



c/o State Coastal Conservancy
1515 Clay Street, 10th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612

(510) 286-7193

sfbayrestore.org
info@sfbayrestore.org

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 8, 2017

TO: Governing Board
San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority

FROM: Sam Schuchat, Executive Officer; Matt Gerhart, Program Manager; Kelly Malinowski, Project Manager
San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority

SUBJECT: Edits to the Draft Request for Proposals and Application

Staff recommends that the Authority adopt Resolution 32 to adopt the edited Request for Proposals (RFP) and edited Application, and direct staff to initiate the 2017 grant solicitation.

I. Discussion

Staff has been actively pursuing review of, and revisions to, the draft RFP and Grant Application. After incorporating comments received on “Key Considerations” at the April 4th Board meeting, staff received extensive comments from the Advisory Committee at its May 12th meeting, reviewed and discussed edits with the Board at its June 9th meeting, and revisited outstanding issues with the Advisory Committee at its August 11th meeting, and Ad-Hoc Committee meeting preceding the August 11th Advisory Committee meeting.

The version currently proposed for adoption addresses cumulative input from the Board, Staff, Advisory Committee as a whole, individual committee members, and the public. For a summary of specific edits made to the RFP and Grant Application, please see Attachment 1.

Key updates reflected since the June 9th Board presentation are summarized briefly below:

Timeframe for CEQA. Numerous comments revolved around the details and process involved in CEQA. After consideration, no changes were made to the 12-month timeframe for CEQA-readiness proposed earlier to the board. Staff will work with proponents through the consultation process to ensure CEQA requirements and timeframes are well-understood.

Project Types vs. Eligible Activities. Commenters were consistently confused by the combination of the Project Types derived from the Authority’s enabling legislation and the Programs/Activities set out by Measure AA. Language was developed to clarify the distinction between what makes a project itself eligible, versus what activities of an eligible project may be funded using Measure AA funds.

Further Definition of Scoring Categories. A great deal of input was received on the scoring categories proposed in the RFP, in some cases with conflicting perspectives expressed. In general, consensus emerged from the Advisory Committee that revisiting scoring criteria regularly will be needed as future solicitations proceed, to improve overall transparency in scoring. Particular feedback received focused on refining the concept of “Likelihood of Success,” resulting in the development of three proposed scoring sub-categories. Extensive discussion of the pros and cons of weighting various prioritization criteria resulted in language specifying that projects will not be judged simply on the number of criteria addressed, but the quality and depth with which they address prioritization criteria.

Budget. A number of clarifications to the budget tables and discussions were proposed, resulting in the addition of task budgets by calendar year, inclusion of contingencies, a 15% allowance for direct project management costs, clarification of eligible overhead, and a discussion of proposed and secured sources of matching funds.

Barriers, Risks and Uncertainties. Discussion of the unknown or uncertain factors that may impact project success led to the inclusion of a new section where proponents will be asked to discuss the barriers, risks and uncertainties present in their project, and propose strategies for addressing those factors.

Monitoring. Monitoring has come up for discussion in numerous contexts: overall monitoring of ecological processes in the estuary (health of the estuary), the monitoring and measurement of the Authority’s progress towards its goals, and the monitoring requirements for particular projects. Staff and the Advisory Committee have recognized this is a complex set of issues requiring a longer-term approach to developing recommendations and approaches. Regarding the first round of Authority projects, it was determined that monitoring requirements should be kept to a minimum beyond existing (i.e. permit and other legal or funding requirements) and should be focused on demonstrating the effectiveness of the project.

Community Support and Engagement. Comments received during the review process with the Advisory Committee, as well as public comment received and attached, focused on the engagement and support of community groups, as well as community engagement within economically disadvantaged communities. As a result, the application has been edited to require robust discussion of engagement, community support and involvement, with ties drawn to the scoring framework.

II. Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Authority adopt Resolution 32 to adopt the proposed, revised Request for Proposal and Grant Application, and direct staff to initiate the 2017 grant solicitation.

III. Attachments

1. History of the Request for Proposals (RFP) and Grant Application
2. Draft, Amended Request for Proposals (RFP) and Draft, Amended Grant Application;
(Redline Version, compared to June 9, 2017 Draft)
3. Resolution 32 to Adopt Amended Request for Proposals (RFP) and Amended Grant Application
 - a. Exhibit A: Proposed Request for Proposals (RFP) and Proposed Grant Application (Clean)
4. Public Comment Letter