



## City of Covington

16720 SE 271<sup>st</sup> Street, Suite 100 • Covington, WA 98042 • (253) 638-1110 • Fax: (253) 638-1122

### PROS PLAN FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

1. In the RFP, GIS data for the park system is specifically called out. For the GIS data product, do you want a point shapefile of park amenities (benches, playgrounds, picnic tables, etc.) to know where particular facilities are located within parks and track your park assets and long term maintenance? Or do you want park facility inventory data associated with individual park parcel data for the creation of maps, generating park inventory queries and tables?

**Initially, we would like park facility inventory data associated with individual park parcel data. We have a number of HOA neighborhood parks and church and school district owned athletic facilities in addition to our own parks and undeveloped property. We want to determine where there may be overlaps and what portions of the city are underserved.**

2. We have found that the expense of a statistically valid survey is better served on issues involving the willingness of the community to support park funding and/or tax measures. As you indicated on the phone, you are looking for information on programming needs, park facility needs and future development goals. If this is the case, a community questionnaire can provide the same information as a statistically valid survey, but can reach a larger group of the population, by allowing anyone who wants to participate the opportunity to provide input. Do you have a preference toward a mail or telephone approach to meet the validity requirement?

**We would like your recommendation and the reasons for them when it comes to phone vs. mail vs. web-based surveys. We need to have a statistically valid survey. We can also make that survey available to the general public. We want to be able to compare the two samplings.**

3. Are you envisioning this project as an overhaul to the previous parks plan - or - a technical update? Given that the RFP suggests a review of standards and definitions, I am assuming the former, but just want to check.

**This project is part overhaul and part new document. It involves a review and consolidation of many existing planning documents that have been developed over several years. Information from the many documents needs to be boiled down into a digestible six-year work plan. The PROS Plan should be in line with the Parks Element comprehensive plan as much as possible.**

4. Has the City conducted any attitudinal surveys of residents in the past two years?

**No. There was a resident survey done in 2006. A citizen survey is planned for the near future.**

5. I noticed that the RFP calls for a Financial Plan as part of the section titled "Development of Final Plans and Supporting Material." I also understand that the City has an active PIF program, which looks like it was updated in '07 based on CMC references. Is a PIF review or update part of the scope?

**A recommendation would be appreciated, although Chapter 18.122 of the Parks, Recreational Facilities and Open Space Impact Fees of the Covington Municipal Code is current through Ordinance 09-09, passed May 12, 2009.**

**The link to Chapter 18.122 of the CMC is:**

**<http://www.ci.covington.wa.us/documents/CMC%20Chapter%2018.pdf>**

**The link to the complete CMC is:**

**<http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/covington/>**

6. In that same section "Development of Final Plans," deliverables should be compatible with City software. Can you specify which software?

**MS Office or Adobe Acrobat**

7. In two places the RFP mentions having 2 sessions with the Parks & Rec Commission. Should I read this as a requirement of the consultant for 4 total meetings?

**The requirement of the consultant will be a total of seven group meetings as listed below; three meetings will be with the general public, two meetings with the City Council and two meetings with Parks and Recreation Commission. In addition to the group meetings, the consultant and the city's Project Manager shall hold progress meetings as often as necessary, but in no case, less than once per month until the final plan is approved by the City Council scheduled for Tuesday, May 11, 2010.**

<b>Public Meeting #1</b>	<b>Wednesday, September 30, 2009</b>
<b>Public Meeting #2</b>	<b>Wednesday, November 4, 2009</b>
<b>Public Meeting #3</b>	<b>Wednesday, February 3, 2010</b>
<b>Parks and Recreation Commission Review #1</b>	<b>Wednesday, February 17, 2010</b>
<b>City Council Review #1</b>	<b>Tuesday, March 9, 2010</b>
<b>Parks and Recreation Commission Review #2</b>	<b>Wednesday, March 17, 2010</b>
<b>City Council Review #2</b>	<b>Tuesday, April 13, 2010</b>

8. Do you want the consultant to prepare a SEPA Checklist, CTED notification and RCO Self-Certification for the project?

**This would be optimum.**

9. Given the timeline, it is not clear whether you also want this project to roll into a Comp Plan amendment cycle (e.g., Annual Review)? Is that something staff will handle once the final PROS plan is adopted by Council?

**The city has limited staff and all have very heavy workloads. The more that can be done by the consultant, the better.**

10. How do you envision the role of the Parks & Rec Commission in the project?

**The Parks and Recreation Commission is an advisory board to the city council. They will serve an active role in the PROS Plan process.**

11. Regarding the proposal requirements (background info) for the submittal, does the proposal need to follow that same outline of information - or - should the proposal just include all of those items in whichever format/outline deemed appropriate? Is there a page limit required of submittals?

**The proposal does not necessarily need to follow the same order, but please understand that we have a limited amount of staff time for reviewing proposals. There is no page limit, but again staff time for review should be considered.**

12. In the "Economy of Preparation" section, does this mean B/W submittal, with staple (e.g., no coil bindery, fancy tabs, etc)?

**Economy of Preparation means to be efficient with materials. Please do not assume more information is better. We prefer a small amount of quality information to a large quantity of irrelevant information. Demonstrate to us that you can develop a concise and meaningful document.**

13. Should the proposal also list/detail the insurance coverage of the submitting firm?

**No. This will be included in the agreement with the selected consultant.**

14. Will staff provide any support or logistics for the 3 public meetings (e.g., securing venue, press announcements, etc)?

**The Project Manager will assist with securing meeting venues and passing on press information to the city's Community Relations Manager. Preparing press releases and meeting minutes will be the responsibility of the consultant.**

15. Under the "Analysis of Programs" section, you are asking for a user fee analysis. What are you looking for specifically? Do you want the consultant to identify target/market fees for each program area? Are you

looking for a cost recovery assessment? Does Covington have cost recovery goals for recreation programs or facilities?

**We are looking for a recommendation. Currently we only have aquatics fees. There are no cost recovery goals at this time.**

16. How large of a role will trail planning be in this project? Are trails a critical element to the plan?

**Our 20 year CIP includes a trail network. Developers of new subdivisions are required to develop trails if they are shown in the CIP, so we want to make sure the existing trail plan still makes sense. As with other existing documents, our PROS Plan project will review existing planning documents and refine that info into a manageable and affordable six-year work plan - including building trails, if appropriate. The citizen survey will guide us in how much emphasis to put into trails. That said, we are not looking for a completely separate non-motorized bicycle/pedestrian plan. However, we would expect recommendations about next steps for trails.**