

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS  
CONSULTANT SERVICES LAND SURVEYOR  
RFP # 2010-4**

**ADDENDUM # 2**

**June 14, 2011**

ADDENDUM and Responses to Questions.

**General:**

The District is looking to achieve two goals. The first is to update the information on the school sites and the second is to gather adequate information to design the improvements contemplated. To that end, the District encourages cost saving alternate proposals that will achieve these goals. Please review the questions and responses below as responses will affect the scope of work

**Pricing:**

**Please provide a separate cost proposal for each site.**

**Responses to questions**

The following questions were received by the District and responses follow each question.

- 1) Does the district desire to have an aerial survey or ground topographic survey completed on these school sites?

**Response:** We are looking for a ground topo survey suitable for design. If an aerial survey will produce suitable results, an alternate proposal is acceptable.

- 2) The survey request for White Hill Middle School identifies 5 different area types. Does each area type have a different type of surveying requirements?

**Response:** Yes. Only some areas will be affected by the proposed construction.

- 3) Is mapping of the entire school property for Brookside Upper, Brookside Lower, Manor and Wade Thomas schools being requested?

**Response:** No. Please refer to addendum # 1.

- 4) On the Manor school site is mapping only needed on the 5.59 acres of usable area?

**Response:** Actually less. Please refer to Addendum # 1.

- 5) Does any mapping of the adjoining streets need to be included, are there any proposed offsite improvements at any of the school sites?

**Response:** Anticipate need only at White Hill.

- 6) Is it possible to visit the school sites prior to finalizing our proposal for surveying services?

**Response:** Yes. Please make arrangements through this office. Classes are out for summer break and only custodians are on site.

General questions pertaining to the entire project:

- 1) The General Requirements require both 'boundary research' and property line surveys to be shown from information provided by Assessor's Parcel Maps'. Is the District requiring boundary surveys and subsequent Records of Survey be performed and prepared for each site, or are they requesting that boundary lines be plotted from GIS data obtained from sources similar to the MarinMap website?

**Response:** The District does not believe that the retracement of boundary lines will result in a requirement of filing a Record of Survey.

- 2) Will the District be providing Title Reports for each site that easements are to be plotted from?

**Response:** The District has preliminary title reports for each site dated 1999 which should be adequate for the needs on this project.

### **Site Specific Questions:**

#### White Hill Middle School:

- 1) Per requirements as outlined in Exhibit 2, is the School District aware that a Record of Survey Map will most likely need to be prepared and recorded with the County, and this service will increase the fees for the project?

**Response:** Response above.

- 2) Per requirements as outlined in Exhibit 2, are the limits of topographic survey to be performed the 'Property Line', or the 'yellow' and 'red' areas shown on the Survey Request Exhibit (page 4 of Exhibit 2), or are the limits similar to those shown in Exhibit 3 (the topographic survey prepared by Tronoff Associates)?

**Response:** The limits are as shown on Exhibit 2 however as no building construction work is contemplated in the areas not shown on Exhibit 3, the level of detail can be low. Alternate proposals for achieving the desired results are acceptable.

#### Brookside School / Lower Campus (Lower Brookside)

- 1) In order to add the additional 5 classrooms, we would anticipate the need to survey the ball field or a portion thereof. Would it be possible to provide us the 'Limits of Survey' for this project?

**Response:** Please refer to addendum #1.

#### Brookside School / Upper Campus (Upper Brookside/Hidden Valley)

- 1) Same question as Lower Brookside?

**Response:** Please refer to addendum #1.

### **Technical and Scope of Services Questions**

1. Is the Survey Completion Checklist developed by Sherwood Engineers identified as attachment 2 under the White hill Middle School the same for all of the sites? The scope of services identified as Attachment 1 in the RFP is more general than Sherwood's checklist. Please clarify which list or requirements are to be proposed on.

**Response:** The Survey Completion Checklist is specific to the White Hill Middle School site due to the proposed scope of work. The work proposed at the other sites is significantly less and the

District does not need the same level of detail. The District does want to have up to date utility information, site topography and features for all the sites. As indicated in the RFP, the District has significant information from past survey work, however because of construction work following, it is not current.

2. Is there a preferred underground utility locating service that the Ross Valley School District would prefer to use?

**Response:** No

3. Is it anticipated that the underground utility locating service will be a direct sub-consultant to the selected consultant/surveyor or will the District retain them independently?

**Response:** This work would be best coordinated by the land surveyor. Please include these services.

4. The Sherwood checklist suggests that variations between the deed/record boundary and actual field dimensions be noted and that the right of way lines be identified? This will require a formal boundary analysis and most likely a record of survey for each site. Is this the intent? Will placing the assessor's lines on the mapping be adequate for the intended use of the topography as suggested in Attachment 1 in the RFP? The Sherwood checklist also requests the type of found corner monumentation. This will require a search in all these areas. Again, is this necessary? We will have to do this if a boundary analysis is required anyway, but it does not seem to be necessary. The Attachment 1 in the RFP does not require this service. A formal boundary analysis and record of survey for each site will be costly and we are not sure if that is the intent or if the District anticipated this in their funding.

**Response:** Placing the assessor's lines on the mapping is adequate. Physically locating and identifying monuments is not required unless they are determined to be within a construction area.

5. If a record of survey is required, will the District pay for the Marin County map checking and recording fees or is the consultant expected to include those fees?

**Response:** As per response to a prior question, the District does not believe that the work requested will require a record of survey.

6. Will title reports be provided for each site? Is the consultant expected to obtain them from a title company? Is so; is there a preferred title company? Title reports are necessary to identify record encumbrances (easements). Attachment 1 in the RFP requests identifying the easements.

**Response:** The District has preliminary title reports from 1999. These should be sufficient for the scope of work contemplated.

7. The Sherwood checklist suggests that all encroachments from adjoining development be identified. This will require a boundary analysis to determine the extent of the encroachment over the boundary or property line. Is this necessary? Once the topography is completed and the design limits identified with respect to the area surveyed, if there is an area in question additional data can be obtained. Please elaborate on the need or requirement.

**Response:** No. As per the suggestion we will deal with the issue if needed.

8. The Sherwood checklist suggests that all trees 2" in diameter be identified. There are a lot of trees within the limits of each of the campuses. Is that the intent? 2" is very small. Are the trees to be tagged for future reference? One could interpret that all trees within the property

lines/boundary of the campus be identified while the other could interpret the trees in the immediate vicinity of the improvements. Please elaborate on the need or requirement.

**Response:** Limit to areas of proposed construction.

9. The Sherwood checklist suggests that the grades along the property lines be obtained. In some cases the property line is so far from any existing or contemplated improvements and in areas of very dense vegetation. Please elaborate on the need for this request.

**Response:** Grades along property lines required only along Glenn Drive and identified as high-level on attachment 2

10. The Sherwood checklist suggests the need to obtain information on basements. Do any of the campuses have basements that need to be identified?

**Response:** There are no basements.

11. Exhibits in the Facility Master Plan for Ross Valley School District identify each of the campuses and their existing improvements. Attachments 3 thru 7 in the RFP are very helpful but don't identify the areas of the planned improvements which are in need of the topographic design survey. Are there any actual schematic plans that can be provided that identify the areas slated for improvements? Will the requested survey be limited to the area of the planned improvements or the entire campus? Please elaborate on the actual areas needing to be surveyed.

**Response:** Please see addendum #1. With the exception of White Hill, the areas to be surveyed are limited.

### **Submittal Material and Format Questions**

1. Is the 30 page limit inclusive or exclusive of cover sheets, back covers, and tab dividers?

**Response:** Exclusive assuming tab dividers do not include information requested in the RFP.

2. Should the fee proposal be included within the body of the proposal or submitted under a separately sealed envelope?

**Response:** The fee proposal is part of the evaluation and should be included as part of the submittal.

3. Under Submittal Format, Relevant Project Experience: it requests the owners name and contact person as well as the owner reference, contact name and phone numbers. Does this mean that the owner has to be the reference or is it possible to use another project reference whom would be more intimately familiar with our performance and services on that chosen project?

**Response:** An alternate project reference is acceptable providing the alternate was in a position of authority.

Question: A review of the attachments to the RFP show property boundary and easement details for several of the school sites. Will the previous site surveys be available in electronic format for use in the new surveys? Will the survey control, including coordinate for property corner and found reference monuments, from the previous surveys be available? The RFP indicates specific site requirements for White Hill Middle School; can specific site requirements be provided for the other four school sites?

**Response:** Attachment 1 defines the available information for each site.

\*\*\*\*\* End of Document \*\*\*\*\*