



**ADDENDUM NO. 6**  
**Issued February 28, 2024**

**TO**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**  
**TO CONDUCT**  
**THE SOUTH MEADOWS REDEVELOPMENT CONSIDERA-**  
**TIONS STUDY**

**(RFP Number 24-AUTH-004)**

**Note:** Entities submitting a Proposal are required to acknowledge this and all Addenda in Section 4 of the Proposal Form.

## 1. RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS

This Addendum consists of responses by the MIRA Dissolution Authority (the “Authority”) to written questions received. The Authority will continue to answer questions received in subsequent Addenda through the schedule specified in Section I.C. of the RFP

1.	Question	Do you have records of asbestos surveys when the plant was operating?
	Answer	The Authority undertook two asbestos surveys, both of which were completed in the NU Building, while the plant was operating as a resource recovery facility. One survey was completed by TRC in December 2001/January 2002, and the second survey was completed by HRP Associates in February/March 2012. Note that the TRC report, dated January 9, 2002, is included as Appendix A of the March 29, 2012 report by HRP Associates, which report has been made available to all potential proposers in the Google Drive for this RFP.
2.	Question	Do you have records of past asbestos abatement work performed at the plant?
	Answer	The Authority has added a folder named “Asbestos Abatement” to the Google Drive for this RFP. The documents included in this Google Drive folder include abatement of Power Block Facility roofing materials in 2017 (two times) and in 2019, as well as abatement of the stator insulation wrapping inside Turbine 6 in December 2018/January 2019. There are no other abatement reports readily available at the current time.
3.	Question	Are there any plant operators still around, or involved in the project that will be available for interviewing while performing the hazardous building materials surveys?
	Answer	Proposers should assume that there are no former plant operators available for interviewing. The Authority does have contact information for a couple of former plant operators and will reach out to them to request interviews, if requested to do so by the successful proposer; however, there is no guarantee that said people will be available for interviewing.
4.	Question	Since there is uncertainty on the status of electrical systems throughout all buildings, can we assume sampling of wiring and other electrical system components for asbestos and other hazardous materials is not included in the scope of services? Sampling worker safety would require a qualified MIRA representative to perform OSHA lock out tag out procedures for all electrical systems throughout the entire site.

	Answer	Proposers should plan to identify wiring and other electrical system components that they believe merit sampling, and provide that list to the Authority. The Authority will then confer with a licensed electrician to determine which locations are energized. Sampling of electrical systems that are currently energized (and that need to remain energized) will not be performed. Sampling of de-energized systems that are not required for current site operations will be performed. At a minimum, Proposers should assume that sampling of wires in the control panels in the “old Control Room” (in the NU Building) will be required.
5.	Question	We understand that equipment present onsite is anticipated to be auctioned/sold at some point in the future. Most equipment would require partial or complete dismantling to sample for hazardous building materials and could result in damage to the equipment and affect its future resale value. Can we assume that sampling of equipment for hazardous building materials is not included in the scope of services? If not, will the Authority provide information as to which pieces of equipment should be considered a part of the survey?
	Answer	The Authority anticipates that much of the on-site equipment either has value for sale at auction or as scrap metal, and will therefore not have to be sampled for hazardous building materials. The Authority expects that all equipment insulation materials that will have to be removed for equipment sale/scraping (such as pipe wraps and boiler insulation) will be part of the survey and will have to be sampled for hazardous building materials. Additionally, all rubberized conveyor belts (including RDF and coal conveyors, but not steel pan conveyors) that were in-service when the RRF shut-down will also be part of the survey and will have to be sampled for hazardous building materials.
6.	Question	The future status of site buildings is uncertain and therefore do we need to assume that damage to roofing systems caused by sampling will need to be repaired?
	Answer	Yes, all proposers should include costs for repairing roof damage caused by sampling.
7.	Question	Can we assume that entry into confined spaces for sampling is not required?
	Answer	Yes, all proposers should assume that entry into confined spaces for sampling is not required.
8.	Question	Can we assume that sampling of equipment within the Eversource controlled switchyards and other Eversource facilities, public utilities and non-Authority owned facilities is not required?
	Answer	Yes, all proposers should assume that sampling of equipment within the Eversource-controlled switchyards and other Eversource facilities, public utilities and non-Authority owned facilities is not required.

9.	Question	The status of piping systems and their contents within the buildings is uncertain. Can we assume that dismantling of piping systems, valves and conduits to obtain samples of gasket materials and pipe contents is not included in the scope of services?
	Answer	All water supplies to the Power Block Facility and the attached NU Building have been shut off, and all steam cycle piping associated with the municipal waste combustors and boilers #9 and #10 are inactive, so proposers should assume that sampling of gasket materials and pipe contents associated with these piping systems is included in the scope of services.
10.	Question	Buried piping and conduits are present throughout the site and their status and contents may be unknown. Can we assume that only coatings/insulation associated with those buried piping and conduits accessible via removable cover and non-confined space entry are required to be sampled under the scope of services?
	Answer	Yes, all proposers should assume that only coatings/insulation associated with buried piping and conduits accessible via removable cover and non-confined space entry will be required to be sampled.
11.	Question	Hazardous building materials can be present in areas that are inaccessible, except by performing localized demolition to expose materials hidden within areas such as walls and floors. Can we assume that localized demolition using only small hand tools and small hand power tools to perform sampling is required and localized demolition with heavy equipment and heavy power tools is not included in the scope of services?
	Answer	Yes, proposers should assume that localized demolition using only small hand tools and small hand power tools to perform sampling is required, and that localized demolition with heavy equipment and heavy power tools is not included in the scope of services.
12.	Question	Areas of certain structures, such as the Track Hopper Room and the screen houses are submerged. Can we assume that submerged area sampling is not included in the scope of services?
	Answer	Yes, proposers should assume that sampling of submerged areas is not included in the scope of services. Note that the majority of the structures at Screen House #1 and #3 are not submerged and are, therefore, available for sampling.
13.	Question	Access to certain areas may be unsafe to enter due to structural damage and deterioration. Can we assume that sampling these areas is not included in the scope of services?
	Answer	As noted during site tours, Screen House #2 is considered unsafe for entry due to deterioration of its structure, and the Track Hopper Room is considered unsafe for entry due to deterioration of its cat-walk structure. Sampling of these two areas is not included in the scope of services. There are no other areas of the property that have been deemed unsafe for entry due to structural damage or deterioration.

14.	Question	The cellar area beneath the boiler house in the main power plant had large diameter cooling water pipes, other piping and debris widely scattered throughout the area during the site tour. Can we assume that only coatings on the exterior of piping surfaces requires sampling in this area under the scope of services? Can we assume that visually similar debris can be grouped into categories for the purpose sample collection under the scope of services?
	Answer	<p>It has been noted during the site tours that the referenced large diameter cooling water pipes are described on site drawings as “cement-lined” steel. There are access ports with bolt-on covers along the runs of these pipes. If Proposers believe that the “cement” lining merits sampling, then they should plan to remove the bolt-on covers and collect samples if they are able to obtain such samples without entering the pipes. As noted previously, Proposers are not expected to enter confined spaces for sample collection.</p> <p>Sampling of the pipe exterior coating(s) will not require confined space entry and should also be assumed.</p> <p>Proposers can assume that visually similar debris can be grouped into categories for the purpose sample collection under the scope of services.</p>
15.	Question	Lighting was not active in many areas of buildings during the site tour. Will lighting be activated during the performance of hazardous building material sampling?
	Answer	Proposers should assume that they will have to provide portable lighting during performance of hazardous building material sampling.
16.	Question	Confirm that manufactured building material products suspected to be pre-1979 are to be sampled and analyzed for PCBs, including: paints/coatings, roofing, adhesives, glues, mastics, caulks, glazes, joint material and galbestos siding?
	Answer	Yes, manufactured building material products suspected to be pre-1979 are to be sampled and analyzed for PCBs.
17.	Question	Will a MIRA escort be required to be with the sampling crew during the inspections? If so, will there be more than one person available should multiple sampling crews be scheduled on the same day?
	Answer	The Authority will provide sampling crew(s) with primary and alternative contacts for coordination of daily activities. An Authority escort will not be required to be with sampling crews during inspection; however, sampling personnel will be required to follow a buddy system for worker safety.
18.	Question	Will weekend sampling work be permitted?
	Answer	Sampling work will only be permitted when Authority personnel are present on-site. Proposers should therefore assume that no weekend sampling work will be permitted.
19.	Question	Will extended work hour sampling such as 6am to 7pm be permitted?

	Answer	Sampling work will only be permitted when Authority personnel are present on-site, which is typically between the hours of 7:00 AM and 5:00 PM, Monday through Friday. Proposers should assume that they will have to conduct on-site sampling work within this schedule.
20.	Question	Are there MIRA site specific health and safety requirements and training required for this project? Can we assume that the consultant will be required to prepare a site-specific health and safety plan and furnish a copy of the document to MIRA?
	Answer	<p>The Authority does not have site-specific health and safety requirements and training. It will be the responsibility of the selected Proposer to develop a site-specific health and safety plan, and to provide its personnel with all required health and safety training.</p> <p>The selected Proposer will be expected to provide the Authority with copies of all site-specific health and safety plans developed for completion of the Study.</p>
21.	Question	Has there been a recent survey? Can we assume that one will be provided in electronic format and a new property/topographic survey will not be required for this project?
	Answer	<p>Proposers should review the ELUR drawings dated 3/28/2018, which are on the Google Drive for this RFP, for the most-recent property survey. The Authority only has these drawings available in PDF format.</p> <p>The Authority does have older property survey files (December 2000 and December 2007) available in AutoCAD (*.dwg) format; however, these files do not have site topography.</p> <p>There is also a base map for the property in AutoCAD (*.dwg) that includes topographic contours through August 2004, so it does not reflect changes in topography that have resulted from site remediation activities since that time.</p>
22.	Question	Is the intent to do a structural/roof evaluations of all buildings? If so, can it be assumed that process equipment will be removed first?
	Answer	Structural/roof evaluations of all buildings are not included in the scope of services. The Authority has not yet established a schedule for removal of any process equipment from any of the Facility buildings.
23.	Question	Are the building floor plans or other drawings that show the building interior spaces available?
	Answer	<p>Plans for most building floors are available in hard-copy and/or electronically in PDF file format. There are no CAD files of building interior spaces available.</p> <p>Note that most of the floors in the Power Block Facility around the municipal waste combustors are grated steel catwalks, and that there are no floor plans available for these catwalks.</p>
24.	Question	Can the documents listed as not being available online in Attachment B of the RFP be made available electronically if needed?

	Answer	The documents that are listed as not available on-line will not be made available electronically. As noted in Attachment B, potential proposers can schedule an appointment to review those documents in the Authority's main offices.
25.	Question	Will CAD files for the drawings included in the documents in Attachment B be made available to the winning proposer?
	Answer	Proposers should assume that no CAD files are available for drawings that are included in the documents referenced in Attachment B of the RFP. Review the answer to question #21 above for a summary of what drawings are available in CAD.
26.	Question	How much decommissioning of the old powerblock, as well as the gas turbines has been performed and documented? Have you cut power to some or all parts of the plant(s) yet? Is there power in the plant buildings for lighting, elevators, etc?
	Answer	<p>The Jet Turbine Facility ceased operation on May 31, 2023. The units are retired from the ISO New England Market. The MODs on the transformers connecting the units to the grid were opened and locked out in June 2023. The fuel in the 500,000 gallon fuel tank was removed during the summer of 2023. The fuel tank and piping have not been fully cleaned at this time.</p> <p>The Waste Processing Facility ("WPF") and the Power Block Facility ("PBF") ceased operation on July 19, 2022. Loose waste materials at each facility were cleaned by broom sweeping and loading into containers that were shipped off-site for proper disposal. Lubricating oils at each facility were shipped off-site for proper disposal. The natural gas service line to the regenerative thermal oxidizers was disconnected from the main gas line in Maxim Road in November 2022; and the natural gas service line to the Power Block Facility was disconnected from the main gas line in Reserve Road in November 2023. (Note that there is still an active natural gas service to the Waste Processing Facility from the main gas line in Maxim Road.) Fire protection system at the PBF was shut down in 2023 after staff no longer occupied the PBF. Fire protection system zones at the WPF were shut down in areas that staff no longer occupy.</p> <p>The two steam turbine generators at the PBF were drained of lubricating oils. Valves were closed on steam and water piping, associated with the boilers and generators, including condenser water. With a few exceptions, all of the energy currently used at the site to maintain systems associated with the Authority's administrative office at the WPF, site lighting, stack lighting, ongoing wastewater discharge, automatic security gates, and other energized systems is fed through the 115KV interconnection for the steam turbine generators. Circuits associated with non-operating systems at the PBF and WPF have been de-energized to the extent possible. Theoretically, these circuits could be re-energized in the future, although this is not guaranteed.</p> <p>Proposers should assume that no elevators will be available for use. Note that the elevator at the PBF is no longer certified operational, and would have to be repaired and re-commissioned before use.</p>
27.	Question	Is water available onsite, restrooms, etc.

	Answer	All water to the Power Block Facility and to the processing area of the Waste Processing Facility has been turned off. Water and restrooms are available in the Jet Maintenance Shop and in the Authority's administrative office building.
28.	Question	Do you have records of asbestos surveys for the powerblock, gas turbines, and the waste recycling center?
	Answer	<p>The March 29, 2012 hazardous building materials survey in the NU Building, which has been included in the Google Drive associated with this RFP, contains the only asbestos survey work that the Authority is aware of having been completed within the property buildings.</p> <p>As noted in the response to question #2 above, the Authority has also added a folder named "Asbestos Abatement" to the Google Drive for this RFP, which folder includes abatement reports associated with 3 roof repair projects, and with stator insulation wrapping replacement inside Turbine 6. The Authority is not aware of any other abatement reports at the current time.</p>
29.	Question	Do you have records of past asbestos abatement work performed at the plant?
	Answer	As noted in the response to question #2 above, the Authority has added a folder named "Asbestos Abatement" to the Google Drive for this RFP, which folder includes abatement reports associated with 3 roof repair projects, and with stator insulation wrapping replacement inside Turbine 6. The Authority is not aware of any other abatement reports at the current time.
30.	Question	How much ash, fly ash/bottom ash exists in the boilers/plant? Are any records available of cleaning ash from the plant when it closed?
	Answer	There is a minimal amount of ash remaining in the facility, primarily in the upper levels of the Power Block Facility. The three municipal waste combustors were explosive cleaned in July 2022 after they were permanently removed from service, with all removed materials shipped off-site for proper disposal. All baghouse compartments were emptied of fly ash and all baghouse filters were removed and shipped off-site for proper disposal. All ash handling conveyors and the pug mills were run out, with all ash going to the ash load-out building for shipment off-site for proper disposal. Loose ash was then cleaned by broom sweeping and loading into containers that were shipped off-site for proper disposal.
31.	Question	Do you have any information about PCBs in building materials, caulking, paints, insulation, etc.?
	Answer	The March 29, 2012 hazardous building materials survey in the NU Building, which has been included in the Google Drive associated with this RFP, contains the only survey information regarding PCBs in building materials.
32.	Question	Do you have any information, or a survey of PCBs in transformers, capacitors, high voltage equipment, high voltage wiring, etc?
	Answer	The Authority owns fourteen (14) oil-filled transformers on the property. All 14 transformers are designated "Non-PCB," with non-detect (<2 ppm) PCB analytical results for 13 of the 14 transformers. The 14 <sup>th</sup> transformer contains PCBs, specifically, PCB-1260, at a concentration of 5 ppm.



33.	Question	Can you provide for the bidders, your expectation for PCBs survey and the number of samples we should include in our bid for; electrical equipment, wiring, building materials, and paints?
	Answer	The Authority is relying on proposers to include estimated sample quantities in their proposals for the hazardous building materials survey work.
34.	Question	What level of cost estimate(s) are you looking for? AACE "International Recommended Practice 18R-97: Cost Estimate Classification System" Class III, IV, V?
	Answer	Regarding the cost estimates to be developed in the Study for the permitting and remediation activities to prepare the Site for each Potential Future Use, an accuracy range of -30% to +50% would be expected, which would be consistent with Class 4 estimates under the referenced AACE document.
35.	Question	Can a plan showing the flood control system right-of-way be provided? Will the USACE/GHFC consider all structures within the right-of-way as encroachments that will need to be removed?
	Answer	<p>The dike easement line is depicted on ELUR Survey Sheet 1 of 6.</p> <p>The scope of services includes "production of a report on proper abandonment/removal requirements ... for each penetration/encroachment of the Flood Protection System." The USACE/GHFC will consider all structures within the right-of-way as needing to be assessed in the report. (The future decisions regarding removal of these structures will be informed, in part, by this report.)</p>
36.	Question	Page 7, third bullet, second sub-bullet: please define "close proximity".
	Answer	"Close proximity" describes any structures that are located within the easement for the flood control dike but not physically attached to the dike. Some examples of structures in close proximity to the flood control dike include, but are not limited to, the screen houses on the Connecticut River, the above-ground water storage tanks adjacent to the concrete dike wall, and the transfer building.
37.	Question	Does the feedback from the Authority and revision cycle mentioned in Milestone Reports on pp. 10-11 include feedback from USACE/GHFC/DEEP for the Operation, Inspection and Maintenance Plan, Emergency Preparedness Plan, and removal/abandonment report?
	Answer	<p>The Operation, Inspection and Maintenance Plan and the Emergency Preparedness Plan both have to be developed, accepted by the GHFC, and implemented following each Plan's acceptance by the GHFC. The Authority expects that these two Plans will therefore be developed in consultation with the GHFC, since both the Authority and the GHFC will have roles in the Plans. The selected Proposer will ultimately provide a presentation of the finalized Plans to the Authority's South Meadows Transition Committee for informational purposes.</p> <p>The removal/abandonment assessment report for penetrations and encroachments to the Flood Protection Systems will be subject to the feedback and revision cycle mentioned in the Milestone Reports section on pages 10 and 11 of the RFP because USACE/GHFC/DEEP approval of this assessment report is not required.</p>

38.	Question	Will the GHFC/USACE provide the Authority with flood control system record drawings and inspection reports for use by the selected firm during the project?
	Answer	<p>The May 10, 2022 Technical Memorandum to MIRA from the GHFC is included in the Google Drive associated with this RFP. This Technical Memorandum includes an inspection of on-site flood control dike penetrations (with photos), and copies of relevant site plans and details, including USACE dike construction drawings.</p> <p>It is the GHFC/USACE's decision regarding what other record drawings and/or inspection reports to make available for use by the selected Proposer.</p>
39.	Question	Can you provide for the bidders, your expectation for a Mercury screening and the number of substrate core samples we should include in our bid?
	Answer	The Authority does not want to provide any such expectations. The Authority believes that the Proposers should be guided by their knowledge and experience with other similar projects when developing their proposals. The Authority recommends that proposals clearly state any assumptions and associated costs related to mercury screening and follow-up substrate sampling, if such screening and sampling are included in the proposal.
40.	Question	In addition to bulk sampling of suspect PCB building materials should the bidders include additional pricing for follow-up substrate sampling?
	Answer	The Authority recommends that proposals clearly state any assumptions being made by the Proposer regarding follow-up substrate sampling and the costs associated with it.
41.	Question	Can you provide any information on the lime used for the vitrification process?
	Answer	Two types of lime were used on-site: pebble lime (calcium oxide) was slaked and used for neutralization of acid gasses in the air pollution control systems for the municipal waste combustors; and dolomitic lime (calcium magnesium carbonate) was utilized as an amendment to the municipal waste combustor ash.
42.	Question	Has DEEP provided responses/comments to the submitted Closure Plan?
	Answer	<p>DEEP has provided two Requests for Additional Information (RFAIs) regarding the Closure Plan. The first RFAI was dated 10-14-2022, with MIRA's subsequent response dated 1-5-2023. The second RFAI was dated 1-17-2024, with the MIRA Dissolution Authority's subsequent response dated 2-16-2024.</p> <p>PDF copies of the Closure Plan, both RFAIs, and both responses to the RFAIs are available in the Google Drive for this RFP.</p>
43.	Question	Has MIRA or TRC (or other firms working for MIRA) had any discussions with CTDEEP on whether the investigation and remediation of river sediment impacted by operations and spills at Site will be required? Either with the property use industrial/commercial, or residential?
	Answer	There has been no discussion with CTDEEP regarding investigation of Connecticut River sediments.

44.	Question	Is there a site diagram that shows all the buildings and additions with the ages of their construction? Each separate age of construction is supposed to be investigated and sampled separately for hazardous building materials and 2 ages of construction versus 10+ makes a big difference.
	Answer	There is no site diagram that depicts buildings and their additions with ages of construction. There are a number of blueprints in the NU building that date back to the original development of the property as a fossil-fueled power plant c.1920. Based on the years listed on drawers in this blueprint room, it appears that there were significant Facility additions (which may have been equipment additions with little building alteration) in 1927, 1930, 1937, 1942, and 1947. As noted previously, the Waste Processing Facility was newly-constructed in the mid-1980s, at which time the Power Block Facility was also modified for construction of the three new municipal waste combustors.
45.	Question	Are the floor plans showing the interior/room/area layouts throughout all the floor/buildings (this would make the HBM survey proposal for building materials with asbestos, lead, pcbs, etc much easier/more accurate)?
	Answer	Plans for most building floors are available in hard-copy and/or electronically in PDF file format. There are no CAD files of building interior spaces available.  Note that most of the floors in the Power Block Facility around the municipal waste combustors are grated steel catwalks, and that there are no floor plans readily available for these catwalks.
46.	Question	To confirm, in the shared documents, there are only two HBM reports, one testing and one abatement report from HRP 2012 and one listed from TRC February 2007(ACM Investigation Work Plan – have not been able to locate this one in documents)?

	Answer	<p>The March 29, 2012 hazardous building materials survey of portions of the NU Building, which has been included in the Google Drive associated with this RFP, contains the only HBM survey information in building materials.</p> <p>As noted in the response to question #2 above, the Authority has also added a folder named “Asbestos Abatement” to the Google Drive for this RFP, which folder includes abatement reports associated with 3 roof repair projects, and with stator insulation wrapping replacement inside Turbine 6. The Authority is not aware of any other abatement reports at the current time.</p> <p>The February 2007 ACM Investigation Work Plan referenced in this question covers the investigation of asbestos found in soil (not building materials) in Area WPF 4 at the Waste Processing Facility. The November 2013 “Remedial Action Report, Waste Processing Facility – Area WPF 4,” which is available in the Google Drive associated with this RFP, describes the soil remediation that was performed to address this area of concern. Note that this Area WPF 4 corresponds to Subject Area L in the Environmental Land Use Restriction that has been recorded on the property.</p>
--	--------	--

## **2. CONTRACTOR’S POLLUTION LIABILITY INSURANCE**

By way of this Addendum 6, Contractor’s Pollution Liability Insurance is added to the minimum limits of insurance specified in Section 6.2 of the (form of) Agreement included as RFP Attachment D as follows:

“6. Contractor’s Pollution Liability Insurance with a limit not less than \$5,000,000.”

**- END OF ADDENDUM 6 -**