

IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

RFP0921 Coeur d'Alene Basin Property Remediation Program Remedial Contractor - 2013

PRESUBMITTAL CONFERENCE

**March 26, 2013, 9:00 A.M.
35 Wildcat Way, Kellogg, Idaho**

PRESUBMITTAL QUESTIONS, DEQ RESPONSE AND RFP ADDENDUM

This document contains the questions submitted by proposers for the above noted Request for Proposals, responses provided by the Department of Environmental Quality and addendum to the RFP.

Purpose of this Request for Proposal

The Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) is seeking a qualified Contractor to provide services associated with Coeur d'Alene (CDA) Basin Property Remediation Program (BPRP) to reduce exposure to lead and other constituents of concern. The Contractor will be required to provide labor, materials, equipment, and temporary facilities necessary to excavate and transport contaminated materials from the project site to a designated DEQ repository, backfill with clean gravel and/or soil obtained from an off-site source, perform general and final grading, compact backfilled graveled areas, and vegetate backfilled soil areas with sod/hydroseed and other plantings. Other work supporting the overall remediation goal may be required as outlined in Request for Proposal (RFP) document RFP0921.

Administrative Notes

Proposals for this RFP are due at the DEQ State Office April 15, 2013, 4:00 pm Mountain Time. Proposals must be submitted to: (hand delivery, mail, or courier) Idaho Department of Environmental Quality, ATTN: Marcia Todd RFP0921, 1410 North Hilton, Boise, Idaho 83706. You will be issued a receipt from the DEQ noting the date and time the proposal was submitted. For proposals submitted by delivery, the receipt will be sent to you.

The selection process is confidential. Upon completion of the selection, the process will be complete and subject to public information. All cost proposals submitted to the state will be treated as confidential and will not be released to competing firms, individuals, agencies or the general public until the contract is signed.

This Presubmittal Conference was the sole opportunity that proposers had to ask questions and clarify points. At no other time during the remainder of the RFP process will DEQ technical personnel or contracts officers be available to respond to questions of a technical nature from proposers. Questions with regard to administrative procedures for proposing will be answered up to the time bid proposals are due. For questions of an administrative nature, please contact DEQ Contracts Officer Marcia Todd by email: marcia.todd@deq.idaho.gov.

Any major questions/clarifications 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, using taxpayer dollars, must maintain an even playing field so that everyone has the same information, the same chance at submitting a proposal with the same information as the prospective proposers who attended this conference.

The contents of the RFP, Proposers' Questions and DEQ Response, RFP addendum and the selected proposal submitted will become the contract statement of work.

PLEASE NOTE:

a) On page 39 of the RFP under Section 4.8 Price Proposal, the last sentence should read: Pages 40 through 44 of this RFP shall be completed and submitted as the Price Proposal.

b) On page 44 of the RFP table 'For Information Only (Items 25 – 28), the title should read "For Information Only (Items 24 – 27)".

Proposer Questions/DEQ Answers

Proposer questions are numbered and in **BOLD** type.

1. There is a Davis Bacon wage determination on the DEQ website that pertains to this project. Actually, it appears to be 3 different determinations combined into one document. Included are Wage Determinations ID130063, ID130068 and ID130072. There is some confusion as to which one of these wage determinations applies. There is a substantial difference of rate between the different determinations in some categories which could make a substantial difference in the cost of performing the work.

For example, let's look at the Backhoe Operator:

In Wage Determination ID130063 a Backhoe Operator would receive \$26.26 per hour plus a fringe payment of \$12.60 for a total of \$38.86 [sic]

In Wage Determination ID130068 a Backhoe Operator would receive \$26.46 per hour plus a fringe payment of \$12.60 for a total of \$39.06

In Wage Determination ID130072 a Backhoe Operator would receive \$20.24 per hour plus a fringe payment of \$0.54 for a total of \$20.78 (\$18.08 difference from highest rate)

A similar situation is in regards to Laborer.

In Wage Determination ID130063 a Laborer would receive \$24.66 per hour plus a fringe payment of \$8.36 for a total of \$33.02

In Wage Determination ID130068 a Laborer would receive \$23.75 per hour plus a fringe payment of \$8.98 for a total of \$32.73

In Wage Determination ID130072 a Laborer would receive \$18.04 per hour plus a fringe payment of \$6.60 for a total of \$24.64 (\$8.38 difference from highest rate)

Is it possible for you to provide some clarification as to which one of the wage determinations we are supposed to use when calculating our bid?

Answer: For the purposes of bidding only, Bidders will use the Davis Bacon Prevailing rates as established by the Idaho Department of Labor for Shoshone County (copy attached). However, realizing that the current projects are split roughly 85% in Shoshone County and 15% in Kootenai County, the DEQ reserves the right to negotiate the Contract based on the two separate Prevailing Wage Rate Decision(s) for Shoshone and Kootenai County. Furthermore, DEQ is coincidentally requesting the Idaho Department of Labor make Wage Rate Determinations for all labor classifications that exist in the Shoshone County Determination, but do not exist in the Kootenai County Determination and vice versa.

2. RFP Section 3.1.1 (pg.20) states “...the Contractor should assume the removal of 10,000 square feet of surface area per property. From the typical property, approximately 370 cubic yards of excavation and disposal would be required.” Utilizing the table 2 (pg.20) numbers, the volume calculates as 273 cubic yards per property excavated in 2011 and 288 cubic yards per property excavated in 2012.

Is the 370 cubic yard Removal and Disposal estimate taking into account Barrier Enhancement listed in RFP Section 3.5 (pg.28) and Cut and Fill listed in RFP Section 3.6.2.2 (pg.31)? Both Barrier Enhancement and Cut and Fill can and do dramatically affect the unit rate price of Removal and Disposal.

Answer: The 370 cubic yard removal and disposal rate estimate includes 0-12 inch removals.

Table 2 (page 20) gives total values, including non-typical properties.

If Barrier Enhancement and Cut and Fill were not previously accounted for in the 370 cubic yards of excavation and disposal calculation, would you be able to provide a revised cubic yard total that would more accurately reflect a “typical property”?

Answer: Cut and Fill is not considered typical and sites will be addressed individually and paid for by Time & Materials.

3. Can you provide an estimate of square footage for either a typical property, or perhaps on an annual basis, for Barrier Enhancement? Likewise, for Cut and Fill?

Answer: Barrier enhancement amounted to about 5% of the total square footage for both years listed in Table 2 (page 20). An evaluation of the enclosed draft construction plot plans will give an estimate of the types of properties typically encountered in a season and could be used for bid purposes.

Cut and Fill will be paid for at Time & Material rates.

4. RFP Section 2.4 Health and Safety (pg.15), and 2011 Remedial Design Report Section 6.3 Health and Safety (pg. 62-63) state that traffic control is required, which includes flaggers. All ingress points and work along public roads necessitate the use of flagger(s), usually at each end of the work zone and for extended periods. Are all traffic control measures, including flaggers, to be considered incidental to the work and not to be paid separately?

Answer: Yes. This should also be covered under Mobilization/Demobilization costs, Section 3.7.1.

5. Previous contracts paid for “Excavate and Fill Around Trees” as separate line items. These old contract line items (three line items) have been removed from the current RFP. Will handwork excavation around trees now be considered incidental to the work?

Answer: Yes.

6. Previous contracts paid for “Tree Removal”, “Stump Grinding”, “Demolition & Removal Existing Concrete” and “Demolition & Removal Existing Retaining Wall” as separate line items. These Line items have been removed from the current RFP. Is it the intention of the IDEQ to pay for these items on a case by case basis under Time & Materials?

Answer: Yes.

7. RFP Price Proposal (pg.44) lists Pay Items 24-27 as incidental to the respective unit rates.

Can you elaborate as to what these line items actually represent, respective size, and where they might be considered applicable? For example, what would the property size expect to be for line items 24, 25, and 27; and how many plants would line item 26 expect to warranty?

Answer: The purpose of these line items was to determine the additional cost associated with watering the sod/hydroseed, warranting the sod/hydroseed, plants, and drainage on an average BPRP property (10,000 ft²). These items are incidental to each

of their bid items. This section is for information only to ascertain costs of providing maintenance and warranties.

Item 26 should cover five plants per average BPRP property.

Would these line items be better served to simply be assumed to be covered under the base bid line items?

Answer: These items are incidental to each of their bid items. This section is for information only to ascertain costs of providing maintenance and warranties.

8. What are the scheduled hours that the repositories may be accessed by the Contractor?

Answer: 07:15 – 17:30 Monday through Thursday.

9. Does the IDEQ have an estimate of the number of Draft Construction Plot Plan Drawings that are ready for release to the successful Contractor at the start of construction? Also, is it the intention of the IDEQ to release the bulk of the Draft Construction Plot Plan Drawings early in the season, or spread out over the duration of the construction season? This affects the ability of the Contractor to more (or less) efficiently schedule and coordinate the work forces, and directly impacts construction costs.

Answer: Currently, about 50% of the draft construction plot plans are available for release. DEQ intends to release the construction plot plans, as needed, to the contractor to facilitate the overall remediation program. For instance, high risk properties will need to be remediated throughout the season, and adequate available workload and budget will be necessary to address these properties.

10. Some properties may require site access through adjoining properties for remediation. Will costs associated with access preparation and site restoration be reimbursed by the IDEQ?

Answer: Yes, but the need for site access through adjoining properties for remediation will be determined on a site by site basis, and require prior approval by DEQ.

Further Explanation: DEQ realizes that some properties may require such access improvements and will reimburse where they determine it is necessary to perform the work. However, secondary and improved access created to increase production and/or for contractor convenience will not typically be allowed. All access improvements and access restoration will meet the criteria of the contract documents and/or the ICP, whichever is more protective of existing barriers and/or human health. All secondary and improved access construction must be approved by the DEQ, whether reimbursable or not, prior to start of work.

11. On page 41 “Bid Items for a Hypothetical Property”: Is that how our price will be evaluated?

Answer: No. The total from the Unit Price Bid Sheet page 43, line #23 is moved to the box on page 41 of the RFP and used to evaluate pricing (using the formula on page 38).

12. Has OPIS been done away with?

Answer: Yes.

13. Page 43 ‘Proposed mark-up percentage for additional materials/sub-contractors’: Is that part of the evaluation?

Answer: No. Each proposal will be reviewed and evaluated by an evaluation committee on the basis of the criteria indicated in Table 3 on page 37 of the RFP. The proportions of the possible points assigned to each criterion reflect their relative importance. The Technical portion of your proposal is approximately 60% of your score; the Price Proposal is 40%.