



MOUNTAINS RECREATION & CONSERVATION AUTHORITY
Los Angeles River Center & Gardens
570 West Avenue Twenty-Six, Suite 100
Los Angeles, California 90065
Phone (323) 221-9944 Fax (323) 221-9934

January 30, 2024

Questions and Answers to RFP for Resource Management Plan, Public Access Plan, & Coastal Resilience Strategy

The Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority (MRCA) as titleholder and Coastal Corridor Alliance (CCA) (dba Banning Ranch Conservancy) as a project partner, request proposals from professional, highly experienced consultants to develop a (1) Resource Management Plan (RMP) which contains a Public Access Plan (PAP) and (2) Coastal Resilience Strategy (CRS) for the Frank and Joan Randall Preserve/Genga [Tribal Name To Be Determined] located in Newport Beach, CA. Below is a recollection of all questions received by 5:00 pm on Monday, January 22, 2024.

The proposal deadline has been extended to Thursday, February 15, 2024, by 5:00 PM, submitted to Isabela Noriega via email to isabela.noriega@mrca.ca.gov. ****NOTE THE CHANGE of MRCA contact.****

1. Can a list of other interested firms be shared?

A: These are the firms that submitted questions or replied with interest regarding the RFP: SWA, Rana The Cohabitat Co., The Olin Studio, Placeworks, MIG, ICF, Burns & McDonnell, Dudek, and Environmental Science Associates (ESA).

2. The requirement for the lead (prime) consultant firm to “include a biologist with a coastal California gnatcatcher (*Poliioptila Californica californica*) 10(A)(1)(a) permit” (page 7, section 2: Qualifications and Background), we would like to know if this role may be fulfilled through the overall project team as a subconsultant to the prime?

A: Yes, the requirement of having a biologist with the necessary California gnatcatcher permit can be fulfilled by having them as a subconsultant and part of the overall project team.

3. To what degree will the consultant be responsible for tribal engagement?

A: Tribal nations and groups should be considered as a stakeholder group to engage as part of the overall RMP plan outreach. A Tribal Access & Engagement Plan (TAEP) is also required of the Property Management Plan and is a separate process to this RMP, PAP & CRS. However, there will need to be some coordination between the plans and consultant teams, as the TAEP and RMP will inform the PAP. Communication between the consultants will be imperative.

4. Per Section 2: Qualifications and Background, is it a requirement that the lead firm employ the biologist with the described areas of expertise and permit, or may that requirement be satisfied through the consultant team overall?

A: The requirement can be fulfilled by having the biologist as a subconsultant and part of the overall project team.

5. Is there any flexibility in the interview dates?

A: The interview dates will be set after the proposals are reviewed. Only a selection of the submitted proposals will be considered for a follow-up interview. At this time, interviews are anticipated to be held the week of February 26th due to the amended proposal due date.

6. When is the site visit?

A: The site visit will be Friday, February 2, 2024 at 11:00 am. Interested parties must email Julien Buenaventura at julien.buenaventura@mrca.ca.gov if you wish to attend. Only one individual per consultant team is allowed to attend. As a reminder, the site visit is **not required** to submit a proposal.

7. Since the site visit is Friday, February 2nd, will the proposal due date be extended?

A: Yes, the proposal deadline has been extended to Thursday, February 15th by 5:00 pm and proposals must be submitted via email to Isabela Noriega at isabela.noriega@mrca.ca.gov.

8. The proposal states “The Consultant Team is encouraged to contain at least 25% certified disadvantaged businesses (DBE)?” If we include a DBE, does it need to be from the MRCA’s vetted short list?

A: No. We encourage the consultant team to include DBE’s, but it is not a requirement to submit a proposal and furthermore, the contract will be with CCA.

9. Was this RFP a limited distribution to MRCA’s vetted short list?

A: No, this RFP was advertised in the LA Daily News, OC Register, and sent to MRCA’s compiled RFP distribution list and CCA’s contacts. It is also posted on MRCA and CCA’s websites and social media channels for maximum exposure.

10. Is it possible to extend the submittal deadline?

A: Yes, the proposal deadline has been extended to Thursday, February 15th by 5:00 pm and proposals must be submitted via email to Isabela Noriega at isabela.noriega@mrca.ca.gov.

11. Submittal requirements for Section 2 request information from the lead firm. Bullet 8 mentions identifying subcontractor work but doesn’t request qualifications or information about subcontractors. Are the qualifications and experience of subcontractors considered in the selection of the consultant? If so, it is acceptable to consider the submittal requirements listed for Section 2 to apply to the lead firm plus all subcontractors included on the team?

A: Yes, the qualifications and experience of subcontractors listed will be considered in the selection of the consultant. The lead firm shall treat Section 2 to include subcontractor’s qualifications and experience for the specified role that the lead firm has identified for them. For example, if the lead firm does not have a biologist on their

team, they can utilize a subconsultant to fill the biologist role and identify the experience the biologist has for the role.

- 12. Bullet 8 of the requirements for Section 2 requests information on the current assignment and level of commitment to that assignment for each key personnel. Are you asking for the total combined level of commitment to existing work for each person or are you asking for the level of commitment for each individual project a person is involved with to be provided. The latter would be a very large amount of data, and for some projects could be confidential. Would it be acceptable to simply indicate the portion of a person's time that would be made available to this project?**

A: Consultant team does not need to report what their current assignments are or level of commitment to that assignment is, however, lead firm shall identify all key personnel that will work on the RFP and identify the number of hours they will devote to this project. This is for CCA and MRCA to ensure that work and grant timelines can be met.

- 13. Section A: Data Gathering of the scope of work lists several various studies, mostly biological. Other portions of the RFP indicate the importance of cultural resources on the site, but there is no request for cultural resource surveys as part of this project. Is it correct to assume that no new cultural resource surveys, records searches, or other data gathering is required, and that any discussions in the RMP with regard to managing cultural resources will be based on a review of existing data sources as well as input from the TAEP?**

A: The TAEP is also required of the Property Management Plan and is a separate process to this RMP, PAP & CRS. However, there will need to be some coordination between the plans and consultants, as the TAEP and RMP will inform the PAP. No new cultural resource surveys will be conducted under the RMP, but reports, studies and resources from the TAEP will be shared (and due to sensitivity or anonymity, some parts may be redacted or anonymous) to be included in forming the RMP. Communication between the consultants will be imperative.

- 14. Are the results from the requested surveys intended to be used strictly for planning tasks in this RFP, or are they intended to be used for potential upcoming environmental documentation or permitting purposes? Given the large amount of resource information that already exists for the property, we are seeking to understand how to maximize the value of new surveys.**

A: As noted in page five of the RFP, "*new focused surveys to be done to identify additional information/changes in Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA) and species location, abundance and diversity, and restoration opportunities.*" The additional information is intended to support the development of the planning document, but could be used in the future to implement recommendations in the RMP or CRS.

- 15. Can you provide a list of existing studies and/or data sets that exist for the property (or online access to the library of studies)?**

A: A complete list of existing studies and data sets will be given to the consultant who is awarded the contract. Some information about the site can be found at the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Board website, that has some of the environmental data available to the public. Additional information can be found as part of the Coastal Commission proceedings related to the site.

https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile_report.asp?global_id=SL0605921271

<https://documents.coastal.ca.gov/reports/2016/9/w14d-9-2016.pdf>

<https://documents.coastal.ca.gov/reports/2017/2/th12a-2-2017.pdf>

16. Can you elaborate on what is desired for the “Site specific studies: elevational gradients, habitat transition zones, wetland feasibility, and marine influence areas”?

A: Site specific studies should include detailed explanations of (1) how elevational gradients on the property do or don't influence species richness, diversity, and ecological patterns, (2) how habitat transition zones do or don't influence the mixture and type of species and its distribution on the property, (3) how or if recreating tidal wetlands on the property contributes to climate resilience [this component should include a wetland feasibility study], and (4) how or if the marine environment is influencing species or habitats on the property.

17. In Section B: Research of the scope of work, can you clarify what is desired for “recommendations for on-site application”?

A: The CRS should include recommendations for on-site application of nature-based solutions (such as restoration of tidal wetlands, removal of non-native/exotic plants, water capture/storage, etc.) that build climate resilience for the property and any co-benefits of those concepts for nearby disadvantaged communities (such as reduction in urban heat island effects, improved stormwater capture, reduced neighborhood flooding, etc.).

18. Section C Plan Development of the scope of work indicates there will be draft, draft final, and final renditions of the reports. The second paragraph indicates that a draft plan will be prepared for review by various entities, and a final report will be prepared after the public has had the opportunity to comment. Which of the 3 report renditions do the “draft” and “final” reports mentioned in the second paragraph correlate to?

A: The first draft plan will be reviewed by the project team, resource agencies and the Advisory Committee. Once their feedback has been incorporated, a draft final [aka a public draft] will be issued. This public draft will be released for public comment and review. During this time, public meetings will be held and comments will be assembled and addressed for the final documents.

19. Deliverables for Section C include coastal resilience information (king tides, coastal inundation, etc.). Are you requesting coastal hydraulic modeling as part of the scope of work, or are the requested evaluations to be based on existing data that exists for the property and/or the region? Have coastal modeling or

hydraulic studies have been conducted for the property in the past and will that data be available to the team?

A: We are unaware of coastal modeling or hydraulic studies having been completed on the property for this type of planning. Hydraulic studies should be part of the wetland feasibility study referenced above. Teams wishing to include coastal modeling can include that as a separate line item in the budget as an “a la carte study.”

20. Section E Jurisdictional Coordination of the scope of work requests 4 meetings with each jurisdictional entity. It lists a variety of entities along with “other responsible entities”. Can you clarify how many agencies are intended to be allocated 4 meetings so we can determine how much budget to allocate to the meetings?

A: It is anticipated to be between 15-20 jurisdictional groups and representatives. At this time the known entities have been listed in the RFP, but additional jurisdictional representatives may be identified during the coordination meetings themselves.

21. The 12-point font and double-spacing requirements apply on to the proposal narrative and therefore, tables/charts/graphics/ fee tables and our pre-formatted resumes can be presented differently?

A: Yes, the font and double-spacing requirements are only required of the narrative.

22. Is a firm eligible to submit a proposal if it's not listed in the MRCA 2020 list of qualified firms?

A: Yes, any firm can submit a proposal. It does not have to be from MRCA's vetted short list.

23. Given the complexity and multi-disciplinary nature of the requested services, the time of the site visit only 4 working days prior to the proposed deadline, and the time required to conduct appropriate DBE firm due diligence, is MRCA and CCA willing to extend the questions and proposal deadline?

A: As a reminder, the site visit is not required in order to submit a proposal. In addition, there is no DBE requirement, it is only encouraged. The proposal deadline has been extended to Thursday, February 15th by 5:00 pm and proposals must be submitted via email to Isabela Noriega at isabela.noriega@mrca.ca.gov.

24. The *General Description of Services* states that “Focused surveys (as applicable) are therefore included in this scope of work.” (RFP page 5). However, Attachment 3 *Scope of Work* does not define which species are to be surveyed. Please provide a list of the species that are to be surveyed as part of the scope of work.

A: Based on past surveys of the property, we know the following rare, sensitive, threatened or endangered species exist or have existed on the property: Chaparral Sand-Verbena (*Abronia villosa* var. *aurita*) Aphanisma (*Aphanisma blitoides*) Southern Tarplant (*Centromadia australis* ssp. *parryi*), and California Box-thorn (*Lycium californicum*). Wildlife species include: San Diego fairy shrimp (*Branchinecta*

sandiegonensis), Burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*), Loggerhead shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*), Least Bell's vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*), Coastal cactus wren (*Campylorhynchus brunneicapillus sandiegonensis*), Coastal California Gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*), Yellow-Breasted Chat (*Icteria virens*), Belding's savannah sparrow (*Passerculus sandiwchensis beldingi*), and Southwestern Willowflycatcher (*Empidonax traillii extimus*).

25. Does MRCA have existing tribes that they have engaged with, and does the list of tribes also include the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation?

A: A TAEP is also required of the Property Management Plan and is a separate process to this RFP. As part of the TAEP, MRCA is required to do government consultation and must follow SB-18 and AB-52 which requires utilizing the California Native American Heritage Commission's (NAHC) Contact List.

26. Would MRCA plan to lead engagement/ consultation with Native American tribes or depend on the consultant to do so?

A: A TAEP is also required of the Property Management Plan and is a separate process from this RMP, PAP & CRS. However, there will need to be some coordination between the plans and consultants, as the TAEP and RMP will inform the PAP. Communication between the consultants will be imperative when community outreach is needed on the RMP, PAP, and CRS process. On the RMP process, the consultant selected will help coordinate with MRCA and CCA on community engagement meetings and agendas, as well as facilitate (run) all community engagement meetings (Page 12 of 25 of RFP).

27. Are you aware of any formal AB 52 or Section 106 consultation that is needed?

A: A TAEP is also required of the Property Management Plan and is a separate process to this RFP. As part of the TAEP, MRCA is required to do government consultation and must follow SB-18 and AB-52 which requires utilizing the California NAHC Contact List. The work on the TAEP will help inform the RMP and PAP, so it's imperative that the consultant selected for the RMP communicate with the consultant(s) for the TAEP in sharing information.

28. Does MRCA have existing archeological technical information for the Preserve?

A: CCA has documents available on its website for context and historical purposes from the development plans which includes Cultural and Paleontological Studies. This information is available online at: <https://bit.ly/CCA-Resources>. (See Draft EIR Appendices > Appendix J [Parts 1, 2 and 3])

29. What parties are on the TAEP?

A: The TEAP process is being administered by MRCA, with advisory support from Sacred Places Institute (SPI). The other parties involved in the development of the process will include tribal nations and tribal representatives with interest in the site as listed with the NAHC. The plans development will also incorporate services from an ethnographer and possibly an archaeologist.

30. One of the selection criteria is recommendations of prior clients. Does MRCA and CCA want to receive formal recommendations from prior clients, or will they be contacting references included with the examples of relevant projects requested in Section 2: Qualifications and Background? If separate recommendations are required, is there a minimum or desired number of client recommendations to submit?

A: Please provide at least 3 firms to reference, with contact information that MRCA and CCA can seek recommendations. No letters are necessary.

31. Cost is not listed as part of the evaluation criteria listed on page 9 of the RFP. Should consultant costs be submitted in a separate sealed envelope to maintain confidentiality and eliminate cost considered in the selection process?

A: Page 3 of the RFP states "*The anticipated budget range for the scope of this RFP is between \$500,000-\$700,000.*" Page 8 of the RFP has *Section 4: Fee Proposal*. The Proposal shall include "*a fee proposal subdivided by tasks described above, subdivided as necessary. Fees should be supported by a detailed spreadsheet showing the number of hours projected for each member for each task. Attach schedules of hourly rates for lead firm and all sub-consultants. List assumptions with all cost calculations. The fee proposal shall include all sub-consultants considered necessary to complete the work.*" Page 9 of the RFP states that proposals will be evaluated based on the "value" offered, which includes an analysis of the Fee Proposal.

32. Will consultant costs be treated as confidential information?

A: No, MRCA is a public agency, and all correspondence and bidding materials are subject to public review upon a Public Records Act request. Since this grant is funded by public grants, CCA will follow all reporting requirements, which may include releasing information on expenditures, but it is not anticipated that bids would be released publicly.

33. The Submittal Requirements state that the "proposal narrative should be typed with a standard 12-point font, double-spaced, no less than one-inch margins and be submitted as a PDF." Is the double-spacing and 12-point font applicable to the Project Approach Narrative, or will other sections, appendices, and resumes be required to adhere to the font and spacing requirements outlined? Reformatted resumes and other sections may make it more challenging to provide all required content within the 60-page limit.

A: Yes, the font and double-spacing requirements are only required of the narrative.

34. Will information about the removed oil infrastructure and area being remediated be made available to this project?

A: Yes, information can be found at the State Water Resources Control Board Geo Tracker:

https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile_report.asp?global_id=SL0605921271
as well as through Cal Gem's Well Star site:

<https://wellstar-public.conservation.ca.gov/General/Home/PublicLanding>.

Information will also be made available from the previous owner that MRCA can share.

35. Due to time needed to outreach to certified disadvantaged businesses, could the proposal deadline be extended by one week to 5:00 PM on Thursday, February 15, 2024?

A: There is no DBE requirement, it is only encouraged. Yes, the proposal deadline has been extended to Thursday, February 15th by 5:00 pm and proposals must be submitted via email to Isabela Noriega at isabela.noriega@mrca.ca.gov.

36. Do you have preferred templates for the deliverable documents (i.e., RMP, PAP, and CRS)?

A: Preferred templates for the deliverable documents should be created in Microsoft Word.

37. Will you provide the available biological and survey data (e.g., the most recent habitat mapping, wetland delineation, protocol survey reports for California gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo, fairy shrimp, etc.)?

A: Any surveys that MRCA may have, will be shared with the selected consultant. CCA also has the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and Coastal Commission documents available on its website at: <https://bit.ly/CCA-Resources>. (See Draft EIR Appendices > Appendix E [Parts 1, 2 & 3])

Additionally per the EIR's Biological Resources, "the following 45 five vegetation types and land cover types occur on the Project site: southern coastal bluff scrub, California sagebrush scrub, Encelia scrub, coyote brush scrub, coyote brush scrub/mule fat scrub, goldenbush scrub, southern cactus scrub, southern cactus scrub/Encelia scrub, saltbush scrub, disturbed southern coastal bluff scrub, disturbed sage scrub, disturbed Encelia scrub/mule fat scrub, disturbed Encelia scrub, disturbed goldenbush scrub, disturbed goldenbush scrub/mule fat scrub/salt marsh, disturbed southern cactus scrub, disturbed southern cactus scrub/Encelia scrub, ruderal/disturbed Encelia scrub, ruderal/disturbed Encelia scrub/disturbed mule fat scrub, ornamental/disturbed southern coastal bluff scrub, non-native grassland, non-native grassland/ruderal, ruderal, vernal pool, ephemeral pool, freshwater marsh, alkali meadow, disturbed alkali meadow, salt marsh, disturbed salt marsh, mudflat, open water, mule fat scrub, willow scrub, willow riparian forest, disturbed mule fat scrub, disturbed mule fat scrub/ruderal, disturbed mule fat scrub/goldenbush scrub, disturbed willow scrub, disturbed willow riparian forest, giant reed, cliff, ornamental, disturbed, and disturbed/developed."

From previous surveys completed for the development plans, we know there are or the site has the potential to have: Chaparral Sand-Verbena (*Abronia villosa* var. *aurita*)

Aphanisma (*Aphanisma blitoides*) Southern Tarplant (*Centromadia australis* ssp. *parryi*), and California Box-thorn (*Lycium californicum*). Wildlife species include: San Diego fairy shrimp (*Branchinecta sandiegonensis*), Burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*), Loggerhead shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*), Least Bell's vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*), Coastal cactus wren (*Campylorhynchus brunneicapillus sandiegonensis*), Coastal California Gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*), Yellow-Breasted Chat (*Icteria virens*), Beldings savannah sparrow (*Passerculus sandiwchensis beldingi*), and Southwestern Willow flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii extimus*).

38. What is the estimated wetland acreage on the property?

A: According to the Draft Environmental Impact Report, Biological Resources Chapter "Marshes and Mudflats" make up 31.45 acres of the property.

39. Are there any specific species for which focused surveys will be needed?

A: Previous biological surveys have observed the following special status (including species of special concern, threatened or endangered) species on the property, including: (At a minimum focused surveys would need to occur for species in **bold**):

Plant Focused Surveys: **Chaparral Sand-Verbena** (*Abronia villosa* var. *aurita*) **Aphanisma** (*Aphanisma blitoides*) **Southern Tarplant** (*Centromadia australis* ssp. *parryi*) Southwestern spiny rush (*Juncus actus* ssp. *leopoldii*), **California Box-thorn** (*Lycium californicum*) and Woolly Seablite (*Suaeda taxifolia*).

Wildlife Focused Surveys: **San Diego fairy shrimp** (*Branchinecta sandiegonensis*), Riverside fairy shrimp (*Streptocephalus woottoni*) (Cooper's hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*), Sharp-shinned hawk (*Accipiter striatus*), Northern harrier (*Circus cyaneus*), White-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*), Osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*), Merlin (*Falco columbarius*), California gull (*Larus californicus*), **Burrowing owl** (*Athene cunicularia*), Loggerhead shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*), **Least Bell's vireo** (*Vireo bellii pusillus*), California horned lark (*Eremophila alpestris actia*), **Coastal cactus wren** (*Campylorhynchus brunneicapillus sandiegonensis*), **Coastal California Gnatcatcher** (*Polioptila californica californica*), Yellow Warbler (*Dendroica petechia brewsteri*), **Yellow-Breasted Chat** (*Icteria virens*), **Beldings savannah sparrow** (*Passerculus sandiwchensis beldingi*), and **Southwestern Willow flycatcher** (*Empidonax traillii extimus*).

CCA also has the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and Coastal Commission documents available on its website at: <https://bit.ly/CCA-Resources>. (See Draft EIR Appendices > Appendix E [Parts 1, 2 & 3])

40. Are GIS shapefiles for previously mapped resources available?

A: Yes, currently the consultant working with the previous oil operator has some GIS files. MRCA will obtain and share with the selected consultant team.

41. Are cultural resource surveys needed to inform the PAP?

A: A TAEP is also required of the Property Management Plan and is a separate process to this RMP, PAP & CRS. However, there will need to be some coordination between the plans and consultants, as the TAEP and RMP will inform the PAP. No new cultural resource surveys will be conducted under the RMP, but reports, studies and resources from the TAEP will be shared (and due to sensitivity or anonymity, some parts may be redacted or anonymous) to be included in forming the RMP. Communication between the consultants will be imperative. CCA has documents available on its website for context and historical purposes from the development plans which includes Cultural and Paleontological Studies. This information is available online at: <https://bit.ly/CCA-Resources>. (See Draft EIR Appendices > Appendix J [Parts 1, 2 and 3])

42. What tribes will we be working with?

A: A Tribal Access & Engagement Plan (TAEP) is also required of the Property Management Plan and is a separate process to this RFP. As part of the TAEP, MRCA is required to do government consultation and must follow SB-18 and AB-52 which requires utilizing the California NAHC Contact List. Most likely, community outreach which includes tribal nations and tribal governments would include those tribes listed on the NAHC contact list.

43. Are you looking for an Archaeological Constraints and Opportunities Analysis that would include archaeological/cultural resources records searches and new archaeological surveys of the property?

A: There will be no new archeological surveys or reports pulled for this RFP. The TAEP will have an ethnographer to pull archeological reports and those can be shared with the selected consultant team for the RMP, PAP, and CRS development. The Archeologist on the RMP, PAP, and CRS team will help analyze the archeological and the TAEP reports to accurately include in the RMP, PAP, and CRS, while also being aware of cultural sensitivities, anonymity, or redaction of some of the oral history reports shared for the TAEP.

44. Has MRCA or CCA consulted with any Native American Tribes regarding this project? If so, which ones?

A: A TAEP is also required of the Property Management Plan and is a separate process to this RFP. As part of the TAEP, MRCA is required to do government consultation and must follow SB-18 and AB-52 which requires utilizing the California NAHC Contact List. MRCA has been in contact with these tribes on the NAHC list for the TAEP work.

45. The RFP identifies a Tribal Access and Engagement Plan, but it is not included in the Scope of Work. Who will be developing the Tribal Access and Engagement Plan?

A: The TAEP is a separate plan and process, fully funded by the California State Coastal Conservancy (SCC). Sacred Places Institute for Indigenous People (SPI) was hired to advise on the process for tribal outreach, engagement and access. An RFP for an ethnographer for the TAEP will be issued soon to help with conducting research,

data collection and interviewing with tribal community members via oral history, while also reviewing ethnographic and archaeological reports to help inform the TAEP, which will help inform the overall Property Management Plan. With the help of SPI and an ethnographer, MRCA will draft the TAEP by December 2025.

46. The RFP identifies a Property Management Plan, but it is not included in the Scope of Work. Who will be developing the Property Management Plan?

A: The Property Management Plan is the umbrella term that encompasses the three plans: The RMP, TAEP, and PAP. Each process is separate, but the RMP and TAEP will inform the PAP.

47. What is the question for the SWOT analysis?

A: A SWOT analysis involves identifying the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats related to a particular strategy, in this case, a Coastal Resilience Strategy. This could include strengths (such as natural resources, community engagement, existing infrastructure), weaknesses (limited funding, infrastructure gaps, policy and regulatory gaps), opportunities (such as technological advancements, collaboration and stakeholders, research and innovation), and threats (such as climate change, urbanization, and economic factors).

48. Which local jurisdictions will we be working with?

A: Local jurisdictions could encompass elected officials or staff from local, regional, state, or federal level, Coastal Commission, non-profits, community colleges, California Department of Fish & Wildlife, United States Fish & Wildlife Service, United States Army Corp of Engineers, MRCA, etc.

49. How will coordination happen between the consultant and 2 project partners?

A: MRCA and CCA have a Memorandum of Understanding, as well as a scope of work that defines each partner's roles. With this understanding along with constant communication with each other, we actively coordinate with each other and with the future selected consultant team.

50. What background studies have been prepared to date? What, if any, legal site descriptions or site history documentation has the client team prepared to date that can be made available to the consultant team?

A: CCA has the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and Coastal Commission documents from the previous development plans available on its website at: <https://bit.ly/CCA-Resources>. Please reference these documents for studies that have been prepared already.

51. What public engagement has already been done to date?

A: No public engagement for the RMP, PAP and CRS have been done to date. CCA has hired a Senior Community Organizer that is working with the nearby communities to engage in the planning processes.

52. What level of public interest and engagement in the project do the project partners expect?

A: Project partners should expect a high level of public interest and corresponding high level of engagement to ensure substantive feedback is obtained and incorporated into the documents as appropriate to meet management and stewardship objectives.

53. Will the project partners do CEQA in-house based upon the deliverables in this contract?

A: CEQA will be required in the future for the MRCA to lead. However, this scope is for a plan, which is exempt under CEQA Statute, Section 15306 – Class 6 Categorical Exemption – Information Collection. Therefore, CEQA is not currently needed until projects are implemented on the site.

54. How much of public engagement do the project partners anticipate will be online versus in person?

A: We anticipate that public engagement will be both online and in person, as this is both a regionally significant project, but will have a local focus to reach the surrounding communities. The percentage of each type is not currently determined, but a 60/40 split should be considered at this time. An engagement platform is being constructed for this public engagement process by CCA.

55. Where do the project partners want the dividing line be between consultant and CCA on the digital engagement platform? Who will provide most of the content and host/design/prepare the web platform?

A: CCA is constructing an engagement platform for the RMP, PAP, and CRS. The Consultant team will be relied upon for technical expertise and content review, but the majority of the platform will be created and managed by CCA. CCA will work with the MRCA on the content for the platform. The Consultant Team should plan on a 30-35% role in this feature.

56. Regarding attachment 2 – submittal requirements: Does the page limit identified in section 1 (project approach narrative) only apply to section 1 (project approach narrative) or does it apply to the entire proposal (sections 1-6)?

A: The page limit applies to the entire proposal section. *“Proposal shall not exceed 60 pages in length, including any appendices, cover letters, resumes or forms.”* (Page 7 of RFP).

57. Regarding attachment 2 – submittal requirements: Does the line spacing and font size identified in section 1 (project approach narrative) only apply to section 1 (project approach narrative) or does it apply to the entire proposal (sections 1-6)

A: Yes, the font and double-spacing requirements are only required of the narrative.

58. Regarding Attachment 2 - submittal requirements: Can the resumes requested in section 2 (Qualifications and Background) be moved to an attachment at the end of our proposal?

A: Yes, this is acceptable.

59. The RFP makes clear that funding for the Coastal Resilience Strategy is separate and apart from the other funding. However, this budget was not disclosed. There is a broad range of analysis that could go into such a strategy including sea level rise calculations and assessments. I am concerned that unless we understand the budget limitations for this task, we might exceed the amount of funding for this task. What amounts of funds is earmarked for the Coastal Resilience Strategy?

A: The RMP, PAP, and CRS were combined in the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) grant application. The budget listed in the RFP is inclusive of all components available from the federal grant award. At this time, MRCA and CCA are working to secure additional funding to build on the NFWF grant funding, potentially adding \$150,000-\$250,000 more to cover this Scope of Work.

60. Would you be able to describe any current relationships MRCA has established with tribal groups regarding the property?

A: TAEP is also required of the Property Management Plan and is a separate process to this RFP. As part of the TAEP, MRCA is required to do government consultation and must follow SB-18 and AB-52 which requires utilizing the NAHC list. MRCA is exploring co-management strategies with the TAEP.

61. Does MRCA see any benefits to the consultant team including a consultant with tribal associations?

A: It is not a requirement for proposals to submit a consultant with tribal associations. Tribal involvement is a high priority for all plans being developed for the site, however their engagement and involvement is first and foremost within the TAEP process. If the consultant includes a tribal liaison on their consultant team, they must have experience working directly with California Native American Tribes.