

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AUTHORIZING THE) RESOLUTION NO. 90-1190
ISSUANCE OF A REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS)
FOR AN ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL) Introduced by Rena Cusma,
RISK INVESTIGATION FOR THE METRO) Executive Officer
EAST TRANSFER STATION)

WHEREAS, The Metro Council approved the award of contracts to Trans Industries for construction and operation of the Metro East Station; and

WHEREAS, The Metro Council ordered additional environmental risk investigation work at the site of the Metro East Station; and

WHEREAS, The Metro Code Section 2.04.010 defines a personal services contract to include the services of a registered professional engineer; and

WHEREAS, Metro Code 2.04.053 allows for personal services contracts over \$10,000 to use the Request for Proposals process; and


WHEREAS, Attached to this resolution as Exhibit #1 is a Request for Proposals for Additional Environmental Risk Investigation for the Metro East Transfer Station; and

WHEREAS, the Executive Officer has reviewed these documents and recommends Council approval; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

That the Council of the Metropolitan Service District authorizes the Executive Officer to issue a Request for Proposals to solicit proposals for additional environmental risk investigation for the Metro East Station.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District this 11th day of January 1990.



Tanya Collier , Presiding Officer

STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 89-1190 FOR THE PURPOSE
OF AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF A REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
FOR AN ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL RISK INVESTIGATION FOR
THE METRO EAST TRANSFER STATION

Date: December 12, 1989

Presented by: Bob Martin

When the Metro Council approved the award of contracts for the Metro East Station, the Council ordered additional environmental investigation of the site. The additional investigation is based on recommendations made by Dames and Moore in their November 2, 1989 report for Metro.

A request for proposals (Exhibit #1 to Resolution No. 89-1190) for the additional environmental risk investigation will address several remaining issues of concern. A qualified consulting firm will be selected to perform the following tasks:

- Determine if the concentrations of lead and chromium contamination in the soil at the site vary between the surface and six inches below the surface in the northwest portion of the site.
- Determine if an operative groundwater monitoring system exists. The monitoring wells will be used to determine the occurrence of any contamination from off-site sources.
- Remedy the gap in the groundwater monitoring system that will result when MW-7 is destroyed during the removal of underground storage tanks in the vicinity. Installation of an additional monitoring well along N.W. 61st Avenue shall allow for the detection of possible contamination entering the site in the upper groundwater aquifer from the southeast.
- Develop a consistent and concurrent evaluation of ground water quality and direction of flow in the shallow aquifer beneath the site. Field sampling and laboratory testing and analysis shall be performed in a manner that complies with current and proposed applicable agency regulations and standards. The laboratory analysis shall be performed by an EPA contract laboratory.
- Confirm or refute the presence of battery chips in the areas of potential fill, along the northwest and northeast portions of the site. Twenty (20) shallow testpits shall be excavated through any existing fill.

The maximum allowable contract budget for this proposal is set at \$40,000.

The Executive Officer recommends adoption of Resolution No. 89-1190, authorizing the issuance of a request for proposals for an additional environmental risk investigation for the Metro East Station.

DRAFT

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
METRO EAST TRANSFER STATION
ENVIRONMENTAL RISK INVESTIGATION**

date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND 1

SCOPE OF WORK 2

SELECTION PROCESS 6

PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA 6

GENERAL PROPOSAL/CONTRACT CONDITIONS 7

RFP as Basis for Proposals 7

Limitations and Award 7

Contract Type 7

Subconsultants; Disadvantaged Business Program 7

Billing Procedures 7

Validity Period and Authority 8

ATTACHMENTS 9

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS METRO EAST TRANSFER STATION ENVIRONMENTAL RISK INVESTIGATION

INTRODUCTION

The Solid Waste Department of the Metropolitan Service District (Metro) requires the services of a consulting firm to perform additional environmental investigation work for the Metro East Transfer Station (MES) project. It is anticipated that the resulting information and analysis may be used at a later date during public hearings or litigation measures. Metro invites consulting firms to submit proposals for soil and groundwater sampling and analysis.

The proposals will be due on January 26th, 1989, 2:00 P.M. at Metro, Solid Waste Department, 2000 S.W. First Avenue. Details concerning the project and proposal are contained in this document.

PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND

The East Transfer Station will be located at 6161 N.W. 61st Avenue, Portland, Oregon. Currently, this property consists of a large warehouse structure on 10.4 acres. Trans Industries will purchase this property from American Steel and develop it for use as a solid waste transfer and material recovery facility for Metro. The existing warehouse will be remodeled and the surrounding site will be regraded. Construction activities are anticipated to start in early December. The transfer station must be in operation by February 1, 1991.

The property is adjacent to the NL/Gould Inc. site and Rhone-Poulenc and Shell Oil facilities. A vicinity map, a map of the property and surrounding area, and an existing site map are included as Attachments A, B, and C.

Metro engaged the services of Dames and Moore in October, 1989 to assess the environmental risk and liability of developing a transfer station on the site. Nine existing reports pertaining to the site and adjacent properties were reviewed. The investigation resulted in a recommendation for additional work to address existing issues of concern about soil and groundwater contamination from off-site sources. Refer to Task 6, Attachment D from the Dames and Moore report, for a summary of the remaining issues of concern. The scope of work will address these issues.

SCOPE OF WORK

A consulting firm will be selected to perform the following tasks for this project:

1. Determine if the concentrations of lead and chromium contamination in the soil at the site vary between the surface and six inches below the surface in the northwest portion of the site. Refer to the List of Contaminants Found Above Detection Levels, Figure 5, Attachment D.
 - Divide the northwest portion of the site into six subareas. For each subarea, collect eight discrete samples, four at the surface and four at a depth of six inches. A portion of each discrete sample shall be combined such that 2 composite samples result for each subarea, one composite representing the surface soils and one composite representing the soils six inches below the surface. Store the remaining portions of the 48 discrete samples for up to 60 days.
 - The 12 composite samples shall be analyzed for total lead and chromium and for EP Tox lead and chromium.
 - If directed by Metro, up to two composite samples that indicated abnormally high concentrations shall be further analyzed. For any composite sample that receives further analysis, the corresponding discrete samples shall be tested using the same parameters to verify and pinpoint soil contamination.
2. Determine if an operative groundwater monitoring system exists. Ten monitoring wells are currently installed on the site to determine the occurrence of any contamination from off-site sources. Refer to the Existing Site Plan, Attachment C for the well locations.
 - Inspect and evaluate the existing ten monitoring wells on the site.
 - Recommendations shall be made concerning methods for protecting the wells from future destruction and from unauthorized access.
3. Remedy the gap in the groundwater monitoring system that will result when MW-7 is destroyed during the removal of underground storage tanks in the vicinity. Installation of an additional monitoring well along N.W. 61st Avenue shall allow for the detection of possible contamination entering the site in the upper groundwater aquifer from the southeast. Refer to the Existing Site Plan, Attachment C

for well locations and Groundwater Conditions, Figure 4 in Attachment D for groundwater flow direction.

- Install an additional monitoring well adjacent to N.W. 61st St. The bottom of the well shall terminate in the upper aquifer unit. The top of the well screen shall be located such that sampling of the groundwater surface can be performed. Refer to Attachment E for the existing well boring logs in the vicinity (MW-1 and MW-7).

- The well shall be located in the eastern corner landscaped area and installed such that on-site construction and operation of the facility are not impeded and such that the serviceability of the well will be maintained. The well must be secure from unauthorized access and must be installed such that heavy vehicles can drive over it without damaging the well. Refer to the Preliminary Site Plan, Attachment F and Preliminary Landscape Plan, Attachment G.

4. Develop a consistent and concurrent evaluation of ground water quality and direction of flow in the shallow aquifer beneath the site.

- Static water level measurements shall be made to an accuracy of ± 0.1 feet in existing monitoring wells MW-1 through MW-7, MW-15S, MW-15I, MW-15D and in the newly installed well described above.
- The wells shall be completely purged before samples are taken from the existing 10 monitoring wells and the one newly installed monitoring well on the site.
- The groundwater samples shall be analyzed for the following compounds:
 - Total lead and chromium,
 - Dissolved lead and chromium,
 - Volatile organic compounds (EPA Method 624),
 - Pesticides and PCB's (EPA Method 608, and
 - Chlorinated herbicides (EPA Method 8150).
- Quality control/quality assurance methods shall be sufficient for use of the results in regulatory enforcement action or other litigation. Quality control/quality assurance shall include, but not be limited to:
 - At a minimum, one field blank, one duplicate sample and one duplicate-spiked sample. The field blank shall be prepared on the day the samples are

collected and tested to determine if the sample collection equipment and containers are contaminated. The duplicate field-spiked sample shall be spiked with substances including but not limited to benzene and lead.

- Documents describing sample collection methods and observations, transport times and methods, and chain of custody records.
 - Documentation of precision, accuracy and detection limit for each analytical test.
5. Confirm or refute the presence of battery chips in the areas of potential fill, along the northwest and northeast portions of the site. Refer to Attachment E for monitoring well logs in the vicinity (MW-2, 3, & 6), Attachment H for location of areas of suspected battery casings, and Attachment I for potential fill areas.
- Excavate 20 shallow testpits through any existing fill.
 - Maintain testpit logs and a photographic record for each testpit.
6. Submit a draft and final report presenting and interpreting the results of the investigation. The draft report shall be submitted within 30 days of notice to proceed.
7. Provide up to two individuals to provide expert testimony at public hearings before elected officials or meetings with Metro staff or regulators. Total hours shall not exceed 20 hours.

Sampling, testing and documentation of methods shall be performed in a manner that complies with current and proposed applicable agency regulations and standards. The report shall include descriptions of the sampling and testing procedures employed, and references to the applicable regulations that were observed. The laboratory analysis shall be performed by an EPA contract laboratory.

Six (6) copies of the draft and final report shall be delivered to Metro. One (1) copy shall be left unbound and suitable for reproduction purposes.

Copies of all pertinent project information, including field notes, raw data, calculations and correspondence records shall be submitted to Metro within 15 days after submittal of the final report.

The maximum allowable contract budget is set at \$40,000.
PROPOSAL FORMAT

To facilitate evaluation of proposals, Metro requires that all responding proposers adhere to the format below.

Three (3) copies of each submittal shall include:

1. Transmittal letter. Include one or more paragraphs which summarize the approach and methods to be used. Indicate that the proposal will be valid for 60 days. State the ability of the proposer to complete the project within the proposed budget and to comply with the project deadline.
2. Detailed description of methods (work plan) to accomplish each of the seven tasks in the attached Scope of Work. The work plan shall include:

- Environmental Monitoring Plan. The plan shall include 1) new well location and depth, 2) well construction specifications, 3) parameters to be sampled, 4) sample collection methods, 5) sample handling and chain of custody methods (including filtration or not), 6) list of analytical method references, 7) acceptable minimum detection limits, 8) analytical quality assurance plan, and 9) copies of the applicable agency regulations and standards that will be complied with during the investigation.

- Cost of labor for each task listed in the Scope of Work and the number of hours to complete the task.

- Separate non-labor cost for each task listed in the Scope of Work.

- Statement indicating the laboratory employed and the laboratory's qualifications.

- Staffing/Project Manager Designation. Identify specific personnel assigned to major project tasks, their roles in relation to the work required, and percent of their time on the project. Also identify special qualifications they may bring to the project.

- Timetable showing anticipated schedule to complete the work scope tasks.

3. Statement of Qualifications indicating the firm's experience with similar projects involving environmental site investigations in the Metro region.

4. Statement concerning acceptability of the Metro Personal Services Agreement language. The Proposal should include revised language if the Metro language is unacceptable. Refer to Metro Forms, Attachment J.
5. Completely filled out Disadvantaged Business Program Compliance Form and Disadvantaged/Women-Owned Business Enterprise Utilization Forms. Refer to Attachment J.
6. Statement of insurance coverage which includes summary of coverage, coverage limit, and deductibles for professional liability, business automobile, and workers compensation insurance. Refer to Attachment J.
7. Exceptions and Comments, if any. Firms wishing to take exception to, or comment on, any specific task or criteria in this RFP are encouraged to document their concerns in this part of their proposal. Exceptions or comments should be succinct, thorough and organized.

SELECTION PROCESS

An evaluation committee will:

- Review the proposals submitted by proposers.
- Rank the proposals in accordance with the evaluation criteria.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

- Compliance with RFP
- Methodology (Work plan and rationale) 20%
 - Level of specificity/detailing work required to accomplish the project
 - Quality of Environmental Monitoring Plan
 - Quality of reasoning upon which the approach is based
 - Ability to accomplish the project within the specified deadline
- Project team experience/qualifications 40%
 - Firm's experience with similar projects
 - Firm's experience with similar projects involving environmental site investigations in the Metro

region

- Assigned personnel's experience with similar projects involving environmental site investigations in the Metro region
- Subcontractor's experience and qualifications

- Cost

408

GENERAL PROPOSAL/CONTRACT CONDITIONS

RFP as Basis for Proposals. This RFP represents the most definitive statement Metro will make concerning information upon which proposals are to be based. Any verbal information which is not contained in this RFP will not be considered by Metro in evaluating the proposals. All questions relating to the RFP, or the project must be submitted in writing to Linda Pang-Wright. Any questions which in the opinion of Metro warrant a written reply or RFP amendment will be furnished to all parties receiving a copy of this RFP. Metro will not respond to questions received after January 15th, 1990.

Limitations and Award. This RFP does not commit Metro to the award of a contract, nor to pay any costs incurred in the preparation and submission of proposals in anticipation of a contract. Metro reserves the right to accept or reject, to negotiate with all qualified sources, or to cancel all or part of this RFP.

Contract Type. Metro intends to award a Personal Services Agreement with the selected firm for this project. A copy of the standard agreement, which the successful consultant will be required to execute, is attached.

Subconsultants; Disadvantaged Business Program. A subcontractor is any person or firm proposed to work for the prime Contractor on this project. Metro does not wish any subcontractor selection to be finalized prior to Contract award. For any task or portion of a task to be undertaken by a subcontractor, the prime contractor shall not sign up a subcontractor on an exclusive basis.

In the event that any subcontractors are to be used in the performance of this Agreement, the Contractor agrees to reach the goal of subcontracting 7 percent of the Contract amount to

Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE), and 3 percent of the Contract amount to Women-Owned Business Enterprises (WBE) or make good faith efforts to reach the goals as defined in Metro's Disadvantaged Business Program (Section 2.04.160 of the Metro Code). The Contractor shall contact Metro prior to negotiating any subcontracts. Metro reserves the right, at all times during the period of this Agreement, to monitor compliance with the terms of this paragraph and Metro's Disadvantaged Business Program.

A copy of the Metro Code relating to the Disadvantaged Business Program, Section 2.04.1, is attached. Refer to Attachment J.

All questions regarding DBE/WBE requirements should be addressed to the Contracts Officer, Mr. A. M. Hazen at (503) 221-1646.

Billing Procedures. Proposers are informed that the billing procedures of the selected firm are subject to the review and, prior approval of Metro before reimbursement of services can occur. A monthly billing, accompanied by a progress report, will be prepared for review and approval.

Validity Period and Authority. The proposal shall be considered valid for a period of at least sixty (60) days and shall contain a statement to that effect. The proposal shall contain the name, title, address, and telephone number of an individual or individuals with authority to bind any company contracted during the period in which Metro is evaluating the proposal.

PROJECT MANAGER AND CONTACT

Linda Pang-Wright
Metropolitan Service District
Solid Waste Department
2000 S. W. First Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97201
(503) 221-1646
(503) 241-7417 (FAX)

ATTACHMENTS

- A: Vicinity Map
- B: Site Map
- C: Existing Site Plan
- D: Preliminary Assessment, Environmental Risk and Liability, American Steel Property by Dames & Moore, November 2, 1989
- E: Boring Logs
- F: Preliminary Site Plan
- G: Preliminary Landscape Plan
- H: Location of Battery Casings and Matte plan
- I: Site Contour Map, 1954
- J: Metro Forms
 - Metro Personal Services Agreement
 - Metro Disadvantaged Business Program (Ordinance 87-231)
 - Metro Disadvantaged Business Program Compliance Form
 - Metro Disadvantaged Business Utilization Form
 - Metro Women's Business Utilization Form
 - Sample of Required Letter of Agreement
 - Metro Insurance Requirements

SOLID WASTE COMMITTEE REPORT

RESOLUTION NO. 90-1190, FOR THE PURPOSE OF AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF A REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR AN ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL RISK INVESTIGATION FOR THE METRO EAST TRANSFER STATION

Date: December 13, 1989

Presented by: Councilor Gary Hansen

Committee Recommendation: The Solid Waste Committee voted 4 to 0 to recommend Council adoption of Resolution No. 90-1190. Voting: Councilors Hansen, Buchanan, DeJardin and Ragsdale. Absent: Councilor Wyers. This action taken December 12, 1989.

Committee Discussion/Issues: When approving the award of contracts for the Metro East Station, the Metro Council ordered additional environmental investigation of the site. The additional investigation is based upon recommendations made by Dames and Moore in their November 2, 1989, report to Metro.

A request for proposals will address several remaining issues of concern. A qualified consulting firm will be selected to perform the following tasks:

- Determine if the concentrations of lead and chromium contamination in the soil at the site vary between the surface and six inches below the surface in the northwest portion of the site
- Determine if an operative groundwater monitoring system exists. The monitoring wells will be used to determine the occurrence of any contamination from off-site sources.
- Remedy the gap in the groundwater monitoring system that will result when MW-7 is destroyed during the removal of underground storage tanks in the vicinity. Installation of an additional monitoring well along N.W. 61st Avenue shall allow for the detection of possible contamination entering the site in the upper groundwater aquafir from the southeast
- Develop a consistent and concurrent evaluation of groundwater quality and direction of flow in the shallow aquafir beneath the site. Field sampling and laboratory testing and analysis shall be performed in a manner that complies with current and proposed applicable agency regulations and standards. The laboratory analysis shall be performed by an EPA contract laboratory.

SOLID WASTE COMMITTEE REPORT

Resolution No. 90-1190

December 13, 1989

Page 2

- Confirm or refute the presence of battery chips in the areas of potential fill, along the northwest and northeast portions of the site. Twenty (20) shallow testpits shall excavated through any existing fill.

The maximum allowable contract budget for this proposal is \$40,000.

The Committee asked if the \$40,000 was sufficient to accomplish the proposed work. The Solid Waste staff said they feel it is adequate.

The Committee asked the Solid Waste staff if the proposed Scope of Work would address the environmental questions that have been raised. The Solid Waste staff stated that they feel it will.

There being no further questions or discussion, the Committee voted to recommend Council adoption of the resolution.

GH:RB:pa
RB.133