

**Kit Carson Park Wetland Permits Mitigation Areas – Request for Proposals
Addendum #2 – July 19, 2018**

Question #1: Will the contractor be required to remove non-native trees that are not shown as "Exotic Tree To Be Removed" in the Attachment E map for task 4, in both RGP 94 Areas A and B?

Answer: RGP 94 tree removal per the mitigation plan has been completed, so no further tree removal is required by agency permits. Task 4 (an optional task) has been recommended by restoration specialists to ensure the long-term success of the project. The selected consultant may recommend other higher-priority trees or arundo to be removed in place of the ones mapped in Attachment E for the ultimate goal of a successful mitigation site, as long as the budget for Task 4 does not increase.

Question #2: Can the bidders be provided with a shapefile that includes the tree and arundo locations for task 4?

Answer: The shapefile will be uploaded to the FTP site when available.

Question #3: Are prevailing wage maintenance rates appropriate to use for bidding the project?

Answer: Yes, prevailing wage rules apply for landscape work and surveying. Prevailing wage rules do not apply to other work, such as biological services, reporting, mapping, etc.

Question #4: Are there staging areas available within the park for tree removal activities?

Answer: Yes, staging areas are available at Kit Carson Park in coordination with the City of Escondido Public Works/Parks Division.

Question #5: Is there irrigation pipe installed in RGP 94 and if so, will it need to be removed from RGP 94 Area B at the end of the maintenance period?

Answer: No, there is no irrigation pipe installed in RGP 94 mitigation areas.

Question #6: Is there access on the dirt trails within the park around Eagle Scout Lake for crew trucks to drive adjacent to the maintenance sites?

Answer: Yes.

Question #7: There are discrepancies in mapped non-native trees between Attachment A1 and Attachment E. Does one take precedence over the other, or are all trees/non-natives within the site expected to be removed?

Answer: Attachment A1 is from the original RGP 94 Mitigation Plan, approved in 2015. After significant tree and giant reed removal was completed per plan in 2015-2016, additional exotic trees were identified as recommended for removal (as shown in Attachment E). Removal of these trees is not required per the mitigation plan, but the City has an interest in the long-term success of the site and has thus included Optional Task 4 in this RFP to consider implementing the recommendations in Attachment E within the contract period.

Question #8: Many of the non-native trees are in the middle of areas that are surrounded by native trees. What access will be allowed within mitigation sites to bring in heavy equipment to remove trees? The non-native trees are too large to cut and remove by hand and will require heavy equipment. In order to access them, native plants will need to be cut back to create a ingress/egress.

Answer: Optional Task 4 will require heavy equipment. As tree removal per Attachment E is not required per the approved RGP 94 Mitigation Plan, challenges with implementation of Optional Task 4 will be considered and adapted for the contract with the selected consultant.

Question #9: Is cut-stump or drill and kill method allowed rather than complete biomass removal of non-native trees?

Answer: For optional Task 4, 18 of the 21 trees are located adjacent to public use areas, therefore for safety reasons the City is requesting complete removal of the trunk rather than using the drilling and herbicide treatment. However, cut stumps may be acceptable. For three of the 21 identified trees, drilling and herbicide treatment is acceptable due to their location further from public access areas.

Question #10: Is supplemental hand watering allowed as part of our planting and seeding efforts?

Answer: For the additional plantings requested within RGP 87, it is assumed that no supplemental watering is authorized since the project is in year 6, but that can be discussed with the regulatory agencies.

For RGP 94, a goal of the mitigation is to have the restored and enhanced areas persist and be self-sustaining without temporary irrigation for at least 2 years before the mitigation program is complete.

Question #11: Will any maintenance activities be done by another contractor between the RFP date of July 3 and the date of contract award and execution?

Answer: No, it is not expected that maintenance activities will occur by another contractor during this period. Two of the four quarterly visits have been completed.

Question #12: In the Contents of the Proposal section of the RFP, there are a variety of page limits listed that refer to “double-sided pages”; however, the submittal is electronic only so can you please clarify the page limits? For example, for the Proposed Project Team section it states “maximum 2 double-sided pages” – does this mean 4 pages maximum for this section?

Answer: Yes. Any references to double-sided page limits should be assumed to be that number of pages times two for electronic submittal.

Question #13: Is a copy of the Year 2 Annual Report for the RGP 94 mitigation site available for review?

Answer: See additional materials posted to the FTP site as part of Addendum #1.

Question #14: In Task 3, the second bullet references CRAM analysis to be completed in Years 3 and 5.

Answer: Budget in the current contract have since allowed for CRAM to be completed in year 3. Therefore, the proposal need only include CRAM in Year 5.

Question #15: For RGP 87, is there any documentation of what exactly the Regional Water Quality Control Board staff has requested?

Answer: The May 2018 Site Visit report from Alan Monji has been uploaded to the FTP site. It is anticipated that, to improve the native coverage, additional plantings will be needed. Alan’s related comments are:

“Overall the site appears to be doing well and self-sustaining but I am concerned about the % native cover well below the year 5 benchmark. My recommendation will be to continue monitoring for another year and see how the % native cover, sycamore height, and oak tree height are doing after another year along with the other performance measures.”

Question #16: The 3rd bullet of Task 1 requests “managing updates to plans if needed.” Please provide more information.

Answer: Updates to plans are not expected. If needed, minor changes would be estimated at no more than 10 hours during the contract period.

Question #17: In Task 2, reference is made to “temporary fencing if needed.” Please provide more information.

Answer: To date, this project has not needed temporary fencing but the fencing is listed in the approved plans as a possible measure to protect the mitigation work. For bidding purposes, assume no more than 2000 linear feet.