

**IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY  
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)**

**RFP0915**

**TECHNICAL AND REMEDIAL SERVICES FOR REMEDIAL ACTIVITIES  
IN THE COEUR D'ALENE BASIN**

**DEQ KELLOGG SUPERFUND PROJECT OFFICE  
KELLOGG, IDAHO**

**PROPOSAL DUE DATE: FEBRUARY 10, 2012**

**REGARDING PRESUBMITTAL QUESTIONS, DEQ RESPONSE  
AND RFP ADDENDUM**

This document contains Administrative Notes and RFP Addendum for the above noted Request for Proposals.

**Purpose of this Request for Proposal**

The Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) is seeking a contractor (Contractor) to provide project management, minor engineering (design to construct level), and construction oversight services (the Work) for the Coeur d'Alene Basin Project (Project). The Project headquarters is located in Kellogg, Idaho.

**Administrative Notes**

The schedule for the remainder of the Request for Proposal process is as follows: Proposals for RFP0915 are due at the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality **February 10, 2012, 4:00 P.M. (MT)**.

Proposals must be submitted to: Marcia L. Todd  
Grants/Contracts Officer/RFP0915  
Idaho Department of Environmental Quality  
1410 North Hilton  
Boise, Idaho 83706

You must obtain a receipt from DEQ noting the date and time the proposal was submitted. For proposals submitted by mail, or delivery service, the receipt will be sent to you. Proposals received after the deadline will not be accepted. The sealed proposals will be opened publicly **February 10, 2012, at 4:05 P.M. (MT)**. Only the names of those submitting proposals will be identified at the public bid opening.

The bid selection process is confidential. Proposals received shall remain confidential until the contract, if any, resulting from this RFP is issued. Thereafter, all proposals submitted in

response to this request shall be deemed public record. In the event that a proposer desires to claim portions of its proposal as exempt from disclosure, it is incumbent upon the proposer to identify those portions. Please refer to Section 7.5 beginning on page 20 of the RFP for further instructions.

At no other time during the remainder of the RFP process will DEQ Technical Personnel or Grants/Contracts Officers be available to respond to questions of a technical nature from prospective bidders. Questions with regard to administrative procedures for bidding will be answered up to the time bid proposals are due. For questions of an administrative nature, please contact Grants/Contracts Officer Marcia Todd by email at [marcia.todd@deq.idaho.gov](mailto:marcia.todd@deq.idaho.gov).

Any major questions/clarifications that are addressed in the Presubmittal Conference are shared with other prospective proposers even if they did not submit questions. The reason the information is shared is that the State of Idaho must maintain an even playing field so that everyone has the same opportunity to submit a competitive proposal using the same information as the prospective proposers who attended the Presubmittal Conference.

The contents of the RFP, Presubmittal Questions/DEQ Response, RFP Addendum if any and the selected proposal submitted will become the contract's statement of work.

### **Presubmittal Questions with DEQ Response**

Presubmittal Questions are in **Bold**. DEQ responses are in regular type font.

- 1. The proposals will be opened at 4:05 p.m. on February 10. Will the contract not be awarded until later in the month?**

Answer: Once the proposals are received and opened, there is a process that we have to go through. The proposals are first checked to make sure everything we asked for is there. They are then handed over to the evaluation committee for scoring. After the evaluation committee has finished its review, those points are combined with the cost proposal points and the proposals are ranked. A letter of intent is sent out to the higher scoring offeror. The contract will probably be let towards the end of February, 2012.

- 2. Some of the scopes that are listed in the proposal are pretty general and vague. Is there any way to get more description, detail, or more information on some of those items?**

Answer: A lot of them actually haven't been designed. As you know the design packages have everything from the cost estimates and the scheduling to the engineering design and specs. The only thing that is somewhat available to view is the design and specs for repositories. These are very large files. We are in the process of generating the design and specs for each one of the individual yard removals so they are not available yet. You can make an appointment with Bruce Schuld so you can come into the office and look at the design and specs of the repositories and look at an example of the designs of the individual yard removals.

**3. The proposal describes minor engineering. Major engineering would be something like a repository. Could you give us an example of ‘minor’ engineering?**

Answer: We are currently looking at two new repository locations in the upper basin. One is at Osburn and the other is near the Star Mine. We have just wrapped up the 30% designs on the Osburn Repository. Eventually we would be taking it the rest of the way to 100% design. That task as well as the design of the Star Repository will fall to our engineering contract that is currently out and being advertised under a RFQ. The repositories are a good example of a major engineering design that is going to another contract. The design and construct that we would be looking at for this RFP is where we have for instance an operating repository that needs upgrades that our contractor is responsible for operating when we do upgrades on that we would probably need design to construct engineering specs for those types of projects. In addition, there is the potential of having smaller projects that we want to just hand to the contractor and have them do the conceptual designs, get approvals on that, and then follow it all the way through. An example of that is the State of Idaho is likely going to be responsible for doing remedial actions on unpaved roads in the Basin that fall within the Superfund Project. Conceptually, we will be removing a certain amount of material from those unpaved roads and reconstructing it so that a certain thickness of the surface is clean and is a protective barrier to the users on those roads from the contaminated materials in the flood plains underlying those roads. At that point in time when we would identify a mile of road we would come to the contractor and say we want to pilot this project. We’re looking to do a mile of road, we want you to do a design to construct project. Conversely, there may be larger road projects that the State may be implementing. For example, say we started looking at something that was miles, in an integrated road system similar to the project in Pinehurst a few years ago. The city actually had the money to redo the sewers and several other things. If it became a convoluted not really straight forward thing that type of design project would go to the science and engineering contract. It would be a major engineering project.

**4. Page 42 of the RFP: Table 2 Costs of Operating Equipment. Is that meant to include a Davis Bacon Operator or is it the equipment wet only?**

Answer: It is fully loaded with Davis Bacon . There may be some projects that are not Davis Bacon related. But we want you to all use the same standard for this bid. Then if we do have projects that are not subject to Davis Bacon Wages after the contract is in place, we will identify those projects. Most of the work that we are going to be doing will be Davis Bacon because we are using federal dollars on it.

**5. The equipment at a repository would fall under project management overseeing the repository operation? Mark mentioned the cost of the equipment to be used so when I first saw project management here I wasn’t sure if you were talking the actual equipment operator or just the oversight of it.**

Answer: I think fully loaded means that you want to include the amount of oversight it takes to supervise that individual operator as well. Which is spread out over all your equipment; you are going to have certain overhead costs.

- 6. So the reason that you have this Table 2 Costs of Operating Equipment you are talking about the actual equipment like your project management is overseeing the repository, for example Big Creek or the Flats. You are also talking the equipment that it would take to operate that.**

Answer: That is correct.

- 7. Physically move dirt.**

Answer: Correct.

- 8. But the wages paid to those people doing that kind of construction work , is that to be included?**

Answer: That is to be included in that hourly rate.

- 9. So this is project oversight all the way through construction?**

Answer: That's correct. One of the things that may be loaded into that as well since a lot of the equipment moves back and forth between the repositories you may want to consider what the rates for mob and demob and how that affects the fully loaded hourly rate on your equipment.

- 10. When was the present contract awarded?**

Answer: Four years ago.

- 11. This question is in regard to your 'base' case. Are you going to be able to evaluate reasonableness with that number or do you intend for us to break down our resources, hours used etc., those assumptions with that number? Otherwise you are going to get just one number. How do know how reasonable that number is?**

Answer: When we created the 'base' case we decided that it would be however you would do the job and the total cost.

- 12. Would it make sense to put a time limit or some kind of a time frame on there?**

Answer: Including a time frame is a good idea. We will add to the description of the Base Case for Price Proposal that the waste needs to be moved, transported, placed and compacted in the active repository in one week (40 hours).

**13. This sounds like you are looking for someone who is the right hand person out in the field implementing this program whatever kind of pace Bruce sets or whatever type of agenda or schedule that you see fit depending on the time of year so it's kind of as needs arise. In the summer months it will be more geared up than it is this time of year. Am I assessing this correctly?**

Answer: That is correct. A big portion of this will be structured routines in the repository ops as well as the yards operations. There is, however, a tremendous amount of logistics and shifting of priorities on a day to day basis.

**14. So we would need to be prepared for that with a lot of flexibility?**

Answer: That's correct. For instance we could get access to yards but all of a sudden we get a lot of rain so you can't get into the yards because it's too wet. We may shift our priorities towards getting the crews completely moved to the other end of the valley to get into a drier climate to implement. There will definitely have to be some adaptability built into your plans.

**15. Did I see a percentage in here for woman owned or minority owned businesses?**

Answer: On page 22 of the RFP is Section 7.10 Contracting With Small Business and Minority Firms, Women's Business Enterprises, and Labor Surplus Area Firms. Since it is national policy to award a fair share of contracts to small, minority, and women's business firms, DEQ requests Contractor support. Affirmative steps are included as items 1- 6.

**16. And that can be on a case by case basis?**

Answer: Yes.

**17. Is there much drafting in this project or is that mostly on the scientific side?**

Answer: There will be some, but we really have an emphasis on constructability analysis and there is a lot of number crunching that goes in to figuring out how we are going to put logistics into moving our materials around, how we are going to manage our wastes and reuse where we can and place accordingly. I don't know that we'll be doing a lot of design and specs in the form of plans.

**18. As part of the project team, do you want to see the actual contractor in the field and what if that changed during the course of the contract? For instance, if we partner up with a particular company that's doing the construction and they go out of business in a year or they have moved on and that changes. Should they be shown initially in our proposal?**

Answer: When there are changes made we need to know that so we can approve who you partner with or hire, and who is on the ground.

**19. You want to see everyone's name now up front?**

Answer: That's correct.

**20. When Tetra Tech was doing the yards before, we would draft up the yards and what needed to be done with the yards. Is that still happening then?**

Originally we answered that that part of this. However, with some help from TerraGraphics we have this correction: This contract does not provide the yard maps and remedial plans. That is a different contract.

**21. Any other special certification besides the ICP Certification? The certification that we have to get to do work in the Silver Valley.**

Answer: You need that and everyone that is on the project sites will have to have the 40-hour Hazwopper training. There may be other certifications that may be appropriate. Most would be value added. But you will have to have the 40-hour Hazwopper and the ICP Training. There is a health and safety plan in place for most of the projects we would be looking at whether or not it is necessary to modify the existing health and safety plans.

**22. Under Section F Experience and Capabilities of the Firm, Project Experience, a. through j. lists some different services that might be required. How much do you see these items playing a part in this contract? Are these minor?**

Answer: No, those items will be pretty major during the evaluation of the technical qualifications of the group.

**23. So backgrounds or experience in wetland mitigation and the revegetation with native species is required?**

Answer: Our future remedial work plans into the both the Upper Basin and Lower Basin repositories could potentially involve a lot of stream channel work, a lot of flood plain removals and things like that. We have no idea what level of mitigation the federal government will require of us. So this experience is important.

**24. Following up on a previous question: Does this contract actually include drawing up the work plans for individual yards?**

Answer: No. That is a separate contract.

**25. When you first addressed that it sounded like down at Boise whoever was preparing individual plans and then when construction time comes the plans come off the shelf and give them to the contractor?**

Answer: The actual plans for the yards themselves are prepared under the scientific contract, so it is not part of this contract. The oversight of the work under this contract focuses on other contractors work as prescribed by those yard plans.

**26. As-builts are done under the scientific contract or done under this contract?**

Answer: They are done under the scientific contract

**27. How much is it weighted on having an existing local office open here right now, today?**

Answer: Having one existing here today? Not important. As far as having an office here after the contract award it is very important. We feel it is very important that people are vested here in the valley. We want the locals to know that we are vested.

**28. In the Davis Bacon Wage Determination Attachment, on page 7 of 10 it shows rates from 09-03-2003. That's pretty old so do we factor this up for inflation?**

Answer: I got that right from the DOL site so I think that it is current. If you all use those numbers that would be good, then later if we find that there are changes to be made then all the rates would be adjusted appropriately. We are cognizant of the Davis Bacon applications.

**29. For example, right above the 09/03/2003, there is listed a Laborer, General/Cleanup and that is fairly current – 06/01/2011. There is such a huge difference between the two.**

Answer: I went to <http://www.wdol.gov/wdol/scafiles/davisbacon/ID12.dvb> and printed out the pages 1-10. If you find during your bidding process that you have more current numbers that we have included, state very clearly that you used more up to date numbers and where they came from.

**30. Does the work in this contract include confirmation sampling or is that being done by someone else? After the yards are completed?**

Answer: We haven't decided yet, but we believe that it will become part of the science and engineering contract. Over the course of the last 15 years the purpose and objectives of sampling in the yards has changed dramatically. Some is related to validating what actually occurred in the yard; some is relative to recontamination as a result of adjoining yards, roadways, and things like that. There is a flux that is occurring and that is why we think it should be in the science and engineering contract.

**31. The repositories that are currently operating that fall under the scope of this work would be East Mission Flats, Big Creek and the Page?**

Answer: The repositories under this contract would be East Mission Flats and Big Creek. Page is under a separate contract.

**32. Are any more repositories going to be coming online during this contract? You described two possibilities – the Star and Osburn.**

Answer: I can't answer that with any degree of certainty. We have problems with siting, getting approvals, and getting community acceptance. We do know that we have a space inventory problem that we are constantly balancing within the repositories. We would like to have another site prepared and ready to go but we are not there yet.

**33. Can you give an example of some of the different types of O&M work that's being done at the repositories?**

Answer: I am going to speak from my experience at the Page. The construction management team for the repositories is inspecting from a qualitative standpoint on a daily basis and they should be. I try to get to each of them on a weekly basis as a part of my determining priorities for the ongoing O&M operations. They are very actively managed and part of the qualitative observations that are being made out there is part of those responsibilities.

**34. I wasn't sure if there was any water sampling?**

Answer: All water quality sampling and analysis is done under the Scientific contract.

**35. On the evaluation criteria where it talks about 'Experience and Capabilities of the Firm', is the 'Firm' collectively because in our case there are several of us going in together, is it collectively or would be the lead firm?**

Answer: It would be collectively. Whoever your team is going to be that you are putting on this project is the 'firm'.

**36. The construction is the portion of it that is actually physically being done? That portion would be the repositories. The actual remediation of the yards is under a separate contract.**

Answer: The mechanics of the yards remediation is actually implemented by two contractors. We are currently using Stewart and Ferguson. We are negotiating an extension of their contracts. There are those instances that I talked about earlier where we came up with an urgent remedial action that needed to be implemented where we were doing a design to construct. At that point we would draw in the prime's resources to actually do the construction work.

**37. So just to clarify, the construction that is for the repositories is if there is some kind of needed maintenance or construction of something for the repositories?**

Answer: All the construction work at the repository is done by the prime for this contract.

**38. They would be contracted through us rather than by DEQ?**

Answer: Yes.

**39. And we need to know who our contractor is going to be up front?**

Answer: Yes.

**40. Is there any analytical in this RFP as far as samples being analyzed by a lab?**

Answer: No. Everything that will be analyzed will be turned over to the Scientific contract. If you see some need for additional characterization or analysis that needs to be done, then you would take it to the Project Manager and he would assign it.

**41. The operation of the repositories with the current contractor; is that proprietary information like their manpower, staffing, equipment use? For example, if we are going to bid on this it would be nice to know what they are currently using, like a 10 or 15 man crew, how many pieces of equipment. Is that proprietary?**

Answer: In order for you to look at any proposal or contract information, you need to do a Public Records Request. To do this, go to [www.deq.idaho.gov](http://www.deq.idaho.gov); select Assistance and Resources (on the left side of the page), and at the bottom of the page that comes up will be 'Public Records Requests' where you can read all about it.

**42. There is a section that talks about conflicts of interest. Would that be considered on a case by case basis? For example if we were doing a job for someone up the valley and some of this work might interfere with that would we just discuss that and figure out if it is a conflict and if it was then a different contractor would do some of that work?**

Answer: If it is something that may be a conflict, you should come and talk to us about it ahead of time so we can see whether it is a conflict of interest or not. Then we can take care of it at that time.

**43. The conflict of interest is mainly the contractors working this versus the mining companies that are potential responsible parties – is that what you are looking for?**

Answer: That's right.

**44. How about providing the oversight and being the remedial contractor?**

Answer: It would definitely be frowned on heavily. One of the reasons that we want folks here is to oversee the construction work being done and we would try with the exception of the repositories to limit how much work that this prime is doing turnkey

from conception through completion on construction work. We want the contractor to be my representative on the ground overseeing what is being done and being able to pick up the phone and say it's done, and it's done right.

**45. How likely is it that this contract would be broken up into different parcels? For example, one contractor would operate the repositories and another one would do different sites. You are looking for just one contractor to do everything? So it is unlikely that this would be broken up.**

Answer: That's correct, we are looking for just one contractor to do everything and it is highly unlikely that this contract would be broken up. If you came in with a construction management team that said they had a sub that is absolutely fabulous at running repositories and we are going to use them for nothing but repositories; if you are doing roadwork and say you are bringing in someone entirely different to do that work; or if you are doing stream channel alteration work and you want to bring in an entirely different subcontractor for those things – that would be up to you but we would first have to approve those subs for the job.

**46. You mentioned the health and safety plan already being prepared and you would check to see if it needed modifications.**

Answer: We have health and safety plans that are actually in the works for each of the repositories and we have a health and safety plan for the yards work that those contractors that are implementing that have to follow. We have weekly safety meetings for all contractors doing all levels of earth work. I can't say that there is one health and safety plan that umbrellas over the project.

**47. Earlier you mentioned that you did not want to spend a bunch of money in modifying the health and safety plan?**

Answer: We have a lot of products like the health and safety plan that we are not going to go through and revise on an annual basis.

**48. So we will probably use one that is already in place?**

Answer: Yes.

**49. And what about the QAPP?**

Answer: We have a number of QAPP's already in place. Most of them are designed under our scientific contract. We do have some that we put into place under the existing contract for different things but everything is run by QAPP's for different purposes and objectives.

**50. If one needed to be modified to suit the project then we would go ahead and do that?**

Answer: Yes. As an example: Nothing is routine about yard removals and remediation. As this project moves down lower into the Basin we are doing more sites that have shorelines. We do an annual lessons learned meeting and as a result of that meeting we may change some of those documents. The SAPP, QAPP, Hazard, or the Health and Safety Plan. There may be something that pops up that will cause us to make those modifications. You may recommend it to us or we may come up with the recommendation that we want those changes. We would do a task order change to authorize it.

**51. Did you say the scientific contract is up too?**

Answer: We have an engineering one for the Basin that is just going out for RFQ, which is a request for qualifications. It is posted on the DEQ website now.

**52. They were talking the clear separation between the yard contractor and the person that holds this contract. Is there a clear separation that has to be in place between the remediation contractor and the scientific contractor?**

Answer: No. We just separated it out because there seemed to be a clear differentiation between the services provided.

**53. Are examples of ingenuity a big factor in scoring? I know that you need someone who is versatile but you also need someone that can on the fly can come in with something new and change things and help you through processes.**

Answer: Initiative and ingenuity is a factor that helps me judge the quality of what someone can do for me in the future. However, on this site there is a lot of ingenuity and initiative that is often questioned by our federal counterparts. Besides having those characteristics, you have to be able to defend those characteristics. As far as the proposal that you submit, we can only score you on things that we ask for.

**54. You say that you have an appreciation for ingenuity and initiative but other people may not.**

Answer: Sometimes the decisions that I make really also rely heavily on approval by EPA. When there are certain suggestions that are made that sound like good common sense I do want to make sure that the people working for me have the ability to support me in that decision to EPA.

**55. Could we talk about the oral presentation? It sounds like it is not always done, but could be done?**

Answer: If we have reason to think we need to see an oral presentation then we notify you and give you time to prepare one. Normally we don't have oral presentations. Sometimes after the evaluation committee has reviewed and scored the submitted proposals they may arrange to have the offeror do a presentation on their proposal and

answer questions from the evaluation committee. The score from the oral presentation is included with the proposal score. The schedule for selection is set. We are currently in crunch time for a major budget period. We need to finish up all the planning and logistics so we can hit the bricks running in late April, May, June. We're not sure when we will start the construction work but we have to be ready.

**56. Because it's mostly weather dependent but somewhat funding dependent too?**

Answer: Yes, it's both.

**57. When is the budget finalized for this particular contract? Is the money there right now?**

Answer: We have money that carries us through the end of Fiscal Year 2012 which is June 30. Sometimes there is residual budget to take us through from the time of award to the end of the year. We have to evaluate what that residual budget is and what's left in the task orders that we can't get done this year.

**58. So if work started in May that would carry through until June 30, when the next fiscal year starts.**

Answer: Right. That work is pretty much budgeted. It's more of the additional planning and design for other works that we want to do for example in August. We start planning some of those projects right now so we know what resources we need; what procurements we are going to have to do; things like liners that you never know if they are going to be available on a 2-week hurry up order or an 8-week hurry up order. One of the first things that we are going to do is evaluate the existing budget to see what work remains for this fiscal period. Then we start planning the budget for the next fiscal period so that we can tie that schedule in without losing a step.

**59. How do I find out how many proposals were received and from whom?**

Answer: You can send an email to Marcia Todd at [marcia.todd@deq.idaho.gov](mailto:marcia.todd@deq.idaho.gov)

**60. In Section 2.1 of RFP0915, three major categories of tasks in the work plan are listed:**

- 1) **Facilitation of the BPRP Yard Remediation**
- 2) **Basin Repository Operating, Maintenance and Construction, and**
- 3) **Design/Construct additional Basin remedial actions specified by DEQ.**

**For a contractor who currently has one of the BPRP Yard Remediation contracts, bidding on RFP0915 would clearly involve a conflict of interest. For the same contractor, would working item 2 as a subcontractor to a primary be a conflict of interest? How about for item 3?**

Answer: Yes

**61. In Section 2.1, the scope of work includes “Basin Repository Operating, Maintenance and Construction” yet little description of what this entails is given. Of particular interest in “operations” at the repositories. Please describe briefly the current operations (staffing levels, normally daily deliveries, facility layout).**

Answer: Each operating repository may have as few as three or four staff for day to day operations of materials segregation, placement, compaction, revegetation and manning the decon stations. A track hoe and small dozer with a couple of operators are often shared for dirt work at the two Basin repositories, which requires mobilizing the equipment between the two every week or so. However, whenever significant upgrades are taking place at the repositories such as expansion work another operator and piece of equipment may be necessary.

**62. Tracking systems currently in place for managing the different operations are not described (software, type of data tracked, how supported). Can additional detail be provided?**

Answer: Currently we used weekly reports which included bulleted items or volume estimates (truckloads) on waste delivered to the repositories and placed. The weeklies also give a very brief description of work completed that week. A monthly report is also prepared and submitted to DEQ which captures more of the details of the previous months operations and an accounting of costs and charge codes with an invoice to be paid by DEQ. These weekly/monthly reports should have certified time sheets included detailed Davis-Bacon expenditures.

**63. Appendix C, Price Proposal Format, has a column: “Fully Loaded Salary Rate Per Hour” What does the foot note reference?**

Answer: Please see the attached Appendix C Price Proposal Format Revised Table 1. The footnote has been removed.

**64. Table 2, Costs of Operating Equipment, identifies a column that requires a “Fully Loaded Salary Rate per Hour”. Please provide clarification in regard to what this hourly rate represents. For example: Is it the labor portion to operate equipment? Where do we propose the hourly rate for the equipment?**

Answer: Please see the Attached Appendix C Price Proposal Format Revised Table 2. Proposers will prepare Table 2 using fully loaded operating rates (equipment, operators, profit, and overhead) for each type or piece of heavy equipment. In addition, proposers will prepare a unit cost for mobilization and demobilization for each piece of equipment. This provision is necessary because individual pieces of equipment are not expected to be permanently affixed to the project(s) throughout the term of the Contract. . I would also like to mention that there should be an economy of effort; there is an economy of mob/demob that goes with the planning process.

**65. Table 2, Costs of Operating Equipment, MARKUP PERCENTAGES – is the offeror to provide one single markup for equipment and for subcontractors or just the equipment?**

Answer: The markup is the Contractors one percentage of profit for both.

**66. Is the Base Case a real job or just provided for proposal purposes?**

Answer: The Base Case is provided for the proposal as typical of what may routinely occur as a matter of maintaining the ICP stockpile areas.

**67. Appendix C, Price Format – How will the Fully Loaded Hourly rates proposed on this exhibit be evaluated?**

Answer: The ‘Fully Loaded Hourly Rates’ are reviewed to make sure they are appropriate. They are also used as reference to validate invoices from the incumbent contractor.

**There were no further questions.**

**RFP0915  
TECHNICAL AND REMEDIAL SERVICES FOR  
REMEDIAL ACTIVITIES IN THE COEUR D'ALENE BASIN**

**Addendum 1**

**RFP Appendix C Price Proposal Format: Table 1 is changed by deleting the footnote '1' from the Fully Loaded Salary Rate Per Hour column.**

**Table 2 is changed by removing 'Salary' from the fourth column title so that it reads 'Fully Loaded Rate Per Hour'; to incorporate a column for 'Fully Loaded Davis-Bacon Rate Per Hour'.**

**Base Case for Price Proposal is also changed by adding: The waste needs to be moved, transported, placed and compacted in the active repository in one week (40 hours).**

**Fully loaded means equipment, labor, profit, overhead.**

**The Davis-Bacon Wage Determination is attached for your use.**

**Appendix C Price Proposal Format Tables 1 and 2 are amended and included with this document.**

**Base Case for Price Proposal is amended and included with this document.**

**COMPLETED APPENDIX C PRICE PROPOSAL FORMAT TABLES 1 AND 2 REVISED AND BASE CASE FOR PRICE PROPOSAL REVISED SHALL BE RETURNED WITH THE TECHNICAL PROPOSAL IN A SEPARATE ENVELOPE.**





**BASE CASE FOR PRICE PROPOSAL REVISED**

**Each repository has an ICP stockpile area where waste was previously deposited. The Contractor is to pick up 1000 cubic yards of this waste, transport it 1/10 of a mile, place and compact it in the active repository.**

**The waste needs to be moved, transported, placed and compacted in the active repository in one week's time (40 hours).**

**THE TOTAL COST FOR COMPLETING THIS TASK IS: \_\_\_\_\_**

**RFP0915  
PRESUBMITTAL CONFERENCE ATTENDEES**

Chris Major	United Mine Services	<a href="mailto:cmajor@unitedmineservices.com">cmajor@unitedmineservices.com</a>
Kevin Yrjana	North Wind	<a href="mailto:kyrjana@northwindgrp.com">kyrjana@northwindgrp.com</a>
Mark Feldman	North Wind	<a href="mailto:maverick@cpcinternet.com">maverick@cpcinternet.com</a>
Merle Van Houten	Van Houten Consulting	<a href="mailto:vanhoutencd@yahoo.com">vanhoutencd@yahoo.com</a>
Darrel Haarr	Verdis	<a href="mailto:dhaarr@verdisnw.com">dhaarr@verdisnw.com</a>
Sandy Young	Verdis	<a href="mailto:syoung@verdisnw.com">syoung@verdisnw.com</a>
Colin Meehan	Allwest	<a href="mailto:cmeehan@allwesttesting.com">cmeehan@allwesttesting.com</a>
Michael Pereisa	Allwest	<a href="mailto:mpereisa@allwesttesting.com">mpereisa@allwesttesting.com</a>
Dan McCracken	TerraGraphics	<a href="mailto:dan.mccracken@terragraphics.com">dan.mccracken@terragraphics.com</a>
Natalie Morrow	Tetra Tech	<a href="mailto:natalie.morrow@tetrattech.com">natalie.morrow@tetrattech.com</a>