

Questions & Answers
Bill's Service Station
COMM # 53581-2801-10-A
BRRTS # 03-53-000539

Question: Should the utility survey include neighboring properties because soil contaminated has been identified in the utility corridor within Gage Street?

Answer: It is the departments' intent that the consultant evaluate whether the utility corridor is/could be a conduit for contamination. That may mean drilling 1 or 2 borings near the corridor to decide. At this point the departments can only assume contamination from Bill's has migrated toward Gage Street. The only documented contamination along the utility corridor can be found in SB8, although in this case, the contamination appears to be greatest at/near the soil/water interface, and SB10, in which contamination is documented throughout the soil column (based on PID readings) and is located more closely to the Broadbent and/or Foremost property than it is to Bill's. The scope of the Bill's Service bid does not include a neighborhood survey as not enough is known about the utility corridor as a conduit, as of yet.

Question: Elevated levels of lead have been identified at the site but no TCLP tests have been performed to determine if the soil is hazardous. Should the soil drums on site be considered hazardous as defined by NR605?

Answer: The documentation available to the departments does not include lead data from Bill's Service. The disposal option would need to be determined by analyzing the soil accordingly.

Question: If the groundwater, extraction, or test wells cannot be found or repaired do they need to be replaced?

Answer: All wells, with the exception of TW1 and EW2 are supposedly present and functional. Locating and assessing the functionality of TW1 and EW2 is required in the bid spec. If they cannot be used, they should be abandoned; therefore, they would not be part of the sampling network. However, if they are functional, then they should be sampled. The current scope of work bid spec does not include reinstalling TW1 and/or EW2.