

Request for Proposal - Questions and Clarifications
CEQA Analysis for Wildwood Canyon State Park Fuels Treatment Project
2/14/2024

Question #	Question	Clarification
1	Would it be possible to extend the questions deadline to February 14 in case we have questions after the site walk?	The deadline to submit questions was extended to February 13, 2024 at 5:30 p.m. Registered firms were notified via email.
2	Please clarify the consultant's responsibility for botany survey. Page 4 says "Conduct site surveys for habitat and presence of regulated wildlife and botanical species.." but also says" Consultant will not be tasked to perform botanical surveys."	The selected consultant will not perform botanical surveys. IERCD will provide data from recent botanical surveys. The selected consultant will need to perform wildlife surveys as needed.
3	Has State Parks done any surveys or studies that will be available to the consultant (and what are they)?	Limited cultural resource surveys and a historical structures report have been completed for the State Park. These are not comprehensive and cannot be solely relied upon for the requested CEQA analysis. These will be provided to the selected consultant.
4	Will we need a 4WD vehicle for the site tour on February 13?	No, we will stay on well-maintained park roads.
5	RFP Section IV (Scope of Services) states that a "full assessment of natural resources, including silviculture" should be included in the CEQA document. Please clarify if this is requesting a full inventory of all trees within the treatment areas, including a health	No, the scope is not requesting a full inventory of all trees within the treatment areas.
6	RFP Section IV, Task 1 requests review periods be incorporated for all deliverables for "IERCD and partners." Please clarify if these include California State Parks, CAL FIRE, and City of Yucaipa, and if any of the partners require different review period lengths.	Yes, the partners include California State Parks, CAL FIRE, and City of Yucaipa. The partners do not require different review period lengths.
7	RFP Section IV, Task 2, states that the scope should include determining the proper CEQA document (NOE, ND, MND, or CalVTP). However, two bullets below, an Initial Study and potential EIR are included in Task 2. The appropriate document will be determined after review of project activities and technical studies. For example, a scope for an EIR may not be included if an MND is determined to be sufficient. Would IERCD prefer the scope to present one type of CEQA document only (preliminarily determined to be the appropriate document), and develop a second scope later if needed based on the results of initial review? Otherwise, please clarify if the RFP is requesting all of these CEQA documentation types to be presented in the scope.	As part of the project scope, the selected consultant will be tasked with determining the appropriate type of CEQA document for this project. It is not expected that proposers will have the information needed to determine the type of CEQA document required based only on the Request for Proposal. Proposers may choose how to present this determination process and subsequent preparation of the CEQA document in their proposal. However, it is not recommended that proposers preliminarily select the type of CEQA document that may be needed and only propose on that option.
8	Does the IERCD or the State Park have an ongoing consultation arrangement with a Tribe for AB52 consultation and/or tribal monitoring during cultural resource surveys and construction? If so, which Tribe(s)?	The partners do not have a specified AB52 consultation arrangement with any Tribe. State Parks and CAL FIRE each have a cultural resource contact list. These contact lists will be used to notify local Tribes of the project. During Tribal outreach, if presence of a Tribal monitor during surveys/project implementation is requested, CAL FIRE and State Parks Cultural Resource staff will work with Tribal representatives to determine an appropriate course of action.
9	Does the IERCD assume firms will include a tribal monitoring component during pedestrian archaeological survey?	See the clarification provided for question #8.
10	Is the IERCD or the State Park able to share the non-confidential built environment resource records for the historic resources identified in the RFP?	There are no existing cultural resource documents to share prior to selection that are non-confidential. The selected consultant will be provided the information noted in the clarification for question #3.
11	Could you describe what the proposed Manual Infrastructure Protection (MIP) treatment entails?	The Manual Infrastructure Protection (MIP) treatment will be implemented to bring structures into compliance with the defensible space/hazard reduction standards identified in Public Resources Code 4291, Yucaipa Municipal Code 87.1160, and Yucaipa Municipal Code Chapter 8.20. Please review these codes for more information and compliance details.
12	Is there a specification of in-person or virtual bi-monthly IERCD meetings?	These meetings will be virtual.
13	Is there any possibility of fuel breaks around the WUI being added as a treatment activity?	The current project scope will not be expanded.
14	Is there any desire or potential to expand the project area to cover the entire park?	The current project scope will not be expanded.

15	<p>We have a question regarding exceptions to the Service Agreement (Attachment 2). As stated in the RFP on Page 7, "...exceptions must be clearly noted in the proposal and may be reason for rejection.." Can you clarify if this means that any exceptions/redlines clearly noted in the proposal will be considered and/or discussed with the proposer beforehand or is the inclusion itself reason for rejection?</p>	<p>Any exceptions/redlines to the Professional Services Agreement (PSA) template will be considered by IERCD and/or discussed with the proposer. Exceptions may be reason for rejection of the proposal if IERCD and the proposer cannot resolve the exceptions. The inclusion of proposed exceptions to the PSA will not result in automatic rejection of the proposal.</p>
16	<p>What permitting is required for the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) with CAL FIRE as the lead agency?</p>	<p>Within the jurisdiction of the Lahontan RWQCB, CAL FIRE relies on Lahontan's Timber Waiver for these types of projects. The Santa Ana RWQCB currently has no such Timber Waiver program. CAL FIRE will work with the selected consultant to prepare documentation for compliance with Santa Ana RWQCB as necessary. The treatment areas were designated in an attempt to avoid areas that would require a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement with CDFW, but CAL FIRE will work with the selected consultant to prepare this documentation as necessary.</p>
17	<p>Please confirm date (month/year) that the Historical Resources inventory was completed and clarify if State Parks inventoried <u>and</u> evaluated all on-site structures of historic age. Also, did the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) review the evaluations and if so, did they make determinations of eligibility?</p>	<p>See the clarification provided for question #3.</p>
18	<p>As indicated today, are the GIS files of the treatment units available?</p>	<p>The GIS files of the treatment units will be provided to the selected consultant.</p>