

REPORT OF GENERAL MANAGER

NO. 01-145

DATE May 2, 2001

C.D. 13

BOARD OF RECREATION AND PARK COMMISSIONERS

SUBJECT: BARNSDALL PARK - PHASE I MASTER PLAN IMPLEMENTATION (#1026C) -
REQUEST FOR EXTRA SERVICES TO DESIGN CONTRACT NO. 2621

J. Combs _____
A. Corrales _____
J. Duggan JD
J. Kolb _____

H. Fujita _____
*M. Tamuri _____
M. Matthews _____



General Manager

Approved _____

Disapproved _____

Withdrawn _____

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Board:

1. Approve extra services in the amount of \$16,325.00 to design Contract No. 2621 with Peter Walker William Johnson Partners (PWP) for additional services to be performed as described in the body of this report.

SUMMARY:

In September 1997, the Board executed an amendment to contract No. 2621, with PWP in the amount of \$1,218,900.00 for the completion of construction documents for the subject project. Since the execution of the amendment, the design firm, in conjunction with its specialty sub-contractors, has completed plans with the input from a task force established of community members, design professionals, the Council Office, and the two (2) other Departments involved in the facility, Cultural Affairs (CAD) and General Services (DGS). The implementation of the master plan as delineated by the construction documents has been presented to the community at community meetings at least twice during the completion of the plans and specifications.

The completion of the plans and specifications for this project required a myriad of approvals and permits due to the historic status of the site and several of the structures on the site. The impact the historical status of the buildings on the source of some of the funding revolved around the resolution of the sensitive nature of the repairs and hazard mitigation completed on the buildings and site due to the necessity to resolve issues surrounding the repair or replacement of the historic fabric. There were almost two years of negotiations with FEMA/OES and the State Office of Historic Preservation regarding the extent and type of repairs that were allowed and could be performed without impact to future more intrusive seismic rehabilitation/restoration of the building. Approvals were finally received for completion of all the work included in the construction documents in January 2001. In December 2000 the project was advertised for bid on March 6, 2001 in order to assure sufficient time to construct the FEMA repairs and not jeopardize the funding for that portion of the contract.

REPORT OF GENERAL MANAGER

PG. 2

NO. 01-145

During the approval/permit process staff ran across a problem with securing the permits for one of the buildings, Residence A, due to the fact the occupancy of the building had never been changed since it was constructed as a single family residence. The building has been used for the past 50 years as an art center and should have a commercial occupancy. Concern had been raised in the community that since there are not funds for further construction in Residence A that the art center program is in jeopardy.

At the Board meeting of April 11, 2001 the Board requested staff hold a community meeting for the purpose of reviewing the design process and review of the construction documents with the community. Staff has requested the consultants make a full presentation to the community regarding the process the design has taken to get to this point and review the content and relevance of the work included in the construction documents.

The consultant has met all the requirements of their contract regarding meeting with the community and making required presentations for permits and approvals. Therefore the preparation for and completion of a community meeting is in addition to the scope of work included in their contract. Since the award of a construction contract is time sensitive, in order to not lose funding for a portion of the project, staff has had the consultant prepare for the community meeting to be held at 7:00 pm May 2, 2001 at the Municipal Gallery Theater, and submit a proposal that includes the direct costs associated with the meeting. The consultant has submitted a proposal of \$16,325.00. Staff has reviewed the proposal and determined that the request not only work outside the scope of the plans required under the contract. Some of the costs were higher than normal due to the accelerated time frame required to complete the community meeting. Therefore, staff recommends the Board approve the request for extra services.

Prepared by Kathleen Chan, Project Manager