

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)  
CONSULTANT SERVICES FOR REVIEW OF  
PENNSYLVANIA GAME COMMISSION DEER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM**

**General Overview:** The Pennsylvania Game Commission (PGC) deer management program is designed to meet the goals of healthy deer, healthy habitat and reduced deer human conflict. The agency indicates that it uses metrics that are quantitative and science-based to achieve these goals. In the interest of full public transparency regarding how this public agency is managing a public resource, the Pennsylvania House Game and Fisheries Committee (PHGFC) is reviewing the PGC deer management program. As part of that general review, the PHGFC requests a proposal to conduct a science-based review and analysis of specific questions developed by the committee. The review and analysis should rely primarily on existing data sets and published literature. Where field work is deemed necessary, Wildlife Management Units (WMU) should be selected to represent the statewide issue in question.

Work will be compartmentalized into phases and the PHGFC reserves the right to proceed with some or all of the Consultants phases recommended for the proposed project.

**Scope of Work:** The successful Consultant is to produce a report that thoroughly addresses the following questions:

1. What model is used to estimate deer populations at the WMU level in Pennsylvania? The structure and functionality of this model should be described for the PHGFC.
2. How well does the model perform and compare to past models used in Pennsylvania? The model should be applied to historical data back to 1982 so that long-term trends can be understood by the PHGFC.
3. What are the deer population estimates for each WMU since their adoption, including 2005, 2006 and 2007? How do these trends compare to approximate historical county-based trends back to 1998?
4. What are the deer population trends for the past 20 years by WMU or their approximate equivalent?
5. What is the scientific merit for using embryo count data to assess deer herd health and is it an appropriate index for that purpose?
6. What is the scientific basis for using embryo count data as an indicator to understand the relationship between deer numbers in a particular WMU and availability of food/habitat to support those deer in a sustainable fashion? It should be determined if those data are appropriate for that purpose.

7. What are the definitions of the terms “recruitment” and “reproduction” as they pertain to the PGC deer program and scientific literature cited by the PGC?
8. Is PGC sample size regarding embryo counts appropriate and useful in making science-based management recommendations related to deer herd condition?
9. What is the scientific basis for PGC definitions of deer in “Poor” health, “Fair” health, and “Good” health?
10. What is the scientific merit for relating deer condition or health to habitat condition or health?
11. What does the PGC define as “Healthy” habitat? How does it relate to ecosystem function, composition and structure, and what is the basis for that classification in the scientific literature?
12. What is the scientific merit for the link between metrics used by the PGC from the Forest Inventory Analysis and deer impacts on habitat?
13. While analyzing deer/habitat interaction data, is the current technique of pooling Forest Inventory Analysis data across years appropriate for guiding deer management decisions made annually?
14. Are Citizen Advisory Councils a good measure of current levels or trends of deer/human conflict within a WMU? If so, what is the scientific basis and management logic?
15. Does the Citizen Advisory Council process violate the spirit of the Pennsylvania Sunshine Law?
16. Are Citizen Advisory Council recommendations consistent with the goals identified by the PGC deer stakeholders used to develop the Statewide Deer Management Plan and those of statewide surveys?
17. Does deer density, habitat type, land use, deer vulnerability, hunter assess, and deer impacts vary within WMUs? If so, how much variability exists and what impacts does that have on deer herd management?
18. Are data collected by the PGC in large WMUs reflecting the reality on the ground anywhere within these large geographic units? Could reducing the geographic size of the WMUs result in improving PGC deer management recommendations at a localized level?
19. How effective are the current large WMUs in achieving management goals outlined by the PGC deer stakeholder process?

20. Could the goals of healthy habitat, healthy deer and reduced deer/human conflict be more likely achieved within smaller WMUs?
21. Would smaller WMUs give managers, hunters, landowners, and local communities greater flexibility in managing deer according to their expectations, goals and interests?
22. Is there evidence that deer management would be improved by having hunting regulations that vary by WMU and are designed to target the needs and conditions within each WMU?
23. What is the formal decision-making process for developing antlerless quota recommendations? For example, how does PGC address conflicting goals such as poor deer herd health but low deer/human conflict?

### **Phase I – Information Request and Field Work Design**

- Submit to the PGC and PHGFC an information request that lists specific and general information/data required by the consultants to address the identified questions.
- Meet and work with appropriate PGC staff to answer the questions identified by PHGFC and those listed above.
- Request PGC input on field work design, data collection and analysis.

### **Phase II –Analysis and Field Work**

- Conduct analysis of data provided by PGC and literature review relevant to the questions identified by HGFC and those listed above.
- Conduct appropriate field studies deemed necessary by the PHGFC
- Work with PGC staff during field work and analysis requesting their input, participation and feedback.

### **Phase III –Draft Report**

- Present draft report to the PGC for their review and comments.
- Respond to PGC review comments.
- Present draft report to the deer stakeholder groups for their review and comments.
- Respond to deer stakeholder groups review comments.

#### **Phase IV – Present Final Report to HGFC**

-Present written report to PHGFC members

-Participate in PHGFC Hearings on report.

**CONSULTANTS PROPOSAL:** The consultant is required to submit a fee proposal, including a breakdown of fee for each phase of work. Fees to include all work identified in the Scope of Work Phase I, Phase II and Phase III above. Within the fee proposal, the consultant should identify and include: a) fixed costs associated with each Phase; b) “cost plus” fee schedule for all individuals and services provided by the Consultant that would be charged as additional work; and c) identify consultants (if not in-house) and submit cost of their services. Standard rates for reimbursable costs should also be identified and included (e.g. travel, graphics, materials, etc.).

The Consultant is required to submit the following supplementary information: a) size and type of organization; b) relevant representative projects recently completed by the firm or individual; c) firm’s current workload; d) resumes of the personnel that will be associated with this project, this must include all consultants who will analyze data to conduct the evaluation; e) management chart of the project team; and f) three (3) references with address and phone number.

The Consultant shall effect and maintain insurance to protect the Consultant from claims arising under Worker’s Compensation Acts, claims for damages because of bodily injury, including personal injury, sickness and disease, or death of any of his or her employees or of any person other than his or her employees, and from claims for damages because of injury to or destruction of tangible property, including loss of use resulting there from. Consultant shall further agree to indemnify and hold PHGFC harmless from and against any and all claims, demands or causes of action of whatsoever nature, resulting from or arising out of any act or omission on the part of the Consultant, its agents, servants or employees in connection with the Project. The Consultant shall effect and maintain comprehensive general liability insurance in an amount not less than Five Hundred Thousand (\$500,000) dollars protecting the Consultant from claims arising out of the performance of professional services caused by any of the Consultant’s errors, omissions or negligent acts.

The PHGFC reserves the right to reject any or all of the proposals received for the project identified herein.

Sealed proposals should be submitted to:

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)  
CONSULTANT SERVICES FOR REVIEW OF  
PENNSYLVANIA GAME COMMISSION DEER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM**

**Fee Schedule:**

Phase I \_\_\_\_\_

Phase II \_\_\_\_\_

Phase III \_\_\_\_\_

Individual Services (hourly rate) \_\_\_\_\_

Consultant Services (hourly rate) \_\_\_\_\_

**TOTAL** \_\_\_\_\_

**Reimbursable cost rates:**

\_\_\_\_\_ @ \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ @ \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ @ \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ @ \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ @ \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ @ \_\_\_\_\_