

**Q.1: Under section 2.2 item C, ... The 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point identifies surveying. Can you provide additional insight? What type of surveying does the department expect? Would this be for the creation of accurate property figures showing the location of borings, or something beyond? Appreciate if you can provide additional insight as surveying a property usually means locating property corners in the field with requires obtaining legal descriptions from the register of deeds and other research before going onsite to locate these accurately with property boundaries.**

A.1: While each scope of work will be project-specific, it is anticipated that requests for surveying will be limited to surveying the locations of soil borings, monitoring wells and key site features, and measuring the elevation of the ground and top of casing of monitoring wells used in the investigation.

**Q.2: If any site presents a conflict of interest, are we contractually bound to move forward - or is there an option of declining the site assignment? Please provide more information about how this scenario would be handled.**

A.2: If a selected consultant is unable to perform the work requested by the DNR for a particular project, the firm can decline the opportunity and will not be required to establish a site-specific contract with the DNR for the project. After receiving a request from the DNR, the selected consultant is expected to notify the DNR in writing within 3 business days and provide reason why they cannot complete the work. The DNR will then request another consultant selected through this RFQ process provide the DNR with a proposal for the work.

**Q.3: Considering this is a Request for Qualifications, would the WDNR want the cost proposal submitted as a separate document from the other proposal elements?**

A: Cost proposals should be submitted as outlined in the RFQ.

**Q.3: Under Scope of Services section and for the sake of project continuity, what is the anticipated turn-around time for WDNR/EPA document review?**

A: The DNR/EPA's document review and response time is dependent on the services requested and the complexity of the site.

**Q.4: The QAPP section discusses the need to address petroleum and non-petroleum hazardous substances. Currently PFAS are not classified as hazardous substances by the EPA and may require a higher level of effort for ensuring data integrity. Quality assurance and sampling protocols for PFAS may require a level of effort that is not currently accounted for the \$3,000 flat fee reimbursed under the brownfield grant program. Will the WDNR/EPA consider raising that amount to account for PFAS quality assurance procedures as part of the QAPP development?**

A.4: Costs for development of the QAPP is set at \$3,000. The DNR understands that implementing protocols for PFAS sampling and data integrity may require a higher level of effort, and that level of effort will be considered in evaluation of proposed field sampling and analysis costs.

**Q.5: The Phase II ESA investigation discusses underground storage tank (UST) assessments. For clarity, does the WDNR anticipate the need for the Tank System Service and Closure Assessment Reports (TSSAs) as part of this consultant service contract?**

A.5: Possibly, but on a very limited basis. Removal of USTs and the associated TSSA Report are eligible expenses under the WAM program, but only if removal of the UST is needed to complete the site assessment.

**Q.6: *Is the consultant responsible for release reporting or is that the responsibility of the municipality where the brownfield site is located?***

A.6: Discharge notification requirements are defined in Wisconsin Administrative (Wis. Admin.) Code § NR 706.05. A consultant may be requested to assist a party in reporting a discharge to the DNR.

**Q.7: *Section 13.1.5 of the Phase I E1527-13 standard identifies sixteen non-scope considerations that may also be considered Business Environmental Risk (BER) issues that while outside the scope of the standard, may have an impact on current or planned redevelopment of a commercial property. Non-scope considerations are further discussed in Appendix X5 Summary of Common Non-Scope Issues (Common Non-Scope Considerations). The WDNR RFQ scope of work discusses identifying “whether a Business Environmental Risk (BER) exists”. Can the proposers assume that for the sake of the project costing, BER identification is limited to the 16 non-scope considerations that are identified in section 13.1.5 of the ASTM Phase I ESA standard?***

A.7: Selected consultants are required to follow all requirements in current ASTM Phase I standards, All Appropriate Inquiry and Wis. Admin. Code chs. NR 700 - 758. The reference to BER's should be read in the context of the full sentence written in Section 2.2.B of the RFQ. The reference to BER's in this context is a request to identify hazardous substances as defined by Wis. Admin. Code § NR 700.03(25) or environmental pollution as defined in Wis. Admin. Code § NR 700.03(19) (e.g., per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances [PFAS]) in the Phase I ESA.

**Q.8: *How many firms applied for the previous WAM contract? How many were selected? Please list the selected firms and annual billings for each.***

A.8: In 2016, the DNR received 37 SOQs in response to request for qualifications for WAM contractors; four contractors were selected. We are not providing annual billings amounts at this time as a part of this question and answer response because the current cooperative agreement is not an accurate comparison with the previous request in terms of amount or duration.

**Q.9: *We understand the amount of work given to each firm will vary and is not guaranteed, but can you shed some light on the anticipated amount of work a firm might receive under this agreement? The total funding is \$600,000. Assuming \$200,000 is used for remediation - the remainder is \$400,000, or \$80,000 per year, for the 5-year period. Divided by 4 firms, this results in approximately \$20K/year per firm. Is that in the right anticipated range?***

A.9: The total funding provided to the DNR under the Assessment grant for the program is \$600,000, all of which must be used for assessment (i.e., none can be used for remediation). DNR cannot predict the disbursement of work per selected consultant or annual allotment, as work efforts may not happen evenly over the 5-year period.

**Q.10: *With respect to Attachment 2: EPA Federal Terms and Conditions – will WDNR be managing these terms and conditions via your interactions with the USEPA? Are there specific items the WDNR wants the consultant to be aware of and actively involved with?***

A.10: Yes, the DNR manages the terms and conditions as the recipient of the cooperative agreement. However, there are provisions in the terms and conditions that contractors receiving funds under the cooperative agreement must also abide by. The DNR may discontinue work with a selected consultant if that consultant makes meeting the cooperative agreement terms and conditions difficult (e.g., substantial progress). The DNR encourages proposers to fully read the terms and conditions.

**Q.11: Cost Proposal Scenario 1**

- **Can you define “small manufacturing facility”?**
- **How large is the property and building?**
- **Should a vapor encroachment screening also be included in the Phase I?**
- **How many properties will need to be reviewed in this scenario? (i.e. sites with “hits” in radius report)**

A.11: For Scenario 1, you can assume a 20,000-square foot industrial building on a 2-acre parcel, with five sites identified within specified search distances from the subject property that require review. A vapor encroachment screening is not included in the scope of work for Scenario 1.

**Q.12: Cost Proposal Scenario 2**

- **Can you specify the three RECs identified?**
- **Does Scenario 2 require scoping for PFAS?**

A.12: For purposes of estimating level of effort to develop the sampling plan under Scenario 2 (Phase II ESA Sampling), assume that the scope of work that the consultant develops in Scenario 2 matches the sampling activities outlined in Scenario 3 (Phase II ESA).

**Q.13: Cost Proposal Scenario 3**

- **Are any of the borings within pavement? If so, are they in areas where concrete coring will be required?**
- **Are there any QA/QC samples that would be required for soil and groundwater? (field blanks, equipment blanks, trip blanks, duplicates, etc)**
- **Should we account for private utility locating, surveying, or access agreements?**

A.13:

- Assume no concrete coring is required.
- Yes, include the number of QA/QC samples in your assumptions for the Cost Proposal.
- No, the access agreements are anticipated to be provided by WAM applicant, and Scenario 3 does not include surveying or a private utility locate.

**Q.14: Will Site Eligibility Determinations (SEDs) be prepared and submitted to EPA by the WDNR?**

A.14: Yes, the DNR will prepare and submit site eligibility determinations.

**Q.15: Will the same consultant selected to prepare a Phase I ESA also be selected to provide Phase II and remedial planning services for that site?**

A.15: For most projects, yes, the same consultant will stay on a site throughout the lifecycle of that site in the WAM program. Instances when the DNR may decide to select a different consultant may include unsatisfactory work or progress in the previous phase or a newly identified conflict of interest.

**Q.16: Access Agreements – will the consultant be responsible for any and all communication with property owners during coordination of site access; OR will the DNR be involved in sending out correspondence etc.**

A.16: For most projects, the WAM applicant will obtain access; however, there may be situations where the consultant would be requested to assist with access coordination. The level of involvement from the DNR will vary based on site-specific circumstances.

**Q.17: *For Scenario 3 in the cost proposal, should the consultant assume that the WDNR would or would not require data validation to be completed on the analytical testing results?***

A.17: Assume that data validation is not required for purposes of the cost proposal for Scenario 3.

**Q.18: *Will the interviews with the top ranked respondents be conducted in person or virtually?***

A.18: If circumstances allow, the DNR plans to conduct interviews in person. The DNR can accommodate virtual interviews, as needed.

**Q.19: *Does WDNR have any restrictions on email attachment sizes?***

A.19: The DNR's current limitation for email attachments is 35 MB.

**Q.20: *For the Cost Proposal, are labor rate tables and unit rates for equipment part of the 4 page limit? Or can they be included as an attachment and excluded from the page limit?***

A.20: The DNR understands that a firm's standard rate tables may not fit into the format prescribed in the RFQ. Therefore, the DNR will allow respondents to include the rate tables as attachments to the Cost Proposal, and these will not be restricted to the page limit or format requirements outlined in the RFQ. The page limit and format requirements for the Cost Proposal remain as written in the RFQ for presenting the example budgets for the Scenarios.