



ReWild Mission Bay: Development of Restoration Plan Alternatives

Request for Proposals

The following document outlines a request for proposals from the San Diego Audubon Society for the development of ReWild Mission Bay Restoration Plan Alternatives, the feasibility study portion of ReWild Mission Bay (ReWild MB). Inquiries may be directed to Rebecca Schwartz, ReWild MB Project Manager, by phone at 858-273-7800 x 101 or email at schwartz@sandiegoaudubon.org.

The deadline for receipt of proposals is 5:00 p.m. PDT on September 1, 2015.



Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-------|
| I. Introduction | 3 |
| II. RFP Elements and Evaluation Criteria | 4-6 |
| III. Background | 6-10 |
| A. Goals and Objectives of the ReWild Mission Bay Restoration Plan | |
| B. Problem Context | |
| C. Project Products | |
| D. Planning Groups | |
| IV. Scope of Work by Task and Relevant Considerations | 11-21 |
| Task 1: Site assessment and data collection | 11-18 |
| <i>Considerations:</i> | |
| 1. Existing sensitive habitats and endangered species | |
| 2. Hydraulics, hydrology, and geophysical processes | |
| 3. Existing infrastructure | |
| 4. Sediment/substrate characterization | |
| 5. Historical ecology | |
| 6. Ecosystem services | |
| 7. Climate change | |
| 8. Dredging and sand intrusion | |
| 9. Archaeology | |
| 10. Legal, political and regulatory environment | |
| 11. Public access and interpretation | |
| 12. Education and Research | |
| Task 2: Stakeholder outreach | 18-19 |
| <i>Considerations:</i> | |
| 1. Community impacts and outreach efforts | |
| Task 3: Conceptual plan development | 19-21 |
| <i>Considerations:</i> | |
| 1. Adaptive restoration | |
| 2. Phasing | |
| 3. Construction scheduling/Cost | |
| 4. Maintenance and management | |
| Task 4: Project management | 21 |
| VI. General terms and conditions | 21-22 |
| Exhibit A: Planning Area | 23 |
| References | 24 |



I. Introduction

The San Diego Audubon Society (SDAS), founded in 1948, is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization dedicated to fostering the protection and appreciation of birds, other wildlife, and their habitats. SDAS has served the San Diego region for over 60 years, with community-based habitat restoration projects, environmental education programs, and recreational offerings in North County, Metro, East County, and South Bay communities. SDAS is a leader in on-the-ground conservation efforts within the Mission Bay Important Bird Area (IBA), where we have been restoring sensitive dune and salt marsh habitats and California least tern nesting sites for more than 20 years. SDAS works collaboratively with the City of San Diego, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, University of California Natural Reserve System, several non-profit organizations, and others to help manage natural resources in this IBA.

In 2011, San Diego Audubon led a conservation planning process for the Mission Bay Important Bird Area (IBA), which engaged 22 local experts from 12 cross-sector organizations to identify and respond to major conservation threats and opportunities in the area. One significant outcome of this planning process was consensus on the need for wetlands restoration in the bay at the mouth of Rose Creek, an effort that has been proposed for many years and is consistent with the Mission Bay Park Master Plan. This effort, now referred to as ReWild Mission Bay (ReWild MB), aims to protect and restore salt marsh in the northeast corner of the bay, contiguous with the Kendall Frost Marsh Reserve/Northern Wildlife Preserve (Exhibit A). A feasibility study for ReWild Mission Bay was added to the Southern California Wetlands Recovery Project Work Plan in 2013 and received full funding jointly from the California State Coastal Conservancy and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in 2014.

SDAS seeks professional services to complete various tasks included in the ReWild MB feasibility study. Work includes facilitation of the planning process, technical analyses, and preparation of a detailed set of approaches to protect and enhance 40 acres of existing tidal wetland habitat and restore up to 130 acres of wetland and upland habitat. Planning also will address enhancing public access for research, education, and compatible recreation. The final product will be a written Conceptual Restoration Plan with at least three feasible restoration alternatives that will be appropriate and sufficiently robust for environmental review (CEQA/NEPA).



II. RFP Elements and Evaluation Criteria

The San Diego Audubon Society seeks proposals for the development of the ReWild Mission Bay restoration plan alternatives from consulting firms skillful in coordinating and managing such a feasibility and design project. SDAS anticipates that the multidisciplinary project team could include specialists in wildlife biology, wetland and restoration ecology, civil engineering, hydrology and geomorphology, planning, landscape architecture and other appropriate disciplines. SDAS reserves the right to contract for the work with a single primary consultant, which may perform the work in-house or through one or more subcontractors, or to contract with multiple consultants. The work plan proposed below is provided as a starting point and may be refined as appropriate in consultation with project staff. SDAS seeks a thoughtful level of analysis that is focused, adaptive to new information, and minimizes costs. To that end, refinements from the proposed approach are welcome.

Proposals for the feasibility and design study should include all of the following items. The total proposal package should not exceed 25 pages (including cover letter).

- Statement of qualifications
- Descriptions of the firm, team members, and subcontractors if applicable, and estimated number of hours and percentage of time each member, including subcontractors, will devote to each task
- Specific examples of relevant experience with similar projects in California; include monitoring and implementation outcomes where possible
- Detailed description of tasks and work products
- Proposed planning path and schedule of work, inclusive of dates for specific deliverables, with a project end date of April 1, 2017
- Proposed fixed-price project budget, broken down by task/work product, contractor/ subcontractor, and team member; include hours by task, hours by staff level, and total cost per task; include rate sheet with hourly billing rates for each person to be employed on the project, including subcontractors, plus any related billing provisions (rate sheet does not count towards page maximum); identify all proposed markups for subcontractors; total budget shall not exceed \$350,000.
- Description of any other client or project with the potential to be a conflict, of interest or time, for the firm/team, its members, and subcontractors while conducting the study



Upon receipt of these documents from an interested firm, SDAS may request additional information and will conduct interviews with firms/teams regarding top-ranking proposals.

SDAS will rank contractors based on the following criteria and their respective weights:

- Demonstrated competence, including the firm/team's and individual members' track record with similar projects in California [20%]
- Identifiable experience in the development of imaginative, practical, and cost-effective solutions to restoration and design problems [20%]
- Responsiveness of the proposal to RFP requirements and a demonstrated understanding of project components and issue areas [20%]
- The education/experience of key personnel, particularly local experience, and proposed level of participation of principals and other team members [10%]
- GIS capabilities and other specialized qualifications for the services to be performed [10%]
- Ability to clearly and concisely communicate in written and graphic materials [10%]
- The longevity and stability of the firm(s) and staff turnover [5%]
- The firm/team's readiness and ability to complete the project in a timely manner [5%]

SDAS will attempt to negotiate a contract with the highest-ranking firm/team at compensation determined to be fair and reasonable. If the parties fail to conclude satisfactory arrangements, negotiations with that firm/team will be terminated and negotiations will then proceed in the same manner with other firms/teams in order of ranking. If SDAS is unable to negotiate a satisfactory contract with any of the ranked firms/teams, it may re-advertise the RFP, and continue the negotiation process.

A pre-proposal meeting is scheduled for Thursday, August 6, from 10:00am-1:00pm to answer questions from interested firms/teams. Please confirm your attendance at the meeting by August 1st by RSVPing to the ReWild Mission Bay project manager, Rebecca Schwartz, at schwartz@sandiegoaudubon.org. The location of the pre-proposal meeting is TBD, depending on the number of attendees and will be confirmed closer to the meeting date. The meeting may include an office presentation/Q&A as well as a site visit.



Interested firms/teams should send two hard copies and one electronic copy (via email to schwartz@sandiegoaudubon.org) of proposals to:

Ms. Rebecca Schwartz
Conservation Program Manager
San Diego Audubon Society
4010 Morena Blvd, Suite 100
San Diego, CA 92117

Reference materials selected from the attached list are available for review at the SDAS offices (4010 Morena Blvd Suite 100, SD 92117) on Monday – Friday from 10 a.m. – 3 p.m., by appointment only. (Call 858-273-7800 x 101 to request an appointment).

The deadline for receipt of proposals to SDAS is 5:00 p.m. on September 1, 2015.

III. Background

A. Planning Goals and Objectives

The primary goal of the ReWild Mission Bay Restoration Plan is to create a realistic design for the enhancement and restoration of sustainable estuarine ecosystems in the northeast corner of Mission Bay (Exhibit A). The final product will be a written feasibility study with at least three conceptual restoration alternatives that will be appropriate and sufficiently robust for subsequent environmental analysis. Objectives to achieve this goal are described in detail below under “Scope of Work” where they are listed as project deliverables.

A secondary goal of the ReWild Restoration Plan is that the process for the development of restoration alternatives be transparent and inclusive, and that the ultimate vision for this restoration be informed by public input. Objectives to achieve this goal include conducting stakeholder outreach and public meetings with educational components and opportunities for public comment on project deliverables. These objectives will also help to achieve a tertiary goal of this planning effort: to develop public support for wetlands restoration in this area that will in turn lead to the implementation of the resulting restoration plan.



B. Problem Context

As in much of Southern California, wetlands in Mission Bay have been drastically altered and destroyed over the past 200 years. Approximately 7 percent of the historic wetlands (i.e., salt marsh, mudflat, salt pan) in Mission Bay remain today¹. This system-wide destruction has left much of Mission Bay without the functional benefit of wetlands to provide sediment trapping, nutrient uptake, and habitat/cover for native biota¹. Anticipated sea-level rise poses a significant threat to the remaining wetlands, since little transitional habitat is available for upslope migration. This project's planning area (Exhibit A) is the most likely extensive area in Mission Bay where wetlands and their associated ecosystem processes can be recovered. In addition to the wetland habitat, the planning area also includes areas that could be restored to native upland habitats, areas for upslope marsh migration as sea levels rise, and public recreation, education, and research opportunities.

The 40-acre Kendall-Frost Marsh/Northern Wildlife Preserve is the last remaining salt marsh habitat in Mission Bay². It is an isolated fragment of habitat undergoing changes in vegetation due, in part, to the loss of freshwater and sediment influxes following the channelization of Rose Creek to flow directly into Mission Bay, bypassing the marsh³. There are insufficient adjacent native uplands to support wetland-upland processes (e.g., habitat for pollinators, high tide refuge). Despite these impacts, the marsh supports the federal and state listed light-footed Ridgway's rail (*Rallus obsoletus levipes*), state listed Belding's savannah sparrow (*Passerculus sandwichensis beldingi*), interjurisdictional fish, and migratory birds².

It has been the City's policy to explore the restoration of salt marsh habitat in the planning area for 36 years, starting with the Mission Bay Park Master Plan in 1978 (updated in 1994 with specific recommendations regarding wetlands restoration in the northeast corner of the bay and further amended in 1995, 1997, and 2002), followed by the Mission Bay Natural Resources Management Plan in 1989². Additionally, City voters passed Proposition C in 2008 to provide capital funding for Mission Bay Park improvements from non-tax payer funds (lease revenues within Mission Bay Park), with the priorities for the use of these funds to include the expansion of wetlands, improvement of water quality, and an increase in wildlife preserves and delicate habitats⁴. Recent land-use factors make the timing of this feasibility study particularly auspicious, as leases for two City-owned parcels



immediately adjacent to the Kendall-Frost Marsh have either expired or will expire soon. Campland on the Bay (an RV resort) and De Anza Point Mobile Home Park, both former wetland habitat, could be available for habitat restoration in the near future. These parcels are specifically called out in the Mission Bay Master Plan Update as areas for possible habitat restoration (Campland) or for “special study” (De Anza). The lease at De Anza Point expired in 2003 (with a pending court-case recently settled between the City and residents) and the lease at Campland will expire in 2017. The City will need to determine and plan for future uses for these State tidelands⁵, while also supporting the provision for tent and RV camping facilities within the park as outlined in the Mission Bay Park Master Plan.

C. Project Products

The primary product of the ReWild Restoration Plan is a feasibility and design study including a set of alternatives for the restoration of estuarine habitat in north Mission Bay based on the following premise: the restoration area (Exhibit A) includes a dynamic natural system and restoration actions are needed that support habitat diversity and sustainability while anticipating and allowing natural physical and biogeochemical processes and the effects of climate change, as well as provide expanded opportunities for community engagement with the marsh. Secondary products of this project include project deliverables as outlined in the scope of work below. The deliverables shall at a minimum include Project Goals and Objectives, Existing Conditions Report, Opportunities and Constraints Report, Stakeholder Outreach deliverables, Range of Restoration Alternatives, and Comparison of Alternatives to Goals and Objectives Report.

D. Planning Groups

Throughout this planning process, SDAS staff and the selected consultant(s) will work closely with three main project groups. The three groups are as follows:

1. Wetlands Working Group (WWG)

- Purpose: The WWG serves as the project’s core team to advise the overall planning process.
- Responsibilities: The WWG works to develop the other project groups of the ReWild Restoration Plan; provides input in regards to Requests for Proposals (RFPs) and Scopes of Work for hiring, directing, and overseeing consulting firms



to complete project tasks; and advises on matters relating to engaging with the City of San Diego and other key stakeholders. The WWG will have the opportunity to review and provide input in a timely manner on all project deliverables and will work cooperatively to finalize these deliverables.

- **Membership Composition:** Members of the WWG are invited to participate in the WWG by SDAS staff. Membership of the WWG consists of all project partners, including contributing funders (e.g., California State Coastal Conservancy [SCC] and US Fish and Wildlife Service [USFWS] Coastal Program), landowners (City of San Diego and UC Natural Reserve System), key volunteers (Friends of Mission Bay Marshes), and staff of SDAS involved in the project.

2. Science/Technical Advisory Committee (STAC)

- **Purpose:** The STAC provides scientific advice to the WWG to ensure that the restoration plan is based upon the most up-to-date science and best restoration practices. This group will also provide technical advice to ensure that proposed plans are consistent with City of San Diego planning objectives and procedures, and are feasible within current City infrastructure.
- **Responsibilities:** The STAC reviews the science used in the restoration planning process, advising the WWG and project consultant of new scientific findings that may be used to inform the planning process, as well as provide technical input on project deliverables with respect to engineering/existing infrastructure (e.g., water and sewer pipes), other adjacent planning efforts (e.g., De Anza Special Study Area, Mid Coast Trolley), and real estate issues. The STAC will have the opportunity to review and provide input in a timely manner on all project deliverables prior to finalization.
- **Membership Composition:** The STAC consists of personnel/experts from three main areas (outlined below). Additional individuals may be asked to provide specialized scientific or technical expertise at various times during the project. This may be in the form of reviewing interim project deliverables and/or attending one or more STAC meetings as appropriate.
 - i. Staff from relevant City departments most applicable to the technical aspects of the project (e.g., Public Utilities, Public Works, Development Services, Transportation and Storm Water, Park and Recreation, Planning, Real Estate Assets)



- ii. Wetlands scientists (e.g., wetland ecology/restoration, hydrology, sedimentology, biogeochemistry, plant ecology/botany, wildlife ecology/zoology)
 - iii. Resource agency personnel (e.g., USFWS, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Marine Fisheries Service, Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Coastal Commission, and San Diego Association of Governments)
3. Community Representative Group (CRG)
 - Purpose: The CRG is composed of specific on-the-ground stakeholders with whom ReWild MB wishes to engage throughout the planning process, as their knowledge and support is key to the grassroots success of this project. This group will provide an avenue for political entities, local land users/lessees, community leaders, and local non-profits to engage with the planning process from the outset.
 - Responsibilities: Members will be responsible for providing input during the process, and encouraging public attendance at the larger town hall meetings by reaching out to their particular constituencies where appropriate.
 - Membership Composition: The CRG is expected to include representatives from the Pacific Beach Planning Group, Pacific Beach Town Council, BeautifulPB, City of San Diego City Council District 2 and San Diego Mayor's offices, City of San Diego Parks and Recreation Park Ranger staff, Mission Bay Park Committee, Campland on the Bay, Mission Bay High School, local environmental non-profit organizations (e.g., Friends of Mission Bay Marshes, Friends of Rose Creek), Native American community groups, local universities, other local community groups that have traditionally used the marsh, and other representative organizations as identified by SDAS staff during the course of the project.



IV. Scope of Work and Relevant Considerations

Task 1: Site assessment and data collection

Subtask 1.1: Restoration Goals and Objectives

Work with WWG and STAC to refine the following Objectives to address the project's vision and goals. That process should accommodate flexibility in the restoration planning based on what is learned through the effort, including a system for re-evaluation of Goals and Objectives throughout the planning process.

Project Vision:

- To enhance and restore estuarine habitats in the northeast corner of Mission Bay at the mouth of Rose Creek, contiguous with the Kendall Frost Marsh, and expand opportunities for compatible community access to the marsh.

Project goals and draft objectives:

- **Goal #1:** Aid in the recovery of native estuarine habitats and associated native and sensitive plants, animals, and other taxa.
 - **Draft Objectives:**
 1. Establish and protect substrate integrity (including grain size) to support the existing and created estuarine habitats
 2. Reduce loss and expand acreage of salt marsh and associated tidal channels
 3. Maintain an extent of mudflat sufficient to support ecosystem functioning
 4. Provide upland/ecotone to support ecosystem functions and provide area for marsh migration
 5. Include appropriate reintroduction of sensitive plants, animals, and other taxa
- **Goal #2:** Minimize anthropogenic impacts, both direct and indirect, associated with adjacent development to the existing and restored estuarine habitat and associated sensitive species.
 - **Draft Objectives:**
 1. Provide an adequate buffer between urban development and habitat areas that protects essential ecosystem function



2. Ensure improved quality of water flowing through and exiting the restored marsh and, ultimately, flowing into Mission Bay, through addition, enhancement, and configuration of estuarine ecosystems and/or other facilities
 3. Shield estuarine habitats from artificial night lighting
 4. Address dredging
 5. Consider adjacent use when planning for restoration
- **Goal #3:** Restore dynamic estuarine processes and functions that are increasingly resilient to climate change and its associated effects. Planning for this should be informed by prior restoration projects in the area, and the effort should allow for flexibility in planning, restoration, and management.
 - **Draft Objectives:**
 1. Include mechanisms to address sea level rise, such as appropriate sediment deposition and/or marsh accretion
 2. Create an adaptive management strategy that includes questions, identified decision points, and a quantitative monitoring, management, and maintenance plan for before, during, and after restoration
 3. Integrate restoration planning with local and regional conservation plans and goals
 4. Restore appropriate freshwater inputs to the Kendall-Frost Reserve, such as restoring the hydraulic connection between Rose Creek and the Kendall-Frost Marsh
 5. Incorporate sustainable energy practices when designing and planning for restoration
 - **Goal #4:** Expand and support ecosystem services and functions provided by the existing and restored estuarine ecosystems.
 - **Draft Objectives:**
 1. Strengthen the marsh's carbon sequestration capabilities
 2. Maintain healthy primary productivity and fisheries support of the marsh
 3. Improve the marsh's natural ability to stabilize the shoreline, protect against floods, and act as a buffer against sea level rise
 4. Improve the marsh's ability to filter out nutrients, heavy metals, and pollutants to improve the water quality of Mission Bay



- **Goal #5:** Provide opportunities for public access. Incorporate the development of these opportunities concurrently with planning for restoration of the wetland and ensure that the cultural/anthropological importance of the site is acknowledged in the restoration and public access planning process.
 - **Draft Objectives:**
 1. Support research and education activities associated with the marsh
 2. Allow for ecologically compatible recreation in the area
 3. Develop a cultural/educational visitor's facility adjacent to the marsh

Subtask 1.2: Existing Conditions

Document relevant existing conditions for the site, watershed, and surrounding area that include but are not limited to the Considerations listed below.

Considerations:

1.2.1. Existing sensitive habitats and endangered species

- Sensitive habitats within the project area (Exhibit A) include coastal salt marsh, eelgrass, riparian, upland, mudflat, and saltpan habitats. Light-footed Ridgway's rail (federally-listed endangered) and Belding's savannah sparrow (state-listed) nest in the planning area, while California least tern (federally-listed) have been observed foraging there. Several other protected species are known to use the area as well⁶. An inventory of existing sensitive habitats and species and their locations within and around the project area should be recorded. Habitat preservation and restoration goals must be considered and potential direct and indirect impacts to existing habitats and the protected species they support must be evaluated.

1.2.2. Hydraulics, hydrology, geophysical and biogeochemical processes

- Over the past 150 years, natural processes within Mission Bay and higher in the watershed have been anthropogenically altered with great consequences for the estuary and its processes¹. Restoration



and enhancement of hydraulic, hydrologic, and geophysical processes is a priority for wetland restoration in the area.

- Restoration of this functioning will be complicated by factors including current channelization of Rose Creek, adjacent and upstream flood management concerns, and existing roads and infrastructure. Additionally, the City of San Diego was recently issued a 401 Water Quality Certification (R9-201-0077) for routine channel maintenance of their storm water facilities near Mission Bay High School and Pacific Beach Drive. Dynamic geophysical processes, including flooding and sedimentation, must also be examined and understood as they relate to habitat restoration goals, design, and management.
- Considerations include existing topography and bathymetry and location of habitat types within ranges of elevations for north Mission Bay, presence or influence of wind, waves, water circulation patterns, biogeochemical processes, water quality, salinities, and tidal and fluvial sediment inputs/dynamics, impacts of adjacent boat wakes, influence of bioengineering (e.g., invasive invertebrates).

1.2.3. Existing infrastructure

- Existing infrastructure will impact and inform planning efforts. The location and conditions of such infrastructure, including roads, water/sewage pipes, stormwater discharge points and volumes, hardscape, rip rap, docks, easements, etc., will need to be identified. Accommodations for immovable infrastructure, and relocation (when possible/required) or demolition, modification and removal (where appropriate) of this existing infrastructure will need to be analyzed as a component of this feasibility study to re-establish a self-sustaining riparian and estuarine system.
- Consideration of forthcoming storm drain improvements by the City (e.g., Noyes St.) and consideration of natural solutions to infrastructure challenges are also needed.

1.2.4. Sediment/substrate characterization

- Compilation of recent available data and collection of new data characterizing the sediment/substrate and disposal will be key



components of the planning process and will be a significant factor in determining restoration costs.

- Sediment/substrate data should include soil texture, organics, chemistry and toxicity, and benthic community structure. This is true of areas where the wetland habitat has been in-filled/hardscaped (e.g., the Campland and DeAnza properties). Those areas must be delineated and a testing plan (including analysis of sediment texture and composition, contamination, nutrient retention, and drainage) must be carefully designed to inform the feasibility of restoration of different habitat types in specific areas, and the selection of alternatives and assessment of beneficial use and disposal options.

1.2.5. Water quality

- Considerations include the compilation of existing data and collection of new data on quantities and frequencies of fluvial inputs, accumulations of organics (including bacteria), heavy metals, tidal range, locations of MLLW and MHHW.
- The California State Water Board lists Mission Bay at Campland and Rose Creek as impaired waterbodies due to bacteria, toxicity, poor water quality, and/or trash⁷. Sources and follow-up data are however limited so more current conditions assessment is needed.

1.2.5. Historical Ecology

- An historical ecology reconnaissance study is currently being completed by the San Francisco Estuary Institute to build a more robust understanding of historical conditions in the project area prior to major modification. Results from this study should be considered during the documentation of existing conditions.

Subtask 1.3: Opportunities and Constraints

Document opportunities and constraints that include but are not limited to the considerations listed below.



Considerations:

1.3.1. Ecosystem Services

- The ecological impact of future restoration on the ecosystem services provided to the public by the estuarine habitats should be identified. These services include, but are not limited to:
 - Flood and storm buffering, including changes in sediment accretion and possible reduction of flood risk to upstream development along Rose Creek
 - Water quality
 - Shellfish and juvenile fish nursery habitat
 - Biogeochemical modification of seawater chemistry
 - Carbon storage
 - Shoreline stabilization, including opportunities beyond exclusively marsh restoration (e.g. oyster beds) to reduce erosion

1.3.2. Climate Change

- Climate change and its associated effects, including sea level rise (SLR), and changes in fluvial and tidal dynamics, must be assessed and included in criteria for the feasibility and design study. Consider the Draft Sea Level Rise Guidance Document produced by the California Coastal Commission to determine what should be analyzed and how (e.g., a site plan showing low, mid, and high projections of SLR and the restoration strategies that will maintain ecosystem sustainability in the face of these changes).
- Consider strategies to promote ecosystem resilience and migration/retreat without wetland loss, such as sediment augmentation, reduction of wake, etc.

1.3.3. Dredging and sand intrusion

- The City of San Diego regularly conducts dredging within portions of the planning area (e.g., next dredging planned for Fall 2016) in order to maintain navigable passages, and also conducts beach enhancement actions on nearby shoreline. How these actions will influence and interface with restoration efforts must be assessed, including potential impacts of historical dredging and sand



intrusion (especially the movement of coarse grained sediments) from nearby beach nourishment.

1.3.4. Archaeology

- The presence of prehistoric people in the project vicinity has been documented⁸. The planning process should incorporate an approach for assessing potentially significant archeological findings, especially as they relate to the National Historic Preservation Act and its regulations. Consideration of how these may affect the feasibility of and inform restoration actions in specific areas must be considered in designing restoration alternatives.

1.3.5. Legal, political, and regulatory environment

- The project shall evaluate site-specific land use restrictions or other special factors that may constrain or enhance restoration opportunities, specifically as these factors relate to the 2017 lease expiration for Campland on the Bay and the 2003 lease expiration/2014 relocation settlement for the De Anza Point property. Additionally, the Mission Bay Park Master Plan and its associated Natural Resources Management Plan, Charter of the City of San Diego Charter Section 55.2 (Mission Bay Park and Regional Parks Improvement Funds), National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), federal/state endangered species statutes (e.g., Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended; California Endangered Species Act), Migratory Bird Treaty Act, state/federal water quality regulations (e.g., Clean Water Act; Rivers and Harbors Act), Migratory Bird Treaty Act, state/federal water quality regulations, the National Coastal Zone Management Act, California Coastal Act, and state Tidelands/Coastal Zone designations are among the regulatory concerns that should inform project planning.

1.3.6. Public access and interpretation

- Improving the existing level of public access and assessing potential public access enhancements compatible with other project objectives is an important part of the project scope. As such, the study shall identify opportunities for public access,



recreation, and interpretation that will serve visitor needs and be compatible with the ecological goals of the project. The public access analysis should include a study of the feasibility of incorporating boardwalks/walkways, interpretive facilities/visitor's center, and connecting the Mission Bay Bike Trail with the wetland area, in a manner compatible with habitat conservation and restoration.

1.3.7. Education and research

- Given the immediate adjacency of several educational institutions to the project area, including Mission Bay High School and the University of California's Kendall-Frost Marsh Reserve, as well as the long-standing role of research and education by local universities, including UC San Diego's Scripps Institution of Oceanography, in the restoration and preservation of the remaining wetland, opportunities for education and research must be considered.

Task Deliverable(s): interim and final reports for Project Goals and Objectives, Existing Conditions Report, Opportunities and Constraints Report

Task 2: Stakeholder outreach

Subtask 2.1: Public Workshops

Conduct public workshops/meetings, timed to coincide with key project deliverables. Number of meetings/workshops to be determined but a minimum of five will be conducted.

Considerations:

2.1.1. Community impacts and outreach efforts

- There is a great deal of community interest in the future of the planning area, including current and future land use. The outreach process must include clear and engaging explanations of the functions and benefits of wetlands and their restoration, and ample opportunity for public input from the beginning of the process. It should also evaluate restoration impacts on public and private properties adjacent to (or within) the study area. In



addition, project information shall be made easily accessible to the public. The scope of work for the consultant shall include developing a stakeholder outreach process that will engage the surrounding communities in a visioning process for the planning area that could guide the development of the site program and the ultimate restoration and management plan for the planning area.

Task Deliverable(s): meeting minutes for all public workshops; all fliers/handouts and presentations created for public workshops and meetings; summaries of conclusions and significant minority opinions from the participants

Task 3: Conceptual plan development

Subtask 3.1: Restoration Alternatives

Develop a range of conceptual restoration plan alternatives which are each suitable for the next phase of project development including preliminary engineering and environmental review under CEQA and NEPA through an iterative process and guided by input received directly from the WWG, CRG, STAC, and results from public stakeholder meetings. A wide range of potential restoration measures will be identified, and then winnowed down to a smaller, more manageable range of screening alternatives that best capture the goals and objectives in consideration of the opportunities and constraints. This range will then be winnowed down to a set of at least three final restoration alternatives that will be appropriate and sufficiently robust for environmental analysis as part of the subsequent implementation phase.

Considerations:

3.1.1. Adaptive restoration

- The uncertainty associated with habitat restoration, lessons learned from testing approaches on a small scale with documented scientific methods, results of consistent monitoring to document restoration outcomes, and the inclusion of promising approaches in the specifications for large-scale projects should be considered during this planning process. Research, monitoring, and construction experience associated with previous restoration projects should be incorporated into the feasibility and design



study, and, where deemed necessary, new scientific protocols should be integrated.

3.1.2. Phasing

- Several large parcels of the planning area are still in use for commercial/recreational enterprises. In defining restoration alternatives, the feasibility study must take into consideration that some parcels may not be available for restoration until sometime in the future. For this reason, the restoration design must be flexible enough to allow for phased implementation as parcels are approved for restoration.

3.1.3. Hydraulic modeling

- Considerations of engineering and economic feasibility for various hydraulic regimes will be a major factor in identifying potential restoration alternatives. Therefore, hydraulic modeling needs to be conducted to determine the feasibility of the restoration alternatives.

3.1.4. Construction scheduling and cost

- Identify alternative restoration scenarios and compare estimated costs associated with them, including final design and engineering, construction, monitoring, maintenance and overall management.

Subtask 3.2: Comparison to Goals and Objectives

Complete a comparison to analyze how the restoration alternatives compare in satisfying project Goals and Objectives, in consideration of the documented Opportunities and Constraints. This analysis will likely include estimates of earth grading quantities and opportunities for disposal, comparison of habitat created and habitats impacted, climate change evaluation (e.g., SLR), tidal hydraulics analysis, fluvial hydraulics and sedimentation assessment, implementation phasing development, and cost assessment.

Considerations:

3.2.1. Maintenance and management

- The dynamic nature of wetland systems, particularly in relation to cycles of flooding and potential sedimentation, requires careful consideration for assessing project feasibility and appropriate



design alternatives. Future project performance and anticipated maintenance and management actions must be articulated and addressed as a core component of this feasibility and design study. Generally, a self-sustaining environment without “hard structures” and requiring minimal and predictable maintenance actions is in the interest of both wildlife and the public. An evaluation of habitat goals and restoration approaches is needed, which factors the site’s evolution over time, its long-term sustainability, and anticipated maintenance and management needs, particularly in terms of responsiveness to future SLR and other anticipated effects of climate change. Anticipated maintenance and management actions and their costs for each alternative need to be identified.

Task Deliverable(s): Interim and final reports detailing Range of Restoration Alternatives including maps and reports describing the final alternatives, and Comparison of Alternatives to Goals and Objectives Report

Task 4: Project management

The consultant will coordinate with the ReWild Mission Bay Project Manager/SDAS Conservation Program Manager, Rebecca Schwartz, to keep her informed about the status of the project. The consultant will be responsible for managing the budget and schedule, submitting requests for disbursement, selecting and managing subcontractors, and other project management activities.

Task Deliverable(s): progress reports, invoices, and subcontract documentation

V. General Terms and Conditions

1. As a condition to its agreement with SDAS, the consultant and each of its subcontractors shall assign to SDAS all rights and interest in all material, data, information, and written, graphic or other work produced under this contract, including, without limitation, any right to copyright, patent or trademark the work.



2. This RFP is a solicitation for proposals only, and is neither intended, nor to be construed as, an offer to enter into an agreement or engage in any formal competitive bidding or negotiation pursuant to any statute, ordinance, rule, or regulation. SDAS reserves the unqualified right to reject any or all proposals for any reason.
3. SDAS is not responsible for, and shall not be bound by, any representations otherwise made by any individual acting or purporting to act on its behalf.
4. SDAS shall not in any way be liable or responsible for any costs incurred in connection with the preparation, submittal, or presentation of any RFP prepared and/or submitted in response to this request.
5. Responses to this RFP shall be made according to the specifications and instructions contained in this document. Failure to adhere to RFP instructions may be cause for rejection of any proposal.
6. SDAS reserves the right to interpret or change any provisions of this RFP at any time prior to the proposal submittal date. Such interpretations or changes shall be in the form of addenda to this RFP.
7. Such addenda will become part of this RFP and may become part of the resultant contract. Such addenda shall be made available to each person or organization that has received an RFP from SDAS. If a firm received the RFP from a party other than SDAS, they should contact SDAS to be added to the official distribution list. Firms submitting proposals may be required by the terms of an addendum to respond to requirements for additional information, and in that event the failure to address the requirements of that addendum may result in SDAS's disregard of the proposal.
8. SDAS, at its sole discretion, may determine that a time extension is required for submittal of proposals, in which case an addendum shall indicate the new proposal submittal date.
9. No changes to the proposals shall be allowed after submittal to SDAS.
10. Be advised that any contracts entered into between SDAS and any consultants shall be considered to be fixed-price agreements unless specified otherwise.



Exhibit A: Planning Area



Map produced by: GIS Services
Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Map Date: March 27, 2014
Data Source: San Francisco Estuary Institute



References:

- ¹ City of San Diego. *Mission Bay Park Master Plan Update*, Prepared by Wallace Roberts & Todd. (Part IV: Environment). 2002. (Print)
- ² City of San Diego. *Mission Bay Park Natural Resources Management Plan*, Prepared by the City of San Diego Development and Environmental Planning. 1990. (Print)
- ³ San Diego Earthworks. *Rose Creek Watershed Opportunities Assessment*, Prepared by KTU+A. (Section 2.2.1: Recommendations for Enhancing the Connection to Mission Bay). 2005. (PDF accessed July 2015 via <http://www.rosecreekwatershed.org/>)
- ⁴ City of San Diego City Charter. Article V, Section 55.2: Mission Bay Park and Regional Parks Improvement Funds. (PDF accessed July 2015 via <http://www.sandiego.gov/city-clerk/officialdocs/legisdocs/charter.shtml>)
- ⁵ California State Coastal Conservancy (SCC). *Mission Bay Wetlands Conceptual Plan Staff Recommendation*, Prepared by SCC staff for consideration by SCC Board of Directors. 2014. (Print)
- ⁶ Cooper, Daniel. *Important Bird Areas of California*. Pasadena, CA: Audubon California, 2004. (Print)
- ⁷ California State Water Board. *Final 2010 Integrated Report, CWA Section 303(d) List / 305(b) Report*. (Category 5: 2010 California 303(d) list of water quality limited segments). 2011. (Accessed via <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/>)
- ⁸ van den Hazelkamp, Alette. (2011) *Shell Middens of the Mission Bay Area, San Diego, California*. Proceedings of the Society for California Archaeology, Volume 25.