

Q&A Post Responding to Bidder Questions:

PERMITTING SPECIALIST FOR FISH PASSAGE CONSTRUCTION AT METROLINK RAILWAY
BARRIER ON TRABUCO CREEK

Responses posted 8/20/2026

Contact: Nate Yancheff, Project Manager – California Trout
nyancheff@caltrout.org

Q1: Approximately how many project team meetings should we anticipate throughout construction? Should we plan for monthly meetings, or will meetings occur on a different schedule?

A: Permitting Specialist should plan for bi-weekly meetings throughout the primary construction season (June 1 – October 31) and monthly meetings outside of the primary construction season. Permitting Specialist should also expect ad hoc meetings resulting from unforeseen project circumstances such as cultural discoveries.

Q2: For budgeting purposes, could you provide an estimated number of days per construction season (June 1 – October 31) for the following activities: Initial ground disturbance and clearing/grubbing; Diversion installation and dewatering; Diversion removal?

A: Permitting Specialist should assume and estimate 66 construction days for the above-mentioned activities in 2027 and 30 construction days for the above-mentioned activities in 2028.

Q3: Would part-time biological monitoring be sufficient for the project, such as periodic or biweekly compliance spot checks, rather than having a biologist onsite full-time? We would have full-time monitoring during specific construction activities (e.g., initial ground disturbance, clearing/grubbing, dewatering).

A: We expect part-time biological monitoring to be sufficient outside of the specific construction activities mentioned. Part-time biologists will need to be on-call and readily available to provide immediate on-site assessment when notified.

Q4: Is Cultural (CR) monitoring anticipated only during the initial ground disturbance and clearing/grubbing activities, or will CR monitoring be required during other construction activities as well?

A: Cultural Monitoring is expected to be required during clearing/grubbing, geotechnical work (if needed), excavation/grading, establishment of laydown area boundary, fishway and wall construction, and restoration of the intervening channel.

Q5: Would CalTrout prefer the Specialist to submit monitoring logs on a weekly basis, or would you prefer a weekly email summarizing monitoring activities and observations?

A: Permitting Specialist shall provide monitoring logs on a weekly basis.

Q6: Between the 2027 in-water work stop date and the anticipated start of in-water work in 2028, will construction activities continue in the upland areas or will construction completely stop?

A: Construction is expected to completely stop between the 2027 in-water work stop date and the anticipated start of in-water work in 2028. Work in the upland areas is not expected to occur during this time.

Q7: How many construction days should be assumed during the Above Ordinary High Water Mark phase (Feb 1 – May 31, 2027 and Feb 1 – May 31, 2028)? Every workday, or only a certain number within this time period?

A: 30 construction days should be assumed during the Above Ordinary High Water Mark Phase of Feb 1 – May 31, 2027. No additional construction days are expected from Feb 1 – May 31, 2028.

Q8: How many construction days should we assume during the Within Ordinary High Water Mark phase (June 1 – Nov 1, 2027 and June 1 – Nov 1, 2028)? Every workday, or only a certain number within this time period?

A: Permitting Specialist should assume 109 construction days from June 1 – Nov 1, 2027, and 108 construction days from June 1 – Nov 1, 2028.

Q9: How long will the construction workdays be?

A: Permitting Specialist should assume 8hr work days.

Q10: Will construction work follow a standard work week (Monday – Friday)?

A: Permitting Specialist should assume Monday – Friday work week.

Q11: The matrix provided references mitigation measures from an Initial Study document. Please provide the Initial Study that these measures are from.

A: The Initial Study was prepared by Stillwater in 2010-2019 with the intent to follow a standard CEQA MND pathway. With the pathway now being the State Water Board General Order and associated programmatic EIR, the PEIR mitigation measures are the standard. The spreadsheet that has IS MMs to address restoration requirements for the General Order should be sufficient to inform the respondent's proposal.

Q12: Have all the requirements from the resource agency permit conditions referenced in the matrix been included in the General Protective Measures and Special Provisions appendices?

A: This is not established yet. NMFS and USFWS measures are still in process.

Q13: Has the Covered Species Capture and Translocation Plan already been prepared (presumably for pond turtles and native fishes), or should that be assumed as a task in the proposal?

A: That is prepared and under review for steelhead. Please include preparation of this for other species.

Q14: Have the resource agencies provided specific information on pre-construction surveys and relocation methods for western pond turtle?

A: No

Q15: Have the resource agencies provided specific information on pre-construction surveys and relocation methods for other native fishes, other than for salmonids (e.g., arroyo chub, lamprey)?

A: No

Q16: Have the resource agencies provided specific information on pre-construction surveys and monitoring for Crotch's bumble bee?

A: No

Q17: Have the resource agencies provided specific information on the frequency of required monitoring reports during construction?

A: No

Q18: Have Cultural Resources studies been completed for this project?

A: Initial Cultural Resource studies have been completed. Any additional Cultural Resource studies will be completed outside of the requested scope of work for the Permitting Specialist and should not be included in the Permitting Specialist proposal.

Q19: Has a Paleontological Resource Study been completed for this project?

A: No, this is progressing as part of Section 106 with NOAA.

Q20: Has Tribal consultation already been completed? If not yet completed, who is leading the Tribal consultation effort? Should it be included as a task in the proposal, or will CalTrout be carrying out the consultation?

A: Formal Tribal Consultation has not been completed. NOAA-RC is lead for federal consultation while San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board is lead for state consultation. Formal Tribal Consultation should not be included as a task in the proposal.

Q21: Will Native American monitoring be required? If yes, will the Native American monitoring be contracted directly with CalTrout, or should it be included as a task in the proposal?

A: Yes, Tribal Monitoring will be contracted directly with CalTrout and should not be included as a task in the proposal.

Q22: The RFP states that the Permitting Specialist will conduct pre-construction surveys for special-status species, including fish. Please confirm whether all fish surveys, fish relocation/salvage efforts, and any associated permitting compliance activities are the responsibility of the Permitting Specialist or will be provided by CalTrout, the Construction Manager, or another consultant?

A: These activities will be the responsibility of the Permitting Specialist.

Q23: If a firm pursues or is currently under consideration for General Contractor or other construction-related services associated with the Project, would that create a conflict of interest that would preclude the firm from serving as Permitting Specialist?

A: A firm's pursuit, consideration, or existing contract for other construction-related services would not necessarily preclude them from serving as Permitting Specialist, but the specific situation would require further review to ensure that there is no conflict of interest. CalTrout is currently not aware of any firms pursuing the Permitting Specialist role that are also pursuing other construction-related roles or are otherwise under contract for construction-related services in relation to this Project. If a firm is actively pursuing other construction-related roles or services for this project, they must disclose that in email to Nathan Yancheff at nyancheff@caltrout.org prior to submission of a Permitting Specialist proposal.

Q24: The RFP states that permit issuance is anticipated by the end of September 2026 and that obtaining permit approvals is not included in the scope. Please confirm whether all federal, state, and local permits required for construction will be secured prior to Notice to Proceed and identify any permits that may still require consultant support after contract award.

A: Federal and state permits are currently under review by the respective resource agencies. Local permit applications are actively being prepared in accordance with the timelines and prerequisites required by the respective local authorities. Any remaining work on pending permits at the time of the Notice to Proceed will not be the responsibility of the Permitting Specialist, and work to secure those permits should not be included in the Permitting Specialist proposal. The selected Permitting Specialist will be provided with access to all permitting documents after Notice to Proceed has been issued.

Q25: Will Biological Monitoring, Cultural Resources Monitoring, and Archaeological Monitoring be performed under one consultant contract, or may portions of these services be subcontracted to qualified specialists?

A: CalTrout is seeking a Permitting Specialist that is qualified to provide all services under one consultant contract. If subcontractors will be used, the Permitting Specialist must note the name and budget for the subcontractor, which may impact the proposal score under the Qualifications category.

Q26: Can CalTrout provide estimated frequencies, durations, or anticipated person-days for biological, archaeological, and cultural monitoring services during the two construction seasons?

A: This should be derived by the Permitting Specialist respondent from the RFP and proposed construction schedule.

Q27: Will Worker Environmental Awareness Training and Worker Cultural Awareness Training be required once per construction season, once per contractor crew, or on another schedule?

A: WEAP and WCA training will be provided for contractor groupings per activity. This is an extremely important element of the construction process given the cultural sensitivity.

Q28: Can CalTrout confirm that Appendix F (Permit Responsibility Matrix) and Appendix G (Permitting Requirements Matrix) represent the complete compliance obligations anticipated for the Permitting Specialist, or are additional permit conditions expected following permit issuance?

A: Appendix F and Appendix G represent reasonable and expected compliance obligations for the Permitting Specialist. However, these obligations may be revised and/or supplemented upon permitting issuance and directions provided by resource agencies.

Q29: The scope includes preparation of a Final Wetlands and Revegetation Plan and updates to biological and GIS documentation. Please confirm whether baseline GIS files, existing delineations, jurisdictional boundaries, and environmental datasets will be provided in editable format to the selected consultant.

A: Existing GIS files, delineations, jurisdictional boundaries, and environmental datasets will be provided in editable format to the selected Permitting Specialist.

Q30: Approximately how many construction days are planned/assumed?

A: 247 total construction days.

Q31: Is there a CEQA document associated with this Project? One was not in the documents/folders provided and does not appear to be available on CEQAnet.

A: San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (SDRWQCB) will be CEQA lead for the project. SDRWQCB has confirmed the Project SRGO application is complete and is currently drafting the NOA. All CEQA documentation will be provided to the selected consultant.

Q32: What permits have been issued thus far, and which permits (if any) are anticipated)?

A:

- a) SRGO 401 with CEQA certification – San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board; NOI accepted, NOA in process
- b) NWP60 USACE 404 – in consultation, near final upon USFWS and NMFS consult
- c) RMP CDFW (LSAA, ITP) -submitted, near final
- d) NMFS Section 7 consultation - initiated
- e) USFWS Section 7 consultation - initiated

- f) City of San Juan Capistrano – Pre app for grading permits; City Council approval obtained to start grading plan application process
- g) SCRRA (railroad) - Plan review; encroachment permit and others needed

Q33: Have all tasks related to compliance under CEQA and Section 106 (cultural resource inventory, evaluation, assessment of effects/impacts, along with essential consultation) been completed? If so, can we have the technical reports?

A: No, they are in process. Project Team is working with NOAA on Section 106 and with SDRWQCB on CEQA. Data will be provided upon Permitting Specialist selection.

Q34: Can we get a full list of the “cultural BMPs” as listed on p.12?

A: These will be defined in near future, please forecast your budget for cultural BMPs for culturally sensitive areas.

Q35: Page 8 notes that NOAA is the NEPA lead. Was NOAA the lead agency for Section 106?

A: Yes, NOAA is the lead agency for Section 106.

Q36: Can we get a copy of the “partnership and monitoring agreements between tribal representatives and CalTrout” (mentioned on p.8)?

A: Agreements between tribal representatives and CalTrout include work scopes beyond monitoring services that reference information sensitive to the Tribe. CalTrout respects the sensitivity and cultural significance of Tribal information and will not provide copies of these Agreements at this time. The selected Permitting Specialist may request monitoring work scopes within the Agreements, and CalTrout will provide this work scope upon approval granted by the Tribe.

Q37: What role will the County of Orange play? In the specifications document, responsibility for cultural resources/tribal coordination compliance appears to be the County of Orange.

A: For the Metrolink fish passage project, the County of Orange is not directly engaged. The SDRWQCB and NOAA are leads for cultural resources/tribal coordination in collaboration with CalTrout and others.

Q38: The RFP makes recurrent mention of the Acjachemen Tribe in San Juan Capistrano, California. Which of the 3 Acjachemen tribes recognized by the NAHC will be working on this project? Elsewhere the document references the “Acjachemen tribal community” (which would be much larger than either of the 3 recognized tribes). Will client pay cost of labor/travel and contracting for Tribal Monitoring?

A: CalTrout has provided invitation to all three Acjachemen tribes recognized by the NAHC to participate in Tribal Monitoring. As listed on the NAHC website, CalTrout has executed a contract with Juaneño Band of Mission Indians – Acjachemen Nation (Belardes) for Tribal

Monitoring services. CalTrout also expects to execute a contract with Juaneño Band of Mission Indians – Acjachemen Nation 84A. Juaneño Band of Mission Indians (Santa Ana, CA) has not expressed an interest in participating in Tribal Monitoring, and is not expected to enter into a contract. CalTrout will pay the cost for these Tribal Monitoring services.

<https://nahc.ca.gov/cp/p17acjachemen/>