



**ADDENDUM**  
**City of Seaside RFP for Planning, Environmental Review and**  
**Fort Ord Base Reuse Plan (BRP) Consistency Analysis Services**  
**December 22, 2011**

- 1. How many firms received the RFP/RFQ package directly? Did the same group of firms receive all three solicitations? Is it possible to get a list of the firms who received the RFP/RFQ?**

Eight firms received all three solicitations: EMC, PMC, RBF, Rincon Consultants, LSA Associates, Golden State Planning, Cardio Consulting, and Denise Duffy and Associates.

- 2. Will the City consider responses from firms that did not receive the package(s) directly from staff?**

Yes. The City will consider responses from firms that did not directly receive the RFP package(s).

- 3. Is it possible that the City may wish to customize a consultant team(s) for each project or based upon review of the proposals?**

Yes. As stated on page 4 of the RFP under Selection Process, "The City also reserves the right to reject any and all proposals, or part of any proposal, to postpone the scheduled proposal deadline date(s), to make an award in its own best interest..."

- 4. Will the efforts for the Amendment, Amendment EIR and Project Management be city-funded?**

The majority of the scope work for the Amendment, Amendment EIR and Project Management of the Amendment will be City/Agency funded.

- 5. If a firm has contracted directly with the Monterey Downs applicant in the past (for technical studies or related work) does that present an inherent conflict?**

No, not if the firm is no longer under contract with the Applicant. However, as stated on page 6 of the RFP, the City reserves the right to require a proposer to provide information regarding such conflicts should it appear to the City that a conflict of interest may exist relative to the proposed scope of work.

- 6. The cover of the Project Management RFQ identifies a due date of January 12. The body of the RFQ says January 9. Please confirm the due date for this RFQ.**

The correct date is January 9, 2012, at 12:00pm.

**7. Can we assume that the annexation process with LAFCO will be conducted separately and is not included in the scope of work?**

Yes. While a proposed annexation and land conveyance is part of the Monterey Downs Proposal Project Description, the annexation process with LAFCO will be conducted separately and is not included in the scope of work.

**8. NEPA: Has the City consulted with the Veterans Administration regarding the CCVC for federal funding and the NEPA approach? Is a NEPA document required for the approval process and if so, what type? If so, can we assume that the NEPA analysis will be done separately from the scopes of work?**

Yes. NEPA analysis will be done separately from the scopes of work and is not required for the City and County's consideration of project approval.

**9. For the cultural resource assessments, do you want in field studies conducted?**

It is expected that a preliminary cultural reconnaissance of the site would be conducted as stated on page 26 of the RFP.

**10. Is it your assumption that both the City and County will conduct public hearings on the Monterey Downs and Horse Park by December 2012?**

The desired goal is that both the City and County will conduct public hearings on the proposed Monterey Downs and Horse Park by December 2012. However, the integrity of the process and the completeness and quality of the work product is of utmost importance and is a higher priority than the desired completion date.

**11. Is it your assumption that no new technical studies will be required as part of the background analysis and data collection as described on page 11 of the RFP. If not, what new technical studies do you envision?**

As stated on page 11 of the RFP ..."Consultant shall conduct independent studies and research as required to update the 2004 General Plan information, issues, and policies addressing Seaside-Fort Ord Lands given current market conditions and resource constraints." The City is relying on the professional expertise of the Consultant to identify the reports and studies required to prepare the Amendment. These studies are separate from technical studies required for the preparation of the corresponding EIR.

**12. Page 3 of 36 notes that the cost of reimbursable items, including the production of documents, is to be accounted for in the estimated hours and not listed as separate line items. Why and how can this be done if it's an external expense?**

The City considers the production of documents to be part of overhead costs because in many cases it is done in part, if not all in-house.

**13. Page 13 of 36 asks for the preparation of several technical reports:**

Topic	Question
<b>Aesthetics/Visual Quality Analysis</b>	Is a separate technical report required? Typically this analysis is prepared as part of the EIR.
<b>Biological Assessment and Forest Management/Resource Plan</b>	Given the conceptual nature of the land planning, existing background studies, and future clean up requirements, do these studies need to be prepared at this stage?
<b>Cultural Resource Assessment</b>	Given the conceptual nature of the land planning, existing background studies, and future clean up requirements, do these studies need to be prepared at this stage?
<b>Geology &amp; Soils</b>	Can't we use existing studies?
<b>Land Use and Planning</b>	Is a separate technical report required? Typically this analysis is prepared as part of the EIR.

The City expects the scope of work to include the identification and review of existing technical studies and the update of these studies or the preparation of new studies as appropriate for the preparation of a Program-level EIR for the Amendment.

**14. Page 26 – Aesthetics/Visual Quality Analysis asks for the preparation of a minimum of 8 visual simulations from public roadways... However, page 28 notes use of elevations and site plans as provided by the Project Applicant. Which do you prefer? If the former, what type of simulations keeping in mind the potential cost implications given the size and nature of the project.**

It is expected that visual simulations taken from the vantage point of public roadways and key viewing areas would be prepared incorporating elevations and site plans as provided by the Applicant to analyze the proposed project's potential visual impacts.

**15. What is the status of the Monterey Bay Trade and Convention Center Project that the City solicited RFQs for in May of 2011? Is there a scope and schedule available for the project?**

The Agency has selected a consultant and negotiated a scope of work and contract to provide site planning services for the proposed Monterey Bay Trade and Convention Center. However, the contract has not been awarded by the Agency Board. In August 2011, the California Supreme Court issued a "stay" prohibiting redevelopment agencies from entering into new agreements or expanding existing agreements. The "stay" is in place until the Supreme Court issues its ruling regarding ABx1 26 and ABx1 27. We anticipate that may occur sometime prior to January 15, 2012. The contract and proposed project will need to be re-visited pending the state Supreme Court's ruling.

Read and acknowledged by: (Please print, sign and date name and title)

---