



ADDENDUM NO. 3

Responses to Inquiries and Questions

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

PART A: PRE-SITE RESTORATION SERVICES and

PART B: SITE RESTORATION SERVICES (Construction Management at Risk) Project

No. 431-PA27-001 & 27-002

June 17, 2026

1. Is it permissible to include our firm's project sheets within the Appendices and would such information be excluded from the overall page limit for this SOQ?
 - You may submit your firm's projects sheets, however they will be subject to the overall page limit.
2. Is it acceptable for the Contractor to satisfy the bonding requirements through bonds supplied by procured subcontractors, in lieu of the bonding being provided directly by the Contractor?
 - The CMAR must provide bonding in accordance with the requirements outlined in the RFQ.
3. The RFQ for both Shreveport & Monroe states: "Sealed 'Proposals' (Statements of Qualifications) will be received until 12:00 p.m. local time, Monday, June 26, 2026, for furnishing the work described herein." However, June 26, 2026 falls on a Friday rather than a Monday. Can you please clarify the correct proposal due date?
 - Proposals are due by 12:00 p.m. local time Friday June 26th, 2026. The RFQ has been updated to reflect this.
4. Regarding the estimated number of wells to be plugged in the SOQ then GMP for the Monroe and Lafayette Districts (RFQ Project No. 431-PA27-001) does the LDCE prefer equal numbers of wells to be estimated for the Monroe District as with the Lafayette District?
 - Proposals are for Shreveport and/or Monroe, Lafayette is an alternative scope of work with the potential to be included in the bidders response. For GMP the selected PSRM will provide a separate, district-specific quote for each scope of work, including a separate quote for the Lafayette District. For SOQ, Proposer should provide separate estimates of the number of orphaned well sites that Proposer can restore, consistent with requirements outlined in the RFQ within one year, for both the primary District (Monroe or Shreveport) and for the alternate District (Lafayette).
5. Regarding the estimated number of wells to be plugged in the SOQ then GMP for the Shreveport and Lafayette Districts (RFQ Project No. 431-PA27-002) does the LDCE prefer equal numbers of wells to be estimated for the Shreveport District as with the Lafayette District?
 - Proposals are for Shreveport and/or Monroe, Lafayette is an alternative scope of work with the potential to be included in the bidders response. The selected PSRM will provide a separate, district-specific quote for each scope of work, including a separate quote for the Lafayette District. For SOQ, Proposer should provide separate estimates of the number of orphaned well sites that Proposer can restore, consistent with requirements outlined in the RFQ within one year, for both the primary District (Monroe or Shreveport) and for the alternate District (Lafayette).
6. Are there any high priority wells that the LDCE would like to be included on the Proposers estimated plugging list for the Monroe and Lafayette Districts (RFQ Project No. 431-PA27-001)?
 - A final list of wells will be determined through the pre-restoration design period and in the Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) Amendment.

7. Are there any high priority wells that the LDCE would like to be included on the Proposers estimated plugging list for the Shreveport and Lafayette Districts (RFQ Project No. 431-PA27-002)?
 - A final list of wells will be determined through the pre-restoration design period and in the Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) Amendment.
8. Have “Pits” been assigned a SN or identified on Sonris GIS for estimating cost of P&A or will they be at the discretion of Districts Agents?
 - See the pit information available to the general public via LDCE’s Strategic Online Natural Resources Information System (“SONRIS”).
9. Will the CMAR contractors have the ability to discuss SOW on wells in each district prior to cost analysis?
 - Review the RFQ, including the Draft Form of Statewide Restoration Manager Agreement (AIA A133-2019 as modified by the State) and the Draft General Conditions of the Contract (AIA A201-2017 as modified by the State)(hereinafter referred to as the “AIA documents”).
10. Will there be pre- and post-methane monitoring by the state or by the CMAR?
 - Review the RFQ scope of work
11. Will change order rates be standardized?
 - Review the RFQ, including the AIA documents.
12. Is there an estimated turnover time for the State to fund contractors after the final report has been approved and signed off?
 - Review the RFQ, including the AIA documents.
13. Is the new ASTM Type I Portland cement considered the same as Class A Portland cement in the eyes of the C&E and this contract?
 - Not relevant to RFQ.
14. Is there a time frame for all funds to be used under either contract?
 - Review the RFQ, including the AIA documents.
15. Is it permissible to include our firm’s project sheets within the Appendices and would such information be excluded from the overall page limit for this SOQ?
 - You may submit your firm’s projects sheets, however they will be included in the overall page limit.
16. Lafayette Alternate – Funding and Evaluation - The RFQ requires separate, district-specific pricing and identifies the Lafayette District as an optional scope. Please confirm whether the Lafayette alternate is included within the overall program value (greater than \$15 million) or represents separate or contingent funding. Additionally, please clarify whether the Lafayette alternate will be evaluated independently or in combination with the Shreveport base scope.
 - The RFQ does not require that a bidder’s proposal include separate district-specific pricing. For GMP the selected PSRM will provide a separate, district-specific quote for each scope of work, including a separate quote for the Lafayette District. For SOQ, Proposer should provide separate estimates of the number of orphaned well sites that Proposer can restore, consistent with requirements outlined in the RFQ within one year, for both the primary District (Monroe or Shreveport) and for the alternate District (Lafayette).
17. Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) Structure - Please confirm whether the SRMR is expected to develop separate GMP proposals for the Shreveport and Lafayette scopes, or a single GMP with an additive alternate for the Lafayette scope.

- Proposals are for Shreveport and/or Monroe, Lafayette is an alternative scope of work with the potential to be included in the bidders response. For GMP the selected PSRM will provide a separate, district-specific quote for each scope of work, including a separate quote for the Lafayette District. For SOQ, Proposer should provide separate estimates of the number of orphaned well sites that Proposer can restore, consistent with requirements outlined in the RFQ within one year, for both the primary District (Monroe or Shreveport) and for the alternate District (Lafayette)..
18. PSRM-to-SRMR Transition Criteria - Beyond successful GMP agreement, please clarify the primary performance factors or evaluation criteria the State will use to determine satisfactory PSRM performance and eligibility for award of the SRMR (Part B) contract.
 - In addition to reaching an agreement as to the GMP amendment, and without limitation as to other appropriate considerations, the State will need to be convinced that the State has received excellent service and competitive pricing during the Pre-Site Restoration phase and that the State reasonably expects to receive the same in the Site Restoration Phase.
 19. Scope Definition and Reliability of Well Lists - To what extent should proposers rely on the well lists provided in Exhibits 6 and 7 as the final scope of work?
 - Review the RFQ scope of work.
 20. Throughput and Production Assumptions - The RFQ requires proposers to estimate the number of wells deliverable within 365 days. Please clarify whether the State has an expected or target production range to guide staffing plans and scheduling assumptions.
 - Review RFQ requirements.
 21. Advanced Project Start (APS) Activities - Please clarify how APS (Advanced Project Start) activities will be authorized, defined, and compensated, particularly in instances where scope, duration, or contract value may be modified following award.
 - Review the RFQ
 22. Carbon Credits and Salvage Value - Please clarify the State's expectations regarding ownership, accounting, and reporting of carbon credits or salvage value, and whether proposer participation in these activities is considered optional or will be evaluated as part of the overall approach.
 - PSRM / SRMR may pursue salvage value and/or carbon credits associated with wells abandoned using federal funding. In such cases, the SRMR will be required to adjust the billed amounts accordingly or provide an equivalent contingency credit reflecting the value derived from salvage or carbon credit transactions.
 23. There are 2 main project areas (Monroe and Shreveport) with an option for Lafayette. Is the \$15mm total sum per project area, or is that the total for both projects combined?
 - Proposals are for Shreveport and/or Monroe, Lafayette is an alternative scope of work with the potential to be included in the bidders response. For GMP the selected PSRM will provide a separate, district-specific quote for each scope of work, including a separate quote for the Lafayette District. For SOQ, Proposer should provide separate estimates of the number of orphaned well sites that Proposer can restore, consistent with requirements outlined in the RFQ within one year, for both the primary District (Monroe or Shreveport) and for the alternate District (Lafayette).
 24. How will it be determined if the Lafayette project will be funded?
 - Review the RFQ

25. Based on the list of wells given, how many wells are to be plugged for each project area (Monroe and Lafayette)?
 - Review the RFQ
26. Is there any criteria the state is requiring when selecting wells from the list, or does the plugging contractor have full autonomy to select any wells they choose from the list?
 - Review the RFQ
27. Will there be an expected number of wells to be plugged?
 - Review the RFQ
28. What will be the deciding factors on who is selected to do the projects.
 - Review the RFQ.
29. Clarification 1 – With regards to the \$15M +/- Budget – Is there a current list of definitive wells to be included within each district for review, or depending on the orphan wells importance within the Monroe, Shreveport, and Lafayette districts be bid on a well-by-well basis based upon contractor award and the schedule of importance by C&E and the total will be within this \$15M budget?
 - Review the RFQ. Proposals are for Shreveport and/or Monroe, Lafayette is an alternative scope of work with the potential to be included in the bidders response. For GMP the selected PSRM will provide a separate, district-specific quote for each scope of work, including a separate quote for the Lafayette District. For SOQ, Proposer should provide separate estimates of the number of orphaned well sites that Proposer can restore, consistent with requirements outlined in the RFQ within one year, for both the primary District (Monroe or Shreveport) and for the alternate District (Lafayette).
30. Should the Lafayette district SOQ response be a standalone attachment that provides a complete response to all 12 Tabs or can the Lafayette response be included but separate within the 12 Tab for the northern district (Monroe or Shreveport) response as applicable.
 - Proposals are for Shreveport and/or Monroe, Lafayette is an alternative scope of work with the potential to be included in the bidders response. For SOQ, Proposer should provide separate estimates of the number of orphaned well sites that Proposer can restore, consistent with requirements outlined in the RFQ within one year, for both the primary District (Monroe or Shreveport) and for the alternate District (Lafayette).
31. Is there any requirement that a company submitting a bid proposal have an office in Louisiana prior to submitting a bid?
 - No, this isn't required prior to submitting a bid proposal.
32. Is there any requirement that a company submitting a bid proposal register with the Department prior to submitting a bid?
 - No this isn't required prior to submitting a bid proposal
33. Will the sign-in sheet from today's mandatory meeting be posted online?
 - Yes, it has been posted on the Department's website at: <https://www.dce.louisiana.gov/page/iija-orphaned-well-projects>
34. When submitting a bid proposal do proposers need to include Lafayette District wells within the \$15 Million amount required by the RFQ?
 - Proposals are for Shreveport and/or Monroe, Lafayette is an alternative scope of work with the potential to be included in the bidder's response. For GMP the selected PSRM will provide a separate, district-specific comprehensive execution plan with quote for each scope of work, including a separate quote for the

Lafayette District. For SOQ, Proposer should provide separate estimates of the number of orphaned well sites that Proposer can restore, consistent with requirements outlined in the RFQ within one year, for both the primary District (Monroe or Shreveport) and for the alternate District (Lafayette).

35. Pipeline abandonment / decommissioning was not mentioned in the RFQ documentation. Is there any pipeline scope within this project?
 - Review the RFQ.
36. What activities are considered schedule critical by the State? What factors are driving the schedule?
 - Review the RFQ.
37. What activities are not included in the Site Restoration Manager at Risk scope but are still expected to be coordinated?
 - Review the RFQ.
38. Who has final authority when technical, environmental, and cost considerations conflict?
 - Review the RFQ, including the AIA documents.
39. What well information will be provided such as logs, drilling reports, historical failures, and mechanical integrity issues?
 - See the well information available to the general public via SONRIS.
40. Will geographic information system data for access routes, environmental buffers, and site boundaries be provided?
 - See the geographic information available to the general public via SONRIS.
41. Will the State provide records of spills, blowouts, or enforcement actions?
 - See the records available to the general public via SONRIS.
42. Will surface ownership and access documentation be included?
 - The contractor is responsible for landowner contact.
43. What assumptions should be used for casing, annulus, and cement conditions when data is incomplete?
 - See the records available to the general public via SONRIS.
44. Will the State coordinate with other agencies or must the Site Restoration Manager at Risk manage all regulatory interfaces?
 - Review the RFQ.
45. When State and Federal requirements conflict, which requirements take precedence?
 - Review the RFQ and consult your legal counsel.
46. Will the State secure surface access agreements or must the Site Restoration Manager at Risk negotiate them?
 - The contractor is responsible for landowner contact.
47. Will pre project assessments of access roads and well pads be provided?
 - Review the RFQ
48. What emergency response capabilities are expected for spills, blowouts, or injuries?
 - Review the RFQ

Signed addendum must be returned with bid documents for each bid submittal. Addendum is now part of Bid Packet 431-PA27-001 and 431-PA27-002.

(Company Name)

(Company Representative Authorized Signature)

(Date)