



## Spokane Park Board Special Meeting Minutes

8:30 a.m. Friday, Sept. 23, 2016

Finch Arboretum - Woodland Center, Ponderosa Room  
3404 W. Woodland Blvd.  
Spokane, Washington 99224

### **Park Board Members:**

- ✓ Chris Wright – President
- ✓ Susan Traver – Vice President
- ✓ Eadie, Leroy
- ✓ Kelley, Ross
- ✓ Van Voorhis, Ken (Left: 10:53 a.m.)  
Selinger, Sam (Absent/Excused)
- ✓ Pendergraft, Lauren (Left: 11 a.m.)
- ✓ Sumner, Nick
- ✓ McGregor, Ted
- ✓ Gilman, Greta  
Mumm, Candace (Absent/Excused)

### **Staff:**

Berry Ellison  
Garrett Jones  
Jo-Lynn Brown  
Fianna Dickson  
Jon Moog  
Pamela Clarke

### **Guests:**

Matt Walker  
Kip Hill

## **SUMMARY**

- The Park Board approved the Looff Carrousel facility water transmission main line contract amendment with Berger Partnership not to exceed \$21,385. This expenditure is budget neutral to Parks, as Utilities has agreed to reimburse Parks the entire cost of the water line replacement.
- The Park Board approved a fee estimate of \$35,585 for Stantec to revise design plans on the Riverfront Park Recreational Ice Rink and Skyride facility. The additional design fee is the result of negotiations between Parks and Stantec to incorporate value engineering options which keep the project within budget guidelines.
- The Park Board reviewed and fine-tuned a document which outlines the Pavilion/Central Plaza's program and event uses, infrastructure and floorplan, lighting, projection, sound, and overall design guidelines. This document will be utilized in developing the Request for Qualifications in selecting the project's design-builder.
- A report was provided on the Recreational Rink/Skyride facility budget and schedule.
- The Park Board agreed to defer action on the Pavilion/Central Plaza progressive design-build resolution and the Hill International contract amendment. These items will be brought to the Riverfront Park Committee and, if approved by the committee, will come before the Park Board Oct. 13.

## MINUTES

**Roll Call:** *Pamela Clarke*

See above

### 1. Discussion items:

#### A. Pavilion/Central Plaza

1. Program – *Ted McGregor* presented an overview of the history and proposed programming for the Pavilion and the surrounding Central Plaza. Mr. McGregor explained the Pavilion is envisioned to be a year-round, focal point for the city featuring a blend of passive and active zones. Following a review of the various design elements, the Park Board weighed in and fine-tuned the draft program document which will be used as the basis for the Request for Qualifications (RFQ). The RFQ is the next step in selecting the project's design-builder. The Park Board reviewed the following elements: 1) program and events; 2) infrastructure and floorplan; 3) lighting, projection and sound; and 4) Central Green area design. Edits to the draft and discussion included:

- Page 1, Program and Events: Bullet item #3 to read: *Cultural, music and art centered events*, and remove Bullet item #9: *Music Concerts*
- Add footnotes/call outs in each section referencing the appropriate study/report(s) which provide foundation to the program direction.
- Page 1, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph: Remove language “*a kind of Swiss Army knife, as we have called it.*” This edit is designed to better define the focus on being a venue for community events.
- Page 1, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph: Change language to: “*a variety of community-oriented events, both large and small, while supporting future needs and desires.*” This edit is also designed to provide clarity on the program focus for the Pavilion.
- The Park Board agreed not to enter into the business of concert promotion, but concurred that Parks should actively market the venue to event/concert promoters.
- The board and staff agreed the Pavilion lighting system must be sustainable to Spokane's climate.
- Page 2, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, strike the existing paragraph and replace it with: “*It is assumed that many of the existing site improvements, including the ice rink and canopy, ice rink support building, east pavilion building, and the IMAX theater/building, will be demolished and portions thereof retained only for compelling budgetary, construction or programming reasons.*”
- The Park Board agreed to add the following language: “*The existing administration building will be renovated for staff office space and other program elements.*”
- While the IMAX building may be removed, the Park Board does not want to jeopardize its current shoreline rights.
- The kitchen design may be defined by a business plan.
- The number of restrooms will be based on passive use as opposed to active use activities and events. Temporary facilities will be required for those activities which attract more park visitors.
- Page 2, Lighting, Projection and Sound section: Strike “*Additional*” and replace it with “*Integrate.*” Also, add *the lightning should be weather and lightning resistant.*
- Park Board members agreed priorities should be assigned to LED lighting, video projection and sound features in order to remain within the budget guidelines. A report, previously provided to Parks by Hal McGlathery, should be included or referenced in this section.

- Interior finishes need to be included in the document.

The Park Board directed staff to make the changes discussed during the meeting and to bring the edited document before the Riverfront Park Committee at the Oct. 10 meeting. The committee's recommendation would then come before the board Oct. 13 at the regular Park Board meeting. By next week, the revised version should be distributed to all board members for review.

2. Budget – *Matt Walker* provided a recap of the \$13.5 million Pavilion/Central Plaza design-build budget.
3. Delivery method – *Matt Walker* reported on the proposed progressive design-build delivery method for the Pavilion/Central Plaza project. The project timeline involves submitting the application to the Project Review Committee Nov. 1, issuing the Request for Proposal the end of January 2017, and culminating with the construction period from October 2017 through December 2018.

B. Recreational Rink

1. Budget reconciliation – *Matt Walker* provided a detailed overview of the Recreational Rink budget reconciliation.
2. Value engineering items – *Matt Walker* presented the Recreational Rink value engineering options. In order to avoid cost overruns, a variety of value engineering options were agreed upon by Parks and Stantec. Proposed cost-saving measures involve removing basalt columns, simplifying some landscaping elements, and replacing the majority of concrete walkways with asphalt.
3. Schedule – *Matt Walker* reviewed the Recreational Rink and Skyride facility timeline which reflects the facility will be open to the public mid-November 2017.

2. Action items:

A. Looff Carrousel Facility – Water Transmission Main contract with Berger Partnership (\$21,385) – *Berry Ellison* presented a proposed amendment to the existing Riverfront Park public spaces and park grounds design contract for the addition of the water transmission main line replacement within the Looff Carrousel site, not to exceed \$21,385. The expenditure is budget neutral to Parks, as Utilities has agreed to reimburse Parks the entire cost of the water transmission line replacement.

**Motion No. 1:** Ted McGregor moved to approve the Looff Carrousel facility water transmission main line contract with Berger Partnership not to exceed \$21,385.

Ross Kelley seconded.

The motion carried with unanimous consent (6-to-0 vote).

B. Pavilion progressive design-build resolution – The Park Board agreed to defer action. This action item will come through the Riverfront Park Committee Oct. 10. If approved, the item will be recommended to the board for action at the Oct. 13 Park Board meeting.

C. Hill International contract amendment (\$39,000) – The Park Board agreed to defer action. This action item will come through the Riverfront Park Committee Oct. 10. If approved, the item will be recommended to the board for action at the Oct. 13 Park Board meeting.

D. Stantec contract amendment – Value engineering (\$35,585) – *Berry Ellison* reviewed a request to approve a fee estimate of \$35,585 for Stantec to revise design plans on the Riverfront Park Recreational Ice Rink and Skyride facility. The value engineering options were the result of negotiations between Parks and Stantec to keep the project within budget through simplified landscaping and replacing some concrete elements with asphalt.

**Motion No. 2:** Ross Kelley moved to approve the Stantec proposal in the amount of \$35,585.

Nick Sumner seconded.

The motion carried with unanimous consent (6-to-0 vote).

3. **Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 11:52 a.m.

Minutes approved by:



---

Leroy Eadie, Director of Parks and Recreation

**PROGRESSIVE DESIGN BUILD (PDB)**

1. Contract
  - a. Owner has one contract with Constructor and Architect/Engineer – no liability gap
  - b. DB owns most of the construction budget/cost/risk
  - c. Fixed Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) contract – flexible scope
  - d. GMP is open book
  - e. GMP locked in at about 50% CDs
  - f. Fewer change orders
2. Procurement
  - a. PRC approval required
  - b. Process takes about three months - RFQ & RFP phases
  - c. Design-Builder (DB) selected on qualifications and pricing component – no design competition
  - d. Initial design documents (Predesign/program, etc.) in RFP can be conceptual
3. Design
  - a. DB emphasizes collaboration between constructor, AE and owner
  - b. Estimator and designers work collaboratively to design to the budget – target value design
  - c. Early contractor input adds value to project
    - i. Elevator rail example
    - ii. Construction Documents review
    - iii. Field verification of existing conditions
    - iv. Complicated pavilion demolition/maintenance work
4. Construction
  - a. Work can be phased or fast tracked; start during design phase
  - b. Pavilion work can be completed prior to HSBM
  - c. Early contractor involvement provides opportunities for better value
  - d. Generally the fastest delivery method
5. Project Administration
  - a. Reduces PMO administrative burden
6. Cons
  - a. PDB procurement & DB pre construction costs
  - b. Limited number of Constructors who can compete

**7. RECOMMENDATION**

The biggest Riverfront Park Redevelopment risks are related to construction costs and schedule. PDB allows for enhanced constructor-designer collaboration to maximize value (i.e. design, constructability, cost and schedule) to the Parks department within a fixed GMP contract.



September 22, 2016  
File: 2046055600

**Attention: Berry Ellison**

Riverfront Park Redevelopment Program Manager  
City of Spokane  
Parks and Recreation Department  
5<sup>th</sup> Floor—City Hall  
808 West Spokane Falls Boulevard  
Spokane, WA 99201

Dear Berry,

**Reference: Proposal, City of Spokane Riverfront Park Recreational Ice VE Response**

This scope includes the costs to implement the following value engineering options outlined by the Spokane Parks and Recreation Division concerning the recreational ice and skyride project at Riverfront Park.

We have followed the format of the original document in responding to the requested value engineering items. We have not provided fee estimates to items that the City has declined to move forward on, which have been discussed through our recent negotiations.

Notably, our initial fee proposal included line-item fee estimates to verify the construction cost savings for each item identified below. The City of Spokane has elected to not accept this methodology of confirming the estimated construction cost savings before completing the design work changes. Therefore, we cannot guarantee the accuracy of the estimated construction cost savings identified in this document.

Below are the identified PMO responses to the proposed VE options.

1. Ice—Eliminate the waste heat used for the snowmelt pit and save \$20,000.

**a.**

**This is a redundant system to the hot water that is available for snow melt. It involves using the excess heat from the ice mechanical, a heating coil, and piping to make the snow melt pit more efficient for the maintenance crews.**

**Fee Estimate for Implementation:**

**\$2,520**

2. Dramatically simplify the removable curb and railing around both sides of the ribbon and save close to \$50,000.

**a.**



September 22, 2016  
Berry Ellison  
Page 2 of 6

**Reference: Proposal, City of Spokane Riverfront Park Recreational Ice VE Response**

**Stantec will explore simplifying the railing curb to a kickplate, but keep the tempered glass panels intact. This scope includes preparation of preliminary detail for optional railing. If selected, Stantec will prepare plan details of railing and revise specifications.**

**Fee Estimate for Implementation: \$5,820**

**3. Civil—**

a. The vertical basalt columns that hide the outfall can be removed on the landscaping plan to account for \$50,790 in savings. Total identified savings \$72,790.

**i. PMO - replace basalt columns with boulders – estimated construction cost savings \$25K**

**Stantec will work with our Landscape sub consultant, SPVV, to verify the positions and number of basalt columns and replacement boulders for the outfall screening. Implementation for civil engineering will include depicting the resulting change on the plans. SPVV will be responsible for the unit cost change, the VE cost estimate, implementation, the cost to update the Landscape plans, specifications and cost estimate.**

**Fee Estimate for Implementation: \$825.00**

**ii. Items developed from civil peer review exercise, with DCI. Estimated construction cost savings \$35,000.**

**Stantec will work with the VE peer review engineer's list of VE items. Though we do not anticipate a long list, we expect some items to be identified. Without knowing what those items this estimate is our best estimate for completing the analysis of the suggested changes and reviewing the potential cost savings entailed by those changes. Implementing changes that are deemed cost effective is likely to require a similar level of effort to engineer and draft. Once we have an opportunity to see the list, we may need to revise this estimate further.**

**Fee Estimate for Implementation: \$10,000.00**



**Reference: Proposal, City of Spokane Riverfront Park Recreational Ice VE Response**

4. *Landscape*—the landscape architect agreed to deleting the 27 basalt columns, removing some of the breakout areas and aluminum edging, and reducing the Karl Foerster grasses and groundcovers by 20%, and deleting 5 standalone planters for a cost savings of \$27,000.

**a. PMO – see City provided sketches for possible landscape revisions including:**

**i. Replace west shrubs with turf/curb**

**Fee estimate to make changes: \$500**

**ii. Replace river rock west of skyride with turf**

**Fee estimate to make changes: \$500**

**iii. Revise spacing/number of trees at Locust Lane**

**Fee estimate to make changes: \$500**

**iv. Remove shrubs/add A/C paving & tree gates at Locust Lane**

**Fee estimate to make changes: \$500**

**v. Reuse planter wall south of Fountain Cafe**

**Fee estimate to make changes: \$840**

**vi. Change decomposed granite to 3" deep bark mulch**

**Fee estimate to make changes: \$500**

5. The landscape plan has a significant amount of reinforced concrete paving to accommodate the City's need for making Locust Lane support heavy truck traffic. Overall, the concrete budget for the site is \$254,460.

a. The only place it is recommended to leave reinforced concrete is the skyride queuing slab, since that has to cantilever out over the gondola return pit.

b. Current estimate:

c. 4" Concrete w/WWM reinf., 6" crushed gravel base \$5.50/SF, 22,600 SF, \$124,300





**Reference: Proposal, City of Spokane Riverfront Park Recreational Ice VE Response**

- d. 4"Concrete w/ 4" crushed gravel base \$4.00/SF, 32,540 SF, \$130,160  
\$254,460
- e. Asphalt pavement is currently about \$60/ton in the Spokane market for quantities over 100 tons. For the low traffic load estimated, we recommend using a section with 2-inch asphalt over 6" crushed gravel base. For replacing all but the 360 square feet of the skyride queuing slab, we would use 685 tons of asphalt and 1,015 cubic yard of crushed gravel base at \$20/CY. Our estimate keeps the unit cost of the concrete with WWM at \$5.50/SF:
- f. 4"Concrete w/WWM reinf., 6" crushed gravel base \$5.50/SF, 360 SF, \$1,980
- g. 2" Asphalt w/ 6" crushed gravel base \$1.15/SF, 54,780 SF, \$62,997  
\$64,977
- h. Total Landscape identified savings of \$189,483.
- i. **PMO – Refer to City's provided sketch for pavement revisions/Add concrete curb – estimated savings \$125,000**

i.

**Stantec will support the Landscape sub consultant, SPVV, in evaluating the cost of switching pavement from concrete and reinforced concrete with asphalt. To accomplish the civil portion of this evaluation, the prudent, supportable approach is to design using the WSDOT ESAL calculation approach. Required inputs from Parks include the type of design vehicle and the estimated annual traffic count for that vehicle, as well as an estimated annual traffic count for light trucks and utility 4-wheelers. We anticipate a 20 year pavement design life. We suggest the design vehicle might be a 3-axle 50,000 pound vehicle, which may traverse Locust Lane 20 times per year (10 such vehicles per year, entry and exit via Locust Lane). From the information from Parks, Stantec will calculate the necessary pavement design, share that with SPVV, and collaborate with SPVV in developing a new cost estimate for the evaluation. Implementation by Stantec civil would include replacing the pavement section details and the plan view callouts on the site plan, and revising the pavement narrative specification.**

**Stantec will modify the civil plans to reflect changes in the landscaping plans requested in the PMO's sketch up, should those be selected for**



**Reference: Proposal, City of Spokane Riverfront Park Recreational Ice VE Response**

**implementation per item 5i. The changes will include altering grading to account for different surface coverage under the skyride, and updating the civil plan background and site plan callouts to include the updated landscaping plans.**

**Implementation Fee: \$9,280.00**

6. *Structural & Architecture*— Building-related cost saving items – prices are approximate and need verification:

- a. Make skyride queuing canopy an alternate in the bid docs: 35-40k **Add Alternate Estimated Value - \$35,000**

**Implementation Fee: \$1,900.00**

- b. Make kitchen equipment an alternate in the bid docs. Kitchen: \$100k (assuming leaving rough-in items for future install)  
**Estimated Value \$100,000**

**Implementation Fee: \$1,900.00**

**Schedule and Deliverables**

If Item 3bII entails significantly more work than anticipated, the additional resulting work may require reevaluation of this scope, fee, and schedule. Assuming the City's executed contract is received by Stantec on September 28, implementation is scheduled for completion by October 24, 2016.

**Scope of Work Clarifications**

The scope of work includes the previously identified changes to the construction drawing set. It does not include multiple revisions and a review/redline process with the City's PMO team. Stantec and their landscape subconsultant will make the changes to the construction drawings and they will be considered final (for the fees identified in this document).



September 22, 2016  
Berry Ellison  
Page 6 of 6

**Reference: Proposal, City of Spokane Riverfront Park Recreational Ice VE Response**

It is dually noted that our initial fee proposal included line-item fee estimates to verify the cost savings for each item identified below. The City of Spokane has elected to not accept this methodology of confirming the estimated construction cost savings before completing the design work changes. Therefore, we cannot guarantee the accuracy of the estimated construction cost savings identified in this document.

Regards,

**Riley Witt**

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Riley Witt" with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Riley Witt  
Associate  
Phone: (907) 343-5239  
Fax: (907) 258-4653  
riley.witt@stantec.com

Attachment: NA