



#

#

RESPONSE TO VENDOR QUESTIONS REGARDING RFP FOR FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR THE POLARIS CREEK AND WETLAND RESTORATION PROJECT

1. To what degree has the RCD identified suitable recreation relocation sites and potential opportunities or constraints associated with those alternatives?
ANSWER: Tahoe RCD had initial conversations with partners about locations for potential alternative locations for the soccer/baseball field and campground, but nothing has been specifically identified. This project will require working very closely with the project partners who own land within the project area including Placer County, Tahoe City Public Utility District, California Department of Parks and Recreation and California Tahoe Conservancy; in order to develop the potential opportunities and constraints for all alternatives including an alternative for no action and alternative to improve the facilities and allow them to remain in place will be explored.

2. Is there a preferred project schedule or deadline for completion of the Final Feasibility Study?
ANSWER: Preferred project schedule would be to select consultant in July 2018, draft conceptual plans and feasibility study by June 2019 and final Feasibility Study by September 2019.

3. Has any public outreach been conducted to-date on this project?
ANSWER: No, not specifically on this project. There has been previous outreach for other portions of the Polaris, Lake Forest and Burton Creek watershed restoration activities over the last decade.

4. Can you give us more information about the Advisory Committee such as: have they been meeting and if so, for how long. Would they be open to adding additional member to the advisory ground such as private neighbors, HOA's, other stakeholders?
ANSWER: The Advisory Group has met formally one time in March 2018 to finalize roles, responsibilities and outline the Request for Proposal guidelines. The Advisory Group is made up of vested property owners, funding partners, and the grantee. While committed to a robust public outreach and solicitation of input from a spectrum of interested

#



#

#

individuals and groups, there are no plans to change the makeup of the Advisory Group.

5. How will the public access information about the project at this stage and future stages? Is there a web page or site that can be used, or should we include this in our scope?

ANSWER: At this stage, Tahoe City Public Utility District and Tahoe RCD will host information on our websites. Tahoe City PUD has also offered to assist consultant with outreach efforts to notify stakeholders of public workshops including e-mail and e-newsletter blasts, mailers, press releases and/or sign notifications. A location for public access to information in future stages will be determined at that time.

6. Can we add additional deliverables to this RFP such as development of initial public information materials?

ANSWER: Yes, add deliverables that are needed to execute the project scope. Inclusion of added deliverables will be determined during scope negotiations.

7. Who do you think the project supporters will be outside of the Advisory group? What will be the biggest challenges from the public perspective?

ANSWER: The project supporters and challengers are anticipated to overlap in some stakeholder areas. There are residents and families that may be upset at the potential of moving facilities and some who will be pleased at the prospect. Depending on alternative locations for the ballfield relocation, there could be additional supporters and challengers that arise in the proposed alternatives. The nearby Homeowners Associations, University of California Davis, Desert Research Institute will have a stake as well as visitors of the Lake Forest Campground and Boat Launch.

8. Have any baseline studies of the area been completed to date that are publicly available or could be made available?

ANSWER: There have been some baseline studies performed in and around the area of this project. All materials will be provided to the selected consultant. Materials are fairly dated (greater than 15 years) but some hard copies can be provided to the selected consultant including Lake Forest Erosion Control Project Area B (SEZ/Habitat Restoration) prepared for Placer County Department of Public Works by Wood Rodgers (hard copy only).

#



TAHOE

RESOURCE CONSERVATION DISTRICT

870 Emerald Bay Road Suite 108, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150 530.543.1501 PH 530.543.1660 FAX TahoeRCD.org

#

#

9. Have preliminary alternative locations for the baseball field been identified yet and if so, what are those locations?

ANSWER: See question #1 above. Discussions about preliminary alternative locations for the soccer/baseball field and campground have been initiated among the Advisory Group, however no locations have been identified. Alternatives to improve the facilities and allow them to remain in place will also be explored.

#