

**REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS**  
**CEQA Consulting Services, Student Housing**  
**University of California Santa Cruz**

**INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

The University of California Santa Cruz (UCSC) is seeking an environmental consulting firm to prepare the environmental documents for a project that would develop up to 3,000 beds of student housing on the UCSC main campus. The proposed project would provide new apartment-style housing, site development and outdoor amenities, and associated circulation and utility improvements on both previously developed and undeveloped land. The Project is expected to require an environmental impact report (EIR) and may require an amendment to the UCSC Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) land use boundaries.

Design and construction would be performed by a private developer under a ground lease. The University plans to issue a request for proposals (RFP) to developers in April 2017 and to select a developer by July 2017. The proposed project partially implements the 2005 UC Santa Cruz Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). The LRDP defines a general building program and land use areas for proposed facilities to accommodate the projected enrollment of 19,500 students by 2020. An accompanying programmatic Environmental Impact Report (the 2005 LRDP EIR) analyzed the general effects of implementing the plan.<sup>1</sup>

The selected EIR consultant will be responsible for all aspects of CEQA document preparation. CEQA consultant and all subconsultant costs, including reimbursables, are estimated to be in the range of \$300,000 - \$400,000 depending on the specific environmental documents produced. The selected consultant team will assist the campus in determining the appropriate strategy for CEQA compliance, and prepare the CEQA documentation for the proposed development. The Campus is considering two options for CEQA compliance. Under the first option, all CEQA analysis would be completed by November 2017. Under the second option, two CEQA documents would be prepared, one to support a University approval in November 2017 and a second CEQA document to support a subsequent approval in winter/spring 2018.

The selected firm may provide: technical studies and analyses; Notice of Preparation, including Initial Study; Draft and Final EIR(s) and/or Mitigated Negative Declaration; Mitigation Monitoring Plan; participation in public meetings; and agency coordination. The CEQA documents will be tiered from the UC Santa Cruz 2005 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) EIR. However, program-level impact analysis will be required for water supply, housing, and climate change, and updates to the LRDP EIR analysis may be required for other topic areas.

**PROPOSED PROJECT**

The proposed Project would provide approximately 3,000 new beds for upper division undergraduates, graduate students and students with families. All units will be in apartment configurations. The project would also include social amenity spaces, a small grocery/convenience store, parking, a child care facility, infrastructure and possibly a pedestrian bridge. Circulation improvements will include pedestrian paths, service and emergency vehicle access,

---

<sup>1</sup> The entire 2005 LRDP and the 2005 LRDP EIR can be found at <http://lrpd.ucsc.edu/>

and parking. The Project would also extend Campus, and, possibly, PG&E utility services onto the site. The new utilities would include medium voltage power, telecommunications, sanitary sewer, municipal water, and high-pressure natural gas. Off-site improvements to the Campus and/or PG&E electrical distribution infrastructure may be required. Storm water runoff would be handled on site and conform to the principles of Low Impact Development as set forth in the Campus' Post Construction Storm Water Management Requirements. Compliance with the UC Policy on Sustainable Practices would be required. The Campus anticipates that Project construction would take place in three phases, with the first group of beds online by August 2019 or August 2020.

Undeveloped land on the 50-acre project site includes redwood forest, oak woodland, and open meadow. The site also includes an existing parking lot, which may be re-developed, and an existing 200-unit family student housing complex which would be redeveloped.

### **AVAILABLE DOCUMENTS**

The 2005 LRDP and the 2005 LRDP EIR are available online at <http://lrdp.ucsc.edu>. Previous UCSC project-level CEQA documents are posted online at <http://ppc.ucsc.edu>. Other relevant resource studies and Campus planning documents related to the Project will be made available to the EIR consultant in electronic format.

### **POTENTIAL FOR PUBLIC CONTROVERSY**

The Campus is not aware of any specific areas of controversy associated with this Project. However, all UCSC projects are subject to a high degree of public interest and scrutiny. The quality and legal adequacy of the EIR is therefore of utmost importance.

### **ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES, BACKGROUND INFORMATION, AND REQUIRED TECHNICAL STUDIES**

The following discussion provides a brief description of project-related environmental issues that have been raised to date and outlines some of the studies that are available to inform analyses of those issues. This information is intended to orient prospective consultants to some of the issues associated with the project but it is not intended to be a comprehensive discussion of all issues likely to require analysis. Prospective consultants should (a) review available studies, (b) make judgments about the nature and extent of additional studies and analyses required to fully address all CEQA standards of significance, and (c) reflect those judgments in proposals submitted to the University.

#### **Aesthetics**

The Project site includes developed areas as well as mixed evergreen forest, coyote brush scrub, and open grassland. A portion of the site is visible from Empire Grade, which is a County scenic road. It is expected that the visual impacts of the Project will require thorough analysis. The 2005 LRDP EIR identifies scenic vistas and scenic resources on Campus.

Under the first CEQA schedule option, the visual analysis would be based on a reasonable “worst-case” massing scenario consistent with the developer RFP and developed by the Campus. Under the second CEQA schedule option, the University anticipates that a conceptual site plan and building elevations will be available in July 2017, and will be used by the EIR consultant to prepare visual simulations from several vantage points to aid in the CEQA analysis.

### **Agricultural and Forestry Resources**

The proposed project site has not been used for agricultural purposes since the establishment of the UCSC campus. The University anticipates that impacts to agricultural resources will not be an issue of concern and that the impact analysis can rely on the LRDP EIR.

Although the site is not used for growing timber, portions of the site where redwood and Douglas fir trees are growing are considered “timberland” under the California Forest Practice Rules. The Campus anticipates that a timberland conversion permit (TCP) from the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection and a timber harvest plan (THP) will be required for the project. These documents will be prepared by a Registered Professional Forester hired by the Campus but will rely on the environmental analysis in the University's CEQA documents. Therefore, the EIR should analyze the potential environmental effects of tree removal in the appropriate sections of the EIR. These effects may include biological resources impacts, aesthetic impacts, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and noise impacts associated with tree removal.

### **Air Quality**

The project CEQA document will follow the Monterey Bay Air Resources District (MBARD) 2008 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines to analyze potential air quality impacts of project construction and operations. The project would generate typical construction-related air contaminants; operational sources of air pollutants would include area sources and emergency natural gas/propane-fueled emergency generators. Although the 2005 LRDP EIR identified inconsistency with the applicable Air Quality Management Plan as a significant unavoidable impact of development under the 2005 LRDP, the MBARD (formerly Monterey Bay Area Unified Air Pollution Control District) has since issued a consistency determination for the 2005 LRDP.

### **Biological Resources**

The proposed project site includes areas of redwood forest, oak woodland, and grassland. The following paragraphs summarize the findings of the previous studies, relative to special-status species and sensitive habitats. Several of these studies were completed in 2016. The EIR consultant will conduct additional site surveys as needed to analyze the project's potential impacts to biological resources.

#### **Botany**

A botanical survey of the project site, including seasonally timed focused species surveys, was conducted in 2016. No special-status plants were observed, with the exception of

Monterey pine (*Pinus radiata*), which occurs on the site as planted or naturalized landscape occurrences. Coastal prairie was observed in portions of the site.

## **Wildlife**

### *Invertebrates*

Based on mapping soil types, previous studies have identified a portion of the meadow south and west of the project site as potential Ohlone tiger beetle (*Cicindela ohlone*) (OTB) habitat. A survey of the project area was conducted by an entomologist between March and June 2016, during a period when OTB adults and larvae were observed at other locations on the campus. The survey report concludes that OTB does not occupy the project site.

### *Amphibians and Reptiles*

The study area does not provide suitable breeding habitat for the California red-legged frog (CRLF) and CRLF have not been observed on the site. Previous studies have identified a portion of the site as an area where transient or dispersing CRLF could occur. A CRLF habitat assessment was conducted for the project site in 2016, to update earlier studies and to identify potential movement corridors and barriers to CRLF movement. The report describes about 4 acres at the southern end of the site as CRLF dispersal habitat with minimal barriers to movements between breeding and non-breeding aquatic habitats. The remainder of the Project site consists of ruderal/developed habitats, and CRLF dispersal habitat with barriers to movement between aquatic habitats. The Campus anticipates that the EIR consultant will rely on this assessment to identify potential project impacts to CRLF.

### *Birds*

The biological resources assessment for the proposed project should analyze potential impacts on special-status birds including the golden eagle, northern harrier, white-tailed kite, short-eared owl, long-eared owl, loggerhead shrike, and burrowing owl.

### *Mammals*

The biological resources assessment for the proposed project should analyze potential impacts on special-status mammals, including several species of bats and the San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat.

## **Cultural Resources**

Both prehistoric and historic resources have been found in a number of areas of the campus through site-specific resource studies. A cultural resources assessment, including records review, consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission, and field inventory, was conducted for the project site in 2016. Based on the results of the 2016 assessment, the Campus anticipates that no additional cultural resource studies will be required in advance of construction. The Campus anticipates that the EIR consultant will rely on this assessment for the project cultural resources analysis.

## **Geology and Soils**

The project site is located in a seismically active region of California; however the potential for surface rupture and liquefaction are low. Erosion and subsurface conditions, including karst hazards, may be issues of concern for the project, but they can be addressed by appropriate design. The Campus has conducted feasibility-level geotechnical studies for much of the project site and anticipates that the EIR consultant will rely on these in conjunction with the 2005 Campus geologic map and geologic hazards assessment for a description of the geological setting, identification of potential impacts and mitigation options.

## **Climate Change**

The 2005 LRDP EIR did not include an analysis of the climate change impacts of Campus development under the 2005 LRDP and the Campus has not completed a program-level analysis of the climate change impacts associated with development on the campus. Under the first CEQA schedule option, a program-level climate change analysis would be included in the single EIR. Under the second CEQA schedule option, the program-level analysis would be included in the first CEQA document. The Monterey Bay Air Resources District (MBARD) has not issued guidelines for climate change analysis therefore the EIR consultant will be required to work with the campus and MBARD on the appropriate methodology and significance thresholds

The UC Policy for Sustainable Practices commits each University of California Campus to specific climate protection targets. UC's carbon reduction goals are: 1990 levels by 2020; climate neutrality from scope 1 and 2 sources (as specified by the Climate Registry) by 2025; and climate neutrality from specific scope 3 sources (as defined by the American College and University Presidents' Climate Commitment) by 2050 or sooner. In 2012, the Campus prepared a Summary Climate Action Plan, which is available online at <http://rs.acupcc.org>. The UCSC Climate Action Plan does not meet the requirements of a Plan for the Reduction of Greenhouse Gas Emissions as defined in the CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5(b).

In 2016, the Campus completed a year-long Climate and Energy Strategy process to help the campus develop a roadmap for achieving carbon neutrality by 2025. The process resulted in development of a range of policies and energy efficiency, conservation and renewable energy projects; and a scenario analysis tool that enables the Campus to identify paths to carbon neutrality. The Climate and Energy Strategy report will provide current background on the Campus' greenhouse gas emissions and progress towards the UC climate protection targets.

## **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

With the exception of typical household hazardous materials and materials typically used in construction, the Project would not involve the use of hazardous materials or generation of hazardous waste. The Project site is not on or near a known hazardous waste site. The 2005 LRDP EIR analyzed the potential impacts associated with wildland fire hazards on the campus.

## **Hydrology and Water Quality**

The northern and eastern portions of the project site are in the Cave Gulch watershed; the southern portion of the project site drains to an existing detention basin which discharges to a tributary to Moore Creek, known on campus as the West Entrance Fork. Most of the runoff

within these watersheds infiltrates to a subsurface karst drainage system. The karst system discharges to springs and seeps, most of which are located at the periphery of the campus.

The developer would be subject to UCSC's Post-Construction Storm Water Management Requirements (Appendix C of Campus Standards). The EIR consultant will be responsible for analyzing impacts of the project and developing appropriate mitigation measures if needed, in consultation with the Campus Storm Water Program Manager.

### **Land Use and Planning**

The land use plan governing development on the proposed project site is the 2005 UCSC LRDP. No other land use plan, including general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance applies to the project site. The LRDP land use plan divides the campus into designated land use areas (e.g., Campus Core, Colleges and Student Housing, Protected Landscape, etc.) and describes the program elements may be constructed within each Land Use Area. A portion of the proposed project site is designated Colleges and Student Housing; the remainder of the site is designated as Campus Resource Land. The proposed use is consistent with the Colleges and Student Housing designation. The Campus Resource Land designation is assigned to lands on which no development is planned under the proposed 2005 LRDP, and which are reserved for future unidentified uses. Development of the proposed project may require an amendment to the LRDP to change the designation from Campus Resource Land to Colleges and Student Housing. The CEQA documents would include an analysis of the potential environmental impacts of this LRDP amendment.<sup>2</sup>

### **Mineral Resources**

The entire UCSC main campus is situated in an area designated a Mineral Resource Zone due to the presence of subsurface limestone marble. The area is classified as "Zone 3," an area where mineral resources are known to exist, but where insufficient information is available to determine the value of those resources. According to the Division of Mines and Geology, development within Class 3 Zones is not considered to result in significant impacts under CEQA. Moreover, the project site is not located on or near any of the historic limestone quarries on campus. The Initial Study which was circulated with the Notice of Preparation for the 2005 LRDP EIR determined that development under the 2005 LRDP would not have the potential to result in significant impacts on mineral resources. Therefore, this impact area was not analyzed in the 2005 LRDP EIR and the Campus anticipates that the proposed project would not result in impacts in this area.

### **Noise**

The proposed project is not expected to result in significant operational noise and is not located in the vicinity of noise sources which would be incompatible with the proposed residential use. The Campus anticipates that noise-related issues of concern would be limited to the effects of construction noise on nearby classrooms, offices, and residential buildings.

---

<sup>2</sup> In the January 2005 Draft LRDP, which was analyzed in the Draft LRDP EIR, the entire project site was designated as Colleges and Student Housing.

## **Population and Housing**

Under the terms of a legal agreement which settled a lawsuit over the 2005 LRDP EIR, the analysis of housing impacts may not rely on the LRDP EIR. The CEQA documentation would include a programmatic analysis of the housing impacts of development under the 2005 LRDP. Sources of background information include employee and student housing market studies completed by the Campus in 2014 and the City of Santa Cruz General Plan 2030 (adopted in 2012) and 2015-23 Housing Element.

## **Public Services**

The City of Santa Cruz Fire Department provides first response services for all fire emergencies on the campus. The UCSC Police Department is exclusively responsible for on-campus police protection, except when specific calls for assistance are made to other law enforcement agencies. It is expected that the CEQA documents will need to provide updated information on staffing levels at campus and local fire and police departments, and will need to evaluate increased demand on public services in relation to the CEQA standards of significance. Effects on schools will also need to be evaluated.

## **Recreation**

The 2005 LRDP EIR will provide the basis for the project EIR analysis of impacts related to recreation.

## **Transportation/Traffic**

The Campus will provide recent intersection turning-movement counts and pedestrian counts to the EIR consultant in March. The EIR consultant will prepare a traffic impact analysis to support the CEQA documentation. The proposed project would provide on-campus housing for upper-division undergraduate and graduate students and some student family members. The Project would generate a small number of commute trips by residential and maintenance staff. In addition, limited parking would be provided for residents of the new apartments, some of whom are expected to own cars and use them to travel to off-campus jobs and for recreational purposes. Campus traffic generation is within levels projected and analyzed in the LRDP EIR and subsequent project-specific EIRs. However, not all off-campus transportation network improvements identified as necessary to accommodate campus growth in the LRDP have been constructed (e.g., improvements to the Mission Street/Bay Street intersection), although the Campus has paid its proportional share of the equivalent of the Traffic Impact Fee to the City of Santa Cruz.

The project would add pedestrian traffic to nearby campus intersections. Large numbers of pedestrians during class change periods have the potential to affect the efficiency of public transit vehicles. The methodology and significance thresholds used in the traffic analysis, including whether intersection level of service and/or vehicle miles traveled will be considered, will be determined through consultation with the Campus and City of Santa Cruz. The Project EIR should also analyze potential impacts to alternative transportation.

## **Utilities, Service Systems, and Energy**

The Santa Cruz Water District (SCWD) supplies water to the UCSC campus. The City water system relies heavily on surface water sources. Historically, in years with average or above-average rainfall, the area receives more rainfall than is needed to meet customer demand or can be stored. Therefore, the primary water management problem facing the City is inadequate supply availability during low-rainfall years, particularly during extended drought. The City is currently evaluating several options to improve the sufficiency and reliability of the Santa Cruz water supply<sup>5</sup>.

Under the legal agreement that settled the lawsuit over the 2005 LRDP EIR, the Campus may not rely on the water supply analysis in the LRDP EIR. Therefore, the CEQA documentation will need to provide an analysis of project and cumulative water supply impacts.

An extension of the Campus sewer system to will be required to serve the proposed project. The campus plans to size the new sewer infrastructure to accommodate additional future development in the vicinity of the Project site. The Santa Cruz Wastewater Treatment Plant, which serves the UCSC campus, operates at approximately 60 percent of capacity. The City completed an expansion of the Arroyo Seco sewer line, which serves the Campus, in 2010. With this expansion, the Campus anticipates that the City's wastewater conveyance and treatment system will have sufficient capacity to serve Campus development under the 2005 LRDP, including the proposed project.

The UCSC campus is served by the City of Santa Cruz Landfill. Recent information from the City indicates that landfill capacity is adequate to serve the City, including UCSC, through the year 2044. Increases in solid waste generation have been moderated by the implementation of the campus's recycling and composting program. UC System goals for diversion are 75% by 2012 and 95% by 2020.

Extensions of the Campus' electricity and natural gas systems, and off-site improvements to the Campus' electrical distribution system. A portion of the site is currently served directly by PG&E. The campus plans to size the new utility infrastructure to accommodate additional future development in the vicinity of the Project site. The CEQA documents will need to provide updated campus energy use information, project energy demand information, and other information necessary to fully evaluate energy impacts in relation to the standards of significance.

## **SCOPE OF WORK**

The EIR consultant will be responsible for ensuring that the environmental review meets the legal requirement of CEQA, the state Guidelines for Implementation of the CEQA, and University of California Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA. The requisite tasks to complete these documents, as identified by the University, are listed below; however the EIR consultant should review, verify, or modify the tasks below as part of the qualifications submittal.



### **Task 1 - Coordination with UCSC staff**

The selected consultant will attend a kick-off meeting with UCSC staff to coordinate scopes of work, data needs, deliverables, schedules, protocols for contacting UCSC staff and agency staff, etc. The consultant will then meet and/or hold conference calls weekly or twice monthly with UCSC staff during preparation of the CEQA documentation.

### **Task 2 – Technical Studies**

The selected consultant will prepare all technical studies required to support the EIR. The Campus anticipates that these will include: visual simulations; construction and operational air quality and greenhouse gas emissions modeling; wildlife habitat assessment; noise impact analysis; transportation impact analysis; and water supply impact analysis.

The schedule for the technical studies will be coordinated with the Campus based on the level of project information required. The consultant will submit one draft of each technical study report for Campus review before preparing a final report.

### **Task 3 - NOP and Scoping**

The University will file a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the EIR(s). The consultant may assist in preparation of an Initial Study to accompany the Project NOP for the Project EIR to focus the scope of the EIR to the extent feasible. The consultant will attend, and if requested will assist in conducting, one public scoping session during each scoping period. The consultant will revise the draft scope of services prepared for the original proposal, as necessary and with UCSC concurrence, based on a review of letters and oral testimony received during each scoping period.

### **Task 4 - Alternatives Memo and Cumulative Impacts Memo**

The consultant will develop a list of alternatives to the proposed project in consultation with UCSC staff. The consultant will submit a brief memo describing proposed EIR alternatives at least 2 weeks prior to submittal of the Administrative Draft Project EIR. The alternatives memo will provide (a) a brief description of alternatives considered but rejected without further analysis, (b) a brief description of alternatives proposed for analysis in the EIR, (c) a tentative comparison of the relative ability of proposed alternatives to reduce impacts, and (d) a tentative comparison of the proposed alternatives' ability to meet project goals and objectives.

At the same time, the consultant will also submit a brief memo outlining the proposed approach to analyzing cumulative impacts for the EIR topic sections, including (a) a list of short-term projects that would be completed on a schedule similar to that of the proposed project, to be developed in consultation with UCSC staff, (b) a description of the approach to be implemented for analyzing short-term cumulative impacts, and (c) a

description of the approach to be implemented to update the LRDP Program EIR analysis of the cumulative impacts of full development under the 2005 LRDP.

#### **Task 4 - Completion of Administrative Draft EIR/Draft Initial Study**

For each Draft EIR or Draft Initial Study, the consultant will submit an Administrative Draft for University review. should be complete and adequate in all respects, and should provide all text, graphics, and references. The consultant will also need to maintain and submit with the Administrative Draft EIR/IS a record of all data sources (including technical reports and memos, phone logs that provide data used in the EIR, etc.).

Consultant should assume the campus will require approximately two weeks to return comments.

#### **Task 5 - Public Draft EIR**

Each Draft EIR or Draft Initial Study will be filed with the State Clearinghouse and circulated for public review with the Notice of Completion (NOC). Filing and distribution of the NOC and Draft EIR will be conducted by the campus.

#### **Task 6 - EIR Public Hearing and Summary of Key Issues**

The consultant will attend, and if requested will assist in conducting, one public hearing during the public review period for each Draft EIR. The consultant will be responsible for preparing necessary materials for the hearing, e.g., (a) a handout depicting and briefly describing the project and summarizing impacts and mitigations, (b) other large scale graphics, to be determined. The consultant will also prepare a topic-by-topic memo summarizing the key issues raised during the public comment period, recommending approaches for responding to comments, and identifying any additional technical analyses that might be required. A draft of this memo will be submitted by the consultant no later than one week after the close of the public review period. (Consultant should assume the campus will require approximately three days to return comments on the final draft memo.)

#### **Task 8 - Administrative Draft Final EIR/Final Initial Study**

An Administrative Draft of each Final EIR/Final Initial Study will be submitted for University review. This draft should be complete and adequate in all respects, and should include responses to all comments, any necessary changes to the text and graphics, and a mitigation monitoring program (to be prepared with University assistance). Each Final EIR/Final Initial Study will ultimately include, in a single volume, the revised Draft EIR/Draft Initial Study and responses to comments. An electronic version all text should be submitted electronically, in Word and pdf formats. (Consultant should assume the campus will require approximately 2 weeks to return comments.)

#### **Task 9 - Final EIR**

The consultant will deliver to the University (a) 6 bound copies of each Final EIR/Final Initial Study; (b) 15 hardcopies of executive summary; (b) 5 labeled CDs of a web-ready version of the Final EIR/Final Initial Study, executive summary, and Findings in PDF format; (c) electronic version of the Final EIR/Final Initial Study with text in Word and graphics in a mutually agreed upon format. Each Final EIR/Final Initial Study will be submitted to the Regents for their consideration, and if certified, will be filed with the State Clearinghouse with a Notice of Determination (NOD). (Filing and Distribution of the NOD and Final EIR will be conducted by the University.)

### **Task 10 - CEQA Findings (Requested as additional services)**

The consultant may be asked to prepare the CEQA Findings, in accordance with UC standards and sample formats for these documents. The preparation time for the Findings document should include adequate time for responding to UCSC and UCOP staff comments on draft Findings.

In addition to the above deliverables, the Campus reserves the right to review a camera-ready version of each Draft and Final EIR/Initial Study to ensure that all agreed upon revisions and changes have been made prior to printing. As specified in the University's Professional Services Agreements (PSAs), all drawings, documents, reports, surveys, renderings, exhibits, prints, photographs, and other material prepared by the consultant for the project are the property of the University and shall at all times be available to the University. Work product will be delivered in printed and digital electronic format including a web posting ready version of the Draft and Final EIR/Initial Study.

The content and format of all documents shall be consistent with the requirements of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, the University of California CEQA Handbook (2002)<sup>3</sup>, and CEQA documents previously prepared for UC Santa Cruz.

### **USE OF SUBCONSULTANTS**

The primary consultant may engage any subconsultants needed to prepare a portion of the scope of services to be provided. The primary consultant retains the responsibility for the timeliness and quality of the work performed by any subconsultant. Additionally, the University reserves the right to approve all subconsultants. If a subconsultant is not approved, the University reserves the right to recommend a different subconsultant, including a subconsultant from a different consultant team.

### **SCHEDULE**

For the purpose of this RFQ, consultants should assume a start date of approximately March 1, 2017. Under one option, the Final Project EIR would be submitted to the UC Office of the President (UCOP) by November 1, 2017. Under a second option, a Final EIR would be submitted to UCOP by November 2017 and a subsequent document would be submitted to UCOP in late winter or spring 2018. All other milestones in the CEQA review process should be scheduled to

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.ucop.edu/ceqa-handbook/>

comply with the requirements of CEQA and this RFQ and to ensure timely completion of all tasks. Proposals should include a schedule and an assessment as to whether the consultant team could achieve the schedule noted above.

## **MEETINGS**

1. Subsequent to approval by both parties of any contract and authorization resulting from the RFQ, the consultant will be required to participate in a kick off meeting and a scoping meeting, as described above.
2. The consultant will also meet and/or coordinate weekly or twice monthly with UCSC staff during preparation of the CEQA documents, as described above.
3. Progress and working meetings with the consultant and UC staff are to be held as needed to successfully complete the scope of work and to provide University staff with information on work progress, project schedule, and project budget. (These meetings should be further described in the proposal.)
4. The consultant will attend, and if requested will assist in conducting, one public hearing during the public review period for each Draft EIR, as described above.

## **BASIS FOR AWARD**

The consultant proposal be evaluated according to the criteria listed below.

Experience - Qualifications of company and staff and any subconsultants and their staff assigned to this project as evidenced by information provided as part of the proposal, including demonstrated experience in completing CEQA analysis and documentation for projects similar in nature, size, and scope; length of time consultant and proposed subconsultants, if any, have been performing the types of tasks outlined in the RFQ; demonstrated experience and length of time consultant has successfully been working with appropriate state and local government agencies on similar tasks; and demonstrated experience in providing written documentation for legal proceedings and expert legal testimony.

Methodology - Consultant's approach and thoroughness in the methods and techniques proposed to accomplish each task, as reflected in the proposal.

Delivery - Ability to accomplish tasks in a timely manner as evidenced by proposed staffing, schedule for each task, and consultant references.

References - Consultant's experience, quality of work, reliability, and record and ability to perform tasks on-schedule, as evidenced by performance on past contracts of similar size and complexity.

Responsiveness - Consultant's demonstrated understanding of project needs, overall approach and thoroughness of the proposal in submitting all information designated and required with this RFQ.

Written Submittals - The overall quality of the writing and presentation of the materials submitted in response to this RFQ as an example of the consultant's quality of work.

## **INITIAL SUBMITTAL: CONSULTANT PROPOSAL**

1. Three (3) printed 8.5”X11” copies of the consultant's qualifications and one digital copy in pdf format on a CD/flash drive or other electronic format, to include all information and documentation identified below. (Qualifications submitted without the required information will be considered incomplete and subject to disqualification.)
2. A Scope of Services, including the following separated by tabs in the qualification submittal:
  - i. A project description,
  - ii. A specific list of tasks by the prime and subconsultants
  - iii. An explanation of how the consultant proposes to accomplish each task, with particular attention to how each CEQA topic will be addressed,
  - iv. A project schedule (taking into account the milestones identified above),
  - v. A description of time commitments (estimated hours) of key personnel and subconsultants for accomplishing each task, and
  - vi. Evidence of ability (based on availability of staff and resources) to accomplish all tasks within the specified schedule and on budget.
3. A statement of consultant's qualifications.
4. One Sample EIR prepared by the firm's project manager for the proposed project.
5. At least three references for completed projects of a similar nature, size, and complexity. Each reference must include client's company name, address, telephone number, contact person involved in day-to-day oversight and management of the project, and a brief description of the completed project.
6. Project personnel, including resumes of project manager and key staff who would be assigned to this project.

7. Hourly billing rates from all job classifications used in the proposal to complete the CEQA review.
8. If subconsultants will be used for a task or portion of a task, consultant must submit information requested in Items 3, 5, 6, and 7, and one reference for each proposed subconsultant. In addition, consultant must describe type of contractual arrangement with each subconsultant.
9. Complete and attach the following forms:
  - Attachment B: Statement of Qualifications
  - Attachment C: Comparable Project Information
  - Attachment E: Supplemental Information—Claims
  - Attachment F: Consultant Experience

### **SUBMITTAL TIME, FORM, AND PLACE**

To be considered for this solicitation, interested individuals and firms should submit their responses not later 12 p.m., Wednesday, February 15, 2017. Responses received after this time will not be considered and shall be disqualified. Responses submitted without the required information shall be considered incomplete and subject to disqualification. The University reserves the right to request supplemental data and/or conduct discussions with short-listed firms. Responses should be delivered in person or via courier or express delivery to

University of California, Santa Cruz  
Physical Planning and Construction  
1156 High Street  
Santa Cruz, California 95064  
(831) 459-2170  
Attention: P3 Housing EIR RFQ

Hours of Business: Monday thru Friday 8 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

**FAX OR EMAIL RESPONSES WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED**