QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS NO. 1
OF THE PLANS, SPECIFICATIONS, PROPOSAL AND CONTRACT
FOR CITY OF LACEY

S07 FIRE TOWER DEMOLITION

LACEY CONTRACT NO. PW 2026-17

TO ALL PLAN HOLDERS:

You are hereby notified of the following questions. Issued this 21st day of October 2026.
THIS DOES NOT NEED TO BE ACKNOWLEDGED.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Question 1: PFAS in tower concrete – The Hazardous Materials Survey (Appendix H, Section 4.3.4) reports PFAS in the tower concrete (up to 8,260 ng/kg on the 1st floor). Does the City require the tower concrete and CMU debris to be landfilled, or may it be taken to a concrete recycler? If recycling is allowed, will the City provide any additional characterization the recycler may require?

Answer 1: The reported PFAS concentrations range are below the persistence-based dangerous-waste thresholds identified by the Washington State Department of Ecology. The City does not require the concrete and CMU debris from the Fire Tower to be disposed of as dangerous waste, solely due to the reported PFAS concentrations. The material may be disposed of at an appropriately permitted landfill or recycled at a facility authorized to accept it, subject to applicable regulations and recycling facility acceptance requirements. The Contractor shall coordinate directly with the recycling facility and be responsible for any additional testing or documentation required for acceptance in case they chose to recycle.

Question 2: Demolition sequence – Special Provision 1-08.4(1) requires demolition "from the higher to the lower level." Would the City accept a method where the top-floor walls are removed so the roof slab drops onto the 3rd floor, followed by floor-by-floor removal, provided it is detailed in the submitted demolition plan? Will the City require the demolition plan to be stamped by a professional engineer?

Answer 2: The City will not approve specific demolition methods prior to bidding. The successful Contractor shall submit a detailed demolition plan in accordance

with Special Provision 1-08.4(1) for the Engineer's review and approval prior to commencing demolition. A PE-stamped demolition plan is not expressly required by the specifications; however, any engineering documentation required by applicable regulations shall be provided by the Contractor.

Question 3: Paving window – Section 5-04.3(1) prohibits wearing-course HMA from October 1 through March 31 without the Engineer's written concurrence. Given the earliest on-site start of November 28, will the City approve placing the Commercial HMA patch during the winter, accept a temporary patch with final paving in spring, or allow Physical Completion before the final paving?

Answer 3: Commercial HMA placement may be permitted during the winter months when weather and site conditions are suitable, subject to the Engineer's written concurrence and applicable specification requirements. If adverse weather prevents paving, adjustments to the paving schedule may be considered in coordination with the Engineer. Final paving remains a requirement for Physical Completion.

Question 4: Tower foundation – Are record drawings available showing the fire tower's foundation type, thickness, and depth? Is the 860 sf foundation area on the Demolition Plan a slab-on-grade with perimeter footings, or a mat foundation?

Answer 4: Record drawings of the existing fire tower foundation are not available. The City cannot confirm the foundation configuration, thickness, or depth. The Contractor shall determine actual conditions during demolition and remove the foundation in accordance with the Contract Documents.

Question 5: Wood shed dangerous waste – The shed debris is designated Dangerous Waste (TCLP lead 52 mg/L). Will the City act as the generator, provide the EPA/State ID number, and sign the hazardous waste manifest? Or does the City expect the Contractor to obtain a site ID number?

Answer 5: Based on guidance received from the Washington State Department of Ecology, a State/EPA identification number is not required for this waste shipment. The Contractor shall coordinate with an appropriately authorized dangerous-waste disposal facility and arrange for proper handling, transportation, and disposal of the woodshed waste in accordance with the Contract Documents and applicable regulations. The City will coordinate with the Contractor regarding any required generator signatures or waste shipment documentation. The Contractor shall provide copies of all required disposal records to the City. Refer to section 1-08.4(1) order of work.

Question 6: The PFAS represent an uncommon new material for disposal Would the city consider extending the bid date for time to research the rules/regulations/disposal and/or cleanup process for this material?

Answer 6: The City will not extend the bid date. Refer to the response to Question 1 regarding PFAS characterization and disposal requirements.

Question 7: Asbestos-Containing Roofing Materials – Please clarify which layers of the roof contain asbestos. Multiple layers are visible, but the Hazardous Materials Survey does not clearly identify the specific asbestos-containing layers.

Answer 7: There appears to be 4-5 layers and lose friable material tagged as “black Debris” in the report, on top of the roof slab. All layers on the Fire Tower Roof, including the layer the Lab defined as “Black Debris” found to be ND, are to be treated as ACBM by virtue of the Friable 30% Chrys roofing layers above. Asbestos containing Material Layers under RC3 cannot be abated without disturbing other Layers, therefore all roofing material under RC3 is deemed inseparable and must be treated as ACBM for the purposes of removal and disposal.

Question 8: The HAVMAT report did not tell if the CMU was filled with concrete. Can you tell me if it was. I need to understand to what we can anchor our fall protection to correctly bid this project. Can the iron stairs as an anchor for the abatement.

Answer 8: The City does not have record drawings or structural documentation confirming whether the CMU walls are fully grouted or verifying the load capacity of the existing steel stairs. Please refer to the photograph labeled “Sample No. 13, 14 – Brick and Mortar” in the Hazardous Materials Survey Report, which shows the location where the inspector sampled the masonry. Observations from the survey suggest that portions of the CMU walls may be hollow; however, this has not been confirmed. The Contractor shall be responsible for evaluating and providing suitable fall-protection systems in accordance with applicable safety regulation.