

March 16, 2009

LDEQ ANSWERS TO PROPOSERS QUESTIONS
RFP No. 7225-09-01
“Abandoned Underground Storage Tank Closure and Site Investigation – Whitney Food Store”

LDEQ’s answers to the following questions are intended to provide information to potential proposers questions to RFP No. 7225-09-01.

Question 1: Can you please confirm that all I need to be allowed onsite for the March 3rd site visit are the following:

- Hold Harmless Agreement
- Hazwoper Training

When do we register with the LDEQ representative ? onsite?

Also, who signs the hold harmless agreement? The individual onsite for us or an officer of the company?

Does anything need to be notarized???? Are there any other forms required?

LDEQ’s answer: For the site visit, each individual will need the Hold Harmless Agreement and proof of current Hazwoper Training. Contractors will register with one of the LDEQ representatives on site when they get there. The Hold Harmless Agreement should be signed by the individual attending the site visit. It does NOT need to be notarized, and can be witnessed by DEQ representatives or individuals with the contractor. No other forms will be required for the site visit.

Question 2: My lab was interested in being involved with this proposal. Would it be possible for me to get a list of firm who attend the mandatory pre-bid meeting tomorrow?

LDEQ’s answer: A copy of the sign-in sheet can be obtained through the public records process. For assistance concerning public records, phone (225) 219-3172, e-mail publicrecords@la.gov or go to <http://www.deq.louisiana.gov/portal/tabid/2234/Default.aspx>

Question 3: Is there any way I can get a copy of the sign in sheet of who was at the meeting?

LDEQ’s answer: Contact DEQ Public Records. See answer to question 2.

March 16, 2009

Question 4: Has all the piping been removed at the site?

LDEQ's answer: The LDEQ cannot definitively answer this question; however it is assumed that since the tanks and associated vent pipes have not been removed, that the piping is still in place.

Attachment 2, Statement of Work, Section 3.5(2)(b)(1) directs the Contractor to remove the piping during tank closure activities.

Question 5: If it is necessary to excavate the dirt beneath the old dispenser with the canopy; and we have to remove the dispenser island supporting the canopy; will we have to replace the canopy?

LDEQ's answer: No excavation will be done beneath the dispensers. The canopy will not be removed under this contract.

Question 6: The LDEQ is requesting that GeoTech work be done, but did not say if it would be done during the Tank Removal phase or in the corrective action phase. Please clarify.

LDEQ's answer: Geotechnical sampling should be conducted as part of the site investigation. Please refer to Attachment 2, Statement of Work, Section 3.3(1)(h).

Question 7: Are we responsible for replacing the concrete?

LDEQ's answer: Yes, the site must be returned to its original condition. Please refer to Attachment 2, Statement of Work, Section 3.5(4)(c). The number of units for concrete replacement has been amended to one thousand (1,000) square feet.

Question 8: Do we need to include a price to remove the 3 additional tanks or a price to investigate to see if they are there?

LDEQ's answer: Please refer to Attachment 2, Statement of Work, Section 3.6 and Section 3.7 (UST Removal – Contingency). The Statement of Work describes the tasks related to closure of contingency tanks. Attachment 2, Statement of Work, Sections 3.5 and 3.6 have been amended to allow closure in place if removal is not possible due to the location of the USTs.

March 16, 2009

Line Items 14, 15, 16, and 17 of the Schedule of Prices are related to removal activities associated with additional tanks found during assessment/closure activities. Line item 14 allows for no more than 3 tanks at a per tank payment unit. Line item 14 should include costs for all activities related to Attachment 2, Statement of Work, Section 3.6.

Question 9: Can we include a price for security?

LDEQ's answer: A price for security is not included in Attachment 4, Schedule of Prices. The Contractor may factor security into the proposed unit rates for any of the tasks listed in the Schedule of Prices, but it will not be a separate line item.

Question 10: Is there a firm answer about what will be done with the additional tanks if found? Closed in place or pulled?

LDEQ's answer: Please refer to Attachment 2, Statement of Work, Sections 3.6 and 3.7 (UST Removal – Contingency). The Statement of Work describes the tasks related to closure of contingency tanks.

Attachment 2, Statement of Work, Sections 3.5 and 3.6 have been amended to allow closure in place if removal is not possible due to the location of the USTs.

Question 11: Do I get a copy of all questions and answers?

LDEQ's answer: All questions received for this RFP will be posted with their responses to the LDEQ Contracts and Grants website for public viewing.

Question 12: Have the eight monitoring wells been P&A'd? If so, can we use the same hole to redrill out, or do we need to drill in an adjacent location? If so, how deep?

LDEQ's answer: The eight monitoring wells/recovery wells have not be plugged and abandoned. Plugging and abandonment of the existing wells is addressed in Attachment 2, Statement of Work, Section 3.10. This section has been amended to include plugging and abandonment of eight (8) monitoring wells and three (3) recovery wells.

The Contractor shall submit a work plan for site investigation in accordance with Attachment 2, Statement of Work, Section 3.3. Re-sampling the historical sampling locations is not required. The Contractor is tasked with determining an adequate number of borings (and locations) required to fully delineate the

March 16, 2009

hydrocarbon plume. The Contractor shall review investigation and corrective action documents for this facility to determine an appropriate depth for the soil borings/monitoring wells installed under the terms of this contract. All historical sampling information is available through the LDEQ public records (EDMS).

Question 13: Do we need to restore the location of former dispenser islands to parking lot grade?

LDEQ's answer: Attachment 2, Statement of Work, does not address excavation of the former dispenser islands; therefore restoration of this area is not required. As stated in Attachment 2, Statement of Work, Section 3.3, the Contractor shall select sampling locations adequate to determine the presence of contamination beneath and around the former dispensers. Results of the site investigation will also be used as confirmatory sampling locations as part of the tank closure. Soil samples will not be collected during tank removal activities. The area of excavation will be determined prior to tank removal based upon the results of the site investigation.

Please note that the investigation activities will be conducted prior to the tank closure activities. Refer to the note in Attachment 2, Statement of Work, Section 3.3(1). Results of the site investigation will be used as confirmatory sample locations as part of the tank closure. Sample locations must be adequate to determine the presence of contamination beneath and around the tanks, former dispensers and associated piping in addition to determining the extent of the historical contamination.

This contract is an investigation contract that includes the removal of the abandoned USTs. The intent of this contract is to determine the extent of the contamination and develop risk-based clean up standards (RECAP).

Question 14: Do we need to include costs to reinstall the canopy if it needs to be removed to perform the scope of work? Should this be included as a line item price separate from bid?

LDEQ's answer: The canopy will not be removed under this contract. Attachment 2, Statement of Work, does not indicate the requirement for canopy removal. This activity will not be included as a separate line item.

Question 15: If there is a need to stabilize the building due to removal of tanks beneath, does contractor need to include costs for architectural firm to design stabilization plans?

March 16, 2009

LDEQ's answer: Removal of any additional (contingency) USTs will not be conducted if it is determined that the integrity of the building could be compromised as a result of tank removal. A determination regarding removal of any contingency tanks will be made based upon the results of the site investigation and removal of the 3 registered USTs. Closure in place may be conducted under this contract. Attachment 2, Statement of Work, Sections 3.5 and 3.6 have been amended to allow closure in place if removal is not possible due to the location of the USTs.

It is the Contractor's responsibility to determine the appropriate activities and charges to include in the unit price for Schedule of Prices line item 14, UST removal – Contingency.

Question 16: Does contractor need to include pricing to address safety concerns for customers and employees of existing convenience store if store is to remain operating during performance of scope of work. Example: If canopy need to come down, does contractor need to include pricing to construct a protective path for customers to enter the store.

LDEQ's answer: It is the Contractor's responsibility to ensure security at the site during investigation and tank removal activities. The Contractor may include security in the unit prices for the tasks listed in the Schedule of Prices, Attachment 4; however the LDEQ has not indicated a requirement for this.

The canopy will not be removed under this contract.

Question 17: Can DEQ clarify to what extent they would want contractor not to interfere with existing store business or lengths to go to allow store to remain open.

LDEQ's answer: The Contractor shall make every effort to avoid interference with the day to day operations of Whitney Food Store.

Question 18: Can DEQ provide information regarding available security at the site. Should contractor include costs for security?

LDEQ's answer: The LDEQ will not provide security. It is the Contractor's responsibility to ensure security at the site during investigation and tank removal activities. The Contractor may include security in the unit prices for the tasks listed in the Schedule of Prices; however the LDEQ has not indicated a requirement for this.

March 16, 2009

Question 19: Can DEQ clarify unit pricing for removal of additional tanks if they do extend under building. Do we need to include costs incurred for having to excavate beneath building (Ex. Stabilization, demolition, etc..) in unit price or can these costs be added at a later date?

LDEQ's answer: Costs for stabilization or demolition will not be included as a separate line item or added at a later date. Removal of any additional (contingency) USTs will not be conducted if it is determined that the integrity of the building could be compromised as a result of tank removal. A determination regarding removal of any contingency tanks will be made based upon the results of the site investigation and removal of the 3 registered USTs. Closure in place may be conducted under this contract. Attachment 2, Statement of Work, Sections 3.5 and 3.6 have been amended to allow closure in place if removal is not possible due to the location of the USTs.

It is the Contractor's responsibility to determine the appropriate activities and charges to include in the unit price for Schedule of Prices line item 14, UST removal – Contingency.

Question 20: Section 3.2(3)(c) of Att 2 Statement of Work – The Contractor shall conduct off-site reconnaissance of adjacent properties – Does DEQ want the contractor to access off site properties for reconnaissance or just make observations from the Site boundaries and/or public roadways?

LDEQ's answer: It is the Contractor's responsibility to obtain access to off-site (neighboring) properties. Attachment 2, Statement of Work, Section 3.2(1), Site Access, requires the Contractor to obtain the owner's signature on an access agreement prior to performing any site field work. This section does not limit the access activities to the boundaries of the Whitney Food Store property.

Question 21: If offsite access is required for reconnaissance purposes or if offsite sampling is necessary for delineation of contamination, how will site access be obtained?

LDEQ's answer: It is the Contractor's responsibility to obtain access to off-site (neighboring) properties. Attachment 2, Statement of Work, Section 3.2(1), Site Access, requires the Contractor to obtain the owner's signature on an access agreement prior to performing any site field work. This section does not limit the access activities to the boundaries of the Whitney Food Store property.

March 16, 2009

Question 22: Have historical recovery wells (RW-1 through RW-3) been plugged and abandoned or are they still viable for use in phase recovery if deemed necessary based on site investigation?

LDEQ's answer: The three recovery wells have not been plugged and abandoned; however LDEQ cannot confirm the condition of the recovery wells. In the event that free product removal is required, use of these recovery wells is up to the discretion and technical judgment of the project manager and Contractor and as determined by results of the site investigation and risk evaluation.

Question 23: Section 3.4 of Statement of Work – Site investigation activities shall include P&A of all boreholes, monitoring, and recovery wells (new and existing). – Should monitoring wells and recovery wells be plugged and abandoned during site investigation activities, or should this be done at a later date, pending results of site investigation and DEQ determination of whether quarterly monitoring or PSH recovery is required?

LDEQ's answer: The project manager will direct the Contractor to plug and abandon any monitoring wells based upon the results of the site investigation. The LDEQ cannot confirm that monitoring wells will be plugged and abandoned immediately following completion of the site investigation. A separate mobilization for plugging and abandonment at a later date may be required if quarterly groundwater sampling and/or free product recovery is required.

Question 24: Should the canopy removal (if necessary) be billed and addressed as a separate portion of the proposal? The canopy is supported by the building which would require refacing of the building.

LDEQ's answer: The canopy will not be removed under this contract.

Question 25: The Request for Proposal outlines that 1,000 square feet of concrete may be included in the Scope of Work. However, the allowable billing for repaving the surface of the project site is limited to only 800 square feet. Can the area for repaving the surface of the project site be adjusted to meet the area of concrete removed?

LDEQ's answer: Please refer to the RFP Addendum. Concrete replacement has been amended to allow for one thousand (1,000) square feet.

March 16, 2009

Question 26: Should the subsurface investigation confirm the presence of additional underground storage tanks, should concrete removal of this area be addressed in a separate portion of the proposal?

LDEQ's answer: See Attachment 2, Statement of Work, Section 3.6, UST Removal - Contingency

Question 27: The yardage allowed for replacement in the RFP is 65 cubic yards. Based on the tank sizes and size of excavation it will require close to 120 cubic yards of fill to obtain compaction requested.

LDEQ's answer: Attachment 2, Statement of Work, Section 3.5 (4) (b) does not limit the amount of clean backfill to replace if the backfill is not determined to be contaminated above LDEQ action levels. LDEQ stated sixty-five (65) cubic yards as an approximate volume of soil to be replaced, not a limitation. If the backfill is determined to be contaminated above the LDEQ action levels, the volume of clean fill shall not exceed eight hundred (800) cubic yards.

Question 28: Which Proctor standard are you referring to for compaction?

LDEQ's answer: The LDEQ did not refer to a Proctor standard. There is no regulatory requirement for density testing. The excavation area should be backfilled in twelve inch lifts using standard industry compaction measures for parking lots.

Question 29: If shoring is required, should that be a separate cost fee?

LDEQ's answer: No, shoring will not be a separate cost fee for this contract. Shoring is not an LDEQ requirement; it is an OSHA requirement (Standard – 29CFR) for excavations of 5 feet or more. The Contractor must meet all federal, state, and local regulations and guidelines.

Question 30: At the site visit the abandoned tanks near the building were discussed as having to be reviewed by this is not in the RFP. Should this be a separate line item as concrete removal, backhoe time, etc will be required?

LDEQ's answer: Please refer to Attachment 2, Statement of Work, Section 3.6, UST Removal – Contingency. The LDEQ has allowed for the removal of 3 unregistered (contingency) tanks.

March 16, 2009

Question 31: If tanks were coated internally or externally they will have to be disposed of. Do you want this cost included in the bid or as a separate item?

LDEQ's answer: All disposal costs should be included in the bid; however based on the age of the tanks the LDEQ does not anticipate the tanks to have any dielectric coating either internally or externally.

Question 32: Should there be unit pricing on fluid disposal as on some jobs hundreds of thousands of gallons can accumulate in the excavation and need to be disposed?

LDEQ's answer: No; however, the Contractor may allow for such instances in his unit price for line items related to UST removal.

Question 33: The investigation portion calls for offsite investigation. Will the Department assist in offsite permission?

LDEQ's answer: Please refer to Attachment 2, Statement of Work, Section 3.2 (1). The Contractor shall be responsible for obtaining off-site access.

Question 34: What is the purpose of the population and ecological information request and what are your expectations on how you would like this reported?

LDEQ's answer: The Contractor should use this information for site investigation planning purposes. The information will not be submitted in a separate report, but should be included as part of the RECAP evaluation.

Question 35: The RFP requires litigation support and possibly public meetings. Should these time fees be bid as a contingency if needed?

LDEQ's answer: These items should be bid in accordance with Attachment 2, Statement of Work, Section 7.16 and 7.17.