

RFP 2026-06

Thank you for your questions regarding the LCWC Strategic Planning RFP. Responses are provided below.

1. Budget allocation: Is the \$100,000 intended to cover all five tasks roughly equally, or does PlanRVA have a preferred allocation between capacity assessment and strategic plan development phases?

PlanRVA does not have a prescribed allocation of the \$100,000 budget across the five tasks. Proposers are encouraged to recommend a budget structure they believe is appropriate to successfully complete the scope of work. That said, we anticipate that Tasks 1–3, which focus on organizational assessment, engagement, and facilitation, will likely require a substantial level of effort to support the development of a strong and implementable strategic plan under Tasks 4–5.

2. Tribal engagement: Has PlanRVA already established a consultation relationship with the relevant Tribal representatives, or is the consultant expected to initiate and build that relationship? Are there specific protocols or Nation contacts we should be aware of?

PlanRVA and LCWC partner organizations have existing working relationships with the participating Tribal Nations through the Lower Chickahominy Watershed Collaborative framework and associated Memorandum of Understanding. The consultant will not be expected to independently initiate Tribal relationships from scratch. However, the consultant should be prepared to engage respectfully and collaboratively with Tribal representatives as part of the planning process and facilitation activities.

Coordination with Tribal representatives will be facilitated by PlanRVA staff. Any engagement protocols or points of contact necessary for project implementation will be communicated to the selected consultant following award.

3. In-person requirements: How many in-person facilitated sessions are anticipated and are there minimum attendance expectations for key personnel at those sessions?

The exact number of in-person facilitated sessions is not prescribed, and proposers may recommend an approach they believe is appropriate to accomplish the project objectives.

There are no formal minimum attendance requirements for key personnel specified in the RFP. However, firms should demonstrate that proposed project leads and facilitators will be sufficiently available and engaged throughout the project duration to ensure continuity and effective relationship-building with LCWC partners.

In-person sessions may be limited based on Tribal and Local staff capacity, so in-person meeting planning should consider local staff capacity and meeting impact.

4. Accessibility of Firm and Key Personnel: For the Accessibility of Firm and Key Personnel criterion (20%), how will the evaluation committee assess firms not located in the Richmond region? Specifically, what commitments or demonstrated capacity would allow a non-local firm to score competitively on this criterion?

The evaluation committee will consider the proposer's demonstrated ability to maintain responsive communication, consistent engagement, and reliable participation throughout the project.

Non-local firms may score competitively by clearly describing:

- Availability and responsiveness of project leadership;
- Proposed communication and coordination approach;
- Capacity to attend in-person meetings as needed;
- Familiarity with regional, Tribal, watershed, or collaborative planning contexts; and
- Strategies for maintaining strong working relationships with LCWC partners over the course of the project.

5. LCWC partner count and composition: How many partner organizations comprise the LCWC, and what is the mix of entity types (local government, nonprofits, state agencies, federal)?

Signatories of the LCWC MOU are:

- Three Tribal Nations;
- Three local governments;
- Two Planning District Commissions.

Additionally, members who participate in regular workgroup meetings include

- Multiple nonprofit organizations;
- State agency partners;
- Federal agency partners; and
- Additional technical and institutional stakeholders as appropriate to project activities.

In total, LCWC membership currently stands at 50 staff of these organizations.

The collaborative structure includes both Steering Committee and workgroup participation, and overall participation levels may vary depending on meeting topic and project phase. Meeting numbers generally range from 5-15 participants.

6. Existing documents: Will the full MOU, prior plans, and grant narrative be made available to shortlisted firms before proposal submission, or only post-award?

The Memorandum of Understanding establishing the LCWC may be found on page 32 of the LCWC Priorities Action Plan at the following link: planrva.org/wp-content/uploads/Lower-Chickahominy-Watershed-Priorities-Implementation-Plan.pdf. Additional background materials, including prior planning documents, grant materials, and relevant collaborative resources can be provided upon request.

Currently, PlanRVA does not anticipate issuing a formal shortlist process prior to proposal submission.

7. Would you please share more about the desired timeframe for the engagement? Is an immediate start date hoped for on June 9th, 2026, wrapping up nine months later, or is beginning the engagement in late summer 2026 a possibility?

Regarding the project timeline - we would like to begin working with the contractor on project planning in June, and would like to ideally begin engagement work with the contractor before the end of July.

Additional questions – 5/15/2026

1. How many documents should we anticipate reviewing as part of the Framework Assessment, and will PlanRVA provide a document inventory?

At this time, PlanRVA does not have a finalized document inventory prepared for the selected consultant. However, we anticipate providing a focused set of foundational materials related to the LCWC's formation, governance, prior planning efforts, grant deliverables, and workgroup activities. The volume of materials is expected to be manageable (5-10 plans, agreements, task tracking spreadsheets) and targeted toward supporting organizational and strategic assessment tasks.

Relevant background documents will be organized and shared during project initiation.

2. Can PlanRVA share any expectations around the format or length of the Capacity Assessment Memorandum?

PlanRVA does not have a prescribed format or page length for the Capacity Assessment Memorandum. We are primarily seeking a clear, actionable assessment that identifies organizational strengths, challenges, opportunities, and recommendations to inform strategic planning efforts.

Proposers are encouraged to recommend a format and level of detail they believe is appropriate based on their proposed methodology and facilitation approach.

3. Section 1.6 states the initial period of performance is nine months, but the cover page states the contract runs through September 2026. Can you please clarify the intended period of performance?

The reference to a nine-month period of performance in Section 1.6 was a typographical error. A corrected version of the RFP is being posted reflecting the intended contract period of performance through March 2027.

4. Are the three LCWC workgroups established in 2022 still active and meeting, and is the Steering Committee still structured as described in the 2022 Watershed Priorities Implementation Plan?

The LCWC workgroups remain active, with quarterly meetings and regular communication. The Steering Committee structure remains the same as well.

The selected consultant will have the opportunity to assess current organizational dynamics and recommend refinements as part of the strategic planning process.