



Addendum

**RFP LCLGRP 03-25 Eastern Hemlock Assessment for the Lake George Watershed
RFP Questions and Answers
July 21, 2025**

-
- 1. Is there an existing or preferred model that the LCLGRP would like consultants to use for this assessment, or is the assumption that the consultant will create an existing model or use their own? If there is a preferred model, could you please provide that information?**
 - a. There is no preferred existing model. Consultants may propose their own model or utilize existing tools, with the understanding that the approach must be accessible, replicable, and useful for communicating with the public and landowners.
 - 2. Which environmental response variables are to be modeled?**
 - a. Environmental response variables should focus on water quality impacts, including but not limited to sedimentation, erosion, stream temperatures, and aquatic habitat changes resulting from Eastern hemlock decline or loss.
 - 3. Project Extent: Are there already known, specific priority areas within the Lake George Watershed that the LCLGRP would like the consultant to focus on for assessment and management planning?**
 - a. Yes, the Lake George Hemlock Coalition has mapped and prioritized hemlock stands and known HWA infestations in the watershed. The consultant will use this data to guide and confirm assessment priorities.
 - 4. Landowner Selection: Who will select the landowner for the demo plan, and when?**
 - a. The selected consultant and LCLGRP will collaborate to select the landowner. The current timeline suggests this occur April – August 2026, but this can be adjusted if needed.
 - 5. Modeling Tools: Are there preferred hydrologic or ecological models from LCBP we must use or align with?**
 - a. No. There are no model requirements from LCBP. All modeling and data collection must be outlined in the QAPP and approved by LCBP before any work can begin.
-

- 6. Partners: Are there any existing partners, agencies, or organizations already involved in or expected to contribute to the Eastern Hemlock Assessment project (e.g., land managers, academic researchers, conservation groups)? Understanding the collaborative landscape would help inform our approach to coordination, data sharing, and outreach.**
- a. Existing partners include the membership of the Lake George Hemlock Coalition, which includes NYSDEC, NYSHI, Lake George Land Conservancy, Lake George Association, LCLGRPB, Washington and Warren County Soil and Water Conservation Districts, and others.
- 7. Data Access: Will we have access to any proprietary data from the Lake George Hemlock Coalition?**
- a. Yes, the GIS and other relevant data from the Coalition will be shared with the selected consultant.
- 8. Interactive Map Hosting: Are there specific platforms or hosting limitations/preferences for the final interactive map?**
- a. No. There are no restrictions. Consultants may propose the most appropriate platform.
- 9. Public Outreach: Is any direct public engagement (e.g., webinars, landowner meetings) expected or required?**
- a. Yes. Consultant participation may be required in landowner meetings as part of the Landowner Outreach Component.
- 10. Budget Expectations: Are there any anticipated budget constraints or guidance beyond the itemized format?**
- a. The total consultant budget for this project is \$60,000. Proposals should include itemized budgets aligned with the scope.
- 11. Regarding Section 4, item 2: Will LCLGRPB or the Coalition provide access to existing GIS datasets or maps (e.g., canopy coverage or known HWA infestations)? If so, in what formats and platforms will these be made available?**
- a. Yes. GIS data will be provided in ArcGIS Shapefile format or another mutually agreed upon format.
- 12. Is there a recommended platform for providing the interactive map? Would Esri ArcGIS Online be sufficient for this request?**
- a. Yes, Esri ArcGIS Online is acceptable.
- 13. Does the scenario modelling tool need to be in a particular format? Would a spreadsheet tool be allowed?**
- a. This is up to the consultant. LCLGRPB preference is a format that is easily understood and explained to the public.

14. What are the specific requirements (parameters) for the scenario modeling tool? Have those been identified or will these be selected after the project award?

- a. The task narrative is as follows: “Building on the mapping and analysis that has already been conducted, LCLGRPB will work with the consultant to complete a scenario modeling tool for various levels of species loss. This will help land managers communicate with the public about the devastating impacts that loss of the Eastern hemlock may have on the watershed if not addressed in an appropriate and timely manner.”
- b. We are looking specifically at impacts to water quality -sedimentation, erosion, warming temperatures, aquatic species impacts, etc.

15. Has a remote sensing assessment of all Hemlock locations been completed previously? Should our responses include new Hemlock location maps from high-resolution imagery?

- a. A remote sensing assessment of the watershed has been conducted; this information will be available. Updates and refinement of that assessment should be considered.

16. Would imagery-based Hemlock change detection be applicable for this project?

- a. Yes

17. Is there a project budget, and can that be shared?

- a. The total project budget is \$60,000

18. What is the anticipated timeline for the development and approval of the QAPP? Are there any milestones or deadlines associated with this deliverable?

- a. The QAPP should be completed and approved by LCBP by December 31, 2025. The QAPP outline is available on the Lake Champlain Basin Program’s website: <https://www.lcbp.org/about-us/grants-rfps/grant-toolkit/qapp/>. The selected consultant will work with LCLGRPB and the LCBP Project Manager to complete this task.

19. Will access be provided to existing datasets, research, and mapping resources? If so, what format will these resources be in, and are there any restrictions on their use?

- a. Yes. These will be shared in ArcGIS-compatible formats. There are no major restrictions on use within the project scope.

20. Are there specific sources or datasets that the consultant is required to use for hemlock mortality modeling and HWA presence information?

- a. No, there are no requirements here. Consultants may use best-available and relevant data.

21. What level of field-based mapping is anticipated? Should the consultant plan for extensive fieldwork, or is this expected to be supplemental to existing data?

- a. Fieldwork should be used to supplement existing data. The level of effort is at the consultant's discretion based on their proposed methodology.

22. Are there specific modeling tools or software that the consultant is expected to use for the scenario modeling?

- a. No. The selection of appropriate tools is up to the consultant.

23. Will the scenario models need to be updated or revised based on feedback from stakeholders or LCLGRP?

- a. Yes, stakeholder input may necessitate revisions to ensure usability and effectiveness.

24. Concerning the level of detail expected in the management plan guidance for landowners- should it include cost estimates, implementation timelines, or other specifics?

- a. The purpose of the landowner guide is to outline alternatives for HWA management. This should include options for treatment, methods for controlled loss of Eastern hemlocks, native species restoration and replacement plantings, and benefits and challenges associated with the various options. The consultant may use their discretion on the other aspects of the guide.
- b. Additionally, this guidance will be tailored for one specific landowner based on site conditions.

25. Is there a platform or technology preferred for the interactive mapping tool?

- a. No preference. Flexibility is encouraged.

26. What level of public accessibility is required for the mapping tool?

- a. The final map should be accessible to a general audience and support public communication objectives.

27. Will the consultant be responsible for maintaining or updating the mapping tool after the project is completed?

- a. No. Ongoing maintenance is not part of the project scope.

28. What is the anticipated timeline for the overall project? Are there specific deadlines for interim deliverables?

- a. The QAPP is due by December 31, 2025. Project tasks will begin following QAPP approval and are expected to be completed by late 2026. A more detailed schedule will be finalized with the selected consultant.

29. How will progress be monitored and evaluated, and will there be regular check-ins or progress reports required?

- a. Yes. Regular check-ins and progress reporting will be required, including quarterly updates and coordination meetings. The consultant will be asked to attend periodic Lake George Hemlock Coalition meetings either in person or by Zoom.

30. What is the allocated budget for this project?

- a. \$60,000 is allocated for the consultant's work.

31. Will there be an opportunity for shortlisted firms to present their proposals or clarify their approach in an interview?

- a. This may occur at LCLGRP's discretion. Proposers will be contacted if an interview is requested.

32. Are there any known challenges or risks associated with this project that the consultant should be aware of?

- a. No.

33. Will the selected consultant be required to submit quarterly financial reports detailing project progress, deliverables, and milestones to comply with the LCBP awarded grant for this Project?

- a. LCLGRP will be responsible for creating and submitting these reports. The consultant will be asked for quarterly updates to provide information for the reports.

34. Does LCLGRP have a specific outcome or data need or "research question" in mind for the modeling?

- a. The key focus is on modeling the impact of hemlock loss on watershed health and water quality.

35. Are there particular aspects of water quality envisioned by LCLG? (sediment load, nutrient inputs, temperature?)

- a. Yes: sediment load, stream temperature, erosion, and aquatic species habitat are primary concerns.

36. Is the modeling deliverable intended to be for Lake George itself? Or inclusive of tributary streams and rivers?

- a. Yes: sediment load, stream temperature, erosion, and aquatic species habitat are primary concerns.

37. Is there a specific model/program and/or set of data inputs that have been contemplated by LCLGRP that can be described?

- a. No specific model or dataset has been predetermined. Consultants may propose the most suitable approach.

- 38. Can LCLGRPБ confirm that the modeling is intended to be water quality (and not forest/terrestrial-based) modeling? Is there the expectation that modeling would include both forest stand conditions and water quality outcomes?**
- a. Yes, modeling is intended to be water quality based. Forest conditions should be considered in relation to their influence on water quality outcomes.
- 39. Is there a particular timeframe being contemplated for the modeling? For example a 10-year, 20-year, or 30-year future?**
- a. A 10–20-year model is preferred but may be adjusted based on the proposed approach and data availability.
- 40. Does LCLGRPБ anticipate that fieldwork is necessary to satisfy the scope of work? Or is the fieldwork considered by LCLGRPБ to be more of an optional component depending on the particular scope of a contractor?**
- a. Fieldwork is optional and should be proposed as needed to meet the project goals.
- 41. Can LCLGRPБ confirm that the scope of work does not include maintenance, additions, or further assistance after the initial development of the interactive mapping tool?**
- a. There is no ongoing maintenance. The consultant is responsible for initial development and delivery only.
- 42. Does LCLGRPБ have a preference for proposals to submit proposed costs as a lump sum or as Time & Materials?**
- a. Please submit costs as lump sum per task.
- 43. Can LCLGRPБ confirm the maximum total contract value, and whether that value is inclusive of reimbursable expenses (for example, travel expenses for fieldwork)?**
- a. The total contract value is \$60,000, inclusive of all reimbursable expenses.