State of Nevada
Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Division of State Lands
901 S Stewart Street, Suite 5003
Carson City, NV 89701

Jim Gibbons
Governor

James R. Lawrence
Administrator

SUBJECT: Amendment No. 2 to Request for Qualifications No. "NDSL NORTH CANYON RFQ 11-01" Questions/Answers from the July 27, 2010 Site Visit

DATE OF AMENDMENT: August 4, 2010

DATE OF RFP RELEASE: July 13, 2010

DATE AND TIME OF OPENING: August 31, 2010 @ 2:00 p.m.

AGENCY CONTACT: Elizabeth Harrison, Water Quality Program Manager, NDSL

The following shall be a part of RFQ No. "NDSL NORTH CANYON RFQ 11-01". If a vendor has already returned a proposal and any of the information provided below changes that proposal, please submit the changes along with this amendment. You need not re-submit an entire proposal prior to the opening date and time.

Question #1	Are there any benefits to being a minority or woman owned small company?
Answer #1:	The only preferences the State of Nevada gives on services contracts are to disabled-veteran-owned businesses per NRS 333.3361-333.3369.
Question #2	Was the spillway at the Spooner Dam designed for the 100 year event?
Answer #2	It is believed that it was designed for the 100 year event or larger. Its main purpose is for emergency flow situations and is actually situated to capture flows which exceed the elevation of the archeological resources.
Question #3	Is the water level in Spooner Lake on the day of the site visit normal?

Answer #3	No. It is below the normal elevation.
Question #4	Are there objectives to designing flow out of Spooner Dam into the North Canyon Creek below for any targeted fish species?
Answer #4	No. There is only Brook Trout in the stream and their populations are sustaining quite well.
Question #5	Is there only 1 spillway for the lake?
Answer #5	Yes.
Question #6	Does State Parks regulate the dam?
Answer #6	Yes but State Water Resources should be consulted as well.
Question #7	Was the filling of the South Ditch a part of the archeological work completed in the 2010 2nd Nature document?
Answer #7	The archeological data utilized in the 2nd Nature study came from a separate archeological report completed by Susan Lindstrom in 2001. The South Ditch was a part of that study but further consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) will be necessary to determine if the South Ditch can truly be filled and to determine what other types of requirements may exist for these historic features.
Question #8	What is the NTRT's opinion about increasing the riparian shrub community?
Answer #8	The intent is to increase the riparian shrub community, particularly willows but maintain open corridors as well.
Question #9	Has groundwater been monitored at this site?
Answer #9	Yes, State Parks has installed several monitoring wells (not piezometers) at the site at varying depths earlier this year. All monitoring wells were at least 2 feet in depth or greater. Most of the wells are in the 4-5 feet depth but range up to 6 feet.
Question #10	Is there any soils data to corroborate with the monitoring well data?
Answer #10	No soils profiles were evaluated in association with the monitoring well installation.
Question #11	How often are the monitoring wells measured?
Answer #11	About once a week in spring until the flows start diminishing.
Question #12	Are there any monitoring wells at the 1 foot depth?
Answer #12	No.
Question #13	Is the condition of the South Ditch the same from the roadway, west into the meadow?

Answer #13	The condition of the South Ditch is more stable and well vegetated (although deeply incised) near the dirt roadway crossing. The banks become less stable and the channel more incised and less vegetated as it heads west through the meadow.
Question #14	What is the plan with the South Ditch when it is abandoned as part of this project?
Answer #14	We plan to fill the South Ditch and revegetate it. However consultation with SHPO will be necessarily to determine if that is possible.
Question #15	Was previous topographic survey work completed in the 2nd Nature study to develop the preferred restoration strategies?
Answer #15	No, that work would need to be done as part of the design.
Question #16	Is there LIDAR available on this project?
Answer #16	LIDAR will be eventually available for all areas in the basin through work contracted by Tahoe Basin agencies. However it may not be available in time for this project.
Question #17	How far does the South Ditch extend along the tree line?
Answer #17	It extends about 120 meters and then reconnects with the remnant channel.
Question #18	Is the #3 location on the map (see 2nd Nature 2010 report, Figure 7.1) where the ditch flows combine with the main channel?
Answer #18	Yes
Question #19	How wide do the creek crossings need to be for snow cat activity?
Answer #19	Approximately 10-12 feet since the snow cat is about 8 feet wide.
Question #20	Who would be responsible for designing the creek crossings?
Answer #20	This is part of the RFQ design package.
Question #21	How long should the creek crossings be?
Answer #21	Likely 14 feet to allow the weight of the crossing vehicles to be distributed outside the area of the bank.
Question #22	Will the crossings be temporary or permanent crossings?
Answer #22	Recent discussions with the concessionaire have indicated that permanent crossings will be designed since some of these structures are difficult to get to and remove on a yearly basis.
Question #23	How many crossings of the creek are needed?
Answer #23	There are 3 crossings in the lower meadow and one over the North Ditch.
Question #24	Is there concern that by planting willows, we will be drying up the meadow?

Answer #24	It is expected that willows will take up a substantial amount of water in a water starved system so we will need to balance the desire to enhance wildlife habitat with limiting undesirable impacts on streamflow.
Question #25	Were there detailed biological surveys completed in the 2010 2nd Nature Report?
Answer #25	Yes and they were completed by David Catalano, Wildlife Biologist with NDOW on the NTRT. David does goshawk and osprey survey as well as other small mammal surveys.
Question #26	Are these biological reports available?
Answer #26	Yes they are available from David Catalano
Question #27	When do you see gopher activity in the meadow?
Answer #27	Generally mid-April to May.
Question #28	Is there a plan to thin the forest adjacent to the South Ditch?
Answer #28	There are no plans to thin the forest in the next 5-10 years in the immediate vicinity of the meadow. A vegetation plan for the picnic area will be completed in the 5-10 year timeframe.
Question #29	Are you managing for encroachment of conifers into the meadow?
Answer #29	No and without management the conifers will eventually encroach the meadow and start to dry it out.
Question #30	Was there a quantified assessment completed of the amount of meadow area that has been lost over time through the encroachment of conifers into the meadow?
Answer #30	We don't believe one has been done but it could be completed using the old aerial photography.
Question #31	Was there a detailed analysis of the floristic change in the meadow over time?
Answer #31	No. The 2002 RCI report included a species list for the watershed area. Also, there was a detailed vegetation mapping completed as part of the 2010 2nd Nature report for the project area. We are not aware of any other vegetation mapping projects.
Question #32	When did grazing stop in the meadow?
Answer #32	Archeological records indicate grazing activities were greatly reduced in the 1930's.
Question #33	Are there any plans to burn the meadow?
Answer #33	Likely within a 5 year time span.
Question #34	Is there a desire to incorporate turnouts on the management road?

Answer #34	Having turnouts may prevent some of the off road parking that we experience today where folks are pulling over for others to pass or where they are trying to turn around. Having turnouts however is not consistent with the management desires for the area.
Question #35	What is the typical road maintenance schedule?
Answer #35	In 2002 water bars, and web material and gravel was installed in the wet areas of the road. No maintenance has really happened since that time and there really isn't money for maintenance. Crews have done some hand work to try and fix water bars but this work is better suited for equipment. We have noticed that the road starts to get scoured out because mountain bike traffic is so high. Also with the hot temperatures and dry conditions, wind erosion carries away a lot of sediment. Periodic water on the road moves sediment and fills water bars.
Question #36	What kind of vehicle traffic does the maintenance road see?
Answer #36	State Parks-2 vehicle trips per day,NDOW-1 or 2 trips per week, NDF-Daily when working on projects
Question #37	Are you managing the roadway for vehicles or recreation?
Answer #37	The road must be managed for both uses. There are some trailers and small dump trucks and other vehicles that must have access for management of the park and the water system.
Question #38	What type of budget is available for maintenance?
Answer #38	There really isn't a budget for maintenance. A long term management plan is really what is needed. A management plan will help avoid fixes that are less than optimum which occur in emergency situations. State Parks is interested in low maintenance road designs.
Question #39	Is there a way to manage equestrian uses?
Answer #39	The equestrian use is often very dispersed but there is the ability to control the use. For instance, designated areas could be established for horses to access the creek in a controlled manner.
Question #40	Do you want to enhance mountain bike features?
Answer #40	If they could fit into the design, it could be desirable.
Question #41	Does State Parks limit the number of mountain bikers and equestrians and how are they tracked?
Answer #41	State Parks really only limits the use by the availability of parking. The users are tracked by the fees collected.

Question #42	Are there any limitations on equipment to construct the plug and pond at the North Ditch?
Answer #42	We definitely want to limit the impacts on the stream environment zone and the riparian areas. There are many management roads that can be used for access. We also should make cost/benefit evaluations of getting heavy equipment into the more remote areas. You likely will have the ability to cut back a lot of the overgrown willow to access the channel as it will grow back very quickly. There are also dry "fingers" that lead down to the North Ditch that could be used for access. The lower part of the North Ditch however is pretty wet and vehicle access in this area should be avoided or limited.
Question #43	Has the LCV been completed? What is considered SEZ?
Answer #43	The LCV has not been completed. The design process early on could consider that a majority of the areas we are working in are SEZ to be conservative. The LCV will be submitted and verified by TRPA during the design process.
Question #44	Has topographic data been surveyed in for the North Ditch?
Answer #44	No.
Question #45	When will the contract be in place to complete the LCV work? Do you want to complete it before winter?
Answer #46	It is expected that the contractor will be selected in October but the contract must be approved by the State Board of Examiners (BOE) in December. The State cannot authorize any work on this project until the BOE approval is achieved.
Question #47	Are both the South Ditch and the North Ditch above the low points of the meadow?
Answer #47	Yes both irrigation ditches are on the perimeter of the meadows and above the low point of the meadows.
Question #48	Do you want to maintain the aspen or the willow community?
Answer #48	Both. We want to restore the hydrologic regime to support both species and also to support a diverse age class for wildlife. Also we want to maintain decent corridors for larger mammals. The willow in the North end of the meadow is mostly mature and growing in dense thickets.
Question #49	Are there any major water quality concerns?

Answer #49	There is definitely sediment being contributed to the creek from the roadway; that is likely the largest contributor of sediment. We are not moving forward with this project to meet TMDL objectives for fine sediment as this system is not much of a contributor. The project focus is an overall ecological restoration for wildlife, vegetation and water quality that is completed in a cost effective manner.
Question #50	Is the area of the "Little Grand Canyon" included with this project?
Answer #50	The restoration of the Little Grand Canyon is not included within the project scope but potentially when addressing the road system, this area may need to be taken into consideration.

***WITH EXCEPTION TO AMENDMENT #1 AND #2, ALL ELSE REMAINS THE SAME FOR RFQ* "NDSL NORTH CANYON RFQ 11-01".**

Vendor shall sign and return this amendment with the proposal submitted.

NAME OF VENDOR _____

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE _____

TITLE _____ DATE _____

RFQ "NDSL NORTH CANYON RFQ 11-01" Amendment 2

This document must be submitted in the "State Documents" section/tab of vendors' technical proposal