

**Middle Peninsula Planning District Commission
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL #FY26-GRIT1
ADDENDUM #1**

RFP ISSUE DATE: December 4, 2025

ADDENDUM ISSUE DATE: January 13, 2026

RESPONDENT QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES:

1. *Under the Local Economic Participation category in the Selection Criteria, use of academic partners was listed. Are academic institutions eligible to submit a proposal directly, versus merely being a subconsultant to a private firm?*

Yes, academic institutions may provide a response if they determine they are the most qualified and able to perform the work. Academic institutions also may have additional opportunities throughout the project outside of this procurement to directly contract with MPPDC to supplement the project.

2. *Can we get a copy of the NFWF grant application?*

Yes, the NFWF application has been loaded onto the website with the RFP. MPPDC is also engaged with additional funding sources to support this project that are pending final agreements.

3. *Will the consultant who developed the grant application be allowed to bid on this RFP?*

There was not a consultant who developed the grant application. The NFWF grant application was developed by Virginia Marine Resources Commission in coordination with the Virginia Department of Wildlife Resources and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Chesapeake Bay Office. Various sources were utilized to inform the grant application including VIMS Shoreline Studies Program, with location selection further informed by the VIMS Shoreline Change Mapping System, the NOAA-funded VIMS Nearshore Oyster Restoration Siting and Prioritization Tool, Adapt VA, other prioritization tools, and various reports.

4. *Is there a page limit on the proposal?*

There is no page limit to the proposal. Respondents are encouraged to be efficient in their responses.

5. *Is there a preferred number of references to include in the proposal?*

Respondents should provide at least three (3) references. See Addendum 2.

6. *Does MPDDC have existing data that they intend to provide to the selected firm? If so, what data will be available?*

As part of Task 2, respondents should consider any data publicly available and be prepared to assess and identify any data gaps or needs in coordination with the MPPDC and project partners to identify additional data or field services that may be required to support the project. MPPDC may also contract with academia or other entities for field services adjacent or concurrent to this contract that may be utilized in Task 2. Any costs associated for additional field services under this contract will be negotiated separately under Optional Task 8.

7. *Does MPDDC already have specific projects in mind within the identified area?*

There are not specific projects already identified for the area. Respondents should consider the NFWF grant application that is posted on the MPPDC website. Respondents should also be prepared to identify a suite of projects based on deliverables of Task 1 and Task 2.

8. *The Guinea Marsh complex is quite large. Are there specific focus areas we should prioritize for the conceptual design in the proposal, as well as for the design engineer's field data collection and detailed project design? For example, should proposed projects be concentrated around properties owned by the Middle Peninsula Chesapeake Bay Public Access Authority, or should the effort focus more on areas involving private properties? The project will primarily focus on implementation on or adjacent to PAA and DWR owned property. However, the resilience feasibility assessment and the land conservation suitability assessment may consider long term impacts and resilience plans for both public and private properties.*

9. *How much fieldwork do you anticipate firms will be required to complete to support final design? For example, will the collection of high-resolution LiDAR data be required, or would traditional field surveys be sufficient? Additionally, are there specific survey standards, data resolution requirements, or site characterization efforts (e.g., topographic, bathymetric, or vegetation surveys) that firms should plan to include in their proposed scope of work?*

Field work, such as system-wide LiDAR or system-wide bathymetric surveys, will be considered as part of the Optional Task 8 for Field Services and will not be considered during proposal evaluation. However, it is expected that the respondent be prepared to access the system by boat to familiarize themselves with the stressors on the system and field verify critical elevations associated with the proposed designs to ensure they are permissible and realistically implementable based on field conditions. It is assumed that field confirmation of mean lower water, mean high water, and 1.5 times mean tide range will be required in order to provide complete and permissible draft JPA packages. See clarification included in Addendum 2.

10. *The grant application referenced in the most recent addendum indicates that more than \$3 million in oyster habitat restoration is planned within the project area. Could MPPDC provide mapping of these restoration locations, along with any available conceptual or proposed design information for the oyster reef projects?*

The NFWF applications specifies construction of intertidal oyster habitat structures but does not specify the specific design of these structures. This could include any intertidal design that is designed to support sustained oyster growth and reef function as either a primary or secondary benefit.

11. *The NFWF grant application included in the most recent addendum states that design plans would be developed to approximately 90 percent completion. However, the current RFP indicates that the selected firm will prepare conceptual and preliminary design alternatives for nature-based shoreline and marsh resilience features. Please clarify the distinction between these two scopes of work and how they relate to one another.*

The respondents should rely on the tasks outlined in the SOW to achieve the outcomes associated with the NFWF grant, which the project team has identified as development of conceptual and preliminary design alternatives for nature-based shoreline and marsh resilience features aligned with stakeholder input and ecological data within the guinea marsh system suitable to initiate permitting. If additional funding becomes available, designs may be advanced to a more developed design-level.

12. *Can you please confirm that a cost proposal is not required at the initial submission stage, and will only be requested if shortlisted? Page 7 of the RFP lists Cost proposal as items that must be addressed in this response. However, Page 10 Section V says proposal cannot include cost. At such time as a cost proposal is required, are there any guidelines or forms that would be preferred?*

Correct. A cost proposal should not be submitted with the proposal. Since this is an RFP for professional services, MPPDC will not ask for cost information with the proposal submittal. VA Procurement Law 2.2-4302.2A4 notes, "The Request for Proposal shall not, however, request that offerors furnish estimates of man-hours or cost for services. At the discussion stage, the public body may discuss nonbinding estimates of total project costs, including, but not limited to, life-cycle costing, and where appropriate, nonbinding estimates of price for services." Per RFP section V. Project Cost, "Following the proposal period MPPDC will enter a discussion stage with chosen contractors based on the qualification criteria. During this stage we may request nonbinding estimates of total project costs and budget management strategies to demonstrate efficient use of funds and value for the money without compromising technical quality. "

13. *For public or stakeholder engagement during the Phase 1, will the responding team be providing specific public engagement support or would that be conducted by the Planning District?*

The respondent will be considered technical support for the stakeholder engagement. MPPDC has already engaged University of Virginia Institute for Engagement and Negotiation and Consociate Media for public engagement. However, the respondent should be prepared to coordinate with regulatory entities to understand likelihood of permit issuance of proposed designs and participate as project technical support in at least 2 in-person public meetings and additional stakeholder engagement.

14. *Does Section 1 – Cover Sheet refer to the cover of the proposal or a cover letter included behind a section 1 tab?*

There is not a page limit to the proposal. Respondent can structure the sections as they feel necessary to provide a complete proposal.

15. *Is it acceptable to omit the page number on covers and tabs?*

Yes

16. *Section III of the RFP, Proposal Format (pages 6-7) lists 11 items that should be addressed including number 11. Cost Proposal. There are no additional instructions for a Section 11 – Cost Proposal. Should this section be included in our proposal and if so, what information should be included in that section?*

Item 11 on Page 7 of the RFP package should be struck. See Addendum 2.

17. *Is the text on page 8, Section 5.4 that begins with “Participation in the design advisory process...” meant to be included in this section? If so, how are you looking for firms to respond to it in their proposals?*

Firms are not required to address this section. Section 5.4 is a clarification for participation during the design and construction phases.

18. *Would MPPDC consider providing a list of existing Guinea Marsh site information they possess or know to exist so that respondents will be able to focus the proposal efforts regarding field data collection on specific needs?*

See response to Question 6 above.

19. *If we are planning to submit proposal hard copies via FedEx, what address should be used for delivery?*

Respondent is responsible for confirming delivery to MPPDC Office located at HUB 33, 4521 Lewis B. Puller Memorial Highway, Mattaponi, VA 23110 in addition to the digital copy submitted via email.

20. *For Task 2, to what extent does MPPDC/DWR expect teams to rely on existing publicly available datasets (e.g., LiDAR, imagery, bathymetry), versus collecting new, site-specific field data as part of the base scope?*

See responses to Questions 6 and 9 above.

21. *While Task 2 references “Field Data Assessment,” can you clarify whether any infield data collection is expected as part of Task 2?*

See responses to Questions 6 and 9 above.

22. *If Task 2 requires fieldwork, will the field assessment include ground-truthing or only for filling gaps?*

See responses to Questions 6 and 9 above.

23. *Can you clarify how Optional Task 8 is envisioned relative to Task 2? Specifically:*

- a. *Is Optional Task 8 intended only to address identified data gaps, or*
- b. *Could it include more comprehensive field data collection, to include monitoring changes relative to climate and storm events?*

See responses to Questions 6 and 9 above.

24. *What is the resolution of the LiDAR and bathymetric data available to the selected team and from what year is the most current data? Are these datasets expected to be shared at project kickoff?*

See responses to Questions 6 and 9 above.

25. *For marsh vulnerability and sea-level rise analyses (e.g., SLAMM or similar), is the expectation that teams use available regional datasets, or is there an interest in higher-resolution, site-specific elevation data if teams identify limitations in existing data?*

Respondents should use regional datasets to inform conceptual designs, identify additional datasets or granularity of detail necessary to advance designs to a permissible stage, and be prepared to field verify key design elevations in preparation for a JPA submittal.

26. *Given that marsh vulnerability and loss projections are highly sensitive to elevation accuracy, how does the project team view the tradeoff between model precision and budget constraints when considering new field data collection?*

The primary outcome of this phase of the project is to get to permissible projects that are ready to submit complete JPA and ready to advance productively through permitting, additional design phases, and move into implementation. Respondents should be prepared to inform the Project Team about tradeoffs with this outcome in mind.

27. *Is new bathymetric data collection anticipated under this project, or is the intent to rely on existing bathymetric datasets?*

See responses to Questions 6 and 9 above.

28. *If new bathymetric data are anticipated, does the project team have expectations regarding:*
- a. *Collection methods (e.g., sonar-based surveys vs. depth sounding transects), or*
 - b. *Depth thresholds, channel-ward extent or areas of focus (e.g., tidal creeks, nearshore zones)?*

See responses to Questions 6 and 9 above.

29. *In addition to data referenced in Task 2, what available plans or studies will be shared at the beginning of this project to refer to? Will any existing studies, basemaps, conceptual designs, or prior planning documents be provided to inform Task 3, or should teams assume that conceptual alternatives will be developed from first principles based on the Existing Conditions Report?*

See response to Question 6 above.

30. *For Task 3, is the expectation that conceptual designs:*
- a. *Are schematic, landscape-scale strategies applicable across the project area, or*
 - b. *Are tied to specific priority reaches or sites identified in other tasks?*

The primary outcome of this phase of the project is to get to permittable projects that are ready to submit complete JPA and ready to advance productively through permitting, additional design phases, and move into implementation. Respondents should be prepared to inform the Project Team about landscape-scale strategies or specific priority areas that achieve this outcome.

31. *For Task 7, is the intent to identify permitting pathways and provide solutions to the complex nature of this project or is the expectation to prepare a draft JPA package, which would include the development of design-level materials (e.g., 30–60% plans, impact plates) to support permitting?*

Task 7 is intended to identify permitting pathways and prepare permittable JPA packages. See Addendum 2 for additional information.

32. *Does the project team have an anticipated order-of-magnitude estimate for:*
- a. *Total shoreline length addressed, and*
 - b. *The number of conceptual or priority projects that may advance toward permitting under this contract?*

See Addendum 2.

33. *For the two community or stakeholder engagement events, what level of involvement is expected from the selected consultant team?*
- a. *Is attendance and technical support sufficient, or*
 - b. *Should the consultant anticipate supporting meeting planning, materials, or presentations?*

- c. *If so, what cost is anticipated for materials (e.g., posters, name tags, handouts, signage) and will there be any rental fees to use a space for these events?*

See response to Question 13 above. Respondent should be prepared to summarize interactions with regulators and may be asked to prepare any technical graphics necessary to support other stakeholder engagements.

34. *What is the expected level of participation from the selected firm with the engagement effort?*

See response to Questions 13 and 33 above.

35. *What is the anticipated availability of the engagement consultants data and deliverables to the GRIT project team?*

Final documents will be made available once complete. Further coordination as needed will occur through the project team during project execution.

36. *Page 10 references that pricing should not be included, but the RFP appears to ask for cost estimates in the items listed to be addressed in the proposal (#11 on page 7). Can you please clarify whether to include pricing at this stage of the procurement?*

See response to Question 12 above.

37. *What are the expectations regarding final deliverables: are hard-copy submissions required, similar to the proposal, or will deliverables be submitted strictly in digital format?*

Electronic submittals are acceptable.

38. *If a cost proposal is required for submission, can you confirm a budget for optional task 8 and how you would like that to be estimated (e.g., based on # of acres, etc.)?*

See response to Question 12 above.

39. *Is there a preferred or expected number of references to include with the proposal?*

See Addendum 2.

40. *Are there any minimums or maximums on the number of relevant projects teams should include in the qualifications section?*

See Addendum 2.

41. *Beyond the 25 MB file size limit, is there a page limit for the proposal submission?*

See response to Question 4 above.

42. *Given the range of potential approaches to field data collection, how will the evaluation committee ensure teams proposing different levels of field effort are evaluated consistently and equitably?*

See response to Questions 6 and 9 above and clarifications included in Addendum 2.

43. Does the order of tasks relate to the order in which tasks should be completed? For example, Task 5 is likely to inform Tasks 3 & 4. Please confirm there's no strict milestone order.

Tasks do not need to be completed in a linear or sequential manner but instead should be completed in the manner that is most effective for the project and most efficient use of funds.

44. Are any firms conflicted from performing this work due to their involvement in the NFWF grant application that resulted in funding for the project?

All firms are welcome to submit proposals, but the MPPDC reserves the right to disqualify any firm from consideration if, in the MPPDC's sole determination, that firm is unable to perform work under this RFP because of an actual or perceived conflict of interest based on applicable law.

45. On the original copy of the RFP response, are wet signatures required or are verified e-Signatures acceptable?

Verified e-Signatures are acceptable.

46. If proposals are delivered by FEDEX, should we use the same address provided in the RFP for hand delivered proposals?

See response to Question 19 above.