

Questions from Consultants at the August 20, 2018 Pre-Bid Conference, and City Responses

- 1. There is overlap in the scopes between Scopes 1 and 7; they both reference archaeological resources. Can we assume that the archaeological work is only part of the CEQA scope, and not part of the Precise Plan scope?**

Yes. The Precise Plan work relative to cultural resources will focus on historic sites and structures and historic preservation issues. With respect to CEQA evaluation, the City already has a data base of archaeological resources that should reduce the level of effort required. The City also has a data base of historic resources, but the survey work is quite dated and many of the APN's and addresses are obsolete.

- 2. The transportation scope doesn't assume an analysis of alternatives. Should that be included?**

Yes, but this would be a qualitative evaluation and would not include model runs for each alternative.

- 3. For the CEQA evaluation, how many alternatives should be presumed?**

We would expect three alternatives to be evaluated.

- 4. The utilities scope does not include a Water Supply Assessment. Should that be included?**

While the EIR should address impacts and mitigation measures related to water, we are not anticipating a formal Water Supply Assessment as defined by SB 610.

- 5. Will the Precise Plan scope on historic resources include CEQA level analysis?**

Yes. The inventory of historic resources done for the Precise Plan should be sufficiently detailed to determine whether structures meet historic resource criteria under CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. Some of the structures in the existing data base (from the mid-1980s) likely do not meet CEQA criteria for historic significance, presenting a potential obstacle to transit-oriented infill development.

- 6. Is it possible you will want to do project-level CEQA analysis for any of the Downtown opportunity sites as part of this effort?**

Not at this time. In the event this arises during the course of the project, the scope and budget would be amended accordingly.

- 7. The Precise Plan scope states that a good faith effort should be made to retain DBEs on the team. If you're not asking for teams, how can we comply?**

We would not expect bidders to add firms to their team simply to show a good faith effort. Some of this responsibility falls on the City as it selects and assembles firms or teams to do the work.

- 8. If we are bidding as the Precise Plan prime, can we comment on the other scopes for the consultants that may be working directly for the City but are effectively working as “subconsultants” to us?**

Yes. We would welcome comments from the consultants on the other scopes of work, and suggest these be included in the “Approach” section of your proposal.

- 9. Can you clarify that you are not expecting teams (with economists, transportation firms, etc.) to submit on the Precise Plan, because the firms retained to do the corresponding General Plan work will also be tasked with doing these Precise Plan components?**

Yes, that is how we envision the process working. If you want to propose something different, you can do so, and explain in your proposal why you think it makes more sense.

- 10. What is the Downtown boundary to be used in the Precise Plan? Could it include adjacent neighborhoods?**

Defining the boundary is one of the first tasks in the scope---we expect it will be a hybrid of some of the boundaries used in recent studies. Traditional boundaries of downtown may need to be augmented to include more of the PDA. However, we do not anticipate that it will include adjacent residential neighborhoods.

- 11. Are you confident that the EIR can be completed within the MTC grant timeframe?**

Yes. The MTC grant has a 30-month timeframe, which is substantially longer than the schedule for the work.

- 12. The Precise Plan will require a higher level of detail and focus on urban design and transportation than the General Plan. Should that be reflected in the scope? It seems logical that a lot of the visualization work will focus on Downtown.**

Yes, our expectation is that there will be a much more focused and granular effort to look at urban design and transportation for Downtown than for other parts of the City. We have a large number of development projects proposed downtown and have found that historic resources and traffic are often the biggest issues. We would like to be able to expedite CEQA clearance by addressing these issues thoroughly through this process.

- 13. How do the visualization exercises described in Scope 6 reflect similar work that may be proposed by the Precise Plan consultant in Scope 7?**

Scope 6 is intended as a “catch all” for miscellaneous services that the City may need on an on-call basis, including opportunities to engage DBEs. Firms bidding on the Precise Plan may indicate that they have the capacity to perform these services, and can propose these services as optional tasks as they wish.

14. How will sea level rise be addressed in the General Plan? Should the team members be equipped to deal with scientific issues related to sea level rise and feasible responses?

We are open to creative proposals that address this question and anticipate that sea level rise will be addressed in the Safety/Resilience Element and be a factor in evaluating land use choices. However, we do not expect the General Plan to serve as the City's "blueprint" for responding to sea level rise; follow-up actions to be completed after Plan adoption may be identified through the process.

15. Will the Precise Plan drive the General Plan urban design policies for Downtown, or will the General Plan provide the urban design direction for the Precise Plan?

We anticipate an iterative process, but the General Plan work will precede the Precise Plan to some degree, since the process is already underway and since the General Plan already addresses Downtown urban design issues.

16. Are there any examples of Precise Plans and form-based codes that the City thinks are good models?

Many of the issues addressed in the Redwood City Downtown Precise Plan are transferable, and the City has been referencing that document as a good example.

17. Is the project going to rely on the existing countywide TAM model, or is there a subarea model that the City is using?

We have met with TAM and anticipate using the new 2040 model that is now being completed.

18. Why have you chosen to call this a Precise Plan, if you anticipate the zoning-level regulations associated with a Specific Plan?

We expect the Precise Plan to have many of the elements of a Specific Plan, including zoning-level regulations. However, we do not want to be bound by the legal requirements associated with a Specific Plan, including those related to infrastructure, implementation, and public works projects.

19. What is the level of change that is anticipated? Are we changing densities downtown and citywide?

Our assumption is that Downtown is the primary location in the City where we will see land use densities and intensities change—future growth in this area will follow transit oriented development principles consistent with OBAG grant requirements. Beyond Downtown, our neighborhoods are built out and we don't anticipate major shifts. We don't anticipate conversion of "greenfields" or open space areas to development. We do expect change on targeted sites such as Northgate Mall and some of the commercial and industrial sites in the city—most of these sites have already been identified by the prior General Plan.

20. Who do you see as responsible for developing the alternatives at the General Plan/CEQA level and the Downtown Precise Plan level?

At the General Plan level, alternatives will primarily be generated by staff and the Consulting Project Manager, working in collaboration with the Steering Committee. We will consult with the CEQA consultant as needed to ensure that the alternatives are appropriate for consideration in the EIR. At the Precise Plan level, we see this as part of the consultant's scope of work.

21. Will there be a range of densities and intensities (e.g., growth forecasts) for the Downtown alternatives, or will there be control totals?

Alternatives for Downtown may vary somewhat in terms of buildout capacity, but it's unlikely that we'll have one alternative with a vastly larger population/employment forecast than the others. The Downtown forecasts will need to be consistent with what we're anticipating citywide.

22. Will the CEQA document test the buildout envelope for Downtown?

Not necessarily. We expect that we will need to make an estimate of how much Downtown growth could reasonably occur by 2040; this may be less than the maximum capacity. At this point, we don't know how much change to existing allowable heights and densities will be proposed so it's difficult to know the gap.

23. How will the Downtown Precise Plan economic analysis address Downtown's relationship to the Canal business district?

We expect the Downtown Plan to focus on Downtown and not include the Canal. However, we acknowledge that there are synergies and relationships between the two areas that should be addressed through the Precise Plan process.

24. There is a \$5,000 budget discrepancy for the Precise Plan "prime" scope listed in the RFP and the Precise Plan "prime" shown in Appendix C.

The correct total for the Precise Plan prime is \$410,000. Appendix C reflects estimates that were intended for use by MTC when disbursing OBAG grant funds to the City.