

## Additional information in response to SFOC CRSMP Outreach RFP questions received

1. *How much of an FTE do you imagine this work to be? Are you imagining that it will be full-time for one person, or part-time? It seems that there are some very substantive tasks in here, so we're just trying to get a sense of your expectations to map against our availability.*

Response: We do not have a set expectation for how a proposal or proposing team might allocate the hours to complete the work. It could be set up with a senior and a junior staff member, for example. We do expect a lot of hours in a short window, especially on the governance task where much remains to be done. The funds for the project were allocated at a high amount so that the contractor could pull out all the stops in order to get the work done in the available timeframe.

2. *Is \$90,000 the maximum contract amount? Are proposals expected to come in at that amount?*

Response: It is a maximum; there is no set expectation re budgets that may be proposed. We will see what comes in.

3. *What is meant by "governance structure"? Will it be mandatory or voluntary to implement? What does "accepted" by local governments mean? Is there a permitting component?*

Response: The governance structure will establish a future forum for work to implement Regional Sediment Management by the affected entities within the Plan area. It would likely implement initial steps that the Plan recommends, such as initial studies or funding source development for individual projects. Plan implementation and future RSM coordination is voluntary. There is no direct link to project permitting at this point. Local governments may adopt or accept the Plan; past RSM efforts in other coastal CA areas may inform the structure of that effort.

4. *Why is this work not being completed with in-house capacity?*

Response: We don't currently have the staff capacity.

5. *What kind of public involvement has there been to date? Where have there been conflicts?*

Response: Public involvement focused on beach users, surfers, environmental groups, homeowners associations and citizens who live in the coastal areas. Our plan area included a

major existing conflict around Sharp Park Golf Course: endangered species preservation versus continued golf use, among other issues. We would expect continued outreach on identified issues, not necessarily broadening the outreach to a wider group.

6. *How much effort is expected on Task C?*

Response: Likely less than other tasks. Task C work will likely be more of a facilitation effort to get technical responses from CSMW partners.

7. *How will the consultant work in relation to CSMW? Will it be more of a handoff or will there be continued engagement?*

Response: We'd expect that SFEP would provide input regarding background work done to date. CSMW staff would coordinate going forward, with 3 individuals as points of contact. See the response to Question 13 for further detail.

8. *Task A of the RFP indicates that the selected contractor should review previous input related to potential governance structure options obtained from previous outreach activities. How many of the previous outreach activities were focused on governance options for the SFOC CRSMP, and who was involved in these activities (e.g., the general public, concerned parties, etc.)?*

Response: There has been relatively little work to date on developing governance structure. There is a minimal set of recommendations from ESA contained in their final report. Initial efforts focused on having ABAG serve as the governance entity for RSM work for the SFOC littoral cell. That was determined to be a poor fit, so the consultant will need to review and recommend potential replacements and work with those agencies to assess viability. A 'governance board' with rotating Chairs or other MOU-style approaches could be considered for that replacement, as should other approaches that might work for the region. Meetings to be held as part of this RFP will hopefully help the contractor, ABAG, and CSMW collectively decide on the best path forward to help implement RSM across the region.

9. *Who will ultimately be responsible for deciding on the governance structure to support implementation of the SFOC CRSMP (e.g., the CSMW, CNRA, etc.)?*

Response: This will depend on securing a willing agency, no objections from partners, and support of CSMW. In addition, it will probably be an iterative process, but the contractor's efforts should be focused on those goals. We assume that the contractor would come up with a set of recommendations relative to governance structure. Anything beyond that would be up to the CSMW and willing partners.

10. *For the Governance Structure Recommendation Memo that will be produced through Task A, should this memo be a written document, or can it be in PowerPoint form?*

Response: We don't think a PPT alone would be sufficiently detailed. A PPT could certainly be useful for outreach purposes, but we wouldn't want it in lieu of a report/memo.

11. *The RFP mentions the previous outreach activities that were conducted and the need to re-engage the Stakeholder Advisory Groups (SAGs). How many SAGs are there, and how many individuals are part of each group? Have these groups been inactive since the November 2012 meeting (the most recent meeting listed on the CRSMP website)? When were stakeholders or the general public last solicited to provide feedback on the SFOC CRSMP?*

Response: There is one Stakeholder Advisory Group comprised of affected agencies and municipalities. The other group is the public outreach group. The outreach element of this Plan has not been active since 2012. Work since that time has focused on development of a final CRSMP for the subject area suitable for sharing with jurisdictional agencies to obtain their input and involvement in governance efforts to be conducted under this RFP. The CSMW recently obtained a final draft of the Plan from Halcrow/ESA and should have the Plan ready for sharing by the time the contract is let. The stakeholder list is available on the CSMW page for the SFOC CRSMP ([http://www.dbw.ca.gov/csmw/crsmp\\_sf.aspx](http://www.dbw.ca.gov/csmw/crsmp_sf.aspx) and click the link at right to the "Public Outreach Contact List"). We might add that during the hiatus, San Mateo County with the assistance of the Coastal Conservancy has created a Climate Resiliency Taskforce/Workgroup, and a number of coastal communities have received grants from the OPC, SCC, and CCC for incorporating SLR into their LCPs. A concerted outreach effort to these entities could be fruitful, especially on governance development.

12. *Task B mentions the need for the contractor to update the outreach website. Previously, what type of information was provided on the website? When was the last time that the website was updated? Will the contractor have administrative privileges to update the website, or will updates be done in collaboration with ABAG/CSMW? Is the idea to redesign the website or just update the information on it?*

Response: The website has not been updated since 2012. It has not been determined exactly how the web updates will be handled. Updating information is the priority rather than redesigning the page. The page is available for review at <http://www.sfestuary.org/our-projects/watershed-management/crsm>. CSMW's website can be the main vehicle for updating information. The contractor will not have administrative capabilities, but CSMW staff will coordinate with the consultant to make sure that data is posted in a timely manner. Links to all the CRSMP web pages are provided at the bottom of this document.

13. *The RFP mentions that the contractor will work closely with the CSMW to ensure that tasks reflect the needs of the region and state. Will the contractor be working with the entire CSMW, or are there representatives/a committee within the group that the contractor will work with more closely?*

Response: There are three key CSMW representatives: the point person will be Clif Davenport, CA Department of Conservation. John Dingler, USACE, is a technical resource, and Chris Potter,

CNRA, can assist with policy development. These three will work with the main body of CSMW to bring a recommended approach to the group. If for some reason Clif wasn't available, Chris Potter would be the point person.

14. *Is it possible to view the draft SMP report drafted by Halcrow and completed by CWMW?*

Response: The CRSMP report is not yet available for review.

15. *According to your website, public meetings took place in 2012. What meetings and outreach activities have you conducted since then?*

Response: Please see question #11, above.

16. *Third, the draft schedule includes outreach activities over the winter holiday period as well as an aggressive timeline for work to be completed by March 1, 2016. Would you please explain the deadline to help us better understand the planning and outreach context?*

Response: The funding for this work expires then.

Online resources showing work on the project to date:

- SFEP/ABAG SFOC CRSMP general page for the CRSMP (public focused), last active November 2012: <http://www.sfestuary.org/our-projects/watershed-management/crsm/>
- SFEP/ABAG SFOC CRSMP SAG page, last active November 2012: <http://www.sfestuary.org/our-projects/watershed-management/crsm/crsmags/>
- CSMW SFOC CRSMP page: [http://www.dbw.ca.gov/csmw/crsmp\\_sf.aspx](http://www.dbw.ca.gov/csmw/crsmp_sf.aspx)