

AMENDMENT #2 TO AGREEMENT BY AND BETWEEN MONTEREY COUNTY WATER RESOURCES AGENCY AND ICF JONES & STOKES, INC

THIS AMENDMENT NO. 2 is made to the PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT ("Agreement") for the provision of providing services for the development of a long-term Salinas River Management Plan, Habitat Conservation Plan and associated CEQA/NEPA requirements by and between **ICF JONES & STOKES, INC.**, hereinafter "CONTRACTOR", and the Monterey County Water Resources Agency, a political subdivision of the State of California, hereinafter referred to as "Agency".

WHEREAS, CONTRACTOR entered into the Agreement with the Agency on April 3, 2018; and

WHEREAS, the Agency and CONTRACTOR entered into Amendment No. 1 to the Agreement on May 6, 2021; and

WHEREAS, the Parties wish to amend the Agreement by making the following changes: revising Exhibit A – Scope of Work; extending the term to June 30, 2026; revising Exhibit B – Budget; and increasing the dollar amount by \$3,280,530. for a total contract amount not to exceed \$6,409,506.

NOW THEREFORE, the Agency and CONTRACTOR hereby agree to amend the Agreement in the following manner:

1. Amend Section 1, "**Employment of CONTRACTOR,**" to read as follows:

Employment of CONTRACTOR, Agency hereby engages CONTRACTOR and CONTRACTOR hereby agrees to perform the services set forth in **Exhibit A – REVISED**, in conformity with the terms of this Agreement. CONTRACTOR will complete all work in accordance with the Scope of Work/Work schedule set forth in **Exhibit A – REVISED**.

The scope of work is briefly described and outlined as follows:

- a) Provide services for development of a long-term Salinas River Management Plan, Habitat Conservation Plan and associated CEQA/NEPA requirements.
- b) The CONTRACTOR shall perform its services under this agreement in accordance with usual and customary care and with generally accepted practices in effect at the time the services are rendered. The CONTRACTOR and its agents and employees performing work hereunder are specially trained, experienced, competent, and appropriately licensed to perform the work and deliver the services required by this Agreement.
- c) CONTRACTOR, its agents and employees shall perform all work in a safe and skillful manner and in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations. All work performed under this Agreement that is required by law to be performed or supervised by licensed personnel shall be performed in accordance with such licensing requirements.
- d) CONTRACTOR shall furnish, at its own expense, all materials and equipment necessary to carry out the terms of this Agreement, except as otherwise provided herein.

CONTRACTOR shall not use Agency premises, property (including equipment, instruments, or supplies) or personnel for any purpose other than in the performance of its obligations hereunder.

2. Amend Section 2, **“Term of Agreement,”** to read as follows:

The term of this Agreement shall begin upon execution of this Agreement by CONTRACTOR and Agency, and will terminate on **June 30, 2026**, unless earlier terminated as provided herein.

3. Amend Section 3, **“Payments to CONTRACTOR; maximum liability,”** to read as follows:

Payments to CONTRACTOR; maximum liability, Subject to the limitations set forth herein, Agency shall pay to CONTRACTOR the amounts provided in **Exhibit B – REVISED**. The maximum amount payable to CONTRATOR under this contract is **six million four hundred nine thousand five hundred six dollars and no cents (\$6,409,506)**.

4. Except as provided herein, all remaining terms, conditions and provisions of the AGREEMENT are unchanged and unaffected by this AMENDMENT No. 2 and shall continue in full force and effect as set forth in the Agreement.
5. A copy of this AMENDMENT No. 2 shall be attached to the Agreement dated April 3, 2018.

This section intentionally left blank

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this AMENDMENT NO. 2 on the day and year written below.

MONTEREY COUNTY WATER
RESOURCES AGENCY

CONTRACTOR

General Manager

By: _____
Signature of Chair, President, or
Vice-President

Dated:

Printed Name and Title

Approved as to Fiscal Provisions:

Dated:

Deputy Auditor/Controller

By: _____
(Signature of Secretary, Asst. Secretary, CFO,
Treasurer or Asst. Treasurer)*

Dated:

Approved as to Liability Provisions:

Printed Name and Title

Risk Management

Dated:

Dated:

Approved as to Form:

Approved as to fiscal provisions:

Assistant County Counsel

CAO Analyst

Dated:

Dated:_____

*INSTRUCTIONS: If CONTRACTOR is a corporation, including limited liability and non-profit corporations, the full legal name of the corporation shall be set forth above together with the signatures of two specified officers. If CONTRACTOR is a partnership, the name of the partnership shall be set forth above together with the signature of a partner who has authority to execute this Agreement on behalf of the partnership. If CONTRACTOR is contracting in an individual capacity, the individual shall set forth the name of the business, if any, and shall personally sign the Agreement.

EXHIBIT A – REVISED (SCOPE OF WORK)

Project Understanding

Monterey County Water Resources Agency (hereafter, AGENCY) proposes to develop a habitat conservation plan (HCP) and apply for incidental take permits (ITPs) for certain species listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and for identified species that may become listed in the future. The HCP is intended to support the proposed issuance of ITPs for federally threatened and endangered species regulated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS; collectively, Services). The ITPs would provide take coverage to AGENCY for the various projects and activities associated with the long-term management of the Salinas River and other waterways in Monterey County.

In support of the ultimate goal of finalizing and implementing a Salinas River HCP, AGENCY began in early 2018 a series of efforts that collectively became known as the Salinas River Management Program (<https://www.salinasrivermanagementprogram.org/>). The first step in this effort was the development of the Salinas River Long-Term Management Plan (LTMP), a stakeholder-driven, comprehensive approach to effective management of the Salinas River, Salinas Lagoon, and floodplain. Since completing the LTMP in early 2019, AGENCY has pursued various funding sources to support development of the reservoir re-operation protocols (an eventual HCP covered activity), to conduct research to improve best available data for HCP development, and to develop the HCP and environmental compliance documents.

The following scope of work is a modification of the original scope of work approved by AGENCY in 2018. This scope of work includes all of the originally scoped tasks, plus a number of new tasks identified and undertaken to support HCP development.

Project Approach

The Salinas River Management Program was initially conceived as three phases:

Phase 1: Salinas River LTMP

Phase 2: HCP Development

Phase 3: CEQA/NEPA Documentation for HCP

The actual evolution of Salinas River HCP development can be better captured in a phased approach summarized as follows:

Phase 1: Strategic Planning in support of HCP Development

Phase 2: Draft Public Review HCP and CEQA/NEPA Documents

Phase 3: Finalize HCP and CEQA/NEPA Documents

Phase 4: Implement HCP

This scope of work (in its original form as well as in this current version) focuses on the first three phases. Phase 1 is well underway and includes the development of the LTMP, the re-operation protocols, and several studies focused on species and habitat surveys throughout the greater Salinas River watershed. Phase 2 has also begun with initial efforts to turn information developed during Phase 1 into draft HCP chapter content. Phase 3 will commence when the HCP and environmental documents are released for public review.

The action by NMFS and USFWS to each issue an ITP is subject to review under NEPA. Similarly, the action by AGENCY of signing and accepting the ITP—and therefore committing to implement the conservation strategy in the HCP—is subject to CEQA review. The NEPA and CEQA processes promote informed decision making by requiring an environmental review process before a final

decision is made on whether and how to proceed on a proposed project. NEPA applies specifically to federal proposed actions and CEQA applies to state and local government actions. While AGENCY will be the lead agency for CEQA, NMFS or USFWS will take on the role of lead agency for NEPA. Federal lead agencies require different consultant staff be utilized than those that develop the HCP. As such, CONTRACTOR staff preparing the HCP will be distinct and unique from CONTRACTOR staff preparing the CEQA/NEPA documents, with the exception that CONTRACTOR staff developing the GIS or graphic-based figures and editorial staff may be the same. This will allow CONTRACTOR to separate the CEQA/NEPA team with a firewall, which is necessary for the lead federal agency to direct the independent work of consultant staff on the NEPA document. The NEPA document must provide an independent assessment of the effects of implementing the HCP on the human environment, so this separation and firewall is critical to demonstrate that independence.

All final deliverables required to be submitted to a state or federal agency for public review must be formatted in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and California Assembly Bill No. 434 of 2017, allowing screen-reader software to read the document aloud. The cost estimate for the tasks described below includes time to allow formatting of document templates and for compliance work associated with public draft and final HCP and environmental compliance documents.

This scope of work is funded by multiple grants. For grant tracking purposes, CONTRACTOR will establish separate subtasks, as needed, to ensure time under a task described below is properly allocated to the related grant.

Tasks

Task 1 – Program Management and Meetings

Task 1.1 – LTMP Project Management and Meetings (Completed)

CONTRACTOR will provide expert project management services to develop the LTMP for the Salinas River. Specific services will include:

- ◆ Providing overall strategy and project leadership to AGENCY staff
- ◆ Facilitating AGENCY's decision-making process through coordination of meetings and conference calls
- ◆ Developing and presenting materials for the LTMP team's review, including meeting agendas
- ◆ Facilitating meetings with resource management agencies, as appropriate
- ◆ Coordinating scientific input, advice, and review
- ◆ Managing the consultant team
- ◆ Providing additional project administration services including budget and personnel management, schedule management, communications protocol, and quality control/quality assurance

Meeting	No. Mtgs Assumed in Phase 1	Contractor Staff Attending (% of Meetings)	Est. Hrs per Mtg ¹	Notes
LTMP Monthly Coordination	10	Project Manager (100%) Deputy Project Manager (100%) Project Director (75%)	2	These meetings are primarily between the CONTRACTOR and AGENCY staff. Meetings are assumed to occur in person in Salinas (10%) or by conference call (90%)

Meeting	No. Mtgs Assumed in Phase 1	Contractor Staff Attending (% of Meetings)	Est. Hrs per Mtg ¹	Notes
Program Management (bi-weekly)	20	Project Manager (100%) Project Director (50%) Up to two staff per teaming partner as needed	2	These meetings are for CONTRACTOR coordination and are intended to ensure team members are advancing their respective tasks. Meetings are assumed to occur by conference call (75%) or in-person in Oakland or San Francisco (25%) where much of the team is based
Technical Design Committee (see Task 2.2)	Minimum 4 – Maximum 6	Project Manager (100%) Project Director (100%) One Technical Staff from each teaming partner as needed Lead Facilitator	4	One meeting will be for organization and framing the approach. The subsequent two meetings will be tailored to weigh in to key issues and core components of the plan
Scientific Working Group (see Task 2.2)	Minimum 4 – Maximum 6	Project Manager Technical Staff from each teaming partner as needed Lead Facilitator	2	These two meetings will allow the project team members to interface and confer on the detailed scientific approach with agency staff or other key people to vet data and process
HCP Training Workshop (see Task 2.5)	2	Project Manager (100%) Project Director (100%)	4	CONTRACTOR will deliver custom training sessions in Salinas on the LTMP and HCP process, specific to this project
Phase 1 Internal Scoping Meeting (see Task 3.1)	2	Project Manager Project Director Deputy Project Manager Up to 2 Technical Staff from each teaming partner	6	One meeting is assumed to occur in person in Salinas, with one follow-up meeting by conference call
Stakeholder Planning Group (see Task 2.3)	Minimum 3 – Maximum 4	Project Manager Lead Facilitator Associate Facilitator	2	N/A
Total MAXIMUM	50			

¹ Does not include preparation and travel time

Deliverables

- ♦ Work plan of key deliverables and meeting topics to support achieving outcomes
- ♦ Meeting agendas, materials, and minutes of discussion topics, key decisions, and action items
- ♦ Monthly invoices, including updates on the status of the LTMP development process

Task 1.2 – Strategic Planning and HCP Project Management and Meetings

CONTRACTOR will provide project management services for the HCP, similar to the project management efforts utilized for LTMP development under Task 1.1. Specific project management services will include facilitation of the decision-making process through coordination of meetings and conference calls; developing and presenting materials for AGENCY's review, including meeting agendas; facilitating meetings with resource management agencies, as appropriate; coordinating scientific input, advice, and review; managing the consultant team; and providing additional project administration services including budget and personnel management, schedule management, communications protocol, and quality control/assurance.

A summary of anticipated meetings is included below, based on the assumption that strategic planning and HCP development will occur over a 76-month timeframe from the completion of the LTMP in February 2019 to release of a Public Draft HCP in mid-2026. Because this task captures work under both Phase 1 (post-LTMP) and Phase 2, meeting timelines are approximate and

intended to inform the costing in addition to expectation management for AGENCY staff. This task will continue through Phase 3 and the finalization of the HCP and permit issuance estimated to be June 2028.

Meeting	No. Mtgs Assumed	Consultant Staff in Attendance (% of Meetings)	Est. Hrs per Mtg ¹	Notes
Bi-weekly AGENCY Coordination	152	Project Manager (100%) Deputy Project Manager (100%) Project Director (75%)	2	These meetings are primarily between the CONTRACTOR team and AGENCY staff. Meetings are assumed to occur by conference call.
Internal coordination meetings (monthly)	76	Project Manager (100%) Deputy Project Manager (100%) One staff per teaming partner as needed	2	These meeting are for CONTRACTOR team coordination and are intended to ensure team members are advancing their respective tasks. Meetings are assumed to occur by conference call
NMFS and USFWS Monthly Coordination	76	Project Manager (100%) Deputy Project Manager (75%) Project Director (75%)	2	These meetings are to support communication with the regulatory agencies.
Total	304			

¹ Does not include preparation and travel time

Deliverables

- ♦ Meeting agendas, materials, and minutes, as needed
- ♦ Monthly invoices including updates on the status of the strategic planning and/or HCP development processes

Task 1.3 – Grant Administration and Management

At the direction of AGENCY, CONTRACTOR will provide administrative support in managing grants funding the program. Support may include preparation of invoices, periodic reporting, data management, and any other tasks as requested.

Deliverables

- ♦ Drafts of administrative documents for grant compliance as requested by AGENCY

Task 2 – Stakeholder Engagement and Participation

The primary goal of stakeholder engagement and participation is to create widespread support for the goals and content of the Salinas River Management Program. The program envisions a series of conversations with different focal points and levels of information that culminate in a LTMP and an HCP that is accepted and understood among a diverse range of Salinas River stakeholders.

Task 2.1 – Conduct LTMP Stakeholder Issue Assessment and Refine Process Design (Completed)

CONTRACTOR team, led by Gina Bartlett at CBI, will conduct a stakeholder issue assessment. The purpose is to understand the histories, perspectives, and opinions of a range of stakeholder interests. The primary method will be interviews, in person and on the telephone, individually or in small groups. The assessment findings will be used to refine the proposed stakeholder engagement process, tailoring the scope and composition of the committees and anticipating technical questions and scientific conundrums that stakeholders may identify as part of the process. The

CONTRACTOR team will develop a set of interview questions in cooperation with AGENCY staff and an initial list of interviewees. Interviews will be confidential, and the findings will be shared without attribution. The findings will be made available publicly to help inform the work of the project team, the Technical Design Committee (TDC), and the Stakeholder Planning Group.

Deliverables

- ◆ Interview questions
- ◆ Up to 20 interviews in person and by phone, individually and in small groups
- ◆ Stakeholder issue assessment briefing report and/or presentation
- ◆ Refined work plan for stakeholder engagement, including TDC, scientific committee, and Stakeholder Planning Group

Task 2.2 – Establish and Facilitate LTMP Technical Design Committee and Scientific Working Group (Completed)

CONTRACTOR will establish a consensus seeking TDC as a central hub to make recommendations on core planning elements. The TDC will be responsible for partnering with CONTRACTOR and AGENCY staff to realize the goals of the planning process. The TDC will provide guidance and input on the planning elements and refer detailed scientific work to the Scientific Working Group (SWG) (discussed below). The TDC will also provide guidance on the stakeholder engagement process, identifying issues that would benefit from Stakeholder Planning Group input. The TDC will receive input, recommendations, and proposals from the SWG and Stakeholder Planning Group, making recommendations to AGENCY and CONTRACTOR on how to incorporate stakeholder input into the planning process. The TDC will meet up to six (6) times during Phase 1.

CONTRACTOR will establish a smaller advisory SWG as a subset of the TDC. Scientific input and peer review from other hydrology, species, habitat, and technical experts will be sought as needed and approved by AGENCY and CONTRACTOR. This external input could prove valuable on critical elements of the process throughout all development phases. Most input will be solicited informally via telephone conversations and email communications. CONTRACTOR will facilitate and attend two in person meetings and two (2)–four (4) web-based meetings.

Deliverables

- ◆ Facilitation and attendance for four (4)–six (6) TDC meetings
- ◆ Facilitation and attendance for two (2) in-person and two (2)–four (4) web-based SWG meetings
- ◆ Work plan with meeting topics to achieve the necessary outcomes
- ◆ Charter outlining roles, responsibilities, and decision making
- ◆ Meeting agendas and minutes
- ◆ Memoranda from CONTRACTOR summarizing issues needing direction from the TDC and SWG

Task 2.3 – Facilitate LTMP Stakeholder Planning Group (Completed)

In cooperation with the TDC, the CONTRACTOR will organize and facilitate a Stakeholder Planning Group. Stakeholders representing all the major interests in the Salinas River System will have representation on this body, and meetings will be open to the public to promote transparency. The purpose of this group is to create a highly informed group of stakeholders who can engage in joint fact-finding processes (framing key questions and developing a high level of understanding of the planning process opportunities and technical approaches) and advance the planning process in the larger communities among stakeholders. The CONTRACTOR will design and facilitate these meetings, documenting the input received, including areas of consensus and divergent opinions to inform the planning team's work. Stakeholder Planning Group outcomes will be reported and discussed at the TDC which will integrate the input into the work underway.

Deliverables

- ◆ Facilitation and attendance for minimum of three (3) and maximum of four (4) meetings
- ◆ Work plan with meeting topics and stakeholder planning group roles
- ◆ Meeting agendas and high-level outcome-oriented summaries

Task 2.4 – Design and Implement LTMP Public Outreach Program (Completed)

CONTRACTOR will design and implement a public outreach program to inform the public about the goals of the project and the work underway. The outreach program will be based on best practices, input received during the stakeholder assessment, and familiarity with local issues. In cooperation with AGENCY staff, CONTRACTOR will prepare a Communication and Engagement Plan to document the overall approach to public outreach. The team will form a small engagement committee with two or three stakeholders to meet three times via phone during Phase 1 to ground-truth and advise the team on the outreach strategy. CONTRACTOR will implement a creative and cost-efficient suite of tools to raise awareness about this important effort, including fact sheets and briefing materials that everyone involved can use to share information about the project. Public workshops and webinars will be planned at convenient times around key milestones (including project kickoff) to provide project information and invite the public into the planning process. CONTRACTOR will translate outreach materials to serve the large Spanish-speaking population in the area. The team will develop an independent website, linked to the AGENCY site, to make all materials available and transparent. All of these tools serve a critical purpose—ensuring that all interested parties, agencies, communities, and the public are receiving the same information and messaging about this effort.

Deliverables

- ◆ Communication and Engagement Plan
- ◆ Coordination and attendance at two (2) public workshops
- ◆ Hold minimum of two (2) and maximum of three (3) public webinars
- ◆ Up to three (3) engagement subcommittee conference calls
- ◆ Stakeholder outreach materials (e.g., fact sheets, briefing materials)
- ◆ Two (2) public workshop agendas and up to three (3) webinar agendas
- ◆ Program website

Task 2.5 – HCP Training Workshops (Completed)

CONTRACTOR will prepare and conduct up to two half-day training sessions on issues that arise during the initial scoping meeting (Task 3.1) and from the initial stakeholder issue assessment (Task 2.1) specific to the Salinas River HCP. It is anticipated that one training session be given to the internal team (AGENCY staff and decision makers), and the second training session be targeted to key stakeholders.

Deliverables

- ◆ Facilitate up to two (2) training workshops at AGENCY office
- ◆ Draft and final agendas and training materials
- ◆ HCP Training Workshop, including PowerPoint presentation, agenda, and notes (to be posted to the program website for those who could not attend)

Task 2.6 – Continue Facilitating Working Groups

During HCP development, CONTRACTOR will continue to facilitate smaller working groups that will focus on specific technical issues or challenges and scientific uncertainties. The working groups may include external scientific experts to help support the HCP. The working groups will meet as needed.

Deliverables

- ◆ Facilitate and attend a maximum of 15 meetings

- ♦ Meeting agendas and summary of key decisions and action items

Task 2.7 – Continue Facilitating the LTMP Stakeholder Planning Group (Completed)

CONTRACTOR will continue to facilitate a Stakeholder Planning Group. Stakeholders representing all the major interests in the Salinas River System will have the opportunity to provide representation on this body, and meetings will be open to the public to promote transparency. CONTRACTOR will continue to design and facilitate these meetings, documenting the input received, including areas of consensus and divergent opinions to inform HCP development. Stakeholder Planning Group outcomes would be reported and discussed at the TDC as necessary.

CONTRACTOR would plan these meetings around key project milestones to ensure adequate time to benefit from the planning group's input. Stakeholder Planning Group members will assist in the broader outreach process, briefing constituent groups in concert with the public outreach program.

Deliverables

- ♦ Facilitate, design, attend and document a maximum of 10 meetings
- ♦ Work plan with meeting topics to document stakeholder group roles
- ♦ Meeting agendas and high-level outcome-oriented summaries

Task 2.8 – HCP Public Outreach Program

CONTRACTOR will continue to implement a public outreach program to inform the public about HCP development. CONTRACTOR will work with AGENCY to evaluate if the Communication and Engagement Plan developed in Phase 1 requires any adjustment to account for specific needs of HCP development and to coordinate public outreach requirements of the CEQA/NEPA process.

Public workshops will be planned around major milestones to provide project information and invite the public into the planning process. The CONTRACTOR will work with AGENCY to determine which outreach materials to co-translate to serve the large Spanish-speaking population in the area. The team will expand and maintain the independent website developed in Phase 1, linked to the AGENCY site, to make all materials available and transparent. These tools serve a critical purpose—they ensure that all interested parties, agencies, communities, and the public are receiving the same information and messaging about this effort.

Deliverables

- ♦ Revised Communication and Engagement Plan, as needed
- ♦ Stakeholder outreach materials (e.g., fact sheets, briefing materials)
- ♦ Three to five public workshops in the plan area
- ♦ Expanded website adjusted to fit the needs of the HCP
- ♦ Maintenance of project website
- ♦ Maintained interested parties list

Task 2.9 – Support CEQA/NEPA Public Meetings

CONTRACTOR's HCP staff will support all of the public meetings for the HCP and CEQA/NEPA documents. Time for CONTRACTOR's CEQA/NEPA team leading this task is included in the CEQA/NEPA scope of work under Task 8. CONTRACTOR's HCP development team will prepare and present an overview of the proposed HCP, including many of the strategic planning items described in Task 4 which will have been reviewed by AGENCY by that time. The public will be encouraged to ask questions and provide comments at these meetings and throughout the entire planning process. This task includes participation in up to six (6) public meetings, two for the CEQA/NEPA scoping process, two during the public comment period on the draft HCP and CEQA/NEPA documents, and two during the public comment period on the final HCP and CEQA/NEPA documents.

Deliverables

- ♦ Development and/or review of meeting materials (boards, fact sheets, FAQs) regarding the HCP
- ♦ PowerPoint presentation on the proposed HCP in support of each public meeting
- ♦ Attendance at up to six (6) public meetings on the HCP and CEQA/NEPA documents

Task 3 – Data Gathering and Strategic Planning

Task 3.1 – Internal LTMP Project Scoping Workshop (Completed)

Together with AGENCY, CONTRACTOR will plan and facilitate an internal project scoping workshop. A key goal of this workshop will be to identify AGENCY's critical needs on the project and confirm project goals that are achievable in Phase 1, based on the schedule and budget limitations. This internal scoping workshop will include discussion of the many projects and programs AGENCY is currently undertaking and how they will relate to and inform the LTMP.

The scoping workshop will also focus on determining key aspects of the LTMP, including geographic scope, potential covered species, and potential covered activities. The LTMP will be developed to ensure that information is gathered and described in a manner that is directly related to, and transferable to, the HCP to reduce the level of effort in developing HCP-specific content in Phase 2. The approach for stakeholder involvement, including establishment of the TDC and the smaller SWG will be confirmed.

Deliverables

- ♦ Internal scoping workshop with AGENCY
- ♦ Materials to facilitate internal scoping workshop
- ♦ A detailed work plan for Phase 1 based on the outcomes of the workshop

Task 3.2 – Data Gap Assessment (Completed)

CONTRACTOR will review existing and available information to perform a data gap assessment, identifying technical information not currently available but that may be necessary to develop the LTMP, HCP, or CEQA/NEPA. Anticipated existing data sources include information developed in support of the Interlake Tunnel EIR, Salinas Valley Water Project EIR, Stream Maintenance Program EIR, and existing hydrological models developed as part of these projects and others. In addition, hydrogeological groundwater models developed in support of current basin studies (i.e., seawater intrusion), Interlake Tunnel engineering and EIR, and SGMA Groundwater Sustainability Plans may also be utilized.

With an understanding of the existing data and models, CONTRACTOR will identify data gaps which may include specific and pertinent hydrological, ecological, and biological information. Specifically, data gaps may exist for species occurrence and distribution mapping, land cover mapping, project or operations specific data, site-specific topographical or biological survey data, land use and water demand, historical flow data, and water quality data. Once data gaps have been identified, CONTRACTOR will determine which data gaps are associated with which Phase. CONTRACTOR will recommend which data gaps are essential to fill to complete Phase 1, the general methods to fill these gaps (including necessary field work), when the data are needed, and if technical studies may be carried out as part of Task 3.3 to fill the gap. This task will culminate in the preparation of a Data Gap Assessment Memorandum.

Deliverables

- ♦ Data Gap Assessment Memorandum identifying which data gaps apply to which phase; recommendations and strategy to fill data gaps essential to Phase 1 to be included as an appendix to the LTMP (Task 4)

Task 3.3 – Priority Data Collection and Focused Studies (Completed)

Based on the findings of the Data Gap Assessment and input from the SWG, CONTRACTOR will develop a strategy to fill the critical data gaps. Focused studies may be required to improve the understanding of the physical, hydrological, and biological conditions in the watershed and could include such actions as developing species-specific habitat models, conducting focused land cover mapping, or developing a habitat/flow model specific to fish.

Due to the uncertainty in the findings of the data gap assessment, a wide variety of outcomes for focused studies are possible and may range from simple site-specific field investigations to utilizing or modifying existing hydrological models. CONTRACTOR will work with AGENCY and other targeted parties (e.g., regulatory agencies) to prioritize those studies that can be conducted in 2018 to support the LTMP versus those that will need to be deferred to Phase 2 when additional funding is available. In addition, projects that may be implemented through other means such as voluntary landowner conservation efforts or small grant programs will be identified. Studies that cannot be completed under this task due to schedule or budget limitations will be identified in the Data Gap Assessment Memorandum (Task 3.2) for Phase 2. CONTRACTOR will collect readily available data in GIS format, maintain GIS-based and digital libraries of the available data, including new data collected.

Deliverables

- ◆ Technical Memorandum from focused studies conducted, to be included as one or more appendices to the LTMP (Task 5)
- ◆ Copy of GIS and digital library
- ◆ Scope and cost estimate for technical studies prior to implementation

Task 3.4 – Develop Initial Permitting Strategy

The strategy for permitting the activities described in the LTMP, and eventually the HCP, will influence the content of the LTMP. Thus, the Phase 1 work directly supports data needs for Phases 2 and 3, as well as permitting needs beyond just the HCP. Other permits and/or agreements that AGENCY is likely to require for implementation of HCP covered activities include:

- ◆ CWA Section 404 permit (for dredge and fill), regulated by the Corps
- ◆ CWA Section 401 water quality certification, regulated by the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
- ◆ Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act Waste Discharge Requirement, regulated by the Central Coast RWQCB
- ◆ CESA incidental take permit (ITP), regulated by California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)
- ◆ California Fish and Game Code Section 1600 Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement, regulated by CDFW
- ◆ Scientific collection permit, regulated by CDFW
- ◆ Coastal Development Permit, regulated by the California Coastal Commission
- ◆ Cooperative Agreement with State Parks

Many of these permits, as with the HCP, will also require compensatory mitigation for instances when avoidance and minimization actions do not entirely avoid impacts to regulated resources (listed species and aquatic resources).

Deliverables

Permitting and Compensatory Mitigation Strategy Memorandum that includes:

- ◆ Overview of regulatory processes affecting AGENCY
- ◆ Summary of existing AGENCY permits, coverage and terms

- ♦ Evaluation of streamlined permitting approaches and any bundling opportunities available to AGENCY
- ♦ Summary of compensatory mitigation options available
- ♦ An assessment of the anticipated benefits, range of costs, and schedule typically associated with each permit type including level of effort in implementation (e.g., level of monitoring or reporting typically required for various permit types)
- ♦ A proposed regulatory compliance strategy for the LTMP and HCP
- ♦ Evaluation of CEQA compliance needs and any necessary implementation for the LTMP conducted by Terry Rivasplata

Task 3.5. Confirm Permitting Approach (Completed)

Under this task, CONTRACTOR will assist AGENCY in internal discussions as well as with NMFS and USFWS regarding approach to permit coverage for take of listed species under the HCP. The strategy may include a short-term (i.e., pre-HCP permitting) approach to only cover monitoring (directed research). CONTRACTOR will help AGENCY identify the key issues and the differences in positions on these issues.

Under this task, CONTRACTOR will also work with AGENCY and the Services to develop a charter (as described in the HCP Handbook) for NMFS and USFWS. The charter will provide a forum for agreement on how AGENCY and the Services are going to work together to develop the HCP.

This task will also consider the permitting approach for how state-listed species will be addressed by the HCP and how to involve CDFW in the development of the plan.

Deliverables

- ♦ Up to 6 meetings with AGENCY and NMFS/USFWS
- ♦ Confidential technical memo that outlines the issues considered
- ♦ Salinas River HCP Charter

Task 3.6. Develop Strategic Interim Monitoring Program (Completed)

CONTRACTOR will work with AGENCY and NMFS to develop an interim monitoring approach for steelhead that targets the information most critical for developing the HCP. The memo will identify the key issues related to steelhead management, proposed monitoring methods, and expected outcome and uses for the collected data.

Deliverables

- ♦ Two meeting with AGENCY, and potentially NMFS
- ♦ Technical memo identifying proposed monitoring approach

Task 3.7 – Lagoon Delineation (Completed)

A CONTRACTOR wetland delineator will review available project information, aerial photography, USFWS's National Wetland Inventory, California Rapid Assessment Method (CRAM) wetlands database, UGSG 7.5-minute quadrangles, and historical resources mapping in the project site to identify the boundaries of current and historical wetlands and waters of the U.S. in the project site. The desktop review will be used to produce a wetland and waters of the U.S. map identifying potentially jurisdictional locations under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. CONTRACTOR will conduct one (1) full-day wetland delineation (1 wetland delineator) of the project site. Once the field delineation is complete, CONTRACTOR will prepare a wetland delineation report documenting the findings, which will include a discussion on the jurisdictional nature of wetlands and waters of the U.S. identified in the project site.

As needed, CONTRACTOR will support AGENCY in submitting the final delineation to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) to request an approved jurisdictional determination. This task will include coordination with the Corps including one field verification meeting, if needed.

Assumptions

- ♦ Access to the project site will be coordinated by AGENCY and approved by California State Parks prior to conducting the delineation.
- ♦ Limited agency coordination related to the wetland delineation verification process.

Deliverables

- ♦ Wetland and waters of the U.S. map and wetland delineation report. A maximum of one (1) round of revisions of the wetland delineation report to address to AGENCY comments and one (1) final wetland delineation.

Task 3.8 – Gabilan/Tembladero Watershed Assessment (Completed)

CONTRACTOR will provide an update on previous work in the watershed (primarily Casagrande et al. 2003 and Casagrande and Watson 2006a), and fill knowledge gaps that have been identified through review of existing documentation. Three different methods will be employed to evaluate aquatic habitat (with a focus on steelhead) in the watershed, including:

- ♦ Assess steelhead migration barriers through literature review and field verification. Work will include reviewing historical stream flow which will be examined through archived data from the “Gabilan Creek near Salinas” and “Reclamation Ditch near Salinas” stream gauges operated by U.S. Geological Survey (USGS).
- ♦ Assess aquatic habitat quality (water chemistry, discharge, benthic macroinvertebrate community, stream cover, in-stream shelter, etc.) through installation of water quality loggers.
- ♦ Evaluate presence of steelhead through eDNA sampling and analysis.

Deliverables

- ♦ A draft report for review and comment by AGENCY
- ♦ A final report incorporating comments received

Task 3.9 – Least Bell's Vireo Surveys (Completed)

CONTRACTOR will conduct targeted species monitoring for least Bell's vireo in suitable habitat along the mainstem of the Salinas River where accessible.

Deliverables

- ♦ One draft and one final technical memo discussing the methods, analysis, and conclusions.

Task 3.10 – Steelhead Approach for Re-operation Protocols

CONTRACTOR will characterize existing steelhead habitat conditions in the Salinas River and provide a summary of the flow conditions necessary to support one or more aspect of the steelhead life cycle downstream of the Nacimiento Dam. This task will result in a written description of the geologic setting of the Salinas Valley that addresses both geomorphic and hydrologic conditions impacting instream flows and steelhead passage within the project area. Work products are anticipated to identify what data gaps—if any—must be addressed in order to understand the flow requirements of steelhead and conditions of the system that support those flows.

Work will include a review of previous studies and relevant current research including but not limited to:

- ♦ The Salinas River LTMP regarding the historical and existing conditions of the Salinas River and its watershed
- ♦ The steelhead species account developed under task 4.1 during Phase 1
- ♦ The Salinas Valley Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plans (GSP)

- ♦ *Steelhead in the Salinas–Conceptual Model Outline* (Stillwater Sciences 2020)
- ♦ Fisheries and water quality monitoring report conducted for the 2007 Biological Opinion (BO)

This qualitative analysis will be supplemented with quantitative outputs from the USGS model of the Salinas River Groundwater Basin in development called the Salinas Valley Operational Model (SVOM) based on the Salinas Valley Integrated Hydrologic Model (SVIHM; USGS 2018) to provide a detailed description of reach-by-reach water budgets of various surface water flow regimes (e.g., by representative water type years, seasonal variation) throughout the period of record (e.g., 1949–2018). This analysis will also capture the spatial and temporal variation between reaches (e.g., why one reach may have substantive flow but another reach further down the system may be dry) and causes of such variation.

Information from the LTMP on specific geomorphic and hydrologic conditions impacting instream flows will be used as a starting point for this analysis, but additional work will be required to capture the annual and seasonal variations in stream flow. The SVOM will be used to provide reach-by-reach water budgets of surface water flow regimes throughout historical hydrologic periods. These historical reach-by-reach water budgets may be used to provide quantitative descriptions of flow conditions. The SVIHM simulates historic and present-day characteristics of the drainage system that can be used to characterize the environmental setting.

Deliverables

- ♦ Updated 10-Year Flow Report.
- ♦ Two drafts of a technical memorandum describing the proposed baseline and modeling to be done to estimate baseline conditions. The first draft of this memorandum will be circulated to AGENCY staff, NMFS, and technical experts for feedback on the proposed approach. The second draft will incorporate feedback.

Task 3.11 – IRWM Groundwater Extraction

CONTRACTOR will evaluate historical groundwater extractions in the Salinas Basin utilizing the SVOM and SVIHM to analyze effects of groundwater pumping on instream flows. CONTRACTOR will also complete a historical model run to compare a no pumping scenario to current conditions. Additional model runs may be implemented that compare a reduction in pumping against no pumping and/or current pumping levels.

Deliverables

- ♦ One draft and one final technical memo discussing the methods, analysis, and conclusions.

Task 3.12 – Steelhead Surveys

CONTRACTOR will conduct surveys for steelhead in targeted locations in the Salinas River mainstem, key tributaries, and/or the Salinas Lagoon. Specific survey requirements will depend on the requirements of the survey funding source.

Deliverables

- ♦ Final report on work conducted and findings.

Task 3.13 – Goby Surveys

CONTRACTOR will conduct surveys for tidewater goby in the Salinas Lagoon and adjacent geographies. Specific survey requirements will depend on the requirements of the survey funding source.

Deliverables

- ♦ Final report on work conducted and findings.

Task 3.14 – Steelhead Passage Criteria

CONTRACTOR will re-evaluate steelhead passage flow criteria within the study area. Current river conditions will be assessed to identify areas of critical passage needs and evaluated to identify the flow necessary to provide for passage of adult and juvenile steelhead during the migration season(s). It is anticipated that drone technology using 3D mapping will be utilized to identify the critical passage areas with field verification as necessary. The final methodology will be determined with the consultant identified to assist with the project.

The purpose of this task is to re-evaluate the assumptions and resulting flow criteria used in the 2007 Biological Opinion and determine if the criteria require updating. The approach to this task will be to first identify stream reaches where passage by adult and juvenile steelhead may be limited by flows during migration, and second, to analyze one or more critical riffles within each reach to determine the flow criteria necessary to allow fish passage. Reaches will be identified through a combination of past research and field-based knowledge by staff, consultants, and regulators. Critical riffles will be identified using the following methods once confirmed with NMFS. Flow criteria (e.g., cubic feet per second, timing of flows) for steelhead passage over critical riffles derived from this task will be incorporated into the SVOM to simulate reservoir releases necessary for maintaining required streamflows for fish migration.

This task will identify physical passage requirements for different steelhead life stages in the lower Salinas and lower Arroyo Seco for inclusion as conservation measures in the HCP. This information will be used to re-evaluate passage flow thresholds (currently 260 cfs at Chualar for adult upstream migration) and revise the definition of connectivity between the lower Arroyo Seco and Salinas River based on physical passage requirements (currently 1 cfs).

Deliverables

- ♦ One draft and one final technical memo discussing the methods, analysis, and conclusions.

Task 3.15 – Dam & Reservoir Fish Passage Feasibility Study

CONTRACTOR will develop a fish passage alternatives feasibility analysis for Nacimiento and San Antonio dams. Work will initiate with development of a draft Alternative Feasibility Study document outline for review by AGENCY prior to beginning development of content. Next, CONTRACTOR will compile the geographic/topographic and hydrologic setting of the project, dam engineering and operation details, and other background information necessary for the development of the analysis. This effort would draw primarily—if not entirely—from information previously gathered or developed for the Salinas River LTMP, Salinas River Steelhead Conceptual Model (Central Coast Salmon Enhancement 2020), and the Salinas Valley Integrated Hydrologic Model: Overview and Future Opportunities (Henson and Franklin 2020). CONTRACTOR will then develop an initial list of upstream and downstream passage concepts. The list will be based on a review of existing large-scale fish passage facilities and fish passage technologies, CONTRACTOR staff expertise, guidance from AGENCY, and others as directed by AGENCY. This list would be comprehensive and not constrained by site-specific physical characteristics or operational characteristics.

Further analysis and refinement of the initial list based on the compatibility of the concepts with site-specific conditions and proposed covered activities under the Salinas River HCP will then take place. This would include an assessment and discussion of other limiting factors that affect fish passage success, outside of the passage alternatives, such as non-native predatory fish species in the reservoirs, lack of flow vectors and attraction flows, and water quality. This task will conclude with identification of alternatives aligned with the conditions present at San Antonio and Nacimiento

Dams. CONTRACTOR will evaluate alternatives using a matrix and scoring process, resulting in a ranking of alternatives and recommended set of alternatives.

All analyses and outputs of this task will be finalized through production of a final passage alternatives feasibility report.

Deliverables

- ♦ Draft passage alternatives feasibility report.
- ♦ Incorporation of comments and development of final passage alternatives feasibility report.

Task 3.16 – Habitat Assessments

CONTRACTOR will conduct one or more habitat assessments for one or more covered species. At a minimum, CONTRACTOR will conduct a habitat assessment for steelhead in the upper watersheds of San Antonio and Nacimiento rivers. Specific survey requirements will depend on the requirements of the survey funding source.

Deliverables

- ♦ Final report on work conducted and findings.

Task 4– Prepare Historical and Baseline Conditions Assessment Report and HCP Framework

Task 4.1. Prepare Historical and Baseline Conditions Assessment Report (Completed)

Based on data compiled and collected as part of Task 3, CONTRACTOR will develop an assessment of the historical and baseline conditions of the Salinas River watershed, including the San Antonio, Nacimiento, and Arroyo Seco Rivers. This assessment will inform development of the LTMP and HCP and will be based on and built on existing data, scientific literature, and models provided by AGENCY and publicly available information, as described in Task 3. The report will be developed in a manner that facilitates easy integration with the LTMP document and the HCP.

CONTRACTOR will review and build on the report *Historical Ecology Reconnaissance for the Lower Salinas River*, developed by the San Francisco Estuary Institute (SFEI) in 2009. This is an excellent foundation for the historic geomorphology, vegetation, and land uses in the lower Salinas River. As part of this task, CONTRACTOR will contact SFEI and explore whether funding may be available for them to expand this study to 1) include more of the Salinas River upstream of King City (where the 2009 report stops), 2) map historic vegetation based on historical data sources, and 3) help CONTRACTOR address key questions about the restoration potential along the river.

The assessment will account for fluctuations in water years, including AGENCY operations. New data and information developed or collected as part of Task 3.3 will be included in this assessment, as appropriate. This effort will culminate in a Historical and Baseline Conditions Assessment Technical Report. Information gathered as part of the Historical and Baseline Conditions Technical Report will be incorporated as background information in the LTMP (Task 5, below) and into the Existing Conditions chapter of the HCP (Phase 2).

Deliverables

- ♦ Review the 2009 *Historical Ecology Reconnaissance for the Lower Salinas River*, developed by SFEI in 2009
- ♦ Consult with SFEI to determine if the 2009 study can be expanded and brief memo documenting scope and budget for expansion
- ♦ Draft Historical and Baseline Conditions Assessment Technical Report (report and comments will be incorporated into the LTMP)
- ♦ A summary of historic and existing land use and management actions

- ♦ Physical conditions, including climate, geology, geomorphology, instream flow, surface runoff and erosion, groundwater, and linkages between these conditions
- ♦ A summary of current water quality conditions and contributing factors
- ♦ Biological conditions, including ecoregions, aquatic/terrestrial habitats, riparian habitat, special-status species, and habitat connectivity
- ♦ Linkages between physical and biological conditions
- ♦ Environmental pressures and stressors such as agriculture, development, dams/diversions, invasive species, recreation, infrastructure, and climate change

Task 4 cont'd– HCP Strategic Planning

AGENCY will be faced with many important decisions during HCP development. Many of these key decisions include issues that will be addressed in part during Phase 1, including which species will be covered, what activities will be covered, and what area the permit will cover. Nonetheless, preparation of an HCP document is a highly iterative process. To facilitate the learning process among participants and to provide for efficient decision making, CONTRACTOR will separately prepare and provide for review individual chapters or portions of the document, following a similar approach as the LTMP development process.

CONTRACTOR will work with AGENCY to determine the best approach to framing the critical information for HCP development to support decision making. In some cases, decisions will be introduced, framed, and documented through a standalone memo. In other cases, it may be more efficient to frame the topic and document the decision as a section of a draft chapter of the HCP. This approach will streamline developing the HCP and help provide context for reviewers.

CONTRACTOR proposes to use the following outline for the HCP. Some of these chapters are proposed for a partial or complete first draft as part of Task 4 deliverables.

- | | |
|---|---|
| ♦ Executive Summary | ♦ Chapter 9. Costs and Funding |
| ♦ Chapter 1. Introduction | ♦ Chapter 10. Alternatives to Take |
| ♦ Chapter 2. Environmental Setting | ♦ Chapter 11. Literature Cited |
| ♦ Chapter 3. Covered Activities | ♦ Chapter 12. List of Preparers |
| ♦ Chapter 4. Assessment of Take | ♦ Appendix A. Glossary |
| ♦ Chapter 5. Conservation Strategy | ♦ Appendix B. Covered Species Accounts |
| ♦ Chapter 6. Conditions on Covered Activities | ♦ Appendix C. Hydrology Model Information |
| ♦ Chapter 7. Monitoring and Adaptive Management Framework | ♦ Appendix D. HCP Cost Data and Model |
| ♦ Chapter 8. Implementation and Assurances | ♦ Appendix F. List of Acronyms |

The following subtasks include CONTRACTOR's proposed strategic planning efforts by topic area.

Task 4.2. Confirm Covered Activities

The HCP must identify the activities that could result in take of covered species and that will be covered by the plan. These covered activities should include all the activities, projects, or types of projects that AGENCY undertakes that could have an effect on federal listed species.

CONTRACTOR will assist AGENCY in developing the covered activities list and in determining which activities to specifically exclude from coverage. Work may include up to five days of site visits to see infrastructure or other resources that may be addressed in the HCP.

Deliverables

- ♦ Meeting with AGENCY to finalize list of covered activities
- ♦ Draft and Final Memoranda describing the covered activities criteria, selection process, and data sources and a brief description of covered activities (a more detailed description will be developed in the covered activities chapter of the HCP)

Task 4.3. Define Plan Area and Permit Area

CONTRACTOR assumes that the HCP plan area will be similar to the LTMP study area. The plan area is the area analyzed in the development of the HCP, but it may include areas where covered activities will not occur. A permit area is also defined in an HCP. By definition, the HCP permit area will include all areas where covered activities and expected conservation actions will occur that have the potential to affect covered species. CONTRACTOR will develop the proposed plan area and permit area, if different, for the HCP. CONTRACTOR will begin by evaluating the LTMP study area as a possible plan area and the LTMP management area as a possible permit area.

Deliverables

- ♦ Draft and Final Memoranda recommending and describing the rationale for the HCP plan area and permit area
- ♦ Maps illustrating the proposed HCP plan area and permit area

Task 4.4. Define Permit Term

The permit term of an HCP is the length of time for which the ITPs are valid and during which Permittees may undertake activities covered by the permit. The permit term is also the time period in which all mitigation and conservation measures must be accomplished. Several factors are considered when selecting a permit term, including guidance from regulatory agencies, the time horizons of covered activity implementation, and the time necessary to implement the conservation strategy.

Deliverables

- ♦ Draft and Final Memorandum recommending and describing the rationale for the permit term

Task 4.5. Confirm Covered Species

Covered species are those species that will be listed on the ITP permits issued by USFWS and NMFS. This scope of work and cost estimate assumes that there will be up to 15 species covered by the HCP. This scope includes field surveys as needed and as budget allows. At a minimum, AGENCY and CONTRACTOR anticipate surveys for least Bell's vireo, steelhead, and tidewater goby.

Deliverables

- ♦ Draft and Final Memoranda describing the covered species criteria, selection process, special-status species considered, data sources, and proposed covered species list

Task 4.6. Develop Species Accounts

CONTRACTOR will prepare an ecological profile for each covered species that will be covered in the HCP. These species accounts provide an important foundation for the HCP impact analysis and conservation strategy.

Draft species accounts will be provided for review by, at a minimum, AGENCY, NMFS, and USFWS to ensure that they are complete and provide an adequate foundation for the HCP impact analysis and conservation strategy. These accounts will not be comprehensive compilations of all that is known about a species (i.e., not a treatise), but summaries of the important information needed to support an HCP. Species accounts will be included as an appendix to the HCP.

Deliverables

- ♦ Update if included in the LTMP or draft species accounts for each covered species using readily available information

Task 4.7. Develop Species Habitat Distribution Models

All HCPs are required to quantify the level of take authorization requested for each covered species. CONTRACTOR will quantify this level of take for most of the covered species in terms of acres of habitat lost or degraded as a result of covered activities. The primary tool for quantifying take will be a species habitat suitability model. Such a model has the advantage of predicting species' occurrences throughout the permit area in a consistent fashion for use in both the impact analysis and the conservation strategy. Habitat models for terrestrial species will be based on the land cover mapping conducted for the LTMP, in combination with other parameters such as elevation, habitat connectivity, soil type, proximity to different land cover types, and species movement distances.

For the covered fish, the habitat models will utilize existing hydrologic models and measures of habitat suitability. If possible, habitat suitability will be expressed in terms of easily-measured parameters such as water clarity, water depth, velocity, or temperature using a widely-accepted tool such as Habitat Suitability Index. The specificity and resolution of the habitat models will be limited to the specificity and resolution of the land cover GIS database, the design and intended use of the hydrologic models, and other existing GIS data. Models for some species may be partitioned into habitat uses such as breeding, foraging, and movement, if necessary and if adequate data are available. Final modeling methods and results will be incorporated into the species accounts.

Species models may not be feasible for all covered species because of a lack of understanding of species habitat requirements, insufficient data, habitat parameters that occur on a scale too fine to map regionally, or a combination of these factors. CONTRACTOR assumes that up to 12 species habitat distribution models will be developed for the HCP.

Deliverables

- ◆ Draft species habitat distribution models, including habitat parameters, which will also be added to the species accounts using existing land cover data

Task 4.8. Assess Impacts and Level of Take

The first step in assessing the level of take will be to evaluate each of the covered activities to identify the mechanisms that could result in direct or indirect impacts on covered species or any ESA-designated critical habitat (critical habitat must be evaluated because of the internal Section 7 consultation USFWS and NMFS will be conducting during permit processing). These impact mechanisms will be linked to each covered species in a matrix and narrative description.

The next step in the evaluation process is to identify the appropriate method for measuring levels of take (e.g., area of habitat affected, number of individuals or populations taken) for each covered species resulting from covered activities in the permit area. CONTRACTOR will quantify the level of take for terrestrial covered species in terms of acres of habitat lost or degraded. It is anticipated that the level of take for fish covered species will be quantified using the available hydrologic models and specific simulated conditions.

Species without habitat models, often including plants, may require a different, qualitative analysis of take, such as in terms of populations. Tracking impacts and conservation in terms of populations will ensure that impacts to covered plants are being minimized and mitigated to the maximum extent practicable (ESA standard). CONTRACTOR will also describe the potential indirect impacts to covered species in qualitative terms because indirect impacts (and the resulting take from indirect impacts) are difficult to quantify on a regional scale.

Deliverables

- ◆ Draft impact assessment for review by AGENCY and wildlife agencies
- ◆ Second draft impact assessment to be incorporated in the administrative draft HCP

Task 4.9. Develop Biological Goals and Objectives

Biological goals and objectives are a required element of an HCP. Biological goals are broad, guiding principles based on the conservation needs of the resources. Biological objectives are expressed as conservation targets or actions. Biological goals and objectives serve two important functions in an HCP—they act as a useful focus for the often-complex conservation strategy, and they provide the measurable, typically quantitative targets of the HCP that will be monitored during implementation. The biological goals and objectives will consider the regional conservation needs of the species as identified in the LTMP and HCP and will guide the development of conservation measures including avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures.

CONTRACTOR will prepare goals and objectives for each covered species, by building upon the information developed for the LTMP and proposing draft goals and objectives for covered species for review by AGENCY, the wildlife agencies and the stakeholder group. Quantitative and/or qualitative goals and objectives for habitats associated with each covered species will also be incorporated. Species recovery plans with recovery goals and objectives have been developed by USFWS or NMFS for some of the covered species (e.g. Central Coast steelhead). These plans will be used to help develop the goals and objectives for the HCP covered species.

Deliverables

- ◆ Recommended draft goals and objectives for covered species on the final approved covered species list
- ◆ Second draft goals and objectives for covered species

Task 4.10. Develop Conservation Strategy Framework

CONTRACTOR will work with AGENCY, wildlife agencies, and the stakeholder group to develop a functional and practicable conservation strategy. CONTRACTOR's approach to the conservation strategy emphasizes laying solid groundwork on which the conservation measures will be built. CONTRACTOR will seek consensus on components of the conservation strategy as it is developed. By receiving agreement from the wildlife agencies and the stakeholder group, there will be much less chance of key elements of the conservation strategy being challenged later.

Much of the background information will be developed during Phase 1, including collection of historic and baseline conditions (Task 4), and conducting a data gap assessment (Task 3.2).

Deliverables

- ◆ One memorandum on alternative approaches and recommendations for conservation strategy structure. This information will inform development of preliminary draft Chapter 5 *Conservation Strategy*

Task 4.11. Develop Conservation Strategy and Conservation Alternatives

CONTRACTOR will develop habitat-level and species-level conservation measures to address conservation needs. These conservation measures will be adjusted or recombined to form different alternatives from which AGENCY, wildlife agencies, and the stakeholder group can identify the conservation strategy for inclusion in the administrative draft HCP.

Species-specific management measures will be developed that are practical, cost-effective, and clear. Sources used to develop the habitat and species conservation measures will include:

- ◆ USFWS Recovery Plans
- ◆ NMFS South-Central California Coast Steelhead Recovery Plan
- ◆ Practical management experience of local landowners and other local land managers

One key to successful implementation of the HCP will be developing partnerships with landowners, existing organizations, and other local agencies during Plan preparation to facilitate integration of the

HCP conservation strategy with existing and planned conservation and management activities in the Salinas River System. This approach will provide opportunities to share knowledge and resources during HCP implementation, thus reducing costs and increasing effectiveness.

As part of developing the conservation strategy for steelhead, CONTRACTOR will support AGENCY in developing re-operation protocols based on the results of the 10-year report—a compliance metric for the 2007 Biological Opinion—developed by AGENCY, SVOM simulations, policy decisions, and stakeholder feedback. To begin this work, CONTRACTOR will review the draft 10-year report and update the report to better inform the criteria that will be used to evaluate fish passage success and the overall health of the Salinas basin fish population with the intent of providing information to support HCP development.

Once relevant data is collected and reviewed, CONTRACTOR will support AGENCY in conducting multiple SVOM simulations to evaluate how alternative re-operation protocols affect desired multi-benefits, including steelhead habitat, outflows to the ocean, agricultural irrigation, and groundwater recharge. This task will be influenced by the outcomes of all the other tasks, including initial public outreach. Re-operation protocols will be simulated under a range of predicted climate scenarios. The re-operation protocols to be modeled will be limited in number and well defined. As part of this task, the re-operation protocols will be determined by AGENCY and consultants and vetted with the wildlife agencies before the re-operation protocols are simulated.

Preliminary cost estimates indicate budget is sufficient to evaluate three alternative re-operation protocols with three simulation runs each, assuming minor modification of each re-operation protocol simulation based on the results of the previous runs. Example alternative re-operation protocols may include the following.

1. Current flow prescription to establish baseline conditions.
2. “No operation” of the Nacimiento and San Antonio dams under current hydrologic conditions to provide information on the condition of the system if the covered activity of operating the dams was not undertaken.
3. Operation to manage for flood flows during winter months.
4. Up to three additional model runs for scenarios with modified release regimes that would benefit steelhead.

Deliverables

- ◆ Preliminary draft sections of the conservation strategy on habitat and species conservation measures based in part on opportunities identified in the LTMP
- ◆ Three draft alternative conservation strategies
- ◆ Draft conservation strategy chapter with the selected conservation strategy in detail (administrative drafts, draft, and final versions will be completed under Task 5)
- ◆ Technical memo with methods used and SVOM simulation results and recommended flow prescription

Task 4.12. Develop Cost and Funding Plan

As an initial component of this task, CONTRACTOR will prepare a brief paper (10-15 pages in length) addressing funding options to support decision making regarding potential covered activities. The brief paper will identify the types of covered activities that may be proposed for coverage by the HCP and identify the relationship to stakeholder benefits. Next, to determine the order of magnitude for funding requirements, CONTRACTOR will work with AGENCY to assign relative costs to the different types of covered activities identified in the first step. Finally, CONTRACTOR will compile a list of available financing mechanisms and identify which mechanisms could be used to fund different types of covered activities.

Once the covered activities are more settled, CONTRACTOR will develop a draft cost and funding plan for the HCP as required by the ESA, drawing on the initial work completed for the brief paper. Both NMFS and USFWS must make findings for permit issuance documenting the adequacy of the cost estimate and funding strategy. All costs of the Plan will be identified and estimated and CONTRACTOR will ensure that appropriate assumptions are used to develop estimates for the cost of:

- ◆ Implementing HCP conservation measures
- ◆ Conducting management and monitoring
- ◆ Implementing habitat restoration and remedial measures
- ◆ Facilitating land acquisition and due diligence (e.g., appraisals, pre-acquisition biological surveys, legal fees)
- ◆ Administering HCP implementation

CONTRACTOR will develop a detailed Excel cost model to document all of these costs in a way that can be easily updated and refined as the HCP evolves. CONTRACTOR will also develop the appropriate funding framework for the HCP based on impacts and the needs of the conservation strategy.

Deliverables

- ◆ List of cost assumptions for the economic cost model
- ◆ Draft Excel cost model (with updates periodically during plan development)
- ◆ Draft funding strategy
- ◆ Administrative draft of HCP Chapter 9, *Costs and Funding*

Task 4.13. Prepare Monitoring and Adaptive Management Program

Monitoring is an essential part of an HCP because it is the process by which the success or failure of the conservation actions is measured. Monitoring is also required by the ESA for all HCPs. CONTRACTOR will develop a thorough monitoring program for the HCP that builds on monitoring conducted to date. Monitoring will focus on three primary components:

- ◆ Compliance monitoring
- ◆ Effectiveness monitoring
- ◆ Status and trend monitoring

Adaptive management is the process by which information from monitoring is analyzed and interpreted to inform and improve future management. An adaptive management program will be developed that is linked to the monitoring program and meets the requirements of the ESA and 2016 HCP Handbook. The program will describe the structure of the process and guidelines for implementing it.

Deliverables

- ◆ Administrative draft of HCP Chapter 7, *Monitoring and Adaptive Management Framework*

Task 4.14. Prepare Implementation Chapter, Including Requested Assurances, and Take Alternatives Chapter

The implementation chapter of the HCP describes the “who” and “how” of the HCP. The implementation chapter of the HCP will describe key elements related to implementation, including:

- ◆ Which organization(s) will implement one or more of the conservation measures
- ◆ Structure and roles of the organization(s) that will implement the HCP
- ◆ Role of outside parties (e.g., regulatory agencies, scientists) in implementing the plan
- ◆ Timeline for implementation

- ◆ How conservation measures will be made permanent or durable for the duration of the permits (e.g., conservation easements)
- ◆ Reporting requirements to the regulatory agencies
- ◆ Standards and procedures for amending the plan or the permit, if necessary

Regulatory assurance is another important component of the implementation chapter of the HCP. The assurances section of the implementation chapter will describe several types of assurances including those requested by AGENCY of the regulatory agencies (e.g., no surprises, funding commitments, staff participation in implementation); those requested by the regulatory agencies of AGENCY (e.g., funding and implementation commitments); and, possibly, those requested by other groups (e.g., neighboring landowner protections). The assurances section will also include definitions and descriptions of changed circumstances, unforeseen circumstances, and remedial measures for changed circumstances presented in the HCP. CONTRACTOR will develop the assurances section to address the needs of AGENCY, the wildlife agencies, and interested stakeholders and to meet regulatory requirements.

CONTRACTOR will also develop the first working draft of the take alternatives chapter of the HCP. The alternatives evaluated will follow the regulatory requirements of the ESA, which requires that alternatives to take be examined. A broader discussion of alternatives will be left for the CEQA/NEPA documents.

Deliverables

- ◆ Administrative Draft of HCP Chapter 8 *Implementation*
- ◆ Administrative Draft of HCP Chapter 10 *Alternatives to Take*

Task 5 – Develop Long-Term Salinas River Management Plan

CONTRACTOR will develop an LTMP for the Salinas River System including preparation of a document outline (Task 5.1), an administrative draft (Task 5.2), and public LTMP (Task 5.3).

Task 5.1 – LTMP Annotated Outline (Completed)

Based on the information collected, analyzed, and discussed with AGENCY and the SWG, CONTRACTOR will prepare an annotated LTMP Outline for review and approval by AGENCY. The LTMP Outline will be driven by the anticipated data needs of the LTMP, as well as the HCP (Phase 2) and CEQA/NEPA documents (Phase 3).

Deliverables

- ◆ Draft and final annotated LTMP Outline

Task 5.2 – Administrative Draft LTMP (Completed)

CONTRACTOR will prepare an Administrative Draft LTMP for the Salinas River System. Key components of the LTMP will be compiled as the administrative draft using the organization agreed to under Task 5.1, and as further refined through the stakeholder engagement process (Task 2) and AGENCY feedback. Expected key LTMP components include:

- ◆ Historical and Baseline Conditions
- ◆ Data Gap Assessment and Focused Studies
- ◆ Goals and Objectives. The LTMP will identify long-term management goals and objectives which will seek to address issues associated with the following subjects at a minimum:
 - Salinas River Stream Maintenance Program
 - Salinas River Lagoon (including steelhead and tidewater goby rearing habitat, flooding, and sandbar management)
 - Suitability of the OSR for steelhead migration
 - Opportunities for steelhead population enhancement

- ESA compliance for the AGENCY's O&M activities
- New project compliance with the ESA
- Improvement of minimum flows and water quality
- ◆ Project and Design Strategies
- ◆ Environmental Compliance Strategies
- ◆ Management Strategy
- ◆ Management Strategy Implementation

Technical appendices to the LTMP are anticipated to include, at a minimum:

- ◆ A summary table of the data gap assessment
- ◆ Technical documents related to any focused studies conducted (determined through Tasks 3.1 and 3.2)
- ◆ A comprehensive list of related projects

Preparation of the Administrative Draft LTMP will include an editorial review of the document in its entirety for consistency of format, terminology, and approach. CONTRACTOR will also incorporate feedback from stakeholders and the TDC on technical memoranda. The Administrative Draft LTMP will be available for review by AGENCY only, due to the limited time in Phase 1.

Deliverables

- ◆ Administrative Draft LTMP, including the technical appendices for AGENCY review

Task 5.3 – Public LTMP (Completed)

CONTRACTOR will revise the Administrative Draft LTMP to incorporate AGENCY's comments and prepare the Public LTMP. The Public LTMP may include recommendations for additional targeted studies or other analyses, the completion of which could result in the need to revise the LTMP at a future time. CONTRACTOR will produce a version of the LTMP that is print-ready.

Deliverables

- ◆ Public LTMP, including updates based on, and responses to, AGENCY comments

Task 5.4. Review LTMP (Completed)

As described in Task 5.3, the Public LTMP may include recommendations for additional targeted studies or other analyses. In addition, the development of the HCP or CEQA/NEPA documents (Phases 2 and 3) may reveal a potential need to include additional management actions in the LTMP. CONTRACTOR will work with AGENCY to identify and track these needs, and will update the LTMP as budget allows.

Deliverables

- ◆ Targeted revisions to the LTMP, including if applicable, technical appendices

Task 6 – Other Tasks

Task 6.1 – Develop Grant Applications for HCP Planning (Completed)

With approval from AGENCY, CONTRACTOR will assist AGENCY in development of Section 6 Grant Applications to fund Phase 2 and Phase 3 of the scope of work. In addition, CONTRACTOR will assist AGENCY in identifying and applying for other grant funding to support completion of Phase 2 and Phase 3 work.

Deliverables

- ◆ Section 6 Grant Applications for submittal to CDFW by AGENCY (CDFW then submits selected grant applications to USFWS)
- ◆ Other grant applications as directed by AGENCY and as budget allows

Task 6.2 – Revised Scope of Work for HCP and CEQA/NEPA (Completed)

Updated scope of work for the HCP and CEQA/NEPA documents (Phases 2 and 3), including the following:

- ◆ A work plan for completing Phases 2 and 3
- ◆ A detailed project schedule for the HCP and CEQA/NEPA documents
- ◆ A summary of key issues and recommended approaches for addressing the key issues
- ◆ A cost estimate for completing Phases 2 and 3

Deliverables

- ◆ Refined scope of work and cost estimate for Phases 2 and 3

Task 6.3. Prepare Grant Applications and Support Other Funding Opportunities

Complex HCPs that address multiple issues such as resource management, restoration, and habitat enhancement are often competitive for a number of small and large grant programs. The Salinas River HCP may qualify for “Non-Traditional” or “Traditional” Section 6 grants, which provide funding for planning, habitat restoration, species status surveys, public education and outreach, captive propagation and reintroduction, nesting surveys, genetic studies, and development of management plans. The Salinas River HCP may also be highly competitive for Proposition 1 grants (currently offered through both CDFW and the California Coastal Conservancy) or the Reclamation Agricultural Water Conservation and Efficiency grant program.

CONTRACTOR will develop grant applications, including any grant scope amendments, to support development and/or implementation of the HCP or LTMP, as directed by AGENCY and as available budget allows.

Deliverables

- ◆ Up to three targeted grant applications as determined by AGENCY and as budget allows

Task 6.4. Prepare Other Regulatory Documents

AGENCY is likely to require permits beyond the ITPs issued for the HCP, such as permits to support Clean Water Act compliance or Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreements. The scope and scale of the permits needed vary greatly and will depend on the projects AGENCY ultimately desires to be permitted. CONTRACTOR will work with AGENCY during HCP development to identify projects that will require additional permits and prepare additional regulatory documents that are designed to be consistent with, and in support of, the ESA ITPs. CONTRACTOR will develop permit documents, as directed by AGENCY and as available budget allows.

Deliverables

- ◆ Draft and final permit applications ready for submittal by AGENCY.

Task 7 – Develop Habitat Conservation Plan

Task 7.1. Prepare 1st Administrative Draft HCP

CONTRACTOR will prepare the 1st Administrative Draft HCP for review. Some of the administrative draft chapters will have been partially drafted through development of technical components (Task 4), but this task includes development of complete chapters as a single package. This entails completing details of the conservation program and other required components of the document. The 1st Administrative Draft will also include new components such as the Literature Cited chapter (Chapter 11), glossary (appendix), and all other technical appendices.

Deliverables

- ◆ 1st Administrative Draft HCP document (delivered electronically in Word and PDF)

Task 7.2. Prepare 2nd Administrative Draft HCP

CONTRACTOR will revise the 1st Administrative Draft HCP to develop the 2nd Administrative Draft HCP based on comments received.

Deliverables

- ♦ 2nd Administrative Draft HCP document (delivered electronically in Word and PDF).

Task 7.3. Prepare Public Draft HCP

CONTRACTOR will revise the 2nd Administrative Draft HCP to develop the Public Draft HCP based on comments received from AGENCY and wildlife agencies. Preparation of the Public Draft HCP will include an editorial review of the document in its entirety for consistency of format, terminology, and approach. This task includes development first of the Screencheck Draft HCP, which allows AGENCY and wildlife agencies to confirm all final edits.

Deliverables

- ♦ Two (2) Screencheck Draft HCP documents (delivered electronically in Word and PDF);
1 with track changes, 1 clean copy
- ♦ Public Draft HCP document (delivered electronically in Word and PDF)

Task 7.4. Prepare Response to Public Comments and Develop Strategy to Finalize

Developing responses to comments received during the public review period is primarily a task for CONTRACTOR's CEQA/NEPA team. CONTRACTOR's HCP team will develop draft responses to comments on the HCP and transmit those responses to USFWS and NMFS for the CEQA/NEPA team to incorporate into the Final CEQA/NEPA document. This is also a period in which the HCP may change in substantive ways, and these changes will require AGENCY to review, deliberate, and decide on how to address the comments. CONTRACTOR will support AGENCY in this effort and work closely with AGENCY to update the HCP.

Once the scope of the responses to comments has been determined, CONTRACTOR will conduct one workshop with the stakeholder group to explain AGENCY's proposed approach to revising and finalizing the HCP.

Deliverables

- ♦ Response to Comments document (delivered electronically in Word to USFWS and NMFS for incorporation into the CEQA/NEPA document by CONTRACTOR's CEQA/NEPA team)
- ♦ Preparation of workshop materials, including agenda, presentation, and meeting minutes

Task 7.5. Prepare Administrative Final HCP

Based on the approach to responding to comments determined in Task 7.4, CONTRACTOR will revise the Public Draft HCP to develop the Administrative Final HCP for review. The Administrative Final HCP will use the track changes feature to allow decision makers and stakeholders to see how their comments have been incorporated.

Deliverables

- ♦ Administrative Final HCP document (delivered electronically in Word and PDF)

Task 7.6. Prepare Final HCP

CONTRACTOR will revise the Administrative Final HCP to first develop the Screencheck Final HCP and then the Final HCP based on comments received. CONTRACTOR will prepare two versions of the Screencheck Final, one version with track changes and another clean copy. CONTRACTOR will revise the Screencheck Final HCP to develop the Final HCP. CONTRACTOR will prepare two

versions of the Final Draft, one internal-only version with track changes and another clean copy for public distribution. The clean copy will be developed to be print ready.

Deliverables

- ♦ Two (2) Screencheck Final HCP documents (delivered electronically in Word and PDF);
1 with track changes, 1 clean copy
- ♦ Final HCP document (delivered electronically in Word and PDF)

Task 7.7. Prepare Material to Support Federal Decisions

CONTRACTOR will prepare technical materials to support NMFS and USFWS decision documents for permit issuance, as requested by those agencies. Both NMFS and USFWS must prepare a Biological Opinion and a set of ESA Findings. Based on new ESA Section 7 regulations (from 2018), the Biological Opinion for the HCP may incorporate by reference extensive material in the HCP instead of repeating it (as was commonly done in the past). However, NMFS and USFWS may still benefit from technical assistance from CONTRACTOR to provide material from the HCP packaged and formatted to support the Biological Opinion.

Deliverables

- ♦ Technical material from the HCP repackaged and formatted to support NMFS and USFWS decision documents, if requested

Task 7.8. Prepare Low-Effect HCP for Lagoon and Sandbar Management

CONTRACTOR will collaborate with AGENCY staff to complete development of a low effect HCP for lagoon and sandbar management associated with managing flooding in the Salinas Lagoon. CONTRACTOR will build the low effect HCP using as much information as feasible from the existing Salinas River LTMP and draft sections of the Salinas River HCP. CONTRACTOR will supplement and complete the analysis for the low effect HCP based on discussions with AGENCY and USFWS. The majority of this technical work will be incorporated into the Salinas River HCP.

As directed by AGENCY, CONTRACTOR will prepare a categorical exemption (CE) under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the Salinas River Lagoon and Sandbar Management Low Effect HCP. CONTRACTOR will prepare a brief CE document that explains why the project does not trigger exceptions to the CE and would not result in any significant impacts. Documentation will be enough to provide a clear administrative record supporting AGENCY's project decisions.

In addition to the categorical exemption document, CONTRACTOR will prepare a "mini"-initial study checklist, from CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, that briefly documents why the project would not result in potentially significant impacts or require mitigation measures to reduce potentially significant impacts. This step will occur prior to preparing the CE document to confirm that none of the requirements for use of a CE would be violated and to confirm with AGENCY the level of risk involved or other considerations before proceeding.

Should AGENCY proceed with preparation of a CE, CONTRACTOR will prepare a draft version for review by AGENCY and will revise the CE document based on the draft comments. This scope of work assumes 2, 1-hour meetings with AGENCY to approve the approach and review comments on the draft document.

Once a final CE is finalized, CONTRACTOR will prepare a notice of exemption (NOE) for AGENCY to file with the county clerk, should MCWRA decide to file a notice. The notice will include a brief description of the project, a finding that the project is exempt, citations to the applicable exemption and a brief statement of reasons supporting the finding of exemption.

This scope of work assumes use of the current low effect HCP documentation and materials. Materials for use in the CE document will be independently reviewed for accuracy and for adequacy

to meet CEQA requirements. Should AGENCY determine that an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration is the preferred CEQA documentation for the low effect HCP, additional funding would be required.

This task also includes time for project management and agency coordination specific to the low-effect HCP.

Assumptions

- ◆ Agency Draft will require two rounds of review and revision

Deliverables

- ◆ Second Administrative Draft HCP (electronic) for AGENCY to review
- ◆ Agency Draft HCP and Low Effect HCP Screening Form (electronic) for USFWS review
- ◆ Public Draft HCP (electronic)
- ◆ USFWS HCP application form
- ◆ Draft Federal Register notice of the categorical exclusion and availability of the Public Draft HCP
- ◆ Final HCP
- ◆ "Mini" Initial Study Checklist
- ◆ Draft and Final CE Documents

Task 8 – Develop CEQA and NEPA Documents

Task 8.1 – Develop CEQA/NEPA Strategy

CONTRACTOR will work with AGENCY, USFWS, and NMFS to develop the strategy for developing the CEQA and NEPA compliance documents. A first step in this process will be development of a memorandum to summarize key information, provide guidance on timing, and identify issues requiring resolution. Key questions to resolve include which federal agency will be lead agency for NEPA, the type of CEQA and NEPA document needed, and if the environmental documents should be combined or stand-alone. This task will also support early-stage coordination between CONTRACTOR, AGENCY, USFWS, and NMFS in resolving these questions.

Deliverables

- ◆ Draft and final version of a technical memorandum addressing the subject.

Task 8.2 – Project Management and Meetings

The success of the joint CEQA/NEPA documents will depend in large part on frequent and effective communication between CONTRACTOR, AGENCY, and NMFS, and, to a lesser degree, USFWS based on the current understanding that NMFS will be the lead federal agency. CONTRACTOR's scope of work provides for monthly meetings between CONTRACTOR, AGENCY staff, and NMFS staff to facilitate this process. Additional meetings may also be included to address specific concerns or topics. One such meeting will be an CEQA/NEPA kickoff meeting with AGENCY, NMFS, USFWS, and other appropriate participants to identify the relevant information applicable to the HCP as a basis for the CEQA/NEPA documents, develop protocols for communication, confirm or refine the CEQA/NEPA scope of work, and refine the project schedule to reflect the status of the HCP. A key outcome of the kickoff meeting will be the establishment of a mutual understanding of the CEQA/NEPA objectives and key issues. A summary of anticipated meetings is included below.

Also included under this task is a project management budget associated with project oversight, budget and schedule coordination and control, assistance with monthly invoice preparation and review, and team oversight and guidance.

Meeting	No. Mtgs Assumed	Contractor Staff in Attendance (% of Meetings)	Est. Hrs per Mtg ¹	Notes
Monthly CEQA/NEPA Management Meeting	24 ²	Project Manager (100%) Technical Staff (50%)	2	Meetings are assumed to occur remotely.
CEQA/NEPA Specific Issue Meetings	5-10 ²	Project Manager (100%) Technical Staff (50%)	2	One (1) in person kick-off meeting in Salinas and 10 issue-specific remote meetings.
Alternatives Development Meetings with the Lead and Cooperating Agencies ³	1-3	Project Manager (100%) Deputy Project Manager (100%)	2	Meetings are assumed to occur remotely.
Public Scoping Meeting	2	Project Manager Deputy Project Manager	2	Assumed to occur in Salinas and South County
Public Meeting on Draft CEQA/NEPA	2	Project Manager Deputy Project Manager	2	Assumed to occur in Salinas and in South County.
Board of Supervisors Certification Hearing on Final EIR	2-4+	Project Manager	2	Assumed to occur in Salinas.
Total	34-45+			
¹ Does not include preparation and travel time. The cost estimate assumes most meetings will be attended by two CONTRACTOR staff.				
² Assumes review over a 24-month period.				
³ The cost of these meetings is captured under Task 8.5.				

Deliverables

- ♦ Meeting agendas and notes, as needed

Task 8.3 – NOP/NOI and Public Scoping Meeting

CONTRACTOR will draft a Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Notice of Intent (NOI). The NOP/NOI will include a general description of the HCP, potential alternatives, and a preliminary list of issues to be addressed in the CEQA/NEPA documents. CONTRACTOR will submit the NOP to the County Clerk and provide a copy of the NOI to NMFS for submittal to the Federal Register. The NOI requires review and approval by NMFS prior to publication in the Federal Register. Because this process can take up to three months or more, CONTRACTOR will expedite review of the NOI through active coordination with NMFS staff and by addressing NMFS' comments in a timely manner.

As required under CEQA and NEPA, CONTRACTOR will hold two scoping meetings to solicit comments on the scope of the CEQA/NEPA, one in Salinas and one in the South County (location to be determined). Key staff from CONTRACTOR'S CEQA/NEPA team and CONTRACTOR'S HCP team will attend the scoping meetings and be available to answer questions regarding the CEQA/NEPA documents and HCP. CONTRACTOR will plan and facilitate these meetings with assistance from AGENCY, including preparation of the agenda, the PowerPoint presentation, and materials such as sign-in sheets, handouts, displays as needed, and comment cards. CONTRACTOR will provide minutes and documentation of the scoping meetings that summarize the issues raised by the public in an Environmental Scoping Memorandum.

Deliverables

- ♦ Draft and Final NOP and NOI
- ♦ Meeting planning, including facilities and equipment, agenda, and PowerPoint presentation
- ♦ Scoping meeting materials, including sign-in sheets, handouts, comment cards, and poster boards
- ♦ Environmental Scoping Memorandum

Task 8.4 – Data Gathering and Data Needs Assessment

CONTRACTOR's CEQA/NEPA technical team will review the available background materials to assess where data may be adequate or inadequate to support the CEQA/NEPA analysis. Based in part on the LTMP Data Gap Assessment (Task 3.2), CONTRACTOR will provide a memorandum describing data gaps, if any, relevant to the CEQA/NEPA analysis. The memorandum will list background materials provided, materials to be provided by AGENCY and NMFS or USFWS, and materials to be acquired from other sources.

Deliverables

- ◆ Memorandum describing any data gaps relevant to the CEQA/NEPA analysis

Task 8.5 – Prepare Draft Chapters of the CEQA/NEPA Documents

CONTRACTOR will prepare preliminary drafts of the CEQA/NEPA chapters described below. Preliminary draft CEQA/NEPA chapters will be submitted to AGENCY and NMFS for review prior to assembling the Administrative Draft document.

Chapter 1, *Purpose and Need*, will provide a brief overview of the HCP; the inventory area; the CEQA and NEPA lead agencies; the decisions to be made; and the uses of the CEQA/NEPA documents by AGENCY, NMFS, and the responsible, trustee, and cooperating agencies. This chapter will fulfill both the requirements of NEPA (i.e., explain the need for and the purpose of the Lead Agency action) and requirements of CEQA (i.e., Statement of Objectives, including the underlying purpose of the project).

Chapter 2 of the CEQA/NEPA documents will describe the Proposed Action/Project (approval and implementation of the proposed HCP), the No Action/No Project alternative, and up to two Action/Project alternatives.

Chapter 3, *Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures*, will focus on the effects of implementation of the project alternatives on resources. Each resource section will begin with a description of the setting for each resource topic, which will provide the baseline for comparison of the impacts from the proposed project/action. Each resource section will include a concise description of the methodology used in the impact analysis and the standards used to determine whether an impact is significant. The standards of significance will be based on guidance from CEQA (including Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines), NEPA (40 CFR 1508.27), Council on Environmental Quality regulations on implementing NEPA, and Department of Commerce and Department of Interior regulations on implementing NEPA. The methodology for development of mitigation measures will also be described. The impact analysis for each resource will assess the direct, indirect impacts (including beneficial and adverse) and cumulative impacts that will result from each alternative. The cumulative impacts analysis will consider reasonably foreseeable projects and planning efforts.

A preliminary list of resource topics anticipated to be addressed in the CEQA/NEPA documents include the following:

- ◆ Biological Resources
- ◆ Hydrology and Water Quality
- ◆ Agricultural Resources
- ◆ Cultural Resources
- ◆ Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources. Recreation
- ◆ Public Services and Utilities
- ◆ Air Quality
- ◆ Greenhouse Gases (GHGs) and Climate Change
- ◆ Land Use Planning and Consistency
- ◆ Population and Housing

- ◆ Transportation
- ◆ Socioeconomics/Environmental Justice
- ◆ Noise and Vibration
- ◆ Aesthetics

In addition to the sections described above, the CEQA/NEPA documents will include the following additional introductory and conclusory sections:

Cover Sheet that includes lead agencies and CEQA responsible agency; the title of the document; the project location; name, address, and telephone number of each lead agency contact person; one paragraph abstract; and date comments must be received and information on where to submit them.

Executive Summary that will include the major conclusions of the CEQA/NEPA documents; a table summarizing the no-action and the action alternatives, including the impacts; mitigation measures presented in the document; a summary of issues raised by the public; areas of controversy, and issues to be resolved including the choice among alternatives.

Table of Contents that clearly depicts the structure of the document, including appendices.

Introduction that clearly directs the reader on how to find information in the document. The Introduction will provide a brief overview of the plan area, explain the roles of the CEQA and NEPA lead agencies and the legal authorities guiding each, and explain the relationship between the HCP and the CEQA/NEPA documents. This section will also describe the scope and intent of the CEQA/NEPA documents.

Cumulative impacts of the proposed action. Cumulative impacts will be assessed based on specific criteria for cumulative projects established at the outset of the analysis. The cumulative analysis will consider any major projects currently under review by AGENCY.

The CEQA/NEPA documents will also include a list of agencies and persons contacted, references, a list of preparers, acronyms and glossary, and technical appendices, as needed to support the CEQA/NEPA analysis.

Assumptions

- ◆ The cumulative impacts analysis will consider reasonably foreseeable projects and planning efforts.
- ◆ It will not be necessary to update data, fill data gaps, or improve mapping resolutions for biological resources addressed in the HCP as part of the CEQA/NEPA scope due to the thorough nature of the biological data collected to date.
- ◆ The water quality analysis will be based on existing data and information developed in support of the LTMP and HCP.
- ◆ CONTRACTOR cultural staff will not conduct any new field surveys, site identification, or historic properties evaluations to support the cultural resource analysis.
- ◆ All covered activities would be consistent with the County General Plan policies and would be subject to cultural resource mitigation measures such that the impacts would be adequately mitigated.
- ◆ Under CEQA, compliance with Assembly Bill 52, which requires consultation with California Native American tribes, would also be required. This scope of work assumes that AGENCY would conduct this consultation; however, CONTRACTOR will provide support to AGENCY by drafting consultation letters and responding to comments from the tribes.
- ◆ Air quality issues will be limited mostly to PM₁₀ emissions from construction or operation and maintenance, and there will be no need for emissions modeling. Quantitative assessments for air quality and GHG emissions are not included.
- ◆ Traffic modeling will not be required for the scale of impacts associated with the HCP.
- ◆ Site reconnaissance and visual rendering or photo simulations will not be needed to perform the aesthetic analysis. CONTRACTOR assumes that existing photographic

documentation will be made available by others or collected remotely from existing sources.

Deliverables

- ♦ Preliminary draft of Chapter 1, *Purpose and Need*, of the CEQA/NEPA documents for review by AGENCY and NMFS
- ♦ Three meetings to formulate 2 action alternatives for analysis
- ♦ Preliminary draft of Chapter 2, *Proposed Plan and Alternatives*, of the CEQA/NEPA document by email for review by AGENCY and NMFS
- ♦ Preliminary draft of Chapter 3, *Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures*, of the CEQA/NEPA documents for review by AGENCY and NMFS
- ♦ Preliminary drafts of the cover sheet, executive summary, table of contents, introduction, and cumulative impacts analysis of the CEQA/NEPA documents for review by AGENCY and NMFS

Task 8.6 – 1st Administrative Draft CEQA/NEPA Document

Following review of the CEQA/NEPA components described in 8.5 above, complete Administrative Draft CEQA/NEPA documents will be prepared and submitted to the lead agencies for review and comment. Preparation of the Administrative Draft will include a review of the document in its entirety for consistency of format, terminology, and approach.

Deliverables

- ♦ 1st Administrative Draft CEQA/NEPA documents, including the technical appendices

Task 8.7 – 2nd Administrative Draft CEQA/NEPA Document

CONTRACTOR will revise the 1st Administrative Draft CEQA/NEPA document to develop the 2nd Administrative Draft based on comments received.

Deliverables

- ♦ 2nd Administrative Draft CEQA/NEPA documents, including the technical appendices

Task 8.8 – Public Draft CEQA/NEPA Document

Following review and response to lead agency comments on the Administrative Draft CEQA/NEPA documents, Screencheck Draft CEQA/NEPA documents will be prepared and submitted to the lead agencies for review and comment.

Following review and response to lead agency comments on the Screencheck Draft, Public Draft CEQA/NEPA documents will be prepared and circulated for review.

CONTRACTOR will also prepare a Notice of Completion and Notice of Availability for publication by the CEQA and NEPA lead agencies, respectively. These documents will include information on the dates of the comment period, location of review copies, public meeting dates, and information on where to direct comments.

Deliverables

- ♦ Screencheck Draft CEQA/NEPA documents, including the technical appendices
- ♦ Draft Notice of Completion and Notice of Availability
- ♦ Public Draft CEQA/NEPA documents, including the technical appendices

Task 8.9 – Public Comment Meeting and Response to Comments

CONTRACTOR will organize, prepare for, and facilitate two public meetings on the Draft CEQA/NEPA documents, one in Salinas and one in South County. CONTRACTOR will also prepare

notices and meeting materials to support the public meetings and retain a professional videographer to record the meetings.

All comments received during the public review period for the Draft CEQA/NEPA documents will be logged and coded, and appropriate responses will be developed. Through the comment coding process, CONTRACTOR will identify specific comments that require input from CONTRACTOR's HCP team, AGENCY, or NMFS. Response to comments will be provided to the lead agencies for one round of review prior to being finalized. The response to comments will be included in the Final CEQA/NEPA documents.

Deliverables

- ◆ Two (2) public meetings on draft CEQA/NEPA documents
- ◆ Summary of comments received at public meetings in Word and PDF format
- ◆ Draft and Final Responses to Comments

Task 8.10 – Administrative Draft Final CEQA/NEPA

Following completion of the responses to public comments, CONTRACTOR will begin drafting CEQA/NEPA document text changes in response to comments. The Administrative Draft Final CEQA/NEPA documents will comprise:

- ◆ The complete Draft CEQA/NEPA documents, including technical appendices (as modified in response to comments received) with text changes shown in strike-out and underline
- ◆ A table of commenters, copies of the comment letters, and responses to individual comments (including master responses, if appropriate)
- ◆ The mitigation monitoring and reporting plan (MMRP)

Deliverables

- ◆ Administrative Draft Final CEQA/NEPA Documents

Task 8.11 – Prepare and Distribute Final CEQA/NEPA Documents

CONTRACTOR will revise the Administrative Draft Final CEQA/NEPA documents based on comments from AGENCY and NMFS and will prepare Screencheck Final CEQA/NEPA documents for final review by AGENCY and NMFS.

CONTRACTOR will revise the Screencheck Final documents based on comments from AGENCY and NMFS and prepare the Final CEQA/NEPA documents for distribution. CONTRACTOR will prepare the associated decision documents (see Task 8.12).

The Final CEQA/NEPA documents will be distributed by CONTRACTOR to all commenters on the Public Draft CEQA/NEPA documents and all those who have shown interest in receiving the final documents, including the affected agencies.

Deliverables

- ◆ Screencheck Final CEQA/NEPA documents
- ◆ Paper copies (including all appendices) of the Final CEQA/NEPA documents (number to be determined)
- ◆ PDF and Word Files of the Final CEQA/NEPA documents for AGENCY records

Task 8.12 – Prepare CEQA/NEPA Decision Documents and Approval Process Support

CONTRACTOR will assist AGENCY with preparation of CEQA decision documents, including Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, if necessary; the MMRP; and the Notice of Decision. CONTRACTOR will also assist NMFS and USFWS with their NEPA Records of Decision (RODs), including alternatives considered, environmental analysis, comments on the

CEQA/NEPA, and mitigation. It is assumed that NMFS and USFWS will publish their RODs in the Federal Register. Furthermore, CONTRACTOR will support AGENCY in preparation of materials for public hearings and Board of Supervisors meetings. CONTRACTOR is available to attend meetings upon request from AGENCY.

Deliverables

- ♦ Draft and final CEQA and NEPA decision documents

EXHIBIT B - REVISED (BUDGET)

Work Plan Task Number and Name	Identified Funding	Funding Mechanism to be Determined	Total Task Budget
Task 1— Program Management and Meetings			
Task 1.1— LTMP Project Management and Meetings	\$ 95,217.56	\$ -	\$ 95,217.56
Task 1.2 - Strategic Planning and HCP Proj. Mgmt. and Meetings			
Subtask 1.2.1— Phase 2 (3/19 thru 2/22)	\$ 96,971.47	\$ -	\$ 96,971.47
Subtask 1.2.2— FY19 Grant (3/22 thru 3/24)	\$ 140,000.00	\$ 28,000.00	\$ 168,000.00
FY21 Grant PM and Meetings (4/24 thru 11/25)	\$ -	\$ 145,000.00	\$ 145,000.00
Future PM and Meetings (12/25 - 06/28)	\$ -	\$ 197,000.00	\$ 197,000.00
Task 1.3 - Grant Administration and Management	\$ -	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 30,000.00
Task 2— Stakeholder Engagement and Participation			
Task 2.1 – Stakeholder Issue Asses./Refine Process	\$ 13,866.92	\$ -	\$ 13,866.92
Task 2.2 – Establish and Facilitate TDC and SWG	\$ 54,818.53	\$ -	\$ 54,818.53
Task 2.3 – Facilitate Stakeholder Planning Group	\$ 40,460.93	\$ -	\$ 40,460.93
Task 2.4 – Design and Implement Public Outreach Program	\$ 47,386.25	\$ -	\$ 47,386.25
Task 2.5 – HCP Training Workshops	\$ 8,558.75	\$ -	\$ 8,558.75
Task 2.6— Continue Facilitating Working Groups	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Task 2.7— Continue Facil. Stakeholder Planning Group	\$ 552.34	\$ -	\$ 552.34
Task 2.8 – Public Outreach Program	\$ 219,785.82	\$ -	\$ 219,785.82
Task 2.9— Support CEQA/NEPA Public Meetings	\$ 12,500.00	\$ -	\$ 12,500.00
Task 3— Data Gathering and Strategic Planning			\$ -
Task 3.1 – Internal Project Scoping Workshop	\$ 26,066.60	\$ -	\$ 26,066.60
Task 3.2 – Data Gap Assessment	\$ 25,766.25	\$ -	\$ 25,766.25
Task 3.3 – Priority Data Collection and Focused Studies	\$ 7,883.95	\$ -	\$ 7,883.95
Task 3.4 – Initial Permitting Strategy	\$ 6,176.25	\$ 75,000.00	\$ 81,176.25
Task 3.5— Confirm Permitting Approach	\$ 1,266.90	\$ -	\$ 1,266.90
Task 3.6— Devel. Strategic Interim Monitoring Pgm.	\$ 5,981.74	\$ -	\$ 5,981.74
Task 3.7— Lagoon Delineation	\$ 17,413.46	\$ -	\$ 17,413.46
Task 3.8— Gabilan/Tembladero Watershed Assessment	\$ 91,690.89	\$ -	\$ 91,690.89
Task 3.9— Least Bell's Vireo Surveys	\$ 17,494.77	\$ -	\$ 17,494.77
Task 3.10— Steelhead Approach for Re-operation Protocols	\$ 79,636.07	\$ -	\$ 79,636.07
Task 3.11— Groundwater Extraction	\$ 135,000.00	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 235,000.00
Task 3.12— Steelhead Surveys	\$ 48,000.00	\$ -	\$ 48,000.00
Task 3.13— Goby Surveys	\$ 20,000.00	\$ -	\$ 20,000.00
Task 3.14— Steelhead Passage Criteria	\$ 175,000.00	\$ -	\$ 175,000.00
Task 3.15— Dam & Reservoir Fish Passage Feasibility Study	\$ 45,000.00	\$ -	\$ 45,000.00
Task 3.16— Habitat Assessments			
Subtask 3.16.1— Upper Watershed habitat assessment	\$ 35,000.00	\$ -	\$ 35,000.00
Subtask 3.16.2— Rearing/spawning habitat assessment	\$ -	\$ 65,000.00	\$ 65,000.00
Task 4— Hist./Baseline Cond. Assess. and HCP Framework			\$ -
Task 4.1 – Historical and Baseline Conditions Assess. Report	\$ 224,381.07	\$ -	\$ 224,381.07
Task 4.2— Covered Activities	\$ 85,016.30	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 105,016.30
Task 4.3— Define Permit Area	\$ 8,412.06	\$ -	\$ 8,412.06
Task 4.4— Define Permit Term	\$ 2,802.11	\$ -	\$ 2,802.11
Task 4.5— Confirm Covered Species	\$ 16,551.24	\$ -	\$ 16,551.24
Task 4.6— Devel. Species Accounts	\$ 27,372.41	\$ -	\$ 27,372.41
Task 4.7— Devel. Species Habitat Distribution Models	\$ 42,038.12	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 92,038.12
Task 4.8— Assess Impacts and Level of Take	\$ 85,065.58	\$ -	\$ 85,065.58

Exhibit B - REVISED (BUDGET)

Work Plan Task Number and Name	Identified Funding	Funding Mechanism to be Determined	Total Task Budget
Task 4.9– Devel. Biological Goals and Objectives	\$ 20,441.57	\$ -	\$ 20,441.57
Task 4.10– Develop Conservation Strategy Framework	\$ 41,288.99	\$ -	\$ 41,288.99
Task 4.11– Conservation Strategy and Alternatives			
Subtask 4.11.1– Cons. Strategy & Alternatives	\$ 1,035.47	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 26,035.47
Subtask 4.11.2– Modeling Re-Operation Protocol	\$ 390,000.00	\$ -	\$ 390,000.00
Task 4.12– T4 FY19 Sect 6 Devel. Cost and Funding Plan	\$ 80,000.00	\$ -	\$ 80,000.00
Task 4.13– T4 FY19 Sect 6 Prepare Mon. & Adaptive Mgmt. Pgm.	\$ 80,000.00	\$ -	\$ 80,000.00
Task 4.14– T4 FY19 Sect 6 Prepare Implementation Chapter	\$ 60,000.00	\$ -	\$ 60,000.00
Task 5– Long-Term Salinas River Management Plan			
Task 5.1 – LTMP Annotated Outline	\$ 7,975.00	\$ -	\$ 7,975.00
Task 5.2 – Administrative Draft LTMP	\$ 164,922.58	\$ -	\$ 164,922.58
Task 5.3 – Public LTMP	\$ 22,111.25	\$ -	\$ 22,111.25
Task 5.4– Review LTMP	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Task 6– Other Tasks			\$ -
Task 6.1 – Develop Grant Applications for HCP Planning	\$ 1,363.75	\$ -	\$ 1,363.75
Task 6.2 – Revised Scope of Work for HCP and EIR/EIS	\$ 442.50	\$ -	\$ 442.50
Task 6.3– Prepare Grant Apps. and Other Funding Opps.	\$ 22,490.17	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 42,490.17
Task 6.4– Prepare Other Regulatory Documents	\$ -	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 100,000.00
Task 7– Develop Habitat Conservation Plan			\$ -
Task 7.1– Prepare 1st Administrative Draft HCP	\$ 245,494.08	\$ -	\$ 245,494.08
Task 7.2– Prepare 2nd Administrative Draft HCP	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 400,000.00	\$ 500,000.00
Task 7.3– Prepare Public Draft HCP	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 120,000.00
Task 7.4– Prepare Response to Public Comments	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 100,000.00
Task 7.5– Prepare Administrative Final HCP	\$ -	\$ 150,000.00	\$ 150,000.00
Task 7.6– Prepare Final HCP	\$ -	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 50,000.00
Task 7.7– Prepare Material to Support Federal Decisions	\$ -	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00
Task 7.8– MCWRA Lagoon & Sandbar Mgmt Low Effect HCP	\$ 45,000.00	\$ -	\$ 45,000.00
Subtask 7.8.1– LE HCP Implementation assistance	\$ -	\$ 35,000.00	\$ 35,000.00
Task 8– Develop CEQA/NEPA Documents			\$ -
Task 8.1– T5.1 FY21 Sect 6 Develop CEQA/NEPA Strategy	\$ 70,000.00	\$ -	\$ 70,000.00
Task 8.2- Project Management and Meetings	\$ 120,000.00	\$ -	\$ 120,000.00
Task 8.3– NOP/NOI and Public Scoping Meeting	\$ 45,000.00	\$ -	\$ 45,000.00
Task 8.4– Data Gathering and Data Needs Assessment	\$ 35,000.00	\$ -	\$ 35,000.00
Task 8.5– Prepare Draft Chapters of the CEQA/NEPA Document	\$ 155,000.00	\$ -	\$ 155,000.00
Task 8.6– Prepare 1st Administrative Draft CEQA/NEPA	\$ 105,000.00	\$ 95,000.00	\$ 200,000.00
Task 8.7– Prepare 2nd Administrative Draft CEQA/NEPA	\$ -	\$ 150,000.00	\$ 150,000.00
Task 8.8– Prepare Public Draft CEQA/NEPA	\$ -	\$ 80,000.00	\$ 80,000.00
Task 8.9– Public Comment Meeting and Response to Comments	\$ -	\$ 150,000.00	\$ 150,000.00
Task 8.10– Prepare Administrative Draft Final CEQA/NEPA	\$ -	\$ 60,000.00	\$ 60,000.00
Task 8.11– Prepare and Distribute Final CEQA/NEPA	\$ -	\$ 40,000.00	\$ 40,000.00
Task 8.12– Prepare CEQA/NEPA Decision Docs & Approval Support	\$ -	\$ 40,000.00	\$ 40,000.00
ICF Direct Expenses*			
LTMP Direct Expenses	\$ 3,352.52	\$ -	\$ 3,352.52
Phase 1 and 2 through to Public Review	\$ 4,103.78	\$ -	\$ 4,103.78
Phase 3 Post Public Review	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Contingency**			
LTMP	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Phase 1 and 2 through to Public Review	\$ -	\$ 219,500.00	\$ 219,500.00
Phase 3 Post Public Review	\$ -	\$ 65,850.00	\$ 65,850.00
Total	\$ 3,929,156.00	\$ 2,480,350.00	\$ 6,409,506.00

Exhibit B - REVISED (BUDGET)

Work Plan Task Number and Name	Identified Funding	Funding Mechanism to be Determined	Total Task Budget
---------------------------------------	---------------------------	---	--------------------------

** Subconsultant direct expenses are billed under the task in which they were incurred. For the remainder of work, ICF direct expenses will also be billed to the task in which they were incurred.*

***A total of \$57,066 in contingency funds were authorized for the LTMP and Phase 1 and 2 through February 2022 and were allocated to task budgets as needed.*

****Amendment 2 Increases the total agreemnt amount by \$3,280,530 to \$6,409,506. A total of \$3,929,156 grant funding and Agency matching funds have been identified. Agency staff will pursue future grant opportunities to fill the estimated funding gap of \$2,480,350 to reach project completion.*

Summary of Cost by Funding Source			
Monterey County Water Resources Agency	\$ 443,405.34	\$ 55,000.00	\$ 498,405.34
CA State Coastal Conservancy	\$ 750,750.66	\$ -	\$ 750,750.66
DWR Integrated Regional Water Mgmt.	\$ 735,000.00	\$ -	\$ 735,000.00
USFWS Coop. Endangered Species Cons. Fund FY19	\$ 1,000,000.00	\$ -	\$ 1,000,000.00
USFWS Coop. Endangered Species Cons. Fund FY21	\$ 1,000,000.00	\$ -	\$ 1,000,000.00
New Funding Needed (source to be ID'd)		\$ 2,425,350.00	\$ 2,425,350.00
Total***	\$ 3,929,156.00	\$ 2,480,350.00	\$ 6,409,506.00

EXHIBIT B - REVISED (BUDGET) LABOR RATES

ICF Labor Category	Hourly Rate
Sr. Project Director	\$320
Project Director	\$280
Technical Director	\$255
Sr. Technical Analyst	\$235
Managing Consultant	\$220
Sr. Consultant III	\$200
Sr. Consultant II	\$180
Sr. Consultant I	\$165
Associate Consultant III	\$155
Associate Consultant II	\$140
Associate Consultant I	\$130
Assistant Consultant	\$120
GIS	\$150
Graphics	\$140
Editor	\$130
Publications Specialist	\$120
CBI Labor Category	
Sr. Facilitator	\$220
Associate Facilitator	\$120
Administrative Specialist	\$60

Other Direct Expenses
Automobile mileage will be billed at the then-current IRS rate.
A general and administrative charge of 5% will be applied to all other direct costs, excluding subcontractor charges which will have an administrative charge of 2%.
For overnight travel, ICF will follow the per diem guidelines of the County of Monterey.