

Cosco Busan Trustee Council
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) FOR
2013 Eelgrass Restoration Program, San Francisco, California
DUE DATE: March 1, 2013

For technical questions or more information contact:

Natalie Cosentino-Manning
NOAA Restoration Center
777 Sonoma Ave, Suite 219A
Santa Rosa, CA 95403
Phone: 707-575-6081
Natalie.C-Manning@noaa.gov

Submit proposals electronically to:

Niscelle Ward
Coordinator, Program Administration
NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION
1133 15th Street, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202.595.2448
Fax: 202.857.0162
Niscelle.Ward@nfwf.org

**2013 Eelgrass Restoration and Monitoring, San Francisco Bay,
San Francisco, California**

| | | |
|-------------|--|----------|
| I. | Project Overview..... | 3 |
| | A. Introduction..... | 3 |
| | B. Background and Need for the Project..... | 3 |
| | C. Project Goals..... | 4 |
| | D. Project Description..... | 4 |
| | E. Monitoring..... | 5 |
| | F. Timeline..... | 5 |
| II. | Application Procedures..... | 5 |
| | A. General..... | 6 |
| | B. Proposal Content..... | 6 |
| | C. Overhead Costs..... | 6 |
| | D. Environmental Compliance..... | 6 |
| | E. Contract Information for Proposal Submission..... | 6 |
| | F. Cost Analysis..... | 7 |
| III. | Proposal Evaluation Process | |
| | A. RFP Conformity..... | 7 |
| | B. Technical Review..... | 7 |
| | C. CBTC Technical Specialist..... | 7 |
| | D. Proposal Review and Selection..... | 7 |
| IV. | Special Contract Requirements and Considerations..... | 8 |
| V. | Cosco Busan Trustee Council Restoration Project Requirements..... | 8 |

I. Project Overview

A. Introduction

The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (The Foundation), together with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the other Cosco Busan Trustee council (CBTC) agencies, including the United State Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, California State Lands Commission and the National Park Service, are announcing a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the restoration of eelgrass (*Zostera marina*) within the central portion of San Francisco Bay. This is a multi-year (up to 3 years) RFP that will look to increase eelgrass habitat in San Francisco Bay for Pacific herring (*Clupea pallasii*) and other species of concern. Monitoring the success of the restoration and the benefits to herring and other fish and wildlife is also part of this proposal.

The Foundation is receiving and managing funds on behalf of the NOAA for eelgrass restoration and monitoring under the Cosco Busan Oil Spill natural resource damages settlement (United States of America v. M/V Cosco Busan, et al. (Case No. C 07-6045 (SC))). The eelgrass restoration and monitoring funds are designed to compensate the public for the loss of herring as a result of the 2007 Cosco Busan oil spill in San Francisco Bay. These funds will be used for grants and contracts to restore, expand, enhance and monitor eelgrass habitat in the San Francisco Bay Area and in areas where oil was documented and where herring were injured.

The Final Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan for the Cosco Busan Oil Spill, released in February 2012, contains details on the injury assessment and proposed restoration projects to address ecological injuries. The Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan and additional information regarding the Cosco Busan Oil Spill and settlement is available at <http://www.darrp.noaa.gov/southwest/cosco>

B. Background and Need for Project

On November 7, 2007, the freighter Cosco Busan struck a bridge pier on the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge rupturing the hull and discharging approximately 53,000 gallons of bunker fuel oil to San Francisco Bay. Inside the Bay, the oil primarily impacted waters and shoreline within the central portion of the Bay, from Tiburon to San Francisco on the west side and from Richmond to Alameda on the east side. Oil from the spill was documented within eelgrass beds throughout the central San Francisco Bay, approximately 900 acres. In addition, herring spawn in near shore habitats in San Francisco Bay typically from late November to March, soon after the *Cosco Busan* spill. Herring spawn was observed in eelgrass beds and within subtidal and intertidal locations, where surface water and shoreline oiling was observed and documented.

Due to the physical properties of the *Cosco Busan* oil, the Trustees concluded that exposure of aquatic organisms to the oil – and, accordingly, injury – was most likely to occur in nearshore areas where oil stranded along shorelines. Since nearshore areas are also the primary spawning

location for Pacific herring, the Trustees conducted an in-depth assessment of the potential for injuries to the spawning fish. Because of their spawning behavior and high sensitivity to oil toxicity, the Trustees considered herring to be a reasonable proxy for near shore spawning species of fish in San Francisco Bay at risk for exposure from the spill (see Appendix D of the Cosco Busan DARP, <http://www.darrp.noaa.gov/southwest/cosco>).

The injuries to herring populations and to eelgrass within central San Francisco bay were a component of the natural resource damages settlement approved by a federal court on January 27, 2012. A portion of the settlement funds are directed towards restoration and monitoring of eelgrass within San Francisco Bay to off-set both direct and indirect impacts to the ecosystem supported by eelgrass. The overall intent of this solicitation is to expand the current densities and spatial coverage of eelgrass in the bay to provide suitable spawning and nursery grounds for multiple forage fish, in particular herring.

C. Project Goal

This project will create or expand eelgrass beds at multiple locations inside the Bay. The goal of the overall restoration project is to create 70 new or expanded acres of eelgrass over nine years. Theoretically, thirty-six of those acres will be directly planted (four acres per year for nine years), while the remainder is expected to expand naturally from the planted acres. As also noted in the Cosco Busan Restoration Plan, other projects that can enhance or expand eelgrass areas, such as the removal of marine debris or anchor chains, and contribute to the goal of 70 acres will be considered in future solicitations. At this time restoration methods such as transplanting and seeding are the preferred options.

D. Project Description

Methods and recommendations for eelgrass restoration within San Francisco Bay can be found within the Subtidal Habitat Goals Project document (<http://www.sfbaysubtidal.org/>). To achieve the most effective and efficient restoration, each individual restoration site should be able to maintain itself with little additional human intervention over time. This means that restored plants will persist over time, spread clonally, and establish extensive rhizome systems, and/or flower, and contribute seed. Climate change and stressors associated should be considered when selecting the appropriate methods and site selection.

Criteria for site selection should include local conditions such as depth profile, sediment type, waves and currents, salinity patterns, and turbidity. In addition, sites should be chosen because they were within the spill zone and are in locations particularly suitable for use by spawning herring. Based on the recommendations found within the San Francisco Bay Subtidal Habitat Goals Report and the criteria set in the Cosco Busan Restoration Plan, multiple sites within the central bay are preferred. Some site recommendations include, but are not limited to:

- San Rafael Bay
- Corte Madera shoreline;

- Richardson Bay;
- Eastern shore line within the East Bay Regional Park District (multiple sites)

For this solicitation one or multiple sites are eligible for restoration work. Also, on-going restoration sites may be included as well as sites that are in coordination with other restoration efforts, such as living shorelines and wetland creation.

E. Monitoring

Monitoring should be incorporated into the overall framework of the restoration plan. Before, during and after monitoring of eelgrass restoration and herring use of restored beds is a priority under this solicitation. Other fish and wildlife monitoring to describe the benefits of the eelgrass restoration are encouraged. Important metrics to include but are not limited to:

Eelgrass

- 1) Acres created and/or enhanced, expanded
- 2) Percent cover
- 3) Stem density
- 4) Plant height
- 5) Seedling recruitment and survival

Herring

- 1) Presence or absence of spawn
- 2) Percent cover of spawn
- 3) Density of spawn

Note: Methods for monitoring should be as non-destructive as possible.

F. Time line

The overall timeframe for recovery, based on the Cosco Busan injury assessment, of herring and eelgrass in the bay is projected for nine years. This solicitation is looking for three year project meant to increase eelgrass incrementally in the bay. The project proposed should have procedures in place to determine the effectiveness of the restoration and be able to make changes as needed and with acceptance from the CBTC. Restoration and monitoring should start in the spring/summer of 2013 and extend through the winter 2016 herring season. If the project is successful the CBTC may decide to continue the efforts for an additional three years.

II. Application Procedures

A. General

- In order to be considered for funding under this RFP, all proposals must follow the guidelines given below and must be SENT ELECTRONICALLY before or on March 1, 2013 by 11:59 PDT.

Applications must include:

- Detailed qualifications of personnel conducting the work. Proposal should highlight experience performing eelgrass restoration and monitoring.

B. Proposal Content

The proposal package should include Project Summary, Proposed Activities, Budget, and Qualifications. Descriptions must be sufficiently detailed to allow NFWF to write a contract with clear and measurable objectives and to make a cost analysis of each element of the proposed project. Additional sections may be added if needed to include supporting material such as contractor experience and qualifications to perform the work proposed, reports, publications, maps, pictures, and drawings.

A U.S. Federal Taxpayer Identification number must be provided on the first page.

C. Overhead Costs

If administrative overhead costs exceed ten percent of total costs of all other aspects of a proposal, a separate sheet detailing these overhead costs must be attached and submitted with the proposal. Please be advised that if contracts are audited all overhead costs must be justified by detailed accounting records or they will be disallowed.

D. Environmental Compliance

Compliance with applicable laws and permits is a requirement of this project. A list of permits needed for the project will be required along with current status of the permit process (i.e. drafting, pending, secured)

E. Contact Information for Proposal Submission

Please contact the CBTC Technical Specialist for technical content questions:

Natalie Cosentino-Manning

NOAA Restoration Center

777 Sonoma Ave, Suite 219A

Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Phone: 707-575-6081

Natalie.C-Manning@noaa.gov

Please submit each proposal as an MS Word electronic file to:

Niscelle Ward
Coordinator, Program Administration
NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION
1133 15th Street, NW Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202.595.2448
Fax: 202.857.0162
Niscelle.Ward@nfwf.org

F. Cost Analysis

The Foundation's cost analysis of the proposed project will include all project costs. Total project cost used in the analysis will include the total amount requested from settlement funds under this RFP. A total of \$ 2.5 million is available for eelgrass restoration and monitoring for the nine years. Projects that are cost effective and have additional funding sources will rank high, although match is not a requirement of this solicitation.

III. Proposal Evaluation Process

A. RFP Conformity

When received, proposals will be examined for compliance with all RFP requirements. This includes the inclusion of sufficient detail. Proposals not in compliance will be rejected. However, the CBTC may request additional information from the applicant to determine if the proposal can be brought into compliance with the RFP for continued consideration.

B. Technical Review

Following initial review, proposals will be sent to appropriate CBTC technical representatives for review, comment, and scoring.

C. Technical Specialist

Proposal sponsors may contact the CB Technical Specialist in the planning and development of proposals. Consultation with CBTC should be scheduled well in advance of proposal deadlines to allow time to evaluate site conditions, if necessary.

D. Proposal Review and Selection

Proposals will be reviewed by the CBTC evaluation committee to determine the ability of the applicant to successfully complete the project based on the detail provided for each section listed above. Review and evaluation will include:

- Evaluation of scores made by CBTC technical representative reviewers;

- Extent to which the applicant documents demonstrated experience and qualifications;
- Proposals determined to be lacking in detail sufficient to allow a cost analysis to be made or that are found to be not in compliance with state, federal or international law will be rejected.

IV. Special Contract Requirements and Considerations

After applicants are notified of funding decisions, contracts will be prepared and executed by NFWF. Contractors are reminded that work completed before the contract initiation date or after the contract termination date cannot be approved for payment.

Data, photographs, footage, interim reports, final reports, and other work products as a result of this contract become the express property of the CBTC and their representative agencies, and will be made publicly available. The acceptance of funds under this RFP denotes contractor acceptance of this provision. Contractors should read their contracts carefully and be familiar with all details, including the termination date, to avoid misunderstandings.

Please note that the selected applicant will be required to submit the following financial information to NFWF for review prior to the contract being awarded.

- GAAP-audited financial statements from the most recent fiscal year (non-Federal applicants only)
- IRS Form 990 from the most recent year (non-governmental applicants only)
- An IRS determination letter (non-governmental applicants only).
- A133 audit for recipients of Federal grants that total in excess of (Currently \$500,000 in one year (non-federal applicants only)).

V. Cosco Busan Trustee Council Restoration Project Requirements

All Restoration Project Implementers are to provide to the Trustee Council (through the designated Lead Oversight Trustee), the items in the Check List below.

1. Scopes of Work:

- a. Proposed and Final Scopes of Work (SOW) should include a description of the work to be done, a schedule and budget.
- b. Multi-year project implementers should provide Annual SOWs that include:
 - (i) a discussion of any changes or deviations from the Final SOW;
 - (ii) a budget that shows actual amounts spent the prior year and any carryover funds; and
 - (iii) a budget for the coming year.

- c. Draft SOWs (including draft Annual SOWs) shall be provided to the Trustees for review and comment prior to finalization. Implementers should note that the Trustees may have comments on draft SOWs and request revision prior to finalization and so should allow sufficient time for this process.
- d. Final SOWs and Annual SOWs shall incorporate/address all Trustee comments.
- e. Funds will not be disbursed without a Final SOW that has been approved by the Trustee Council. Funds for multi-year projects will generally be disbursed on an annual basis following approval of the Annual SOW.

2. Annual Reports:

- a. The Annual Reports for multiyear projects should include a description of project accomplishments made the prior year and discuss any changes or deviations from the Final SOW and/or the Annual SOW.
- b. Annual Reports must comply with Reporting Requirements (see #4 below).

3. Final Reports:

- a. The Final Project Report should include: (i) a summary of the work completed on the project; (ii) a discussion of performance monitoring data and analysis, as appropriate; and (iii) a final budget of project expenditures.
- b. The Final Project Report must comply with Reporting Requirements (see #4 below)

4. Reporting Requirements:

- a. Draft Reports shall be provided to the trustees for review and comment prior to finalization. Implementers should provide draft Reports to the trustees for review with sufficient time allowed for Trustee review and timely submittal of the Annual Report/Final Report.
- b. Annual/Final Reports shall incorporate/address all Trustee comments provided on the draft Reports.
- c. Reports shall include photo documentation, if appropriate, including before and after photos and/or other photos demonstrating work in progress or accomplished.
- d. Acknowledgment of funding: Reports should acknowledge funding by the Cosco Busan Trustee Council comprised of representatives of the California Department of Fish and Game, the California State Lands

Commission, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the Department of the Interior through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Park Service.

Include names of Trustee Agencies + Logos, and an attribution, such as, "Funding for this restoration project was provided (in part) by the Cosco Busan Trustee Council.

- e. Accessibility Requirements for Reports
 - i. Must be submitted in a format suitable for the Trustees' On-line Administrative Record.
 - ii. Must be in a PDF or Word format that is accessible by people with disabilities. (Compliance with ADA and Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973)