
January 5, 2023

TO: All Proposers under Request for Proposals No. 22-500632

FROM: Department of Purchasing and Contracting, DeKalb County, Georgia

ADDENDUM NO. 2

Request for Proposal (RFP) No. 22-500632 Air Quality and Noise Assessment Study at Dekalb Peachtree Airport. The following questions were submitted and received pertaining to this RFP; the County's responses are as follows:

1. For modeling the 2040 scenario, will PDK provide information on future forecast operations, future time in mode, future fleet mix, future airport configuration, and changes to declared distance, for both the 'with' and 'without' scenarios?

Answer: Future forecast operations, future fleet mix, future airport configuration representing the 'with' scenario, and changes to declared distances for the 'with' scenario shall be provided by PDK that match PDK's Master Plan. The 'without' future 2040 scenario should use PDK's existing (2023) configuration, but with all future forecast operations and future fleet mix. Time-in-modes for takeoff, climb out, and approach should be identical for both future scenarios. The only parameter that cannot be provided (but should be estimated based upon good engineering judgement and analysis of the 'with' and 'without' distances and future fleet mix) is the time-in-mode for taxiing/queuing/idling aircraft.

2. For the modeling of concentrations of UFPs – item 3.C indicates “UFP is representing PM2.5 “.Could you provide more clarity to this comment ? – are you indicating that plume reactivity associated with UFP needs to be applied to the PM2.5 modelling? Or Is the UFP definition in IV.1 indicating that nvPM emission factors should be used in lieu of PM2.5 emission factors? Or, will modeling be performed on the PM2.5 emissions but be reported out as UFP mass?

Answer: For clarity, item 3.C that states “UFP is representing PM2.5” is wrong. We apologize for this confusion.

Particles that are less than 100 nanometers (nm) in diameter are commonly defined as ultrafine, which are far smaller than regulated PM10 or PM2.5. The scientific community, as published in archive journal articles, conclude that aircraft engines only emit particles in the UFP size range. The UFP definition in IV.1 indicates that nvPM emission factors should be used in lieu of PM2.5 emission factors. EPA's AERMOD model shall be used to quantify concentrations of nvPM, as well as other regulated pollutants, and does not have the capability to quantify UFP plume reactivity.

3. Does PDK have real-time ANOMS noise measurement data collected in 2018?

Answer: Yes

4. Should clarifying assumptions that directly correlate to total cost be listed in the cost proposal or in the technical approach document?

Answer: Technical Approach document. DeKalb County accepts all responses.

5. For alternative items listed in VII 1 thru 3 should a proposed scope of work be developed to justify the cost proposal?

Answer: The alternative items listed in VII 1 thru 3 are above and beyond the original scope of work assembled by subject matter experts from the EPA, FAA, and Georgia EPD. As written, these extra items are an alternative to the findings of the assessment. A Project Work Statement should be proposed.

6. In Section V.2, the scope seeks a comparative analysis between the modeling and real time noise measurements. However, there does not appear to be any scope of work associated with collecting real time noise measurements, will those measurement be supplied by the Airport? Secondly, are those noise measurements going to be from 2018, or will we be comparing field measurements from one year with modeling from a different year?

Answer: No. The consultant will complete real time noise measurements and complete a comparison with the modeling.

7. In Section IV.3.A there are three air quality data elements that need to be collected, but there are no parameters regarding the collection of this data. Are you expecting this data to be collected (and representative) of a day, a week, a month, or a year?

Answer: For Study contractors that are familiar with FAA's AEDT model, they will need to enter in the spatial aspects of PDK airport to ensure that the locations of emission sources are accurate, and representative of the operational nature of PDK airport. The Study Contractor should coordinate with PDK staff to obtain the physical locations of emissions sources such as engine run up locations, taxiways, departure queues, etc. This information should be obtained for PDK's current configuration, as well as the full build Master Plan for the 'with' scenario in 2040. Once the physical locations of these emissions sources are properly entered into AEDT as well as the associated emissions characteristics, AEDT will automatically generate an AERMOD input file, which is number (1) of the three elements noted in Section IV.3.A.

The use of EPA's AERMOD dispersion model requires local weather data files (see AERMOD's User Manual for weather data file types) that represents 8,760 hours of the year to ensure that the air quality dispersion modeling quantifies pollutant

concentrations at the appropriate times of the day or night. This weather data will capture hourly, daily, and seasonal temporal variations. It is up to the Study contractor to obtain an appropriate local weather file to complete this scope of work.

8. Please provide an example aircraft or ‘design’ aircraft for each of the for Groups of aircraft provided in III.2 “aircraft Fleet mix”

Answer: Design aircraft is an incorrect term in this context. Examples are general aviation aircraft within these categories are found within the FAA Aircraft Characteristic Database and should reflect the actual observed fleet mix at PDK.

9. Please provide clarity on how Turbo-propeller aircraft should be handled in III.2; as they are unique from piston powered aircraft, and have aircraft types that potentially fit within all four Groups?

Answer: Turbprop aircraft should fall into groups listed in III.2.

10. Is this URL the correct source for the Master Plan; it still states Draft Master Plan: <https://www.pdkmasterplan.com/draft-master-plan-technical-report/>

Answer: The Master Plan is still in draft form. It has not been approved by the BOC

11. Helicopters make up ~2 to ~5% of annual operations from 1990-2018 – how should helicopter operations be addressed for noise and air quality in this study? (source: <https://www.pdkmasterplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Chapter-3-Forecasts.pdf>)

Answer: Helicopters can be ignored for the purposes of this study.

12. The 2040 year in the forecast is 25.18% higher than the TAF; should forecasts for this study be adjusted based on the most current TAF?

Answer: Negative. Please use the same forecast that was used in the Master Plan. The master plan forecast was approved by the FAA for planning purposes.

13. Was there a detailed fleet mix developed for 2040 as part of the forecast work completed in Table 3-16 “Forecast summary” found here: <https://www.pdkmasterplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Chapter-3-Forecasts.pdf> If so; will this detailed fleet mix be made available?

Answer: No, only basic forecast by type. Consultant should create fleet mix.

14. What involvement do, or will GAMA and/or NBAA have during the course of the study in regard to fleet mix development?

Answer: None

15. What, if any known flight path changes will there be in 2040 at PDK? Such as new RNAV/RNP arrivals, or new RNAV/RNP departures?

Answer: None at this time

16. Can you provide an electronic copy of the full Master Plan for the Dekalb Peachtree airport to potential respondents?

Answer: It is too large to place together. You can download each chapter from the site in its entirety.

17. Are their logs available of aircraft number/type/size data available from FAA or PDK airport authorities? Will this be made available? (says 2018 is available, does this have all the information needed by AEDT?)

Answer: Yes

18. Would the airport authority be open to having Meteorology/Air Quality monitor(s) on airport property?

Answer: Placement of equipment/monitors within the AOA is a safety issue. Based on the SOW, there is no need to have meteorological/air quality monitors on airport property.

19. In addition to aircraft operations, do we include ground based noise/emission sources (such as refueling, luggage handling, etc) in our modeling and comparison analysis?

Answer: No. This modeling study is focused on aircraft emissions and noise. No need to include ground-based emission sources.

20. Are the ANOMS continuously collecting data, is this data available? what is the data frequency?

Answer: Yes/ daily

21. Are NMS1-4 per the 2021 Annual Noise Report the stationary ANOMS?

Answer: Yes

- a. Have their locations changed between 2018 and today, future?

Answer: No

- b. How frequently is the data collected and obtainable?

Answer: Daily/Monthly

22. In the SOW Section V #2 Comparative Analysis "PDK's portable ANOMS mobile units" are mentioned. Are the portable monitors available to be used or will they need to be purchased?

Answer: The airport has one portable monitor and will allow the consultant to utilize it if necessary.

Would these need to be cited off airport property, with property owners permission?

Answer: Yes

23. Would the noise files (INM or AEDT) used to develop the 2016 Noise Contours at PDK be available?

Answer: Yes

24. Will the FAA's National Offload Program (NOP) radar data be available?

Answer: Yes. For the 2018 scenario only.

25. What's the project timeline?

Answer: We assume 3-6 months is reasonable.

26. Can you provide more information on how you perceive handling two of the variables cited in IV.2 - terrain/topography and flight path seem like they are fixed based on the study parameters. Could you further explain how pollutants would be parsed for these parameters?

Answer: Please see the user manuals for AEDT and AERMOD pertaining to terrain/topography. Flight path information may be provided by PDK or FAA radar data.

27. The master plan appears to be in draft status. If it is not adopted by the time of this work, can we assume that we would use the data contained in the draft master plan

Answer: Yes

28. The scope of work provides no allowance for engagement with stakeholders, will the airport have full responsibility for communicating with stakeholders?

Answer: The airport can assist in communicating or providing information with any necessary stakeholder engagement needed.

29. I also have a question regarding the solicitation: Will the County allow the vendors to attend the Wednesday, November 9th LSBE meeting for this solicitation and still get credit for attending the mandatory meeting to qualify for participation in this solicitation?

Answer: There were a total of ten (10) LSBE meetings (Wednesday, October 26, 2022, Wednesday, November 2, 2022, Wednesday, November 16, 2022, Wednesday, November 23, 2022, and Wednesday, November 30, 2022). The vendor must have attended one of these meetings to be deemed responsive.

30. I am e-mailing with regards to the RFP No. 22-500632 for Air Quality and Noise Assessment Study at PDK. I noticed on the solicitation that it says the “Mandatory DeKalb First LSBE Meeting: (Bidders must attend 1 meeting on either of the dates listed.)” Unfortunately, ESA was unable to make the meeting time and dates listed. Does this mean that we are unable to submit a proposal for this solicitation? We have great qualifications, and staff in the Atlanta metro area, that would be able to meet the requirements of this RFP. We also have extensive experience with noise and air quality. ESA would be pleased to be able to respond to this RFP.

Answer: There were a total of ten (10) LSBE meetings (Wednesday, October 26, 2022, Wednesday, November 2, 2022, Wednesday, November 16, 2022, Wednesday, November 23, 2022, and Wednesday, November 30, 2022). The vendor must have attended one of these meetings to be deemed responsive.

31. Please confirm that **Attachment H, Exhibit 1** (*First Source Jobs Ordinance Information, First Source Jobs Ordinance Acknowledgement*) is to be submitted by email to fkadkins@dekalbcountyga.gov and not to be attached to the submittal response as an appendix.

Answer: It is mandatory that all forms be submitted with the proposal.

32. Please confirm that **Attachment H, Exhibit 2** (*First Source Jobs Ordinance Information, New Employee Tracking Form*) is to be submitted by email to FirstSourceJobs@dekalbcountyga.gov and not to be attached to the submittal response as an appendix.

Answer: It is mandatory that all forms be submitted with the proposal.

33. Please confirm that **Attachment H, Exhibit 3** (*First Source Jobs Ordinance Information, Business Service Request Form*) is to be submitted by email to jblack@dekalbcountyga.gov and not to be attached to the submittal response as an appendix.

Answer: It is mandatory that all forms be submitted with the proposal.

34. Please confirm that **Attachment H, Exhibit 4** (*First Source Jobs Ordinance Information, Employment Roster*) is not submitted by email and is not to be attached to the submittal response as an appendix.

Answer: It is mandatory that all forms be submitted with the proposal.

It is the responsibility of each proposer to ensure that he is aware of all addenda issued under this RFP. Please sign and return this addendum. You may email L. Deneen Walters, Procurement Agent at ldwalters@dekalbcountyga.gov before the proposals are due to confirm the number of addenda issued.

All other conditions remain in full enforce and effect.

L. Deneen Walters
Procurement Agent

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The above Addendum No. 2 is hereby acknowledged:

(NAME OF PROPOSER)

(SIGNATURE)

(TITLE)