

STATE OF ALASKA

Department of Military and Veterans Affairs
Division of Administrative Services



DATA GAP ANALYSIS FOR CHEFORNAK FEDERAL SCOUT READINESS CENTER

IRFP 240000012

Amendment #1

September 1, 2023

This amendment is being issued for informational purposes only. The contents of this amendment will contain questions and *answer*. This amendment is required to be returned with your proposal

Important Note to Offerors: You must sign and return this page of the amendment document with your proposal. Failure to do so may result in the rejection of your proposal. Only the IRFP terms and conditions referenced in this amendment are being changed. All other terms and conditions of the IRFP remain the same.

Jannah Cayetano
Procurement Specialist 1
Phone: (907) 428-7223
Email: MvaDasProcurement@alaska.gov

COMPANY SUBMITTING PROPOSAL

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE

DATE

Questions submitted by potential offerors and answers from the state:

Question 1: I'll ask Jenna to briefly explain the project details for this IRFP.

Answer: This project is an interesting one because it's technically two projects. What we have here is a continuation remedial action that's already taken place a couple of times at our Chefornak site and it contains 2 spill areas.

The first area has already been remediated and is over by the tank where an old public health pipeline was connected to that tank at one point. This one is finished, and we submitted a request for no further action and closure, however Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) came back and said that they wanted to know what happened with these samples along the pipeline or if any work had been done there. The first section of this project is to do some confirmation sampling along this area, and it would take approximately 8 boreholes, no more than 10. The depth to refusal from the last project was estimated four feet before they hit groundwater and they used a portable A540 drill rig. It may be possible to use a hand auger depending on how much peat and silt are in that area. This is generally the simplest part because we have a rough area that we need to check for diesel-range organics (DRO) if remediation is done in the past or not.

The second part of this project is to determine the need for a new investigation. In 1997, a site investigation took place where they took 2 background samples on what was off site then but had formerly belonged to the National Guard. These background samples came back much hotter than anything we were testing for on our site. With this, the most previous remedial action was tested along the boundary line and came back below action levels. DEC refused the results and asked for us to go back to where the samples have been taken from the sites which we do not have a GPS location for, only have a rough estimate. They returned a picture of a drum pile that would have been roughly in that area. This area belongs to the Village Corporation and if you are selected for this project, you will need to gain a right of entry to get inside the site which we can work with you to get that information. The Army National Guard Bureau will use this information to determine what the priority level is and if this project going to fall in to start a new site investigation if one or more of those samples come back above action limits. I am expecting this area to be roughly around 200 square feet and if we think of a grid pattern, we'll be doing 10 boreholes elsewhere and another 10-12 boreholes with one or two samples essentially per borehole to get to surface and subsurface or water soil line. In addition, since the water table is so high, our monitoring wells should be fairly easy to establish by using a hand auger or a very small drill rig based on past experiences and investigations at this site.

Question 2: You had mentioned 8-10 boreholes along the pipeline plus one more somewhere else pointing right along the Armory, can you please point out where it was again?

Answer: The old Armory building was called sample 6, it is also mentioned in their response letter. And so just one sample can be generally taken in that area because this right next to an area that they already have done an excavation. Out of all the samples, that one is most likely to come back below action levels in my opinion.

Question 3: Along the pipeline, are we confirming if they have remediated there or not?

Answer: That's what we're confirming, because I don't have that in any of my previous documentation. The pipeline no longer exists, and the early reports doesn't have a detailed GPS surveying, that's why I think having 8-10 boreholes in the area will cover roughly where we need to look for those.

Question 4: Is the North arrow up in this map?

Answer: The North arrow is in the right upper side of the map. You can expect ground water to flow in that direction. In the previous investigation, ground water was encountered between 28 to 48 inches so it is very shallow and if they had a wet season, it might be higher than that.

Question 5: How many ground water samples do you expect to be collected?

Answer: At least one for each area.

Question 6: Are we considering 3 areas for this? (Follow up question from Question 5)

Answer: Yes, I would consider it to be 3 areas.

Question 7: What about surface water, how many samples do you expect?

Answer: If there is any surface water at that point, I would consider sampling. But If the water level tables are high enough to be considered surface area, then we have a different issue. But I would not say that any surface water samples need to be taken at this time.

Question 8: Are the monitoring wells still in place?

Answer: They are not, they were temporary wells.

Question 9: Did you want these monitoring wells to be temporary as well?

Answer: Yes.

Question 10: For the number of soil samples, you mentioned 2 samples per boreholes, with 8 to 10 in the first area plus 1 in the second area and 10-12 in the next area, so that totals up to 21 soil samples?

Answer: Yes. And that is if you determined that more or less may be needed just based research. If you're selected, I am happy to discuss that with you. For now we will say about 21-26.

Question 11: 21-26 boreholes or samples?

Answer: Boreholes.

Question 12: Would that be one per borehole and I get about 20 boreholes?

Answer: Yes, for 20 boreholes it would be 40 samples and it would just be DRO that we are sampling for right now.

Question 13: Are we also sampling groundwater for DRO as well? (Follow up question from Question 12)

Answer: Yes.

Question 13: You mention that someone had shown a pile of drums sitting down South of the building there, do you when that photo was taken?

Answer: It was taken in 1967 and I can also provide that photo for you. The picture shows that this Armory existed then, and there is a property boundary line where we sampled right along that line because they didn't want to deal with getting the right of entry, which is understandable. However, we received this picture after the fact when we were submitting for closure. That's when it was said that this area had been a drum repository at some point.

Question 14: Are you anticipating that there's buried drums there as well or they were just surfaced?

Answer: They have not found any during previous investigations. There were no drums buried, but I'm not saying that there is a 0% chance. I would assume that it is likely that they have been removed at some point. Just with how shallow everything is there and how much organic matters are in the soil, it would be pretty difficult for them to be buried too deeply and not have flooding events be the cause of it.

Question 15: Is this imagery and those other reports available?

Answer: Yes, that will be send out in an initial package for the contractor after award. If there's anything specifically, you'd like to see, I'm happy to share that in advance but please be specific with what you're asking for. Most reports should also be on the DEC website as well.

Question 16: Do you know if there is any lodging available in the village?

Answer: I do not know; I can find out that information for you. I have not been to Chefnak before. I might recommend the Armory but based on other sites in the more rural villages, it might not be habitable. I know the school is often used for contractors, and I believe that's where the previous contractors stayed.

Question 17: Should we include accommodations for two to four people to go? Is there a reason why we couldn't just send one person?

Answer: It is at your discretion, typically our office sends two people to the more rural villages just for health and safety reasons, but if you feel that only one person is only needed, then feel free to put that in your proposal.

Question 18: Would you like to stipulate an estimated number of soil samples and depths of samples for bidding purposes?

Answer: I would estimate around 35-40 soil samples from 21 boreholes to be a reasonable number of samples for the two areas of concern.

Question 19: Should we assume that monitoring wells will/will not be needed, for bidding purposes?

Answer: Monitoring wells should be included in the cost estimate.

Question 20: Should we assume a certain depth to groundwater?

Answer: We should assume a certain depth to the groundwater will greatly impact the cost of the well installation if that is needed as heavy equipment which is typically needed for that occasion. Groundwater is very shallow at this location, it is between 2 to 4 feet so the composition of the soil tends to be highly organic and peaty with silt as the major actual soil type there. A hand auger or a small drill would be the most equipment that would be needed to dig down to the water table. If you can hand install well, phenomenal, but I think a drill rig (nothing above A540) should be needed since this is what they used at the last investigation. I'm guessing the ground composition hasn't changed that much.

Question 21: For bidding purposes, should we assume a certain volume of investigation-derived waste? And that the waste is contaminated and must be disposed offsite?

Answer: For this project, I think the assumption should be made that we will be able to return any soil samples to the hole that were brought from. There should be no waste taken offsite. For water, I would expect it to be treated through a carbon filter and return on site as well.

Question 22: What are the accuracy requirements for the surveying (centimeter, sub-meter, etc.)?

Answer: Sub-meter is perfectly acceptable for this type of investigation. The more accurate the better, but if it's going to bump up any of the cost proposals, sub-meter is perfectly fine.

Question 23: To expand on that question, will you need a level loop on top of monitoring casing for potential metric determinations?

Answer: I would say yes, we would like metrics on monitoring wells because they will have through DEC validation, and we also wanted to make sure that we're following the moderating guidelines there.

Question 24: Do you want the numbers of samples to include duplicate samples or should we add duplicate samples on top of those numbers?

Answer: If we follow the general convention of 1 duplicate for 10 samples then we could probably include it in the numbers we already have. Just because I expect refusal at some locations to be shallower than two feet. Therefore, if we account for some samples to only have one sample per boreholes versus two, we should be covered with the 40.

Question 25: What about water? Do you want to duplicate samples for water? (Follow up to Question 24)

Answer: I would do 2 duplicates for the locations along the pipeline and the lower drum dump area.

Question 26: Along those lines, will you want to see matrix spike and duplicate sample as well? (Follow up to Question 25)

Answer: Yes, on duplicates and trip link yes, but probably not on Matrix just based on it being DRO. I think we should be able to get away without it.

****END OF AMENDMENT 1****