

STATE OF ALASKA

Department of Natural Resources
Support Services Division



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) 2027-1000-0027 CENTER PIT LAKE GROUNDWATER INVESTIGATION

ADDENDUM 1

ISSUED JULY 14, 2026

This addendum serves to change the Deadline for Receipt of Proposals date, answer questions from vendors, and make changes to the RFP.

Important Note to Offerors: You must sign and return this page of the addendum 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 13 pages.

RFP CLOSING DATE:

The Deadline for Receipt of Proposals date is changing from July 16, 2026, to **August 03, 2026**, at **2:00 PM** Alaska Time. All dates in SEC. 1.12 RFP SCHEDULE will adjust accordingly.

Shawn M. Olsen
Procurement Specialist 4
Phone: 1 (907) 269-8687
Email: shawn.olsen@alaska.gov

COMPANY SUBMITTING PROPOSAL

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE

DATE

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY VENDORS AND ANSWERS FROM THE STATE

Question 1: *Is there existing site data related to water quality, inflows, outflows, etc., that could assist in characterizing surface and groundwater? Can you provide that for bidding purposes?*

Answer 1: Existing data does not exist.

Question 2: *What are the primary water quality concerns for the State of Alaska as they relate to the Pit Lake?*

Answer 2: Primary concern is to understand dewatering constraints.

Question 3: *What is ADNR's current strategy as it relates to hydrology and reclamation (i.e., bentonite cap, topsoil and hydroseed, other methods for cover)?*

Answer 3: Geomorphic reclamation, rock lined channels, topsoil, and hydroseed.

Question 4: *What is the preferred water treatment method during dewatering? Has direct discharge (possibly with a polishing pond) been considered?*

Answer 4: This is to be determined and will depend on water chemistry/quality. Direct discharge would be preferred.

Question 5: *Has the lake ever spilled? If so, where does it spill and what is the driver of those conditions (GW vs. Surface Water)?*

Answer 5: Unknown. The east end of the pit is the low side.

Question 6: *Is the volume of the Pit Lake known?*

Answer 6: Rough estimate is 137 acre-feet.

Question 7: *How many piezometers are you envisioning and to what depth?*

Answer 7: Number of piezometers, depth, and location to be determined by consultant.

Question 8: *Are historical pit lake water level records available (manual measurements, survey data, or pressure transducer records)?*

Answer 8: No.

Question 9: *Has the pit ever been partially or fully dewatered? If so, are pumping rates, durations, and water level responses available?*

Answer 9: No.

Question 10: *Are any historical bathymetric surveys or pit volume calculations available?*

Answer 10: No.

Question 11: *Are historical groundwater monitoring or piezometer data available from the mine or adjacent areas?*

Answer 11: Some ground water monitoring near Coal Creek. Report provided.

Question 12: *Have any seepage, inflow, or water balance studies previously been completed?*

Answer 12: No.

Question 13: *Are site-specific meteorological data available for the project area (e.g., precipitation, air temperature, snow depth/SWE, evaporation, or weather station records)?*

Answer 13: Nearest weather station is located near Healy.

Question 14: *Have any previous permafrost investigations, geophysical surveys, or frozen ground assessments been completed within or adjacent to the Center Pit? If so, will those data be made available?*

Answer 14: Two reports available. DOWL (2016) and RECON (2025).

Question 15: *Can DNR clarify what historical mining data will be made available? Specifically, will historical operational records such as pit development, mining sequence, dewatering activities, pumping records, pit water levels, groundwater observations, and water management records be provided?*

Answer 15: Historical mining data does not exist and has been removed from the RFP.

Question 16: *Are Federal Funds being utilized for this project?*

Answer 16: Yes.

Question 17: *In Section 3.01, under "Schedule", there are two bullets with undefined report due dates. Are we interpreting this to mean that we should provide our own proposed X number of days in our response?*

Answer 17: Amend so that draft report is due 45 days after field work and final report due prior to completion date. Also, amend Section 3.02 Completion date to April 15, 2027.

Question 18: *Are there any habitat concerns for the area?*

Answer 18: No.

Question 19: *Have fish or aquatic studies been conducted for Cripple Creek, or adjacent streams and waterways?*

Answer 19: None known. Consult with the Alaska Department of Fish & Game (ADF&G).

Question 20: *Are there schedule limitations for work to be performed in the field (i.e. quiet hours, access restrictions, etc.)?*

Answer 20: No.

Question 21: *Are there specific engagement, or notifications to specific parties, required to perform work?*

Answer 21: No.

Question 22: *Are there specific certifications required to perform work at the site (other than an AK business license)?*

Answer 22: No.

Question 23: *Is there specific PPE required by the State of Alaska to perform work on the site?*

Answer 23: No.

Question 24: *Is per diem to be included in field costs?*

Answer 24: See Changed to the RFP; Change 3 and Change 9.

Question 25: *Is there a specific logging or sampling format the State prefers for boreholes being drilled, or piezometers being installed?*

Answer 25: To be determined by consultant.

Question 26: *Are there specific materials or equipment the state prefers to be utilized for piezometer installation?*

Answer 26: DNR does not dictate means, methods, materials, or equipment.

Question 27: **Existing Monitoring Infrastructure** - *Do monitoring wells or piezometers currently exist at or near the project site? If so, are well construction details, historical groundwater elevations, and/or water quality data available for review?*

Answer 27: See Question 11.

Question 28: **Availability of Historical Information** - *Is there historical information from this area or nearby pits available to support the current project scope, such as previous site investigations, mining/reclamation records, hydrologic studies, water quality data, aerial imagery, GIS/CAD files, 3D digital mining models, or prior permitting documentation?*

Answer 28: Three geotechnical reports are being provided upon request.

Question 29: ***Current Discharge Conditions** - Is it currently known if water from the pit currently discharges or flows into the nearby river, either through surface overflow, seepage, or other identifiable flow paths?*

Answer 29: Unknown.

Question30: ***Discharge/Treatment Assumptions** - Are there known or anticipated constraints related to discharge location, water treatment requirements, or receiving water criteria that should be considered in the dewatering evaluation?*

Answer 30: None currently identified.

Question 31: ***Dewatering Endpoint/Design Criteria** - Is there a target pit lake elevation, dewatering rate, or reclamation design endpoint that the dewatering evaluation should be based on?*

Answer 31: Assume complete dewatering.

Question32: ***Analytical Scope** - Does the State have a required analytical parameter list for pit water, groundwater, and/or surface water samples, or should the contractor propose an analytical suite based on project objectives?*

Answer 32: Review Task 3 and consult with DEC if necessary.

Question33: ***Site Access/Logistics** - Are there known access constraints, road conditions, security requirements, or landowner permissions that contractors should account for when planning field work?*

Answer 33: No.

Question 34: ***Schedule Flexibility** - Given the proposed field access window and final report deadline, would the State consider schedule adjustments if weather, access, drilling subcontractor availability, or laboratory turnaround times affect completion?*

Answer 34: Completion date has been amended to allow for additional time.

Question 35: *Phased Approach - Would the State be open to completing the work in phases, particularly if initial field findings indicate that additional characterization, drilling activities, or modeling refinements are needed to support the dewatering evaluation?*

Answer 35: Yes, if the Contractor can demonstrate completion date will be met.

Question 36: *If we submit a draft by the October deadline, is it possible for the final submission to be extended by December 31 - or is there room for a contract extension for more time to complete the analysis?*

Answer 36: New Completion Date is April 15, 2027.

Question 37: *Do any of the existing reports and/or datasets include hydrologic data directly applicable to the following objectives of the scope of work?*

- Evaluate groundwater recharge sources, rates, and pathways.
- Characterize potential subsurface zones of saturation or frozen ground that could impact reclamation design for Center Pit and the adjacent East Coal Creek.

Example data include groundwater level measurements, monitoring well or piezometer data, pit water-level measurements, and streamflow or stage data.

Answer 37: One report provides subsurface exploration and a thaw stability evaluation from a nearby site (but not adjacent).

Question 38: *Are there any existing piezometers or monitoring wells in the vicinity of Center Pit Lake that would be suitable for the execution of Tasks 3 and 4?*

If no piezometers or monitoring wells currently exist:

- Is there a drilling contractor already under contract with DNR for monitoring well installation?
- If drilling services must be procured, will they require a separate procurement process?

Answer 38: See answer to Question 11.

Question 39: *Could DNR provide the coordinates, GIS shapefile, KMZ, or a map identifying the exact location and limits of Center Pit Lake?*

Answer 39: GIS shapefile and KMZ of Center Pit Lake will be provided upon request.

Question 40: *Has a previous bathymetric survey been completed for Center Pit Lake?*

If so, will the bathymetric data, lake boundary (GIS shapefile), or other historical mapping be made available to the successful contractor?

Answer 40: **No.**

Question 41: *Is the requested bathymetric survey intended only to develop the bathymetric surface and water volume estimates, or does DNR also require acoustic imagery of the lake bottom (e.g., side-scan sonar or multibeam backscatter imagery) as deliverables?*

Answer 41: **Acoustic imagery is not necessary.**

Question 42: *Are LiDAR data, drone imagery, aerial photography, or recent topographic survey data available for the project area?*

Answer 42: **LiDAR (although not available yet) will be provided to the successful bidder. Aerial photography is available from Google Earth.**

Question 43: *The RFP includes characterization of potential subsurface zones of saturation and frozen ground.*

Does DNR anticipate the use of geophysical methods (e.g., Electrical Resistivity Tomography) as part of the subsurface characterization, or should these objectives be addressed solely through drilling and hydrogeologic investigation?

Answer 43: **DNR anticipates drilling and the installation of piezometers to characterize groundwater information but in general doesn't dictate means and methods.**

Question 44: *If geophysical investigations are proposed by the Contractor to support groundwater characterization, will DNR consider them an acceptable alternative or supplement to additional drilling where appropriate?*

Answer 44: **Geophysical investigations can supplement groundwater characterization.**

Question 45: *Does DNR have flexibility with the project schedule? Project completion by October 31, 2026, when site access is not anticipated until August 15, is a very aggressive schedule. Would DNR consider extending the completion date, possibly into 2027?*

Answer 45: **Completion date amended to April 15, 2027.**

Question 46: *Would DNR provide a map or description of the planned access road? Will this road provide access to all sides of Center Pit Lake?*

Answer 46: Road maps will be provided. The road provides access to the south and west rim of the Center Pit. Existing small trails can be utilized to access the east end of the pit. DNR is currently improving some of the existing trails.

Question 47: *Will the contractor be responsible for obtaining a Temporary Water Use Authorization for pumping tests? Or will DNR obtain this permit?*

Answer 47: The TWUP is the responsibility of the Contractor.

Question 48: *Are there other access or site use permits the contractor will be responsible for, such as wetlands or historic preservation screening for drilling?*

Answer 48: SHPO clearance has been obtained. DNR is currently consulting with the US Corp of Engineers regarding wetlands; however, the need for a wetlands permit is not anticipated.

CHANGES TO THE RFP

CHANGE 1: This section of 1.04 Minimum Prior Experience is being deleted in its entirety:

~~In order for offers to be considered responsive offerors must meet these minimum prior experience requirements:~~

- ~~• The offeror must not have had a contract terminated for cause by the State within the last three years.~~
- ~~• Three similar projects performing groundwater hydrology and characterization services.~~
- ~~• Must provide bathymetric mapping and drone/sonar-based site characterization services.~~
- ~~• Firm must have five years of experience providing hydrogeology and water quality investigation services.~~
- ~~• Firm must have at least one Professional Geologist (PG).~~

~~Offerors must detail in their proposal how they meet the minimum prior experience requirements above. Offerors that fail to identify in their proposals how they meet the prior experience requirements will be deemed non-responsive.~~

And is replaced with:

In order for offers to be considered responsive offerors must meet these minimum prior experience requirements:

- The offeror must not have had a contract terminated for cause by the State within the last three years.
- **Offeror's team shall include at least one Professional Engineer licensed in the State of Alaska with five years of experience. Relevant experience must include groundwater hydrology, mine dewatering, or related fields.**
- **Offer's team shall include a lead hydrologist with a degree in hydrology, geology, geological engineering or a related field. Relevant experience must include hydrology modeling, groundwater sampling, and interpretation of aquifer test data.**
- Three similar projects performing groundwater hydrology and characterization services.
- Firm must have five years of experience providing hydrogeology and water quality investigation services.

Offerors must detail in their proposal how they meet the minimum prior experience requirements above. Offerors that fail to identify in their proposals how they meet the prior experience requirements will be deemed non-responsive.

CHANGE 2: This section of Sec. 3.01 Scope of Work, Task 6 – Reporting and Deliverables is being deleted in its entirety:

DNR RESPONSIBILITIES

DNR will:

- ~~Provide site access permissions and coordinate with landowners or adjacent leaseholders.~~
- ~~Share **historic** maps, **mining data**, and prior reports.~~
- ~~Arrange access following completion of road construction in July–August 2026.~~
- ~~Review contractor submissions and provide timely feedback.~~

SCHEDULE

- ~~Road construction access: accessible by **August 15**, 2026~~
- ~~Fieldwork: To be conducted immediately following confirmation of safe access~~
- ~~Draft report: Within **X** days of field completion~~
- ~~Final report: **Within X days of receipt of DNR comments.**~~

And is replaced with:

DNR RESPONSIBILITIES

DNR will:

- Provide site access permissions and coordinate with landowners or adjacent leaseholders.
- Share maps, and **three** prior **geotechnical** reports.
- Arrange access following completion of road construction in **August** 2026.
- Review contractor submissions and provide timely feedback.

SCHEDULE

- Road construction access: accessible by August 15, 2026.
- Fieldwork: To be conducted immediately following confirmation of safe access.
- Draft report: Within **45** days of field completion.
- Final report: **Prior to completion date.**

CHANGE 3: This section of Sec. 4.07 Cost Proposal deleted in its entirety:

~~Offerors must complete and submit this Submittal Form. Proposed costs must all direct and indirect costs associated with the performance of the contract, including, but not limited to, total number of hours at various hourly rates, direct expenses, payroll, supplies, overhead assigned to each person working on the project, percentage of each person's time devoted to the project, and profit. The costs identified on the cost proposal are the total amount of costs to be paid by the State. No additional charges shall be allowed.~~

And is replaced with:

Not applicable to this RFP.

CHANGE 4: The evaluation percentage in Sec. 5.04 Experience and Qualifications is increasing from 20% to **25%**.

CHANGE 5: The evaluation percentage in Sec. 5.05 Understanding of the Project is increasing from 10% to **20%**.

CHANGE 6: The evaluation percentage in Sec. 5.06 Methodology Use for the Project is increasing from 5% to **25%**.

CHANGE 7: The evaluation percentage in Sec. 5.07 Management Plan for the Project is increasing from 15% to **20%**.

CHANGE 8: This section of Sec. 5.08 Contract Cost (40%) is being deleted in its entirety:

~~Overall, a minimum of 40% of the total evaluation points will be assigned to cost. After the Procurement Officer applies any applicable preferences, the offeror with the lowest total cost will receive the maximum number of points allocated to cost per 2 AAC 12.260(c). The point allocations for cost on the other proposals will be determined using the following formula:~~

~~$$(\text{Price of Lowest Cost Proposal} \times \text{Maximum Points for Cost}) \div (\text{Cost of Each Offeror's Proposal})$$~~

Example (Max Points for Contract Cost = 40):

Step 1

List all proposal prices, adjusted where appropriate by the application of applicable preferences claimed by the offeror:

Offeror #1 — \$40,000.00

Offeror #2 — \$42,750.00

Offeror #3 — \$47,500.00

Step 2

In this example, the RFP allotted 40% of the available 100 points to cost. This means that the lowest cost will receive the maximum number of points.

Offeror #1 receives 40 points:

The reason they receive that amount is because the lowest cost proposal, in this case \$40,000.00, receives the maximum number of points allocated to cost, 40 points.

Offeror #2 receives 37.43 points.

~~$\$40,000.00$ lowest cost x 40 maximum points for cost = $1,600,000 \div \$42,750.00$ cost of Offeror #2's proposal = 37.43~~

Offeror #3 receives 33.68 points.

~~$\$40,000.00$ lowest cost x 40 maximum points for cost = $1,600,000 \div \$47,500.00$ cost of Offeror #3's proposal = 33.68~~

And is replaced with

Not applicable to this RFP.

CHANGE 9: Attachment 5, Cost Proposal Form is being deleted in its entirety.

CHANGE 10: This section of Sec. 1.02 Budget being deleted in its entirety:

~~The Department of Natural Resources, Division of Mining, Land and Water estimates a budget of **\$200,000.00** dollars for **completion of** this project. **Proposals priced at more than \$300,000.00 will be considered non-responsive.**~~

~~Payment for the contract is subject to funds already appropriated and identified.~~

And is replaced with:

The Department of Natural Resources, Division of Mining, Land and Water estimates a budget of **\$300,000.00** dollars for this project.

Payment for the contract is subject to funds already appropriated and identified.

END OF ADDENDUM 1