

**January 5, 2009**

**To: El Dorado County Board of Supervisors**

**From: Plant and Wildlife Technical Advisory Committee (PAWTAC)**

**Re: Recommendations on the RFP for the Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan**

This memo is in response to your direction at the November 18, 2008 board meeting. The PAWTAC makes the following recommendations:

- 1) Adopt the November, 2008 draft RFP, as modified below, and
- 2) If necessary, divide the contract into two or more contracts, as described below.

**Background and Discussion**

The PAWTAC met on December 9, 2008 to discuss the RFP that was before the board on November 18, 2008 and consider the following request in the Board's motion:

Refer this matter back to PAWTAC and ISAC to work with staff to create a new RFP or modify the current proposed RFP which is to include a review of the need for connectivity including, consideration of the IBC consistent with General Plan policy 7.4.2.9. The committees need to help staff select identifiers and indicator species that would define the need or lack of need for connectivity.

We discussed this request at length and offer the following comments and recommendations.

**1) Wording change to the RFP suggested by ISAC**

Planning staff reported to us that the ISAC was concerned that the RFP did not specifically mention evaluating the limitations of the existing developed environment in Task 1, section ii.

Recommendation: Add the following after the sentence ending "...expenditure of County funds": "Consider also the existing built environment and its effect on wildlife."

**2) The modeling approach**

We believe the modeling approach described under Task 1 of the RFP is appropriate for the purpose of developing the habitat connectivity information directed by the general plan. The specific actions under this and other tasks were designed to provide points of discussion and feedback between the consultants, the Board of Supervisors, advisory committees and other interested publics as the plan was being developed. See for example, subsections i and iii under Task 1.

Recommendation: Adopt the November, 2008 draft RFP as modified by the sentence in Item 1 above.

**3) Evaluation of species**

The approach in Task 1 provides for the consideration of the life requirements, including movement, of various species in the development of the model. Task 1, subsection iii notes the establishment of “attributes for linkages, species, movement, and permeability functions, etc., for use as a suite of decision-making tools and as points of discussion for advisory committee analysis.” This will provide the opportunity for the advisory committees to evaluate information developed by the consultants on the criteria that will be used to run the model.

Recommendation: Adopt the November, 2008 draft RFP as modified by the sentence in Item 1 above.

**4) Dividing the RFP into two or more contracts**

We agreed that the creation of one or multiple contracts was largely a business management decision for the County to make. If the County chooses to divide the RFP, we agreed that it would be best to divide it into 2 or 3 contracts. Tasks 1 and 2 could be grouped or split, and Tasks 3 through 11 should be grouped since they reflect, in total, the steps to develop any conservation strategy.

Recommendation: If the RFP is to be divided into multiple contracts, group or split Tasks 1 and 2, and group Tasks 3 through 11.