

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

FOR

**Stratford Army Engine Plant (SAEP)
Hazardous Building Materials (HBM) Survey**

NOVEMBER 2014

RFQ #2014-080



Prepared for:

Town of Stratford
2725 Main Street
Stratford, CT 06615

**Deadline for the proposal:
3:00 PM, Friday December 12th, 2014**

RFQ #2014-080
Consultant for Brownfield Assessment Project
Stratford Army Engine Plant (SAEP)
Hazardous Building Materials (HBM) Survey

Consultant Selection

The Town of Stratford will select a consultant based on individual or firm capabilities; past like or similar project experience; key staff assigned to the project; knowledge of the Town of Stratford; technical approach; and proven ability to perform within the projected budget.

Consultants must also demonstrate prior experience in project management and working under the Department of Economic and Community Developments (DECD) Brownfield Grant process.

Responses to this Request for Proposal (RFQ) shall include the following:

- A. Consultant's Qualifications and Capabilities:**
Describe the qualifications and capabilities of the consultant as they relate to the management of DECD grants, Brownfields projects, grants management, and the demonstrated ability to provide technical oversight of multiple subcontractors.
- B. Past Project Experience:**
Include project summaries of relevant brownfield projects completed in the State of Connecticut and EPA Region 1. Summarize the scope of work, and provide client contact information.
- C. Key Staff Assigned to the Project:**
Identify specific personnel that will be assigned to the following key roles for the project: Project Manager and Lead Technical Staff members. Personnel identified in the proposal must be the principal staff that will work on the project and represent the majority of hours billed to the project. Consultants must provide organizational chart and resumes for the project manager and the lead technical staff members. Resumes shall not exceed 3 pages in length. Project staff must meet all local, state, and federal requirements to perform work. Certified or licensed professionals (e.g., CT DPH licensed Asbestos Inspectors, OSHA 40 hour Hazwoper Certification, etc.) must be used to perform work as required.
- D. Technical Approach:**
Describe the Technical Approach that will be used to complete the tasks described in this RFQ.
- E. Standard Billing Rates:**
Provide standard billing rates for implementing the attached Scope of Work (SOW). These rates will be considered during the selection of the preferred contractor. However, the Town will solicit a final proposal based on the defined scope of work prior to executing a contractor with the chosen consultant.

Submittal Information

No questions may be directed to, or contacts made with the Mayor, members of Town Council, or Town staff members other than as directed herein concerning this project until a consultant is selected. Violation of this prohibition may result in the disqualification of the consultant from further

consideration. The Town of Stratford is not obligated to enter into any contract on the basis of any submittal in response to this RFQ. The Town reserves the right to request additional information from any consultant submitting under this RFQ if the Town deems such information necessary to further evaluate the consultant's qualifications. The Town reserves the right to interview any consultant submitting under this RFQ. The Town reserves the right to waive informalities and minor irregularities in submittals and reserves the sole right to determine what constitutes informalities or minor irregularities. Consultant shall be responsible for all costs associated with consultant's submittal.

Any questions concerning the scope of this project or requests for additional information, requests to visit the site or any other questions should be directed in writing to Mr. Brian Carey, Conservation Administrator, Town of Stratford at the address indicated below, or by e-mail at bcarey@townofstratford.com by 3:00pm on December 3rd, 2014. No phone calls will be responded to regarding questions associated with this RFQ. Responses, if any, shall be in writing. Responses to questions or requests for additional information shall be posted to the Town of Stratford Purchasing Website and it is the responsibility of the consultant to check the website for updates or addendums to this RFQ.

The Town reserves the right, in its sole discretion, to reject all submissions, reissue a subsequent RFQ and/or RFQ, terminate, restructure or amend this procurement process at any time. This RFQ is not a bid. Evaluation criteria contained herein shall be used in evaluating qualifications. The Town may contact any consultant after receiving its submittal to seek clarification of any portion thereof. The Town reserves the right to request additional information from any consultant if the Town deems such information necessary to further evaluate the consultant's qualifications. In the event the Town elects to negotiate a contract with a selected consultant, the Town reserves the right to negotiate such terms and conditions of the contract, including, but not limited to scope, role, and price and staffing which may be in the best interests of the Town.

This RFQ shall be construed in accordance with the laws of the State of Connecticut and follow the process as described in the State of Connecticut Department of Economic and Community Development document entitled, "Professional Services Selection Process.

Deadline for the proposal is 3:00 PM, Friday December 12th, 2014. Proposals should be directed to:

Mail/Hand Deliver
Town of Stratford
Purchasing Agent
Attention: Michael Bonnar
2725 Main Street
Stratford, CT 06614

Responses to this RFQ must include one (1) original, three (3) and one (1) digital copy, and must be clearly marked on the outside mailing envelope:

Scope of Work (SOW)

November 2014

The purpose of the HBM survey is to identify the type, location, and quantity of building materials that will require special handling and disposal due to the presence of asbestos, lead, mercury, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), or Di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (DEHP). Data gathered during the proposed survey shall be used to develop preliminary estimates for abatement and/or proper management of these materials. The survey shall include the following tasks: 1) an inspection of all accessible interior and exterior areas of each building for asbestos-containing material (ACM); 2) representative sampling of major painted surfaces for the presence of lead; 3) representative sampling of suspect paint and caulking for PCBs; 4) an inspection of lighting systems, pressure switches and thermostatic controls for the presence of PCB/DEHP ballasts or mercury elements; and 5) preparation of a Hazardous Building Materials Survey Report with estimated costs for abatement, recycling and/or offsite disposal of the various regulated or hazardous building components identified.

1.0 Background information

The SAEP was a U.S. Army Tank-Automotive and Armaments Command installation and manufacturing facility located in Stratford, Connecticut, where it was sited along the Housatonic River and Main Street, opposite Sikorsky Airport. The plant was originally built in 1929 as Corporations' manufacturing facility. The Sikorsky S-39, Sikorsky S-40 "Flying Forest", Sikorsky S-41, Sikorsky S-42 "Clipper" and Sikorsky S-43 "Baby Clipper" were built in this plant, which had a seaplane ramp for launching the aircraft into the Housatonic River. When sales of amphibians fell in the late 1930s, due to the growing popularity of land-based aircraft, Sikorsky was merged with the Chance Vought Company by their parent United Aircraft in 1938. The Vought-Sikorsky company then built the Vought-Sikorsky VS-44, Vought-Sikorsky OS2U Kingfisher, Vought-Sikorsky F4U Corsair and Vought-Sikorsky V-173 in the facility. After the combined company was broken into Vought Aircraft and Sikorsky Aircraft in January 1943, Vought built the Vought TBY Sea Wolf, Vought XF5U, Vought F6U Pirate and prototype Vought F7U Cutlass in the facility. Igor Sikorsky, given \$250,000 for helicopter development by United Aircraft, also developed the Vought-Sikorsky VS-300, Vought-Sikorsky VS-316 R-4, Vought-Sikorsky VS-327 R-5 and Vought-Sikorsky VS-316B R-6 in the plant. Sikorsky's production was moved to a plant in Bridgeport Connecticut in 1943 and Vought production was moved to an empty US government facility in Dallas Texas in 1949. In 1954 Sikorsky moved the majority of their manufacturing to a new plant on the north side of Stratford, further up the Housatonic River. This move left the SAEP vacant, and soon afterward, flooding from the Housatonic River damaged much of the facility. The US Air Force purchased the facility in 1951 and renamed it Air Force Plant No. 43. Avco Corporation became the contractor operating the plant and they repaired the damaged buildings, and built dikes. Avco moved a company they owned, Lycoming into the plant in the same year and began manufacturing Wright R-1820 piston engines and General Electric J47 components there. In 1952 Lycoming had Anselm Franz set up a turbine engine development effort in the plant and the Lycoming T53, Lycoming T55, Lycoming PLF1, Lycoming LTS101/LPT101, Lycoming ALF 502, Lycoming AGT1500 and Lycoming TF-40 turbine engines were all designed, developed and manufactured in this facility. By 1968, 10,000 people were employed in the plant. In 1976, the plant was transferred from the

Air Force to the Army and renamed the Stratford Army Engine Plant. Production of the LTS-101 and LPT-101 turbine engines was moved to Williamsport, Pennsylvania beginning in 1980. In 1987 Avco was purchased by Textron to become Textron Lycoming and in 1995, Allied Signal acquired the Lycoming Turbine Engine Division in Stratford. By this time, employment in the plant had fallen to 2,900 people. In late 1995, Allied Signal announced that production would be shifted to its facility in Phoenix Arizona. In September 1998, Allied Signal concluded operations in the plant and returned it to the US Army. AGT1500 production was shifted by the Army to the Anniston Army Depot (ANAD) in Anniston, Alabama and the SAEP closed. Since then, some of the original tract has been transferred and some of the buildings have been demolished. The remaining site is an approximately 78 acre tract which includes approximately 1,700,000 square-feet in approximately 40 buildings and an earthen causeway that was built 800 feet into the Housatonic River mudflats to provide for access by seaplanes. The Connecticut Air and Space Center occupies part of the site.

An asbestos survey of all the buildings was conducted by Malcolm-Pirnie in 1998 and resurveyed by Osprey Environmental Engineering, Inc. in March 2013. Copies of these reports are available for reference.

2.0 Asbestos Inspection

Identification and sampling of suspect ACM shall be performed by Connecticut Department of Public Health (DPH) Licensed Asbestos Inspectors, in accordance with the Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”), National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (“NESHAP”). The survey shall include all accessible interior and exterior areas of each building. Limited destructive sampling may be required to identify whether or not suspect ACM is present behind walls, ceilings, or other fixed surfaces. The scope of destructive investigations shall be reviewed and approved prior to the start of that phase of the project. Exterior roof sampling will require repairs as detailed in the written approvals. Inaccessible areas or materials shall be summarized in the report.

The asbestos inspection tasks shall include the following:

- Task 1: Records Review, Site Inspection and Sample Plan Development
- Task 2: Asbestos Survey (Bulk Sampling, Analytical Services, etc.)
- Task 3: Asbestos-Containing Building Material Survey report with spreadsheets including quantities of materials, sample location sketches and drawings if supplied

Records Review, Interviews, Inspections, Sample Plan Development

Upon completion of the historical documents review, consultant shall develop a site survey and bulk sampling plan. The plan will identify the individual homogenous areas and the number of samples to be taken from each area for friable and non-friable suspect materials. Historical asbestos documentation shall be reviewed for validity of current analytical methods with laboratory sample results reports. Duplication of validated material sample results will not be necessary.

Bulk samples of suspect ACM shall be collected in accordance with protocols developed by EPA under the Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act (AHERA). Sampling protocols are described below for each of the three principal categories of ACM, as defined by EPA.

Surfacing Materials

The required number of samples shall be collected for each suspect homogeneous surfacing material. The EPA sampling protocol for surfacing materials requires that a minimum of three (3) samples be collected for surfacing materials quantified up to 1,000 square feet; five samples for surfacing materials quantified between one 1,000 and 5,000 square feet; and seven samples for greater than 5,000 square feet.

Thermal Systems Insulation

The required number of samples shall be collected for each type of suspect thermal systems insulation (TSI). The EPA requires a minimum of three samples for each different type of TSI. One sample is permissible for TSI patches less than or equal to six square feet or six linear feet.

Miscellaneous Materials

A minimum of two samples for each type of suspect miscellaneous material shall be collected per homogenous area. Where large quantities of miscellaneous materials are present, additional samples shall be collected at the discretion of the Licensed Asbestos Inspector. Current regulations require that sampling of miscellaneous materials “will be conducted in a manner sufficient to provide accurate results”.

Samples of suspect ACM shall be analyzed by PLM, using EPA Method 600/R-93/116. Bulk samples of non-friable organically bound (NOB) material having dense matrices, such as roofing, door and window caulking, vinyl adhesive floor tile, and floor tile mastic are considered by EPA to be “Problem Samples” due to the potential for false negatives by PLM analysis alone. Consultant shall develop a list of NOB samples recommended for additional analyses by EPA Method 600/R-93/116 with gravimetric reduction or EPA 600/R-93/116b

3.0 Lead Based Paint Screening

An inspection shall be performed to evaluate the potential presence of lead-based paint (LBP). Paint chip samples shall be collected from surfaces representative of major building components. Typical test areas will include interior and exterior walls, ceilings, door frames and window frames. Paint chip samples shall be submitted to a Connecticut DPH certified laboratory for lead analysis by Flame Atomic Adsorption (AAS). The consultant may also use an XRF lead-paint analyzer with confirmatory paint chip sampling as needed.

4.0 PCB Paint & Caulking Inspections

The EPA has recently issued a number of advisories regarding the discovery of PCBs in caulking and specialty coatings. PCBs were added to a variety of building materials during the 1930s through 1970s for durability, resistance to degradation, low flammability, and as a plasticizer for application. Depending on the PCB content, the material and the substrate to which the material

is attached may require special handling and disposal as a PCB bulk product waste under the Toxic Substance Control Act (TSCA).

Consultant shall submit approximately 25% percent of the door and window caulking samples collected under Tasks 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 for analysis of PCBs by EPA Method 8082 with Soxhlet Extraction.

5.0 PCB and DEHP Ballast, Mercury Vapor Lighting and Mercury Containing Thermostatic Control Inspection

A comprehensive inspection shall be conducted to assess whether or not light ballasts may be present that contain PCBs. Fluorescent light fixtures shall be inspected to determine the potential for PCBs or DEHP, since the presence of these compounds has the potential to affect disposal costs and overall management of waste removal during remodeling and/or demolition. To ascertain whether or not any PCB or DEHP- containing light ballasts are present, a representative number of light fixtures shall be disassembled and the ballasts shall be visually inspected for labeling indicating the absence of PCBs. Ballasts that are labeled “NO PCBs” are assumed to contain DEHP if the manufacturers date stamp is between 1980 and 1991. Ballasts that are not labeled “NO PCBs” shall be assumed to contain PCBs if no date stamp is present. Any ballast with a manufacturers date stamp after 1991 shall be categorized as non-hazardous. Vapor lighting, pressure switches, and thermostatic controls shall be evaluated for mercury content as a component of the hazardous building materials survey.

6.0 Hazardous Building Materials Survey Report

A Hazardous Building Materials Survey Report shall be prepared detailing the inspection and findings. The final report shall contain a room-by-room inventory including the location, quantity and condition of each type of hazardous building material identified. Each identified material shall also be depicted on building floor plans. The report shall include copies of sample logs, laboratory reports, photographic documentation, and preliminary cost estimates for the abatement and disposal of hazardous building materials and/or universal wastes for each existing building.

ATTACHMENT A
DECD GRANT PROPOSAL

ATTACHMENT B
PREVIOUS ASBESTOS REPORTS