

## San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority (SFCJPA) / City of Palo Alto

Palo Alto Municipal Golf Course – Mitigation for impacts of San Francisquito Creek Flood Protection Project

May 9, 2011 Pre-proposal workshop

Questions and Responses:

- 1) Q - Will the materials handed out at the workshop be available in electronic format?  
A - *Yes. The materials have been converted to pdf format and are available. Please contact SFCJPA Project Manager Kevin Murray at kmurray@sfcjpa.org.*
- 2) Q - What Kind of mapping is available?  
A – *Existing LiDAR mapping was recently completed for Santa Clara County, with detail to 1-ft contour intervals available. Color rectified ortho photos and supporting ground surveys were developed for the creek project.*
- 3) Q - Is the impacted area of the Golf Course included within the boundaries of the photos and ground survey?  
A -*The City also has topographic information and as-built irrigation and drainage from the 1998 renovation of the golf course for use if the design involves areas not covered by the new surveys. All of this mapping information will be given to the selected consultant.*
- 4) Q - Does Golf Course construction need to take place prior to creek project?  
A – *Not necessarily. Golf Course construction activities will not be limited to the same regulatory window as the creek project and therefore can begin prior to the start date of construction within the creek channel (June 15, 2012), but some of the construction elements of the golf course and creek project may be done concurrently . The selected consultant will need to coordinate and concur with the SFCJPA's design consultant who is preparing the construction plan and logistics for the creek project to maximize efficiencies and avoid conflicts. The golf course construction activity should be scheduled to minimize the disruption to course play (e.g. minimize construction duration & schedule work for off-peak golf season, etc.).*
- 5) Q - What level of design information is available?  
A – *Design documents from the 1998 Golf Course renovations will be provided to the selected consultant*
- 6) Q - What is anticipated as sources of soils for the Golf Course project?  
A – *There is not an obvious borrow source within the golf course lands, but some of the surrounding lands may provide suitable soil. A portion of the excavated creek channel and current levee might be another source. It should be anticipated that at least some of the soils needed for golf course reconfigurations would need to be imported.*
- 7) Q - Were the fairways sand capped in the 1998 renovations?  
A – *Yes*

- 8) Q – Is there an established funding source for construction?  
A – No
- 9) Q - Will design documents need to be in a standard format acceptable to the City?  
A – Yes. *The required format will be established during the development of the final scope of work for the contract.*
- 10) Q - Are there restrictions on tree removal?  
A – *It is anticipated that some tree removal and replacement would be part of the golf course design.*
- 11) Q - Will wetland areas outside of the creek area need to be avoided completely?  
A – *A portion of the wetland areas within the golf course will undoubtedly be impacted by the creek project and subsequent mitigation reconfiguration. This impact will be offset by the creation of new wetlands area within the creek channel that is of greater acreage and quality. However, precautions should be taken to avoid impacts to golf course wetlands when possible and practical.*
- 12) Can the requested screening fence between the golf course and hiking trail on the top of the levee be located on the levee?  
A – *The fence can be located at the outboard edge (hinge point) of the levee crown. The fence cannot be located on the slope of the levee.*
- 13) Can vegetation be planted on the levee?  
A – *grasses and low lying shrubs appropriate to maintain continuity with the golf course environment can be placed on the outboard (golf course) slope of the levee. Due to Army Corps of Engineers restrictions, trees or deep rooting plants may not be placed on the levee or within 15 feet of the levee toe.*
- 14) Q – Does the 20 page proposal limit include supporting materials/resumes?  
A – Yes
- 15) Q - Will all environmental and biological consulting be provided (non-consultant)?  
A – Yes. *The SFCJPA environmental consultant for the flood protection project is in contract to assess modifications to the Golf Course within the project EIR, and has completed a wetland delineation study for the entire project area, including the golf course holes that may be changed due to the creek project's encroachment on to lands currently used for golf.*
- 16) Q - Are there requirements of the proposer with regard to business licenses in Palo Alto or California?  
A – No. *This contract will be held by the SFCJPA, which does not require a business license specific to Palo Alto or other municipality in California to contract. However, the proposer should be an established entity with relevant experience and must carry liability insurance that allows for the SFCJPA and its member agencies to be named as additional insured parties.*
- 17) Q - Are there weighted percentages assigned to the selection criteria categories?  
A – No. *The evaluation criteria established by the review panel will be weighted equally.*
- 18) Q - Is there a set minimum or maximum number of proposers to be interviewed?  
A – No. *The review panel will determine the appropriate set of proposers to be interviewed after the proposals are submitted. It is anticipated that all proposers that satisfy the requirements as stated within the RFP will advance to the interview stage of evaluation.*

19) Q – Will maintaining a minimum of 9 existing ‘full length’ holes open for play during the construction process be acceptable (no need to develop temporary tees and greens in an effort to convert the holes not impacted by the reconfiguration project into some form of temporary 18 holes)?

*A – Yes, however during design development the consultant will be expected to advise the City in development of operations planning that preserves playability to the extent possible during construction.*

20) Q – How should the fee structure in proposal to be broken down?

*A – It would be preferred that the fee schedule be presented by task as outlined in the RFP, with consultant team members projected hours and hourly rates assigned by task.*

21) Q – Please provide clarification on the stage in the design process when actual detailed working drawings are to be prepared (staking & clearing plans, grading plans, cart path plans, irrigation plans, sand veneer plans, grassing plans, etc. and specifications). The RFP states that these are not to be prepared until review and comments are received at the 90% stage. If working drawings do not commence until 90% stage, what is the work product from the designer anticipated to be (depicting greens, tees, sand bunkers, new cart paths, limits of turf, proposed new tree locations, etc.) leading up to the 90% stage?

*A – The 30%, 60%, and 90% design document submittals should include a progressively increasing level of detail. It is the intent of the SFCJPA, however, to avoid wasted effort by the consultant by delaying the development of working drawings until input from the Planning and Transportation Commission, Parks and Recreation Commission, and the Architectural Review Board of the City of Palo Alto is received before proceeding with project design beyond each design development milestone. In addition, although the 90% design submittal will include the level of detail commensurate with working drawings, only a subset of the 90% submittal drawing set sufficient to convey the scope and general appearance of the project design will be transmitted to the review bodies for their review.*