



## **REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)**

*Professional Services for the  
2022 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG)  
DISASTER RECOVERY PLAN AGREEMENT (22-CDBG-PL-20040)  
PLUMAS COUNTY 2021 WILDFIRES  
LONG-TERM RECOVERY PLANNING*

### **RFP SCOPES OF WORK:**

- #1 Economic Development Study (Indian Valley / Greenville / Canyon Dam)**
- #2 Housing Assessment (Countywide)**

## **QUESTIONS ADDENDUM**

**RFP SUBMISSION DEADLINE:  
DECEMBER 2, 2025**

### **ISSUED BY:**

*Keli Ward, Disaster Recovery Coordinator  
Plumas County  
[keliward@countyofplumas.com](mailto:keliward@countyofplumas.com)*

### **AVAILABLE AT:**

<https://plumascounty.us/2964/2021-PLUMAS-COUNTY-WILDFIRES-DIXIE-FIRE->  
<https://www.plumascounty.us/bids.aspx>

*Planning Department at 555 Main Street, Quincy, CA 95971*

*County Courthouse at 520 Main Street, Room 302, Quincy, CA 95971*

## RFP CLARIFICATION QUESTIONS

The County of Plumas received the following questions for clarifications by email on or before November 14, 2025, at 5:00PM. The questions are numbered in the table below under the “Question” column with the corresponding answer in the “County’s Response” column.

Question	County’s Response
1. Can I apply as an individual or apply on behalf of the Indian Valley Innovation HUB?	<i>The County shall comply with the County of Plumas Purchasing Policy (Adopted – December 13, 2022) and procurement provisions in 2 CFR (Code Federal Regulations) Part 200.317 – 200.326, Procurement Standards, as well as all other Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to state, local and federally recognized Indian tribal governments as set forth in 2 CFR 200, et. al., as applicable, when hiring a consultant(s) for this RFP.</i>
2. The 4-month timeframe for the project is compressed. Would it be possible for the County to get an extension to the grant expenditure deadline and to extend the project schedule?	<i>The County executed a Standard Agreement with the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) with an expenditure deadline of May 10, 2026. Any extensions will require HCD’s approval and a contract amendment. The County will evaluate all reasonable alternatives prior to determining that an extension is the only remaining viable alternative, such as County staff supplementing consultant(s) capacity and expedited County staff time review.</i>
3. What is the County’s preferred format for the final deliverables (e.g., bound reports, digital documents, presentations)?	<i>Digital documents are preferred for deliverables; a high quality Adobe PDF version in addition to an editable Microsoft Word document (or other Microsoft format product such as Excel) and all source files for any graphics and supporting data and documentation.</i>
4. What level of detail is expected? For example, should the Economic Development Study include detailed implementation action plans with assigned responsibilities and timelines, or should it focus more on strategic recommendations and priorities?	<i>The studies are intended to provide a thorough, actionable planning-level analysis. The Economic Development Study should identify strategic economic development priorities and anchor projects to support long-term growth scenarios and recommend an implementation strategy but prescriptive, project management level implementation plans (e.g., assigned responsibilities and timelines) are outside the scope.</i>
5. Are there any formatting or style preferences (page limits, graphic requirements, etc.)?	<i>All documents and data should be professional, organized, and readable although the County does not have any formatting or style preferences. Graphics should be utilized, as appropriate, to enhance understanding. No page limits identified. Digital source software preferred includes Microsoft products. Esri GIS (geographic information system) software for mapping and spatial analytics is acceptable.</i>

Question	County's Response
6. Does the County prefer two separate standalone deliverables, or would an integrated approach with cross-references between the Economic Development Study and Housing Assessment be more useful?	<i>Two separate deliverables are expected; however, cross-references and integrated approaches between the two documents are welcome to inform the analysis.</i>
7. Section 2 references extensive existing studies and data sources (Housing Element, Vulnerability Assessment, Hazard Mitigation Plan, etc.). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are all referenced documents and datasets currently available in digital format?</li> <li>Will they be provided at project kickoff or should the consultant plan to request/obtain them independently?</li> <li>Are there any known data gaps that the County is aware of?</li> </ul>	<i>Listed sources are available in digital format and will be provided during project kickoff. Some sources may require further consultant(s) investigation (e.g., Dixie Fire Collaborative's various plans, reports, and resources on website) or data requests (e.g., Plumas Housing Council, County GIS, County Building Department permits). Note, Vulnerability Assessment and Hazard Mitigation Plan were not listed in Section 2, page 3-4 of the RFP. The County recognizes there likely will be data gaps uncovered by the consultant(s) beyond Section 3A, Scope of Work, of this RFP which generally lists the known gaps in data and information to be discovered.</i>
8. What level of community engagement is expected within the 4-month timeline (e.g., surveys only, focus groups, public workshops, combination)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there specific stakeholder groups that must be engaged?</li> <li>Does the County have preferred engagement platforms or methods based on past success with the community?</li> </ul>	<i>Community engagement methods should be at a level sufficient to ensure meaningful input, reflect community priorities, and complement the type of information being sought after to include online and paper surveys, focus groups/listening sessions, one-on-one interviews, public workshops, or a combination thereof. County staff will be heavily involved in community engagement and bring capacity to the efforts. Specific housing and economic development stakeholder groups will be identified by the County during project kickoff and provided to the consultant(s).</i>
9. What is the current status and meeting schedule of the CDBG-DR Long Term Recovery Group? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there other concurrent planning processes that this work should coordinate with, and if yes, what are those planning processes and their schedules relevant to the 4-month project period?</li> <li>Should the consultant plan to attend specific meetings or briefings beyond bi-weekly check-ins?</li> </ul>	<i>There are concurrent long-term wildfire recovery, housing, and economic development planning processes that the consultant(s) will be made aware of by County staff but will not be required to attend specific meetings or briefings to directly engage. The consultant(s) should propose to engage in bi-weekly check-ins and attend certain community engagement methods.</i>

Question	County's Response
10. Does the County have a preferred or expected budget allocation between Scope #1 (Economic Development Study) and Scope #2 (Housing Assessment), or should the consultant propose the allocation based on scope complexity?	<i>The County does not have a preferred or expected budget allocation between Scope #1 and Scope #2. The County's objective is to perform both scopes of work for a combined total of \$155,000. The consultant(s) should propose the allocation based on scope complexity by providing a detailed line-item cost budget table, by task, for the proposed scope(s) of work.</i>
11. Some tasks contain language like "if applicable" or "as needed." Are there any scope elements that the County considers optional or lower priority if budget constraints require trade-offs?	<i>Tasks under Section 3A, Scope of Work, of this RFP do not include phrases like "if applicable" and "as needed." The County does not consider any specific scope elements as optional or lower priority.</i>
12. The RFP requires Admin Drafts (March), Draft Deliverables (April), and Final Deliverables (May 10, 2026). What is the expected County review and feedback timeline for Admin Drafts and Draft Deliverables? How many rounds of revisions are anticipated between Admin Draft and Final? Are there specific milestone dates within March, April, and early May that we should target?	<i>Respondents should assume approximately 1-2 weeks for County staff review of the Admin Draft and Draft deliverables, with one round of revisions on each. Consultant(s) should propose recommended milestone dates within March, April, and early May to target.</i>
13. Can you clarify the intended differences between Admin Draft, Draft, and Final versions?	<i>The Admin Draft Deliverable should be an internal working draft for initial review of the outline and preliminary content of the documents to help identify any missing components. The Draft Deliverable should incorporate County staff feedback on the Admin Draft and be a complete document suitable for public and stakeholder circulation, although still subject to revision. The Final Deliverable should be fully revised to address County, public, and stakeholder comments and prepared for publication.</i>
14. Should the proposal account for potential weather-related delays in community engagement or site visits? Are there flexibility provisions if severe weather impacts the schedule? Are conversions to virtual meetings permitted if inclement weather affects scheduled public events?	<i>The schedule is set according to the grant expenditure deadline of May 10, 2026. The County is generally willing to coordinate schedule adjustments if they do not compromise the Final Deliverable deadline. Virtual meetings are acceptable.</i>
15. Are there specific CDBG compliance documentation requirements beyond standard HUD environmental review and civil rights provisions?	<i>Review Attachment 2 of the RFP for compliance. All standard CDBG provisions apply including standard HUD provisions.</i>

Question	County's Response
16. Are there local hire preferences or DBE participation goals that should be reflected in our team composition or subcontracting approach?	<i>The County of Plumas Purchasing Policy (Adopted – December 13, 2022) can be reviewed <a href="#">HERE</a>.</i>
17. Does the County have GIS data layers available for the consultant's use (e.g., parcels, infrastructure, planning areas)?	<i>Yes, the County has a GIS Department and coordinator that can assist.</i>
18. What level of GIS mapping is expected in the deliverables?	<i>Maps should be incorporated into the deliverables, as appropriate, to enhance understanding of spatial patterns. The County has a GIS Department and coordinator that can assist. Supporting GIS shapefiles with sufficient metadata should be provided for all final deliverable maps used in the analyses to allow the County GIS coordinator to view and query the data in the future.</i>
19. Does the County have preferred GIS software or formats for any mapping deliverables?	<i>Esri GIS software for mapping and spatial analytics is acceptable.</i>
20. Does the County have a preference for jobs/housing balance methodology (e.g., specific ratio targets, commute time-based analysis, workforce housing needs-based approach)? Are there any existing County policies or goals that should guide this analysis?	<i>The County does not have a preferred methodology for calculating the jobs/housing balance and is open to the consultant(s) professional recommendation. The analysis should be guided by goals identified in the <a href="#">2035 Plumas County General Plan</a> and the <a href="#">2024-2029 Draft Plumas County General Plan Housing Element</a>.</i>
21. Should the jobs/housing balance goal be developed separately for different planning areas or as a countywide target?	<i>Housing needs and job opportunities vary by County subregion (e.g., towns); the jobs/housing balance goal would be most useful divided by subregion, but at minimum, a countywide target is needed.</i>
22. If interviews are conducted, what is the expected format (in-person in Quincy, virtual, hybrid)? How many team members should plan to participate? What is the expected duration of the interview? Will there be a presentation component, and if so, how long?	<i>Interviews for this RFP solicitation can be in-person or virtual or hybrid. It would be a 1-hour interview. A presentation component would be involved, at approximately 20 minutes, with questions &amp; answers (Q&amp;A).</i>
23. For the Economic Development Study (Scope #1), should analysis be limited to Indian Valley/Greenville/Canyon Dam, or should it also consider countywide economic development implications?	<i>The primary focus should be on Indian Valley, Greenville, and Canyon Dam while exploring broader regional (i.e., Countywide, Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy [CEDS], and North State Jobs First counties) economic linkages, identifying regional gaps and opportunities for complementary growth.</i>

Question	County's Response
24. For the Housing Assessment (Scope #2), should equal analytical depth be provided for all seven planning areas, or should fire-impacted areas receive more detailed analysis?	<i>Efforts should be relatively consistent for all planning areas although wildfire-impacted areas that directly lost housing units require additional consideration and discussion.</i>
25. Task 1.2 references “10 to 15 years (or reasonable identified growth horizon).” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the County have a preference for the planning horizon for growth projections (10 years, 15 years, longer)?</li> <li>• Should this align with the timeline of the Plumas County 2035 General Plan?</li> <li>• Should different horizon years be used for different types of projections (e.g., near-term recovery vs. long-term growth)?</li> </ul>	<i>Analyses should generally align with the 2035 Plumas County General Plan while selecting a reasonable growth horizon appropriate for each analysis.</i>
26. The RFP mentions engaging with Maidu communities and references the Greenville Rancheria. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there specific tribal consultation protocols or requirements that the consultant should follow?</li> <li>• Has the County already established consultation agreements with tribal governments that would guide this work?</li> <li>• Should formal government-to-government consultation be included in the scope, or is community-level engagement with tribal members sufficient?</li> </ul>	<i>Formal government-to-government Tribal consultation is not required for these studies although engaging in informal communication with native communities and individuals as members of the public and stakeholders in the study area is necessary to ensure all perspectives are appropriately reflected in the findings and recommendations.</i>
27. Where Task 1.2 (Market Analysis), requests identification of “economic baseline trends through market analysis of the local, sub-regional economy”, is this referring specifically to the Indian Valley, Greenville, Canyon Dam area?	<i>Yes.</i>

Question	County's Response
28. Does the County have data regarding the current and historical number and type of businesses in the Indian Valley/Greenville/Canyon Dam area (e.g., business license data)?	<i>The County does not require businesses licenses or maintain comprehensive data of current and historical businesses, although the filed Fictitious Business Name Statements with the County Clerk-Recorder's Office can be queried for the Indian Valley/Greenville/Canyon Dam area and will be made available. In addition, the Dixie Fire Collaborative and the Indian Valley Chamber of Commerce may have current and historical business information to provide.</i>
29. Has the County already collected and compiled all of the information and data needed for the 2024-2029 Housing Element, or does the County anticipate that the housing assessment would somehow inform the Housing Element?	<i>It is not anticipated that the Housing Assessment will inform the 2024-2029 Plumas County General Plan Housing Element.</i>
30. Is there a proposal page limit?	<i>There is no overall page limit restriction for this RFP response.</i>
31. Does the County have a desired format for the Housing Assessment final deliverable?	<i>Digital documents are preferred for deliverables; a high quality Adobe PDF version in addition to an editable Microsoft Word document (or other Microsoft format product such as Excel) and all source files for any graphics and supporting data and documentation.</i>
32. Is consultant expected to present findings before any County Board or Commission? If so, could you please provide an estimate of number of presentations and whether presentations would be in-person or via web-meeting?	<i>No, the presentation of findings before any County board or commission are not included in Section 3A, Scope of Work, of this RFP.</i>
33. Is BOS approval/adoption of final Economic Development Study and/or Housing Assessment Deliverable required to satisfy CDBG grant?	<i>No.</i>