



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA HASTINGS COLLEGE OF THE LAW

RFP 45-0180
QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

May 26, 2015

Q1: Will there be a programmatic description of the height and bulk of the new construction at 333 Golden Gate and 198 McAllister for use in the EIR?

A1: *A pre-design site analysis for the proposed 333 Golden Gate building has already been provided as part of the available documents for the RFP. The analysis is the "8. UC Hastings 333 Golden Gate Ave 80' Academic Facility, Pre Design Site Analysis" file. Information regarding the proposed height, bulk, and density for the proposed new 198 McAllister student housing project will also be provided (See also response to question 10. below).*

Q2: Should the EIR scope include potential shadow effects on public open space?

A2: *Yes, the EIR scope should include potential shadow effects on public open space.*

Q3: Would CEQA revisions under SB743 apply to this EIR: A project in a transit priority area, on an infill site, and is a residential, mixed-use residential, or an employment center, would be presumed to not have significant aesthetic impacts, or significant parking effects. AB743 also directs lead agencies to move away from Level of Services Standards for intersection analysis to other metrics that account for greenhouse gas reduction?

A3: *SB743, which added Chapter 2.7 to Division 13 of the Public Resources Code, would apply if the criteria set pursuant to that Section are met. However, that Section does not eliminate the need to comply with policies or thresholds set by UC Hastings. It also does not relieve a public agency of the requirement to analyze a project's potentially significant impacts related to air quality, noise, safety or any other impacts associated with transportation. The specific thresholds of significance to be applied must be determined during the EIR process.*

Q4: Has UC Hastings developed a Campus Climate Action Plan?

A4: *No, UC Hastings has not developed a Campus Climate Action Plan.*

Q5: Does UC Hastings anticipate interaction with San Francisco Planning Department staff during preparation of the Draft EIR, such as review of certain technical studies?

A5: *While UC Hastings is not subject to San Francisco Planning Department requirements and guidelines, UC Hastings is expecting to receive input and comments from the San Francisco Planning Department.*

Q6: Does UC Hastings have travel surveys or other documented travel demand sources re: how often, when, why, and by what mode (e.g. transit, car, walk, etc.) their populations (e.g. student, staff, professor, etc.) travel?

A6: *No, UC Hastings does not have any recent travel surveys or other documented travel demand sources.*

Q7: If no, should travel surveys and the development of UC Hastings population-specific travel demand rates per population be a part of this effort?

A7: *Given that the primary projects to be studied by the EIR are an academic facility, which replaces an existing academic facility, and a new student housing project, which would likely effectively reduce travel demand, it is assumed that travel surveys and the development of UC Hastings population specific travel demand rates do not need to be a part of this effort. However, this may be reevaluated after a consultant has been selected and/or as work progresses.*

Q8: If yes to 6), but no to 7); Is UC Hastings looking to the transportation and environmental consultant to propose a less expensive (than new surveys), but still defensible approach to travel demand?

A8: *Per the response to question 7, above, proposing a less expensive, but still defensible, approach to travel demand would seem to be a reasonable approach.*

Q9: The projects that will be analyzed in the EIR are clearly explained in the RFP, but please elaborate on the program-level analysis that will be required.

A9: *UC Hastings will develop the project description, i.e., define the program, for which the consultant will prepare an EIR scope. It is not currently anticipated that the EIR consultant will perform a programming analysis.*

Q10: Please elaborate on the anticipated subsequent phases of development (i.e. student housing and other infrastructure projects) and on what future projects (or types of projects) might be tiered from this CEQA document.

A10: *The primary projects to be studied under this EIR are the new academic facility at 333 Golden Gate Avenue, and the subsequent new student housing project to be developed on the site of the original 198 McAllister academic facility, once it has been replaced by the new academic facility and can be demolished. The new student housing facility is anticipated to include 400-450 units in an approximately 140-foot tall building. The other projects to be studied include the modernization of an existing annex building at 198 McAllister Street, renovation and reconfiguration of existing student housing at 100 McAllister Street, renovation and reuse of the Great Hall at 100 McAllister Street, and additional infrastructure projects as set forth in UC Hastings' Five Year Infrastructure Plan. Please review the Five Year Infrastructure Plan for additional infrastructure projects, which may or may not require environmental study.*

Q11: Please clarify how many public meetings are anticipated during the EIR process, in addition to the public scoping meeting and public hearings on the Draft and Final EIRs. What level of community engagement is anticipated?

A11: *UC Hastings anticipates holding two to three public meetings in addition to the public scoping meeting and public hearings. UC Hastings will be responsible for conducting community engagement with support as needed from the EIR consultant and other project team members.*

Q12: Please clarify the types of examples expected for the Illustrative Materials (page 7 of the RFP).

A12: *The respondent should include the minimum number of Illustrative Materials examples that it deems necessary to represent its past work, which is relevant to the UC Hastings' scope of work.*

Q13 For the proposal evaluations, is the cost estimate a factor in the proposal scoring process?

A13 *As stated in the RFP, fee proposals will be evaluated after interviews have been completed.*

Q14 Will technical documentation regarding hazardous materials be available (such as Phase I Environmental Site Assessments) for the EIR analysis?

A14: *A past Phase I Environmental Assessment for the 333 Golden Gate Avenue site will be available. Any other past hazardous materials reports, which have been prepared, will also be made available.*

Q15 Please clarify what is meant by “climate change analysis for the whole campus”. Is this analysis intended to cover the increase in campus operations associated with the project or are you looking for a campus-wide inventory of GHG emissions (which would include existing conditions)?

A15 *The specific studies to be conducted will be determined during the EIR process. At this point it does appear that a campus-wide assessment is appropriate.*

Q16 Please reconcile the statement on page 10 that says services should be lump sum not to exceed with page 7 which says fee proposals should be provided for time and work effort required.

A16 *The statement on page 10 is part of a sample agreement, which is provided for reference purposes. As noted on page 8, the firm selected as first choice will be notified and asked to negotiate final pricing and terms of the contract with the Chief Financial Officer of UC Hastings.*

Q17 The RFP notes an expected EIR certification date of March 2016. As this is an aggressive schedule, please clarify the driving schedule factors (i.e., funding obligation deadlines, etc.).

A17 *The EIR certification date has been established by UC Hastings based on the past timing for completing EIRs, which have been previously prepared by UC Hastings.*

Q18 The RFP indicates the EIR will evaluate the project through 2020. Are there other buildout years that should be evaluated in the EIR?

A18 *No other buildout years need to be evaluated in the EIR*

Q19 For Air Quality, please clarify the background studies expected.

A19 *Please submit proposals based on the Air Quality background studies that the respondent would customarily expect to be completed given the location and scope of UC Hastings' proposed projects.*

Q20 Are the Plan/Project elements included within the City of San Francisco's adopted greenhouse gas reduction plan, Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions?

A20 *The Plan/Project elements are not included within the City of San Francisco's adopted greenhouse gas reduction plan, but UC Hastings would be supportive of any efforts to incorporate the Plan/Project elements into the City's plan. San Francisco's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy is based on CEQA and Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) guidelines. Therefore, similar issues would apply here, as would any regulations specific to UC Hastings.*

Q21 While UC's CEQA Guidelines, UC CEQA Handbook, indicates use of the local air district's thresholds may be used to evaluate and determine project impacts, because the project is located within the City of San Francisco (which has its own approach to evaluating impacts), is the UC amenable to using portions or all of the City of San Francisco Environmental Planning's approach to evaluating impacts? For example, per City of San Francisco Environmental Planning's requirements, projects located within the project area are required by City of San Francisco Environmental Planning requirements to implement enhanced building ventilation per Article 38 of the San Francisco Health Code in addition to enhanced construction mitigation; implementation of these measures would result in a less-than-significant health impact. Would the UC be amenable to utilizing a similar approach, or would they prefer a Health Risk Assessment consistent with Bay Area Air Quality Management District requirements?

A21 *If the respondent is recommending that UC Hastings consider this approach, then it should include this recommendation as part of its proposal along with an explanation of the pros and cons of this approach relative to any other approach for UC Hastings' evaluation.*

Q22 Respondent has noted the aggressive schedule that UC Hastings is pursuing for preparation of the EIR. Is there something in particular that is driving the schedule?

A22 *Per the response to question 17, above, the EIR certification date has been established by UC Hastings based on the past timing for completing EIRs, which have been previously prepared by UC Hastings.*

Q23 Respondent has also noted that the RFP identifies interactive meetings, planning charrettes, open forums, and workshops and presentations as elements of the EIR planning process. Is the expectation that the EIR consultant would be responsible for conducting the public process? Or, would this be the responsibility of the UC Hastings team?

A23 *Per the response to question 11, above, UC Hastings will be responsible for conducting community engagement with support as needed from the EIR consultant and other project team members.*

Bidder acknowledgement
SIGN AND RETURN WITH YOUR PROPOSAL

Date