



LARKSPUR LANDING DEVELOPER REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

SUBJECT: Larkspur Landing Developer Request For Qualifications – Submitted Question List

DATE: September 19, 2025

A list of submitted questions pertaining to the Larkspur Landing Developer Request for Qualifications dated August 4, 2025 (“RFQ”) along with corresponding responses are provided below. Please note that RVSD and its consultants have discretion regarding which questions were answered and how questions were answered.

#	Question	Response
1.)	Should we include anticipated consultants (architect, land use counsel, civil engineer, etc.) in the project team?	Each respondent may decide whether to do so individually. It is not necessary to introduce the entire team at this time, but including this information will help RVSD understand the relative strengths of the team. Information about financial and equity partners may be informative.
2.)	Would the district be open to retaining portions of the property that are deemed undevelopable due to wetlands via a lot line adjustment? Alternatively, would a dedication to the City as open space be acceptable?	RVSD would not be open to retaining portions of the property. Respondents should conduct their own due diligence to confirm acceptability of dedication to the City as open space.
3.)	Would the district be open to allowing emergency vehicle access through their pump station / yard for emergency egress purposes if required by the fire marshal?	RVSD would be open to discussions regarding emergency vehicle access through its pump station/yard for emergency egress purposes if required by the fire marshal.
4.)	Will the City allow a 100% residential project in the mixed use zone?	Per City of Larkspur Municipal Code Section 18.101.070.A., "projects consisting of entirely residential uses are permitted" on the site. However, respondents should conduct their own due diligence to confirm what the City will allow.



#	Question	Response
5.)	The district has expressed they prefer their future yard to be fee simple, how would they plan to proceed if the City of Larkspur is unable to process a final map (land subdivision) within the 2 year purchasing timeframe?	This question will be addressed with shortlisted respondents as part of the subsequent RFP process.
6.)	Will the City of Larkspur allow a CFD on the property to reimburse eligible infrastructure and impact fees?	Respondents should conduct their own due diligence to confirm if the City of Larkspur will allow a CFD on the property to reimburse eligible infrastructure and impact fees.
7.)	What is the minimum size and configuration the district will consider for the yard adjacent to the pump station they wish to maintain onsite?	~10,000 square feet minimum for yard with configuration to be determined based on proposed development plan and additional area for shared driveway to Sir Francis Drake Boulevard and Larkspur Landing Circle.
8.)	Could you please clarify if there are any Union Labor / Prevailing Wage requirements for the construction of future development at the Larkspur Landing site?	Respondents should conduct their own due diligence to confirm if any union labor/prevailing wage requirements would be applicable based on their proposed development plan.
9.)	Please clarify and confirm the required affordability. It seems the City of Larkspur zoning and general inclusionary requirements are not consistent with each other, and City defines lower income differently from SLA. - City of Larkspur Zoning requires 20% affordable to lower income households. Is this standard 80% AMI definition or their City Inclusionary Requirement at 65%? - SLA requires 25% affordable to lower income (80% AMI). - City Inclusionary Requirements require either 15% VLI and 5% Moderate or 10% VLI 5% LI and 5% Moderate.	As stated in the RFQ, the City of Larkspur has indicated that the Housing Priority Overlay Zone requirement that at least 20% of residential units in a project to be developed on the property be affordable to lower-income households supersedes the City's inclusionary requirements. Since a project to be developed on the site is already required to restrict at least 25% of residential units to lower-income households to qualify the property as exempt surplus land under the Surplus Lands Act, by default, the Housing Priority Overlay Zone requirement will also be satisfied. Respondents should conduct their own due diligence to confirm this including review of relevant sections of the State Surplus Lands Act (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=GOV&division=2.&title=5.&part=1.&chapter=5.&article=8) and City of Larkspur Housing Priority Overlay Zone (https://larkspur.municipal.codes/Code/18.101).



#	Question	Response
10.)	The RFQ says the zoning requirement supersedes the City's Inclusionary Requirements - does this mean that 25% affordable to Lower Income satisfies 1) the zoning 2) SLA and 3) City Inclusionary Requirement? In this case is lower income 80% consistent with SLA?	As stated in the RFQ, since a project to be developed on the site is already required to restrict at least 25% of residential units to lower-income households to qualify the property as exempt surplus land under the Surplus Lands Act, by default, the Housing Priority Overlay Zone requirement will also be satisfied. Respondents should conduct their own due diligence to confirm this including review of relevant sections of the State Surplus Lands Act (https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=GOV&division=2.&title=5.&part=1.&chapter=5.&article=8) and City of Larkspur Housing Priority Overlay Zone (https://larkspur.municipal.codes/Code/18.101).
11.)	Please clarify that the requirement that proposed projects comply with CEQA is subject to exemption pursuant to AB130 adopted June 30th and based on the infill nature of the property CEQA will not be required. Is there any reason from SLA, RVSD, the City, or any prior CEQA documents or environmental clean-up obligations that this exemption would not be available?	RVSD is not aware of any reason that applicable CEQA exemptions would not be available. However, respondents should conduct their own due diligence to confirm applicability of potential CEQA exemptions.
12.)	Please confirm that the City of Larkspur will calculate density based on the gross area of 10.7 acres, prior to netting out the RVSD pump station parcel and any public or private roads etc.	RVSD's understanding is that density calculations are based on gross site area. However, respondents should conduct their own due diligence to confirm how density is calculated. Please note that the RVSD pump station is on a separate parcel that is not part of the property's 10.7 acres .
13.)	Does RVSD or City of Larkspur expect any roadways internal to the property, including potential connection to Drake's Cove Way to be public or can it be private? If public, will the City maintain it after completion?	RVSD's understanding is that the City of Larkspur expects a roadway to connect Drake's Cove Way to Larkspur Landing Circle, and RVSD expects a driveway adjacent to its yard to connect from Sir Francis Drake Boulevard to Larkspur Landing Circle. This driveway may be shared with the development project. Respondents should conduct their own due diligence to confirm if roadways would be subject to public or private ownership and/or maintenance.



#	Question	Response
14.)	Please provide a link to CEQA and engineering related to the clean-up and construction of the existing retaining wall.	<p>Cleanup CEQA: Final-Initial-Study-Mitigated-Negative-Declaration-PDF is available at: https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/oubq4nnkdr363bnpqwhd7/Final_IS_MND_MMRP_Larkspur-Land-Rem-Project_061417.pdf?rlkey=40l61j7yqzqwkc8z89resjqn4&st=hta871hl&dl=0</p> <p>Retaining Wall was part of attached 2007-09 Interim Grading Plan (no CEQA available). See plans and record drawings available at: https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/rzguoqo58qgiw0tkux5gs/2000-LLC-LDSI-Plans_2007.pdf?rlkey=bxhsmipuh61sxmlh5yiosmhrke&st=5xv9fe5o&dl=0</p> <p>and at: https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/e5d7lks4zsv5298hbtwc5/Site-Grading-and-Improvements_Record-Drawings_2009.pdf?rlkey=gbe6jhjqy7bfp0um55f4joqdz&st=s6rudq6u&dl=0</p>
15.)	Does RVSD have a survey of the site in its current condition post remediation? Esp boundary and topo.	<p>See assessors map at: https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/pye0qhvxfii7kyvkthh3/500358-assessors-map.pdf?rlkey=dqdhgeov5h9cvfewo7mxsn52u&dl=0</p> <p>and pre-cleanup topographical survey from February 2019 at: https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/f9capxjwf1gcro0fq8hss/2000-Larkspur-Landing-Topo-Pre-Cleanup.pdf?rlkey=diymd21emnx81ojn7on2nwfns&dl=0</p> <p>Site grade was restored to substantially pre-existing condition after remediation project (except piles of debris shown on the topographical survey were removed).</p>



#	Question	Response
16.)	Does RVSD have any information on utility capacity and locations?	Sewer systems in Larkspur Landing Circle and Sir Francis Drake Boulevard have adequate capacity (both lines are 10" diameter). Existing onsite building has utilities (electric, water, sewer), but no natural gas service. Respondents should conduct their own due diligence to confirm that these utilities have adequate capacity for their proposed development plans. The Marin Municipal Water District easement onsite is inactive with no associated pipeline. The property has no utilities crossing it except for incomplete storm drains and sanitary sewers at the retaining wall that may be removed.
17.)	Per ODDS, Larkspur Landing T5 Transit Village designation requires shared open space at a ratio of 50 square feet per 1,000 sq ft of designed site area. Please confirm 1) what is "shared" open space - is that private and shared among users of the property, or is it public, or something else? 2) define "designed site area," is this just building footprint area? Or does it include internal roadways?	Respondents should conduct their own due diligence regarding these questions.
18.)	The EPA PCB Cleanup Completion Report was copied to Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria. What will their involvement be, if any, with the project?	Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria would be consulted on any subsurface excavations for cultural resource assessment as may be required by the California Environmental Quality Act.
19.)	Is there a creek located on the east side of the site and if so, is there any information on it or setback requirements?	RVSD's understanding is that the east side of the property includes an engineered channel, not a creek, and there is no setback requirement for the channel. See also US Army Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation (August 31, 2017) at: https://rvsd.org/DocumentCenter/View/1295/Dept-of-Army-Letter_08-31-17?bidId=



#	Question	Response
20.)	Is any portion of the site subject to RWQCB or state marshland protections?	RVSD's understanding is that the wetlands delineated in the US Army Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation (August 31, 2017) at: https://rvsd.org/DocumentCenter/View/1295/Dept-of-Army-Letter_08-31-17?bidId= are subject to state protection. Respondents should conduct their own due diligence to confirm that the wetlands delineation remains unchanged.
21.)	Is there a map that shows extent of the protected woodlands. Can the protected woodlands be counted towards open space?	See general delineation of open space at: https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/obw7wbbuyok78b5evn0su/LL_Open_Space.pdf?rlkey=yn42zs2ec66ixy33l0v1fm1ha&st=f35ol14p&dl=0 . Respondents should conduct their own due diligence to confirm the exact extent of protected open space/woodlands and wetlands and the applicability of protected open space/woodlands and wetlands to open space requirements.
22.)	Are any trees on the property subject to the City's Tree protection ordinance?	See general delineation of open space at: https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/obw7wbbuyok78b5evn0su/LL_Open_Space.pdf?rlkey=yn42zs2ec66ixy33l0v1fm1ha&st=f35ol14p&dl=0 . Respondents should conduct their own due diligence to confirm if any trees on the property are subject to the City's tree protection ordinance.
23.)	Did the EIR associated with the GPU have a focused traffic study for the site?	Please review the General Plan Final EIR (available at: https://www.cityoflarkspur.org/DocumentCenter/View/20041/71-Attachment-1---Final-EIR), which includes a section that reviews and discusses possible impacts of the Housing Priority Overlay Zone, which is applicable to the property. Respondents should review the General Plan EIR and conduct their own due diligence to confirm traffic study and mitigation requirements.
24.)	Has the increase in residential units been fully contemplated and therefore allow the project to bypass any further traffic studies and associated traffic mitigation?	Please review the General Plan Final EIR (available at: https://www.cityoflarkspur.org/DocumentCenter/View/20041/71-Attachment-1---Final-EIR), which includes a section that reviews and discusses possible impacts of the Housing Priority Overlay Zone, which is applicable to the property. Respondents should review the General Plan EIR and conduct their own due diligence to confirm traffic study and mitigation requirements.



#	Question	Response
25.)	Is there documentation regarding the protected trees in the northeast portion of the site?	Please see responses to questions 21 and 22.
26.)	Have any biological or other studies been conducted on the protected trees?	RVSD is not aware of any biological or other studies that have been conducted on protected trees.
27.)	Is the density of the site calculated on gross acres or net acres?	Please see response to question 12.
28.)	Has the city ever processed an SB330 application?	Respondents should conduct their own due diligence regarding this question.
29.)	Has the city worked on Density Bonus projects?	Respondents should conduct their own due diligence regarding this question.
30.)	Is a fee simple transaction preferred over a lease?	As stated in the RFQ, RVSD prefers an outright fee simple sale of the property but will consider developer proposals for a long-term ground lease of a portion of the site.
31.)	The RFQ references "compatibility" with RVSD policies and goals - can you elaborate/highlight some of the most important elements of this evaluation criteria that respondents should be aware of? Is there anything specific to the site and RVSD's objectives not otherwise referenced in the RFQ that we should be aware of?	RVSD collaborated with the City of Larkspur on its General Plan process, and conformance with the General Plan will generally meet RVSD policies and goals.
32.)	How will the RVSD be making decisions around the RFQ/RFP process? Is the RVSD's board responsible or are there other constituents or public input that is envisioned as part of the decision-making process?	RVSD staff will work with its consultants to score the RFQ submittals and make recommendations to the Board for their approval.
33.)	Could you provide more detail on what you'd like included in the "project concept" (e.g., narrative vs. diagrams, program assumptions, access/circulation, civil design, architectural elements)?	For the RFQ submittal, respondents should provide a summary description of any proposed project concept(s) and/or anticipated approach(es) that they would like to share. This may include a narrative, program summary, and/or conceptual plans and diagrams. RFQ submittals are not expected to include detailed plans and drawings.



#	Question	Response
34.)	Are there specific development challenges you'd like emphasized in our experience (e.g., post-EPA remediation sites, inclusionary/density-bonus execution, by-right processing under objective standards, signalization/frontage improvements, or coordination with an operating public agency)?	It would be appropriate for respondents to describe their relevant experience with development challenges such as those noted in the RFQ.
35.)	Could you describe how you define "compatibility" within the evaluation criteria?	Please see response to question 31.
36.)	Please indicate whether RVSD favors a sole developer delivering both market rate and inclusionary affordable housing, or a partnered team split between market rate and affordable portions of the project. Please clarify if the evaluation will differ by approach.	RVSD does not have a preference.
37.)	Can all the 25% required BMR's be located in one standalone building?	RVSD's understanding is that the 25% of units required to be restricted to lower-income households can be dispersed throughout the project or provided in a standalone project/building, but respondents should conduct their own due diligence to confirm this.
38.)	Can they all of the BMRs be rental if the market rate residential components contain both rental and for-sale housing?	RVSD's understanding is that the 25% of units required to be restricted to lower-income households can be either rental or for-sale, but respondents should conduct their own due diligence to confirm this.
39.)	Does the BMR unit mix (bedroom count) need to be proportionate to the overall project mix?	RVSD's understanding is that the 25% of units required to be restricted to lower-income households does not need to be proportional to the overall project unit mix, but respondents should conduct their own due diligence to confirm this.



#	Question	Response
40.)	Can you please confirm that the City of Larkspur will price the BMRs based on California HCD Income levels not County of Marin published rates? They appear different.	Please see response to question 9.
41.)	Will the project be to assigned to San Rafael or Larkspur Schools? There is conflicting or missing information on the various websites regarding this site. Is there an opportunity to request a change in the District?	Respondents should conduct their own due diligence to confirm applicable school district and ability to request change in school district.
42.)	Is there a survey of the site with the current topography and existing easements expected to remain available?	Please see responses to questions 15 and 16.
43.)	Please confirm that the net developable area of the site will be <i>less</i> the 46,362 SF Miwork Park Addition per attached exhibit and Chapter 18.101.10b?	City of Larkspur Municipal Code Section 18.101.090.10.b states that "no construction is permitted in the forty-six thousand three hundred sixty-two (46,362) square feet of park dedication area for open space."
44.)	Can the shape of the dedicated Miwork Park Addition be modified to include the wetlands area (if verified as wetlands) depicted in the attached exhibit if the area still remains the same SF? The two areas do not seem aligned.	Respondents should conduct their own due diligence to confirm the ability to modify the Miwok Park addition area boundaries.
45.)	Please see attached Plotted Easement Map. - Will the ROW easement along Sir Francis Drake Blvd need to remain? During the site visit, it was described that the physical berm could be removed but the easement was not discussed. - Is there a water line within the existing Marin Water easement? Has Marin Water agreed to quitclaim the easement? It does not appear to have been accounted for in the 2005 project.	The ROW easement is expected to remain, but note that this easement is in the sidewalk and street outside of the property fence and berm. There is no water line within the Marin Municipal Water District (MMWD) easement, and MMWD will likely agree to vacate this 1920 easement this year as there is no foreseeable need for a line at this location.



#	Question	Response
46.)	Will the roads within the project offered be dedicated per 18.101.8.c be maintained by the City once accepted or need to be maintained by the Project?	Please see response to question 13.
47.)	Is the District expecting that the project applicant will meet all the HPO Zone Site Specific Standards and not use SDB waivers or concessions to modify? It appears in the RFQ that it is understood that SDB waivers or concessions may be used for the Objective Design Standards.	RVSD does not have any expectations regarding the use of State Density Bonus waivers or concessions. However, compliance with the City of Larkspur's Multi-Family Residential Objective Design and Development Standards and Housing Priority Overlay Zoning provisions would be recommended to allow for ministerial review.
48.)	Given the low truck traffic described during the site visit, can a simple 20-foot wide driveway be used to allow District vehicles entering onto Larkspur Landing Circle behind the adjacent property?	RVSD anticipates that a 20-foot wide driveway would be sufficient to provide truck access.
49.)	Can you please clarify if the 20 page maximum submittal excludes the Financial Information?	The 20-page maximum may be exclusive of the financial information.
50.)	Sanitation District member mentioned at the site tour that he would be sending around a survey of the site and wanted to check in and see how we can gain access to that.	Please see responses to questions 15 and 16.
51.)	What does RVSD envision being the governing principal in determining the average Area Median Income for the Affordable component? The RFQ states 25% of the units to be restricted to up to 80% AMI and also provides the City of Larkspur's inclusionary requirement options.	Please see response to question 9.



#	Question	Response
52.)	Should the development team and RSVD pursue an affordable component where all affordable units are in one building, is RSVD willing to subdivide that parcel and enter into a long-term lease agreement for the affordable component?	RVSD is open to these options. Additionally, please see response to question 37.
53.)	Is RVSD aware of any City of Larkspur incentives available to help offset the added cost of potentially creating the new desired stoplight intersection?	RVSD is not aware of any such incentives.
54.)	Can the ingress/egress for the RSVD existing office be shared access for all site users, both from SFD and Larkspur Circle?	A driveway from Larkspur Landing Circle may be shared with the development, but an entrance from Sir Francis Drake Boulevard would be directly into the corporation yard and therefore not publicly accessible. Additionally, please see response to question 13.
55.)	Is it RVSD's current thought that the existing berm is to remain as-is?	RVSD anticipates that the berm may be removed as part of development of the property.
56.)	AB 2097 (parking minimums): Please confirm this site qualifies under AB 2097 and the City will not impose any minimum off-street parking requirements.	RVSD's understanding is that the property would qualify under AB 2097. However, respondents should conduct their own due diligence to confirm this and if the City of Larkspur may impose any minimum parking requirements.
57.)	Private garages (townhomes): Please confirm private, code-compliant garages count as "parking provided" for any ratio we choose (and for related calculations).	Respondents should conduct their own due diligence to confirm such matters.
58.)	EV readiness (Title 24/CALGreen): Please confirm the applicable EV-ready/EV-capable requirements for attached townhomes and any multifamily building on this site, and whether Larkspur has any local reach code that modifies state basics.	Respondents should conduct their own due diligence to confirm such matters.



#	Question	Response
59.)	It is indicated that affordable housing shall be delivered proportional/concurrent with market rate units. How will this be measured for phasing (e.g., by COs, foundations, or framing milestones)?	RVSD's understanding is that income-restricted units must be available for occupancy when market rate units are available for occupancy. However, respondents should conduct their own due diligence to confirm this.
60.)	BCDC: Please confirm whether any portion of 2000 Larkspur Landing Circle falls within BCDC jurisdiction including the 100-ft shoreline band along Corte Madera Creek or the Corte Madera Chanell.	No portion of the property falls within Bay Conservation and Development Commission jurisdiction.
61.)	Will the City support a 100% residential development, or is ground-floor retail/commercial expected under the zoning designation?	Please see response to question 4.
62.)	What are the City's priorities in balancing unit count versus open space, and how will this affect design flexibility?	RVSD's understanding is that the City's open space expectations have been met by not permitting construction in the forty-six thousand three hundred sixty-two (46,362) square feet of park dedication area for open space specified in the City of Larkspur Municipal Code Section 18.101.090.10.b and by protection of the delineated wetlands. However, respondents should conduct their own due diligence to confirm this and the City of Larkspur's priorities. Additionally, please see response to question 43.
63.)	Please confirm whether the minimum 300-unit requirement supersedes the zoning minimum density, resulting in a blended minimum density of approximately 29 units per acre.	As stated in the RFQ, the RVSD Board of Directors has adopted a resolution declaring the property to be exempt surplus land pursuant to Section 54221f(1)(H) of the Surplus Lands Act, which among other requirements specifies development of a minimum of 300 units on the site.
64.)	Does the 25% affordability requirement need to be met across all product types, or can it be concentrated within one component?	Please see responses to questions 37 and 38.
65.)	Please confirm that no further remediation or ongoing monitoring is required beyond the previous cleanup acknowledgement.	As stated in the RFQ, a site cleanup completion report was submitted to and accepted by the EPA in December 2021 enabling unrestricted use of the property.



#	Question	Response
66.)	Are any infrastructure upgrades anticipated beyond what is shown in the cleanup documentation?	RVSD does not anticipate any further site remediation. However, respondents should conduct their own due diligence to confirm infrastructure requirements.
67.)	Will design standards require specific buffers or setbacks around the pump station parcel?	RVSD does not anticipate requiring any setbacks or buffers around the pump station parcel.
68.)	Is the number of parks fixed, or can open space be consolidated or redistributed for efficiency?	Please see response to question 44.
69.)	Are elevator cores required in each block, or can some be shared?	Respondents should conduct their own due diligence regarding this question.
70.)	What level of flexibility exists in programming common green areas – are they intended as public parks or resident-only spaces?	Respondents should review applicable requirements including the City of Larkspur's Municipal Code Section 18.101 including Section 18.101.090.10.A and the City of Larkspur's Multi-Family Residential Objective Design and Development Standards including Sections 20.03.060.9 and 20.03.060.10. Respondents should conduct their own due diligence regarding potential additional requirements.
71.)	Given the developer bears all entitlement costs, what protections or flexibility will be available if unforeseen entitlement hurdles extend the project timeline beyond the option term?	As stated in the RFQ, if final non-appealable entitlements have not been obtained before the expiration of the option term, RVSD may terminate or extend the option term at its sole discretion. To the extent that RVSD elects to terminate the option term, the selected developer will have a one-time right to exercise the option and proceed with purchasing the property based on the pre-determined and agreed-upon pricing provided that the developer has made reasonable progress in obtaining entitlements and is in compliance with the DDA and related business plan. This question may be further addressed with shortlisted respondents as part of the subsequent RFP process.
72.)	What is the anticipated timeline for entitlements and approvals under the ministerial review process? Can assurances be provided that it will be within the two year option period?	Respondents should conduct their own due diligence to confirm the anticipated timeline for ministerial review. While ministerial review is anticipated to shorten the timing required to obtain project approval, RVSD cannot provide any assurance that ministerial review will be completed within the proposed two-year option period.



#	Question	Response
73.)	Will the option agreement include provisions for extension if entitlement delays occur outside the developer's control?	Please see response to question 71.
74.)	Will there be any restrictions on selling the site after entitlements have been obtained? Any lock out period?	This question will be addressed with shortlisted respondents as part of the subsequent RFP process.
75.)	Is there any Geotech information available?	No geotechnical information regarding the property is available at this time.
76.)	Is a survey of the site available for review?	Please see responses to questions 15 and 16.
77.)	Can you share any more detail on the Pump Station shared driveway? Is it intended to connect to Larkspur Landing Circle as with the current condition?	<p>The intention is to provide a one-way path of travel for RVSD vehicles entering from westbound Sir Francis Drake Boulevard and exiting onto Larkspur Landing Circle. This will prevent noise from vehicles backing up and unsafe reverse entry of RVSD vehicles onto Sir Francis Drake Blvd. In addition, RVSD requires entry to the corporation yard via Larkspur Landing Circle for RVSD vehicles traveling eastbound on Sir Francis Drake Boulevard.</p> <p>Additionally, please see responses to questions 13 and 54.</p>
78.)	Should we assume the density calculations are inclusive of the Pump Station Area?	The pump station is on a separate parcel, so density calculations for the subject property should not include the pump station parcel area.
79.)	Can you provide more information regarding the current status of the Pump Station - will it be required to be upgraded? Does it need to be operational during Construction? Does it have a fuel-based generator requiring access?	The pump station is currently fully operational, and RVSD does not anticipate any pump station upgrades beyond the access way improvements described in the RFQ and the responses to RFQ questions. It is to remain operational during any project construction and thereafter as it conveys all sewage east of U.S. Route 101, but this should not affect development of the property. The pump station requires access 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, year-round.
80.)	Is there any ongoing enviro/testing reports available?	There are no ongoing environmental/testing reports. Additionally, please see response to question 65.
81.)	Could you please provide or direct us to the most recent survey of the property?	Please see responses to questions 15 and 16.



#	Question	Response
82.)	Is there an updated map available that clearly delineates the boundary of the open space zoning on the site?	Please see response to question 21.
83.)	Is there an updated map available that clearly delineates the Seasonal Wetlands and Drainage Ditches?	Please see response to question 20.
84.)	What are the minimum required dimensions for the RVSD access lane, including width and any applicable clearance standards?	Central Marin Fire Department standards for two-way driveways should be adequate for RVSD access requirements. Additionally, please see response to question 48.
85.)	Please confirm you are willing to close escrow on building permits ready to issue and construction loan closing	This question will be addressed with shortlisted respondents as part of the subsequent RFP process.
86.)	Please clarify the project design involvement by the RSVD as this can impact the timing of entitlements or discretionary approvals	This question will be addressed with shortlisted respondents as part of the subsequent RFP process.
87.)	Please confirm the District is equally interested in a ground lease and a fee simple transaction.	Please see response to question 30.
88.)	Please confirm the neighboring HOA is desirous of a street being constructed to connect Drakes Cove Way with Larkspur Landing Circle.	This is RVSD's understanding based on informal discussions with HOA representatives, because connecting Drakes Cove Way with Larkspur Landing Circle will provide neighboring residents with access to a signalized intersection on Sir Francis Drake Boulevard. However, respondents should conduct their own due diligence to confirm the neighboring HOA's desires.
89.)	Please confirm the easement required by the District allowing direct access from Sir Francis Drake Blvd. east of the Larkspur Landing Circle traffic signal is undefined outside of the area discussed by Steve Moore during the onsite tour.	Other than a widened driveway from Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, RVSD does not anticipate needing any other access from Sir Francis Drake Boulevard.