



ADDENDUM NO. 2 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS 2026-007 KITSAP COUNTY

TO: All Respondents

FROM: Glen McNeill. Purchasing Supervisor

CLOSING DATE: Wednesday **03/04/2026 @2:00 pm [Changed]**

REF NO.: **2025-007 RFP SALMON RECOVERY IN LOCAL PLANNING**

DATE: 02/25/2026

This second addendum to RFP **2025-007 RFP SALMON RECOVERY IN LOCAL PLANNING** answers questions that were received.

Task 3 vs Task 4 Scope + 12% Allocation

- In the scope of work, Task 4: Report and Communicate Results appears to have bullets that are the same as Task 3. Can you please confirm if there are additional details to characterize the scope for Task 4?
- **Task 3 vs. Task 4 Scope Clarification (Exhibit A, Scope of Work, Tasks 3 and 4; p. 9)**
The Scope of Work bullet points listed under Task 4, “Report and Communicate Results,” appear to mirror the bullet points listed under Task 3, “Outreach, Communication, and Public Engagement” (Exhibit A, page 9). Does Task 4 include a distinct set of activities beyond those described in Task 3, or are these tasks intended to overlap, with Task 4 focused primarily on synthesis and final deliverables?
- Task 4 (“Report and Communicate Results”) contains identical bullet points to Task 3. Can the County clarify the intended distinction between Task 3 and Task 4 deliverables and effort?
- Task 4 is labeled “(12%)”—is this intended to indicate anything such as an approximate budget allocation or a weighting of effort in the County’s expectations?
- Is the 12% allocation noted for Task 4 intended as a budget guideline or an estimate of level of effort?

Answers:

- Omit the 12% - that was included in error.

- Task 3 and task 4 are a duplication error. Update shown below:

Task 3: no change

Task 4: Report and Communicate Results

This task will synthesize all prior work into a clear, actionable final product that supports County decision-making and implementation. The consultant, supported by the County's Project Manager and Outreach Technician, shall assist with synthesizing findings from all previous tasks into a comprehensive Salmon Recovery Report.

- Task 4.1 Synthesis and Documentation
 - Compile existing conditions, data-driven observations, and analysis across rural lands and watersheds.
 - Clearly document how salmon recovery goals and strategies intersect with rural land use, conservation priorities, and development patterns.
- Task 4.2 Recommendations Development
 - Identify specific, actionable policy, program, and code recommendations to advance salmon recovery while supporting rural lands planning objectives.
 - Ensure recommendations are feasible, clearly justified, and aligned with County goals.
- Task 4.3 Communication and Briefings
 - Assist with development of presentations, summaries, and briefing materials for County decision-makers and partners.
 - Support public-facing materials that translate technical findings into accessible formats.
- Task 4.4 Draft Report and Final Report
 - Support preparation of a Final Salmon Recovery Report and accompanying presentation materials that communicate results clearly and effectively to decision-makers, partners, and the public.

Outreach and Engagement Scope

- **Task 3: Outreach and Engagement (Exhibit A, Scope of Work, Task 3; p. 9)**

Task 3 of the Scope of Work states that the consultant will assist with “public, stakeholder, and partner engagement activities” (Exhibit A, Task 3, page 9). How many engagement activities does the County anticipate for this project, and which audiences (e.g., general public, rural landowners, partner agencies, technical stakeholders) are expected to be involved?

 - Answer:
 - Up to 4 meetings with project partners, WSPER and HCCC.
 - Up to 15 meetings with technical committee and partners.

- Will outreach necessarily include contractor engagement with public and stakeholder engagement in pre-specified formats (e.g. public hearings, council meetings, etc.) or may the consultant instead support County leaders through the creation of media (e.g. slide decks, website material)
 - Answer: Yes, that is an option.
- Approximately how many public, stakeholder, or partner engagement activities are anticipated during the project, and what formats are envisioned (e.g., workshops, meetings, open houses, online tools)?
 - Answer: Up to 15 meetings with technical committee and partners. This will take a variety of forms that we will discuss together. An online tool, GIS hub, will be part of the project in collaboration with Kitsap County.
- Is the consultant expected to design outreach and engagement materials and strategies, or primarily support County-led outreach efforts?
 - Answer: Outreach technician will generally take the lead on outreach and engagement materials and strategies with consultant support and input.
- Does the county already have an established stakeholder group that would want this work to engage with, or will identifying and engaging stakeholders be part of the of the project scope?
 - Answers:
 - The already established stakeholder groups include West Sound Partners for Ecosystem Recovery (WSPER) and Hood Canal Coordinating Council (HCCC) for the Salmon Recovery Plan information, related data, and technical discussions.
 - A Technical Advisory Committee is in progress and not set. The County will take the lead on identifying and engaging the stakeholders and with input from the consultant.

Data, GIS, and Existing Information

- **GIS and Data Availability (Exhibit A, Scope of Work, Tasks 1.2 and 2.1; pp. 8–9)**
 Tasks 1.2 and 2.1 describe compiling, cataloging, and synthesizing existing datasets and developing maps and geo-referenced products (Exhibit A, pages 8–9). What GIS datasets and spatial information will the County make available to inform the Rural Lands Analysis and Salmon Recovery planning effort?
 - Answer: The County will share the information that is readily available and will discuss and note gaps with the consultant. Data resources will include other agencies and Kitsap County. The inventory as part of Task 1.2 is part of that work.

- Does the County have a defined list of GIS layers and datasets to be used for the analysis, or is the expectation an open-ended data search to identify all potentially relevant sources?
 - Answer: The County has GIS layers and datasets, and part of the work is discussing what we have, what we have access to, and compiling an inventory – noting methodology any gaps.
- If significant data gaps are identified, should addressing those gaps be treated as recommendations for future work rather than in-scope tasks for this project?
 - Answer: Recommendations for future work. We want to work with what we have for this project, but gaps will be noted.
- If prior analyses, draft products, or datasets exist, will these materials be made available to the selected consultant upon contract award?
 - Answer: Yes, to the extent that we can make it available. Some datasets will be readily available, and others will need some discussions.
- Does the County have an existing centralized data repository (e.g., GIS, databases, prior inventories) that will be provided to the consultant at project start, or should proposers assume independent compilation of datasets?
 - Answer: The County has some lists but nothing as comprehensive as this will be between land use and salmon recovery data. Hence the project.
- Should consultants anticipate generating any new datasets or analyses beyond the synthesis and integration of existing information?
 - Answer: No, this should not be anticipated. Gaps can be recommendations for future work. We want to work with what we have for this project, but gaps will be noted.

Task 1 Document Review Scope

- Does the County intend to provide a defined list of plans and reports for Task 1 review, and can the County identify an anticipated or preferred maximum number of documents to be reviewed, with any additional documents treated as optional or additive scope?
 - Answer: Yes, the County has a list that will serve as a starting point that includes Salmon Recovery Plans. We can discuss together a full list and limitations to ensure the work is reasonable.

Deliverables and Level of Analysis

- Aside from the final culminating Salmon Recovery Report, are there specific interim or task level deliverables the County expects for each task? For example, under Task

1, does the County expect a relational database or inventory product in addition to narrative documentation?

- Answer: Yes, deliverables for Task 1 include:
 - Spreadsheet of data inventory
 - Salmon recovery technical **memo** documenting review and inventory and including specific recommendations to inform the Rural Lands Analysis and the Salmon Recovery Report.
- What level of quantitative analysis is expected for identifying trends and patterns (e.g., descriptive statistics and mapping versus modeling or scenario-based analysis)?
 - Answer: It depends on the approach. Descriptive statistics and mapping could lead to modeling and/or scenario-based analysis.
- Are there specific geographic scales or priority areas (e.g., countywide, WRIA- or basin level) that the County would like emphasized in the Rural Lands Analysis?
 - Answer: For this project, the geographic scales will be determined by the Salmon Recovery Plans and data (availability and what it tells us).
- What level of review and revision cycles should proposers anticipate for key deliverables (e.g., number of review rounds, typical turnaround time)?
 - Answer: This will be discussed with the consultant/contractor to find a reasonable timeline.

Project Framework and Scope of Development

- Is the intent of this RFP to continue or build upon an existing framework or methodology for rural lands or salmon recovery analysis, or to initiate a new analytical approach?
 - Answer: Initiate a new analytical approach.
- Is there the possibility for amendments if the scope should expand to accommodate additional tasks?
 - Answer: This is a grant funded project with a time limit, so we will need to stay within the current parameters. Gaps, future work, etc. will be noted.

County Staff Support

- What level of County staff support and involvement is anticipated for data compilation, GIS access, outreach logistics, and draft review cycles?
 - Answer: County staff as project lead, a grant-funded LTE Project Manager, a grant-funded Outreach Technician, and a County GIS Analyst (e.g. GIS hub for the project will be established as part of the Rural Lands Analysis with a Salmon Recovery focus area for this project) will provide support and involvement throughout the project at a variety of levels.

Proposal Requirements and Submission Format

- **Proposal Length (Instructions; Proposal Contents and Evaluation Criteria, p. 9)**

The solicitation describes required proposal contents and evaluation criteria but does not specify a page limit (Instructions, Proposal Contents and Evaluation Criteria, page 9). Is there a page limit or recommended maximum length for the proposal narrative?

 - Answer: These is no page limit or recommended max length.
- The RFP requires four government references and states a Contractor References Form must be used, but no form was included. Can the County provide it or confirm an alternative format?
 - Answer: Will upload separate References document.
- Are subconsultants required to meet the same licensing and business standing requirements as the prime consultant?
 - Answer: Yes
- The RFP lists only USPS and courier addresses. Are proposers allowed to submit proposals via FedEx or similar carriers?
 - Answer: Yes, other courier services are acceptable.
- Should the required electronic copy be submitted via flash drive, or is email submission acceptable?
 - Answer: Please submit via flash drive included with your hard copy response.
- Prior County RFPs include a reference form with a “Go Live Date.” What is the definition of “Go Live Date,” and is it mandatory for this RFP?
 - Answer: This is boiler plate information for multiple types of bids. Just include reference information for contact purposes.
- Must subconsultants also fill out all forms included with the RFP, or is completion by the prime consultant sufficient?
 - Answer: No, completion by the prime consultant is sufficient.
- Are proposers required to sign all forms with original ink signatures, or will digital signatures be accepted?
 - Answer: Digitally signed is acceptable.
- Should proposers print their proposals single sided or double sided, and is there a preferred binding method (stapled, spiral, 3 ring binder)?
 - Answer: Single sided and there is no preferred binding method.
- May proposers include the hard copy proposal and flash drive in the same sealed envelope?
 - Answer: Yes
- Can you confirm the format for submitting bid responses? The RFP indicates the bidder shall submit “one (1) original, marked “original”, and one (1) electronic copy of their proposal”. Does this mean one hard copy (original) needs to be delivered to

the county's office in Port Orchard, WA and one electronic copy needs to be emailed to the Purchasing Supervisor.

- Answer: Both hard copy and flash drive delivered to the county office.
- Is there a specific Proposal structure that the county is requiring for submission? Or is that up to the discretion of the proposer?
 - Answer: This is at the proposer's discretion as long as the required submittals are included.

Contract Terms and Compliance Requirements

- Exhibit E Section 13 includes a section for Prevailing Wages, but no Wage Determination documentation is provided. Would the County be able to provide a Wage Determination in order for Contractors to ensure that the Prevailing Wages are met?
 - Answer: This is boiler plate language, The corresponding contract will not include prevailing wages.
- The RFP allows exceptions but states that proposals in strict compliance are desired, and Section 12 notes that exceptions may deem a proposal nonresponsive. Can the County clarify whether reasonable exceptions will negatively impact scoring or acceptance?
 - Answer: This will depend on the exemptions requested.
- Page 5 requires proposals to remain valid for 120 days, but Exhibit B (Page 12) requires bids to remain firm for 90 days. Which timeframe does the County intend to apply?
 - Answer: 120 days applies
- Exhibit D references Executive Order 11246, but this EO was rescinded in January 2025. Can the County clarify compliance expectations?
 - Answer: Ignore references to EO 11246
- Section 19 requires equipment with unaltered serial numbers, which does not appear relevant to this professional services RFP. Can the County clarify whether this requirement applies?
 - Answer: This is boiler plate language This requirement does not apply here.
- Section 20 refers to manufacturers, brand names, and descriptive literature. What type of literature is required for this planning/analysis proposal?
 - Answer: This is boiler plate language This requirement does not apply here.
- Section 22 requires "complete manufacturer's descriptive literature." What specific literature, if any, is expected for this service-based solicitation?
 - Answer: This is boiler plate language This requirement does not apply here.
- If a proposer lists contract language revisions in Exhibit C, will this negatively affect scoring given that "proposals in strict compliance are desired"?

- Answer: This will depend on the exemptions requested.

Proposal Schedule

- Would the County consider extending the proposal deadline to allow proposers to fully incorporate any addendum changes, given the hard copy submittal requirement?
 - Answer: Addendum 1 Extended the bid due date to 03/04/2026 @2:00 pm

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 1