

## Questions Received via email

### March 31, 2016

1. What can you tell us about the RFP evaluation team or teams? Are they all Parks staff members? Do they have different areas of expertise? If so what?

The RFPs will be evaluated by a panel of 7 individuals, composed of a mix of Seattle Parks and Recreation employees and representatives from other City Departments with expertise related to contracting, land use, historic redevelopment, architecture and/or structural engineering, and a citizen not affiliated or involved with any group included in any proposal or with any stakeholder group within the park.

2. Concerning Parking. What is the total number of spaces available near Building 2 now? Are there restrictions on parking on either side of Bldg.27?

There is an extensive discussion of parking requirements and availability on page 28 of the Building 2 RFP document, which reads, in part:

As described in the Sand Point Overlay District (SMC 23.72) required parking can be provided in on street or off-street parking areas. Approximately 2,300 parking spaces are located within the Overlay District. Of these, approximately 2,000 are directly located within the historic district. Approximately 70 striped parking spaces exist on and adjacent to the Building 2 site. On previous projects, SPR has discovered that existing parking has not been laid out efficiently or reflecting the use of smaller vehicles. It is anticipated that additional spaces could be created through effective parking design.

The lease for The Mountaineers Headquarters specifies that “...*any such change (to the adjacent site) shall not reduce the amount of unrestricted parking within 150 yards of the Building to less than 250 parking stalls (or such higher amount as may be required to obtain and maintain a certificate of occupancy) and shall not reduce the number, availability or access to designated "barrier free" parking stalls.*” The west side of the Building 2 site is located within this area (See Figure 5). Approximately 170-180 parking spaces (including 4 ADA stalls) are located outside the Building 2 site. Proposer(s) will need to demonstrate how 70-80 parking spaces will be retained and/or created on the west side of the Building 2 site and/or develop a plan which increases the number of parking spaces outside the Building 2 parcel to a total of 250.

## **RFP Site Tour**

**March 14, 2016**

### **Attendee Questions**

#### **And March 15 follow up questions:**

1) I was wondering the range of current leases within the park or an estimate of the lease (before considerations) might be. I was actually asking for a ball park figure for the actual lease of the building. I know that is negotiable, but if we could work into our funding whether it is 50cents per foot, or \$1.00 per foot we can give our funders a closer idea of costs and amortization of improvements.

The agreements most similar to a prospective Building 2 agreement would be long term Concession for redevelopment of buildings by a single user. The agreements between the City and Arena Sports and the Mountaineers have therefore been uploaded onto the web page for review by interested parties.

Each project required different amounts of capital investment, and each agreement allows for different levels of construction offsets to be deducted from rent according to different formulas, which are outlined in the respective Concession Agreements.

The approved Final Construction costs for the Mountaineers was \$4,800,000. The total approved final construction cost for Arena Sports were \$7,840,750.15, with a net Historic tax credit of \$1,253,934.37, resulting in a reduction to the Capital Improvement Offset (CIO) of \$940,375.78, leaving a final CIO of \$6,900,374.37 to be applied against Base rent over the life of the agreement.

The above should be understood as being informational only, and not construed as being any part of a negotiating position of the City. Any construction offsets and subsequent approval of costs for Building 2 will be part of a contract negotiation and these totals do not necessarily reflect what might be approved for a prospective the Building 2 lease.

Please find copies of the Mountaineers and Arena Sports Concession Agreements on the Building 2 web page immediately below the question and answer section.

2) Would there be any proposal that Seattle Parks would say no to?

Seattle Parks and Recreation is obliged to consider only proposals which further the Mission of Parks, and is further limited by both local (City of Seattle) zoning restrictions and the Deed Restrictions imposed by the original grant of Congress that conveyed Building 2 to the City.

3) What sort of access to Building 2 exists?

Most Areas of Building 2 are accessible at this time, with the exception of the roof, which is off limits due to a lack of fall protection. As the Building is monitored for Asbestos there may be occasions when parts of the Building are temporarily put off limits in order to deal with Asbestos that has been detected in the air.

4) Is there any way that we can get a look at existing leases at Magnuson Park?

All Leases at Magnuson Park are public documents. Please find copies of the Agreements with the Mountaineers, and Arena Sports posted immediately below this question and answer section on the Building 2 RFP Web page.

## **RFP Site Tour**

**February 26, 2016**

### **Attendee Questions:**

1) What are the terms of the Seattle Conservation Corps (SCC) Lease in Building 2?

The SCC is a program of Seattle Parks and Recreation (SPR), and occupies their space in Building 2 as a part of SPR operations. There is, therefore, no lease, and therefore no lease and no lease obligation to the SCC on the part of any proposer.

2) What is the ceiling height of the North Hangar in Building 2?

The interior height of the ceiling as measured from the concrete floor to the bottom of roof truss varies from approximately 24FT to approximately 26 FT. Existing light fixtures, overhead crane tracks and other equipment reduce the overall clearance height. This condition also exists in the south hangar.

3) What architectural elements need to remain in Building 2 from a historic preservation perspective?

Review of alterations to character defining features is guided by the Sand Point Historic Properties Reuse and Protection Plan (1998, WA DAHP). This plan identified the following architectural character defining features:

- Rolling metal framed hangar doors
- Steel-framed divided light doors and windows on Hangar Bay North, west façade
- Sculpted emblem above Hangar Bay South hangar doors
- Overhead beam extending from Hangar Bay North, west façade
- Interior space volumes in both hangar bay north and south

Note that these are the minimum features based on the Secretary of Interior Section 106 Standards.

This plan also established the basis for the Sand Point Historic District (Washington State Historic Preservation Office) (1998). The two other plans which apply to the district are: National Register of Historic Places, NAS Seattle National Register of Historic Places District (2010); and Seattle Historic Preservation Program – Sand Point NAS Landmark Preservation District (2011, see Figure 7). Note that due to being located within a National Register of Historic Places District allows proposer(s) to apply and utilize federal historic preservation tax credits.

4) Was the renovations for Arena Sports and The Mountaineers the same as is proposed for Building 2?

Generally speaking the renovation of the spaces were similar in the following respects: capital improvements could be credited against minimum rent; public benefit items/tasks were defined to provide public recreation access; historic preservation review and approval were required; all building systems were renovated and/or upgraded to meet current building codes, etc.

5) Was the City required to make improvements to the SCC space?

No, SPR was not required as no building violations were issued for this part of the building. Instead SPR wanted to create a safe environment for employees and Corps members.

6) Have hazardous materials surveys been conducted in Building 2?

Yes; prior to turning Naval Station Puget Sound property over to the City, the Navy conducted surveys in 1993-1996 for lead (primarily painted surfaces) and asbestos (all building materials), solvents or chemicals used in aircraft repair, dry cleaning, etc. As stated in the RFP document it is highly recommended that proposers conduct up to date surveys prior to construction due to revised regulations.

7) Would the City consider a temporary use of Building 2?

A temporary use is problematic. The RFP document specifies that a proposal must identify proposed uses for all spaces within Building 2. While the intent is for permanent uses it may be possible that a proposer could define development phases which include temporary uses. However these would need to be defined within a submitted proposal and be a use that is allowed per the Seattle Land Use Code and be approved by the National Park Service (NPS). It is not guaranteed that such temporary uses would be approved by NPS or SPR. Note that the RFP document specifies that the final development phase must be complete within 10 years.

Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) determined in 2010 that no temporary uses would be permitted until a certain level of life safety improvements were constructed. The level of improvements would be dependent upon the type of temporary use(s) proposed and determined solely by SDCI.

## **Questions From William Chao received Feb 7, 2016:**

1) No plans from the recent work on the north workshops was included in the released documents.

Please provide access to these plans and more information on what improvements were made.

In 2014 Seattle Parks and Recreation re-roofed the Northern wing containing the offices of the Seattle Conservation Corps, and did some minor seismic improvements. Drawings reflecting this work, titled "Architectural Set Sheets 1-6", "Architectural Set Sheets 7-13" and "Structural Set" have been uploaded to the webpage as per your request.

2) The north workshops (first and mezzanine floors) weren't included in the first scheduled tour. Please provide a tour of these areas.

Seattle Parks and Recreation will add these locations to the previously scheduled tour which will take place on Friday February 26, 2016 at 1:00 p.m.

3) Most of the mezzanine level of the west workshops was not included in the first scheduled tour.

Please provide a tour of more of this area.

Seattle Parks and Recreation will add these locations to the previously scheduled tour which will take place on Friday February 26, 2016 at 1:00 p.m.

4) None of the outlying buildings such as the Dope Building and Building 12 were included in the first scheduled tour. Please provide a tour of these buildings.

Seattle Parks and Recreation will add these locations to the previously scheduled tour which will take place on Friday February 26, 2016 at 1:00 p.m.

## **RFP Site Tour**

**January 26, 2016 10-11:30 AM**

### **Attendee Questions:**

1) Did the Federal Government provide any indemnification for hazardous materials at Building 2?

No. Prior to transferring Building 2 and other properties to the City of Seattle and the University of Washington, an Environmental Baseline Survey was conducted. This identified hazardous materials based on known and assumed activities during Navy ownership. Asbestos surveys were conducted in all buildings and structures. Limited to more complete remediation was completed in various buildings. A lead inspection was completed in 15 buildings assumed to have more immediate occupancy and was limited to interior and exterior lead paint and dust. In May 1996 the Washington State Department of Ecology (DOE) issued what is titled a "no further action" letter. Depending upon the building and/or location "no further action" was determined, or "no further action" with conditions. For Building 2 "no further action with deed restrictions" was noted due to heavy metals in soils under the building. Another "no further action" was noted for PCBs identified in two roof samples. Removal or repair of the roof will require special expertise. When properties including Building 2 were deeded to the City by the National Park Service, two specific deed covenants were included: "Hazardous Materials Covenants" and "Lead Based Paint and Asbestos Covenants". More details on these covenants can be found in the Quit Claim Deed. Documents also show that the Navy assumed no radiological materials were used on the base, and so the Navy failed to disclose the presence of radiological materials (radium). In 2009, when a "Radium Room" was discovered in Building 27, and then an Instrument Shop was identified in Building 2, the Navy was therefore subsequently responsible for cleaning up these materials. See the Building 2 RFP website for the Environmental Baseline Survey, several Hazardous Materials Reports, and the Quit Claim Deed. <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/partnerships/building2rfp.htm>

2) How wide do the hangar doors open?

Four door pockets are located at each corner of the south hangar. With all doors fully retracted the approximate clear width is 158 FT. Two door pockets are located at the east end of the north hangar with an approximate clear width of 98 FT. All three sets of doors roll on railroad rails and are moved with a crank, sprocket and chain system. It is not known if or when maintenance was done on the sprockets and chains. One person can open a hangar door section depending upon any soil or other materials lying in the rail track.

3) Did Seattle Parks and Recreation (SPR) complete a utility upgrade for Building 2?

Sewer, water and power upgrades were completed in 2000 throughout the historic district, primarily within public streets. Buildings were reconnected to the new systems. In 2014, an electrical service upgrade was completed to connect SPR buildings to Seattle City Light (SCL) service. In general SPR interior utility upgrades have only occurred when a building or portion of a building is fully renovated. For Building 2, the north wing area occupied by the Seattle Conservation Corps, was connected to a new transformer. Areas of Building 2 which currently have power are being fed from Navy era systems. Most of the center section and south hangar do not have power. No transformers were installed for these section during the 2014 upgrade due to the unknown future uses.

4) Is skating called out as a recreational use?

Roller skating or ice skating open to the public would very likely be considered an acceptable recreational use.

5) Who decides the appropriate uses for Building 2?

SPR controls Building 2 and will accept or decline proposed uses. All reuse of facilities at Magnuson Park are also subject to approval by the National Park Service due to how properties were conveyed to the City through the Federal Lands to Parks program. As a result all SPR properties must be used for "public park and recreation uses in perpetuity" as contained within the deed. As mentioned in the RFP the possibility exists that a proposer might seek a change to a "Historic Landmark" public benefit conveyance. While this would eliminate the "Parks purpose" limitations of the current deed, it would also more stringent historic preservation requirements.