



NFWF

Questions and Answers about the June 2, 2022 Request for Quotations: Improvements to NFWF's Conservation Grant Jobs Calculator

June 17, 2022

NFWF accepted questions about the RFQ in writing through June 13, 2022. All questions and answers have been posted on NFWF's [website](#) so that all offerors have access to them at the same time. Similar questions have been combined.

1. What is the desired budget range for this project?

We cannot share information about the budget for this project. The proposed cost should be adequate for the level of effort necessary for incorporating the updates to the jobs calculator as specified in the RFQ. The final scope and budget for the contract will be negotiated between NFWF and the selected Offeror.

2. Are there any limits on the hourly rates we can use in the budget?

No, there are no limits on hourly rates that may be used. The final scope and budget for the project will be negotiated between NFWF and the selected Offeror.

3. Is it okay to use multiplier data to develop the tool, as long as the objectives of Task 3 are met?

Offerors are encouraged to propose methods they deem appropriate and defensible. Methods may include replicating all or parts of the existing methodology (including the use of multipliers) and/or updating, enhancing or replacing all or part of the existing methods. See the [Jobs Calculator Technical Memo](#) on NFWF's website for more information about the existing methods.

4. Would the contractor have access to the IMPLAN data used in the previous tool or would they need to purchase new data?

Offerors should assume that they will need to have their own access to IMPLAN data to successfully complete the scope of work or they should describe in their proposed technical approach an alternative methodology for accessing up-to-date jobs data.

5. Is it NFWF's experience that there is a major regional variation in job creation, or is that an assumption?

Based on variations in prevailing wages, NFWF anticipates that job creation numbers may vary by region, as well as by the type of restoration activity supported by NFWF grants, among other factors. The Offeror’s proposed methodology should include a discussion of how to estimate variation, if any, in job creation benefits based upon geographic region and/or restoration activities supported.

6. What is the smallest geographic unit of analysis NFWF is looking for (e.g. state or county level)?

NFWF anticipates a geographic unit of analysis smaller than a state level (e.g., county, metropolitan statistical area) but defers to the Offeror to describe the geographic level of analysis that they would recommend for successfully and cost-effectively completing the scope of work called for in the RFQ.

7. Could NFWF share an example output of the data on NFWF grant projects?

The following is a general example. Details that identify the specific project have been removed.

Grantee Organization:	Resource Conservation District
Project:	Off-Channel Creek Habitat Restoration
Award Amount:	\$75,000
Matching Funds:	\$40,000
Location:	California
Supply Chain and Budget Breakdown:	RCD Staff plus Indirect Costs = \$31,227 (7 staff members worked on this project—Project Manager, 2 Project Coordinators, Field Technician, Technical Writer, CEQA/Permit Developer, and Bookkeeper)
	Subcontract for Construction, Environmental Compliance and Habitat Construction Services = \$28,473
	Subcontract for Project Engineer = \$11,600
	Mileage = \$563
	Permit Fees and Insurance = \$3,118