



**Sierra Madre Request for Qualifications  
Questions and Answers – Set #2  
March 26, 2009:**

1 Q: *The RFQ states that the scope of the Community Building should be excluded from our proposal. We would like clarification regarding this area and its possible uses. We understand the University reserves the right to add the community building, associated parking, and infrastructure improvements, but we would request more definitive clarification as to what to assume for the purpose of pricing the project in our general assumptions for the scope.*

A: The community building/parking area is not part of the Site and would not be the developer's responsibility to improve. For your submittal, assume that this is not part of the project. This area would stay "as is" unless the University decides to improve it. Although approved for a community building and parking, the University may not improve it or it may develop the area with something else. As it is adjacent to the West Campus Apartments, it could be part of the University's future redevelopment of that property.

2 Q: *At the site visit it was mentioned that there are agreements for utility connections between the University and the local jurisdiction. Are there negotiated fees the University has for this project with each provider or are we to assume standard connection and service fees with the respective utility providers.*

A: As the University has secured water entitlements for this property, you may assume that the costs for water will consist of Goleta Water District's regular fees and charges for new meters and capital facilities costs necessary to deliver the water to the property to be served, but not charges related to new water supplies. As provided by agreement with Goleta West Sanitary District (GWSD), the project will be subject to the standard connection fees, permit, plan check and inspection fees. The project will be subject to standard user fees for providing service. GWSD also receives a share of the property taxes paid by property owners within its district. Because University is exempt from property taxes, and therefore GWSD does not receive a share of the property taxes for University property, the University's agreement with GWSD provides for payment of a capital facilities fee (current rate is \$7.78 per ERU per month) to be paid for the property. This would be an operating cost borne by the developer. If the property becomes subject to property taxes, then this capital fund charge will be suspended during such time.

3 Q: *At the meeting and site visit on March 5, it was stated that the University has negotiated a certain number of points that are automatically awarded as part of the design and entitlements for projects at the University and that these may be available for this project. We would like to know if such LEED points apply to this project.*



A: The LEED points that have been negotiated apply to projects on the main campus that can take advantage of certain campus-wide sustainable programs and policies. This project would not be covered by that agreement. However, the campus will share with the selected developer pertinent information on its LEED projects, including LEED point information on its pending LEED certification for San Clemente Graduate Student Housing project.

4. *Q: Is the university going to provide any sort of master lease for renting the units back to the developer or will there only be a ground lease and whatever the developer does and how their leases are is up to them?*

A: Page 6 of the RFQ indicates that the ground lease will contain various provisions, including an option in favor of the University to lease individual units and/or master lease one or more buildings. Otherwise, the developer will be responsible for leasing the units to individuals, with the University having approval over the form of rental agreement (see page 7 or RFQ).

5. *Q: Are the team members who participated in the early schematic designs precluded from participating in this RFQ? Is there a preference for using consultants who have participated in the earlier work of this project?*

A: The architects, engineers and consultants who participated in the early designs may participate in the RFQ as part of the developer's team. Likewise, the developer is not required to use any of the consultants who prepared original plans, reports or other materials. The University has no preference.

6. *Q: If the developer selects his own architect, will the new design automatically be in substantial compliance with the entitled design if it is consistent with the Coastal Commission and CEQA approvals, and the University's architectural guidelines? Or does a new design have to be resubmitted to the respective agencies for re-entitlement?*

A: See response to Question 24 in the first set of Questions and Answers posted to the RFQ website on 3/17/09.

7. *Q: Regarding Section 8 "Legal Proceedings" of the Submittal Requirements of the RFQ, please clarify whether the litigation is to be specific to UC Santa Barbara projects only, or to any project regardless of client?*

A: The litigation disclosure covers any litigation during the last five years and is not specific to the University. The second sentence is intended to identify any litigation involving The Regents of the University of California, including any of its campuses, and is not limited to the last five years.



8. Q: *In putting together a pro forma requested in Section 7 of the Submittal Requirements of the RFQ, the developer must make some assumptions, including but not limited to construction costs, and assumptions will vary among the submittals. How should this be handled?*

A: The University expects the proposers to provide the information on which they base their financial assumptions. To the extent you believe an explanation of any assumption you make is helpful, you should include it in the submittal.

9. Q: *There may be alternative methods of financing the Project, including traditional financing through private equity and/or commercial lenders and tax exempt financing. Can we propose more than one method? Would the University consider tax exempt financing?*

A: Yes, you may propose more than one financing structure. As indicated in the RFQ, the University will consider alternative financing structures which may improve the feasibility of the Project and best achieve the University's goals. See "Financing" section (page 7 of the RFQ). Tax exempt financing was used for the East Campus Student Apartments at UC Irvine and the University would consider using a similar tax exempt structure for this Project.

10. Q: *Has the University prepared cost estimates for any components of the project, in particular the off-site infrastructure? If so, are these cost estimates available for review?*

A: Yes. The University has prepared cost estimates for variations of the project when it was considering developing the housing as a campus capital project. The University will not be providing these cost estimates for review.

11. Q: *Has the University conducted any archeological studies for sites in the general proximity of the Sierra Madre site. If so, can these studies be made available for review?*

A: See response to Question 21 in the first set of Questions and Answers posted to the RFQ website on 3/17/09.

12. Q: *We have been informed about the work of UCSB's Cheadle Center for Biodiversity and Ecological Restoration (CCBER) in connection with various University's habitat restoration projects. Please advise if it is acceptable to contact CCBER directly.*

A: We would prefer that you do not contact CCBER prior to the submittals.

13. Q: *Please advise who will be on the selection committee reviewing the responses to the RFQ.*

A: The selection committee has not yet been formed.

14. Q: *It is our team civil engineer's understanding that schematic drainage plan and SWPPP as designed and/or conditioned, (specifically drainage into Devereux Creek) will be reviewed by the California Coastal Commission and the County Flood Control District for compliance, and will not require additional review by other agencies such as Army Corps of Engineers, or Fish and Game. Is this correct? Does the drainage and treatment (bio-filtration) plan as currently designed require a Sensitive Habitat Restoration Plan and separate 404 permit?*

A: The Coastal Commission will review all plans required under the Conditions of Approval for the Project. The University does not have a SWPPP for the project. The developer will be responsible for preparing and processing the SWPPP through the Water Quality Control Board. It is the developer's responsibility to determine which agencies are required to review and approve drainage plans. Developer is responsible for compliance with the Coastal Commission requirements and any other regulatory agencies having jurisdiction over the project.

15. Q: *What is the general timetable for review of completed civil plans and drainage report by the Coastal Commission?*

A: There is no general timetable for review by the Coastal Commission.

16. Q: *Our civil engineer noted that sewer line as currently designed would be connected to Goleta West Sanitary lines. He noted that infrastructure would need to be extended to meet this goal. He suggested that we ask Facilities Staff if project can tap directly into Campus sewer main, which is much closer and would have less construction and connection cost to this project.*

A: The University does not want to connect this project to its existing campus sewer main. Assume that it will be connected to Goleta West Sanitary lines.

17. Q: *Is staff aware of any historic nesting areas within planned areas of construction disturbance?*

A: For information on biological resources, please refer to the EIR (see Section 4.04 Bio Resources, in Volume 1 of Final EIR). Also see the Coastal Commission's Conditions of Approval (in particular, Condition 10) regarding biological resource surveys and construction monitoring.

18. Q: *Is air-conditioning a requirement of this job? Given the temperate climate, and energy efficiencies and atmosphere conditions contemplated by LEED certification, offering air-conditioning within individual units may not be as favorable toward meeting the affordability standards/goals prescribed in the RFQ.*

A: Air conditioning is not a requirement of this Project.



19. Q: *Please confirm that one or two electrical poles proposed for removal at driveway entries do not have sub-leased lines on them (i.e. – fiber optic.)*

A: This will have to be confirmed by the developer conducting its own due diligence investigation. Developer will be responsible for any relocation of utility lines as may be necessary.

20. Q: *Once final design is completed, what is the typical timing for University Design Review (immediate? One month? Two months?)*

A: The Design Review Committee (DRC) will be scheduled to accommodate the project's schedule. If there are no comments necessitating revisions to the design, the approval can be obtained when presented at the meeting. However, the design may be brought to the DRC at an earlier stage so that any comments may be considered as the design is finalized.

21. Q: *Can you provide us with UCSB plan-check and permitting fees estimate based on historical precedent from other projects?*

A: See response to Question 9 in the first set of Questions and Answers posted to the RFQ website on 3/17/09.

22. Q: *Impact fees as noted include traffic mitigation, Devereux Creek Replacement Project, & South Parcel Restoration. We also understand that Developer will need to pay hook-up fees for GWD and Goleta West Sanitary. Goleta Planning Area Development impact fees for the City of Goleta also include Parks/Quimby Fees, Sheriff, Administration, Library, and Fire Fees. Please confirm that this project would be exempt from those fees.*

A: As the property is owned by the University, it is not subject to the County or City jurisdiction and therefore not subject to the fees referenced in your question. The University has agreed to certain traffic impact fees as described in Exhibit 9 of the RFQ. (See response to Questions 18 and 19 in the first set of Questions and Answers posted to the RFQ website on 3/17/09.) There may be other permit fees associated with the project, including offsite work. Also see response to Question 9 in the first set of Questions and Answers posted to the RFQ website on 3/17/09.

23. Q: *Is the archaeological monitoring program required by the Coastal Commission coordinated and/or funded by the Developer?*

A: The developer would contract with and pay for a qualified consultant to prepare and conduct the archaeological monitoring plan.

24. Q: *Who coordinates and funds the 5 year monitoring requirement included in the restoration program?*

A: The developer will contract with and fund CCBER for the required monitoring.



25. Q: *Would University Design Review or other University entity require separate review and approval of interpretive signage to be used adjacent to sensitive or riparian areas?*

A: Interpretive signage is subject to the review and approval of the Coastal Commission as provided in the Conditions of Approval. For the University, the Office of Campus Planning and Design will be responsible for review and approval of interpretive signs.