

Gilsenan, Michael

From: Moyik.Cathy@epamail.epa.gov
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2002 1:42 PM
To: Smyth, Virginia
Cc: Avaltroni, Robert; 'LaPosta.Dore@epa.gov'; 'callahan.Kathy@epa.gov'; Radhakrishnan, Krish; Gilsenan, Michael; 'Basso.Ray@epa.gov'; Santella.Dennis@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: Contractor Pricing Issues



conissues.wpd

Virginia, Attached is a summary of all the pricing issues that came up at our meeting. Please take a look and see if we covered everything, I want to try and address all the pricing issues at one time. We also discussed very briefly the possibility of addressing these issues through a "Formal" request from EPA that based on our field experience that some of these issues could not have been foreseen. But, I am not clear as to what you need from us to assist you in resolving these issues. Can all of these issues be resolved? If not, then the contractors need to be notified and I am not sure of the process the city follows to formally respond the contractors when issues arise.

Thanks for your help with this and let me know whatever we need to do help get things started. (See attached file: conissues.wpd)

CLEANING CONTRACTOR PRICING ISSUES

1) Oversized units - One bedroom or studio apartments in loft type space where the square footage is exceedingly large. For example, we have run into one bedroom unit exceeding 5,000 square feet and a one bedroom unit with large areas of home office space. The contractors have requested price adjustments for these situations. (Note: DEP agreed to address this issue)

2) The contractors requested that the contract be modified to contain a "termination for convenience" clause in case scheduling issues persist and customer interest in the program declines.

3) Common Space Carpeting - In situations where a building owner requests that carpeting be removed, and the work does not fall under the NYC asbestos abatement program, the contractors requested a price adjustment for the cost of carpet removal and disposal as ACM.

4) Large Terraces - The contractors have requested a price adjustment to address the cleaning of large terraces that are accessible from an individuals residence. (Note: DEP agreed to address this issue)

5) One contractor (Termon, Quad D) suggested that they should have the ability to bill up-front for out of pocket expenses and make cost adjustments since the ratio of supervisors to staff is out of line due to slow rate of cleaning at this point.

6) An HVAC qualified contractor (Termon) requested that they be able to clean HVAC units utilizing the partial unit cleaning scheme provided for in the SOW. They also requested that encapsulation of the internal insulation components of the units be priced since cleaning of insulation is not effective and the bid sheets do not provide for encapsulation techniques.

7) Termon requested an adjustment for additional compensation for removal of materials associated with carpet removal, like underlying padding, tacking and glue strips.

8) Termon had a question about cleaning HVAC systems to NADCA standards but not performing microbial cleaning. According to Termon, NADCA standards include microbial cleaning and they are willing to do it, for a cost adjustment.

9) Termon did not include the cost for cleaning supply and return plenums providing HVAC to apartments in their unit price for cleaning partial HVAC systems. Termon interpreted this item as providing cleaning for HVAC systems without extensive duct systems. If this situation occurs Termon will provide pricing on a case by case basis.

MONITORING CONTRACTOR PRICING ISSUES

1) Offsite scheduling work is not reimbursable under the terms of the contract. It is considered part of overhead. The Contractors claim that they are spending a much greater amount of time than expected reaching out to tenants to schedule cleaning.

2) Evaluation of kitchen and bathroom vents was not specifically priced in the bid sheets. Based upon limited field observations we observed that evaluating five of these vent systems is roughly equivalent to the level of effort to evaluate one HVAC system. Accordingly, we recommend that a five to one ratio be utilized to price evaluations of these units.

3) Contractors requested that they be compensated for the travel time it takes to deliver their samples to the lab and the cost of sampling cassettes resulting from the large amount of samples they need to run.

4) Contractors requested that they be compensated for their time accompanying their HVAC subcontractors during field inspections.

5) Dealing with F2L and the data base in general is taking much longer than expected. F2L can't be run on multiple machines and therefore when you have work ongoing in several locations it creates logistical problems that cost the contractors time. Furthermore, they claim they are spending at least one hour waiting for F2L to print the chain of custody forms. At the pre bid meeting they clearly remember being told by us that data base management activities would take minutes not hours. This is a major issue for them and they are requesting appropriate pricing adjustments. Furthermore, they believe that data base management is really project management time (not project monitor) and this position is not provided for under the contract.

6) (Athenica) The quantity of HVAC inspections specified on the bid sheet was 750. Athenica got a unit price based on this volume of work. Athenica doesn't think they will get the volume of HVAC inspections in Battery Park City to warrant a low unit cost price from their subcontractor and as a result are incurring higher unit price costs than anticipated.

7) (Athenica) Unanticipated costs associated with faxing, mailing and copying information for dissemination to residents requesting cleaning or testing.