

Questions Received Regarding the HHS A Campus EIR Project:

1. Is there an architect on board for this project already?

The County will be releasing an RFQ for architectural services in the near future. This RFP is for the HHS A Campus EIR work only. Questions can be answered in more detail at the pre-submittal conference on Friday, Feb. 18th.

2. Has the County established a budget for this EIR and if so can you disclose it?

No specific amount that I'm aware of at this time. The County website has more details on the overall project design and cost estimates which might help give a better idea. The proposal should just be cost-competitive to comparable EIRs.

3. Does the County have a preference for which traffic and historic preservation consultants to use for this project? We don't have specific consultant preferences.

4. The RFP says use City traffic study guidelines, and County significance standards and policies. How does the County handle cases where the City's significance criteria differs from the County's criteria? The County is the lead agency and the County's criteria will be used to determine significance. However, the analysis must assess impacts using the city's criteria as well.

5. What is the current gross square footage (GSF) of the existing buildings?

112,000 (GSF) – See page 100 of the “Napa County Facility Space Needs Analysis” contained in the “Conceptual Site Development and Phasing Plan through 2028”.

6. What is the current average space utilization (GSF per employee)?

344 (GSF) – See page 100 of the “Napa County Facility Space Needs Analysis” contained in the “Conceptual Site Development and Phasing Plan through 2028”.

7. Are there any planned changes to uses and activities as part of the Project? Yes, the project will result in changes on the site, including new uses (uses relocated from elsewhere in Napa). A specific program will be developed by the project architect for use in developing an EIR project description.

8. The Project would consist of the relocation of uses (buildings) during demolition/construction. Where will these uses be relocated to? This has not been determined yet.

9. What phases of the Project, if any, would warrant a project-level analysis versus a programmatic-level of review? The county does not have sufficient funding to build-out the new campus, but can proceed with one or two phases of the development. These phases – the exact parameters of which will be determined within the next six months or so – need to be analyzed at a project level.

10. Would the consultant be required to develop parking facility specifications and be tasked with actually developing preliminary design drawings/concepts of the parking structure? No. We are seeking an EIR team that can assess existing and future parking demand and supply. A master architect will be retained via a separate RFP and will develop a site plan, design drawings, and parking standards.

11. The RFP mentions the use of technical data from the General Plan and "Baseline Data Report" (BDR) – what is included in the BDR and where can the consultant obtain this information? Will the County provide a list of local vendors? Available on website. Also see question #26
12. What extent of public outreach and involvement does the County envision for the Project? Is it specifically intended to address the CEQA issues and process, or also non-CEQA input on the Project or Alternatives that may be appropriate to include in the EIR? The EIR team should have the skills necessary to perform EIR-related outreach and to assist the Master Architect with additional project-related outreach if needed. Proposals may identify this additional outreach as an "optional task."
13. Will the Project involve laboratory facilities for which air toxics and health risks may need to be assessed? There is not a laboratory facility, but the site is very close to a freeway and an analysis of potential health risks may be required pursuant to BAAQMD Guidelines due to the therapeutic childcare center on site. Consultants should demonstrate a familiarity with BAAQMD guidance and be capable of performing a health risk assessment if needed.
14. Phasing – RFP indicates that the EIR will analyze near term phases at a project specific level and will assess future phases more programmatically. The County of Napa Conceptual Site Development and Phasing Plan through 2028 document prepared by Jones Lang LaSalle indicates that development will be phased over 20 years and will be periodically reassessed where and when additional space is needed. Has it been determined what phases/improvements should be assumed to be near term and what should be long term? Our current assumption is that the first two phases will be "near term" and will have to be analyzed at a project level. However, the site plan and phasing strategy in the JLL report is considered preliminary and is likely to change. Consultants should assume some modifications will occur and that the data necessary to complete the EIR project description will be available 4-6 months after notice to proceed (i.e. after scoping, data collection, and setting sections are complete).
15. What level of detail of architectural plans and site plans for near-term phases will be available for analysis in the EIR? See answer to Q. 14, above. Consultants should assume that a site plan, phasing strategy, and very schematic drawings of the early phases of construction are available approximately 4-6 months after notice to proceed.
16. The RFP references historic preservation in a few places – is it correct to assume that an evaluation of the eligibility of the existing buildings on HHSA campus for inclusion in the NRHP and the CRHR needs to be prepared? Yes.
17. Will the City of Napa Cultural Heritage Commission be involved in the review of the project related to historic buildings/resources? The Commission does not have a formal role in review and approval of the project. However, like other interested stakeholders, the Commission may choose to review/comment on the historic resources evaluation and the EIR.

18. **Should we assume that photo simulations of proposed new buildings desired? One for near-term and one for full buildout?** While some illustrations may ultimately be available from the design team, proposals should include the cost of all EIR figures/illustrations.
19. **There are many mature trees on the property, including some very large redwoods. Is there an arborist report available for any of the existing trees that would be impacted by new development or demolition activities?** Not available.
20. **There appears to be some road or utility construction currently underway in front of HHSA campus on Old Sonoma Road – what is being done? Is it new water or sewer pipes?** Not aware. Please contact Napa City Water Department or Napa Sanitation District for information.
21. **Has a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment been completed? Are there any underground tanks or fueling stations on the site?** No. Unknown.
22. **Is any type of temporary housing or medical clinics existing or proposed?** A community health clinic is currently being added to Building B.
23. **Any child care (Playground equipment) or other noise sensitive land uses existing or proposed on the site?** There is a therapeutic child care use on the site.
24. **Range of Alternatives to be addressed in the EIR. Is it likely that the EIR would consider an off-site alternative such as the Downtown County buildings or a combination City/County facility as discussed at November 2010 BOS hearing.** The EIR will need to consider a reasonable range of alternatives, including a possible off-site alternative. The off-site alternative will not involve consolidation with the City or with the County's administrative functions downtown.
25. **Staff Availability After Consultant Briefing: will staff accept additional contact (questions, etc.) by telephone and email after Friday briefing?** No....(see p.12 Item 16 in the RFP)
26. **Local Vendor Preference**
 - **The RFP cites the County's local vendor preference (p. 9). Can staff provide or cite a relevant listing of "qualified local vendors?"**In particular, can staff suggest candidate Napa Co. based consultants for relevant technical areas such as historical resources, noise, air/climate change or other areas? No. Good sources are the yellow pages and the various Napa County Chambers of Commerce.
27. **Public Participation:**

The RFP indicates that a broad outreach to Napa City staff, HHSA clients, the surrounding neighborhood and other interested constituencies is envisioned. The County's Conceptual Site Development and Phasing Plan Through 2028 (CSDPP) report indicates that some public input and associated Board decision-making has already occurred.

 - **Given prev. CSDPP effort and public participation cost implications, can more info. be provided regarding what is envisioned? — (e.g., 2 to 3 meetings, each with a proposed specific purpose (one of these could include CEQA-required, formally-noticed "scoping**

meeting" component on its agenda), or a more comprehensive process (more than 2-3 meetings, preparation and circulation of questionnaires, etc.)? See Q. 12 above.

- **Is the county steering committee cited in RFP (p. 5) still constituted; is it anticipated that this committee will continue to participate?** The consultant will work at the direction of staff in the Department of Conservation, Development & Planning and will not be expected to interact with a steering committee or other County staff.
- **Is there one or more particular neighborhood organizations (names) that have responded?** We can provide specifics about interested stakeholders to the selected consultant team if needed.
- **Is there an appropriate forum and/or approach that staff envisions for soliciting Agency client input?** See Q. 12 above. Also, there is currently a staff committee that will be providing input to the design team. It is not expected that the EIR consultant will have to separately reach out to staff or clients.

28. Project Description:

The RFP states that EIR will analyze near term phases at a project-specific level and future phases in a more programmatic level. We assume the selected architect will be preparing the near-term and future phase site master plan in sufficient detail to prepare these EIR assessments (as per strategy outlined on CSDPP p. 53). Correct.

- **How does staff envision these architect-assigned tasks fitting into the over program schedule (see sim. question I.3 below)--i.e., will public participation process described in RFP provide input into architect's site master plan effort as well as the EIR?** See Q. 12 and 14 above.

29. Historic Preservation

Consistent with CEQA, RFP refers to need for evaluation of campus buildings and features for eligibility for State listing.

- **We understand that no individual onsite resource has been listed on the State or National Register; are we correct? Is any component of 1920's crescent shaped building complex already included on a local (County or City) list of historic resources?** No evaluation of the site has been completed and no buildings are designated or listed on any registers/inventories.
- **Who are the local preservation groups referenced on RFP?** Napa County Landmarks is the primary preservation group in town, however there are also other organizations and individuals who have an interest in historic resources.

30. Transportation and Parking

Project external traffic impacts and parking implications will be a function of anticipated changes in size and geographic distribution of facility staff and client base, access alternatives and transit opportunities, etc.

- **Can staff provide copy of or access to the 2008 Space Needs Assessment cited in the 2010 CSDPP?** Yes.

31. Other Environmental Topics

The RFP cites transportation and parking impacts and historic resources impacts as two environmental issues of particular concern.2.3.

- Has the neighborhood expressed other concerns regarding the program such as noise, light, security, etc? Are there any others that have been identified. Yes, neighbors have expressed concerns related to compatibility, noise, lighting, parking, parking, and parking.

32. Alternatives

CEQA requires EIR to address a reasonable range of alternatives. In our proposal, we may be suggesting some preliminary candidates to consider.

- Are there any specific design alternatives that staff wishes to see evaluated? Not at this time.

33. General:

- May we may contact City of Napa Planning Department staff regarding their EIR scope suggestions (issues of particular concern to the City). Is there a particular City staff person that it would be best to contact? We have no objection if consultants contact stakeholders or City representatives, but we cannot recommend specific individuals.
- Has staff formulated a preliminary public participation/EIR/project design finalization program schedule that it can share?--such as:
 - work program refinement and finalization with Co. staff,
 - public participation phase(s),
 - project description determination, incl. near term and future phase descriptions sufficient for EIR purposes (by county-selected architect?),
 - EIR preparation,
 - EIR finalization and certification,
 - near term/future phase project design finalization.See Q. 14. We have not developed a project schedule.
- Can staff please provide us with listing of, or online reference to, County-adopted CEQA guidelines referenced in RFP (p. 1) Yes
- What federal, state agencies may be involved in project approvals and EIR review? We are not aware of any federal or State agencies who will have to approve the project.

