

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS  
REGARDING  
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)

Missouri Critical Minerals Plan

**STATE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT AND  
ENERGY RESOURCES AUTHORITY (AUTHORITY)**

**MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES' (DEPARTMENT)  
MISSOURI GEOLOGICAL SURVEY (MGS)**

April 20, 2026



- 1. Question:** Regarding the Missouri Critical Minerals Plan RFP, for clarification, should all subcontractors be identified in the proposal or can we merely indicate that a contractor will be identified? For instance, if a marketing firm is needed, can we outline our process/RFP for finding one or must they already be identified?

**Answer:** We do not require that proposal identify all subcontractors specifically, and a proposal may indicate that a subcontractor will be used and that securing the subcontractor will follow the guidelines of the contract. However, we note that as described in the RFP's Section IX, the qualifications and experience of the firm and the team assigned to the project and their understanding of the work required by the RFP are scoring factors. Therefore, the choice not to identify the specific subcontractor for any required task has the potential to negatively affect the proposal's score.

- 2. Question:** While the RFP is specific to making the award to a "contractor" it is not explicit in stating whether a contractor could utilize sub-contractors or lead a collective of contractors. Is it accurate to assume the correct interpretation is that a team of contractors could collaborate and submit a proposal for this RFP?

**Answer:** Yes, we will accept proposals from either a coalition of contract firms and/or individuals or one contract firm intending to subcontract certain tasks.

- 3. Question:** The PROPOSAL and SELECTION OF PROPOSAL sections provide details on what should be included and what items will be scored, however there is no clarification as to whether certain sections or aspects of the proposal will carry more weight than others. Will the components of a proposal be scored equally or which components hold greater value and consequently greater weight in the scoring?

**Answer:** The weighting of factors to be considered in scoring proposals is as follows: Qualifications and Experience of the Firm and the Team Assigned to the Project bears the greatest weight, Understanding of the Project and Plan bears moderate weight, and Missouri Business Preference and Cost bears the least weight.

- 4. Question:** Can MGS and the Authority provide the relative weighting for the four evaluation criteria (Qualifications, Project Understanding/Plan, Missouri Preference, Cost)?

**See response to question 3.**

- 5. Question:** It is explicit in the RFP that the contract will only be for a six-month duration, however several of the items have work products that would likely continue after the contract such as a legislative engagement plan and marketing-mix implementation. Therefore, should the interpretation of this RFP be that it is only interested in planning activities and that items related to legislative outreach (lobbying) and a

marketing/advertising plan be limited to that scope only or does MGS prefer those outreach efforts be included within a six-month period?

**Answer:** The work of the selected contract firm will consist of planning activities only. We anticipate that the Department of Natural Resources, in partnership with stakeholders, will implement the Missouri Critical Minerals Plan, including conducting planned outreach activities, following plan completion by the contract firm.

6. **Question:** The RFP notes that the agreement will include numerous provisions including the Authority's General Terms and Conditions. Would MGS consider providing the General Terms and Conditions as well as specific language related to the bulleted terms and conditions as an amendment to this proposal, so bidders can evaluate before submission? Is MGS open to negotiate terms and conditions that are mutually acceptable to both parties?

**Answer:** The Authority anticipates including customary contract terms and conditions, to include provisions such as Engagement, Duties, Term of Contract, Services and Fees, Personnel, Insurance, Indemnification, General Compliance with Laws, Covenant Against Contingent Fees, Termination, Nondiscrimination in Employment, Employment of State Employees. Employment of Unauthorized Aliens Prohibited. Conflicts of Interest, Ownership of Data and Documents, Confidentiality, Assignment and Subcontracts, Amendments, Governing Law, and Anti-Boycott Certification. The Authority will negotiate contract terms with the selected firm. The contract will not include terms and conditions related specifically to federal funds.

7. **Question:** Are the Environmental Improvement and Energy Resources Authority's (Authority's) General Terms and Conditions referenced in the RFP available for review prior to the proposal submittal date?

**See response to Question 6.**

8. **Question:** Section VI of the RFP acknowledges that subcontractors may need to be relied upon to complete major components of this procurement or project, and this section indicates that all subcontractors must be approved by the Authority and MGS. Has the Authority and MGS identified any limitations or exceptions regarding subcontractors, stakeholders and collaborators as part of a proposed project team other than potential conflicts of interest with the State of Missouri, the Authority, the department, or MGS?

**Answer:** No, we have not identified any limitations or exceptions regarding subcontractors.

9. **Question:** Could you please provide any available guidance on the anticipated budget, funding allocation, or cost expectations for this EIERA and MGS project? Specifically, are there internal estimates or budgetary ranges that proposers should consider when

developing the guaranteed not-to-exceed pricing for the scope of work outlined in the RFP?

**Answer:** This project’s cost must not exceed \$475,000.

**10. Question:** Are there existing comprehensive state critical minerals plans—particularly those addressing economic impacts, resource analysis, and state policy recommendations—that applicants should reference when developing this proposal?

**Answer:** We are not aware of any similar plans comparable to this effort.

**11. Question:** Given MGS interest in identifying relevant leading practices, including legislative and policy frameworks, from other states, would MGS consider clarifying the team/personnel requirements to emphasize relevant experience in the State of Missouri *or peer / relevant markets*?

**Answer:** Section VII. (3) Team/Personnel states the team’s project manager and data analyst should have “critical mineral resources analyses in or related to the state of Missouri, *states with similar mining history/activity, and/or states with similar regulatory environments.*” Section VII. (3)(d)(iv) asks: “Has the person conducted or managed any work addressing critical mineral-related economic modeling in or related to *states with similar mining history/activity, and/or states with similar regulatory environments?*” Section VII. (3)(d)(v) asks: “Has the person conducted or managed any work addressing critical mineral development projects in or related to the *state of Missouri, states with similar mining history/activity, and/or states with similar regulatory environments?*” These requirements offer proposers the flexibility to employ personnel with relevant experience outside of Missouri but demonstrate a clear preference for personnel without Missouri experience to possess experience from states with a similar mining history and/or regulatory environment.