

**RFP 2019-134  
Technical and Facilitation Support for Vital Sign Revisions**

**Amendment 1  
Bidder Questions & Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) Answers  
November 28, 2018**

1	<p><b>Question:</b> Please describe your expected level of effort from both process facilitation and technical services?</p>
	<p><b>PSP Answer:</b> We expect a balance of effort on process facilitation (the focus of sub-tasks 2a, 2b, and 3a) and technical analyses (the focus of sub-task 3b) and have expressed the need for bidder qualifications related to both types of efforts. We expect each bidder to propose a balance of activities and expenditures across these two types of efforts based on the bidder's judgments about the best approach to accomplish the project's objectives.</p>
2	<p><b>Question:</b> Please confirm that the focus of this work is on biophysical vital signs and indicators?</p>
	<p><b>PSP Answer:</b> Task 2 will begin with attention to the overall role of Vital Signs and will not be limited to measures of biophysical condition. We expect that sub-task 2b and Task 3 will focus on biophysical Vital Signs and indicators given that human wellbeing Vital Signs and indicators were reviewed and revised in 2015.</p>
3	<p><b>Question:</b> Please clarify section 3.4.4- are Bidders to propose specific impacts/ outcomes outside of the collaborative process with PSP? Are these outcomes and performance measurements more related to the Bidder's ability to successfully complete the scope of work and implement a facilitation process, or more related to long-term measurements of vital signs and indicators?</p>
	<p><b>PSP Answer:</b> Bidders are asked to specify impacts/outcomes that they anticipate will develop (beyond the project) "as a result of the delivery of [the bidder's] services. Bidders are asked to propose how these outcomes would be monitored, measured, or reported to the Partnership, but we have no expectation or requirement that this monitoring, measurement, or reporting be accomplished as part of this project.</p>
4	<p><b>Question:</b> Please clarify the types of risks that should be described in section 3.4.5- are these risks to successful completion of the scope of work, or external risks that could affect efficacy of vital signs in indicating Puget Sound health in the long-term?</p>
	<p><b>PSP Answer:</b> We expect that this part of the proposal would focus on risks to successful completion of the scope of work.</p>
5	<p><b>Question:</b> What contractor support is currently or has recently been engaged related to Puget Sound vital signs, effectiveness monitoring, and PSEMP. Who are the contractors, if any, and what are their scopes of work?</p>
	<p><b>PSP Answer:</b> In 2017-19, the Partnership has invested (or will invest) in contractor support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvement in Vital Sign monitoring, including estuaries and shoreline armoring (UW,</li> </ul>

	<p>Coastal Geologic Services, and Washington Sea Grant); marine birds (WDFW); Pacific herring (WDFW); human wellbeing (OSU), Chinook habitat common indicators (TBD).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effectiveness assessment, including salmon benefit index (Cramer Fish Sciences, PNNL), stormwater management practices (GeoSyntec), and innovation stories (TBD)</li> <li>• PSEMP coordination and synthesis, including marine waters (UW APL, TBD); toxics (UW PSI); forage fish and food webs (NRC, WDFW); salmonids (Island County, TBD); human wellbeing (UW earth lab); marine birds (Audubon Washington); customer perspectives (ECO Resource Group); and spatial ecology (TBD)</li> </ul>
6	<p><b>Question:</b> How is this work related to the Puget Sound Info work? What overlap, if any, between the Puget Sound Info project and this project are anticipated?</p>
	<p><b>PSP Answer:</b> We anticipate almost no overlap between these projects. Reports on the existing Vital Signs and indicators will transition from the current web pages to new presentation format as part of a Puget Sound Info platform that is currently in development. Eventually, after the conclusion of this project, the Puget Sound Info platform will be used to present reports on the revised Vital Signs and indicators.</p>
7	<p><b>Question:</b> How, if at all, is this work related to ongoing work on LIO data stewardship and synthesis?</p>
	<p><b>PSP Answer:</b> There is little, if any, direct relationship between this project and contemporary work on LIO data stewardship and synthesis. LIO ecosystem recovery plans make reference to existing Vital Signs. Any changes to Vital Signs that arise out of this project will have implications, after the conclusion of this project, for the LIO's recovery plans, data stewardship, and synthesis.</p>
8	<p><b>Question:</b> Is the vital signs revision team contemplated in objective two intended to be a subcommittee of one of the existing boards or coordinating bodies or a new, stand-alone, team? Approximately how many people are anticipated to be part of this team?</p>
	<p><b>PSP Answer:</b> We expect that the effort in sub-task 2b will design the collaborative process, including the composition of the team and its size. Partnership staff discussions have focused on development of a new, special-purpose team convened for the Vital Sign revision effort, but we recognize that this perspective should be checked with the group convened in sub-task 2b.</p>
9	<p><b>Question:</b> Do you have a sense or expectation about the split in project resources / funding between the collaborative process / engagement elements of the work and the technical analysis elements?</p>
	<p><b>PSP Answer:</b> See answer to question #1.</p>