

	Question/Comment	Answer
1.	<p>In response to our previous question about documentation of the presence of hazardous materials you state: <a href="#">This is the available information that SPR has on file for Building 47 from Navy-era records and SPR-commissioned tests.</a></p> <p>Public records indicate that SPR commissioned tests of the peeling paint in the pool storage area, by ECO Compliance Corporation, on November 9th, 2016. The results show lead levels, from six tests, below 40 parts per million in comparison to the HUD occupancy standard of 5,000 parts per million and concludes that if air sample tests indicate that the lead content in the air is not above the L&amp;I standard "no precautions need to be taken when entering, working in or leaving this area." Two air samples commissioned by DPR on November 30, 2016 concluded that "the results of each sample were less than the reporting detection limit."</p> <p>Q. Given these findings, why does DPR persist in calling the peeling paint "lead-based"?</p>	<p>Seattle Parks and Recreation (SPR) follows a zero-tolerance approach to any hazardous materials in our public facilities. This means that SPR will treat any levels found in testing as non-compliant with our operating standards.</p> <p>The lead paint report posted on the RFP website shows an elevated level of lead in the pool storage room paint. Therefore, SPR maintains that the paint in the pool storage area contains lead.</p>
2.	<p>The website provides a reference document titled "hazardous materials reports - lead inspection data" which includes test results for other buildings in the Park but not for Building 47.</p> <p>Q. Are the results for Building 47 available?</p>	<p>SPR has posted all test results on file related to the Building 47 theater and pool area.</p> <p>The 1993 report from the Navy is posted as a courtesy to proposers to provide historical context that hazardous materials can be found in Navy-era buildings on the Sand Point campus.</p> <p>The Magnuson Park Administration Office recently received an additional set of reports that are now posted on the web site.</p> <p>Please see page 5 of the RFP document for more information about the information provided by SPR in this process.</p>
3.	<p>At the first site tour a question was asked about improvements SMT has made to the theatre.</p>	<p>Seattle Musical Theater (SMT) is the current tenant in the</p>

	<p>Q: Are there current drawings which show the improvements made by the current tenant?</p> <p>DPR responds A: Seattle Parks and Recreation (SPR) does not have such drawings as most improvements were minor and did not require building permits.</p>	<p>Building 47 Theater. SMT submitted the information below in italics to provide additional information.</p> <p><i>Seattle Musical Theatre has invested nearly \$1 million in the theatre since its occupancy in 2004. The electrical upgrade alone, for which there was a permit, included several hundred thousand dollars in improvements. We also upgraded the heating system (air handling units), installed a theatrical lighting system (with donated truss and purchased fixtures), a sound system, extended the stage, and built the orchestra enclosure. Additionally, we invested about \$68,000 in architectural renditions for the green room, pool storage and lobby renovations.</i></p> <p><b>Please note:</b> SPR has requested as-built drawings and other records of these improvements and will post on the RFP web site when received.</p>
4.	<p>The RFP requires proposers to identify sources of funding for the renovation:</p> <p>H. FUNDING OF CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATIONS • What is the estimated project cost? Please include the name and firm of the project estimator. Please break down project cost by category. What is the specific project funding plan? Please include cash on hand, financial letters of credit, letters of loan amounts, etc. What current resources have been secured for the proposal? What is/are the source(s) of your funding (bank loans, public investment, personal capital, etc.)? Clearly explain the timing and contingencies of your operations funding plan, and how you will fund subsequent operations of proposed</p>	<p>The RFP states that no City funds are available to renovate and operate the <b>inside</b> premises of the Building 47 theater; hence, SPR is seeking a proposer willing and able to make a significant investment.</p> <p>As stated on page 4 of the RFP document:</p> <p><b>“SPR will maintain responsibility for the building</b></p>

	<p>public programming. What revenues do you anticipate generating from programming and other uses? How do you plan to fund facilities management, maintenance, staff, and operations? Please demonstrate that you have secured appropriate funding which meets the project schedule you propose and state any special conditions or requirements of your funding. Provide financial statements and relevant information to demonstrate the ability to finance and complete the proposed project. Please explain how you will fund the proposed improvements, including the identity of any third-party that will provide financing for the project and the nature and timing of their commitment.</p> <p>Whereas the RFP requires applicants to have "cash on hand, financial letters of credit, letters of loan amounts, etc." there is no assurance from the City that funds will be available for the portions of the building it is required to maintain. For example, DPR acknowledges that the roof is leaking and has a probable lifetime of 6- 10 years but also states " There is no City of Seattle funding available for this project."</p> <p>Q. What funds are budgeted, if any, in the City's Capital Improvement Program, or elsewhere, for the maintenance of the building shell, including the roof, that Parks is responsible to maintain?</p>	<p><b>shell and roof and will perform maintenance on the shell and roof consistent with SPR standards and building conditions during the negotiated term."</b></p> <p>SPR has funding available via its Asset Management and Preventative Maintenance plans for all SPR-owned facilities. The roof and shell of Building 47 is included within these plans and schedules.</p> <p>The Building 47 roof has occasional leaks and SPR has repaired these leaks as they have occurred.</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>In a previous question we asked about the composition of the RFP evaluation team. DPR responds: <b>SPR will assemble a well-rounded review team that will include staff, partners, and stakeholders. This is common practice for all SPR RFP processes.</b></p> <p>Q. What is meant by "stakeholders" and "partners"? Are they City employees? How will they be selected? Will they include people with expertise in the arts?</p>	<p>SPR will assemble a review team with an interest in the future of the Building 47 theater and how it fits into the greater direction and needs of Warren G. Magnuson Park. SPR will be seeking reviewers with an interest and background in the arts. No other information is available at this time as this body of work is still in progress.</p>