



**MISSOULA COUNTY
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL ADDENDUM**

**RFP NAME: Community Wildfire Protection Plan Update
DUE DATE: August 8, 2025 @ 5:00PM MDT**

ADDENDUM NUMBER: 7-2025-1A

To All Offerors:

Attached are written questions received in response to this RFP. These questions, along with the County's response, become an official amendment to this RFP.

All other terms of the subject "Request for Proposal" remain as previously stated.

Acknowledgment of Addendum:

The offeror for this solicitation must acknowledge receipt of this addendum. This page must be submitted at the same time as the proposal or the proposal may be disqualified from further consideration.

I acknowledge receipt of Addendum No. 7-2025-1A

Signed: _____

Company Name: _____

Date: _____

Missoula County Community Wildfire Protection Plan RFP
Responses to Offeror Questions

1. Section 4 – Offeror Qualifications, pages 13 and 14: The RFP requests three examples in 5. Experience and a minimum of 3 References in 7. References. Can these reference projects overlap, or are you essentially asking for six separate project references?

County response: Yes, these can overlap.

2. Section 4 – Offeror Qualifications, page 13: Does the 25-page limit include the signed cover sheet, cover page, dividers, resumes if included in a separate appendix, and any addenda acknowledgment forms?

County response: No, the 25-page limit does not include the signed coversheet, cover page, dividers, resumes if included in a separate appendix and any addenda acknowledgement forms.

3. Cover Sheet, page 1: In addition to the signed cover sheet, may we include a cover page that doesn't count towards the 25-page limit?

County response: Yes, a cover page is allowed and won't count towards the 25-page limit.

4. General - Can one firm serve as a subconsultant to more than one prime contractor?

County response: Yes, a consultant may be listed on more than one proposal as a subconsultant.

5. In the section **Element #1 - CWPP Preparation** there is information on Page 9 and 10 that indicate the "...public outreach and engagement element will include a minimum of three rounds of in-person meetings to be held across the city and county jurisdictions." Furthermore, toward the top of Page 10 Item 3 indicates that one of the "anticipated tasks" is to conduct "...a series of public stakeholder workshops (at least 4 per series - west, south, northeast, urban core) along with attending meetings of existing groups across Missoula County and the City of Missoula...."

We would like clarification on how many core team meetings are required, and separately how many public stakeholder workshops are required. It isn't currently clear with the terms "rounds" and "series" and "along with" to describe each of these. Is the request to have three (3) in-person core team meetings during the process, and then separately have four (4) public stakeholder workshops at various locations to discuss the draft CWPP, or is the request something different? What are the other "existing groups" that you would want the contractor to attend their meetings? Please provide clarification on this section.

County response:

Core meetings – We anticipate these to occur at least quarterly throughout the project, though at times they may need to be monthly. We also anticipate core group meetings to be a combination of in-person and remote. The core group is the partner team that will serve to guide this project.

Stakeholder workshops – Stakeholder workshops are intended to include a much broader range of participants from agency personnel to community organizations to landowners and members of the public. For these workshops, the goal is to have three rounds (or education campaigns) of at least 4 per round for a total of 12 workshops. This would be the minimum for the contractor team. We anticipate that staff will supplement these efforts by attending or in some cases holding additional meetings with existing groups (community councils, neighborhood councils, other community-based organizations, etc.) across the county to meet the overall target of 24 total.

6. On Page 13, in **Section 4 - Offeror Qualifications**, in the first paragraph it states that the "...proposal may include links to other documents and/or appendices; however, the proposer should not assume these will be reviewed." However, on Page 4 on the bottom under **Extraneous or Outside Information** it states explicitly that "...responses may not include references to information located on internet websites, in libraries, or at other external locations unless specifically requested in the RFP."

These statements seem directly contradictory to one another. We would like clarification on whether we can include links to other documents and/or appendices as allowed in Section 4?

County response: Links to other documents/resources and/or appendices are allowed, but the proposer should not assume these will be reviewed in detail. (We'll note the discrepancy in the template.)

7. Pertaining to the information on Page 3 regarding the \$250,000 budget, with \$25,000 allocated for supplies. The remaining amount is \$225,000 for work on Element #1 and Element #2.

We would like clarification on how the county intends to allocate the remaining budget if there end up being two contractors working separately (but together) on Element #1 and Element #2 respectively? Is there an anticipated budgeted amount for Element #1 versus Element #2?

County response: There is not an anticipated budget split at this time. It is something we will need to work out in the contracting phase.

8. Will the total contract amount be \$250,000, including the \$25,000 for materials? Or is the \$25,000 for materials subtracted from the \$250,000 total, making the contract total \$225,000? (Page 3, *Introduction*)

County response: The \$250,000 includes the \$25,000 for supplies (postcard mailing, posters, printed materials, snacks and beverages at meetings, room rental fees, PA system if needed, easels, flipcharts and markers, etc.). We are contacting CWDG administrators to determine if we can adjust that split.

9. Could you please clarify the expected number of meetings and engagement activities? On pages 9 and 10, there's mention of a minimum of three rounds of in-person meetings across the city and county, as well as a series of stakeholder workshops (at least four per series). In Public Engagement Deliverables, page 10, it notes three education campaigns and 24 meetings. (Page 9 and 10)

County response: Please see the response to question #5.

10. If we apply for both elements and propose to use the full available budget, but you ultimately decide to select two different contractors—one for the CWPP and one for the risk assessment—would we need to resubmit or revise the budget accordingly (Page 9, *Project Scope, Timeline, and Deliverables*)?

County response: If that were to occur, we would work with you to revise the budget accordingly.

11. What content management platform will the web designer use? (Page 11, *Digital/online platform*)

County response: We are open to suggestions regarding options that will best integrate with Missoula County website. (Note: Missoula County website is in the process of a significant update and change in platform.) We imagine the online/digital platform associated with this project as a standalone site on a separate platform from the Missoula County website, but are open to suggestions. We are interested in creative ideas and proposals that will enhance public use and engagement with the site along with intuitive navigation of site content. In the 2018 CWPP update we used an ArcGIS story map to assist with outreach (it is still linked to the county website), but its content and design left it limited to outreach associated with the plan and it didn't really have continued utility past plan adoption. For this project, we are interested in an interactive product that extends the life of the CWPP, its implementation and the "call to action" in the public realm.

12. The RFP specifies a minimum of three rounds of in-person public meetings, with at least four meetings per series in different locations (bottom of page 9 and top of page 10). The middle of page 10 identifies a target outcome of 24 meetings. Please clarify the intended number of public meetings as there appears to be a discrepancy here.

County response: See response to question #5.

13. Element #1, Task 3 mentions “attending meetings of existing groups across Missoula County and the city of Missoula...” Can you provide an approximate number of such meetings that applicants should anticipate?

County response: See response to question #5.

14. Element #2, Task 2b. Verify fuels mapping data. Can you elaborate on what the county is expecting regarding fuels mapping verification? Is it envisioned as more of a desktop exercise or field effort?

County response: We anticipate this to be mostly a desktop exercise that involves the consulting team acquiring feedback from local field staff who are familiar with conditions on the ground such as the county’s wildfire program staff and staff from USFS, BLM, and DNRC. The technical advisory committee to be able to assist with this effort.

15. Task 2 under CWPP Document Preparation: *Conduct public engagement and outreach.* How is this different from the work described under the section above under the Public Engagement section?

County response: It’s essentially the same. We were just identifying that public engagement would need to be folded into document preparation.

16. The RFP mentions public meetings, workshops, and education campaigns. Please provide additional details regarding the county’s intention behind each of these. For example, are meetings and workshops synonymous in this context, or are these intended to be separate efforts?

County response: See response to question 5.

17. It is noted to work with City and County communications teams on various items, including "postcard mailings." Is it expected that the consultant will pay for any direct expenses, including a county-wide mailing, or would that mailing fee be assumed by the city/county?

County response: The \$25,000 for supplies is intended to cover those costs; though perhaps not all of that amount will need to be used for that purpose, and some could be shifted to contracted services, with approval of CWDG administrators.

18. What other hard costs should consultants anticipate for engagement and outreach efforts (e.g., securing meeting venues, PA systems, etc.)?

County response: It usually depends on the process, but typically hard costs would include posters, easels, printed materials, meeting room fees, snacks and beverages, PA

or microphone systems. Most of these can be covered by either the supplies line of the CWDG grant or the county. Any recommendations for particularly large hard cost estimates should be highlighted in your proposal and identified whether they can be covered by the consulting team or should be covered by the county.