

CLARK COUNTY

RFP #895 5 YEAR PERIODIC REVIEW of CAMP BONNEVILLE QUESTIONS and ANSWERS UPDATED: June 14, 2024

	QUESTION	ANSWER
1.	If a consulting company or their subsidiaries have previously conducted assessment, monitoring, or cleanup actions at the site, are they conflicted from submitting a proposal for this 5-year periodic review work?	No, conducting previous work on the site would not exclude a company or consultant from submitting a proposal for this work.
2.	Is the 5 June pre-submittal meeting a public meeting as defined under the Washington State Administrative Code? Will the meeting be accessible via Teams, WebX or Zoom? Will the meeting be recorded? Will the public be allowed to attend?	Per RCW 42.30.020(2) and RCW 42.30.030, the RFP pre-submittal meeting is not subject to the OPMA requirements and is not a public meeting. This meeting is for consultants who are interested in submitting proposals in response to RFP 895. During the meeting, all questions received by consultants will be written down. Afterwards, questions and answers are provided by the County to the entire consultant list for this RFP to maintain a fair, competitive environment. The meeting will not be virtual or recorded.
3.	How long do you anticipate the County's review of the final deliverable from this contract will take? Will it occur prior to the January 10, 2025 deadline?	The January 10, 2025 deadline is for submittal of the report to the Department of Ecology (Ecology) for review. Prior to submittal to Ecology, the County will review and provide comments and questions for the consultant to consider. Please assume the County review will take 2 weeks.
4.	Has the County done a periodic review for the Department of Ecology for this Site before?	No, this is the first Periodic Review that has been conducted for this Site.
5.	Is there a conflict of interest for any consultants in reviewing work that they already performed?	The Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) does not address whether periodic reviews must be conducted by a professional with no prior experience on the site.
6.	Will the County also be conducting a third-party review of this document? Is it typical to have a third-party review these documents?	County staff asked the County Council to approve the solicitation for a third-party consultant to review this document; however, the Council did not approve a separate contract. Instead, the Council requested more information, which will be provided in July. It is not typical to have a third-party review of periodic reviews.

Who did a majority of the previous work?	There have been numerous contractors and consultants over the history of cleanup activities at the Site. PBS is currently under contract to do groundwater monitoring and they are preparing the Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study (RIFS) for RAU2C.
Would the submittal of the draft report to Ecology be the end of the contract's scope? Or should consultants assume additional edits and another revised version of the report will be part of this scope after the Department of Ecology makes their comments?	The contract is currently written to provide a "draft" report to Ecology. The County will issue an addendum if the scope of the RFP and resulting contract were to change.
Will all the documentation for the review be readily available?	Consultants are encouraged to view the documents available online on the Department of Ecology's web page for this site. Many of the County's records have been scanned and therefore are readily available, but some of the older documentation is in physical file boxes, which will also be made available as needed.
Will the chosen consultant be asked to address public comments?	No, this scope of work does not include communication with the public.
Do you want the two original proposals to have original wet signatures, or would a digital copy of their wet signature be okay?	A digital signature is acceptable on the original proposals.
Can you send a sample contract for this work?	Please refer to Section IIIB subsection 2 for a link to the sample contract.
	Would the submittal of the draft report to Ecology be the end of the contract's scope? Or should consultants assume additional edits and another revised version of the report will be part of this scope after the Department of Ecology makes their comments? Will all the documentation for the review be readily available? Will the chosen consultant be asked to address public comments? Do you want the two original proposals to have original wet signatures, or would a digital copy of their wet signature be okay?