

**DEPARTMENT OF RESOURCES RECYCLING AND RECOVERY**

1001 I STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814 • WWW.CALRECYCLE.CA.GOV • (916) 322-4027  
P.O. BOX 4025, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95812

September 24, 2013

**To:** All Prospective Contractors

**RE:** Engineering Services for Landfill, Disposal Site and Waste Tire Site Remediation, DRR13017

**Addendum No. 1  
To the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) Method DRR13017**

**The following questions were received during the Questions and Answers period.**

- Q1. Overall, the RFQ seems to apply to a combination of Construction Contract Services and Consulting Contract Services. Is it CalRecycle's intent that the responding qualifications address both Construction Contracting and Consulting?
- A1. There will be no construction. However, per the scope of work, there may be site investigations, geotechnical drilling and testing, construction QA/QC, and construction management.
- Q2. Section I, Process Schedule (pg. 6/8) lists that the Oral Interviews will be conducted on October 19. This is a Saturday. Will the actual interview date be sometime the week of the 19<sup>th</sup>?
- A2. This was a typographical error. The correct date of the Oral Interviews will be October 29<sup>th</sup>.
- Q3. In Section II, Commitment (pg. 7/9) the Contractor (Proposer?) is committed to comply with the Modified General Provisions of the CalTrans Standard Specifications (July 1999). How and when will this document apply to the Engineering Services and to the Engineering Consulting firm selected under this proposed contract?
- A3. The General Provisions of the CalTrans Standard Specifications (July 1999) applies to field work such as site investigations, geotechnical investigations, construction QA/QC, and construction management.
- Q4. In Section II, Commitment (pg. 7/9), the link for the next (and last) bulleted item does not work. Please provide a new link address for the referenced document **2006\_StdSpecs.doc**
- A4. The correct link address is  
[http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/esc/oe/construction\\_contract\\_standards/std\\_specs/2006\\_StdSpecs/2006\\_StdSpecs.pdf](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/esc/oe/construction_contract_standards/std_specs/2006_StdSpecs/2006_StdSpecs.pdf).

- Q5. Section III, Subsection c. Personnel Information (pg. 11/13), asks for the Proposer to include “a list of personnel who will perform the activities described in Section V, Subsection A, Scope of Work” (Description of Work). Section V, Subsection A is one of five aspects (Subsections A, B, C, D, and E) of the Description of Work. Do you intend that the Personnel List also include staff that would perform services under Section III, Subsections B, C, D and E as well?
- A5. Yes. Personnel identified in Section III, Subsection c should demonstrate similar project experience noted in Section V, Subsection A.
- Q6. The last sentence in Section III, Subsection c. (Pg. 11/13) refers to “those personnel listed in the SOQ for support of the SWCP as needed.” Please clarify the reference to SWCP.
- A6. SWCP is the acronym for Solid Waste Clean Up Program. The SWCP is the program within CalRecycle who is managing this contact.
- Q7. Section III, Subsection e (Pg.11/13) states “If other construction firms are proposed as partners or subcontractors...” Does the scope of work require the Consultant team to conduct construction services? We understand that construction will be conducted by one of CalRecycles’ Northern or Southern California contractors that are contracted under separate contracts.
- A7. There will be no construction. However, per the scope of work, there may be site investigations, geotechnical drilling and testing, construction QA/QC, and construction management.
- Q8. Section III, IIPP (pg. 12/14) seems to refer to contractors and to a specific construction site. In past RFQ’s for these services, the State has asked for an IIPP for the Consultant’s office. Would an office IIPP be acceptable to meet the needs of this section? This RFQ does not define construction sites.
- A8. Yes, the Injury and Illness Prevention Program (IIPP) can be general in nature and can accommodate office and general field situations.
- Q9. Section III, IIPP (pg. 12/14) further states that the “IIPP should apply to all employees involved in the Agreement.” If multiple projects and project locations are anticipated, there will need to be multiple IIPPs. Will CalRecycle accept site specific health and safety plans to be prepared on a project by project basis, in lieu of providing an IIPP with this RFQ response package?
- A9. The Injury and Illness Prevention Program (IIPP) can be general in nature at the time of the interview and can accommodate office and general field situations. However, a site specific IIPP will be required for all field work.
- Q10. Section III, Qualifications/Licenses (pg. 12/14) again refers to Contractors, rather than Consultants and requires “a copy of the Proposer’s registration with the Secretary of State.” Please clarify if this section refers to a business license, California Professional Engineer registration (which are held by individuals rather than firms), or some other registration.
- A10. The State recognizes consultants as Contractors for the State. Please provide a copy of the proposer’s registration with the Secretary of State (Business License).
- Q11. In Section IV, Grounds for Rejection (pg. 15/17) the end of the first paragraph ends, “Grounds for rejection of an SOQ package include, but are not limited to, the following:” then goes to the next paragraph that reads, “Additionally, a proposal may be rejected if:” Is there a list missing between these two statements?

A11. Section IV, Grounds for Rejection, should read:

“CalRecycle may reject any SOQ package if it is conditional, incomplete, or contains irregularities. CalRecycle may waive immaterial deviations and the SOQ package may be evaluated based on the information provided when considered to be in the best interest of CalRecycle. Waiver of an immaterial deviation shall in no way modify the RFQ requirements or excuse the firm from full compliance with the Contract requirements. Grounds for rejection of a SOQ package include, but are not limited to, the following:

- It is received after the due date and time for submittal
- It does not include a reproducible master and the required number of copies;
- All responses to an item are not completed;
- Required license information is not submitted with the SOQ package;
- Required authorizations and certifications for the SOQ package are not properly completed and signed.
- The firm has been prohibited from contracting with the State by the Department of Fair Employment and Housing
- The firm has received a substantive negative contract performance from the State
- Any items required by the RFQ are not included with the submittal

No SOQ package will be rejected arbitrarily or without reasonable cause.”

Q12. Section IV, Award of Agreement (pg. 16/18) refers to the “solicitation for the Southern California Region (IWM05017)...” It appears that this section applies to the Construction Contractor selection process and related Agreement, rather than for the Engineering Services Agreement. Please clarify this section in relation to Engineering Services for the State.

A12. The following has been removed from Section IV, Award of Agreement:  
~~If the firm is the highest ranking firm for this solicitation and for the solicitation for the Southern California Region (IWM05017), the award will be based on the firm’s regional preference. Once the regional preference is administered, the next highest ranking firm will be awarded the contract for the remaining region.~~

Q13. Section V, Description of Work, Work to be Performed, Subsection E.9. (pg. 19/21) states, “Hazardous material classification, handling, packaging, manifesting, **hauling and disposal**, including emergency response and assessment of spills and unknown wastes at remediation sites and performing **radiological** support and **disposal.**” Please clarify that it is CalRecycle’s intent to include hauling and disposal, and radiological disposal in the Engineering Services Scope of Services, rather than the construction contractor’s scope of services?

A13. The contractor will not be responsible for the physical hauling and disposal of hazardous wastes. However, they should be knowledgeable in the characterization and state policies and procedures for the removal, hauling, and disposal of hazardous wastes.

Q14. Please clarify Section V, Work Plans (pg. 20/22) as it refers to construction contracting rather than engineering services consulting, especially in subsection 7 which lists the forms that the “Contractor” is to provide as including “payment bond” and “performance bond.”

- A14. Section V, Work Plans has been removed from this RFQ.
- Q15. Section V, Work Plans, item 7 (pg. 20/22) refers to a site-specific IIPP. Should it more appropriately refer to a site-specific Health and Safety Plan or a Safe Work Plan, depending on the specific site hazards/circumstances?
- A15. The Injury and Illness Prevention Program (IIPP) can be general in nature and can accommodate office and general field situations.
- Q16. Section VI, Payment (pg. 22/24) refers to “itemized invoices in triplicate”. Please verify that CalRecycle does require 3 hard copies of Consultant’s invoices.
- A16. Yes, invoices must be provided in triplicate.
- Q17. Section VI, Labor Rates (pg. 22/ 24) refers to prevailing wages several times (second and third paragraphs). These rates do not apply to Engineering Services contracts. Please verify that prevailing wages do not apply to this contract.
- A17. Yes, prevailing wages do not apply to this contract. Section VI, Labor Rates, should read as follows:
- During Contract negotiations, labor rates will be determined for the Contractor and subcontractors as required by law. If a rate is not listed for a required service, the Contractor agrees to accept a fair and reasonable rate for that service subject to applicable legal requirements.
- A mistake, inadvertence, or neglect by the Contractor in failing to pay the legally required wage rates will be remedied solely by the Contractor and will not, under any circumstances, be considered as the basis of a claim against CalRecycle.
- Q18. Please verify that Section VI, Contractor Owned Equipment (pg. 23/25) applies to a construction contractor’s heavy equipment charges and payments. Should this section be removed from the RFQ?
- A18. No, a contractor may use heavy equipment where site investigations and geotechnical drilling and testing are required.
- Q19. Please verify that Section VI, Communication (pg. 24/26) refers only to a construction manager’s cellular phone charges and is not applicable to this engineering services consultant contract. Should this section be removed from the RFQ?
- A19. Section VI, Communication, has been revised as follows:
- CalRecycle may reimburse the Contractor for project-related cellular charges made by a ~~Construction Manager~~ the Project Manager while on a project if approved by the Work Order. A weekly rate of \$25.00 may be approved for these purposes only. All other phone charges by the Contractor or subcontractors are considered part of overhead costs and will not be reimbursed.
- Q20. Please verify that Section VI, Non-Hazardous Material Transport and Disposal (pg. 24/ 26) applies to a Construction Contractor only and is not applicable to this engineering services consultant contract.

- A20. The contractor will not be responsible for the physical hauling and disposal of non-hazardous wastes. However, they should be knowledgeable in the characterization and state policies and procedures for the removal, hauling, and disposal of non-hazardous wastes.
- Q21. Section VI, Insurance (pg. 25/27) lists insurance coverage requirements which are markedly different from the Special Terms and Conditions document that is linked by reference (pg. 7/ 9) Please clarify which set of coverage requirements apply to this contract.
- A21. If the provisions in the Request for Qualifications conflict with those in the Special Terms and Conditions, the specific requirements in the Request for Qualifications will control.
- Q22. Please verify that Section VI, Records (pg. 26/28) applies to this contract. The section refers to daily work reports which are typically required of Construction contractors during a construction project, rather than to an Engineering Services Contract.
- A22. The contractor will be responsible for daily work reports for field work.
- Q23. Section VII, Contractor (pg. 28/30) provides a definition of Contractor rather than Consultant Definition of Terms section the definition of the term Contractor. Is the definition of this term appropriate for an Engineering Services Agreement? A contractor and services provided is different than an Engineering Consultant.
- A23. Yes, this is the correct definition of "Contractor".
- Q24. Attachment A, Section B.1 (pg. SOQ-4/35) requests "Current Class A, General Engineering Contractor's license with Hazardous Substance Removal Certification (HAZ) issued within the State of California. Please verify that this is not required of an Environmental Services Consultant, under the anticipated Agreement for this scope of services?
- A24. No. The form is not required.
- Q25. Under Attachment A, Item D Project Experience requires that each included project considered for evaluation must "Be of a minimum contract amount of \$100,000 for the submitting entity or \$25,000 for subcontractors." Work orders for engineering consulting services, under this contract, have historically totaled less than \$100,000. To demonstrate relevant project experience, would it be acceptable to include a few project abstracts that have contract amounts less than this minimum amount?
- A25. CalRecycle views previous engineering services contracts managed under this program as a three year contract, with a more substantial overall scope than \$25,000. Describing projects that were assigned under individual task orders less than \$100,000 for the engineering services scope is acceptable.
- Q26. Special Terms and Conditions, Section 16 Insurance, first paragraph, in item labeled "1" (pg. 4 of 9): Please consider replacing the word "insuring" with "providing additional insured status".
- A26. We cannot accommodate this request.
- Q27. Special Terms and Conditions, Section 16 Insurance C. (pg. 4 of 9): Please consider deleting the sentence "The coverage shall not include a deductible feature."
- A27. We cannot accommodate this request.

- Q28. Special Terms and Conditions, Section 16 Insurance F. (pg. 4 of 9): Please consider inserting the following words “except for professional Liability which may be on a claims made basis” after the word “only”.
- A28. We cannot accommodate this request.
- Q29. Special Terms and Conditions, Section 17 Liability for Nonconforming Work (pg. 5 of 9): Please consider deleting the words “ensuring the completed work conforms” with the following “performing and completing the work in conformance with”.
- A29. We cannot accommodate this request.
- Q30. Special Terms and Conditions, Section 19 Liquidated Damages (pg. 5 of 9). This should not apply to Engineering Services Agreements, but for Construction Services Contracts, where significant costs can be affiliated with a project. Please consider deleting this section be removed from the RFQ.
- A30. We will accommodate this request and the Liquidated Damages provision will be deleted.
- Q31. Special Terms and Conditions, Section 31 Waste Reduction (pg. 8 of 9): Please consider deleting the word “ensure” and replacing it with “require”.
- A31. We cannot accommodate this request.
- Q32. General Terms and Conditions, Section 5 Indemnification (pg. 1): At the beginning of the paragraph before the word “Contractor” please consider inserting the following “To the extent of its negligent acts or willful misconduct”.
- A32. We cannot accommodate this request.
- Q33. General Terms and Conditions, Section V. Records, “daily work reports are required....” Does this just apply when providing construction services? Or will this apply to engineering design and investigation tasks as well?
- A33. No. Daily work reports are not required for most work within the scope of the engineering services, but scopes of work authorized in Work Orders need to be adhered to. Change order requests for additional schedule or scope need to be presented well in advance of incurring additional costs to allow for proper review and approval time. If construction management services are requested as part of engineering services, daily work reports would need to be prepared for both the contractor and the engineering consultant.
- Q34. General Terms and Conditions, Attachment A, under B.2, Licensing, do you require a copy of the licenses, or will the employee names and their license numbers alone be adequate? And do you require all types of licenses (ie. L.S., P.G., C.I.H., etc...) or does this requirement only pertain to P.E.'s?
- A34. No, a copy of these licenses is not required. But please list any professional license numbers or certificates received where applicable to demonstrate qualifications.
- Q36. General Terms and Conditions, under Attachment A, Item D. Experience Form includes the following question, “Were liquidated damages applied to this project? Yes or No.” Please clarify if CalRecycle is looking to see if liquidated damages were assessed against the proposing

consultant/sub-consultant during that project implementation, or if the contract under which the work was conducted had a liquidated damages clause?

- A36. CalRecycle is asking whether liquidated damages were assessed against the proposing consultant/subconsultant during the project implementation.
- Q37. Has this contract been previously awarded? If so, who is the incumbent contractor?
- A37. Yes, the current contractor is URS Corporation, dba URS Corporation Americas.
- Q38. The description of work appears to be related to the engineering investigation and design services with remediation oversight. However, in page 13, item b Organization Chart, it requests that the resumes of four positions be submitted with the SOQ. Three of these positions are usually more associated with construction services, not investigation/design engineering services as the work scope required. Please clarify whether other resumes are needed to show the proposer's engineering investigation and design capability. Or this project is indeed more focused on the construction oversight services, not engineering services?
- A38. A resume is required for each person shown on the organization chart. Please include all personnel associated with (or that may be associated with) the contract during the course of the term, whether it is for engineering or construction.
- Q39. Project Experience data sheet (Form D in Attachment A) is very limited in space for providing description of the project and the company's participation. Does this data sheet have to be a one-page submittal, or can additional pages be added to provide full description of the Project Experience?
- A39. The data sheet may be more than one page. Please copy additional data sheets to provide a full description of the project experience.
- Q40. How many Project Experience data sheets are needed? Please specify or advise.
- A40. There is no limit on the amount of data sheets for describing the project experience. If a more detailed narrative is required to demonstrate competence, please add the documentation as required.
- Q41. Bond Information (Section E in Attachment A) asks a notarized statement from the bonding company be included. This usually is tied to a bonding capacity in actual dollars. Please advise what the range is of bonding capacity that your agency is expecting.
- A41. A separate Addendum will be posted with this response shortly.
- Q42. In Attachment I, it provides a Proposal Completion Checklist. In this checklist, it has "client reference" as the last item. Is there another form other than the Project Experience data sheet already included in Attachment needed to be used for presenting "client reference"? This appears to be duplicated information of the Project Experience data sheet.

- A42. The references that will be provided within the Project Experience section of Attachment A, Part D, is sufficient.
- Q43. Are the six (6) projects limited to the one page (SOQ-6) space or can a longer project description be attached?
- A43. A longer project description may be attached. Please clearly indicate where the additional documentation is located.
- Q44. Can bonding capacity be flowed down to subcontractors?
- A44. No, bonding cannot be flowed down to subcontractors.
- Q45. Is this Engineering Services RFQ a recomplete or new effort?
- A45. This is a new solicitation with a similar scope of work from previous years.
- Q46. Does our proposed analytical laboratory need to be named as a subcontract?
- A46. No, an analytical laboratory can be identified during the development of the work orders.
- Q47. For this RFQ, does the Prime Contractor need to possess the Class A General Engineering Contractors License with a Hazardous Substance Removal Certification or can a named subcontractor possess the certification?
- A47. The subcontractor may possess the Class A General Engineering Contractors License with a Hazardous Substance Removal Certification.
- Q48. There seems to be a disconnect between the Organization Chart and required personnel presented on Page 11, and the Requirements presented on Section G – Personnel and Organizational Information on SOQ-9. What is the list of required personnel? Is the required personnel from page 11 or Section G? Page 11 indicates and Project Manager, Project Superintendent, Health and Safety Officer, and Cost Estimator, whereas SOQ-9 lists Program Manager but not a Cost Estimator.
- A48. Please disregard the sample organization chart on SOQ-9 and personnel on page 11. However, please provide an organizational chart for key personnel.
- Q49. Are there a maximum number of resumes allowed?
- A49. There is no limit on the number of resumes allowed.
- Q50. On Page SOQ-7 of Attachment A is a requirement for bonding. Typically, contractors are required to be bonded; whereas consultants are almost never required to be bonded. Can CalRecycle clarify that it does intend for its consultants to be bonded for the duration of this contract?
- A50. A separate Addendum will be posted with this response shortly.

- Q51. Is this a new CalRecycle contract? By this we mean has CalRecycle ever requested services for this contract prior to this RFQ? The reason for the question is that some of the anticipated scope of services seems to overlap with the current DRR11055 CIA Disposal Sites Investigation contract and this contract also does not appear to be the same scope of work as the existing Solid Waste and Tire Cleanup Group (remedial action) services contract held by remedial construction contractor(s). Is this a new CalRecycle contract and if so, can a consultant provide a proposal if they hold one of the other two contracts?
- A51. No, this is not a new contract.
- Q52. Page 6 (Process Schedule) states that oral Interviews will be conducted on October 19. October 19 is a Saturday. Also, is this a firm date or a tentative date? October 18 potentially conflicts with a commitment of our project management team.
- A52. This was a typographical error. The correct date of the Oral Interviews will be October 29th.
- Q53. Are Proposers required to accept in total the Special Terms and Conditions and other contractual language identified on Page 7 – Commitment, or will CalRecycle entertain revisions to these Terms and Conditions in a Proposer’s SOQ?
- A53. Proposers must provide their written questions regarding all areas of the RFQ, including the Special Terms and Conditions, by the September 16, 2013 deadline, in order for revisions to be considered.
- Q54. Page 8 of the project RFQ states “Any contractor or subcontractor currently on CalRecycle Unreliable list is ineligible to apply for or participate in this contract. “ Is this list publicly accessible so Proposers can verify the status of potential sub consultants?
- A54. Currently, the only entity on CalRecycle’s Unreliable List is Pacific Playground & Landscape. A publicly available copy of the list will be available soon at [www.calrecycle.ca.gov](http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov). The list will then be updated as necessary.
- Q55. Page 11, Item B, requests that proposers identify “Project Superintendents” in the proposed project organization chart. Since this is an engineering services contract and not a construction contract, are project superintendents a staffing requirement? Or are these staffing categories an artifact from CalRecycle’s construction contracting RFQ which will support this contract?
- A55. Please disregard the sample organization chart on SOQ-9 and personnel on page 11. However, please provide an organizational chart for key personnel.
- Q56. Item A, page 18, of the RFQ states that “This contract will provide engineering services to investigation potential remediation sites, and to develop necessary documents for CalRecycle-managed contractors to remediate sites.” Page 22–26 of the RFQ lists cost and payment language that is usually meant for construction contractors. This language include switching from “consultant” early in the RFQ to “contractor” later, extensive requirements for equipment rates and maintenance items to be paid (page 23), discussion of material transport (page 24), specific mention of how office support is to be paid (page 22), and items in the work plans that

only a contractor could control (page 20). Please verify that all conditions outlined on Pages 22 – 26 are relevant to the Engineering contract to be awarded in connection with RFQ DRR13017, “Engineering Services for Landfill, Disposal Site, and Waste Tire Site Remediation.”

A56. Yes, these items are applicable to the engineering contract.

All other terms, conditions, and requirements of this RFQ will remain the same.

If you have any questions relating to this RFQ process, please contact me by e-mail at [contracts@calrecycle.ca.gov](mailto:contracts@calrecycle.ca.gov).

Sincerely,

*{Original Signed By}*

Wendy Roberson  
Contract Analyst  
Administrative Services Branch

Attachments

ATTACHMENT 1  
Interested Parties Listing For RFP DRR13017

CalRecycle has not confirmed the certification status of firms who have identified themselves as CA Certified Small Business (SB) or Disabled Veterans Business Enterprise (DVBE).

Contact Name	E-Mail	Company	Address	City of CA	Zip	SB	DVBE
IMS IMS	<a href="mailto:abenore@imsinfo.com">abenore@imsinfo.com</a>	IMS	875 Hornblend	San Diego	92109		
Earl Stephens	<a href="mailto:Earl@aegEngineers.com">Earl@aegEngineers.com</a>	Applied Engineering and Geology, Inc.	578 E Street	Lincoln	95648	X	
Jerry Siebum	<a href="mailto:Info@AlliedVetLogistical.com">Info@AlliedVetLogistical.com</a>	Allied Veteran Logistical Services Inc.	5330 Primrose Drive, #231	Fair Oaks	95628	X	X
Paul Mitchell	<a href="mailto:pmitchell@bas.com">pmitchell@bas.com</a>	Tetra Tech BAS	1360 Valley Vista Drive	Diamond Bar	91765		
Tamara Zielinski	<a href="mailto:Tamara.Zielinkski@tetrattech.com">Tamara.Zielinkski@tetrattech.com</a>	Tetra Tech, Inc.	5012 Luce Ave, Suite 103	McClellan	95608		
Earl Stephens	<a href="mailto:marketing@aegEngineers.com">marketing@aegEngineers.com</a>	Applied Engineering and Geology, Inc.	P.O. Box 247	Lincoln	95648	X	
Steven Youschak	<a href="mailto:syouschak@hjigroup.com">syouschak@hjigroup.com</a>	HJI Group	3300 Irvine Ave, Ste. 325	Newport Beach	92660	X	
Roxanne Asser	<a href="mailto:anchormarketing@anchorcm.com">anchormarketing@anchorcm.com</a>	Anchor Engineering	3685 Mt. Siable Blvd., Ste. 345	Lafayette	94549		X
Taylor Waters	<a href="mailto:twaters@earthforensics.com">twaters@earthforensics.com</a>	Earth Forensics	12532 Vista Panorama	North Tustin	92705		
Erik Skov	<a href="mailto:erik.skov@urs.com">erik.skov@urs.com</a>	URS Corporation	One Montgomery Street, Ste. 900	San Francisco	94104		
Laura Franco	<a href="mailto:lfranco@owengroup.com">lfranco@owengroup.com</a>	Owen Group, Inc.	20 Morgan	Irvine	92618	X	
Larry Mathews	<a href="mailto:larry.mathews@noanderson.com">larry.mathews@noanderson.com</a>	Neil O Anderson & Associates	902 Industrial Way	Lodi	95240	X	
Phil Gregory	<a href="mailto:pgregory@caleng.com">pgregory@caleng.com</a>	Cal Engineering & Geology, Inc.	1870 Olympic Blvd., Ste. 100	Walnut Creek	94596	X	
John Hower	<a href="mailto:jmhower@geo-logic.com">jmhower@geo-logic.com</a>	Geo-Logic Associates	250 W. First Street, Suite 228	Claremont	91711		
Michael Yacyshyn	<a href="mailto:myacyshyn@brwncald.com">myacyshyn@brwncald.com</a>	Brown and Caldwell	10540 White Rock Road, Suite 180	Rancho Cordova	95670		
Tod Cameron	<a href="mailto:camerontec@yahoo.com">camerontec@yahoo.com</a>	Ranger Greenfield Construction and Logistics	2231 W. Ave. K-10	Lancaster	93536	X	X
Bob Healy	<a href="mailto:bob.healy@urs.com">bob.healy@urs.com</a>	URS Corporation	100 West San Fernando Street, Suite 200	San Jose	95113		
Cheryl Childs	<a href="mailto:cheryl.childs@urs.com">cheryl.childs@urs.com</a>	URS Corporation	100 West San Fernando Street, Suite 200	San Jose	95113		