



Q&A

SECOG GEOGRAPHIC BOUNDARY: RFP BF #2025-01

WINDHAM GEOGRAPHIC BOUNDARY: RFP BF #2025-02

130 INLAND ROAD TOWN OF SPRAGUE: RFP BF #2025-03

1. *Q: Can there be a one-week extension on these three RFPs?*

A: SECOG will not be offering extensions.

2. *Q: Would you accept a non-conforming bid?*

A: SECOG will not accept non-conforming bids.

3. *Q: We are planning on visiting the two sites included in two of the Brownfields RFPs, in Sprague and Preston. Do we need to coordinate our visits with anyone?*

A: While comprehensive consideration of sites in RFP development is encouraged, SECOG does not have the capacity to offer additional information about the sites or site owner contact info to bidders during this procurement process. Applicants should view sites from the public right of way and should not access sites without property owner permission.

4. *Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, has the Town or other entity awarded the funding associated with this grant to a consulting firm? Or is the Town in the process of awarding that funding to a consulting agency.*

A: The Town has not yet awarded that funding to a consulting agency.

5. *Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, Page 13/ F.2 Proposal Format - Please confirm that the cover, statement of confidentiality, table of contents, and fly sheets do not count against the overall page limits of each section.*

A: The listed items do not count against the overall page limits of each section.

6. *Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, Page 19, J. Attachments - Please confirm Attachment A: Non-Collusion Affidavit and Attachment B: Equal Employment Opportunity Certification can be provided as an appendix and not part of the total page count.*

A: Attachment A and Attachment B are not part of the total page count.

7. *Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-01, the RFP calls for a Phase II Scope Recommendation and Cost Estimate, but no costs for the completion of the Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, do you want us to include costs to perform the Phase II in our proposal, like what is requested for 130 Inland Road?*

A: While we do not consider this a requirement for RFP #2025-01, we would consider this additional information helpful and an indication of a well thought out cost proposal. We have posted "Attachment F" alongside these question responses. Should proposers choose to provide this information for RFP #2025-01, these pages will not count against the cost proposal page limit. For context, 130 Inland Road is a large site with an array of interlocking interested parties and funding streams, thus our inclination for this site to obtain a maximal amount of information up front in comparison to the other sites and scopes.

8. *Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-01, do you have copies of previous environmental reports that can be shared?*

A: SECOG does not have copies of previous environmental reports for this site at this time that will be shared, besides the information included in the RFP.

9. *Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, do you have copies of previous environmental reports that can be shared?*

A: SECOG does not have copies of previous environmental reports for this site at this time that will be shared, besides the information included in the RFP.

10. *Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-02, considering that November 26 falls on the day before Thanksgiving, a federal holiday, would SECOG be open to extending the proposal due date?*

A: SECOG will not be extending the proposal due date. Take note that the submission requirements allow for digital submission, and thus our process does not require travel the day before Thanksgiving. We find the month timeframe allotted for proposal development in line with typical procurement processes.

11. *Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-02, please confirm whether the attached forms in the RFP are required to be submitted with the Technical Proposal and whether they count toward the page limit.*

A: Attachments should be submitted with the Technical Proposal and do not count toward the page limit.

12. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-02, if we have any comments on the attached agreement, may we include them as a separate attachment?

A: We are willing to receive comments on attachments A through C, anticipating that these comments would shed light on the ability of a proposer to comply with stated requirements or suggesting an alternative compliance pathway. These would be important factors for SECOG to understand and consider. However, any content must pertain only to the attachment. SECOG will disregard any commentary that provides additional information on RFP review criteria.

13. Q: Can SECOG share the list of firms that are expected to respond to the RFPs?

A: SECOG will not be sharing a list of firms expected to respond to the RFPs. SECOG advertised these RFPs through the CT Bid Board and expect that many firms were notified of this opportunity through that mechanism.

14. Q: Does SECOG plan to only award one project per consultant or can one consultant be awarded more than one project?

A: One consultant may be awarded more than one project.

15. Q: Does the Consultant Firm need to include the forms in Attachments A & B for each of the RFPs?

A: The consultant firm should provide Attachments A and B for each RFP for which they are bidding.

16. Q: If applicable, can SECOG provide the name of the firm that assisted with the grant application?

A: Not applicable.

17. Q: The grant period of performance is 7/1/2025 to 9/30/2029. However, the "contract end" dates are 1/14/2027 and 7/14/2027. Can you please verify?

A: The tasks identified in these RFPs' Scopes of Work reflect only a portion of the work to be completed by SECOG under the EPA Cooperative Agreement, thus the contract end date is before the end of the grant period. As stated in the RFP, SECOG reserves the right to retain the selected QEP(s) firm for additional services beyond the original Scope of Work.

18. *Q: For the Phase II Scope Recommendation and Cost Estimate Task, Does SECOG assume that Scope/Costs for a Phase II ESA will be determined post-award (i.e., after completion of the Phase I ESA)? OR, Are Scope/Costs for a Phase II ESA required?*

A: Yes, SECOG assumes that the scope and costs for a Phase II ESA will be determined post-award based on the findings of the Phase I ESA. However, as written in the RFP and addressed above in question 7, we are in some cases requiring (RFP #2025-03) or encouraging (RFP #2025-01, #2025-02) rate-based information for Phase II evaluation services, so that we can confirm and compare unit-based price information among proposer and against industry standards. Firms should, however, estimate the cost of preparing the Phase II Scope Recommendation and Cost Estimates deliverable itself.

19. *Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, would SECOG please clarify whether the liaison(s) will be employed or contracted directly by SECOG, a subrecipient (e.g., CT RC&D), or by the selected Qualified Environmental Professional (QEP) firm?*

A: The liaison(s) will be contracted by SECOG.

20. *Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, will compensation for the liaison(s) is to be managed under SECOG's subawards or included as part of the QEP firm's budget proposal?*

A: Compensation for the liaisons will be managed under SECOG's budget.

21. *Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, will the QEP firm's scope include recruiting, selecting, coordinating with, and overseeing the liaisons?*

A: The QEP shall... Create a tailored training curriculum outline covering:

- a. Brownfield basics
- b. Environmental processes
- c. Risk and health communication
- d. Redevelopment strategies
- e. Community engagement

Develop training slides inclusive of above focus areas, including case studies and talking points for outreach. Slides should be submitted in both draft and final forms to SECOG. Once the community liaison is hired, deliver the training. The QEP shall coordinate with SECOG and the community liaison to ensure consistent messaging and prepare the liaison(s) for outreach activities.

The QEP will not participate in recruiting, selecting, or overseeing the liaisons. We do anticipate that the QEP and community liaison will overlap in project team meetings and thus have some level of ongoing coordination facilitated by SECOG.

22. Q: Regarding RFPs BF #2025-01 and RFP BF #2025-03, Attachment 1 calls for up to 5 community meetings. These meetings are not detailed as deliverables in the scope of work. Could SECOG please clarify: Is it SECOG's intent to hold 5 community meetings? Are these meetings expected to be community-wide workshops, more like focus group/stakeholder interviews, or a mix to be proposed by the QEP? Will the QEP firm's scope of work include scheduling, distributing invitations, promoting participation, and facilitating the meetings and/or workshops?

A: We see this question as demonstrating a larger point of confusion. Attachment 1 should not be referenced for RFP scope in any of the three open brownfields RFPs associated with the Coalition Grant. The relevance of the attachment that SECOG included as "Attachment C: EPA Brownfields Assessment Grant Terms and Conditions" should only be referenced starting at Administrative Conditions. The scope of each RFP is confined to the articulated tasks in the RFP body.

23. Q: What will the resulting contract that SECOG will be providing be and will this contract be negotiable?

A: SECOG does not provide a standard contract up front. Note the requirements articulated in RFP Section I – Contracting Provisions. Contracts are negotiable, however, will conform with all terms and conditions articulated in the RFP, cover the whole RFP scope, and conform with stated timelines and staff rates as provided in the RFP response, among all other requirements articulated in the RFP.

24. Q: Regarding RFB BF #2025-02, for the "Identifying Potential Sites" for the brownfields list task, how many meetings with the Town should we assume?

A: Per the RFP, up to three.

25. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, is a copy of the latest Phase I Environmental Site Assessment report for the property available for review?

A: SECOG does not have copies of previous environmental reports for this site at this time that will be shared, besides the information included in the RFP.

26. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, is the site presently occupied, and if so, what activities are being conducted onsite?

A: Please reference the information provided on page 6 in Section C: Background, which represents SECOG's current knowledge of site occupancy.

27. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, are there site plans or maps that depict current/ongoing operations at the site available for review prior to the submittal of a proposal?

A: SECOG does not have copies of site plans or maps for this site at this time that will be shared, besides the information included in the RFP.

28. *Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, understanding the site is subject to various land use restrictions, will it be possible to lift these restrictions to conduct required subsurface investigation?*

A: That is unknown at this time. SECOG will coordinate with appropriate entities on the implications of the restrictions on the site. We anticipate that we can find an answer to this question during the Phase 1 preparation period, so that the selected firm can build this into the CSM and data gaps analysis in preparation for Phase II recommendations.

29. *Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, have previous hazardous building materials (HBM) investigations been conducted at the site, and if so, are there reports summarizing these activities available for review?*

A: That is unknown at this time. SECOG does not have copies of previous investigations for this site at this time that will be shared, besides the information included in the RFP.

30. *Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, can all ten (10) buildings be accessed or are there buildings that are deteriorated to a point they can't be entered?*

A: The status of the buildings is unknown at this time and access will be coordinated with relevant local and state officials prior to investigation.

31. *Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, what buildings, if any, will be repurposed and renovated and which will be demolished (if this level of information is known at this time)?*

A: This level of information is not known at this time.

32. *Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, are there existing groundwater monitoring wells at the site that can be accessed for sampling during the Phase II ESA, or should we assume the collection of groundwater samples will require installation of new monitoring wells?*

A: It is unknown if there are monitoring wells at the site. Bidders should assume the collection of groundwater samples will require installation of new monitoring wells.

33. *Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, the last bullet under the scope of work for Task 2: Phase II ESA indicates, "Implementing additional Phase II investigations as appropriate to delineate the extent of contamination", which is listed sequentially after submittal of a final Phase II report. Is this implying the scope should include delineation of any contamination identified during the Phase II ESA (i.e., Phase III level investigation)? If*

not, please clarify the additional Phase II investigations that may be required under this scope of work

A: Thank you for this question. Yes, the terminology here is a holdover and results from different ways that brownfield investigations may be phased in a Connecticut context versus a federal EPA context. Prior to the start of any Phase II work, the contractor will have prepared the Phase II Scope Recommendation Letter with Cost Estimates. The Phase II Scope Recommendation Letter with Cost Estimates should make recommendations about the necessity for full contaminant delineation and level of investigation that should occur in Phase II.

34. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, under Training Curriculum - by "redevelopment strategies", are you referring to educating the community liaison on redevelopment strategies for the project so that they can bring that information back to their community for feedback?

A: Yes.

35. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, Is the intent of the Direct, Equipment, and Materials Schedule for Task 2 to evaluate unit costs for all field investigation tasks and laboratory analytical costs reasonably anticipated for the Phase 2 effort? Can a list of services requested by SECOG for this task be provided? Without a specific scope task to get quotes from subcontractors it is difficult to provide costing for all tasks that could arise for the Phase 2 effort in Task 2.

A: SECOG will not be providing a list of services requested for this task. Rather than obtaining quotes, we'd anticipate that firms would consider similar previous projects and report a typical unit cost for Phase II services. Please feel free to show work, e.g. if you are providing typical costs for drilling a monitoring well, you can break this out into "monitoring well – surficial/shallow" versus "monitoring well – bedrock" or provide a unit cost of drilling per foot. SECOG understands the variability inherent to brownfields work and the iterative nature of Phase I work informing Phase II, and so on, and that these costs are best estimates that may need to be adjusted based on field conditions. We are evaluating these schedules with two main items in mind: (1) does the principal proposer present unit costs that are in line with industry standards and rates that SECOG has experienced in previous brownfield assessment projects; and (2) in considering its response, has the proposer considered these sites with tools readily available (GIS soil layers, similar) enough to anticipate the types of Phase II services and techniques that could be required given site context and environmental conditions.

36. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, (FIRM NAME) would like to use project-specific actual rates for staff proposed to support the scope of this RFP. Is this allowable or are there existing contract rates that must be used?

A: Actual rates may be used.

37. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, what is SECOG's ultimate goal or end use for the facilities included in this RFP (residential, continued commercial/industrial, other)? Is the goal to eventually sell the property?

A: Exact details are unknown at this time and will emerge from the community reuse planning process. However, it is our current understanding that local and regional goals (CEDs, local POCD) see potential for mixed uses at this site, including residential and commercial, with some possibilities for continued light industrial.

38. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, can SECOG provide access to previous consultant and background reports, permits (previous and current) tables, figures, and plans digitally prior to the submittal of the proposal? Are historical processes at the mill known to reasonably anticipate investigative methods and techniques for contaminants?

A: SECOG will not be providing further information at this time, besides the information included in the RFP.

39. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, what is the current state of SECOG's ACRES database? How much of the relevant information is already loaded into ACRES?

A: No site information has been loaded into SECOG's ACRES database at this time.

40. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, Can SECOG confirm that all aspects of the Notice of Violations issued are now in compliance? This will determine if sediment/sludge sampling is necessary.

A: SECOG cannot confirm this information at this time. We suggest assuming that compliance has not been reached.

41. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, does Casella Waste have any existing releases or outstanding orders against them that would factor into this work scope?

A: This is unknown at this time.

42. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, some of the ELURs require that the buildings and/or pavement stay in place despite possibly being in poor physical condition. If the Phase 1 identifies existing violations of the ELURs, is there a duty to disclose those violations?

A: SECOG's current best guidance is that yes, there is likely a duty to disclose ELUR violations identified during the Phase 1 process. SECOG will take this question to CT DEEP and have a definitive answer by the beginning of the contract period.

43. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, is the 5% a limit on subcontractor markup, profit, or both?

A: The 5% limit applies to markup.

44. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-01, could you please confirm if the meetings referenced in Tasks 3 & 4 can be held virtually?

A: The meetings with municipalities must be conducted in person. The meeting with SECOG/seCTer can be virtual.

45. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-01, can a site visit be scheduled for Monday or Tuesday of next week?

A: SECOG will not be coordinating site visits prior to proposal submissions.

46. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-01, is a Hazardous Building Materials Assessment expected to be included as part of the Phase II scope and cost estimate? If so, which buildings should be included?

A: This is unknown information at this time and is dependent on the findings of the Phase I ESA.

47. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-01, are there any potential reuse options currently being considered for the property?

A: No specific reuse options are currently being considered.

48. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-01, regarding Task 3 and the brownfield inventory: the RFP notes that six municipalities in the SECOG geographic area (excluding Sprague and Windham) have existing brownfield inventories and that the effort should focus on these six towns. The 2024 CTDEEP brownfield inventory includes 11 SECOG member towns, meaning seven towns are not on the existing inventory. Could you please clarify the intended scope for this task? Specifically, how many and which towns should be included in the brownfield inventory update?

A: SECOG has received brownfield inventories prepared by UConn Technical Assistance to Brownfields for six member municipalities. These are the inventories that are being referenced. We have posted these current inventories alongside this Q and A document.

49. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, can a site visit be scheduled for Monday or Tuesday next week?

A: SECOG will not be coordinating site visits prior to proposal submissions.

50. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, is a Hazardous Building Materials Assessment to be included as part of Phase II? If yes, for which buildings?

A: This is unknown information at this time and is dependent on the findings of the Phase I ESA.

51. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, is a release of the ELUR required for the site investigation, or has this already been completed?

A: A release of the ELUR for site investigation has not yet been obtained. SECOG will coordinate with appropriate entities on the implications of the restrictions on the site.

52. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, please confirm that Papermill Pond and Versailles Pond are excluded from the scope of work.

A: As referenced in the RFP, the ponds are part of ongoing cleanup orders and processes. The Phase I ESA likely will not anticipate further assessment of the ponds, but should note the history of their assessment and required compliance. We are asking for a Phase I and Regulatory Status update for the entire parcel, and that scope holds. We can envision a Phase I report that calls out the ponds as AOCs, and then articulates that these AOCs are already under investigation or are part of an ongoing compliance process if that is the case, and likely a Phase II recommendation report that would also take into consideration that Phase II assessment work and beyond is being handled by another party as part of a compliance process, and thus, not recommended for further investigation by SECOG, the Town of Sprague, or other public entities under the Coalition Grant work program.

53. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, should sampling of lagoon sediment or sludge be included in the investigation?

A: This should be included in bidders' proposals.

54. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, the RFP calls for completing a Phase II Site Investigation and then performing additional Phase II investigation to delineate contamination. Delineation is typically considered a Phase III investigation. Should the scope be interpreted as a Phase II followed by a Phase III?

A: Yes. See also Question 33.

55. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, will separate Phase II and Phase III reports be required?

A: See Questions 33 and 54.

56. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-03, for the cost proposal, the RFP states that estimated hours for the Phase II investigation are not required. However, it also states that the cost proposal should be based on time, contractor rates, cost of materials, lab costs, etc. This appears contradictory. In addition, laboratory unit pricing can be provided, but total lab costs cannot be accurately estimated at this stage. Please clarify the expected cost structure and submittal requirements for Task 2.

A: For Task 2 in the Scope of Work of this RFP document, please fill out the respective tables; (1) Personnel Fee Schedule and (2) Direct, Equipment, and Materials Fee Schedule. SECOG understands that because of the iterative nature of Phase II site assessment, it is reasonable for an estimate of hours to be spent on Phase II assessment to be unknown at the time of bid. Therefore, it is not required to include an estimate of hours for Task 2. SECOG will instead evaluate consultant rates and anticipated direct/material costs. For the Direct, Equipment, and Materials Fee Schedule, please provide information on your typical equipment and materials rates for that task. Please note anticipated lab costs, travel, and mark-ups as applicable.

57. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-01, do covers and tabs count towards the page limit?

A: No.

58. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-01, where should the Non-Collision Affidavit and the Equal Employment Opportunity Certification be included, and do they count towards the page limit?

A: They should be included in the Technical Proposal and do not count towards the page limit.

59. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-01, in the Technical Proposal under Project Team, you ask for "the proportion of [team members] overall time that will be spent on this project." Are you asking how the team members will divide time within this project or how this project will fit into individual team members general company workload?

A: How this project will fit into individual team members' general company workload.

60. Q: Is it possible for the SECOG to provide the current existing Brownfields Inventories associated with the 2 requests for proposals?

A: SECOG has posted the inventories alongside this Q and A page.

61. Q: Can you tell us if the Equal Employment Opportunity Certification and the Non-Collusion Affidavit forms count towards the submittal page limit?

A: They do not.

62. Q: The Equal Opportunity Certification references a no longer applicable Executive Order, the referenced 11246, that has been superseded by another Executive Order. Can the COG provide an updated form that does not include reference to this Executive Order?

A: Proposers can skip this form if they feel it is no longer applicable. It is no longer a required proposal element. However, please note that SECOG is still governed by its own Equal Opportunity rules, as well as state requirements. Prior to contracting, the selected vendor will need to verify that it complies with all State of Connecticut Equal Opportunity rules, especially as this scope is partially funded by state DECD funds. If the contractor does not or cannot demonstrate state compliance during the contracting phase, we will move on to the next highest scoring vendor.

63. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-02, do you have the Phase I, II or III environmental reports and the RAP available for review? If any of these are complete, can you share them? Our understanding is that these were completed under a previous phase of work.

A: SECOG will not be sharing these environmental reports prior to proposal submission. Phase III and RAP work are still in process. We anticipate it will be completed by June 30, 2026.

64. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-02, do covers and tabs count towards the page limit?

A: No.

65. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-02, where should the Non-Collision Affidavit and the Equal Employment Opportunity Certification be included, and do they count towards the page limit?

A: They should be included in the Technical Proposal and do not count towards the page limit.

66. Q: Regarding RFP BF #2025-02, in the Technical Proposal under Project Team, you ask for "the proportion of [team members] overall time that will be spent on this project." Are you asking how the team members will divide time within this project or how this project will fit into individual team members general company workload?

A: How this project will fit into individual team members' general company workload.