

# STATE OF ALASKA

Department of Natural Resources  
Division of Support Services



## REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) 2023-1000-0192 PLANNING ENVIRONMENTAL LINKAGE (PEL) STUDY - TRIANGLE COMMUNITY ROAD

### ADDENDUM 2

ISSUED APRIL 7, 2023

This addendum is being issued to answer questions from vendors and make changes to the RFP.

**Important Note to Offerors:** You are required to sign and return this page of the amendment document with your proposal. Failure to do so may result in the rejection of your proposal. Only the RFP terms and conditions referenced in this addendum are being changed. All other terms and conditions of the RFP remain the same. This Addendum is hereby made part of the RFP and is a total of five (5) pages.

#### DAVID N. BAKER

Procurement Specialist 2  
Phone: 1 (907) 269-0998  
Email: [david.baker@alaska.gov](mailto:david.baker@alaska.gov)

---

COMPANY SUBMITTING PROPOSAL

---

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE

---

DATE

## QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY OFFERORS AND ANSWER FROM THE STATE

**Question 1:** *Given the scope of work in the request for proposals (RFP) requires engineering services (see pg. 13, #8), a cost-based evaluation criteria is in conflict with the Brooks Act (Public Law 92-582, 40 U.S.C. 541 et seq.). The Brooks Act establishes the procurement process by which architects and engineers (A/Es) are selected for design contracts with federal design and construction agencies. The Brooks Act establishes a qualifications-based selection process in which contracts for A/Es are negotiated on the basis of demonstrated competence and qualification for the type of professional services required at a fair and reasonable price. Would DNR consider removing the cost proposal from the evaluation criteria?*

**Answer 1:** The RFP scope of work and deliverables found under Sections 3.01 and 3.03 do not require a professionally licensed engineer. Offeror's must meet the prior experience qualifications outlined in Section 1.04. As this solicitation does not require professional engineering services or a professionally licensed engineer, and project tasks are not required to be stamped by an engineer. The cost proposal shall remain part of the proposal evaluation.

**Question 2:** *The Cost Proposal Form states "Costs offered are to remain firm for the duration of the contract...." Please clarify whether this applies only to the base contract (two years) or to both the base and five one-year options (five years).*

**Answer 2:** Costs offered on the Cost Proposal Form are for the initial Triangle Community Road project and are for evaluation of this RFP.

**Question 3:** *Proposal Format Section 4.06 requests only reference names and phone numbers for similar projects but Evaluation Criteria Section 5.04 (2.c) suggests letters of reference should be submitted. Please clarify whether letters are necessary or if client reference contact information will suffice.*

**Answer 3:** Contact information will suffice. See Change 1 to the RFP.

**Question 4:** *Section 5.06 of the RFP states Alaska Offeror Preference is worth 10% of the available points. However, Section 6.10 of the RFP suggests the Alaska Offeror Preference has a weight of 5%. Please clarify whether Alaska Offeror Preference is worth 5% or 10% of the total points.*

**Answer 4:** Section 6.10 ALASKA BIDDER PREFERENCE applies to ITB and not RFP solicitations. Please see section 6.12 ALASKA OFFEROR PREFERENCE on page 29:

### **SEC. 6.12 ALASKA OFFEROR PREFERENCE**

2 AAC 12.260(e) provides Alaska offerors a 10% overall evaluation point preference. Alaska bidders, as defined in AS 36.30.990(2), are eligible for the preference. An Alaska offeror will receive 10% of the total available points added to their overall evaluation score as a preference.

**Question 5:** *This project references the ASTAR project underway by ADNR, with this project being a related/subset effort. Through past ADNR solicitations, we are aware that the ASTAR project is supported by other contractor(s), likely affording those contractor(s) significant inside information relative to their preparation of any response to this RFP. As such, we would like to confirm that prior or previously ASTAR-engaged contractors may not be eligible to submit on this procurement? We believe this would be a clear conflict of interest according to Section 1.09(d) of the RFP.*

**Answer 5:** As the State cannot anticipate which offerors will submit proposals, **Sec. 1.09 (d)** of the RFP will apply. The language in this section states in part, *“Each proposal shall include a statement indicating whether or not the firm or any individuals working on the contract has a possible conflict of interest...”*

Additionally, this section also states, *“...the procurement officer reserves the right to **consider a proposal non-responsive and reject it** or cancel the award if any interest disclosed from any source could either give the appearance of a conflict or cause speculation as to the objectivity of the contract to be performed by the offeror.”*

Furthermore, previous ASTAR projects are linked to in the RFP under **Section 2 – Background Information** with the findings having been made publicly available. All proposals will be evaluated using the methodology set forth in RFP **Section 5 – Evaluation Criteria and Contractor Selection**, with a maximum of 15% possible points assigned to Experience and Qualifications.

**Question 6:** *Please clarify that the minimum of 5-years of NEPA type experience is permissible in lieu of the 5-years of PEL experience; relatively few PEL studies have been performed in Alaska over the past several years (the provided example is the only recent one that we have been able to identify).*

**Answer 6:** Must have 5 years of experience working on or contracted to work on NEPA related documents and analysis. Preferred NEPA experience working for the lead agency preparing Environmental Impact Statements.

**Question 7:** *To help draft the proposal and better understand the project requirements, we would appreciate a little further understanding of the desired intent of the PEL Study/Report – is this report planned to be used as a key document for a permit or right-of-way application? Should any PEL-related studies be developed to be legally defensible (assuming potential use for permitting)?*

**Answer 7:** PEL study will be used for NEPA and EIS analysis and should be able to be incorporated by reference into those documents. PEL should be written in a way that is meant to help streamline a potential EIS process. Whether this PEL study turns into an EIS will be up to North Slope Borough and Community leadership and/or the State of Alaska.

**Question 8:** *We appreciate the significant weighting in the contract to the hourly rates, however please clarify how the ADNR will ensure that rates listed will be the rates used by the key individuals and labor categories for the project? We would recommend adding the identification of specific individuals as part of the Attachment 4. Also, please clarify if the pricing (provided in Attachment 4) should be held constant for the anticipated duration of the contract or if a set annual adjustment can be expected?*

**Answer 8:** DNR will require contractor to bill times at proposed rates. DNR will review billings to ensure that hourly rates match contract proposals. No adjustments to hourly wages will be allowed until after June 30, 2025 (end of state fiscal calendar) hourly rates should consider this when putting bids together.

Blank fields have been provided on Attachment 4 – Cost Proposal Form to allow offerors to identify specific individuals participating in the project.

1.	PEL Consulting Services Position #1 (Enter Title): _____	(Enter Hourly Rate) \$ _____
----	---	---------------------------------

The cost proposal form pricing is specific to the Triangle Community Road project and will be used for award purposes for this RFP.

## ATTACHMENT 4 COST PROPOSAL FORM

Offerors are to submit their cost using this Cost Proposal Form. **Costs offered on this cost proposal form are specific for the Triangle Community Road project.** Costs offered are to remain firm for the duration of the contract and are to include all costs associated with providing required services, including, but not limited to, direct and indirect costs, travel, payroll, supplies, equipment, overhead, and profit. Travel costs include airfare, transportation, lodging, and per diem only (per diem is capped at \$60 per day, per person). **Average Hourly Rate shown on this form in Item #11 is the cost that will be used for evaluation and award purposes for this RFP.**

Future potential as-needed services not related to the Triangle Community Road project will be conducted using the Task Order & Delivery Order Process found in Sec. 3.05 of the RFP. A Task Order may ask for updated pricing for as-needed tasks when the Task Order process is being used.

**Question 9:** *Is there a page limit for the overall proposal?*

**Answer 9:** No.

**Question 10:** *Are individual resumes anticipated to be submitted or should summaries of experience/quals be provided?*

**Answer 10:** Either is acceptable.

## CHANGES TO THE RFP

**Change 1: Section 5.04: Evaluation Criteria** (2, c) has been amended as follows:

*2) Questions regarding the firm and subcontractor (if used):*

- a) How well has the firm demonstrated experience in completing similar projects on time and within budget?
- b) How successful is the general history of the firm regarding timely and successful completion of projects?
- c) ~~Has the firm provided letters of reference from previous clients?~~
- d) If a subcontractor will perform work on the contract, how well do they measure up to the evaluation used for the offeror?

## END OF ADDENDUM 2