

RFP Questions and Answers

Young's Wetland Assessment and Design

The following questions and responses provide clarification to the RFP. Where multiple respondents asked substantially similar questions, they have been consolidated into a single response.

1. Is there a page limit for proposals?

No. There is no page limit.

2. Will there be a pre-proposal site visit or bid walk? Can independent site visits be arranged?

We will not be conducting a sponsor-led site visit. However, independent site visits are permitted and encouraged.

The site is accessible by foot from Glenwood Highway. The property is surrounded by public land, and visitors may park along Glenwood Highway and walk a short distance south to the site. The property is fenced, with a stile along the north side providing access over the fence.

3. Will site access be limited in terms of timing, notification, permissions, or frequency?

No. Frequent or unlimited site access by the selected consultant can be accommodated. There are no known seasonal or cultural restrictions on site access.

4. What is the status of Tribal jurisdiction and permitting for the CLT-owned parcel within the Yakama Reservation?

The CLT-owned parcel is located within a larger WADNR-owned parcel, all within the Yakama Reservation. Currently, the only permitting requirement the Yakama Nation asserts for Tract C is a Tribal hydraulic permit.

Additional permitting requirements will likely be influenced by the source of funding for implementation. If Federal funding is used, Federal requirements, including NEPA and Section 106, would apply.

5. What existing GIS, CAD, LiDAR, imagery, survey, wetland, vegetation, and hydrologic datasets are available?

There are no GIS, CAD, LiDAR, or imagery datasets collected specifically for the site beyond publicly available LiDAR.

The most recent LiDAR known to exist for the project area is the publicly available 1.5-foot-resolution 2022 data available through the Washington Department of Natural Resources LiDAR portal. No ground-based topographic data is currently available.

A plant survey conducted in 2018 by the Washington Natural Heritage Program is available on the Yakama Nation Fisheries website. The survey identified plant species within each of the 11 assessment areas. It did not identify the mariposa lily now known to be present.

Survey control was established in 2007, and GLO monuments were subsequently relocated. Survey information is available on the Yakama Nation Fisheries website.

Initial site evaluation work dates to approximately 2010 and earlier. Existing hydrologic information consists primarily of coarse mapping of hydrologic features, including a site hydrology map developed by CLT.

There is no existing surface- or subsurface-hydrologic monitoring dataset.

6. Has a wetland delineation been completed?

Wetland mapping has been completed, but a formal wetland delineation has not. A formal wetland delineation is therefore included as a project deliverable to inform restoration design and permitting.

The intent is to update information on the extent, quality, and obligate species of existing wetlands; understand how wetland features are spatially oriented across the landscape; and evaluate whether their current extent and configuration reflect natural conditions or altered site hydrology.

If existing wetlands are proposed to be altered, including through minor filling or expansion in other areas, a formal delineation will be needed to inform permitting.

7. What is the expected approach to rare and sensitive plant surveys?

The purpose of additional plant surveys is to inform conservation of rare and sensitive species and to guide restoration approaches that maintain or enhance suitable site conditions.

A comprehensive survey of the entire property is not necessarily prescribed. Please propose an appropriate approach for determining the extent and distribution of rare plants and sensitive species needed to inform design. Respondents should consider appropriate survey timing and methods based on the species known or potentially present.

The 2018 survey identified rare plants and Washington State-listed sensitive species, and the project team needs to understand their current extent and distribution before finalizing restoration design.

8. What are the conservation objectives for the five state-listed sensitive plant species?

The conservation focus is to maintain and enhance site conditions that favor these species. The selected consultant should consider these species and their habitat requirements when developing restoration and management approaches.

9. Will the Yakama Nation coordinate identification of culturally significant plants, First Foods, and Traditional Ecological Knowledge?

Yes. The Yakama Nation will lead this effort.

The YN project team will include an ecologist, watershed planner with wetland delineation experience, wildlife biologist, and cultural resources staff. CLT will also provide its forester and monitoring lead.

10. What cultural resources information is available, and what is the consultant's responsibility?

We are not aware of previous cultural resource surveys for the site.

A cultural resource survey should be completed once the spatial extent of the proposed design has been established. Because the RFP identifies cultural/historical assessment as a project component, respondents should provide a consultant-led cultural resources review/survey as an option in their proposal.

The role of Tribal staff in cultural resource compliance will be determined as the project develops.

11. Are there limitations on aerial or drone mapping?

To our knowledge, the publicly available 2022 WADNR LiDAR is the most recent and highest-quality LiDAR available for the project area.

Drone or aerial mapping is permissible. There are no known seasonal or cultural restrictions on aerial mapping at this site.

12. Are there limitations on installing groundwater monitoring equipment or conducting soil investigations?

The project team is open to installation of surface- and groundwater-monitoring equipment, including shallow piezometers, as appropriate.

Ground-disturbing activities, including soil pits, may require a cultural monitor to be present. The selected consultant will be able to access monitoring locations regularly, including monthly or more frequently during wet seasons, as needed.

13. Are there known downstream water uses, water rights, or drainage dependencies that could constrain changes to site hydrology?

To our knowledge, there are no known downstream constraints. There is minimal surface-water connectivity to the Outlet Creek drainage.

The project should be viewed primarily as a wetland restoration project rather than a stream-driven project. The available hydrology map provides additional perspective on wetted features and existing hydrologic conditions.

14. Have conceptual restoration designs or preliminary alternatives already been developed?

No. No restoration design work or preliminary concepts have been developed to date.

The intent is to collaborate with the selected firm to assess the meadow and develop a holistic approach to restoration and management.

The project should consider the entire site comprehensively, including the forested portions. Potential forest treatments include reducing stand densities, preventing forest encroachment into the cedar swamp, and removing pines planted as part of a seed-tree nursery.

15. What survey coordinate system and accuracy should be used?

The horizontal coordinate system is Washington State Plane South, NAD 83. The vertical datum is NAVD 88.

Respondents should recommend an appropriate survey accuracy as part of their proposal. Grading may be incorporated into the final design, so the survey must be sufficient to support calculation of cut-and-fill volumes and other design needs.

16. Is a current recorded boundary survey available?

Survey information and the available boundary information are posted on the Yakama Nation Fisheries website.

17. What is expected for the final GIS/data package?

The anticipated GIS deliverable is a file geodatabase containing feature classes for points, polygons, and lines, organized into datasets of related feature classes.

Raster and mosaic datasets should be provided for imagery and other raster information. Non-spatial information should be provided in tables. Metadata text files should accompany all generated feature classes, collected imagery, and topographic data.

Specific deliverable formats may be refined through coordination between the Yakama Nation and the selected design firm.

18. How should culturally sensitive information and rare-species locations be handled in GIS products and public documents?

The Yakama Nation will coordinate with the selected design firm regarding the storage and treatment of culturally sensitive information and rare-species locations.

The YN will lead development of public-facing documents and grant applications. Sensitive locations should therefore be appropriately protected and omitted or generalized from public-facing and grant materials as necessary.

19. What are the consultant's responsibilities for permitting under Task 11?

The consultant is expected to support Yakama Nation permit submissions, including development of technical quantities, permit-related language for the Basis of Design Report, and assistance in responding to questions that arise during the permitting process.

20. What is the distinction between Task 10, Permit-Ready Final Design, and Task 14, Reporting and Presentations?

Task 10 is focused on the itemized final design deliverables, primarily drawings and specifications, necessary to produce a permit-ready final design.

Task 14 is intended to consolidate the project information into a comprehensive report and provide presentations, as appropriate, to CLT staff, leadership, and/or the CLT Board. The audience and purpose differ from the technical documents intended for regulators and prospective contractors.

21. What should be included under Proposal Requirement #15, Scope of Work, versus the narrative technical approach requested under Items #6–13?

Items #6–13 are intended to provide a narrative description of the consultant's proposed technical approach and rationale.

For Item #15, respondents should provide a table listing all scope elements, associated timelines, and the corresponding budget for each element.

22. Is there an anticipated budget for the assessment and design contract?

The Yakama Nation does not provide an anticipated contract budget. Proposals should be developed based on the scope provided in the RFP and the consultant's relevant experience.

23. Is there an anticipated implementation budget or funding target?

No specific implementation budget has been established at this time.

The intent is to work collaboratively with the selected firm to develop a realistic and fundable restoration approach. The Yakama Nation has successfully developed projects that can be matched to available funding opportunities, and the assessment and design process should help establish an achievable implementation strategy.

24. What funding supports the assessment and design phase, and what funding may be available for implementation?

The Yakama Nation was awarded a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Tribal Wildlife Grant in 2025 to fund the assessment and design phase.

The same funding source, along with numerous other funding sources, may be available for implementation.

25. Is there an established proposal scoring system or weighting for the evaluation criteria?

No scoring weights or detailed evaluation formula will be provided.

We are interested in proposals that demonstrate creativity, sound technical judgment, and a thoughtful approach to the project rather than proposals developed primarily to maximize a scoring formula.

26. What is the approximate length of streams within the project area?

This is primarily a wetland project rather than a stream-driven project. Respondents should refer to the available hydrology map for information regarding wetted features and site hydrology.

27. Who completed the 2018 vegetation assessment, and what additional vegetation work is anticipated?

The 2018 plant survey was conducted by the Washington Natural Heritage Program and identified species within each of the 11 assessment areas.

The survey did not identify the mariposa lily that is now known to be present. Additional field work will be necessary to determine the extent and distribution of rare and Washington State-listed sensitive plant species and to inform restoration design and conservation measures.

Respondents should propose an appropriate approach to additional surveys.

28. Are there other prior assessments or existing data that consultants should be aware of?

Beyond the plant surveys, existing site evaluation work, coarse hydrologic mapping, survey information, and publicly available LiDAR described above, there are no other known site-specific assessments or datasets.

Respondents should review the Yakama Nation Fisheries website for updated project materials.

29. When should the cultural resources survey be conducted?

A cultural resource survey should be completed after the spatial extent of the proposed restoration design has been established. This will allow the survey to appropriately address the project's anticipated area of potential effect.

30. Will the RFP deadline be extended?

No. The RFP provided six weeks for review and proposal preparation. Given the strong interest in the opportunity and the absence of additional requests for an extension, the current deadline will remain unchanged.