Reservoir Committee and Authority Board Meeting

Agenda Item 3.1: Biological Terrestrial Mitigation Strategy

September 19, 2025



Why is mitigation important?

- Many of our permits require mitigation in place prior to construction or financial security
 - Late mitigation = increased cost for the Authority
 - Important for mitigation to get ahead of construction to control costs
- Biological terrestrial mitigation is the Project's largest construction mitigation cost
- Construction targeted to start in early 2027

Strategy -> RFQ, RFP and Contract

Strawperson Strategy

Workshop and oneon-one feedback in late 2023 and early 2024

Components of a Draft Contracting Strategy

Reviewed and concurred by the Board in May 2024

Obtained legal counsel to assist in mid-2024

Review of other mitigation projects and contracts

Coordinating closely with the CMAR team

Revisions to components reviewed and concurred by the Board in March 2025

Draft Strategy for Industry Review

Released on May 20, 2025

Emailed to our contractor distribution list and posted on sitesproject.org

Comments due June 11, 2025

Comments received from four entities

RFQ / RFP and Contract

Industry feedback reflected in RFQ, RFP, and Contract, as appropriate

No additional updates to the Strategy

Minimum Acreage Commitment

• Several commenters requested a minimum acreage commitment for mitigation (i.e., providing assurances to the contractor for guaranteed minimum purchase)

• Staff Assessment:

- Would likely provide greater cost predictability and efficiency
- Would incentivize early mitigation and larger mitigation areas, which increases construction schedule certainty and reduces risk of needing financial securities

• Staff Recommendation:

- Mitigation Agreement should include minimum acreage commitments
- Staff is considering how to structure to avoid the Authority overmitigating

Bonding Requirements

- Some commenters recommended separate bonding requirements per Task Order rather than requiring that the entire contract value be covered by a single bond
- Others make the opposite recommendation

• <u>Staff Assessment</u>:

- A single bond could limit the bond carrier options, and limit the potential prime mitigation contracts who can access such bond capacity
- Phasing the bonding requirement into smaller, incremental bonds can potentially put the Authority at risk if the contractor does not perform

• Staff Recommendation:

Bond at Task Order level – staff considering limited number of Task
Orders, so these are still decently large bonds

Labor Considerations

 Some commentors raised questions about the need/desirability to comply with specific skilled and trained workforce requirements and/or enter into a project labor agreement

Staff Assessment:

- Mitigation Agreement is being procured through the AB 2251/Public Contact Code Section 20928 RFQ/RFP process, it is necessary for the Mitigation Contractor to comply with the skilled and trained workforce requirements for construction activities
- Authority's Construction Workforce Policy is applicable to any construction actions in an alternative delivery method contract

• Staff Recommendation:

- Compliance with AB 2251 is mandatory
- Compliance with the Authority's Construction Workforce Policy is mandatory

Use of Sites-Owned Property/Annual Price Adjustments

- Several commentors requested clarification on:
 - Use of land acquired by the Authority to provide compensatory mitigation
 - How the Mitigation Agreement will address annual price increases since the contract will span multiple years

• Staff Assessment:

- Mitigation on remanent parcels acquired by the Authority should be considered and should result in a price adjustment
- Price adjustments over time are reasonable

Staff Recommendation:

Evaluate both in the RFP and contract negotiation stage

Target Schedule

- Sept 2025 Informational item at RC/AB Meeting
- Oct 2025 Authority Board and Reservoir Committee consider approval for the Executive Director to issue the RFQ

Thank you!





Sites