

**Addendum #1
To
RFQQ 2013 – 83
Multi-Scale Soundwide Pressure Assessment**

**Questions & Answers from the Pre-Proposal Conference Call
July 1, 2013 2:00 pm to 2:33 pm**

Attendees: Elizabeth McManus – Ross Strategic
Jim Keany – ESA Adolfson
Margaret Clancy – ESA Adolfson
Sarah Brandt – EnviroIssues
Terry Hosaka – Cooper Zeitz Engineers, Inc.
William Taylor – Taylor Aquatic Science and Policy
Paul Schlenger – Confluence Environmental Company
Scott White – Confluence Environmental Company
Charlie Wisdom -- ENVIRON
Jennie Shaw – SWCA Environmental Consultants

Questions and Answers:

Question: To what extent does PSP anticipate relying on other primary data sources (vs. expert elicitation) to inform the outcomes of the assessment and, once those sources are identified, who would do the research/evaluation needed to bring them into the assessment process.

Answer: This assessment will primarily be conducted by eliciting expert opinions about the influence of pressures on specified endpoints. Task 1 refers to “primary data sources, in addition to expert opinion” based on the concept that the expert elicitation will be guided by documentation made available to the experts. This part of task 1 would identify the primary data sources to be included in the documentation. In Task 2, the contractor will include (or refer to) primary data sources in the compiled documentation.

Question: To what extent has the methodology for the assessment process been reviewed / communicated regionally and what amount of support (or opposition) is there?

Answer: The methodology is being developed by a sub-group of the Partnership's Science Panel. The full Science Panel has been apprised at meetings in 2012 and 2013 about the approach under development. Science Panel members who are not among the authors of the methodology will review the methodology to ensure that it is appropriate to deliver results as intended.

Partnership staff and the Science Panel have kept other Partnership boards (i.e., Leadership Council, Ecosystem Coordination Board) informed about the project but these groups have not been consulted about the methodology.

Based on the Partnership's prior use of expert elicitation approaches, we understand that there may be some resistance to this type of approach among experts. We are hopeful that attention to survey design (tasks 1 and 2) and organization of experts (task 3) and the incorporation to workshops (with real-time processing of expert opinions within the workshops) to complement surveys will alleviate some of the concerns that some have expressed about expert elicitation processes.

Question: Has the methodology been through ECB review?

Answer: The Partnership's Science Panel views development of the methodology as a technical endeavor to identify the best available, credible assessment approach. As mentioned above, the Partnership's ECB has not been consulted about the specifics of the project approach.

Question: Is the PSP Science staff and Science Panel anticipating an active role in the technical component of developing specific elements of the assessment?

Answer: Yes. PSP Science staff will engage in each task and will participate, with members of the Science Panel, in:

- Task 1 workshops and discussions about how to apply the methodology.
- Task 2 discussions of survey and data system design.
- Task 3 identification of and preliminary discussion with experts.
- Task 4 workshops.
- Task 5 review of client draft report.
- Task 6 review of draft report.
- Task 6 discussions of approaches to responding to reviewers' comments.

Question: Will reference materials from the Science Panel, e.g., delineation of pressures [Stiles et al.] and pressure assessment methodology, be made available during the proposal preparation period?

Answer: Yes. Methodology "core materials" (Labiosa et al. 2013) and the Partnership's pressure taxonomy (Stiles et al. 2013) are included as addendum 2 to the RFQQ.

Question: Do you anticipate analysis and mapping using GIS for spatial interpretations of assessment results?

Answer: No, not as part of this contract. The contractor will not be expected to develop maps of pressures, endpoints, or assessment results as part of this project. This type of work may occur in a 2nd phase of pressure assessment.

Question: How involved in the identification of experts does the PSP Science staff and Science Panel expect to be?

Answer: PSP Science staff and select members of the Science Panel will work with the contractor to identify and recruit participation of experts. PSP Science staff may provide a “straw man” list of possible experts. Prior experience with and ability to engage Puget Sound experts will be a key facet of the contractor’s qualifications to conduct Task 3, but the contractor will receive support from the PSP Science staff and the Science Panel members.

Question: What is a target number of experts that will provide input to the assessment?

Answer: No target has yet been established. We envision needing participation by enough experts to ensure that each pressure-endpoint combination is assessed by multiple experts, but would recognize that the project will require a balance between sufficient coverage/expertise and maintaining a workable-sized group of experts (especially for workshops and other after-survey activities.) We anticipate that an important collaboration among the contractor, PSP Science staff, and Science Panel members in tasks 1, 2, and 3 will develop the answer to this question.

Question: How many reviewers of the draft report are expected, and how will reviewers be identified?

Answer: The client drafts will be reviewed by 2 to 4 people, PSP Science staff and Science Panel members, who have been engaged in the project. One or more Science Panel members will oversee the review of the draft reports. We envision that draft reports will be reviewed by 3 to 5 individuals and the Science Panel member will deliver compiled comments from all reviewers.

Question: Is it expected that experts will be paid for their time and, if so, will that payment be contracted through the consultant?

Answer: No. We anticipate that experts will be recruited to participate in the assessment with no payment or compensation for their time.

Question: Does PSP have a list of background data sources in mind that are to be addressed in the project at a minimum?

Answer: No. We envision that data sources included or referred to in the documentation will help to reduce ambiguities in the assessment, but have not contemplated a minimum number or minimum set of source materials. Source materials that may be referenced in the survey documentation include the series of reports on Valued Ecosystem Components developed by the Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Program (PSNERP).

Question: Will cultural and economic endpoints be addressed in the assessment?

Answer: The extent to which the assessment will address cultural and economic endpoints will be determined in Task 1 of the contract. Some of the endpoints discussed in the “core materials” (Addendum 2 to the RFQQ) have cultural and/or economic values but the core materials do not specify if or how impacts to cultural and economic values might be assessed. This issue will be discussed and clarified in Task 1 (or, if necessary, in contract negotiations).

.....