



FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY

920 2nd Avenue, Suite A, Marina, CA 93933

Phone: (831) 883-3672 | Fax: (831) 883-3675 | www.fora.org

Draft Oak Woodland Conservation Area Map and Draft Oak Woodland Area Management and Monitoring Plan

Request for Proposals Questions and Responses

1. In the Request for Proposals (RFP), the Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) noted that it may schedule a presubmittal meeting. Is a presubmittal meeting scheduled?

No.

2. When FORA included a Legal Opinion regarding California Environmental Quality Act in the Scope, did FORA mean a Legal Opinion as a legal document potentially to be supported in court?

In reference to Task 8: Environmental Documents Review and Analysis, FORA expects that the attorney preparing the legal opinion would stand by it if challenged.

3. The RFP suggests that the work tasks will deal with oaks in County of Monterey and City of Seaside. Are these the only land use jurisdiction areas that will be involved in this work?

Yes. The County of Monterey and City of Seaside are the only land-use jurisdictions that will primarily be involved in the work.

4. How does the Draft Oak Woodland Management and Monitoring Plan work for both County of Monterey and City of Seaside? Will the consultant prepare two plans, one for County of Monterey and one for City of Seaside? Or one plan for both County of Monterey and City of Seaside?

The consultant will prepare two plans, one for County of Monterey and one for City of Seaside.

5. How open is FORA to receiving a consultant proposal that reorganizes the outline of tasks in the RFP?

We recommend that all submittals address the Scope of Services, Tasks 1 through 11. There is also flexibility to include in your a proposal reorganization of Scope of Services, Tasks 1 through 11 (see RFP, Contents of Proposal, p. 9).

6. What is FORA's timeline for delivery of the work products identified in the RFP?

A project schedule/timeline is required as part of the proposal (see RFP, Contents of Proposal, p. 9). Our objective is to complete all work tasks by December 31, 2016.

7. What is FORA's estimate of the cost to provide these services?

FORA estimates the costs of these services to be less than \$200,000.

8. Task 5: Task Deliverables state that “The Consultant is required to share a Draft Area Map with CDVA.” Is this Map the same as the one developed for Seaside/Monterey, or is this a separate Draft Area Map specific for this task?

The draft map developed for City of Seaside and County of Monterey is expected to be the same for CDVA use.

9. Task 7 calls for one workshop, but Task 2 requires two workshops. Is this a typo? If not, when is the second workshop anticipated?

Clarification: Task 7 should say 2 workshops, consistent with Task 2.

10. Task 9 state: “The Consultant shall develop/conduct up to 4 presentation meetings as directed by FORA.” Are these in addition to other presentations required in Tasks 2, 3, 4, and 5?

Clarification: Yes. The 4 presentation meetings noted in Task 9 would involve 4 additional presentation meetings.

11. I am extremely confused by the way the RFP explains the timing of the various meetings in relation to the various drafts of the MMP. Can FORA lay out in a table which meetings in Tasks 2 and 3 will present which versions of the MMP as outlined in Tasks 7, 9, and 10?

Task 2: Public Participation Meetings and Deliverables

| Meetings | City of Seaside | Monterey County | CDVA | CRMP |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Community | Draft Map (collect Info) | Draft Map (collect Info) | | |
| 2. Workshops | Draft Map / Draft Plan | Draft Map / Draft Plan | | |
| 3. Open-House | Draft Map / Draft Plan | Draft Map / Draft Plan | | |
| 4. Presentations | | | Report preparation meetings | |
| 5. Meetings | | | Draft Mitigation Strategies (2) | Draft Map / Draft Plan |

Task 3: Agency Presentation Process
Task 4: City of Marina Process
Meetings and Deliverables

| Meetings | City of Seaside | Monterey County | City of Marina | Other |
|-----------------------------|---|---|------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 7. Citizen Advisory | Final Draft Map / Final Draft Plan | Final Draft Map / Final Draft Plan | Final Draft Map / Final Draft Plan | |
| 8. Elected Officials | Final Draft Map / Final Draft Plan (City Council) | Final Draft Map / Final Draft Plan (Board of Supervisors) | Final Draft Map / Final Draft Plan | CDVA Mitigation Strategies |
| | | | | |
| 9. Option 4 meetings | Potential | Potential | Potential | Potential |
| 10. Presentation | | | | |
| | | | | |

12. Task 7 states” Presentation of a Draft Management Plans to the Fort Ord CRMP for their feedback.” Is this meant to be a meeting, or is this part of the circulation of the draft document?

This is an additional presentation meeting.

13.. Task 7 indicates that the Draft Management Plan shall require “Access control”. Can you describe what is meant by this term?

This is meant that the Draft Management Plan will include measures that protect oak habitat from degradation due to human activity.

14. Under Task 8, the RFP identifies that the consultant or associated CEQA counsel craft a legal opinion. Does FORA anticipate that the selected consultant team will include a CEQA attorney?

Yes.

15. Does FORA have specific items they are looking for in the alternative approach mentioned under the Contents of Proposal section of the RFP?

Yes. Completion of a CDVA – Oak Tree and Mitigation Strategy Report, Draft Area Map, Draft Management Plan for Seaside, Draft Management Plan for County, and Legal Opinion.

16. Would FORA take any action to adopt or approve the management plan, or is their role entirely support/logistics?

FORA's role is to provide support/logistics. Seaside and County would use the management plans for their jurisdictions. The FORA Board would not adopt or approve the management plan.

17. Will FORA review the draft map/management plan? Would that review be prior to submittal of the draft products to the city and county; or would all three agencies review drafts concurrently?

The consultant should assume that FORA staff will review all project deliverables as part of the preparation process.

18. Would FORA have any ongoing role in implementing or monitoring the management plan (i.e., issue permits?) other than reviewing the annual monitoring reports?

Seaside and the County would have the roles of implementing their individual management plans. FORA would not have this role.

19. Are the City and County interested in an in-lieu fee?

FORA does not know Seaside and County's interest in fee structures at this time.

20. Is the veteran cemetery within the anticipated area of the management plan? Would CDVA be taking any actions to approve their project? Would the cemetery project be subject to approval from the City and/or County, or another agency; and if so should our proposal include any CEQA-related work for that project? Are any details of this project currently available?

Yes. The veterans cemetery is within the identified polygons from the BRP Oak Woodlands policies and programs. CDVA would not be taking an approval action for their project at this time. CDVA has already approved the veterans cemetery project, its NEPA/CEQA document, and the veterans cemetery is currently under construction. The intent would be that the Oak Tree and Mitigation Strategy Report deliverable would be a tool for CDVA to use in implementing oak tree mitigations identified in their veterans cemetery Environmental Assessment/Initial Study Mitigated Negative Declaration. The cemetery project is not subject to approval by other agencies.

21. Are the City and County required to adopt the same management plan, or could there be differences?

Please refer to our response under question no. 4.

22. What GIS data is available (referenced on page 3 of the RFP, under task 1)?

FORA obtains a large portion of its GIS data from the US Army's data accessed from www.fodis.net. FORA will provide all the available GIS data once the Consultant is selected and under contract agreement to complete the work.

23. Is there an identified project schedule?

Please refer to our response under question no. 6.

24. A tentative December 2016 is included in the RFP timeline. Can we assume that the scope of work and all deliverables should be completed within this 8 month timeline?

Yes.

25. Can we assume that the task break out is not based on a linear timeline?

A projected linear timeline is suggested that identifies tasks that can be either completed individually, concurrently or simultaneously. The objective is to complete the work tasks by December 31, 2016.

26. The existing data is out of date. Is FORA expecting biological surveys or ground-truthing to update existing data?

If a consultant thinks that updating existing biological data would benefit completion of the work, FORA would take proposed surveys or ground-truthing tasks into consideration as part a proposal.

27. Can you elaborate on the anticipated Management Plan relationship between the jurisdictions?

Please refer to our responses under questions 4 and 16.

28. The deliverable for Task 8 is a legal opinion. Can you provide additional information about this aspect of the scope? Is the legal opinion in anticipation of future CEQA document preparation?

Please refer to our response under question no. 2.