

Question 1.

The list of recreation elements is a community generated list produced through the public process. The agency sees the task now as taking that list and providing for site analysis in the context of a park design. We do not see the task as designing a specific pool or a specific building.

We know that although the site is relatively large that there will be constraints with as many elements that are popular. Additionally, site planning includes park elements that will be recognizable such as trails, trails to Sound to Olympics and incorporation of landscape elements.

Question 2.

1. We see that there has already been a public input process led by Bob Linz. Has a consultant done any previous or preliminary work on the plan? If so, who and when? No. There has not been a previous park plan for this site. The property was purchased in August of last year. The only concept was one for grant purposes and reflects only the concepts discussed up to point in the public process phase prior to the RCO grant submission.
2. Is there a design budget? There is funding for this site planning phase provided through bond acquisition funding. Major facility development, such as a pool and/or a building would require another bond which would support the design and development phase for non-passive use park space.
3. What are the issues or problems you feel need to be solved in the design? While reading the online materials, it seems that there are wetlands on the site, as well as various community suggestions. Is this correct? Yes, wetlands and a pond are located on-site. Park site planning is required and due to the site and infrastructure demands that the list generates, a capacity analysis to some extent will be important. For instance, can we solve some of our "Wants" by using the site's topography, and for which uses? Will it be better to tie into sewer service at High School Road, which may involve pumping, or tie into Madison Av? Transportation and parking are other concerns. Can we use the ROW along the site at Madison Av. for some of the site parking demand? How do we best reinforce pedestrian and trail connections through the park to the STO or tighten this same connection with regard to Winslow? Are some "Wants" trade-offs? For instance, in thinking out a mountain bike course, a location at this site is ideal among many with the two school locations across the street at Madison Av., and specifically the site terrain with its north – south slope. What might the size of this site element as an example be or its course look like in relation to other site elements?
4. Who will determine the shortlist? Our Leadership Team will determine the shortlist from the RFQ. Representatives from the Capital Facilities Committee will be asked, as well.

Question 3.

In terms of other recent and like projects, we do have an example. Our recent efforts have been community park renovations, such as Rotary Park, trail development projects, small park facility development projects, such as Schel Chelb, or complex shoreline projects that are small in size and scope but burdened by federal/state permitting /consultation process requirements.

The RFQ is looking to bring a team together rather than assemble a couple of teams. Although not endorsing any particular professional site, local planning, architecture and landscape architecture websites offer contracting and job boards that may be useful as a means to assemble as a sub-

contractor under a lead consultant, such as office@wasla.org ; <http://aiawa.org/> . As the RFQ is underway currently, it does not have a prime or contract lead, as yet, and the purposes of the RFQ is for site planning purposes rather than for an immediate construction project. Also, Title VI is noted in the RFQ regarding non-discrimination.

Question 4.

Survey work was completed at the acquisition phase when we needed to create a life estate on the property as a condition of sale.

Question 5.

We are considering the Sakai Park project and have a few questions:

What level of architectural programming and design is desired

We need concept and site park planning expertise with some technical back-up, such as civil engineering. The board will need help sorting concepts and ideas that help fulfill community desires while providing a best fit for an anticipated conditional use permitting process given site and zoning constraints. Some of the public's ideas the facilitator compiled, see Bob Linz letter, are less complex, such as "tennis court." On the other hand, more challenging in terms of site dynamics will be placement of a "Fifty Meter Pool" or "Community Recreation Center." The board will want to work through a couple of scenarios and know the range of potential impacts, such as, traffic, parking, storm water and related infrastructure, as well as administrative / fiscal concerns, such as facility operating cost estimates. Additionally, the site, with its unique combination of historical, social, natural and locational reference points offers exceptional opportunities that the board will want maximize.

Have any firms had previous experience with the project

No. We have completed due diligence, property purchase and boundary line adjustment to accommodate the terms of the life estate and satisfy the transaction's Purchase and Sale Agreement. We have recently completed the public facilitation phase, see Bob Linz, letter.

What is driving the project completion date?

There are no definitive drivers if by that question there is a grant already in place and a mandatory technical completion date, per se. However, board expectations and the public's general desire to "move forward" on a project once launched will hold us as an agency publicly accountable.

Do you plan on going after grants for implementation?

There may be opportunities attached to State of Washington and its capital program that offer grants which under some scenarios look interesting to me, speaking as one staff person and not for the board. However, some of these opportunities our agency would be disqualified categorically from competing in because of county/ or census tract benchmarks. Other categories require partnerships that have not been discussed with the board. There were suggestions to pursue grants during the facilitation phase and its public sessions, including tennis, outdoor sports recreation as well as fund-raising/revenue generation during discussions regarding swimming. RCO is a possibility for a wide range of funding for outdoor facilities, especially in its WWRP, Land and Water, and YAF programs.

Question 6.

1. How many copies of our response to the RFQ are required? And do you require an electronic copy? *One copy, a digital copy would be great, but not required*
2. Is there a page limit or specific format (i.e., 8.5x11)? *Ten page limit.*
3. I don't suppose that a wetland delineation was included as part of the life estate survey? Would that be an additional scope of work to include? *We intend to update the wetlands survey from effort the Sakai family did a number of years ago.*

Question 7.

1. After the presentation of the community planning findings by Bob Linz in August of 2016, did the Board of Directors make any priority ranking of park elements?

No ranking/priority from the process. At present the list has been reviewed and presented to the board. As such what we have is a community's "wish list." These elements will need conceptualization against a template of the regulatory framework, such as traffic, parking, storm water management and height constraints, et.cet.

2. Does the District wish that the Park Site Planning scope of work consider all ten park and community use program elements identified in the findings referenced in Question #1?

As stated, no ranking has gone into the task to date. The current task is how best to group as many of these elements together. We imagine that a couple of concepts will be need to be vetted at this phase.

3. Have you identified a capital budget for these site elements and improvements? Some elements may be grant funded elements, or elements that the foundation or non-profit partners could help facilitate funding. The biggest elements, pool or community center will require bond funding and / or other.

4. Has funding for future design and construction phases been identified?

Some funding exists from the current bond. However, not enough funding exists sufficient to provide for the majority of site improvements, the largest of these, the pool and community center cited. A separate partnership, grants, bond or a combination of both would be important for all site elements to be constructed. This was discussed in the public process phase.

5. The descriptions of work mentions meetings with the Park Board and Design Review Board; will the groups from your extensive public involvement process be reconvened or is an alternate public involvement plan under consideration?

The board has allowed for an extensive public process phase and the results from these committees have been received. That said, all board meetings are public and it would be unusual for Bainbridge to not have a certain level of community energy shown around the topic of park design as this project moves forward.

6. The property is surrounded by a mix of commercial, civic and residential land uses – have you identified any issues related noise, traffic, habitat preservation that the Park Site Planning should address?

The process will need to satisfy local conditional use planning parameters, such as zoning, height restriction, traffic analysis, setbacks, conditions specific to the site and SEPA process. Noise and lighting ordinance are affected by the City code that this project will need to comply. An item that will require research that I understand is under code development review is storm water management. We anticipate more information once new rules are adopted before year end by the City. The site's wetland analysis is being updated.

7. Has the District, or initial public process, identified the location of site access (State Hwy. 305 or Madison Avenue N)?

Site access (motorized) will need to be from Madison. Trail access along SR #305 is anticipated from /to the site as Sound to Olympics moves from its planning phase to development phase.

8. Are there particular geotechnical issues that you know of that would influence the development of the site plan? Some concept elements will require more geotechnical research particularly regarding siting of buildings and use of the slope.

9. Is there anyone against development of the range of uses identified for the Sakai Park?

No, not so far, the balance between the mix of passive and more intense uses may be struck in the community's mind at the present time by the topographical and wetland setbacks associated with the site, as well as natural features - wetland and pond. The site's location in the Winslow area and in proximity to community facilities and commercial areas establishes a baseline for the community conversation and its park use. Conversation around 'let's leave it as it is' may resurface however, the community conversation tended toward participants concluding that the site's central location, its adjacency to STO, and surrounding uses mean some sort of park development. As for the list and possible opposition in total or in part, this has not occurred to date.

10. When you envision your completed project is there a model park or open space that you wish to emulate?

None have come forward specifically from the community engagement phase and a potential peer park project. Community members expressed some park examples but tended to express that this site was a unique site. Certainly the site topography, zoning, history and site attributes make the site compelling and invite a matrix of uses.

11. We could envision a range and level of scope of work detail from 1) site plan and aerial perspective, to 2) site plan and aerial perspective, facility programming for the community Recreation Complex, Fifty Meter Pool, to 3) site plan and aerial perspective, facility programming for the community Recreation Complex, Fifty Meter Pool, and architectural plans and renderings. What level of work and type of deliverables do you envision for the Park Site Planning scope?

We are anticipating that the development of architectural plans will come at a successive point once funding is secure for those potential indoor structures. Site capacity answers are now sought pertaining to the list of recommendations sufficient for the board's decision-making as well as satisfaction of planning and code requirement concerns for projects with an institutional footprint.

12. We have provided range of site planning services fro public parks ranging from \$50,000 \$300,000 fees depending on the number of consultants and the level of detail provided. Is there a Park Site Planning fee range you have in mind?

It is a RFQ process so we are not at the price negotiation phase as yet.

Question 8.

Thank you for your follow up.

- 1) 10 pages (20 faces).
- 2) As stated previously, we have completed the public facilitation phase under Mr. Linz, and that list of preferred park elements is attached to the RFQ. We do not anticipate the consultants working on another public facilitation process or a new phase of the process just concluded by Mr. Linz.
- 3) We are at the schematic park design phase and that typically includes aerial perspective, facility programming to include consideration and presentation of recommended elements from the list of specified park elements. Site and capacity analysis in tandem with park planning is needed consistent with comprehensive plan, Bainbridge Island Municipal Code and civil engineering standard – particularly, storm water, traffic analysis, height and floor area constraints, parking and internal park site circulation under local conditional use permitting standards, City of Bainbridge Island. As mentioned in the RFQ there is life estate of one acre on the site that the District will not be able to incorporate the area for quite some time on the site's southern boundary. I will bring the survey forward and attach to the website.