

STATE OF ALASKA

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF SUPPORT SERVICES



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) # 2022-1000-5161

TRAVEL MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE FORTY MILE RIVER REGION

Addendum One

Date of Issue: June 09, 2022

Addendum One serves to answer questions received from a vendor.

Important Note to Offerors: Only the RFP terms and conditions referenced in this addendum are being changed. All other terms and conditions of the RFP remain the same. This Addendum One is hereby made part of the RFP and is a total of four pages.

Chris Brooks
Procurement Specialist
Phone: (907) 269-8666
Email: christopher.brooks@alaska.gov

Responses to Questions Received by Offeror

Question 1: The RFP suggests the project requires in-person public meetings for scoping the TMP. A. Can we assume that will entail three x two-hour meetings, one each in 1) Anchorage, 2) Fairbanks, and 3) Tok/Chicken?

Answer: Yes.

Question 2: Is there a preference for conducting the Fortymile Region meeting in Tok vs. Chicken?

Answer: Preference is for Chicken.

Question 3: Can we assume that DNR will secure/provide locations (meeting rooms) for them?

Answer: Yes.

Question 4: Can we assume that the Fairbanks and Tok meetings can be scheduled on consecutive days to minimize travel costs/logistics?

Answer: Yes.

Question 5: Is there a need to have any meetings video-recorded, live-streamed, or available to non-local participants virtually via an application such as Teams/Zoom?

Answer: In addition to our normal public notice process, DNR is considering the logistics of virtual/MS Teams type meetings for scoping and the public review draft. We do not anticipate live streaming or video recording.

Question 6: If a virtual component is required, will DNR be in charge of offering/managing the IT components of those meetings?

Answer: Yes.

Question 7: The RFP suggests the project requires in-person public meetings to review the draft TMP. Can we assume that will entail three x two-hour meetings, one each in 1) Anchorage, 2) Fairbanks, and 3) Tok/Chicken?

Answer: Yes.

Question 8: Is there a preference for conducting the Fortymile Region meeting in Tok vs. Chicken?

Answer: Given the public review draft is scheduled to occur during the winter months, we are open to discussion on this question. Chicken during the summer months would be optimal, while Tok in the winter would be a better location.

Question 9: Can we assume that DNR will secure/provide locations (meeting rooms) for any meetings?

Answer: Yes.

Question 10: Can we assume that the Fairbanks and Tok/Chicken meetings can be scheduled on consecutive days to minimize travel costs/logistics?

Answer: Yes.

Question 11: Is there a need to have any meetings video-recorded, live-streamed, or available to non-local participants virtually via an application such as Teams/Zoom?

Answer: In addition to our normal public notice process, DNR is considering the logistics of virtual/MS Teams type meetings for scoping and the public review draft. We do not anticipate live streaming or video recording.

Question 12: If a virtual component is required, will DNR be in charge of offering/managing the IT components of those meetings?

Answer: Yes.

Question 13: The RFP suggests that DNR possesses considerable geographic and other information about Fortymile rivers and RS 2477 trails. Can we assume that the project involves organizing existing GIS and other information, but not generating any new data (via fieldwork or extended discussions with stakeholders or other agencies, aside from the public meetings discussed above)?

Answer: Yes

Question 14: Can we assume that DNR will produce GIS products for the TMPs from existing DNR GIS files (with the contractor providing oversight on what elements to include and how the maps should be presented)?

Answer: Yes.

Question 15: The schedule in the RFP appears extremely challenging, given a contract start date of July 18, 2022. We have already-scheduled fieldwork in July and August, as well some other project commitments in July, August, and September. We recognize State interest in completing the project before the end of October, but we think this may be unrealistic for an initial TMP. Is there flexibility in the schedule whereby scoping could occur in early fall; draft plan development in winter; with final plan adoption set for spring 2023?

Answer: Though we would like to complete the TMP under the proposed contract schedule, we are open to schedule adjustments in order to consider logistics and opportunities for the public to attend meetings. Since this contract is “As-Needed”, there is room for schedule adjustments and we can make these adjustments once the contract is awarded.

End of Addendum One