

March 1, 2010

To: All bidders and interested parties
Subject: File No. 761/10107.SAR
Department of Natural Resources and Environment
Remediation and Redevelopment Division
Remedial Design and Remedial Action Oversight
Spartan Chemical Superfund Site
Request for Proposal
Addendum No. 2

Please acknowledge receipt of this Addendum in your proposal.

Note: The due date has been extended to Thursday, March 18, 2009 at 2:00 p.m. local time.

I. Additional Information

- A. Please see the Meeting Attendance Record for the mandatory walk-through held on Wednesday, February 17, 2010 at 10:00 a.m. at the site posted along with this addendum.
- B. The design contractor must submit an Remedial Design (RD) work plan to describe its proposed approach to completing each project task. The following plans, must be included as part of that work plan.
- Site Management Plan;
 - Health and Safety Plan (HASP);
 - Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP) including the Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP); and
 - Contingency plan

Additional details on these plans and what a work plan consists of can be found in the Chapter 4 (pages 45 – 63) of the Remedial Design/Remedial Action Handbook located at:

<http://www.epa.gov/superfund/cleanup/rdrabook.htm>

These pages provide a good reference to what each document is expected to contain as part of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) review process.

- C. The pilot-scale test must be able to provide an evaluation of the following types of information:
- Full-scale-performance;
 - Treatment train performance;
 - Material handling characteristics;
 - Process upsets and recovery;
 - Residuals generation;

- Energy and reagent usage; and
- Site-specific considerations such heavy equipment access, staging space and local availability of equipment and personnel

Additional details on this information can be found in the Chapter 4 of the Remedial Design/Remedial Action Handbook referenced above.

- D. A 30% Preliminary Design is not required for this request for proposal (RFP).
- E. The 60% Design Submittal as specified in the RFP must contain the elements of a Preliminary Design (30%) and an Intermediate Design (60%) as specified in the Chapter 4 of the Remedial Design/Remedial Action Handbook pages 45 – 63 as referenced above.

These elements include (but are not limited to):

- Design criteria report
 - Project description
 - Design requirements and provisions
 - Process flow diagrams
 - O&M provisions
- Basis of design report
 - Design assumptions
 - RA contracting strategy
 - Permits plan
 - Preliminary easement/access requirements
 - Preliminary piping and instrumentation diagrams
- Preliminary drawing and specifications
 - Outline of general specifications
 - Drawings and schematics, including piping and instrumentation diagrams
 - O&M requirements
 - Unit price lists
 - Chemical and geotechnical data
- Preliminary RA Schedule
- Preliminary RA operation and M costs estimates

- F. The 95% Design Submittal as specified in the RFP for component must contain the elements of a Pre-final/Final Design as specified in Remedial Design/Remedial Action Handbook pages 45 – 63 as identified above. This document should be a draft version of the RD, including all drawings, specifications, reports, and attachments. All comments generated during the 60% design should be incorporated as appropriate, and all design work completed.

These elements include (but are not limited to):

- Design criteria report
- Basis of design report
- Pre-final/final drawings and specifications
 - Complete drawings and schematics
 - Construction QAPP
 - Draft O&M Manual
 - Appendices

- RA Schedule
 - Final RA Cost Estimate
- G. The Remedial Action (RA) Solicitation package identified in the Remedial Design/Remedial Action Handbook is not included as part of the document or the RFP nor is the Report on Value Engineering during RD. These sections are to be omitted from the report will be completed outside of this RFP.
- H. All specifications and drawings must conform to the Construction Specifications Institute (CSI) format when designs are conducted and developed.
- I. The Final (100%) Comprehensive Design will include all the design components compiled into one document with multiple attachments that incorporate all USEPA and DNRE comments. The final 100% Design document will make any modifications necessary to any of the design specifications to incorporate implementation of all of the remedial actions in a timely fashion as established by the RA Schedule. A draft Final (100%) Comprehensive Design will be submitted for review and comment. All comments will be incorporated (as appropriate) and a Final document will be issued.
- J. USEPA and DNRE will provide all comments within 30 Business Days of the receipt of each design document.
- K. The evaluation of monitored natural attenuation (MNA) should be completed based on the first 2 sampling events and historical data. The MNA evaluation results (Item 2i- Complete MNA Evaluation) will be incorporated into a design for EISB. The EISB design will only be implemented if, after the other active remediation measures have been allowed sufficient time to reduce the source area concentrations and additional groundwater sampling for MNA evaluation has been performed, the DNRE and USEPA determine it is necessary. Therefore, the EISB evaluation is not expected to be part of the Final (100%) Comprehensive Design.
- L. Semi-Annual Groundwater Monitoring Reports will be prepared after each sampling event and submitted to DNRE and USEPA for review and approval. After two years of semi-annual sample collection from the entire well network, the Professional will prepare a Groundwater Sampling and Analysis Plan and Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) for the Site to continue to monitor the effectiveness of the implemented remedial actions. The SAP identified in item 2h - Develop Groundwater SAP will rely on the QAPP established and submitted as part of the initial work plan. The final SAP is to be included here. This would include updating the list of groundwater wells, frequency, and parameters to be sampled.
- M. In order for the DNRE to accept a proposal that relies upon MNA for remediation of groundwater, the proposal must document that the remediation is protective of the public health, safety, and welfare and the environment by demonstrating all of the following conditions: (Sections 20118, 21309a, 21311a, 21315 of NREPA, R 299.5705(6), R 299.5601, R 299.5603)

- N. An MNA Evaluation must be conducted in accordance with *RRD Operational Memorandum No. 4, Site Characterization and Remediation Verification, Attachment 8 – Monitored Natural Attenuation* available at:

http://www.michigan.gov/documents/deq/deq-rrd-RRDopMemoNo4Attachment8_260123_7.pdf

It must include, but not limited to, the following information:

- Relevant aquifer characteristics, including but not limited to: porosity, hydraulic conductivity, hydraulic gradient, etc. are determined.
- Impacted groundwater is fully defined both vertically and horizontally to the most restrictive cleanup criteria.
- All receptors have been identified and are not immediately threatened. (R 299.5520)
- The plume has been demonstrated to be stable or shrinking through direct measurements, or a combination of direct measurements and appropriate modeling to predict plume migration.
- All contaminants are capable of undergoing biodegradation, or chemical transformation to less mobile or toxic forms (note metals and some organic compounds do not readily biodegrade) otherwise a waiver to R 299.5705(6) will be required.
- Geochemical indicators (e.g., dissolved oxygen, dissolved iron, nitrates, sulfates, pH) document a naturally occurring biological process is sustainable prior to initiating MNA when biodegradation is the primary mechanism for the decline in contaminant levels, otherwise a waiver to R 299.5705(6) will be required.
- An analysis of alternatives that permanently and significantly reduce the volume, toxicity, and mobility of hazardous substances in accordance with the provisions of Sections 20114(1), 20118(8), 20118(4), 21307(2), and 21311a of NREPA.
- A detailed contingency plan has been prepared and can be implemented in the event that MNA proves ineffective.

II. Questions

The following questions have been compiled to clarify answers to questions in portions of the RFP package:

Q1. Are all face to face meetings held at the site? If not where?

- A1. *All site meetings will be held on site utilizing the temporary facilities during the duration of all field activities. Upon completion of the pilot test and field work (with the exception of the semi-annual monitoring), all additional meetings will occur in Constitution Hall located at 525 West Allegan in Lansing, Michigan.*

Q2. Are the Temporary facilities used for six consecutive months?

- A2. *The temporary facilities at the site need to be in place continuously throughout the end of the field portion of the pilot test operations with the exception of the completion of the semi-annual monitoring of the groundwater which is expected to last 2 years.*

Q3. The ISCO pilot speaks of two rounds of liquid oxidant injection. Is the professional required to use liquid oxidant if it is demonstrated in the laboratory study that ozone is the oxidant of choice?

A3. For the purpose of this RFP, it should be assumed that the results of the liquid oxidant treatability testing are found to be acceptable and that the pilot study will include up to two rounds of liquid chemical oxidant injections within the proposed treatment areas.

Q4. On page 15 under Deliverables it states;” The professional shall provide one unbound reproducible copy of each deliverable.”

a. Does this apply only to the final deliverable or does this include all drafts?

b. One unbound copy or two (one to each governmental organization; DNRE and USEPA)?

A4. One unbound reproducible copy of each deliverable shall be provided on all drafts to the DNRE.

Q5. Figure 3 of the RFP shows an overlapping area between the area requiring ISCO and air sparge/SVE. Are both remedies to be applied in the area of overlap?

A5. Figure 3 of the RFP is intended to show a generic area of each of the remedial technologies and is not intended to provide specific detailed information. Descriptions and preliminary details are provided in the ROD. Exact specifications are to be determined during this scope of work and may require areas of overlap. The goal of the ISCO/AS/SVE will be to significantly reduce concentrations in the source area to levels that will naturally attenuate within a reasonable time frame.

Q6. Under Task 4, there is a reference to ISCO treatment of two areas, while there is only one area displayed in Figure 3. Please explain the discrepancy.

A6. As stated in A5, Figure 3 as well as Figure 2 of the RFP, are intended as a reference to only depict a generic area of each of the remedial technologies and not a defined area of treatment.

Q7. NAPL was measured at MW-101 and MW-108. Was the NAPL ever characterized? What is the nature of the NAPL (LNAPL or DNAPL)?

A7. Concentrations and nature of the NAPL are identified in the supplied documents including the ROD and Proposed Plan.

Q8. What is the expected treatment thickness for the ISCO area?

A8. Generic descriptions of the expected treatment thickness for the ISCO areas are identified in the ROD and Proposed Plan. Final details and the actual area of where the ISCO is to occur will be established through the work performed under this RFP and based on the professional’s recommendations.

Q9. In what Task would the DNRE like the professional to cost any wrap up remedial investigation data gap efforts?

A9. *For any additional investigations that are necessary to complete a specific design component, the costs for the investigation should be identified in its associated item number. Items that additional investigations may be warranted include, but are not limited to:*

- *2i - Complete MNA Evaluation;*
- *2j - EISB Design;*
- *3a - Waste Characterization;*
- *3b - Soil Removal Design;*
- *4c - ISCO Full-Scale Design; and*
- *5b - AS/SVE and Vapor Intrusion Mitigation Design.*

Be sure that the technical proposal provides an adequate description to support the basis of these costs. Costs for the analytical for these sections must be included in 2k – Analytical – State of Michigan Environmental Laboratory and 2l – Analytical – Specialty Laboratory if necessary.

Q10. A desire was expressed at the site meeting to have all field pilot testing task completed in the 2010 field season.

a. How many business days should the professional allow for document review and approval by DNRE and USEPA prior to being granted work plan approval?

A10. DNRE and USEPA are expected to provide comments on all work plans within 22 business days.

Q11. When can the professional anticipate that site access will be granted to DNRE for completion of work on off-site commercial, industrial, and residential properties?

a. Will property access agreements be complete in time for the 2010 field season?

A11. Off site access will be provided within the 22 business days of the work-plan review and comment.

Q12. Semi-annual monitoring of groundwater over 24 months is required prior to completion of the MNA plan.

a. Can the Comprehensive Design be submitted without the MNA Plan document?

A12. The comprehensive design package will be submitted prior to the completion of the 24 months of groundwater sampling. The basis of the MNA Design should be made on the historical data coupled with the initial two rounds of collected data. The final 2 rounds of data will be reported as semi-annual sampling data. Please see Additional Information Items K, M and N above for further clarification.

Q13. Do you have a conflict of interest definition for the bidders to follow regarding previous work completed for Spartan Chemical or its affiliates?

A13. The DNRE has identified Spartan Chemical Co as being a company that is dissolved which the owners filed bankruptcy in February 1992 and abandoned in 1995. No successors or assigns are known to exist.

USEPA continues to investigate for potential liable parties (PLPs); however, at this time its efforts have not yielded any new information on any PLPs. As with all Superfund Sites, USEPA continues to search for PLPs and including parties that are known to be associated with Organic Chemical Inc. (OCI), a company purchased by Spartan Chemical in 1968. At this time no PLPs have been identified by the USEPA as being associated with Spartan Chemical. OCI is located in Grandville, Michigan. A list of PLPs associated with OCI is attached for reference.

Q14. What level of design detail are you requesting in the Comprehensive Design? Would you like all specifications complete that will ultimately be required for the construction bidding specification document or will basic system control parameters and equipment specifications be adequate?

A14. Please see Additional Information Items B – J above.

Q15. Is it permissible for the SVE pilot test effluent VOC's to be discharged without pre-treatment during this effort?

A15. Any effluent generated during the SVE pilot test must be contained on-site and characterized for disposal. Estimated costs must be included for containerizing all wastes and an estimate for disposal should be included under the appropriate item.

Q16. What are the allowable air discharge permit limits for chemicals of concern that full scale SVE design should consider?

A16. Appendix A and B from the installed SVE Bid Specs (attached) include the air emission requirements.

Q17. Is preparation of detailed drawings and technical specifications that would be used by the State to publicly bid the remedial action work (referred to as "biddable specifications packages" in Task 7 on page 14 of the RFP) part of the scope of professional services relative to the 60% (intermediate), 95% (pre-final) and 100% (comprehensive final) design submittals? Technical specifications, in the context of this question, means specifications prepared in the Construction Specifications Institute (CSI) format (such as CSI Master Format Divisions 1 through 16) that convey sufficient information to contractors so that they can bid and construct the project. Similarly, detailed drawings, in the context of this question, means drawings that convey sufficient information to contractors so that they can bid and construct the project.

Therefore, should we consider detailed drawings and specifications to be the same as "biddable specifications packages" as mentioned in Task 7 - Comprehensive Design Report on page 14 of the RFP, which is excluded from the scope of professional services according to Task 7, as written in the RFP.

A17. *Please see Additional Information Items B – J above.*

Q18. Could you please confirm that preparation of detailed drawings and technical specifications (which would be signed and sealed by a licensed professional engineer registered in Michigan) is not part of the current scope of professional services. If you do confirm that the preparation of detailed drawings and technical specifications ("biddable specifications packages") is not part of the current scope of work, then you may also want to consider revising the requirements under DELIVERABLES on page 15 of the RFP. For example, the first sentence of this section says that the "...Professional shall provide electronic copies of all final reports, specifications, drawings..." You may want to delete the word "specifications" in this paragraph.

A18. *Please see Additional Information Items B – J above.*

Q19. In regards to the Professional Questionnaire (specified on page 2 Section I-2 of the RFP), is it okay to provide representative Technical Memorandum excerpts from more than one (1) past project.

A19. *It is recommended that only 1 project be supplied if possible; however, if excerpts from multiple projects are necessary to demonstrate the appropriate experience, more than one excerpt will be accepted.*

Q20. Will the face to face meetings discussed in the Scope of Work – Task 1 take place at the Site?

A20. *Please see Response A1.*

Q21. Do we need to include a cost on the cost estimate sheet for the State of Michigan Environmental Laboratory and an approved specialty lab even those costs are to be direct billed to the DNRE?

A21. *Yes. The estimate should include a description of the number and type of sample being submitted. Any additional investigations that are determined to be necessary should also be included in these sections. A cost sheets for the State of Michigan is attached. Soil samples should use the costs associated with the similar water matrix test. See also the Response A9.*

Q22. Can the office trailer space for the use of the DNRE and the USEPA be located in the Professional office trailer?

A22. *Yes, but they must be separate and able to be secured from the rest of the trailer.*

Q23. How many combinations of oxidants and/or oxidant/activator combinations are required to be bench-scale tested under the Scope of Work – Task 4?

A23. *A minimum of three different oxidants must be bench-scale tested. Any combinations of the oxidant/activator that must be performed are in addition to the three oxidants and must be detailed in the RFP.*

Q24. What size pilot study area is required under the Scope of Work – Task 4?

A24. The extent of the pilot test for Task 4 will need to be established by the professional and must consist an area that contains enough of the variables present at the facility that it can be determined the effectiveness of the liquid chemical oxidant. Variables that must be considered so that an engineer can complete the design include depth, concentrations of contamination expected to be treated, types of contaminants present and that will be treated, geological and hydrogeological parameters. Please see information in Additional Item C.

Q25. How many AS/SVE pilot test wells are required under the Scope of Work – Task 5?

A25. As many as are required to address potential changes in site conditions throughout the areas identified in Figure 2 of the RFP.

Q26. Just confirming, two (2) soil vapor probes are located at the adjacent school property described in the Scope of Work – Task 5?

A26. Correct

Q27. What is required format for the Site Specific Work Plan requested in the Scope of Work – Task 1 and under the Project Schedule? Is the scope of this plan listed under II.3 of the RFP?

A27. Please see Additional Information B above.

Q28. Please provide a list of all PLPs identified for the site and the project.

A28. Please see Response A13.

Q29. What is the current power source available at the site (i.e. is there a power pole set, is 3 phase available?)

A29. All power on the site is currently disconnected. The former remediation system was serviced by 480 Volt, 3 Phase, with a 400 Amp breaker which is accessible in the NW corner of the current remediation structure.

Q30. Page 13 states that a vapor intrusion assessment is not planned, yet we will be tasked with completing an assessment and a report. Please clarify.

A30. Page 13 states "Vapor intrusion assessment is not planned for the former Spartan Chemical Facility property under the current scope of work, but will likely be performed after source area remediation is complete." The statement reflects that the vapor intrusion assessment will not be completed at the property as there are current no risks to for the indoor air inhalation pathway present as the site is vacant and there is no proposed development currently planned.

Q31. Task 2h is to develop a Groundwater SAP, but page 8 states QAPP. Please clarify.

A31. Please see Addition Information L above.

Q32. Are there any labor multiplier limitations?

A32. There are no limitations; however, DMB has provided a guide to assist in providing competitive billing rates.

Q33. Is the previous consultant allowed to bid on this project?

A33. *Yes, all previous consultants that have worked at the Facility for the State of Michigan, that do not have any current issues or conflicts of interest, are allowed to bid.*

Q34. HASP is required for the overall work, but there is no mention of any other USEPA documents (QAPP, SAP, etc.) for the overall project.

A34. *Please see Additional Information Items B – J above.*

Q35. A QAPP and a SAP are required for the ISCO pilot test and for the 95% design submittal, but not for the project. Does a QAPP and SAP currently exist for the work and will it be available for updating?

A35. *Please see Additional Information Items B – J above for further clarification. The QAPP and SAP previously used are no long applicable and can not be relied upon.*

Q36. Please clarify that MNA is requested (page 1 and other places), with all the necessary sampling that demonstrates biological activity (CO₂, methane, ethane, etc.) and not just monitored attenuation (page 4, 3rd paragraph from bottom) of the groundwater contamination.

A36. *RRD Operational Memorandum No. 4, Site Characterization and Remediation Verification, Attachment 8 – Monitored Natural Attenuation describes the requirements for an acceptable evaluation of whether monitored natural attenuation (MNA) is a feasible and effective method of remediation consistent with the requirements of Part 201 or Part 213 of NREPA. A detailed discussion of what constitutes the appropriate field parameters for petroleum and chlorinated solvents is included in Appendices A and B of Operation Memorandum 4, Attachment 8. Please see Additional Information Items K, M and N above and the operational memorandum as referenced above.*

Q37. Page 7, 3rd paragraph states that temporary facilities will be needed for 6 months. Would the State consider including an allowance for the trailer and utilities?

A37. *No.*

Q38. How secure is the site? Have there been any problems with vandalism or office space break-ins in the past?

A38. *The site is secured by a chain link and barb wire fence. Secured buildings have not had any issues with vandalism or break-ins. Former vacant structures, since demolished, experienced occasion entry and vandalism typically associated with accessible structures. DNRE and contractor field equipment has been left on site over night with no issues.*

Q39. First line on page 9 states that the “services provided by the Professional will include appropriately verifying the limits of the proposed excavations included in Figure 5 (based on post-2007 revisions). How will this be accomplished? With new soil borings?

A39. The professional should evaluate the data and determine if the collection of any additional soil data to address any data gaps is necessary. Based upon that evaluation, the Professional should identify a method to collect the necessary data.

Q40. Page 13, 1st bullet states that the State Project Manager will provide vapor intrusion guidance levels. When? How will this impact the Professional’s bid?

A40. RRD’s June 2008 Operational Memorandum No. 4, Site Characterization and Remediation Verification, Attachment 4 – Soil gas and Indoor Air is attached for reference.

Q41. Please clarify the conflict of interest request. Is the former Spartan Chemical Company the only party of concern?

A41. Please see Response A13.

Q42. Are DNRE and USEPA seeking to obtain a meeting for "presentation of the submitted designs," such as a PowerPoint presentation during an on-site meeting to discuss each of the 60% and 95% design submittals?

A42. Meetings are established as a way to discuss site progress and issues as they come up. A PowerPoint presentation is not necessary to discuss each of the 60% and design submittals, but can be if the professional feels it is the most effective way to present the data during a site progress meeting.

Q43. Is the preparation of specifications a component of the 60% and 95% design submittals? No reference to specifications is made in the scope of work.

- If yes, should the design packages include Division 0 (i.e., Bid Form, Agreement, Supplementary Conditions, etc.) and Division 1 (General Conditions) Sections as a component of the 60% and 95% design submittals? At the pre-bid meeting, it was verbally represented that Division 0 and Division 1 were not intended to be requirements of the designs; however, omission of these Divisions would be atypical for engineering designs.**
- If yes, should specifications be provided in the 50 Division Format (Master Format 2004) recently published by the Construction Specifications Institute (CSI) or the older 16 Division Format (Master Format 1995)?**

A43. Please see Additional Information Items B – J above.

Q44. Please clarify the requirements for the comprehensive final design document. Does DNRE or DMB have an example of a comprehensive final design document from another project that bidders could examine?

A44. No example is available. Please see Additional Information Items B – G above.

Q45. It is understood that actual procurement of a Trade Contractor is not part of the scope of work; however, is the comprehensive final design document intended to provide a single biddable package of the individually prepared designs?

A45. Please see Additional Information Items B – G above.

Q46. Please clarify whether DNRE and USEPA seeking to remove all remaining structural concrete, including slabs, as a component of the final design for this task or only in the areas where soil removal is proposed?

A46. The amount of concrete that will need to be removed at the site should be based on the need for access and what is necessary to perform the RD and eventually the RA, not just based on removing all remaining concrete. However, if it can be justified that complete removal of all surface concrete is a more cost effective means of addressing site conditions, then it would be acceptable.

Q47. Is a floor plan map available for the Ambassador Steel Property, including identification of entry ways authorized for the sampling work and accessibility of different parts of the building (i.e., drive-in access, foot access only, ramps, steps, grade separations)?

- **If yes, are details regarding the floor slab construction available (i.e., slab thickness, reinforcement, locations of concrete encased utilities)?**
- **Should bidders contact Ambassador Steel directly for purposes of obtaining information regarding possible equipment constraints?**

A47. A floor plan is not available for the Ambassador Steel Property and will need to be developed as part of this scope of work under the appropriate task. The bid should provide clear indications on what assumptions are made as part of this scope of work. Professionals should only observe Ambassador Steel from accessible roads and parking lots and supply all assumptions in their proposal.

Q48. The State of Michigan licenses only individual engineers and does not issue engineering licenses. Is it the intent that the prime professional firm must meet all requirements for the practice of engineering in Section 339.2010 of Public Act 299 of 1980, Article 20?

A48. Yes.

Q49. As part of their Well Inventory completed in November 2009, did Weston collect depth to water and/or total depth of well measurements at locations other than MW-120s?

A49. No as Weston was not task with sampling all of the monitoring wells. However, there are 67 wells on record in the groundwater monitoring well network. Refer to Table 1 Monitoring well construction Summary of the RFP for a summary of the monitoring wells and their corresponding screen intervals. The monitoring wells are set vertically at varying intervals and classified as shallow, intermediate, deep or bedrock based on screened interval. Well locations are provided on Figure 4. Well inspection logs from a well inventory conducted in November 2009 are provided in Appendix D. The well inventory includes 26 additional wells previously installed for remedial design support purposes that are not included in the standard groundwater monitoring well network but

may be incorporated into other aspects of the remedial design, as needed. Historical investigations and cross section in the ROD can provide additional information. Example depth to groundwater readings collected by the DNRE is supplied in the attached table.

Q50. Twenty-one wells were noted in the November 2009 Well Inventory as containing pumps that DLZ identified as Fultz pumps in their December 2003 Final Technical Memorandum Additional Remedial Investigation report. Are these pumps within the wells? Does the DNRE have the control box to operate the pumps? Should bidders assume that the pumps are functional for purposes of collecting samples?

A50. All pumps that remain in the wells have been identified in the 2009 Well Inventory are bladder pumps that the DNRE has a control box and air compressor for. For the purpose of this bid, it should be assumed that the pumps are all operational.

Q51. Are the temporary facilities described in Task 1 of the scope of work necessary for the design phase or construction phase of the work?

A51. Please see Response A1 and A2.

Q52. Who are the affiliates of Spartan Chemical Company? This information is needed to address the Conflict of Interest issue.

A52. Please see Response A13.

Q53. Items #2e, 2f, & 2g - What are the number of flush mount wells vs. stickups?

A53. For the purpose of this RFP, all new wells should be completed as flush mounts.

Q54. Item #2i - Which specialty analytical tests are not analyzed by the State lab?

A54. All analytical tests not identified on the attached spreadsheet provided by the DNRE Environmental Lab should be considered as a specialty analytical test.

Q55. Item # 5a - Are the SVE well logs and wells/piping drawings available, including the portions that were scrapped?

A55. Bidders should assume that all existing SVE wells are not serviceable for any future work. All piping was removed. Documents included in the DVD do provide information on the former system.

Q56. Item #5c - Are utility drops still in place and functional? Are power costs included in line item #5c?

A56. Please see Response A29.

Q57. Item #5d - Are the numbers of AS, SVE, and monitoring points entirely up to the consultant?

A57. Please see Response A24 and A25. The number of AS, SVE and monitoring points should be based upon a consultants best professional judgment, extent of impact, and necessary design information that needs to be collected.

Q58. Item #5d - Shall we assume that the DNRE will obtain access for the offsite properties (e.g., Ambassador Steel) access for SVE pilot test wells?

A58. Please see Response A11.

Q59. Item #5h - Shall we assume full build-out of AS/SVE and Vapor Mitigation systems per the conceptual treatment area drawings?

A59. Final Design will be based on all supplied information and any supplemental information that the professional firm needs to be collected. Figures 2 and 3 of the RFP provide a generic area for reference.

Q60. Due to unexpected weather conditions, the mandatory site walkthrough was postponed by about one week. Will the DNRE be willing to extend the due date for submittal of the proposals?

A60. Please see III. Extension of Time below.

Q61. Can you provide the names of the reviewers selected for the bid review process?

A61. No.

Q62. Who will manage the project for DNRE?

A62. Matthew Williams, Environmental Quality Specialist, Superfund Section.

Q63. Can you provide additional information about the process for bid evaluation? Is there a checklist with assigned point values for each item? How are points assigned to each bid?

A63. The Professionals will be evaluated based on their Proposal - Parts I and II. Final selection of the Professional will be based on an evaluation of both Parts I and II. Relative weights used for the final selection will be 80 percent (80%) for Part I and 20 percent (20%) for Part II.

Q64. RFP, Attachment II, Task 1, Page 7, 2nd Paragraph: Will the monthly "face to face meetings" during field activities be held at or near the site?

A64. Please see Response A1.

Q65. RFP, Attachment II, Task 1, Page 7, 3rd and 5th Paragraphs: The third paragraph states that "field offices and sanitary facilities" shall be maintained at the site for up to 6 months. The fifth paragraph states that "office trailer space for the use of the DNRE, USEPA, and field staff" will be maintained "while Work is being conducted under this contract." Under this scope of work, is the intent for the field office trailer to remain onsite throughout the length of the entire length of the project (approximately 2 years), and that the sanitary facilities, decontamination facilities, fire protection equipment, temporary lighting, safety equipment, etc. be maintained only during the 6 month field work period?

A65. Please see Response A2. Other facilities include decontamination, fire protection equipment, temporary lighting, safety, etc, must be available during all field activities (as necessary).

III. Request for an Extension of Time

- a. The due date has been extended to Thursday, March 18, 2009 at 2:00 p.m. local time.

Attachments

- *Meeting Attendance Record.*
- *PLP List for OCI*
- *RRD Operational Memorandum No. 4, Site Characterization and Remediation Verification, Attachment 4 – Soil gas and Indoor Air*
- *State of Michigan Environmental Laboratory Cost Sheets (3)*
- *Appendix A and B from the installed SVE Bid Package*
- *DNRE Measured Groundwater Static Water Levels - Partial*