



# ReWild Mission Bay: Development of Restoration Plan Alternatives

---

## Addendum #1- Corrected

Issued: August 21, 2015

Document: Questions and answers from the "Request for proposals pre-proposal meeting", held August 6, 2015 at the San Diego Audubon (SDAS) offices. (Note: Includes correction to Question 29)

Inquiries may be directed to Rebecca Schwartz, ReWild Mission Bay Project Manager, by phone at 858-273-7800 x 101 or email at [schwartz@sandiegoaudubon.org](mailto:schwartz@sandiegoaudubon.org).



## **Pre-Proposal Meeting: In-Office Questions and Answers**

The following represents official SDAS answers to questions posed by attendees of the August 6, 2015 pre-proposal meeting regarding the Request for Proposals (RFP) for “ReWild Mission Bay: Development of restoration plan alternatives” during the official in-office question and answer session. Answers were given verbally during the meeting and are described herein. Where answers were not provided during the meeting, they are not included in this Addendum but will be included in a subsequent Addendum to the RFP (specifically number 18 below). The questions and answers provided below are listed in the order in which they were asked and answered during the meeting.

1. Q: Regarding the “Special Study Area” (SSA) referenced within the Mission Bay Park Master Plan Update (MBPMPU) and the City of San Diego’s current efforts to engage in a planning process for the SSA, how will SDAS be dovetailing ReWild Mission Bay (aka ReWild) with the City’s efforts?
  - A: While the Scope of Work for the City’s efforts have not yet been released, wetlands restoration must be considered when planning for the SSA, per the MBPMPU. However, the City’s efforts and ReWild are different projects: ReWild focuses on a larger planning area and is specifically focused on the feasibility of wetlands restoration in the area, with opportunities for compatible community access as described in the RFP (as opposed to being a full land-use study). That being said, there will be considerable overlap between the two projects with respect to timeline and geography. Therefore, significant communication and coordination will be necessary and is already ongoing: several representatives from the City serve on the Science & Technical Advisory Committee for ReWild, including a planner from the SSA project. Additionally, the two groups have met and agreed on a need to be present at the other’s town hall/public meetings and provide project updates to the other.
  - For a copy of the Mission Bay Park Master Plan Update, click [here](http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/programs/parkplanning/mbpark.shtml) or go to <http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/programs/parkplanning/mbpark.shtml>



2. Q: Is everything within the boundary line of the planning area (see “Exhibit A: Planning Area” included in the RFP) to be considered for proposed changes? For example, could the existing ball fields be converted to wetlands?
  - A: While it may be relevant to consider proposed changes in the entire planning area as part of this project, the primary focus for wetlands restoration are the areas outlined in red in the planning area map. Other areas within the planning boundary should primarily be considered as adjacent areas with other land uses that may affect and interact with the marsh, and may need to be considered in the provision of enhanced compatible public access to the restored marsh.
  
3. Q: Is the resulting document meant to be used as part of the CEQA process?
  - A: The final product for this project is not a CEQA-ready document, but the information included in the final product of this project will be used to create CEQA documents. For example, this project will have no “No Project” alternative but the resulting restoration alternatives from this project will likely be (or at least significantly inform) the alternatives used during the CEQA process.
  
4. Q: How likely is it that this project will actually happen?
  - A: To the best of our understanding, very likely. ReWild Mission Bay was recently chosen by the Regional Water Quality Control Board as a priority project that the Board intends to support through to completion, several agencies have approached SDAS regarding funding opportunities for the restoration phase of the project, there is significant political support within the City of San Diego for this effort, and the MBPMPU specifically describes opportunities for restoration in this area. That being said, certain parcels within the planning area may be available for restoration sooner than others. Therefore, phasing (as described in the RFP) will be an important consideration of the feasibility study.
  
5. Q: How strict is the timeline?
  - A: The timeline for this project is dictated by our funders (California State Coastal Conservancy and the US Fish and Wildlife Service Coastal



Program). Some of the funding will expire at the end of the current timeline but some of the funding may have opportunities for extension.

6. Q: The RFP states, “any contracts entered into between SDAS and any consultants shall be considered to be fixed-price agreements.” However, for the bid submittal the RFP mandates hours per team member, subconsultants, etc. How will payment work? For example, will it be as a percent of task completion, based on hours, etc.?
  - A: Payments will be made based on time and materials spent (as reflected in receipts, invoices, reports, etc.), but the entire project will have a fixed upper limit as described in the RFP (see Section II: “RFP Elements and Evaluation Criteria”).
  
7. Q: In regards to the consultant selection process, who will ultimately be choosing the consultant for this project?
  - A: The Wetlands Working Group (as described in the RFP, see Section III: Background, Part D: Planning Groups) will choose the consultant.
  
8. Q: Are there any existing designs for the area?
  - A: There have been some student-created designs through Dr. Lisa Levin’s course at the Scripps Institute of Oceanography as well as some broad/not-detailed designs included in the MBPMPU. For a link to an example plan, click [here](#) or go to:  
[http://cmbc.ucsd.edu/Students/Current\\_Students/SIO286/](http://cmbc.ucsd.edu/Students/Current_Students/SIO286/)
  
9. Q: How is the small-scale restoration currently being conducted at the Kendall Frost Marsh being considered in the existing conditions?
  - A: The University of California Natural Reserve System (NRS), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Coastal Program (USFWS), and SDAS have all partnered together to complete a transition zone grading and revegetation project in the upland area of the existing Kendall Frost Marsh. As the grading for this project and most of the native plant installation has already been conducted, the “restored” transition/upland area of Kendall Frost will be considered as an existing condition with respect to ReWild. Given that protection of the existing marsh is a goal of



ReWild, the larger scale restoration alternatives completed during this feasibility study should benefit the existing marsh.

10. Q: Does Kendall Frost Marsh have any existing water measurement data?

- A: No. The City may have some data for adjacent areas (including Crown Point) but there are not measurements from Kendall Frost Marsh itself.

11. Q: Have existing habitat types been mapped at Kendall Frost Marsh?

- A: Through the years, graduate students have attempted to map existing habitat types at Kendall Frost Marsh, but with limited success. The City has some LIDAR data and high-resolution topographic maps, but these may or may not still exist. Identification and collection of existing data for the planning area will be an important consideration of the “Existing Conditions” report prepared by the consulting team selected for this project.

12. Q: If this restoration moves forward, to where will Campland on the Bay relocate? Do they have plans to stay within Mission Bay Park?

- A: Campland’s lease expires in 2017 and SDAS knows of no specific plans or commitments from the City for where Campland will move at that time or if any lease extensions will be granted to the operators of Campland. Representatives from Campland have indicated a desire to relocate to the former mobile home property at DeAnza Point, but have also expressed flexibility with respect to other opportunities for relocation. Included within the Mission Bay Park Master Plan is a priority for providing recreational uses, including camping, within the park, but at this time we do not know what form that will take after Campland’s lease expires.

13. Q: How much will recreational uses need to be considered as part of this process?

- A: Recreational uses will need to be considered in as much as they impact the existing and proposed marsh (e.g., boat wakes) as well as opportunities for ecologically compatible recreation (e.g. kayaking) within the restored marsh.

14. Q: To what extent will recreational uses continue?



- A: The extent of recreational uses within the existing and proposed marsh will come to light as the feasibility study process moves forward. Opportunities for recreation outside of the existing and proposed marsh areas will depend on actions by the City, but will be consistent with the MBPMPU's provision for providing opportunities for recreation in the bay.

15. Q: The RFP outlines a robust outreach and engagement process- are there specific issues or concerns that should be aware of as we draft a scope for this?

- A: For issues and concerns, please refer to the considerations included in the RFP. Considerations included in subtasks outside of "Subtasks 2.1: Public Workshops" may also be informative (e.g., Consideration 1.3.6: Public access and interpretation). To clarify, the ReWild consultant will only be responsible for the public workshops/town hall meetings portion of outreach and engagement. SDAS staff will continue to manage the various planning groups outlined in the RFP (e.g., Science & Technical Advisory Committee, Community Representative Group, Wetlands Working Group).

16. Q: How will reverting lease areas within the planning area to marsh affect the percentage of land within Mission Bay Park available for lease, as per the City Charter-imposed maximum of 25% of land area within Mission Bay Park being devoted to leases? Will the land use changes proposed by ReWild affect the acreage of Mission Bay Park available for lease?

- A: The details of this answer will need to be fleshed out as part of the feasibility study process. However, initial statements within the MBPMPU indicate that reverting the proposed area to wetland habitat (thereby "removing" that amount of land area from the park) would not raise the dedicated lease percentage above the 25% maximum (See MBPMPU Section IV: Land Use, Recommendation #24).

17. Q: What are the top three concerns for the Kendall Frost Marsh area?

- A: While an official list has not been compiled, significant concerns include a lack of freshwater input, lack of sediment input, degraded upland areas, steep slope within transition areas, existing storm water



drains/channels, and course grained sediment movement from adjacent City beaches (e.g., Crown Point Shores). The overall restoration alternatives must include enhancement of the existing marsh at Kendall Frost.

18. Q: Should resumes be included in the bid? If so, do they contribute to the 25 page maximum?

- A: To be determined pending WWG discussions. A follow-up addendum will be made available that includes the answer to questions not answered herein.

19. Q: Should the final product include reference to a preferred alternative?

- A: Not as currently described in the RFP.

20. Q: Are there any limits imposed on restoration alternatives other than cost?

- A: The MBPMPU is considered a guiding document for this restoration planning effort. Restoration alternatives should be feasible from both environmental (e.g., ecology, hydrology) and social/political (e.g., consistent with existing City planning documents) perspectives, but other than that there are no other constraints.

21. Q: For implementation of the resulting restoration plan, have funding sources been identified?

- No funds have yet been specifically earmarked for this restoration project. However, we have been in contact with several agencies (including the Wildlife Conservation Board, Army Corp of Engineers, SANDAG, etc.), many of which expressed interest in working with SDAS to identify or secure funds for implementation.

### **Pre-Proposal Meeting: Field Visit Questions and Answers**

The following represents official SDAS answers to questions posed by attendees of the August 6, 2015 pre-proposal meeting regarding the Request for Proposals (RFP) for “ReWild Mission Bay: Development of restoration plan alternatives” during the official site visit portion of the meeting. Answers were given verbally in the and are described herein.



Where answers were not provided on site, they are not included in this Addendum but will be included in a subsequent Addendum to the RFP (specifically numbers 31 and 32 below). The questions and answers provided below are listed in the order in which they were asked and answered during the site visit. Additional informal questions may have been asked to individual members of the Wetlands Working Group, which are not included herein.

*While at the Kendall Frost Marsh Reserve Research Trailer:*

22. Q: What are the current freshwater sources to Kendall Frost Marsh?

- A: The only current freshwater sources, other than rain, are the Olney St. and Noyes St. storm drains. Historically, Rose Creek used to flow into the marsh. Note that the visible channels are tidal channels, not freshwater channels.

23. Q: How persistent and/or stable are the various habitat types/areas within Kendall Frost Marsh?

- A: The salt beds are very stable, but there are unstable ponded areas that have recently developed that are devoid of vegetation.

24. Q: Is the upland area included in the planning area?

- A: Yes, the visible upland area is largely contained within what is referred to as the “Frost Parcel”, which is City-owned but NRS-managed and intended as an opportunity for mitigation.

*While at the Crown Point overlook/platform:*

25. Q: Does the property line of the Kendall Frost Marsh end at the existing chain link fence?

- A: The exact location of the property line is unknown at this time, but is likely very close to the existing chain link fence (which is in place to aid in predator control).

26. Q: Do any listed species utilize this area?

- Yes. Light-footed Ridgway’s rails and Belding’s savannah sparrows both nest within the existing marsh. California least tern forage within the





planning area. See RFP for more information about endangered and threatened species (Consideration 1.2.1).

27. Q: What is the history of the restored marsh, often referred to as the Stribley Marsh, as well as the existing dune?

- The exact details (timing, intent, outcomes) of the Stribley marsh project and the adjacent dune feature will need to be clarified as part of the planning process.

*While at the Mike Gotch Memorial Bridge:*

28. Q: Do the existing pilings and docks belong to Campland on the Bay? If so, would Campland be responsible for removing them if/when Campland relocates?

- Ownership of and responsibility for that particular infrastructure is unknown and will need to be determined during the feasibility study.

29. Q: How far up Rose Creek does the planning area extend?

- ~~The planning area extends up Rose Creek to the Grand Ave bridge.~~
- Corrected answer: The planning area extends up Rose Creek to the Garnet Ave bridge.

30. Q: Does the Mission Bay Boat and Ski Club (MBBSC) have an end-date to their lease?

- The MBBSC is on a month-to-month lease with the City of San Diego. Early discussions with members indicate that they would prefer not to move but have begun scoping alternate locations in the bay.

31. Q: Why does the planning boundary stop where it does? How was this decided?

- To be determined pending WWG discussions. A follow-up addendum will be made available that includes the answer to questions not answered herein.

32. Q: Will the list of meeting attendees and their contact information be shared with all other meeting attendees?

- To be determined pending WWG discussions. A follow-up addendum will be made available that includes the answer to questions not answered herein.