

ROSS VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Responses to questions from prospective consultants

RFP #2010-2 CEQA Consulting Services:

The following questions were received by the school district in regards to RFP # 2010-2, CEQA Consulting Services.

Question: What lighting upgrades are being considered for this project?

Response: The major thrust of the work is the renovation/replacement and addition of classrooms on all of the District's campuses. Assuming the question pertains to exterior lighting, or possibly more specifically playfield lighting and not just the normally anticipated safety/security lighting, then the answer is that the District is currently not considering lighting upgrades. There are however a few light standards at White Hill that may be relocated.

Question: Are there plans to use artificial turf to replace existing playfields?

Response: Not at present. The major work is classrooms. There is a possibility of adding a playfield at the White Hill school campus; however it is preliminary and will depend upon funding.

Question: On page 3 of the RFP, it states that the district is expecting the CEQA documentation to be completed by December 31, 2010 or before. In the event that the CEQA documentation required for these projects necessitates more than a Categorical Exemption (e.g., Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration), will a flexible schedule be considered, as a December 2010 deadline would not be feasible?

Response: Yes.

Question: Under Tab 1, the RFP requires the "Number of current projects and present workload and where possible, projected workload for the period in question." For clarification, does this refer specifically to the proposed project management team? Alternatively, can we focus on projects within our company's Community Development Bay Area Practice Group?

Response: The purpose of the question is to provide some assurance to the District that the responding firm has the means and staff to complete the documentation in a timely manner.

Question: It appears that an Initial Study may be warranted for the White Hill improvements and that Categorical Exemptions may be fine for the other three schools. Is this the District's understanding at this point?

Response: For clarification. There are actually four (4) other sites not three (3). The Brookside school is actually two separate sites but considered as one school by the CDE. Yes at this point, District staff's interpretation of the CEQA is as described above, however the purpose of the RFP is to hire a consultant that will provide the necessary guidance for compliance with CEQA requirements.

Question: Would it be acceptable for us to provide a cost estimate to prepare an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for White Hill and Categorical Exemptions for the other

ROSS VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Responses to questions from prospective consultants

RFP #2010-2 CEQA Consulting Services:

Campuses, with an optional cost if Categorical Exemptions may be appropriate for all campuses?

Response: The cost estimate provided needs to have enough detail to allow District staff to evaluate what the estimated cost might be in either case.

Question: The submittal format lists a 30-page limit excluding cover letter and tabs. Does this include resumes? Are resumes or other documentation permitted in Appendices?

Responses: Yes. The response should be limited to the 30 page limit.

Question: Could you provide a list of those included in the district's RFP distribution list?

Response: This is an open RFP that was advertised in the local newspaper and the documentation is available on the school district's website. Consequently the district can only provide a list of firms that have responded in some way. The District will post this list on Thursday October 14, 2010 on the District website.

Question: The RFP states the District is requesting the selected consultant complete the CEQA documentation by or before December 31, 2010. Is this date to determine the type of CEQA documentation that will be necessary for each school campus undergoing modernization or is the District anticipating that all CEQA documentation for the four school campuses will be completed by December 31, 2010?

Response: The former.

Question: Has an architect, or architects, been retained by the District to develop the modernization program for each of the four school campuses? Has a project description been prepared for each of the four schools that identifies the facilities improvements to be made, including conceptual drawings?

Response: The District has retained an architect who has developed very preliminary conceptual drawings only for the purpose of confirming the feasibility of additional classrooms and for establishing preliminary budgets.

The District thanks you for your interest and is looking forward to reviewing your responses.