San Mateo County Resource Conservation District

PHONE 650.712.7765
FAX 650.726.0494

625 Miramontes Street, Suite 103, Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
www.sanmateoRCD.org

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors
May 16, 2013
Location: RCD Office

Directors present: TJ Glauthier, Barbara Kossy, Neal Kramer, Dave Holland
Staff present: RCD – Kellyx Nelson, Renee Moldovan, Chelsea Moller, Alex Beakes
NRCS –
Guests: Louie Figone (Farm Bureau), Victor Rabinovich

1 Call to Order

- Glauthier called the meeting to order at 6:34 pm.

2 Introduction of Guests and Staff

- Everyone present introduced themselves.

3 Public Comment

- Farm Bureau (FB) Update – Louie Figone
  - Louie and RCD staff discussed the partnership between the RCD and FB, including participation in the San Mateo Food System Alliance (SMFSA), Pilarcitos Workgroup, and shared interest in ponds. Nelson has been attending FB Board meetings every other month and FB has agreed to attend RCD Board meetings on alternate months.
  - FB has been supportive of SMFSA work towards a packing/distribution center which would process locally grown produce and distribute it to local jails, schools, etc. They have been talking about revamping the old mushroom factory, and the owners of property are very interested. There is a currently a draft feasibility analysis out for review by members of the SMFSA.
    - The role of SMFSA is to fix parts of food system that are broken. We have local farms and hunger, obesity and fresh produce, local farm workers that cannot afford to buy local produce, local stores with no local food. These are problems that need to be addressed. The SMFSA completed a draft food system assessment, and a lot of stakeholders said that there is not a mechanism for local produce to be distributed locally. That is what led to this initiative to develop a local packing/distribution center.
    - Figone stated that San Mateo County farmers could not supply enough to support the distribution center on their own, so they will take in produce from Santa Cruz County and Watsonville. All the food will be local and fresh.
    - The project makes no distinction between organic, conventional, etc., it is to support all agriculture.

        - Kossy requested to hear more about this initiative at the next meeting.
            - ***ACTION ITEM: Nelson will bring the feasibility analysis to next meeting***
    - As Fresh As It Gets – This is a cooperative effort by the farming, fishing, and hospitality industries as well as County government to support and encourage consumption of local products. Farmers can go in and sign up to qualify and label their products with the "Fresh as it gets" logo so that consumers can readily identify locally grown foods. Funding has run out for this initiative, but Fred Crowder (County Agricultural Commissioner) is trying to get more funding.
    - Williamson act – FB is participating on a committee with the County to work on this issue.
    - FB is working on regulations for agritourism with the County. Some unpermitted farm stands are popping up on the coast that are unfair to legitimate farm stands who pay their fees.

- Glauthier provided an update about the pending audit. The auditor has been going through staff changes and has not completed the audit on the intended schedule. It is coming soon. No irregularities have come up.

4 Approval of Agenda

- Nelson removed item 6.2 as Martha Poyatos is ill and unable to attend tonight. This item will be postponed until June.
- Kramer motioned to approve the agenda as amended including consent agenda. Holland second. The motion carried unanimously.

5 Consent Agenda

5.1 March 21, 2013 Draft Regular Meeting Minutes

5.2 April 25, 2013 Draft Regular Meeting Minutes

5.3 April 2013 Draft Financial Statement

6 Discussion Items

6.1 Discussion of Board Offices

- Division 9 requires a President and a Secretary role. The Secretary can be an unpaid Director or paid staff to notice meetings, prepare agendas, take minutes, etc. That role is currently filled by paid staff. In the event of the President's absence the Executive Director will ask another Board member to chair the meeting.

~~**6.2 Granada Sanitary District Application for Reorganization – Martha Poyatos, LAFCO**~~

6.3 Draft Fiscal Year 2014 Budget

- The group discussed the draft budget (Attachment A). In general the budget is similar to last year. Our challenge continues to be cash flow, not net cash. It often takes 3-7 months for state or federal grants to reimburse us for work done and expenses already incurred. We are in perpetual arrears. Even when the approved budget would allow us to spend on essential items such as web page design or computers, we rarely have the cash flow to do it, so this year we have budgeted to spend less.

- Nelson went through the budget and discussed what is known versus uncertain and what assumptions were made for each program or project as well as personnel (2% COLA and staff changes).
- Glauthier asked about County response to requests for funding assistance. Nelson said that Supervisor Horsley has advocated to state legislators for state support of RCDs and the County has engaged the RCD in service agreements that are revenue to the RCD for work done, but there has been no movement towards an RCD operating base.
    - ***ACTION ITEM: Nelson will follow up with Dave re: restructuring zero interest loan with the County***
    - ***ACTION ITEM: Holland has a meeting set up with Bob Adler on Monday to talk about this.***
    - ***ACTION ITEM: Glauthier would like to form a finance committee to look into cash flow and County support for an operating base before next Board meeting***.
- There was discussion of the billing rates to cover operating expenses. The rates don't cover all of our costs and can make us less competitive for grants. Some state grants are very prescriptive in how you can bill and limit how much we can bill so we can't use our true billing rates.
- There was discussion of the RCD's immediate needs for a server which has been delayed by cash flow problems. Kossy asked the Board to consider a personal loan for the server while the RCD awaits the cash to reimburse for the purchase.
    - ***ACTION ITEM: RCD staff will email directors a request for a no-interest personal loan for a new server in case any director is able to help.***

6.4 Statewide Perspective – Kellyx Nelson

- Nelson said that other RCDs have recently stepped up under CARCD coordination to take on some of the work that she and Karen Christensen had been doing. The newly evolving team is great and more representative of statewide RCDs.

6.5 Executive Director Report – Kellyx Nelson

- Nelson reported on planning for the upcoming public workshop about the findings of the project to identify and develop solutions to the sources of fecal pollution to Pillar Point Harbor.
    - ***ACTION ITEM: Karissa Anderson will email the PPH Power Point presentation to the Board Directors in advance of the public meeting.***

7 Action Items

7.1 Recommendations for Consultant Team to Develop Solutions to Flooding on Pescadero Road

- Staff described the selection process outlined in the attached memo (Attachment B) .
- Glauthier commented that the process seemed very good.
- Kramer, RCD Board liaison to the project, participated in some of the selection process. He said that it was very thorough, and the committee included a broad group of people. .

- Kramer motioned to approve the selection, Kossy seconded. The consultant team was approved unanimously.

7.2 Resolution 2013-03 to approve Agreement with Coastal Conservancy for Bonde Weir Project

- This resolution is required by the Coastal Conservancy for project funding.
- Kramer moved to approve Resolution 2013-03, Kossy seconded. Resolution 2013-03 was approved unanimously.

7.3 Election of Officers

- Board determined that it will not elect any additional officers. The sole office remains President.

7.4 Personnel Committee Selection & 7.5 Finance Committee Selection

- After some discussion about who has and who is willing to serve on the personnel and finance committees, it was determined that Holland (chair) and Reynolds would form the Personnel Committee, and Glauthier (chair) and Kramer would form the finance committee.
- Holland moved to approve Personnel Committee and Finance Committee selections as described, Kramer second. Committee selections were approved unanimously.

8 Adjourn

- Glauthier adjourned the meeting at 8:05 pm.

San Mateo County Resource Conservation District
Proposed FY 2014 Financial Budget

REVENUE		
Project Revenue		
Accelerated Conservation Planning	$	32,505
Biochar Field Trials	$	31,020
Bonde Weir Fish Passage Project	$	257,745
Cloverdale Ponds Enahcement Project	$	224,775
Coastal Fish Passage	$	10,000
First Flush	$	4,984
Fitzgerald Pollution Reduction	$	375,330
Gully Erosion Control	$	18,420
Integrated Watershed Restoration Program	$	46,000
Johnston Ranch Pond Enhancement	$	1,723
Livestock and Land Program	$	93,425
Memorial Park Fish Passage Project	$	2,923
Pescadero Integrated Flood Reduction Habitat Enhancement Project	$	136,116
Pescadero Streamflow Improvement Project	$	11,706
Pilarcitos Integrated Watershed Management Plan	$	37,865
Rural Roads Program	$	14,000
San Gregorio Watershed Enhancement	$	111,948
SFPUC Vegetation Monitoring	$	18,595
Water Quality Monitoring	$	2,076
Subtotal Project Revenue	**$**	**1,431,156**
Other Revenue		
Individual Contributions	$	1,500
Interest Income	$	500
Property Tax	$	53,000
Service Fees	$	4,500
Subtotal Other Revenue	**$**	**59,500**
Total Revenue	**$**	**1,490,656**
EXPENSES		
Personnel		
Salaries	$	276,668
Benefits	$	36,836
Subtotal Personnel	**$**	**313,504**

Operating Expenses		
Accounting	$	6,500
Bank Fees	$	1,000
Computer Services	$	10,000
Communications	$	13,350
Consultant Services	$	4,500
Discretionary	$	1,500
Equipment	$	2,500
Insurance - Liability	$	2,500
Legal	$	2,500
Membership, Dues and Subscriptions	$	3,500
Mileage	$	1,000
Postage and Delivery	$	500
Printing and Copying	$	1,000
Professional Development	$	4,000
Rent	$	14,400
Supplies	$	750
Travel and Accommodations	$	2,500
Subtotal Operating Expenses	**$**	**72,000**
Program Expenses		
Accelerated Conservation Planning	$	13,340
Biochar Field Trials	$	12,660
Bonde Weir Fish Passage Project	$	236,577
Cloverdale Ponds Enahcement Project	$	217,395
Coastal Fish Passage	$	7,425
First Flush	$	1,654
Fitzgerald Pollution Reduction	$	237,900
Gully Erosion Control		
Integrated Watershed Restoration Program	$	38,000
Johnston Ranch Pond Enhancement	$	1,723
Livestock and Land Program	$	83,100
Memorial Park Fish Passage Project	$	2,923
Pescadero Integrated Flood Reduction Habitat Enhancement Project	$	126,186
Pescadero Streamflow Improvement Project	$	11,706
Pilarcitos Integrated Watershed Management Plan	$	20,600
Rural Roads Program	$	10,000
San Gregorio Watershed Enhancement	$	66,469
SFPUC Vegetation Monitoring	$	1,970
Water Quality Monitoring	$	2,076
Subtotal Program Expenses	**$**	**1,091,704**
Total Expenses	**$**	**1,477,208**
NET	**$**	**13,448**

San Mateo County Resource Conservation District

MEMORANDUM

Date: May 9, 2013

To: Board of Directors

From: Kellyx Nelson

Re: Recommendation for Consultant Team to Develop Solutions to Flooding on Pescadero Road

---

RECOMMENDATION

The Consultant Selection Committee of the RCD's Pescadero Flooding Solutions Advisory Group recommends cbec ecoengineering as the lead consultant team to develop solutions to flooding on Pescadero Road. RCD staff requests Board endorsement of this recommendation.

The Committee's recommendation is supported by the following:

1. cbec received the highest total score for the written proposals.
2. cbec received the highest total score and the highest score in each category for the in-person interview.
3. The Committee agreed unanimously that cbec's team is the right one for this project.

SELECTION PROCESS

The *Request for Proposals to Develop Solutions to Flooding on Pescadero Road* (RFP) was developed with extensive input from the Advisory Group, which includes representatives of state and federal resource agencies with funding and permitting authorities, Pescadero community members-at-large, Pescadero Municipal Advisory Council, San Mateo County Department of Public Works, State Parks, and Trout Unlimited (a national fisheries restoration conservation organization). The RFP was distributed widely through RCD and Advisory Group networks.

RCD staff worked with the Advisory Group to develop agreed-upon criteria to score proposals. The RCD answered questions from potential applicants, distributed the questions and answers to declared applicants, and posted the questions and answers on the RCD website. Eight proposals were received. Members of the Advisory Group were invited to participate as scoring members of the Selection Committee after signing a form declaring no conflict of interest with any member of any applicant team.

One team was disqualified for exceeding the proposal page limit. The Committee scored the remaining proposals. Based on the scores as well as extensive discussion, the Committee chose to advance two teams as finalists for in-person interviews: cbec and Cardno ENTRIX.

Among other preparations for the day of interviews, RCD staff:

- Hosted a conference call for applicants to discuss the agenda and goals for the day of interviews, discuss the selection process, and answer applicants' questions. Applicants were advised that the scores would be a guide to selecting a consultant team but were not intended to be binding, particularly if the scores were close. Additionally, the RCD and Committee were committed to selecting the *right* team for the project and reserved the right not to choose either of the finalists if the committee felt neither team was likely to meet project objectives.
- Elicited and synthesized interview questions submitted by Committee members.
- Drafted and secured Committee approval for scoring criteria and distributing the scoring criteria (but not the interview questions) to the finalist teams.
- Checked finalists' references.

The interviews were held on May 7, 2013 at the RCD office with the participation of Director Neal Kramer. Members of the Pescadero community and other interested parties were invited to observe the interviews and discussions with the consultant teams via the Pescadero Google Group and during the April meeting of the RCD Board of Directors.

cbec/Stillwater earned the higher scores in each category (technical merit, community engagement, and quality assurances and control) and by 7 points overall. The Committee discussed the scores, merits of each team, and unanimously determined that cbec/Stillwater should be recommended to the RCD Board of Directors.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Summary of Applicant Scores

Attachment B: Scoring Criteria

Attachment C: Interview Questions

Attachment D: Request for Proposals for Solutions to Flooding on Pescadero Road

Attachment E: Responses to Questions to RFP

Attachment A: Summary of Applicant Scores

Table 1: Scores for Written Proposals

Proposal	Score by Reviewer							Average[1]
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
cbec	88	95	92	86	80	92	94	90.4
Cardno ENTRIX	79	95	89	56	80	93	95	87.2
WEST	89	88	85	56	69	79	86	81.4
Waterways Consulting, Inc.	80	87	92	58	67	70	91	79.0
O'Connor Engineering, Inc.	80	80	87	70	67	81	79	78.0
ESA	88	82	73	54	70	73	83	76.2

Table 2: Scores for Presentations and Interviews

Criteria	Max. Pts.	Average Points	
		cbec	Cardno ENTRIX
Technical Merit	45	40.3	35.6
Community Engagement	35	32.6	31.4
Quality Control and Assurances	20	18.4	17.1
Total		**91.3**	**84.1**

[1] This table summarizes the scores without the highest and lowest scores. The team rankings were the same whether or not highest and lowest scores were dropped.

Attachment B: Scoring Criteria

For the written proposals:

Evaluation Criterion	Max Pts	Score
Description of Project Approach (17 %)		
Approach supports the purpose and scope of the project	9	
Approach is consistent with the proposed task description and schedule confirmation	8	
Task description and schedule confirmation (20 %)		
Schedule conforms to scope of work and is sufficiently detailed	8	
The tasks and schedule will achieve the desired goal of the project	12	
Personnel Qualifications (20 %)		
Team members are highly qualified	6	
Members have demonstrated ability in their proposed roles vis-à-vis implementation of the described project approach, tasks, and schedule	7	
Integration of the expertise of these individuals will be sufficient to recommend long-term solutions to flooding	7	
Proposed Budget (5 %)		
Cost for services for the total project does not exceed $240,000 and hourly fees do not exceed $175 per hour for any individual	1	
Proposed budget is commensurate with task description and schedule	2	
Proposed budget is sufficiently detailed and realistic	1	
Proposals is cost effective and accomplishes high levels of design with available funds	1	
Success in comparable projects (20 %)		
Demonstrated experience in comparable projects	20	
Performance history (13 %)		
Demonstrated history of cost control, work quality, and adherence to schedules and deadlines	13	
Well-written Proposal (5 %)		
Highly readable, well organized, complies with all submission requirements, and does not contain grammatical or typographical errors	5	
Total	**100**	

For the presentations and interviews:

Evaluation Criterion	Max Pts	Score
Technical Merit (45%)		
The approach and assumptions are technically sound and answers to questions were technically accurate.	15	
The approach will achieve the desired goal of the project.	20	
The team has the necessary technical qualifications to accomplish the objectives of the project.	10	
Community Engagement (35 %)		
The approach assures effective community engagement.	15	
The team is able to convey technical information or complex concepts to a lay and/or polarized audience.	10	
The team has a reputation/ references support effective community engagement.	10	
Quality Control and Assurances (20%)		
The team is fully committed to the project and will allocate appropriate personnel resources.	10	
The team has quality controls and a reputation that assure high quality performance.	10	
Total	**100**	

Attachment C: Interview Questions

QA/QC

1. Can you talk about your current workload and how you expect to fit this project into your current workload.
2. Can you discuss another project you/your team has worked on that includes similar objectives (flood, habitat, community outreach) and give examples of particular tools/approaches that worked well as well as one example of something that really didn't work too well.
3. Can you talk about a project that went haywire (budget, scope, community discord, technical flaw, etc) and how you team approached getting the project back on track.

Technical Approach

1. Will the proposed 1D modeling handle complex floodplain flows and sediment transport sufficiently to make design alternative decisions? Will 2-D modeling, as needed, be included within your scope and budget?
2. Based on your preliminary review of data collected, including the WEST report, what, if any, additional data do you anticipate the need to collect and why?
3. Given that conditions upstream of the bridge play a large role in the current flooding problem, how far upstream will your analysis and potential alternatives extend? What do you see as the appropriate geographic boundaries for models and analysis?
4. How do you intend to address factors outside model boundaries including upstream sediment inputs, tidal influence, and periodic, high-water confluence of Butano and Pescadero creeks upstream of Pescadero road bridge?
5. Given that a sediment deposition zone is a valuable feature upstream of a sensitive habitat, what schemes have you considered for improving flood conveyance while not enhancing sediment delivery downstream?
6. This project, sited on Butano Creek, is clearly located in a flood and sediment deposition prone area. Moreover, the Butano channel form, especially upstream of the project area, has evolved over time in response to factors including watershed conditions, land use, tectonic plate movement, and possible hydromodification. How will you take this into account in developing a workable and sustainable project alternative?
7. How will your analysis of options and alternatives factor in potential sea level rise?
8. Your proposal anticipated a preferred option. How do you envision choosing a preferred option and what will be included in the analysis?
9. What level of analysis do you propose for the non-preferred alternatives?

Community Engagement

1. Describe your approach to effectively engage, communicate, and gain the support of the community and resource agencies, including how you will effectively communicate technical information to a lay audience.
2. Please tell us about your experience communicating complex concepts to a polarized public, including strategies and approaches you have used.

3. How do you propose to deal with conflict if some stakeholders (landowners, community members, resource agencies, NGOs, etc.) feel that the preferred plan does not meet their needs or if your technical findings are not aligned with their preferred solutions?

Cbec

1. Does Stillwater or cbec have staff that can address potential infrastructure or traditional CE issues or modifications regarding the PCR bridge and/or low point in the road?
2. How big of an issue is fish stranding (pages 3,4, and 6)?
3. How do you anticipate getting information from the public that has "not made its way into the readily available documents and datasets" (page 7)?
4. Talking to some of your references, it appears your firm is extremely busy. How can you assure us you will be able to devote the time as proposed, given your other commitments?

Cardno ENTRIX

1. Briefly describe "simple but effective modeling methods" that can "predict water quality implications" (page 4).
2. You mention the channel bed being below the marsh plain in a healthy system, note that the bridge location causes much of the problem, and mention possible upstream channel erosion (bed and bank scour). The proposal also mentions the restoration of deltaic processes and sediment deposition downstream of the bridge. Can you explain how these disparate ideas/concepts work together in analysis and a solution?
3. Your proposal (page 5) states, "expanding and redirecting the flood capacity of the Butano Creek channel could shift sediments into the marsh below the road and introduce greater plant and habitat diversity and improved water quality benefitting a range of wildlife." Is shifting sediments into the marsh one of your goals?
4. Your proposal (page 11) states, "Other possibilities could involve channel reconstruction in the marsh to 'kick start' natural sediment deposition processes and reduce exposure of low flows to organic matter." Please briefly explain the benefits and adverse effects to 'kick starting' this process in the marsh.
5. Your Task 1 takes up nearly one quarter of your proposed budget. This seems high, given much of the existing information involved, or is in the possession of, your Team. Please explain and justify the budget for Task 1.
6. If additional upstream surveys are required after evaluating data gaps in Task 1, is there room in the budget to include such surveys (proposed budget is only $3 under the not-to-exceed amount)?
7. What do you see as the pros/cons of having a long history in this watershed?

Attachment D: Request for Proposals for Solutions to Flooding on Pescadero Road

Project Summary

The San Mateo County Resource Conservation District (RCD) is searching for an outstanding team of professionals to identify, describe, and model conceptual alternatives for flood control projects that will protect and potentially restore critical coastal resources, protect public health, safety, and property, and advance planning and collaboration in Pescadero watershed management.

Several times a year, Butano Creek overtops its banks and floods Pescadero Creek Road. The flooding shuts down the road which is the main entrance into town from State Route 1. When the road floods, it causes hardship and disruptions to community access and egress, emergency response, school district bus service and attendance, downtown businesses, and local agriculture. Residents of the town and elected officials identify flooding as a priority resource management concern.

Background Information

Pescadero is an unincorporated farming and ranching community, located within San Mateo County, in one of the most rural areas in the greater San Francisco Bay area. It is relatively isolated in the mostly undeveloped area of San Mateo County's south coast.

Butano Creek drains the Santa Cruz Mountains, flowing through forest and agricultural land and draining highly erodible soils before crossing under Pescadero Creek Road and entering the Pescadero Marsh Natural Preserve, joining Pescadero Creek near its mouth and then entering the Pacific Ocean. The creek and associated wetlands and riparian area provide valuable habitat for a number of public trust species, including the federally listed California red legged frog, San Francisco Garter Snake, Tidewater goby, and Central California Coast Steelhead, and historically, Central California Coast coho salmon. Habitat in the Butano watershed has been degraded or modified by a number of anthropogenic influences, including elevated sediment loads, relic levees, water control structures, habitat conversion, water diversion, and nutrient inputs.

Increased sediment delivery to the Butano system, along with changes to sediment transport and storage has resulted in localized aggradation of the Butano Creek bed in the vicinity of Pescadero Creek Road, as well as upstream incision. Clearance under Pescadero Creek Road where it crosses Butano Creek has decreased from 13 feet when the box culvert was completed in 1961 to less than 2 feet today. Sediment storage and transport appears to be a major issue with respect to this flooding problem. Road flooding now occurs in minor rain events and is not limited to major storms.

Historically, the agricultural community addressed sediment deposition and flooding by clearing sediment and vegetation out of the creek bed. This stopped with both increased environmental regulation and a change in ownership of the marsh to State Parks. Of the members in the Pescadero community that have expressed an opinion, the majority appears to believe that dredging the creek is the most effective method to address road flooding. The goal of this project is to develop and model alternatives to identify feasible long term solutions to the flooding problem. The solutions identified may be used for seeking implementation funding.

Project Approach

Any long-term solution to the flooding must be an integrated one that successfully reduces the hardships and risks to the community due to flooding while protecting habitat and trust species at the project site and meeting any permitting requirements. The goal of this project is to identify feasible long term solutions to the flooding, while minimizing negative impacts to listed or other sensitive species and with a secondary goal of enhancing or restoring species and habitat within the project area.

The RCD has convened an advisory group for this project that includes two at-large representatives of the Pescadero community, one elected member of the Pescadero Municipal Advisory Council, representatives of resource agencies with funding and permitting authorities, and County staff with engineering and biological expertise and responsibilities. The advisory group will be involved in selection of the consultant team; providing data, information, and other resources to the consultants as needed and feasible; and reviewing deliverables.

To ensure the greatest benefit to project goals, the selected consultant team must coordinate effectively with various ongoing efforts that may provide information relevant to addressing flooding of Pescadero Creek Road. Key efforts include:

- The National Marine Fisheries Service will soon make available field data from the project entitled "Field Data Collection for the Construction of Hydrodynamic Model for Pescadero and Butano Creeks." These field data will facilitate characterization of existing conditions and evaluating potential actions.

- The San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control Board will soon make available the research that has been completed towards the development of Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL) to alleviate impacts from excessive sedimentation in the Pescadero-Butano watershed, including a sediment budget for the Butano Creek watershed.

- Local residents have contracted a consultant that has developed a concept and preliminary designs for a dredging alternative that aims to restore fish passage and may have potential to alleviate chronic flooding.

- A science panel has been formed by California State Parks, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Restoration Center and National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region to investigate ecosystem functions and consider recommendations regarding future management actions at Pescadero marsh and lagoon.

The selected consultant team must be able to identify and answer key technical questions, elicit community input (history, local knowledge, and values) via at least two community meetings, and utilize the Project's Advisory Group to the RCD as appropriate and cost-effective.

Project Scope

The study will contain five primary tasks. The consultant team will be expected to participate in at least two community meetings under tasks 1, 3, and/or 4 as proposed and agreed upon. Project tasks, deliverables, and estimated timeline (subject to refinement during contracting) are as follows:

Task 1: Review Existing Information

Review existing information (geomorphic studies, flooding studies, LiDAR and field survey data, etc.) to identify critical gaps in information that: (1) are necessary for analyzing project alternatives; (2) avoid any redundant work; and (3) directly impede the ability to develop long-term solutions to the flooding problem.

Deliverable *[June 27, 2013]*:

- Memorandum listing information reviewed and identified data gaps.

Task 2: Refine Project Scope

Finalize the Project scope of work with consideration of the existing information from Task 1, including newly released TMDL research for the Pescadero-Butano watershed, anticipated to be available within the specified timeframe.

Deliverable *[July 11, 2013]*:

- Final scope of work approved by the RCD.

Task 3: Existing Conditions Analysis

Analyze existing conditions that affect streamflow, flooding and sediment transport and deposition, habitat, and trust species at the project site. This analysis must be sufficient to identify and develop project alternatives. The scope will be based on the review of existing

information in Task 1 and refined project scope in Task 2 and may include additional data collection as proposed.

Deliverables *[April 1, 2014]*:

- All raw data collected as part of this task
- Summary of findings, documenting existing conditions including flood analysis

Task 4: Identify/Develop and Evaluate Concepts

Identify, develop and evaluate concepts to reduce flooding or adverse impacts from flooding. Evaluation should include modeling and quantification of flood reduction benefit; benefits or impacts to sensitive species; sustainability with respect to sediment supply, transport, and storage; and feasibility of implementation.

Based on existing conditions and any new data collected, develop and evaluate the following concepts:

- doing nothing;
- dredging Butano Creek within the County's Pescadero Creek Road right-of-way as an effective interim solution to the flooding;
- dredging upstream and downstream of the County's Pescadero Creek Road right-of-way to determine whether or not there is an effective interim dredging solution to the flooding;
- a restoration alternative that maximizes habitat protection and restoration, restores the system's ability to store sediment in banks and on the floodplain, and restores a dynamic but stable channel configuration;
- dredging concept currently identified by the local community (which will be provided to the consultant team); and
- new concepts proposed by the consultant team for sustainable long-term solutions to flooding and/or solutions that are integrated with ecosystem restoration.

Deliverable *[July 1, 2014]*:

- Design report that can be understood by the general public that identifies and clearly describes project alternatives to address flooding problems at Pescadero Creek Road. Final conceptual design report will be considered complete when approved by RCD.
    - Alternatives shall be developed to a conceptual level that provides clear understanding among stakeholders of the scope and intent of the proposed alternative, and facilitates effective evaluation of the alternative(s) and their impacts.
    - Concepts shall include, at a minimum, conceptual design drawings in plan view that delineate location and extent of proposed project activities and

written descriptions of the primary project activities and their objectives. Concepts shall include quantification of flood reduction benefit.
- Each alternative shall include suggested, reasonable construction strategies to achieve project objectives.
- Each alternative shall include a discussion of expected post-construction operation and maintenance requirements.
- Each alternative shall include a discussion of feasibility in regards to cost, constructability, and attainability of permits, permissions, and approvals.

Submission Requirements

Submission packages must be thoughtful, clear and well-organized and include the following components *in no more than 20 pages*:

- Cover letter expressing interest and obligating lead consultant to fulfill proposal commitments
- Executive summary
- Description of project approach
- Task description and schedule confirmation
- Personnel qualifications and areas of expertise (including sub-consultants)
- Team organizational chart
- List of comparable projects and references
- Firm profile(s)
- Project budget, including team member fees

Applicants must submit one electronic copy of the package to the San Mateo County Resource Conservation District via email or other digital means to *irina@sanmateorcd.org* no later than 5:00 p.m. PST, Monday, April 1, 2013.

Five original hard copies should be postmarked by the same date and time and mailed to:

San Mateo County Resource Conservation District
Attn: Irina Kogan
625 Miramontes Street, Suite 103
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

Irina Kogan will be available only to answer questions about submission requirements. She can be reached by phone at 650.712.7765 x107 or by email.

Budget and Funding

The cost for services for the total project must not exceed $240,000. $77,000 was awarded through the Bay Area Integrated Regional Water Management Plan under Proposition 84 to develop conceptual designs for solutions to the flooding in Pescadero. $18,000 was awarded under an agreement with the US Fish and Wildlife Service Coastal Program to integrate restoration and recovery of trust species with efforts aimed at reducing impacts from flooding. $145,000 was provided by the County of San Mateo to evaluate the potential for dredging

alternatives within and beyond their right-of-way to alleviate flooding and to integrate with other components of this project.

Consultants will be compensated for work throughout the project as work is completed upon payment to the RCD by the funding agencies after invoices have been approved. Five percent of invoice amounts will be retained until the project has been successfully completed.

Selection Process and Timeline

Submissions are due on April 1, 2013, as described above. A selection committee comprised of members of the advisory group and RCD staff may choose up to three applicants to be interviewed or will make a selection based solely on the proposals submitted.

The Selection Committee will score proposals based on the following scale:

- Description of project approach [17%]

  Successful applicants will describe an approach that supports the purpose and scope of the project. The approach will also be consistent with the proposed task description and schedule confirmation.

- Task description and schedule confirmation [20%]

  Successful applicants will propose a task description and schedule confirmation that is consistent with the proposed project approach and conforms to the project scope. The tasks and schedule will achieve the desired goal of the project.

- Qualifications of personnel [20%]

  Successful applicants will assemble a team of highly qualified individuals who have demonstrated ability in their proposed roles vis-à-vis implementation of the described project approach, tasks, and schedule. These individuals will have expertise and skills in hydrology, hydraulic modeling, surveying/mapping, biology and ecology (including anadromous fish restoration practices and principles and knowledge of local herpetofauna), coastal marsh and lagoon ecology, process and function, fluvial geomorphology; sediment dynamics; biology; project management; civil engineering, and integration of the above fields to create recommendations for long-term solutions to flooding at the Project site.

- Proposed budget [5%]

  Successful applicants will propose budgets that are cost-effective, sufficiently detailed, and realistic. Cost-effective proposals will be able to accomplish higher levels of design with the available funds. The cost for services for the total project must not exceed $240,000. Hourly fees must not exceed $175 per hour for any individual.

- Success in comparable projects [20%]

  Successful applicants will demonstrate experience and success in comparable projects. References will support examples of success in comparable projects.

- Performance history [13%]

Successful applicants will demonstrate a history of cost control, work quality, and adherence to schedules and deadlines. References will support examples of successful performance history.

- Well-written proposal [5%]

  Successful applicants will demonstrate their ability to produce a well-written final project by submitting a well-written proposal. The proposal will be highly readable, well organized, comply with all submission requirements, and not contain grammatical or typographical errors.

Up to four applicants may be invited to present their proposal to the selection committee. Those who have been selected for presentations will be notified by 5 pm PST on April 22, 2013. The RCD will schedule a conference call for 10:00 am on Thursday, April 25, 2013 to provide information about the presentations and to answer questions from applicants as they prepare for the presentation. Presentations will be delivered in Half Moon Bay on a date to be determined during the week of May 6, 2013. If it is not reasonably feasible for an applicant to travel to Half Moon Bay, efforts will be made to conduct the interview remotely.

The RCD Board of Directors will consider the recommendation of the selection committee on May 16, 2013. If the recommendation is approved by the RCD Board of Directors, every effort will be made to execute a contract and begin work immediately thereafter.

Contracting Entity

The RCD is the contracting entity and project manager. The RCD is a non-regulatory public benefit district to help people protect, conserve, and restore natural resources through information, education, and technical assistance programs. The work of the RCD is accomplished through strong voluntary partnerships with land owners and managers, technical advisors, area jurisdictions, government agencies, advocates, and others.

RCDs were established by the state of California to be locally governed special districts that act as focal points for local conservation efforts, using very diverse means to conserve natural resources on public and private lands. Established in 1939, San Mateo County's RCD was the first such district in California. It serves the coastal portion of San Mateo County, including all watersheds in the county that drain into the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary. For more information about the RCD, visit www.sanmateorcd.org.

Attachment E: Responses to Questions to RFP

Q1: Various questions about availability/content of NOAA/National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) data discussed on page 2 of the RFP (e.g. What data is NOAA collecting? Who is the NOAA Point of Contact? When can the consultant team expect to receive lidar and cross sections from RCD via NOAA? Is NOAA putting together a 2D hydrodynamic model under a separate study?)

A: The NOAA study of which we are aware is the one referred to in the RFP. The work is being done by West Consultants for NOAA/NMFS. The project is underway and results have not been released yet. For questions about whether or not that study creates a 2D model, please inquire with NOAA directly. These field data (once available) will facilitate characterization of existing conditions and evaluating potential actions. NMFS POC is Bill Stevens (william.stevens@noaa.gov). The solicitation for the project is also in the Federal Register, and provides a scope of work.

Q2: Previous work done relevant to Butano Flooding.
A: Numerous studies and reports have been produced for the greater Pescadero/Butano watershed. Applicants need to research this on their own for a thorough understanding of previous work. Numerous lists or annotated bibliographies of some of the reports are available online, including UC Riverside's annotated bibliography of the Pescadero Marsh. Some examples of previous studies include: ESA 2008 Pescadero Marsh Restoration Assessment and Recommendations for Ecosystem Management, and Swanson 1999 Pescadero Road Hydraulic study.

Q3: Does this project require biological surveying?
A: We are interested in seeing applicants' proposed approaches. If an applicant deems biological monitoring necessary, include it in the proposal.

Q4: More information about the consultant hired by local residents mentioned in RFP.
A: The consultant that prepared the concept is Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc. in Half Moon Bay.

Q5: Is CEQA analysis part of this project?
A: If CEQA analysis is needed in order to implement solutions developed by the selected consultant team, information that comes from this project would likely be used for the analysis.

Q6: Can resumes be included in an appendix or are they in 20 page limit? Does an 11x17 inch page count as one page or two pages in 20 page proposal limit?
A: The RFP asks for personnel qualifications and areas of expertise as part of 20 pages. If there is a map or similar visual that is used as an insert and needs to be in 11x17 to be seen clearly, we will count it as one page. Please do not submit proposal narrative in 11 x 17.

Q7: Is the Statement of Work developed as part of this RFP final to the project?
A: Please refer to the RFP. Finalizing the SOW is part of Task 2.

Q8: Who from the RCD will be the Project Manager so he/she can be named as part of our project?
A: It is okay to refer to this person as RCD Project Manager.

Q9: What level of specificity is needed for the budget (e.g. are hourly rates needed)?
A: The RFP asks for project budget, including team member fees. The RFP also states that hourly fees must not exceed $175 per hour for any individual.

Q10: Is TMDL data available from the Regional Water Quality Control Board?
A: The Regional Board would need to be contacted for that information.

Q11: Is there flexibility to add a task?
A: The RFP lists 4 tasks and asks for applicants to propose an approach. So if applicant sees need for additional tasks, please propose it that way.

Q12: What is the selection process?
A: Per the RFP, "Up to four applicants may be invited to present their proposal to the selection committee. Those who have been selected for presentations will be notified by 5 pm PST on April 22, 2013. The RCD will schedule a conference call for 10:00 am on Thursday, April 25, 2013 to provide information about the presentations and to answer questions from applicants as they prepare for the presentation. Presentations will be delivered in Half Moon Bay on a date to be determined during the week of May 6, 2013. If it is not reasonably feasible for an applicant to travel to Half Moon Bay, efforts will be made to conduct the interview remotely.

The RCD Board of Directors will consider the recommendation of the selection committee on May 16, 2013. If the recommendation is approved by the RCD Board of Directors, every effort will be made to execute a contract and begin work immediately thereafter."

Q13: Is it envisioned that contractor under proposed flood study would construct a hydrodynamic model of the marsh?
A: The RFP does call for modeling. Regarding whether or not the contractor will construct a model, please tell us what you propose.

Q14: Under "Project Scope" on page 3 of RFP, it states that: "The study will contain five primary tasks." But there are only four listed – Is there a fifth task?
A: You caught an error! There are four tasks, as listed.