

Pre-bid Meeting Notes Bull Bronco

July 2, 2014

Attendee list:

Ron Schneider - High Cascade, Inc.

Jon Paul Anderson – High Cascade, Inc.

Jordan Lanman – Boise Cascade

Andrew Tagliafico – GCSR

Jay Sandmann – Interfor US

Paul Jones - WYEast Timber

Stan Boatman – Boise Cascade via phone

Forest Service Attendees

Bob Gill – West Side Veg Leader

Sam Grimm – Forest Products Program
Manager/East Side Veg Leader

Josh Kenfield – Contract Administrator

Dale Phelps - FSR

Erin Kidwell – Forest Appraiser

Roy Shelby – Contracting Officer

Question came out from group. Two sales combined into one with three projects, end results to address asking for a lot of information group felt 15 page requirements could not be achieved for Technical Proposal.

This requirement has been reviewed. The 15 page requirement has been modified to 25 pages via the posting of these notes.

Technical Proposals will be evaluated and ranked on the basis of the Evaluation Criteria listed below in (i), (ii), and (iii).

The Evaluation Criteria are of approximately equal value. All sub-factors listed under each evaluation criteria are approximately equal in importance. All technical evaluation criteria when combined are significantly more important than cost or price.

Highest Evaluated Rating - Local Area is defined as Hood River, Wasco, and Clackamas Counties Oregon. Skamania and Klickitat counties in Washington

Items Discussed:

Feasibility report shows Helicopter yarding for unit 361. This unit is designated skyline. A change was made during contract review. Feasibility was not updated.

Discussed Alternate Proposals. Required to submit a proposal based on contract as is. You then can submit an alternate proposal with changes. Ask for a narrative up front on what alternate proposal is changing and the cost benefits as reflected in your bid for this change.

Reviewed contract provisions

Contractors to follow a Road Rental Agreement to access unit 1.

Access available to the unit, no crossing live streams, discussed that pre-bunching can occur on ground less than 40%. Need to identify these areas.

Units 18 and 19 abut up against private ownership. We cannot authorize any work on private ownership, if purchaser elects to tail hold (if available) they will need landowner permission in writing with a copy to the Forest Service.

Discuss pavement protection. End result Contractors need to identify in there Technical Proposal how they will protect the pavement from damage.

Project 1 – required completion date of Aug 15, 2015 and prior to entering unit 31.

Hot Mix required re-patching road at this project.

Work required during in stream window as spelled out in the specifications.

Project 2 is entrance management

Project 3 is Pre-commercial thinning – Discussed spacing requirements and reducing fuel loading to 26 tons per acre.

There is a road reconstruction package requirement on road 1600.