preparation of forms and QAPP, that would be a good time to hold a community meeting and explain to local stakeholders the procedures and benefits regarding the brownfield development grant and reports.
  
- 6) On Page 10 of the RFQ, Evaluation of Qualifications, item “6. Reasonableness of cost/price proposal rates (25%)” does not include Hazardous Materials Assessments as a work task. Please confirm respondents should assume (6) Hazardous Materials Assessments over four years as stated under TASK 3 – Site Assessment, on Page 17 of the RFQ.
  - a) Yes, Hazardous Materials Assessments should be included as a work task.
  
- 7) Are there any other documents that TCEDC and Green Thumb Coalition will make available in connection to the program, sites under consideration, etc. in advance of the response deadline?
  - a) The MI Green Thumb Coalition does not plan on releasing additional documents before the closing of bids, but we plan on responding to questions and distributing answers.