

ADDENDUM#1  
RFP#35-17  
Water Source Exploration  
Issued February 27, 2017

**The following questions Water Source Exploration Project # 35-17 have been asked and answered.**

The proposal includes the collection of groundwater samples at the end of a pump test to be “analyzed by a NH Certified Laboratory for all of the EPA Primary and Secondary Drinking Water Standards and as well as 1,4-Dioxane, Glyphosate and PFAS (suite of 23 compounds including PFOS, PFOA & PFHxS, Method 537 modified)”. In our experience the State of New Hampshire Drinking Water Program (NHDWP) would be responsible for dictating what tests are required. With that said, would the testing required be the NHDWP specified analytical requirements for Community Public Water Systems (<http://www.des.nh.gov/organization/divisions/water/dwgb/documents/sdwalist.pdf>), plus 1,4-Dioxane, Glyphosate and PFAS (suite of 23 compounds including PFOS, PFOA & PFHxS, Method 537 modified)?

*That is the list that will need to be analyzed for, along with 1,4-Dioxane and the PFAS's. Glyphosate is in the CWS list*

In reviewing your project summary you note that testing would be performed on any test well yielding in excess of 150gpm based on air testing. The figure included in the RFP shows geophysical survey lines as completed by EGGI, as well as what I would assume to be property boundaries. NH Rule Env-Dw 302 requires a sanitary protective (SPA) radius of 400’ for permitted public water supply well yields equal to or in excess of 144,000 gallons per day (100 gpm). Per the rule, the land area within this radius must be maintained in a “natural state”, and must either owned fee simple or controlled via deeded easement by groundwater withdrawal permittee.

The site plan in the RFP suggests that adequate land area does not exist on either side of what appears to be a rail ROW to meet the requirements of the Env-Dw 302 without the SPA overlapping onto abutting properties and/or the rail ROW . Has this apparent rule conflict been addressed by the City, and if so what assumptions should we make in proposing a scope of work?

*The locations of the wells will need to be at least 400' from the property boundaries with the exception of the rail ROW. The ROW is over City of Portsmouth property and is in the planning stage of being converted to a rail-trail. Preliminary discussions with the DES will need to include this topic, so for this proposal you can assume no setback from the ROW is needed.*

We have reviewed the City of Portsmouth’s RFP for Groundwater Source Exploration, RFP #35-17, and are excited about the opportunity. We have the following questions regarding the RFP:

What overall additional water supply production volume is the City currently seeking?

*The City of Portsmouth is exploring options for increasing supply capacity for long-term planning as well as to improve the redundancy and management options in our system. Ideally we would like to develop a new source that is capable of sustainably producing 300 gpm or more; however, we know the yield potential is dependent upon the hydrogeology and we won't know about that until the test drilling is conducted.*

Regarding the Overburden well assumptions, does the 4 well assumption include 3 overburden wells plus one 2-foot offset well?

*Assume 4 wells total, including the off-set well. Proposals will be reviewed as specified in the RFP. Costs are not a factor in the initial review. You can propose more or less wells if you have a good reason, but please justify along with your approach.*

Is there a goal production volume for the overburden wells (the RFP indicates at least 150 gpm for bedrock but nothing for the overburden wells)?

*See answer to first question*

Can you provide the complete report from EGGI that supplements the transect profiles, if one exists?

*We do not have electronic copies of the hydrogeologic reports; hard copies are available for review at our DPW office in Portsmouth. If you have any specific questions, I'd be glad to look for the answers in the report or photocopy applicable pages.*

Could a vendor walk the site; was there a scheduled site walk?

*There was not a scheduled walk, but vendors are welcome to walk the site on their own,*

Is the hydrogeological report available electronically or in hard copy?

*Hard copies are available for review at the DPW office.*

Will access be possible along the railroad right-of-way?

*Assume access along ROW for proposal.*

Should the costs for project management and permitting be included in the task line items that were specified or put into a separate task?

*Selection will not be made on price, include costs for PM and permitting where it is appropriate for your project cost tracking and describe in proposal as such.*

**Please acknowledge this addendum within your proposal. Failure to do so may subject a respondent to disqualification.**

**End of Addendum #1**