

**Contractor Questions Regarding the Analytical Laboratory Services
Request for Proposal and Division of Hazardous Waste Management
Responses
September 10, 2003**

Q: Attachment 1 lists method numbers 802B and 801B for Volatile Organic Compounds and Non-halogenated Organic Compounds respectively. Are those method numbers correct or is that a typo? If those method numbers are correct, in what EPA document are they listed?

A: Those should have read 8021B for Volatile Organic Compounds and 8015B for Non-halogenated Organic Compounds. An amended Attachment I is included in a link along with the RFP questions and answers.

Q: Method 8015B is typically modified for analysis of particular sets of compounds. Assuming method 801B for Non-halogenated Organic Compounds listed in Attachment 1 is a typo and should be 8015B, what set of compounds are to be analyzed? Is it diesel range organics, gasoline range organics, glycols, alcohols or total petroleum hydrocarbons? If it could be any of the aforementioned set of compounds, what percentage of each can be expected?

A: We will expect analyses for 8015B to include all of the parameters listed in the method. In some cases, GRO and/or DRO may be the only requested parameters, but for the purposes of the price list you should assume all parameters. A modified list of parameters may potentially be negotiated with the winning Contractor once the contract has been awarded.

Q: Why is the initial contract period for only seven months?

A: The initial contract period will be only seven months due to the contract being finalized at an estimated date of December 1, 2003 and extending through the end of the State Fiscal Year 2004, which ends June 30, 2004. It is expected that this contract will then be renewed, by mutual agreement between Ohio EPA - Division of Hazardous Waste Management (DHWM) and the Contractor, for State Fiscal Year 2005, which extends from July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005. The RFP also has an optional provision for extensions of the Contract, upon mutual agreement between DHWM and the Contractor, for State Fiscal Years 2006 and 2007.

Q: Section 3.23 indicates sample disposal costs are the responsibility of the contractor. What percentages of samples are projected to be hazardous? What hazardous classifications are to be expected? In the most recent 12 month period, how many of the samples analyzed in that 12 month period became classified as hazardous, what were the hazardous classifications, and what was the percentage breakdown of each?

A: DHWM does not have an exact tracking of the number of samples that were

submitted for analysis in the past twelve months that ended up being hazardous waste. As a rule of thumb, less than ten percent of the samples submitted by DHWM are expected to be hazardous waste. By far the majority of samples that are analyzed as hazardous waste are hazardous for one or more of the RCRA 8 metals. Lead, D008, is the most common RCRA 8 metals hazardous constituent. Some samples will also be characteristically hazardous for Volatile Organic Compounds (e.g., D018, D028, D029 and D039), and Semi-Volatile Organic Compounds (e.g., D017). Samples will also be submitted and characterized as hazardous for ignitability and corrosivity. The characteristics of ignitability and corrosivity will likely be the most common hazardous waste classifications following TCLP metals. DHWM will be submitting a limited number of stabilized, listed hazardous waste (K061) samples for the purposes of stabilization confirmation. The number is not expected to exceed one eight ounce container per month. However, as this is listed hazardous waste, it must be ultimately handled and disposed of as such.

Q: Attachment 1 lists the analytical methods for each parameter. Are those methods the only acceptable methods, or is any EPA approved method acceptable for this contract?

A: In many cases DHWM will be splitting samples with facilities and would like results from the same methods for comparison purposes. In some cases, DHWM may request alternate methods due to DHWM's desire to split samples with a facility using an alternate method. DHWM may also request, and/or the laboratory may suggest, an alternate method due to matrix interferences. This will be handled on a case by case basis through dialogue between DHWM and the laboratory. For the purpose of this RFP, please use the methods listed in Attachment I.

Q: Section 3.11, will penalties apply for failing QC due to matrix related problems?

A: In the case that corrective measures have been taken (e.g., applicable dilution) and matrix interferences still prevent the Contractor from meeting QC criteria, the penalties will not apply. This will be based on the laboratory taking reasonable steps and measures to overcome the interferences as well as documentation of the interferences/corrective measures being noted in the data narrative. Such results should also bear the appropriate data qualifiers.

Q: No methods listed for Sulfide, Total Dissolved Solids and Turbidity. What methods are requested?

A: The following methods or their equivalents (e.g., U.S. EPA methods, Standard Methods) would be appropriate: Sulfide by U.S. EPA Method 376.1, Total Dissolved Solids by SM 2540C, and Turbidity by U.S. EPA Method 180.1. An amended Attachment I is included in a link along with the RFP questions and answers.

Q: Please clarify the method for Cyanide-free. Attachment 1 says SM 41211.

A: Free Cyanide should be analyzed by SM 4500-CN-G. An amended Attachment I is included in a link along with the RFP questions and answers.

Q: Can ICP-MS methods be substituted for the AA/GFAA methods listed?

A: In many cases DHWM will be splitting samples with facilities and would like results from the same methods for comparison purposes. In some cases, DHWM may request alternate methods due to DHWM's desire to split samples with a facility using an alternate method. DHWM may also request, and/or the laboratory may suggest, an alternate method due to matrix interferences. This will be handled on a case by case basis through dialogue between DHWM and the laboratory. For the purpose of this RFP, please use the methods listed in Attachment I.

Q: Is the QAPP specified in Section 2.3.4 specific to this RFP, or will the standard Laboratory Quality Assurance Plan be acceptable?

A: For the purposes of this RFP, DHWM will review your present QAPP. If any contract specific changes need to be made to the QAPP, these will be negotiated once a contract has been awarded.

Q: Does this RFP have specific MDL/PQL requirements?

A: There are no specific MDL/PQL requirements. However, DHWM will request certain levels be met for specific analyses (e.g., Land Disposal Restriction levels). These levels will be negotiated once a contract has been awarded.

Q: Section 3.23 does not specify retention time for sample storage. How long must samples be held before we can request disposal?

A: Samples may be disposed of with prior approval of the applicable district or Central Office Laboratory Coordinator. The Laboratory Coordinator(s) will give this approval after having reviewed the Contractor's inventory, to be sent out every six months. The majority of samples will be approved for disposal upon review by the Laboratory Coordinator(s). However, a portion of the samples may be requested to be held beyond this notification due to pending litigation or re-analysis. These samples are expected to total less than ten percent of the overall number of samples submitted to the laboratory. The duration of storage can not be specified, but may potentially extend beyond the contract period.