

## **CLARK COUNTY**

## RFP #924 AGRICULTURAL LANDS STUDY QUESTIONS and ANSWERS

**UPDATED: MAY 20, 2025** 

	QUESTION	ANSWER
1.	Section IA . 4 Funding states "Allocation of funds for this RFP will be discussed and negotiated with the most qualified firm identified during the evaluation process."  Is there a range or do not exceed that could be shared at this time?	No, we intend on allocating the funds required after the contract has been negotiated with the top-qualified firm.
2.	What is the county's vision for the outcomes of the study? Is this a study that feeds into a rezoning/designation process, or will the consultant expected to make designation recommendations?	The study will help determine the extent of agricultural resource land in the county and will inform Council decision on proposed UGA boundary expansions.
3.	What has been done to inform the community so far about the study and its desired outcomes?	The study has been discussed at public meetings as a necessary requirement to consider conservation of agricultural resource lands in Clark County and certain UGA boundary expansions.
4.	Beyond the two public meetings and focus sessions described in the RPF are other outreach strategies expected?	These are the minimum required.
5.	Will the county consider engagement formats other than public meetings (e.g., ArcGIS Online comment tools)?	The county is open to other engagement formats.
6.	To what extent does the county expect the methodology to follow the 1994 study?	The county is open to any approach that is consistent with the agricultural resource designation requirements per the WAC criteria.
7.	If designation recommendations are needed:  - What level of documentation is expected for each parcel and how will the county determine which parcels are candidates for plan designation/zone change?  - Will parcel-by-parcel justification required?  - How many properties are likely to be considered for plan designation/zone change?	<ul> <li>The analysis of land should dictate whether certain land meets the designation criteria.</li> <li>Parcel by parcel justification would seem contrary to the WAC guidelines.</li> <li>The number of properties will depend on the outcome of the analysis.</li> </ul>
8.	In item 3 "Scope of Project" it states that "Mapping shall be prepared to present recommendations of each	The study should be looking at all lands outside of the Urban Growth Areas to determine whether

From: Priscilla Mason Purchasing Agent of Record

	resource land type to be designated," and the background study provided as Exhibit A with the RFP documents details prior work on forest and mineral lands as well as agricultural lands. Does this imply that the study is also to include other non-agricultural resource lands, or is the study to focus strictly on agricultural resource lands?	those lands meet the agricultural resource designation criteria.
9.	The Scope of Project notes at least two public meetings will be required as part of the public outreach, while Item 3 in Section IB includes "A final report (due September 1) presented to the County Council at a public meeting on September 3, 2025." Is the expectation that the final presentation is in addition to two public outreach meetings, or would it be considered one of the two minimum required public meetings?	The final presentation would be considered in addition to the two public outreach meetings.
10.	The Scope of Project notes a requirement for a minimum of four interviews with different stakeholders, and then lists four types of agriculture resource constituents. Does the County have a list of stakeholders with contact information that they would like to engage?	Not at this time.
11.	The background study in Exhibit A includes a list of ten indicators in addition to soil quality that were considered in that study. Has the County identified any such indicators or other factors that should be included in or excluded from the analysis?	The indicators were consistent with the WAC criteria. The county has not identified any additional indicators that should be considered.
12.	Similarly, does the County expect or prefer that we follow the same delineation methodology as used in the prior study for consistency, or are you open to or looking for new approaches?	See response to question #6 above.