

In light of the conceptual nature of the shortlisted options for the new Pier, and with respect to the Selection Committee interaction with the Design Teams centered on the concept presentations, the following clarifications are being sought.

### Questions for Pier Park

---

1. Please demonstrate how the project fits within the Pinellas County Water and Navigation permit requirements as it relates to pre versus proposed wall area, roof area and height differences.
  2. Please provide additional examples of successful project features relating to the proposed project landscaping (turf) in a marine environment, on a sloped concrete structure, in terms of survivability and maintenance.
  3. Please provide a cross section of the pier bridge approach at a minimum of three (3) distinct distances over the water. The distances could be at the 1/3, 1/2 and 2/3 points out over the water, or at reasonable locations based on the features of your concept. In the cross sections, please indicate (with dimensions) zones for pedestrian and bicycle uses and those for vehicular and tram uses.
- 

1. In all cases, the information given on transportation options along the pier approach typically focused more on the needs of the pier users and did not as carefully address the needs of maintenance and service vehicles. Please give an assessment of how these other essential needs will interact with and interfere with your plan to transport users.
  2. Questions have been raised about the utility and sustainability of the floating dock elements. Please provide estimates of how many days per year these elements can reasonably be expected to be usable. Also, please provide estimates of how long these elements can be expected to survive before needing to be replaced, and an estimate of the cost to replace in today's dollars.
- 

1. I'm concerned about the durability of the floating docks and their ability to survive a major storm. What is the estimated life of the structures? What category of storm could they reasonably be expected to survive?
2. How does a person step from the fixed structure of the east edge of the pier head onto the bleachers on the floating dock system in 2 foot swells? At what level of wave action would the docks be closed, even when accessing by gangway?
3. Where is the "back of house" space for the restaurant at the pier head (space for storage, garbage collection, electrical, HVAC, etc.)? Is there room on the deck below the restaurant?

4. What are the dimensions of the event lawn and the adjacent event plaza in the latest design? (not just total square feet, but an average length and width).
  5. Does the tram actually drive beneath the shelter of the decks at the pier head? If so, can the elevators be accessed from that point (keeping patrons out of the rain and sun)?
  6. How wide are the tram routes at their narrowest points?
  7. Is the dry classroom capable of housing another restaurant? (Does it have sufficient water, electric, sewer and HVAC?)
  8. Is the restroom/changing room near Spa Beach still in the latest plan?
  9. How many toilet fixtures are in the entire project and where are they located?
- 

1. Please confirm how your proposed concept supports the Plan Themes as noted in the draft St. Petersburg Waterfront Master Plan, including:
  - a. Stewardship of the waterfront environment – a sustainable relationship between the natural and built environments
  - b. Enhancing the experience of the water – expanding St. Petersburg as a waterfront destination for boaters and non-boaters
  - c. An active waterfront parks system – diversifying the activities of the waterfront to meet a growing community
  - d. Economically vibrant downtown places – leveraging the economic potential of in-water and upland areas along the water's edge
  - e. A connected, accessible downtown + waterfront – continuous linkages, service oriented-parking + transit, increased public access
2. Please confirm the M/WBE participation on your team
3. In your own words, please describe how your proposed solution addresses what didn't work in the past on the Pier.
4. Please respond to the key findings in the Lambert Advisory Comparative Assessment of Economic Benefits dated March 11<sup>th</sup>, 2015.
5. Please provide a brief one-page chart noting how your proposal in its current form addresses all pier working group required elements.
6. Please describe how each key element of your proposal is accessible to persons with disabilities.

7. Please confirm any environmental restrictions (i.e. wave activity) that may limit the public's interaction with the water in several locations in your proposal, including the wet classroom and coastal thicket.
  8. Please confirm how all back of house operations will be addressed for all components of your proposal – at the pier head, along the approach and at the welcome plaza.
  9. In your opinion, what is the driver of the identity of this project?
- 

1. Explain how you envision the servicing of your solution will occur. Servicing relates to deliveries, maintenance, locations for support services equipment, etc. specifically explain distances and 'how you would maneuver' to accomplish this.
2. Confirm how your solution is meeting the intent of the waterfront master plan, especially utilization of uplands ie. restaurants.
3. In connection to the masterplan, if parking and driving was totally eliminated, how do you envision your solution maintaining its feasibility?
4. Are you confident that the solution as depicted will be carried out through the design process without significant changes?
5. Further clarify the concept behind the 'iconic' structure.