

  
**ROSEVILLE**  
**REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION**

Date: 7-13-09  
Item No.: 12.a

Department Approval

City Manager Approval



Item Description: Approve Contract with LHB/Cornejo Consulting for the Development of a Park and Recreation System Master Plan Update

1 **BACKGROUND**

2 As a result of Imagine Roseville 2025, the recent City Comprehensive Plan update and  
3 subsequent direction and recommendation by the City Council and the Parks and Recreation  
4 Commission, it is a priority to engage the Community in a Parks and Recreation System  
5 Master Plan update. The process of selecting a professional planning firm to assist, guide and  
6 implement that process has been continuing.

7  
8 On November 17, 2008 the City Council reviewed and authorized issuing a Request for  
9 Proposals (RFP).

10  
11 On November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2008 the RFP's were issued to (13) known qualified firms.

12  
13 On December 12, 2008, (9) proposals were received. All proposals and fees were subject to  
14 interpretation and were sorted out in more detail during review and interviews. Seven  
15 proposals ranged from \$98,000 to \$180,000. Proposing firms included:

- 16 Firm  
17 Bonestroo/106 Group  
18 Brauer and Associates  
19 Bucher, Willis and Ratliff Corporation (BWR)  
20 Hoisington Koegler Group, Inc. (HKGI)  
21 LHB/Cornejo Consulting  
22 Northwest Associated Consultants, Inc. (NAC)  
23 Sanders Waker Bergley, Inc. (SWB)  
24 Short Elliot Hendrickson Inc./Pros Consulting (SEH)  
25 SRF Consulting Group

26  
27 On April 20<sup>th</sup> 2009, an update was requested by the City Council. Staff indicated that the  
28 proposals would be narrowed to four firms for interviews with a recommendation of one to  
29 come in June or July.

30

31 A committee comprised of the Director of Parks and Recreation, Assistant Director, Park  
32 Superintendent and Skating Center Superintendent reviewed proposals and participated in the  
33 interview process. The following key elements were used to evaluate the proposals:

- 34 • Public input for all individual plans
- 35 • Public input for overall process
- 36 • Process for information exchange i.e. Web site, blog.....
- 37 • Number of public meetings
- 38 • Community Center discussion and concept planning
- 39 • Team make-up/qualifications
- 40 • Understanding of the project
- 41 • Input from city staff, recreation, maintenance, other city departments
- 42 • Demographics influence on process
- 43 • Understanding of what is unique to Roseville Parks and Recreation
- 44 • Maintenance issue awareness
- 45 • Practicality
- 46 • Completeness of Proposal
- 47 • Work plan compatibility with our expectations
- 48 • Relevant experience
- 49 • Strength of references
- 50 • Intangibles
- 51 • Fees and costs

52  
53 On June 8<sup>th</sup>, 2009 interviews were conducted with the top four proposers, they were as follows.

54 <u>Firm</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Score (out of 170)</u>
55 Bonestroo	\$140,000	144
56 LHB	\$125,300	156
57 NAC	\$150,000	138
58 SEH	\$ 98,017	140

59 Note: other staff, Parks and Recreation Commission and community members were involved in  
60 providing input and advice in various ways.

61  
62 A portion of the “Best Value Procurement” method was utilized involving five specific filters:

- 63 1) Proposal review
- 64 2) Key elements identified in the proposal
- 65 3) General interviews
- 66 4) Pre-award interviews
- 67 5) Value added discussions with key personnel

68  
69 After interviewing the top four firms for their demonstrated understanding of the project, clarity of  
70 approach, fees and costs and deliverables, staff is recommending that the City enter into an  
71 agreement with LHB/Cornejo Consulting for the Roseville Parks and Recreation System Master  
72 Plan Update for a scope outlined in the attachment for a cost not to exceed \$125,300 to be taken  
73 from the City Park Dedication Fund.

74  
75 Somewhat unclear in all proposals but will become clearer as the process begins is to what extent  
76 a needs assessment (index) and marketing effort should be conducted. The Parks and  
77 Recreation Commission has discussed the need to increase the marketing efforts as appropriate

78 as the process continues. There are varying ways to get at these, some may require additional  
79 resources. If additional resources should be necessary, they would be anticipated to be taken  
80 from the 2008 Imagine Roseville 2025 allocation set aside for the Master Plan process.

81  
82 The next steps in the process will be to:

- 83 • Finalize the agreement between the City of Roseville and LHB/Cornejo Consulting
- 84 • Establish the Park and Recreation System Master Plan Update Team (PARMPUT)
- 85 • Solidify a calendar of milestones
- 86 • Begin Master Planning Process

87  
88 The PARMPUT is anticipated to include one City Council Member. Please consider appointing  
89 that member tonight to allow early involvement.

90 **POLICY OBJECTIVE**

91 To be proactive in planning and to solicit citizen/community input and discussion into projects  
92 and planning efforts is consistent with the processes currently outlined in the Parks and  
93 Recreation Systems Plan and by the City of Roseville.

94 It is also consistent with the City's efforts as outlined in the recent Comprehensive Plan update  
95 and Imagine Roseville 2025 goals and priorities to maintain, improve and protect the Parks and  
96 Recreation System and continue to meet the needs and desires of the community in the short  
97 term and the long term.

98 **FINANCIAL IMPACTS**

99 The cost for the planning services as outlined in the project scope provided by LHB/Cornejo  
100 Consulting is an amount not to exceed \$125,300 to be taken from the City Park Dedication Fund.

101  
102 If additional resources are desired for added marketing efforts and/or needs assessments, they  
103 would be anticipated to be taken from the 2008 Imagine Roseville 2025 allocation set aside for  
104 the Master Plan process.

105 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

106 Based upon the proposals, interviews, costs and the recommendation of the Parks and  
107 Recreation Commission and City Council to accomplish the expressed goal of providing this  
108 Parks and Recreation System Master Plan effort to the citizens, staff recommends that the City of  
109 Roseville enter into an agreement with LHB/Cornejo Consulting to guide and implement a Parks  
110 and Recreation System Master plan effort as outlined for a cost not to exceed \$125,300 to be  
111 taken from the City Park Dedication Fund .

112 **REQUESTED COUNCIL ACTION**

113 Motion authorizing the Mayor and City Manager to enter into an agreement with LHB/Cornejo  
114 Consulting as specified in the attached proposal for planning services to guide and implement a  
115 Parks and Recreation System Master Plan update for a cost not to exceed \$125,300 to be taken  
116 from the City Park Dedication Fund.

117  
118 Motion to appoint a City Council Member to the Park and Recreation Master Plan Update  
119 Team (PARMPUT).

120

Prepared by: Lonnie Brokke, Director of Parks and Recreation  
Attachments: A: Scope and fee schedule

## **Personnel**

For the Roseville Parks Master Plan Update, LHB and Cornejo consulting will draw upon the range of talents and expertise that reside in their respective companies. The team includes planners and landscape architects who are experienced at leading productive public meetings, developing ideas generated at those meetings into real plans and solutions, and creating documents and illustrations that generate support and become real, vibrant places.

While we envision a process that occurs over the period of about fourteen months, we intend that the following personnel will be active and involved throughout that time, and that substitutions of personnel will not be required.

**Michael Schroeder**, ASLA, is a landscape architect with experience in interpretive design, historic preservation, streetscape design, master planning, site design, and community planning and design. This expertise has been provided for clients that include non-profits, community and neighborhood groups, private sector entities, and a wide spectrum of municipal, county and state agencies. He specializes on communities and the engagement of stakeholders in the design process, with an emphasis on the relationship between places and the experiences people desire.

Michael's projects include urban design consulting for towns and cities in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Michigan, Connecticut, Missouri, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Iowa, Georgia, New Mexico, and North Carolina. His past projects include an innovative comprehensive plan and a parks master plan for Taylors Falls, Minnesota; planning for the evolution of downtown Apple Valley, Minnesota as a result of the introduction of bus rapid transit on the Cedar Avenue corridor; a plan for Peavey Park in the Phillips neighborhood of Minneapolis using an intensive public engagement program focused on Listening Sessions; master plans/strategic plans for downtown revitalization work in several cities; and on-going consulting for the National Trust for Historic Preservation's Main Street Center.

***Michael Schroeder will serve as Project Manager and will provide leadership for planning. Michael will also lead meetings with the PARMPUT, public meetings, and presentations to boards and commissions.***

**Jason Aune**, ASLA is a landscape architect at LHB with ten years of experience in landscape design, planning, urban design, and site construction. Most recently, he has been involved in the development of streetscape improvements for Lowry Avenue in Minneapolis, Minnesota, a 24 block reconstruction and streetscape project for an urban street. Jason has worked with multiple private clients, municipalities, associations, and universities on projects that involve master planning, private landscape design, ecological design, streetscapes, recreational trails, parks, and conservation housing developments. Jason's strong ability to design at many different scales has been demonstrated through his work on large regional projects to very intricate site design details.

Jason has excellent graphic representation and design ability and uses it to provide the client with a true vision of the project. In addition, Jason has a unique understanding of diverse ecosystems and how to integrate natural communities with the built environment. He enjoys weaving our natural heritage into creative pragmatic design solutions.

Jason received his Masters Degree in Landscape Architecture from the University of Minnesota and his Bachelor of Science Degree in Landscape Architecture from South Dakota State University. He is a licensed Landscape Architect in Minnesota.

***Jason Aune will lead efforts to create master plans for specific parks, as well as participating in the broader master planning process.***

**Lydia Major**, ASLA, is a landscape architect in LHB's Urban Design + Planning group. She has been involved in community planning projects in West Allis, Wisconsin; Buffalo, Minnesota; and Highland, Michigan. She has also prepared development plans founded on land development capacity, clustered development patterns, and geographic information systems to preserve critical landscapes and features on a nearly 500 acre site in a southwest suburb of the Twin Cities. She helped prepare the 2006 Maple Grove Park Plan, which integrated parks, trails, and other priorities of the Maple Grove Park Board. She is currently involved in the redevelopment of the Wayzata Bay Center in Wayzata, Minnesota, an intensive mixed use redevelopment project that will anchor the eastern end of downtown; and a proposal to create a major education campus in Chaska, Minnesota.

Lydia received her Master's Degree in Landscape Architecture from the University of Minnesota and her Bachelor of Arts Degree in English from the University of Wisconsin - Madison. She is a licensed Landscape Architect in Minnesota.

***Lydia Major will be active in meetings of the PARMPUT and public meetings, participate in the preparation of broad master plan directions and specific park master plans, and assist in the preparation of interim and final reports. She will also be responsible for mapping and coordination with city staff for GIS documentation.***

**CJ Fernandez**, ASLA has over eight years of experience as a landscape architect. During this time CJ has specialized in site design, master planning, and design development for public and private clients. His portfolio of work includes parks, urban design, trails, sustainable design, regional planning, nature center, memorial design, waterscapes as well as subdivisions, transportation and recreational site design.

CJ's design priorities are based on community integration in the design process. In his work, CJ has led large public meetings, communities and private clients through interactive processes as a means of active engagement in the design. Through the use of technological expertise and artistic rendering, CJ has used design for creative problem solving, as a civic actor, for conceptual expression, and during design development. He has worked in a wide variety of presentation situations in both local and international capacities. His experience in park planning and design includes an ecologically sustainable trail design and interpretive program for Crosby Farm Nature Area in St. Paul, Minnesota; a 200 mile recreation corridor along the Red Lake River centered on East Grand Forks, Minnesota; planning for the Gitchi Gami Trail along the North Shore of Lake Superior; and the Minnesota River State Trail between Redwood Falls, New Ulm, and St. Peter.

***CJ Fernandez will assist in the development of the master plan and participate in public meetings.***

**Dan Cornejo**, Principal, Cornejo Consulting, is an award-winning city planner with three decades of innovative thinking and experience in community planning and design, all of which has been characterized by innovative and inclusive public engagement. After an extensive career in public service and directing planning services for a major architectural/engineering firm, in 2004 Dan established his own firm, focusing on Twin Cities communities.

He has worked across North America in a variety of urban, suburban, and rural settings in diverse cultural and community situations. He has served as Director of Planning and Design for St. Paul, Development Director for Robbinsdale, and Planning Director for Staten Island, NY. Prior to that, he led redevelopment planning for a former CP Rail site on the downtown waterfront of Vancouver, Canada that has won numerous awards for its extensive and diverse public open space and trails. Most recently, he led an extensive neighborhood stakeholder consultation process in assessing impacts of the University of Minnesota on surrounding neighborhoods, as well as organizing and leading the

public engagement process for the Edina Comprehensive Plan. Over the past three years on contract with Hennepin County, he has been investigating daylighting portions of Bassett, Shingle, and Bridal Veil Creeks, working with stakeholders to find ways to increase public access and enjoyment through trail and open space connections.

Through his leadership, and in interactions and collaboration with his clients, Dan facilitates analysis and problem solving, strategic thinking, and effective plan-making to produce commitment and follow-through.

***Dan Cornejo will participate in meeting with the PARMPUT and in public meetings, lead the demographic, economic, and sociologic research, analysis, and application, correlate park planning directions with the directions of the comprehensive plan, and play an active role in the definition of policy directions.***

## **Section B: Project Approach**

### **Overview**

Many communities are following up on their comprehensive planning processes of the last two years with efforts directed at complementary plans, like park plans. Few seem to have realized the potential of their parks to shape their communities as Roseville is now doing. Roseville's early planning processes highlighted the city's parks, and generated a belief that it will be creating for itself a world class park system. If this happens, it won't be by accident. Rather, it will result from intensive study, extensive engagement of stakeholders, forward-looking consideration of possibilities, exploration of big ideas and small ones, framing the optimal plan, definition of the path to implementation, and agreement to proceed.

We are proposing a two-part process as a means of defining an appropriate and compelling master plan for the community's park and recreation system. To begin, we would work with the community to define a vision for its parks. Then, based on that vision, we would define a plan for the park and recreation system including a clear path toward implementation. This way, the aspirations of the community and stakeholders become, through an intensive engagement process, the foundation for the master plan as represented in their vision. Key issues and opportunities are resolved in the context of the community's vision in the second stage of the work.

Our Work Plan is framed around this two-part process. We anticipate working with a Steering Committee, the Park and Recreations Master Plan Update Team (PARMPUT), who will be charged with guiding and overseeing our work, and with offering us the chance to have local issues interpreted by those with knowledge of local conditions. Our process includes regular meetings with the PARMPUT and opportunities for greater involvement by the public at key points throughout the planning process. We will rely upon the PARMPUT to communicate information about the progress and directions of the work during the planning process to their constituencies. We also expect that the city's park and recreation staff will be integrally involved in this process, lending their experience directly into the formulation of the plan.

While we describe the work as discreet tasks, it should really be viewed as a continuous effort. Our work plan frames the tasks we would pursue with an idea that there is a natural progression of the planning process, with two significant deliverables: the Vision and the Master Plan. To give a better understanding of the logic behind a continuous work effort, four stages of work are defined:

### **Part One: The Vision**

Stage One: Convene

Stage Two: Explore

### **Part Two: The Master Plan**

Stage Three: Define

Stage Four: Act

## Work Plan

Based on our understanding of the city's needs and their desire for an intensive engagement process that results in a truly progressive plan for the community's park and recreation system, we have framed a work plan and a set of deliverables. While we provide significant detail, we expect that the city will look to make adjustments to ensure it meets the community's needs.

### Part One: The Vision

***The first two stages of the work will focus on the creation of a vision. We begin by building a foundation of knowledge upon which a visionary plan can be framed, and we work with the community to understand the needs and desires for Roseville's park and recreation system. We conclude with efforts directed toward exploring ideas in diagrams and illustrations, building upon our base of earlier research and breathing life into the vision.***

#### Stage One: Convene

During Stage One, the team will work with city staff and the Park and Recreation Master Plan Update Team (PARMPUT) to develop a foundation of knowledge about the City of Roseville, its park system, and the current Master Plan.

Our first task involves building the foundation of knowledge that we will need to get started in both the visioning and comprehensive planning process, but more important perhaps will be the time spent with the Steering Committee coming to agreement on the scope, schedule, and communications that are integral to the process. It's not all organizing during this stage, though; we intend to begin the process of defining and understanding the pressing issues and desires that will become the foundation of plans that guide the Albert Lea community into its future.

#### Stage One Tasks

- 1.01 Meet with city staff and key PARMPUT members to review the planning process, agree to a schedule, define roles (especially roles of staff and the PARMPUT), discuss methods of community input and engagement, establish internal and external communication procedures, and review anticipated deliverables.
- 1.02 Gather and review background data and base information, including past reports and studies, demographic information, planning documents and any other information that might be pertinent to the park and recreation master plan update process. Of particular interest will be the recent update to the city's Comprehensive Plan, and any directions or policies within that document that relate to parks and recreation, open space, conservation or preservation, or other community features that might influence a park and recreation system master plan. We will prepare a summary of background information in the form of a Foundation Documents report as a part of this task that will be included in a "Master Plan Update" workbook (see Task 1.4). As information is reviewed, we will identify key pieces of information from existing plans or studies (including in a particular the update of the Comprehensive Plan) that should be integrated into the master plan.
- 1.03 Assemble base mapping information for park and recreation system using city sources. Using digital information provided by the city, and augmented by other readily available digital information as necessary, we will prepare a base map to be used in the park planning process. Our assumption is that Roseville's GIS data will suffice for overall planning purposes, but that certain information related to specific parks may need to be added to the

base map at a point when more detailed information is required. For compatibility with the city's existing digital information, additions will be made using AutoCAD or ArcView.

- 1.04 Prepare demographic projections using the city's comprehensive plan update as the source of information. Working with city staff, we will assemble projections of demographic changes that will particularly impact the park system and record findings in Memorandum #1.
- 1.05 Prepare community context mapping as a means of identifying significant areas of change posed in the comprehensive plan, with attention to changes that might influence park system components.
- 1.06 Assemble a "Master Plan Update" workbook for use by staff and the PARMPUT that includes, initially, the Foundation Documents report, significant existing documents relating to parks, and other pertinent. The workbook is aimed at establishing a baseline of information for all parties at the start of the planning process, and it will be used as a true workbook throughout the planning process—with new information provided to the PARMPUT as deliverables are created.
- 1.07 Tour existing park and recreation facilities with city staff and representatives of the PARMPUT, noting system highlights and deficiencies referenced by the PARMPUT; adjust the base map or park facility inventory based on found conditions.
- 1.08 Meet with the PARMPUT to review the planning process and the information gathered to date. While the focus of this meeting will be the master plan, this meeting gives us the opportunity for the PARMPUT to share their initial ideas for a park and recreation vision for Roseville, which we will summarize in the form of goals, desires, and even initial visionary ideas in Memorandum #2.
- 1.09 Assemble a summary of the work of Stage One for use by city staff and the PARMPUT in updates to city boards and commissions, and for informing stakeholder groups and the community about the progress of the master planning process. We will participate in an update to the Parks and Recreation Commission and the City Council as a part of this task.

### *Stage One Deliverables*

Meeting minutes from staff and PARMPUT meetings

Foundation Documents summary

Project base map (assumes using information readily available from the city)

Memorandum #1: Demographic projections

Community context mapping demonstrating areas of change that may impact the park system

Master Plan "workbook"

Summary of tour in the form of adjustment to base and context mapping

Memorandum #2: PARMPUT goals, desires and initial ideas

Summary of Stage One work documented in a PowerPoint presentation

### ***Stage Two: Explore***

The work of Stage Two represents what could be the most important component of the planning process. We intend to prepare, in concert with staff and the PARMPUT, a general plan that explores possible scenarios for the evolution of Roseville's park and recreation system. Policy directions will also be explored, but the early focus of this stage will be a

workshop orchestrated to draw input from the PARMPUT directly into the planning process during two intensive planning sessions.

The details and schedule of each planning session will be defined with staff, but it should occur at a time when most PARMPUT members can participate. It is anticipated that planning sessions will intensive sessions (that is, more than a one or two hour meeting). The first such session would be directed toward exploring the changing park needs of the community and imagining how the parks might fit into an evolving Roseville. A follow-up session would focus on concrete ideas about how the parks can respond to that evolution in terms of facility development, programming, and other changes. This approach offers the chance to directly engage the PARMPUT in accomplishing real work, to resolve directions early (or to identify areas where more intensive study may be required), and, most importantly, to establish a real dialog about the critical issues and opportunities that influence Roseville's park and recreation system.

A vision—the focus of Part One—is often defined by words alone. A well-crafted narrative can be compelling, evocative, and inspiring, but words reinforced by illustrations give people real insights about what their future parks might be. Our real challenge in this stage of the work is to frame the vision with words and pictures that people believe in and want to help achieve.

### *Stage Two Tasks*

- 2.01 Conduct Community Meeting 1 to identify the priority issues to be dealt with during the park master planning process. We will share information about the kind of community Roseville is today, based on demographic information collected earlier, as well as the kind of place it will become assuming that certain trends continue. There is a bit of “futuring” in this description, but we’ve found it helpful to offer this information as the community begins to shape a vision for its future. The focus of this session will be issues—factors and influences (positive and negative) that are shaping the community’s park system, and ideas—possibilities for enhancing the park system or the way it functions. This workshop, like others during the master planning process, will be focused on interactions with participants through a combination of large and small group discussions, along with reporting of findings by the groups. As we become more familiar with the community and the desires of the PARMPUT, we will frame a more detailed agenda and review the kinds of questions that we would ask of participants with the PARMPUT. Finally, we would summarize the input provided during this meeting.
- 2.02 Conduct interviews in an effort to better understand the conditions, issues, and opportunities facing Roseville’s park system from the perspective of key stakeholder groups. We will conduct interviews on two days with individuals, groups, or agencies defined by the city (assuming the list of twenty groups identified in the RFP as the starting point). Interviews will be summarized for use by the PARMPUT.
- 2.03 Conduct Listening Sessions with focus groups or neighborhoods to gain insights that are not program specific (as input from the interviews might be described). While the first community workshop is open to the community and focuses attention toward community-wide concerns, there will be areas of more direct concern for certain segments of the community. We anticipate conducting Listening Sessions with up to six groups. These sessions are not a presentation environment; rather, we intend to create a more “free-form” dialog with Listening Session participants. The input from each session will be summarized for distribution to the PARMPUT, and a general summary of all the sessions will be created for use in the master plan.
- 2.04 Identify, based on research of national trends, the relationship between the community and economic and social conditions in a community, and to the extent possible (from locally available information) demonstrate the impact of parks on development patterns in Roseville. Research will be summarized in Memorandum #3.

- 2.05 Highlight ways in which external changes (transportation, development, and socio-economic) will influence the direction of the park and recreation system, using the filter of information gained during the first three tasks of this stage of the work. External changes and their impacts on parks will be described in Memorandum #4.
- 2.06 Review current maintenance and operations practices related to park facilities, including equipment and staffing used in maintenance and operations. Summarize maintenance and operations practices in Memorandum #5. Recommendation for adjustment to these practices will be developed in Part Two of the planning process—when a broader understanding of the direction of the park system is defined.
- 2.07 Compare the level of service and standards for Roseville’s park system features, amenities, facilities, and services using a baseline of the current city park system standards, with comparisons to both accepted national standards and peer communities. Compare park fees and revenue structures of Roseville’s park system to other peer communities. Evaluate deficiencies and highlight areas of significant difference, identify challenges and potential opportunities based on the comparison, and document findings in Technical Memorandum #6.
- 2.08 Identify current Roseville park system standards for facilities and system components based on discussions with city staff and existing documentation of standards. Evaluate existing park and recreation system features, amenities, and services as a comparison to peer communities and national standards; identify challenges and potentials related to the comparison and summarize findings in Memorandum #7.
- 2.09 Research nationwide trends in park systems, services, and facilities, as well as practices related to maintenance and operations, design and construction delivery strategies, environmental stewardship, capital and operations funding, partnering, sustainability, energy use (or energy development), and other innovations. Summarize these trends in narrative form and in a comparative matrix in Memorandum #8.
- 2.10 Identify park and recreation system program needs based on anticipated demographic, economic, and sociologic changes (as documented in the city’s updated Comprehensive Plan and through review of contemporary journals and scholarly research dealing with these kinds of changes). Findings will be demonstrated in Memorandum #9.
- 2.11 Review memoranda with city staff, and make adjustments prior to the city’s distribution to the PARMPUT.
- 2.12 Conduct PARMPUT Planning Session 1 to review findings of Stage Two work completed through the previous tasks, and to begin framing broad ideas related to vision for the park and recreation system. We envision this session to be the first of the intensive, day-long planning sessions.
- 2.13 Frame a broad vision for the park and recreation system, including active recreation facilities, special community facilities and features, open space, culture, historic features, preservation and conservation, public art, trails, and bikeways. The vision will be articulated in both narrative and graphic form, and will be first framed in a draft form for review by the PARMPUT.
- 2.14 Conduct PARMPUT Planning Session 2 to review the draft vision, noting where the vision is appropriately directed, and importantly, areas where the draft vision fails to reach the community’s desires, and make adjustments to the draft vision. We will extend this review into a discussion about the park system components and how they can help meet the community’s park goals and desires.
- 2.15 Demonstrate the ways in which the park system as a whole and individual park system components fulfill the community’s goals and desires by focusing the vision its particular changes, highlights, or features. Augment the broad vision with these demonstrations, in both narrative and graphic format.
- 2.16 Review the augmented vision with the PARMPUT, again noting areas where it meets the community’s goals or areas where more work is required.
- 2.17 Conduct Community Meeting #2 to share the vision (and work completed to date in summary form) with the community. This meeting, like other community workshops, is less about presentation than interaction. The

activities of workshop interactions will be summarized, and potential changes to the vision as a result of the work highlighted for review by the PARMPUT.

- 2.18 Prepare The Vision as a summary report documenting the work of Part One of the master planning process, along with a PowerPoint that can be used to help disseminate The Vision to the community and stakeholder groups.
- 2.19 Participate in an update to the Parks and Recreation Commission and the City Council as a part of this task.

### *Stage Two Deliverables*

Summary of Community Meeting #1

Summary of interviews

Summary of Listening Sessions

Memorandum #3: Economic and social benefits of parks

Memorandum #4: External influences

Memorandum #5: Maintenance and operations practices

Memorandum #6: Comparison to standards

Memorandum #7: Current standards and classifications

Memorandum #8: National trends

Memorandum #9: System program needs

Summary, including graphics, from PARMPUT Planning Session 1

Draft vision, in narrative and graphic form, demonstrating the broad vision for the park system

Summary, including graphics, from PARMPUT Planning Session 2

Draft vision, in narrative and graphic form demonstrating how parks fit the vision

Summary of Community Meeting #2

The Vision report, delivered as ten hard copies bound in a three-ring binder, along with digital versions of the report in native and pdf format, and a PowerPoint summary of the vision

### **Part Two: The Master Plan**

***While often seen as a policy and general framework document, a good master plan has, at its core, a sound vision that holds the plan components together. The vision forms that core and allows the community to move forward with a greater understanding that all parts of the plan will be coherent, comprehensive, and integrated. This stage of the work for Roseville's park and recreation system master plan will go further, refining the broad patterns set out in The Vision, exploring the details of system changes, creating designs of some parks and features, defining "best practices," and outlining a strategy for implementation. We will also offer recommendations for follow-through activities related to the master plan.***

***As we move forward from this point, we will continue to work with the PARMPUT, and if needed we will broaden our outreach to other boards and commissions with responsibility for various aspects of the master plan. But we don't want to lose the connection to the community as we focus on the more specific parts of the park system's future. As in***

***the first stages of the planning process, we will use the PARMPUT as our guide, but also seek the input of others as key elements of the master plan come together.***

### ***Stage Three: Define***

This stage is about definition of the core elements of the park and recreation system master plan, using the findings of the first stages as the basis, and focusing on The Vision as the foundation. One of the more important decisions to be made about the master plan will also occur during this stage—the determination of the components beyond those specifically requested in the city’s RFP that will be incorporated into the document—or even determining which requested components could be framed and more fully articulated in a separate, follow-up process. We recognize that funding for projects in cities are mutable, especially in today’s economic environment. But we also know that the key deliverable for this entire master planning process is The Vision, and that some parts of the complementary master plan might be incorporated in a more incremental fashion. A decision about the final composition of the master plan will be made in concert with the PARMPUT, but it would not diminish the integrity of the core component of the master plan. In the end, this stage of the work will produce policy directions and plan refinements, and a draft master plan will result.

### ***Stage Three Tasks***

- 3.01 Meet with the PARMPUT to review the work of Part One: The Vision, and provide an overview of the key tasks and deliverables anticipated during Part Two: The Master Plan. We will also work with the PARMPUT and city staff to determine which components identified in Part Two are central to the master plan, and which, if any, can be delayed (based on a better understanding of project budgets).
- 3.02 Frame the “plan” that demonstrates larger scale changes to the park and recreation system, including (but not necessarily limited to) the need or opportunity for new park facilities in the community, a transition in use or activity for existing parks, the introduction of special park features or attractions, and the ways in which parks interface with other aspects of the community (development, neighborhoods, infrastructure, natural systems, streets and trails).
- 3.03 Update definitions and standards for the park and recreation system, including general terms and definitions, general standards applied to various park types, and the classification of parks and park facilities. New definitions and quantitative standards for park facilities will be based on the research conducted in Stage One, and the translation of those findings into the system-wide plan, and they will be recorded in Memorandum #10.
- 3.04 Establish program priorities for the recreation, historical, and cultural systems based on the system-wide plan, defining the optimal conditions and locations for the application of each program type in Roseville. Program priorities will be documented in Memorandum #11.
- 3.05 Propose policies and priorities for the park system using the classification methods posed in Task 3.03 and for park programs and services based on dialog with the PARMPUT and stakeholder groups. Policies and priorities will be recorded in draft form in Memorandum #12.
- 3.06 Propose policies and priorities for preserving and restoring natural features and amenities that benefit the community as a whole, making clear the nexus between those features and the park and recreation system. Policies and priorities will be recorded in draft form in Memorandum #13.
- 3.07 Propose policies and priorities for managing environmental quality, habitat, ecosystem protection, and enhancement of water bodies in park areas of the community. Policies and priorities will be recorded in draft form in Memorandum #14.

- 3.08 Propose guidelines for the development of public art and programs in the community's parks, including a review of benefits and investment levels that would achieve the community's goals. These guidelines would be recorded in Memorandum #15.
- 3.09 Propose "best practices" related to maintenance and operations, design and construction delivery strategies, environmental stewardship, capital and operations funding, partnering, sustainability, energy use (or energy development), and other innovations. Best practices will be framed in Memorandum #16.
- 3.10 Meet with the PARMPUT to review the system-wide plan, proposed program priorities, policies, guidelines, and best practices. During this meeting we need to determine if there are individual parks or park components that should be further refined in focused master plans. How parks are selected for more focused master plans will be determined in concert with the PARMPUT, but we might look to the immediacy of potential change, the current status of the park and the age of existing features, or even the potential of a park to demonstrate key directions and policies posed by this master planning effort.
- 3.11 Adjust the draft system-wide plan and supporting elements based on input from the PARMPUT.
- 3.12 Develop individual park master plans for selected parks as identified by the PARMPUT (assume eight such plans will be developed). Master plans will demonstrate, during this task, the basic park program, optimal configuration of components within the park, key relationships between the park and nearby development, special features or focal points of the park, and the character of the park and the anticipated experience of the park for users.
- 3.13 Meet with the PARMPUT to review the individual park master plans.
- 3.14 Adjust the individual park master plans based in input from the PARMPUT.
- 3.15 Conduct Community Meeting #3 to present the system-wide master plan, the policies and guidelines, and the individual park master plans. This meeting may be formatted as an open house, where participants can view elements of the plan that are their particular area of interest, and where a presentation can be made that offers a general overview of the directions of the master plan and its impact on the community. We will summarize the input provided by participants for review by the PARMPUT.
- 3.16 Assemble a summary of the work of Stage Three for use by city staff and the PARMPUT in updates to city boards and commissions, and for informing stakeholder groups and the community about the progress of the master planning process. We will participate in an update to the Parks and Recreation Commission and the City Council as a part of this task.

### *Stage Three Deliverables*

Draft system-wide parks plan

Memorandum #10: Parks classification

Memorandum #11: Program priorities

Memorandum #12: Park policies and priorities

Memorandum #13: Natural features policies and priorities

Memorandum #14: Environmental quality, habitat, ecosystem protection, and water body enhancement policies and priorities

Memorandum #15: Public art guidelines

Memorandum #16: Best practices

Summary of meeting with PARMPUT

Individual park master plans for eight city parks

Summary of Community Meeting #3

Summary of Stage One work documented in a PowerPoint presentation

#### ***Stage Four: Act***

The final stage of the work plan involves the critical step of making the plan a reality. Beyond simply drafting the master plan, taking the plan forward for review and adoption will occur during this stage of the work. Several key tasks are included in this work that help to frame the details of implementation—the strategies that become the foundation for implementing the community’s vision. This stage of the work lays the groundwork for a plan that is useful and useable on an ongoing basis. But most important, we believe that for this master plan to be successful, it must be understood, used, and loved by the community—they have to want it to happen!

#### ***Stage Three Tasks***

- 4.01 Prepare an outline of the master plan that includes those elements that are included directly as a result of this master planning effort, and that highlights those elements that would be recommended as follow-through efforts (those that cannot be accomplished under this contract, or that might be better completed in concert with other planning stages of the implementation).
- 4.02 Meet with the PARMPUT to review the work of Stage Three, the findings of the master planning process to this point, including the reaction of the community to the master plan as shared during Community Workshop #3, and the outline of the master plan posed in Task 4.01.
- 4.03 Establish an implementation sequence based on priorities, opportunities, need, and other factors that might suggest logic in the planned evolution of the park system.
- 4.04 Develop opinions of probable cost for implementation of the major park system components described in the master plan, and for selected individual park master plans, (including cost estimates for the preparation of construction documents for the proposed improvements). Costs will be framed in 2009 dollars, or as directed by city staff based on implementation sequencing.
- 4.05 Recommend phasing of park improvements based on the implementation sequence, costs, and funding opportunities, focusing in particular on a series of impactful first step projects that characterize the new way of thinking about parks under this master plan.
- 4.06 Meet with the PARMPUT to propose capital funding priorities for improvements and acquisitions based on the previously identified tasks.
- 4.07 Prepare draft Parks and Recreation System Master Plan. The document would be organized much like this planning process, with the first part inspiring readers with the common vision of the community, and the second part defining the most appropriate road map for accomplishing that vision. Key decisions about the content of the document, the kinds of information that should be included in the body of the document; the format, tone, and personality of the document; and information appropriate to an appendix will be coordinated with city staff.
- 4.08 Meet with the PARMPUT to review the draft Parks and Recreation System Master Plan, and note the group’s recommendations for changes to the document.
- 4.09 Conduct Community Meeting #4 to share the draft Parks and Recreation System Master Plan. We will document comments offered during the meeting for review by the PARMPUT.

- 4.10 Adjust the draft document based on input from the PARMPUT, and submit the final Parks and Recreation System Master Plan and a summary PowerPoint presentation for use in meetings with decision makers and stakeholders.
- 4.11 Meet with the PARMPUT to review the process of moving the master plan forward for adoption by the city.
- 4.12 Attend meetings of the Park and Recreation Commission and City Council for review of the Master Plan (assume one meeting with each body).

#### *Stage Four Deliverables*

Master Plan outline for review by the PARMPUT

Summary of meetings with the PARMPUT

Implementation sequence for park improvements

Opinions of probable cost for park system improvements

Recommendations for phasing of parking improvements

Recommendations for capital funding sources

Draft Master Plan report

Summary of Community Meeting #4

The Master Plan report, delivered as ten hard copies bound in a three-ring binder, along with digital versions of the report in native and pdf format, and a PowerPoint summary of the vision; we envision this as a complement to The Vision report delivered at the completion of Stage Two.

#### **Schedule**

We have reviewed the general schedule framed in the Request for Proposals and believe that the work required can be accomplished within that timeframe. The following schedule suggests the way the four broad tasks identified in our Work Plan might occur so that the planning process is complete and ready for action by the Parks and Recreation Commission and City Council in late 2009. A more detailed plan will be defined in concert with city staff and the PARMPUT.

## Section C: Fee

LHB proposes to perform the work outlined in our Work Plan for a not-to-exceed fee of \$125,300, inclusive of reimbursable expenses. Our proposed fee can be broken down by task as follows:

Part One: The Vision	
Stage One: Convene	\$11,200
Stage Two: Explore	\$46,600
Part Two: The Master Plan	
Stage Three: Define	\$39,000
Stage Four: Act	<u>\$25,400</u>
Total fee for services	\$122,200
Reimbursable expenses	<u>\$3,100</u>
Total fee	\$125,300

We have established a line item cost estimate for each task described in our Work Plan. That estimate includes hours by each person assigned to a task throughout the planning process. This detailed estimate can be provided to city upon request.

The Request for Proposals requires an identification of rates for personnel that would be assigned to this project. Personnel identified in this proposal and their individual billing rates are:

Michael Schroeder, ASLA	\$190
Jason P. Aune, ASLA	\$134
Lydia Major, ASLA	\$74
Dan Cornejo, APA	\$125