



## ADDENDUM #2 INFORMAL BID 2020-136 RFQ

Kitsap County Parks Department

### Notice to Consultants for Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park Master Plan Services

**TO:** All Respondents  
**FROM:** David McBride, Owners' Representative  
**CLOSING DATE:** October 14, 2020 at 3:00 PM (**UNCHANGED**)  
**REF NO.:** 2020-136 RFQ  
**DATE:** October 12, 2020

---

The following information is provided to assist in responding to the above referenced proposal:

Section II, Scope of Services, has been updated to remove all references to City or City Council, and revised accordingly.

Section V, Special Terms and Conditions, removed any links to the County website.

In response to additional questions received to date, the following answers are provided to assist in responding to the above referenced proposal. Please also see Addendum No. 1 for additional questions received and answers provided.

#### **Questions and Responses**

1. Question: Given the two-page limit, could you clarify the request for Appendix B. How would you like us to provide reports and summary examples? Would you like us to indicate the various formats we provide for the reports and summaries?

**Answer: Regarding Appendix B, this is not intended to be a required section, and it is open to your team to choose how to present examples. Considering the nature of how we're working, the way the selected team communicates information to the County will be important in supporting decision making efforts. The examples you provide, and how you relay the ability to customize reports will be up to your team to determine. Because the Appendices are not counted towards the page-count limit, and this will mostly be reviewed electronically, the Appendices may be formatted with a different page size. Please limit the size of any Appendix page to 11x17 and maintain the font size as 11-Point or larger.**

2. Question: Does the county have previously prepared surveys, mapping, and/or reports for the property that will be provided?

**Answer: A complete survey has not been conducted; however, it will not be expected as part of the scope of this work. The intent is to utilize existing information within available deeds and legal descriptions, agreements, and other documentation available to identify the makeup of the park to create a high-level mapping of the resources and restrictions throughout the park. It is not expected to be a comprehensive document, but to serve the purposes of long-range planning. Anything that is available to the County to aid in this effort will be available to the project team.**

3. Question: The terms Commissioners, Board of Commissioners, County Commissioner Board, and County Commissioners are all used. Are these all the same groups?

**Answer: All references to the Board of Commissioners is the same entity.**

4. Question: Interaction with the Tribes is not mentioned in the RFQ. Will tribal input be requested?

**Answer: Any coordination with tribal entities regarding master planning efforts will be coordinated with the County and part of the approved community engagement plan. This will be discussed later with the selected team; however, some level of coordination is expected.**

5. Question: Will Olympic Property Group provide input and require individual meetings?

**Answer: We may obtain input from Rayonier/Olympic Property Group, specifically as it pertains to easements and other agreements, however, no specific meetings have been identified as necessary at this time.**

6. Question: In the Supplemental Task paragraph, page 4, the term "preliminary" is used. What level of completion does this equate to, 30%? The scope listed is a suggestion and the actual scope will be defined at the completion of the master plan, correct?

**Answer: The intent of this section is to allow the option for the County to engage further services from the selected team to continue efforts beyond the outlined scope if they choose to do so. At this time, further scope is not expected, however, this will be discussed further with the selected team**

7. Question: What is the status regarding the implementation of the Forest Stewardship Plan for the Ecological Restoration of PGFHP (2016).

**Answer: This plan only covered the original Shoreline Block and the northern portions of the upland block directly to the west. The thinning that was completed at PGFHP in 2016 was within the Shoreline Block prior to the acquisition of the Eastern Forest Uplands Block in 2017. There are multiple areas covered by the 2016 FS plan that require some pre-commercial thinning. Pre-commercial thinning will also be required for all areas where Pope/Rayonier has done a final harvest. With the patchwork of harvests on both the East and Western Forest Uplands, pre-commercial thinning will need to be done when the planted trees reach approximately 15 years. This thinning will provide the best opportunity to favor non-Douglas Fir trees species that have seeded in naturally. Additional shade tolerant trees could also be planted.**

**The 2016 Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park - Forest Stewardship Plan does need to be updated to include the entire area owned by Kitsap County. With the timber deed, the revised plan would need to reflect the fact that all the stand units will have been replanted with 2-year-old seedlings. That will be the starting point for the park's future forests.**

8. Question: What is the plan for revegetation of recently harvested areas and if they can share the program of future logging activities and the parcels to be harvested?

**Answer: The agreement was that Pope/Rayonier will reforest per their standard practice and in compliance with DNR forest practices requirements. This means they will be planting Douglas Fir. Given that there is always some natural seeding of pine, cedar, hemlock and red alder, there is the opportunity to favor these more shade tolerant trees when conducting a pre-commercial thinning. If these tree species aren't present in sufficient quantities, they can be planted at that time.**

**As for the program of future harvesting/logging activities Pope/Rayonier's DNR Forest Practices applications so far is quickly approaching 1,000 acres. Since they have been clear-cutting 38 to 40+ year old stands, Rayonier will likely harvest an additional 1,000+ acres within the next 6 to 7 years. Most of the timber on the uplands was planted 35 to 40 years ago and the log market is the only variable that can slow the harvest. We will learn more about future harvest plans in a future meeting with Rayonier in January 2021.**

9. Question: How will this master plan build on and complement the previous studies and work effort of the county and community including: the 2015 Port Gamble Resource Stewardship and Recreational Access Plan, the power point presentation to the Kitsap Public Facilities District, and ongoing MTB Ride Park and the Sound to Olympics Trail?

**Answer: The master plan shall fold in those listed existing plans and build upon them in the remainder of the Park as allowed by existing property encumbrances. It will also provide or enhance additional concepts for conservation, recreation, and economic development.**

10. Question: Can you provide any further information about the anticipated encumbrances; power easements, conservation easements, cultural, timber rights, others?

**Answer: Regarding the many encumbrances referred to, these will be shared with the selected team. The intent of identifying this in the RFQ was to illustrate that there are many restrictions with the property, so the amount of land to consider for development opportunities will be very limited.**

11. Question: The RFQ asks for a complete list of current clients and those served during the twelve (12) months preceding the submission date and a declaration of any potential incompatibility or conflicts of interest between those clients and the County. Is the County looking for ALL clients (including out-of-state and international) or just those in Washington? As you might imagine, current private and public sector clients and those within the prior 12 months is going to produce a sizable list.

**Answer: Regarding Appendix A, please at least include public clients within the State of Washington. Any parks or municipalities out of the state, or private clients, where you provided a similar scope of services may also be included at your discretion.**

END OF ADDENDUM #2