

TO ALL PLANHOLDERS OF RECORD.

RE: Request for Proposals (RFP) – Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan
(RFP Reference No.: RFP26.52129.01)

FROM: Katy Wolf, Emergency Manager

DATE: 10/8/2026

Questions were due on 10/7/26. No further questions are being accepted. Answers are provided below in order of the questions received. See revised RFP for updates.

ADDENDUM NO. 1

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q1: There are conflicting instructions regarding the proposal format in Section 13 – Proposal Requirements and Section 18 – Proposal Format and Required Content. Would you please clarify how you want the content structured?

A1: The RFP Section 18 has been updated to include Section 13, and Section 13 now references Section 18.

Q2: Could you please clarify whether the Tribe is requesting our current state business registration/license, or whether a Washington State or Cowlitz Tribal business license is required for this professional consulting engagement?

A2: A business license in the state the firm does business from is required.

Q3: Should the CEMP cover ilani Casino and Economic Authority facilities, the off-reservation offices along the I-5 corridor, or both? Or is it limited to Tribal government operations on the reservation?

A3: The CEMP will not cover any Economic Authorities. It will be focused on the government, which includes off-reservation offices.

Q4: Which response services (law enforcement, fire, EMS, public works) does the Tribe operate directly, and which are provided through agreements with outside agencies?

A4: The Tribe has a Police Department and Public Works Department. We have an agreement with Clark Cowlitz Fire Rescue to serve the reservation, which is in their service area.

Q5: How many staff are in the Emergency Management division today? This will help us size procedures to what the Tribe can maintain.

A5: 1 FTE and 1 temp Americorps member who serves 10.5 months of the year.

Q6: Does the Tribe have a designated EOC or coordination space today, or should the framework plan for the future Administrative and Public Safety Building?

A6: It will be in the future Public Safety Building.

Q7: Has the Tribe already identified priority hazards for the hazard-specific annexes, or should the contractor recommend them from the hazard review?

A7: We have done only preliminary hazard prioritization and we have access to county hazard analyses.

Q8: Are there cultural protocols the contractor should follow when engaging Tribal leadership, Elders, or members? Should Cultural Resources staff be included to address cultural sites, ceremonies, and sensitive information in the plan?

A8: Yes, Cultural Resources department would be consulted to address cultural concerns. For Elders, we have a program that would provide access to Tribal members. For general membership, we can work with our Communications Department. We would work through our government leadership (Tribal Administrator) to get permission to present to Tribal Council and receive feedback.

Q9: How much drafting does the Legal Department expect from the contractor? Should the contractor deliver full code language, or a framework and recommended provisions for Legal to draft?

A9: The contractor would do the bulk of the code drafting, and receive legal review from Legal.

Q10: Beyond the public University of Washington report, will the contractor have access to any related materials or model code language from that project?

A10: There are no other materials, just the public report which contains the model code.

Q11: Task 9 (Final Code) refers to a "final CEMP" for the Code Committee. Can you confirm this deliverable is the final Emergency Management Code?

A11: Yes, it should be final "Code". See updated RFP.

Q12: How often do the Code Committee and Tribal Council meet? Knowing this will help us build a realistic approval timeline.

A12: Monthly.

Q13: Which documents will be available at kickoff (e.g., the draft Continuity Plan, mutual aid agreements, MOUs, organizational charts, prior hazard data)? Will an NDA be required before they are shared?

A13: Yes, an NDA will be required. The documents mentioned will be available, as well as after action reports, procedure and policies.

Q14: Will the Tribe's portion of the Clark County HMP update be far enough along to cross-reference during the CEMP development period?

A14: The existing version of the HMP will be available but the kickoff for the update has not been scheduled, so it will likely not be far enough along to cross-reference.

Q15: Section 18 mentions security controls. Are there specific data handling or cybersecurity requirements for Tribal information the contractor holds during the project?

A15: The NDA will cover data sovereignty controls.

Q16: About how many departments or individuals should be planned for in the stakeholder interviews?

A16: The Tribe has 12 departments. The number of interviews is up to the consultant's proposed scope of engagement.

Q17: Does the Tribe expect engagement with Tribal members (e.g., community meetings), or is engagement limited to staff and leadership?

A:17 Engagement with Tribal members is not as high of a priority as staff and leadership, and is not required.

Q18: Which meetings, if any, does the Tribe require in person rather than virtually?

A18: If Tribal Council is meeting in person, then presentations are preferred in person. Any kickoff or engagement meeting can be hybrid or all virtual, since Tribal staff work across the I-5 corridor.

Q19: If interviews are held, what is the expected time window so proposed team members can hold the date?

A19: No interview timeframes have been scheduled yet, but if they were to occur, they would be the week of November 16.

Q20: Task 8 includes at least one substantive review cycle, and Section 10 sets a two-round limit on substantive revisions. Do these apply separately to the Code and the CEMP, or combined?

A20: Separately, as they are separate products.

Q21: Is there an established budget or range for this project? Is it grant-funded, and if so, are there grant requirements the plan must align with?

A21: The budget range is up to \$110,000. The project is funded by the FEMA Emergency Management Performance Grants (EMPG). The grant contract could be provided at the time of kickoff, but reporting requirements are typical. As of 10/7/2026, the EMPG 25 grant is available to spend, and ends on 5/31/2027, and the EMPG 26 grant has been applied for, and though the state has not yet given an expected award date, it is expected before end of the calendar year, and would end on 9/28/28. The project aligns with the grant requirements.

Q22: Will deliverable- or milestone-based invoicing be acceptable? If the contract is terminated after the first presentation of draft deliverables, will work completed to that point be compensated?

A22: Yes, that type of invoicing is acceptable. Yes, any work completed would be paid.

Q23: Should travel be billed at actual cost, at federal (GSA) per diem rates, or included in fixed task pricing?

A23: Travel should be billed at actual cost, not to exceed applicable federal/GSA rates.

Q24: Is it acceptable to hold hourly rates fixed for the full contract term, rather than adding an annual adjustment?

A24: Preference that hourly rates remain fixed for the full contract term.

Q25: Does the Tribe have a standard professional services agreement it can share before the due date? Section 17.G asks proposers to submit their own terms, and reviewing the Tribe's agreement first may allow us to simply accept it.

A25: We do have template agreements that we use as the basis for drafting project-specific PSAs. However, these templates constitute attorney work product and are intended for internal use within CIT only. Accordingly, we are not inclined to share them with outside vendors. Vendors should proceed by submitting its own proposed terms and conditions, as instructed by the RFP.

Q26: What insurance types and minimum coverage limits are required for the certificate?

A26: A COI should be required, with a minimum of \$1 million in general liability coverage.

Q27: Is a Tribal business license or other registration required for an out-of-state firm working with the Tribe?

A27: A business license in the state the firm does business from is required.

Q28: Our firm is newly organized, and our team members bring extensive individual experience. Will projects completed by proposed team members in prior roles be accepted as relevant project examples and references?

A28: Yes.

Q29: For Tribal preference under Procurement Code §3-208, is eligibility based only on ownership of the prime proposer, or is Native American-owned subcontractor participation considered?

A29: Yes-The preference is based on ownership of the prime proposal.

Q30: Are there page limits or formatting requirements? Should the cost proposal be combined with the technical proposal in one PDF or submitted as a separate file?

A30: There are no formatting/page limit requirements. One combined PDF is preferred.

Q31: Will questions and answers be shared with all proposers through an addendum, and when?

A31: All questions submitted by vendors, along with the corresponding answers, will be posted to the RFP page, along with an updated RFP with changes highlighted. These will also be shared with all prospective proposers to ensure fairness and transparency throughout the procurement process.

Q32: What is the budget range or not-to-exceed ceiling?

A32: See A21

Q33: Is this a grant funded project? If yes, what is the name of the grant?

A33: See A21.

Q34: Is ilani Casino and the Economic Authority in scope?

A34: See A3.

Q35: Does the CEMP include facility-level plans, and how many sites and departments?

A35: These plans are already in development and are outside the scope of the CEMP project. They will cover all 12 departments across the six office locations. They will be available to the CEMP consultant.

Q36: Who is developing the Continuity Plan, and when will it be done? Should we align the CEMP with the Clark County HMP update?

A36: The Continuity Plan is being completed in-house by the Emergency Manager. The estimated timeframe for finalizing the base plan is Q1 2027. After this, it will be available for reference. The CEMP project will align as much as practicable with the Clark County HMP update.

Q37: How many stakeholder interviews and workshops, and onsite or virtual? Is travel reimbursed?

Q37: See A18 and A23.

Q38: Is there a page limit?

A38: See A30.

Q39: **Funding source and deadline.** Is this project funded in whole or in part with a federal grant? If so, which program, and what is the grant period of performance? Is there a date by which the work must be completed or the funds spent? We want to make sure the proposed 12–18 month schedule fits within it.

A: See A21.

Q40: **Not-to-exceed amount.** Is there a not-to-exceed amount, budget ceiling, or anticipated funding range for this project? Knowing this will help us scale the level of effort, number of on-site visits, and optional services appropriately.

A40: See A21.

Q41: **Planning area.** Should the CEMP cover only the reservation in Ridgefield, or also the Tribe's off-reservation offices and facilities along the I-5 corridor (Vancouver to Tukwila)? Should ilani Casino and the Economic Authority be addressed in the CEMP, or do they keep separate emergency plans that the CEMP would only cross-reference?

A41: See A3.

Q42: **Related planning efforts.** The RFP mentions the Continuity Plan, the Tribe's part in the Clark County multi-jurisdictional HMP update, the 2026–2030 Strategic Plan, and the Master Site Plan. Who is developing the Continuity Plan, and when is it expected to be finished? Will Tribal hazard and risk findings from the Clark County HMP process be available during CEMP development, or should the CEMP use existing county and state hazard data?

A42: See A7, A14, A36.

Q43: University of Washington project. Beyond the published report linked in the RFP, are there other materials from the UW project (draft code language, data, or worksheets) that will be available to the selected contractor?

A43: See A10.

Q44: Drafting roles. Is the contractor expected to draft the full code text for Legal Department review, or to provide policy content and recommendations that Legal will put into code language? Is there a required code format or template?

A44: See A9. The Legal Department would provide the code template and/or format guidance.

Q45: Code Committee timing. How often does the Code Committee meet, and roughly how long does the Tribe's code development and approval process usually take? We want to build a realistic schedule around it.

A45: See A12. The timeframe for development and approval varies widely. Only one presentation to the Code Committee is expected.

Q46: Task 9 clarification. Task 9 (Final Code) says the contractor shall "provide a final CEMP... for presentation to the Code Committee." Can you confirm this should say "final Emergency Management Code"?

A46: Yes. See A11.

Q47: Revision limits. Task 8 requires at least one substantive review cycle, and Section 10 sets a two-round limit on substantive revisions. Should proposers price two rounds of substantive revisions for both the Code and the CEMP? Would revisions beyond two rounds be handled by contract amendment?

A47: Proposing two rounds of revisions for each product would be advisable. Yes, further rounds would be handled through contract amendment.

Q48: Termination after first presentation. Section 10 says the contract may be terminated after the first presentation to the Code Committee or Tribal Council. In that case, will the contractor be paid for all work and deliverables completed up to termination? Does the Tribe prefer payment by deliverable/milestone or monthly invoicing based on percent complete?

A48: See A22.

Q49: In-person expectations. Of the meetings listed in Section 10, which does the Tribe expect to be held in person (for example, kickoff, planning workshops, the draft review workshop, and the Tribal Council and Code Committee presentations)? Is the Tribe open to holding stakeholder interviews and routine project meetings virtually to reduce travel costs?

A49: See A18.

Q50: Insurance. What types and minimum coverage limits of insurance will the Tribe require (for example, general liability, professional liability, auto, and workers' compensation)?

A50: See A26.

Q51: Subconsultants. May proposers use subconsultants or teaming partners? If so, should their qualifications, references, W-9s, and insurance certificates be included in the proposal?

A51: Yes, subconsultants or team partners are acceptable. If a team of multiple consultants is used, one consultant must be listed as the prime for invoicing purposes. The prime consultant would be responsible for insurance and W-9s, but qualifications and references would be required for each team member.

Q52: Structure and page limits. Sections 13 and 18 each list proposal content in a different order. Which structure should proposers follow? Are there page limits or formatting requirements?

Q52: See A1.

A53: Fee schedule and security controls. Section 18 refers to fee review/adjustment frequency and to proposers' "security controls." For a not-to-exceed, task-based planning contract, should proposers address these items? If so, what information about security controls is the Tribe looking for (for example, handling of sensitive or confidential Tribal information)?

A54: See A15.

Q54: Q&A distribution. Will answers to submitted questions be issued to all proposers as an addendum, and on approximately what date?

A54: See A31.

Q55: Which entities and facilities should the CEMP cover: Tribal government departments and programs only, or also the Economic Authority and ilani (as a covered entity or as an interface partner)? Which off-Reservation Tribal facilities (Vancouver to Tukwila) should proposers plan to include, and should the CEMP address assistance to Tribal members affected by disasters off Tribal lands?

Q55: See A3.

Q56: Please describe the Code Committee process for a new code title: the expected number of readings or meetings, how often the Committee meets, and whether Tribal Council adoption follows Code Committee approval. Will the Legal Department or the consultant prepare the final code language?

A56: See A12, A44, A45. The expected number of presentations to the Code Committee and to Tribal Council is once, each. The Code Committee is made up of members of Tribal Council. Potentially only one presentation to Code Committee may be needed for Code approval. If Code has not been approved to send to Tribal Council for approval after one presentation to the Code Committee, then the contract manager may take it from there, or add a contract amendment for consultant revisions to the Code and further presentations to the Code Committee and/or Tribal Council.

Q57: What are the expected completion dates for the Continuity Plan and for the Tribe's portion of the Clark County Hazard Mitigation Plan update?

A57: See A14, A36

A58: Does the Section 10 two-round limit for substantive revisions apply separately to the Code and the CEMP, and do Code Committee or Tribal Council comments count toward it?

A58: Yes, separate revision counts for each product. Yes, comments back from the presentations to those bodies and the revision that follows would count as a revision.

A59: If the contract ends after the first presentation of draft deliverables under Section 10, will work completed and accepted to that point be compensated in full?

A60: See A22.

Q60: Which of the Section 10 meetings does the Tribe expect to hold in person?

A60: See A18.

Q61: What insurance coverage types and minimum limits are required for the Section 18.F certificate?

A61: See A26.

Q62: Is the Tribe's standard professional services agreement available for review before submission?

A62: See A25.

Q63: Is there an established budget or funding source for this project (for example, an EMPG or THSGP award), and do any federal grant flow-down requirements apply?

A64: See A21,

Q54: What review period should proposers assume for each draft deliverable?

A54: A two week review period can be used as a standard assumption.

Q55: Is a Tribal business license or other registration required before award?

A55: See Q2.

Q56: Hazard and Risk Review: The RFP indicates that the Tribe will begin participating in the Clark County multi-jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan update in fall 2026 and directs the consultant not to duplicate existing risk assessments. Please clarify whether the Tribe expects the CEMP project to conduct a substantive hazard/risk assessment, or primarily review and incorporate existing and concurrently developed hazard information. If the Clark County HMP is not sufficiently developed during the CEMP project, what level of independent hazard analysis should proposers assume?

A56: See A7,

Q57: Proposal Format: Is there a maximum page count, font size, file size, or other formatting requirement for the proposal or its attachments? Are resumes and supporting project descriptions included in the page limit?

A57: See A30.

Q58: Reporting requirements: Are there any specific reporting requirements associated with this project, including reporting to Tribal leadership or requirements related to grants or other funding sources?

A58: There are no specific reporting requirements other than a summary of work completed in each monthly invoice, to the contract manager. The contract manager is the grant manager and will complete grant reports.

Q59: Existing materials (Section 4, p. 4; Tasks 1–3, pp. 5–6). Can the Tribe share, now or under the NDA in Section 17.B, any Tribe-specific materials from the University of Washington Emergency Management Code project beyond the published report, the Continuity Plan in development, the Tribe’s inputs to the Clark County Hazard Mitigation Plan update, and any existing hazard or risk information? These materials would help proposers scope the work to incorporate or cross-reference existing information without duplicating it. Please also confirm whether the public University of Washington ResearchWorks item contains the complete project materials or whether additional materials will be provided.

A59: See A10, A13, A36, A14.

A60: Code development role and final deliverable (Section 4, p. 4; Task 4, p. 6; Task 9, p. 11). Task 4 states that the contractor “shall develop a draft code,” and Section 4 states that Code development follows the Tribe’s Code development process with Legal Department support. Is the contractor expected to draft the Emergency Management Code language for Legal Department review, including any legal drafting, or provide technical emergency management content and review, edit, and incorporate language drafted by the Tribe’s Legal Department? Also, Task 9 is titled “Final Code” but refers to providing “a final CEMP” for presentation to the Code Committee. Please confirm that Task 9 covers the final Emergency Management Code only.

A61: See A9, A11.

Q61: Hazards, risk assessment availability, and annexes (Task 3, p. 6; Task 5.C, p. 9; Section 15, pp. 16–17). With the Tribe’s Hazard Mitigation Plan update beginning in fall 2026, does the Tribe have a preferred priority list of hazards, or should the contractor derive it from the Clark County HMP and regional assessments? Will the updated Clark County HMP risk assessment and relevant Tribal inputs be available during the Task 3 timeframe? If not, what interim information should proposers assume will be available? How many hazard-specific annexes should the base price include, with additional annexes priced as optional services?

A61: See A7, A14. The number of hazard-specific annexes that the base price vs. optional services may include is up to the bidder.

Q62: Continuity (Section 4, p. 4; Task 4, p. 6; Task 5.A, p. 8). Continuity of government appears in both the Code and the CEMP, and the Tribe is developing a separate Continuity Plan. How should the CEMP address continuity so that it complements that plan and avoids duplicating its content?

A62: See A13, 36. The CEMP should not duplicate, but should complement the Continuity Plan base plan and proposed appendices by coordinating plan scope and outline with the contract manager.

Q63: Meetings and travel (Section 10, p. 14). For the kickoff, stakeholder interviews, planning workshops, review meetings, and Tribal Council and Code Committee presentations, which activities does the Tribe expect to be conducted in person, and which

may be conducted virtually? Please confirm whether virtual workshops are acceptable and how many on-site visits proposers should budget.

A63: See A18.

Q64: Review cycles and termination (Task 8, p. 11; Section 10, p. 14). Task 8 requires at least one substantive review cycle in the proposed price, while Section 10 establishes a two-round limit on substantive revisions. Should the base price include one round or two? If the contract is terminated after the first presentation of draft deliverables, will the contractor be paid for work satisfactorily completed through that point?

A64: See A47.

Q65: Grant reporting (Section 8, p. 13). Please identify any grant reporting responsibilities assigned to the contractor, such as Emergency Management Performance Grant performance metrics, including required content and reporting frequency, so that these activities can be priced. Please confirm whether responsibility for grant match and grant financial administration will remain with Tribal Finance.

A65: See A21, A58.

Q66: Pricing format (Section 14, p. 16; Section 18.C, p. 19). Section 14 requests a not-to-exceed cost proposal organized by task, while Section 18.C requests an itemized fee schedule identifying how long fixed fees apply and how frequently fees may be adjusted. Will an itemized, not-to-exceed cost proposal by task, with pricing fixed for the contract term, satisfy both requirements?

A66: Yes, this approach is acceptable.

Q67: Tribal preference (Section 19, pp. 20–21). What documentation does the Tribe require to establish eligibility under Procurement Code §3-208, including documentation of applicable ownership percentages and Tribal affiliation? Must this documentation be submitted with the proposal or at award? When a proposed team includes subcontractors, is preference determined solely by the ownership of the prime proposer?

A67: The preference is based on ownership of the prime proposal.

1. Documentation - Signed Tribal Preference Certification -Legal business name, preference category claimed, each owner's name, Tribal Affiliation, ownership percentage.
2. Proof of Tribal Enrollment-Toward preference- Tribal Enrollment Card, or an official enrollment verification letter for each owner whose ownership is counted.
3. Proof of Ownership percentages (records identifying all owners' percentages)-LLC operating agreement and current member schedule - Sole Proprietor should provide business registration identifying the owner.
4. Current Business Registration-Business License and/or registrations

Q68: Insurance (Section 18.F, p. 19). What insurance types and minimum coverage limits are required? Must the Tribe be named as an additional insured at proposal submission, and what documentation of that status must accompany the insurance certificate?

A68: See A26. The Tribe would need to be named as a certificate holder.

Q69: Proposal format, submission, and contract terms (Section 1, p. 2; Section 17.G, p. 18; Section 18, pp. 18–19). Should the proposal, W-9, insurance certificate, references, and proposed contract terms be submitted as one combined PDF or separate attachments? Are there page limits, font requirements, email file-size limits, or a preferred proposal structure beyond Section 18? Will the Tribe provide its own contract form so that a proposer accepting the Tribe's terms may affirm that acceptance instead of attaching its own terms?

A69: See A25, A30.

Q70: Electronic edition (Tasks 9–10, p. 11; Section 18, p. 18). Beyond the required editable Word and PDF files, may proposers offer an electronic rapid-reference edition of the plan? If so, what IT, security, hosting, or accessibility requirements, including any Section 508 or WCAG requirements, must it meet? Must Tribal staff be able to maintain the electronic edition independently of the vendor?

A70: The proposer may offer an electronic edition, but the Tribe must be able to maintain this independently of the vendor.

Q71: Facility-level scope and Economic Authority operations (Section 3, p. 3; Task 5.A, p. 7). Should the CEMP include facility-level emergency procedures for ilani and other Cowlitz Tribal Economic Authority operations, or is the scope limited to Tribal government facilities and services? If Economic Authority operations are included, please clarify whether the contractor is expected to develop facility-specific procedures or establish coordination and cross-references to existing facility plans.

A71: See A3, A35.

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 1