

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS
Clark Store #94
2010 W Wisconsin Ave. Appleton
54914-3117-10
03-45-118098

1. Our site reconnaissance indicated potential upgradient sources for contamination in MW-4; however these potential sources were not addressed in the *Site Investigation Report*. If there is evidence of an upgradient source or co-mingled plumes and would this be classified as a "changed condition"?

The discovery of a previously unknown contaminant source would be a changed condition. If that source was onsite and if additional work was necessary to get closure, it *may* result in the allocation of additional funds. If that source was offsite, it is doubtful that additional funds would be allocated, as the offsite source would be liable for the contamination.

2. Does the RP wish to preserve the canopy structure?

Unknown. For the sake of this bid, plan on the canopy being removed.

3. Will Cooper Engineering submit the PECFA claim for the Site Investigation, or will that claim be the responsibility of the winning bidder?

Unknown. But it would be my opinion that the submittal of the SI claim would be part of the SI phase, therefore subject to SI dollars and not remediation phase dollars.

4. If we remove MW-01 during the soil remediation, must it be replaced, or will the other 5 MWs be considered sufficient to monitor for NA?

If MW-1 is removed, it would need to be replaced with some other GW monitoring point, such as another well or a sump.

5. If MW01 is replaced/remains, do GW samples from it need to be analyzed for 1,2-DCA (it was detected early on above the ES, then never sampled for again??)?

That well will need to be sampled for 1,2-DCA. If it remains above the ES, additional samples will need to be taken to establish a trend.