

## Questions submitted on May 3<sup>rd</sup> 2017 with Answers

1. Course Modifications – If a proposed location requires modifications to the Par 3 course, would Seattle Parks and Recreation employees be required to perform the work at the proposer's expense? If so, what is the process for arriving at an agreed-to a scope and budget?

A – Any modifications needed for the Par 3 course are not required or expected to be performed by SPR employees.

2. Design Review Process –

a. Given the small footprint and anticipated ground disturbance for the proposed facility, is it anticipated that a SEPA review or EIS addendum will be required?

A – A SEPA review is generally not triggered for a building with a footprint <4000 st ft. We do not anticipate that an EIS will be required.

b. What will the City and/or Parks Department design review process consist of (public meetings, Parks design review, City design review, etc.)?

A - The Parks Department will want to review a concept, design development documents and construction drawings at 60 and 95%. The review group is called ProView. They'll also recommend that the builder conduct public meetings to inform and to receive input from the public. City review will be the same that would be required for any building project in the City of Seattle. In addition, the Park engineering staff will conduct a technical review to ensure the bid documents conform to City/ Parks Spec. The Parks engineer must sign off on the bid documents before they're advertised. Park Department in house design review is estimated to cost 0.9% of the total project cost

c. If required, what if any fees associated with Parks staff assignments are anticipated?

A – The successful proposer will need a project manager to assist navigating the Parks and City review processes. Her / his time will be charged at an hourly rate. Obviously the more time dedicated to working on the project, the higher the cost. Parks will also want to oversee/ inspect actual construction, but it is reasonable to expect that full project management duties would be contracted separately.

3. Existing Conditions – Does Parks have access to a survey of existing utilities, connection opportunities and available capacities for storm, sewer, water (fire service), electrical and communications? If so, please provide for review prior to the respondent providing a proposed project cost.

A – Parks does not have a full up to date survey of the existing infrastructure and current site conditions. The most recent documents are record drawings of the new golf clubhouse. They will be provided upon request.

4. General Contract Summary (RFP Section III) –

a. Private Capital Investment – “Construction projects are likely to be subject to payment of prevailing wages and other requirements associated with public works. Contract terms will conform to policies and laws governing this project.”

i. How will any requirement for prevailing wage be determined? Note that this is an important factor in determining overall project cost.

A- As stated in the RFP, the City is not making capital investments or providing funding for the construction of the Clubhouse. As a result, the City did not intend to imply that the tenant improvements would automatically be deemed a public work.

ii. What “other requirements” associated with public works will be required?

A – SPR expects the successful proposer to require its Clubhouse contractor to use affirmative good faith efforts to meet aspirational goals for the inclusion of women and minority owned business as subcontractors.

iii. Will Parks staff project management fees be required, and if so, is there a fee schedule or guideline to assist with project cost estimating?

A- Parks project managers will be useful to guide your project through the design, bid, build processes. Parks has a schedule that breaks down the “City” costs to complete a project by percentage of total cost. The schedule will be provided upon request.

iv. Where can the project team find the “policies and laws” governing project?

A – Proposers are responsible for determining which laws are applicable to their proposal based upon the details of the proposals. SPR rules and regulations may be found at <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/about-us/rules-and-regulations>

5. City Historic Use – “The Proposer/operator will honor outreach programs and programming established and fostered by SPR or its agents.”

a. Please elaborate on which outreach programs processes are anticipated to apply.

A – Parks is committed to providing equitable services to the Seattle Community. They are committed not just to opening doors for all to participate, instead they are actively reaching out to communities who would not ordinarily take advantage of an open door policy. To be specific, Parks is seeking a junior golf programs operator who will actively seek out young people who would not contemplate spending time at a golf course in their day to day circumstances. This would include any underserved youth groups who contribute to diversity of those who use the new junior clubhouse.

6. Parking and Access – “The Proposer/operator will provide for adequate parking and pickup/drop off spaces for junior golf program participants.”

a. How will the City and/or Parks determine the extent of “adequate parking”?

A – It is expected that the occupancy capacity and use of the new building will determine need for more parking. A review of Seattle Building Codes and guidelines is usual.

7. Insurance – At the end of this section there is the statement “(Please make sure this is the most updated information.)”

a. Please confirm this note was meant for the RFP’s author, not the respondent.

A – That statement is intended for the author and not the respondent. It was left in the final document by accident.