



## STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

Tate Reeves  
Governor

### MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Chris Wells, Executive Director

April 25, 2024

#### AMENDMENT #1

#### RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS/CLARIFICATION REQUESTS

RFQ Number: RFx3140003771 MDEQ-RFQ04052024

To Provide: Professional services to prepare and conduct a study for the purposes of developing a plan to improve material recovery and recycling in Mississippi.

1. **Question:** The evaluation criteria notes that 35% of the scoring will be based on cost factors, however, the scope of services defined in the RFQ is generic and has broad and open tasks making it difficult to define and making it challenging to define the project cost – can MDEQ provide details on expected budget and cost?

**Answer:** Offerors must submit a Proposal for Price for the services listed in Section 2.3 Scope of Services in the RFQ. To further clarify, MDEQ is seeking services to assist with Phase I of the Solid Waste Infrastructure and Recycling Grant for States and Territories, State of Mississippi Workplan, which is Attachment F of the RFQ.

2. **Question:** Based on the questions submitted, a substantial change may need to be made by proposers to be responsive to the RFQ after receiving the addendum on the 25<sup>th</sup>. Would MDEQ consider extending the deadline for the proposal by two weeks?

**Answer:** Please see Amendment #2 for the revised timeline.

3. **Question:** Please clarify the types of materials that will be addressed in the study. Is the intent to only include typical recyclables (such as paper, cardboard, plastic bottles and jugs, aluminum, and steel cans) or should it include a broader set of materials (such as yard waste, food scraps, tires, household hazardous wastes, construction, and demolition materials, etc.).

**Answer:** MDEQ's intent is to keep the focus of the planned work centered at this time on the broad categories of traditional recyclables such as paper, plastics, metals, and glass.

#### CONTRACTS DIVISION

POST OFFICE BOX 2261 • JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI 39225-2261 • Tel: (601) 961-5107 • [www.mdeq.ms.gov](http://www.mdeq.ms.gov)

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

4. **Question:** Can you please clarify the information to be submitted as described in Section 4.1 as compared to the Evaluation Factors in Section 4.4.1? For example, Section 4.4.1 refers to Cost factors such as “Relative Cost: How does the cost compare to other similarly scored qualifications.” Can you please clarify whether the solicitation is qualifications based or whether it should include a proposal and associated costs?

**Answer:** The solicitation is qualifications based and Offerors must submit a Proposal for Price as stated in Amendment #2.

5. **Question:** Can you please clarify how much of the contractual budget is for the recycling study, as compared to the development of the marketing campaign?

**Answer:** Offerors must submit a Proposal for Price for the services listed in Section 2.3 Scope of Services in the RFQ. To further clarify, MDEQ is seeking services to assist with Phase I of the Solid Waste Infrastructure and Recycling Grant for States and Territories, State of Mississippi Workplan, which is Attachment F of the RFQ.

6. **Question:** Our firm did not receive this RFQ directly and was just notified of this RFQ by a third party. We are very interested in organizing a team to submit a response to this RFQ. Due to the size and magnitude of this project, it will require more time to organize a strong team and submit a comprehensive qualifications package than the current timeline/due date allows. Would MDEQ consider a two-week extension to the due date for qualifications?

**Answer:** Please see Amendment #2 for the revised timeline.

7. **Question:** We are interested in submitting on the RFQ but wanted to ask if the submission deadline is firm?

**Answer:** Please see Amendment #2 for the revised timeline.

8. **Question:** Considering the question responses are not anticipated to be posted until April 25, is it possible to receive an extension beyond the posted deadline of May 6?

**Answer:** Please see Amendment #2 for the revised timeline.

9. **Question:** We are requesting an extension of the closing date and time to May 20th at 3:30 PM.

**Answer:** Please see Amendment #2 for the revised timeline.

10. **Question:** This solicitation is entitled a “Request for Qualifications.” It appears that requested submittals focus on qualifications, and as is customary in most RFQs, the specific scope and budget will presumably be developed as part of a collaborative process with the selected consultant. However, the solicitation indicates that cost factors (4.4.1) are a significant portion of the evaluation. Is MDEQ expecting the Statements of Qualifications to also include proposed approaches and budgets?

**Answer:** Yes. The SOQ should include proposed approaches and a budget. The solicitation is qualifications based and Offerors must submit a Proposal for Price as stated in Amendment #2.

11. **Question:** Please provide a brief summary of the recycling and composting/organics processing facility data currently available to MDEQ (i.e., list of currently permitted facilities, tonnage processed, etc.) that would be available to the awarded consultant.

**Answer:** Offerors may find Composting/processing facility information at the links below.

Facilities listing available at: <https://www.mdeq.ms.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/MDEQ-Active-Solid-Waste-Facility-Listing.pdf>

Annual reporting data available at: <https://www.mdeq.ms.gov/solid-waste-reporting>

Recycling directory available at: <https://www.mdeq.ms.gov/land/waste-division/solid-waste-management-programs/recycling/>

12. **Question:** 4.1.G What would DEQ consider to show “proof of reliability”?

**Answer:** To show record of reliability, Offerors may submit any summary documentation regarding prior work conducted for MDEQ or other agencies/organizations establishing the Offeror’s ability to complete all work within established timelines and budget or to stay as close to timelines and budgets as possible and within reason.

Documents containing the identity/company information *should be submitted in a separate, sealed envelope clearly marked “Company Information”*.

13. **Question:** 4.4.2 States “Offerors must NOT identify the business/company name on any of the Statement of Qualification documents except on the following documentation...” Please confirm that proposers can still submit proposals using their internal format/style templates, but that company names and logos should be omitted.

**Answer:** 4.4.2 lists which documents can contain the identity/company information but also states that *information provided from those documents listed should be submitted in a separate, sealed envelope clearly marked “Company Information”*.

14. **Question:** Did MDEQ work with any consultants or other third parties in developing the SWIFR Workplan?

**Answer:** MDEQ developed the SWIFR Workplan in-house with influence from similar projects performed in surrounding states and with the input of EPA.

15. **Question:** The SWIFR Workplan mentions a \$469,000.00 allowance for contractors. What portion of this amount is for the recycling study, and what portion is for creation of a logo, slogan, and radio/tv/digital advertising campaign to promote recycling statewide?

**Answer:** For the purposes of the SWIFR Workplan, MDEQ estimated the study would account for \$250,000.00 of the total planned contractual grant budget; however, this estimate is preliminary in nature and not reflective of a fixed budget for the study.

16. **Question:** We are considering responding to the abovementioned RFQ and wanted to submit a question regarding cost/pricing. We noticed that the RFQ evaluation criteria (section 4.4) include cost and indicate that it is weighted fairly heavily as an evaluation factor, but the list of required information for the SOQ in section 4.1 does not include any cost or rate information. Would you please clarify whether cost is being evaluated, and, if so, what type of cost information we should include in our response (hourly rates for proposed team members, etc.)?

**Answer:** : Yes, cost is an evaluation factor as required by the Office of Personal Services Contract Review Rules and Regulations, Section 3-203.01(g). Offerors must submit a Proposal for Price as stated in Amendment #2.

**Offeror shall acknowledge receipt of Amendment #1 by signing and returning this Amendment #1 with its Statement of Qualifications.**

By signing below, Offeror acknowledges receipt of Amendment #1, and that the Responses to Questions/Clarification Requests have been noted, and that its SOQ is being offered in compliance therewith.

Offeror's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

By (Print Name): \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_