Question 1: Can MNDOT clarify the distinctions between the terms or phrases: “project area,” “subject property,” and “property acquisition locations” as these are presented under I. in Sections 2.a., 4.a.i., and 5.a. respectfully?

Answer 1:
- 2.a. “Project area”: From the intersection of TH 218 and TH 30 westbound/SE 89th Ave/County State Aid Highway (CSAH) 16 (approximately RP 029+00.365) to the intersection of TH 218 and CSAH 36 (approximately RP 027+00.772, immediately west of the Steele and Dodge County line). The project may also include work on 3rd Street NE from approximately 2nd Avenue NE to Mill Avenue N; on 1st Street NE to 3rd Avenue NE; and on 3rd Avenue NE from Main Street to 1st Street NE.
- 4.a.i. “Subject property”: A single property from which MnDOT would acquire any type of right of way.
- 5.a. “Property acquisition locations”: Any location within the project’s construction limits from which MnDOT has any type of proposed right of way acquisition.

Question 2: Does MNDOT expect that only one RAP/CCP will be prepared by the Selected Responder as it relates to Section 8?

Answer 2: For the purposes of this RFP, Responders can assume that only one RAP will be prepared and submitted to the applicable regulatory agencies.

Question 3: Under II., 1. Construction Monitoring Implementation Report(s), it is not possible to anticipate how many documents may be requested by the MPCA/MDA, or how many Tank removal Reports may be required, so should Responders include assumed estimates in the Cost Proposal for these possible project construction tasks?

Answer 3:
- The RAP Implementation Report will take place of the traditional Construction Monitoring Implementation Report.
- For the purposes of this RFP, Responders can assume that one RAP Implementation Report will be submitted to the applicable regulatory agencies.
- For the purposes of this RFP, Responders can assume 4 Tank Removal Reports.

Question 4: With the addition of work on the listed cross-streets, it appears the project corridor will be larger than the original Phase I study area. Will MnDOT require a complete Phase I update of the entire corridor, or could an incremental Phase I ESA of the expanded area only be considered?

Answer 4: For the purposes of this RFP, Responder can assume MnDOT would require a Phase I Update that includes the original Phase I ESA study area and any expanded areas.

Question 5: Stakeholder engagement is mentioned in the Project Goals. It is expected that some of the listed meetings will be formal presentations to public audiences. Can MnDOT describe the desired role of the environmental consultant at these meetings? I.e. does MnDOT expect the selected consultant to provide staff to moderate the meetings or will our participation be more of a technical support role?

Answer 5: For the purposes of this RFP, the Selected Responder would be expected to participate in a technical support role.

Question 6: Can MnDOT clarify the number of properties that may be evaluated using the ASTM (single-property) Phase I ESA scope? In the Phase I scope it implies one property will be evaluated. In the Phase II
Investigation the scope mentions “property acquisition locations” as a plural. Does this mean more than one property may be evaluated using the ASTM (single-property scope)? If so, please provide a range of the number of properties evaluated using this method.

**Answer 6:** For the purposes of this RFP, it can be assumed that one property will be evaluated with the single-property ASTM Phase I ESA.

**Question 7:** Test pits can be a valuable supplement to a Phase II drilling investigation. The Phase II Investigation scope describes the use of drilling and excavated test pits for sample collection (Items a. and c.); however the scope listed in Items k. through s. makes no mention of test pits. For the purpose of the proposal, would MnDOT consider a certain number of test pits in lieu of the listed soil borings and if so what number and depth? Would the total sample count remain the same?

**Answer 7:** For the purposes of this RFP, no (zero) test pits are included in the scope of work.

**Question 8:** If no test pit substitutions are allowed for soil borings, would MnDOT entertain an additional number of test pits as part of the Phase II investigation? If so what assumptions for the additional number of test pits and resulting samples should be used for that scope?

**Answer 8:** No.

**Question 9:** Will MnDOT be requesting geotechnical information from the up to 10 hollow stem auger soil borings mentioned in the Phase II scope? If so, could the respondent include soil gradations and or Atterberg soil testing as a value-add for those samples and how many of each?

**Answer 9:** No. For the purposes of this RFP, MnDOT will NOT be requesting geotechnical information from the hollow stem auger borings. The additional soil gradations and soil testing noted in the question are not being considered for the purposes of this RFP.

**Question 10:** Regarding the Phase II investigation, does MnDOT require the 25 soil vapor samples to come from separate soil borings, or could they be combined with the 100 soil borings already included in the scope?

**Answer 10:** For the purposes of this RFP, the 25 soil vapor samples will come from separate soil borings and will NOT be combined with the 100 soil borings included in the Phase II Investigation scope. However, soil vapor and soil boring locations may be located within the same general area.