

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
CITY OF FOND DU LAC
ENGINEERING or PLANNING CONSULTANT FOR
LAKESIDE PARK MASTER PLAN
NOVEMBER 25, 2015**

Introduction & Project Summary

The City of Fond du Lac, Wisconsin (“City”), is soliciting proposals for an engineering or planning consultant to research and prepare a master plan (“Plan”) for the City’s Lakeside Park (“Park”).

The Plan will include reviewing documents related to the Park; offering professional insight into the selection, prioritization, and location of—and cost estimates for—several proposed improvements; and developing an overall Plan for and map of the Park showing the proposed improvements in relationship to each other.

It should be pointed out that many citizens surveyed wanted to retain the open and natural spaces in the Park, so any recommended development within the Park should be balanced with the love of the Park “just as it is.” It was especially clear that a large-scale commercial development or actual transfer of Park land to a private party should not be considered.

The consultant should consider budget, staffing, and maintenance constraints in formulating his or her recommendations.

The City specifically reserves the right to reject any or all proposals, to waive any proposal requirements, to investigate the qualifications of any proposal, to obtain new proposals, or to proceed to have the service provided in any way the City deems appropriate.

Deadline for proposal submission is 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, December 29th, 2015. Please submit five hard copies of your proposal to the address below, as well as an electronic copy to the email address below:

City of Fond du Lac
Public Works Director
P.O. Box 150
160 South Macy Street
Fond du Lac, WI. 54936-0150

Questions and requests for additional information may be submitted to Jordan Skiff at jskiff@fdl.wi.gov or (920)-322-3472. Email questions are preferred and questions will be responded to by email to all potential consultants.

Scope of Work

The work required of the consultant includes the following:

1. Review Documents Related to Lakeside Park

- a. Lakeside Park Exploratory Committee (LPEC): This blue-ribbon committee of 16 members met at least once a month from September 2014 until June 2015 to study the desires of the Fond du Lac community for LSP, and to offer prioritized recommendations to the City Council. Although not asked to spend extensive time or provide specific feedback on all issues, the consultant should review the 27 recommendations the LPEC submitted, as well as the summaries of the extensive conversations and community survey the LPEC held. The report can be found at https://www.fdl.wi.gov/cofuploads/Final_LPEC_Report.pdf. It should be noted that the survey—while incredibly insightful—was not scientific and was conducted in two stages, with the second intended specifically to hear from underrepresented segments of the community such as minorities and students.
 - b. City Recreation Plan (2015-2019): This plan includes a discussion of regional parks, and of specific ideas related to Lakeside Park. The Rec Plan can be found at the following site: https://www.fdl.wi.gov/cofuploads/Rec_Plan___2015_2019_Final_03.pdf.
 - c. Conceptual Plan for Lakeside Trail: In 2015, MSA Professional Services drafted a plan for routing a bike/pedestrian trail through the Park. This will impact several of the proposed projects the consultant will consider, and can be e-mailed upon request.
 - d. City Comprehensive Plan 2010-2030: Although this plan makes only passing references to Lakeside Park (https://www.fdl.wi.gov/cofuploads/Comp_Plan.pdf), the consultant should ensure that its master plan does not conflict with the Comprehensive Plan.
2. Vision Statement: The consultant should draft a vision statement early in the process—describing what this Plan is intended to achieve and what the Park might become—and to obtain City concurrence with this statement.
 3. Plan Recommendations: The consultant should use his or her professional experience and background to evaluate, prioritize, and offer recommendations on each of the following concepts. The consultant may provide as much—or as little—explanation as necessary to justify his or her conclusion. *(Note: At a minimum, the consultant should consider the questions and provide information in these categories, as specified: T—timing, L—location, CB—cost/benefit review, CE—rough cost estimate, R—regulatory limitations, S—potential synergy with other ideas (including complementary components of a phased or related future project), C—potential conflicts with other ideas, P—potential partners who may be critical for an idea to be successful, G—grants for which the project might be competitive, E—consider environmental impacts, especially by the Lake on the Park or vice versa).*

§1. Pavilion: This 6,500 sf facility is arguably the beating heart of Lakeside Park. Its large meeting space is rented throughout the year, usually multiple times each weekend. Its concession area sells food to park users from Memorial Day to Labor Day. It provides a kitchen for renters, and its restrooms are available to renters and park users alike. It is a polling place on Election Day, and a popular gathering place for city meetings and other civic events. Its north windows offer a wonderful view of Lake Winnebago, and its proximity to Fishermen’s Pier, Walleye Weekend activities, and our busy islands make it the hub of the Park.

That being said, the Pavilion’s décor seems dated, and its meeting spaces don’t offer much privacy or many amenities. We believe that a refurbished or replacement Pavilion could be a major step in revitalizing Lakeside Park, and could incorporate many of the LPEC’s recommendations.

The consultant should visit the existing Pavilion and make professional recommendations regarding the following questions:

- a. Would a refurbished Pavilion offer many advantages and opportunities to the Park at a lower cost, or is a full replacement clearly better? *(CB, E)*
- b. Can a permanent shaded seating area be set up to make this a central location for food trucks to serve the public? *(L, P)*
- c. If a new Pavilion is constructed, would a private, full-service restaurant—perhaps on a second floor—be a viable option? Is it possible that the current Pavilion was built with the structural components to add a second floor? *(CB, P)*
- d. The existing Pavilion can be used as a single, large space, or divided into two. How could a new facility have the flexibility to serve more and smaller events? For example, could six or eight “pods” be available for rent, by themselves or combined with others, all with access to basic kitchen facilities and a restroom designated for renters? *(CB, CE, S, P, E)*
- e. Several LPEC recommendations may be challenging to implement as stand-alone projects, but could be added to an upgraded Pavilion without significant additional cost. Ideas like adding historical features, a small nature center, public art, and plaques and a sense of place might be appropriate to include. It should be noted that a Leadership Fond du Lac team may be adding historical photos and narrative inside the Lighthouse in 2016. *(T, CE, S, P, G)*
- f. The LPEC’s surveys showed a desire for public restroom access year-round, and a refurbished or brand-new Pavilion would be a logical place to provide this (along with a drinking fountain available year-round). Ideally, separate bathroom facilities would be available for renters versus the general public accessing restrooms from the outside. *(CE)*
- g. It is always challenging to balance providing a public service while also generating appropriate revenue. The consultant should provide guidance on whether rental rates could or should be raised to make the Pavilion self-sustaining. *(CB, S, P)*
- h. Although the current site seems ideal for the Park’s hub, perhaps it would be less expensive to construct a new multi-use facility elsewhere in the Park, and to retain the current Pavilion. This would also allow the current building to continue to be used for events, probably at a lower cost than the new facility. The consultant should study and make a recommendation on this idea. *(T, L, CB, CE, S, C, P, E)*
- i. The LPEC indicated that there is a perceived shortage of transient boat docks available. Would Fishermen’s Pier—located just north of the Pavilion—be a logical place to offer transient access and bring boaters to the heart of the Park? It should be noted that this is a popular fishing site, perhaps making it undesirable for docking. *(S, C, P, G, E)*
- j. Although off-street parking was not called for by the LPEC or its surveys, a new and expanded Pavilion facility would likely need additional off-street spaces. *(L, CE, S, C, E)*

§2. Public Docks: Currently, approximately 20 boat slips are available in the Marina for transient boaters, and slip tenants are required to notify the Harbor Master when they will be away so their slips are also available. In addition, 20 dock spaces are available on the south side of Oven Island for boats that are low enough to pass under the channel bridges. Mercury Marine is planning to construct a 130’-long dock just east of this site in 2016, creating more docking space for boaters and available anytime other than Walleye Weekend. Finally, as indicated in paragraph *i* above, temporary boat docks may be

added to Fishermen's Pier in a very convenient part of the Park. There is also the possibility of adding boat docks on the west side of the Fond du Lac River, which may bring more activity to that area. The consultant should review the needs of area boaters and advise the City on whether more transient docks are needed, and if so, where the best location(s) would be. *(T, L, CB, CE, R, S, C, P, G, E)*

§3. Amphitheater: One of the LPEC's highest recommendations was to construct a permanent amphitheater. This would support major events like Walleye Weekend, and provide more options for other events. (Adding more concerts and festivals was the second highest LPEC priority.) The LPEC acknowledged the need to select a style that would not take away from the open feel of the area. Detractors of this idea note that a large and popular—but often available—amphitheater already exists in Buttermilk Creek Park, and worry that a significant public investment would be made to construct, maintain and operate a facility that is mostly needed to benefit Walleye Weekend. It should be noted that the Parks system is not currently staffed to operate or plan events for such a facility. Would adding an outdoor stage to a new Pavilion meet this goal at a fraction of the cost? Would Lakeside Park West be an ideal site for an amphitheater, not only due to its open spaces and views of the Lake, but also due to the ability to control access for ticketed events? *(T, L, CB, CE, S, C, P, G)*

§4. Public Beach: The LPEC and its surveys indicate strong public support for a beach. Severe wave action, ice shoves in the winter, and periodic poor water quality have kept this idea from being pursued over the past few decades. If creating and maintaining a beach is feasible, the consultant should provide recommendations on location and maintenance requirements. Although most people would prefer a beach on the Lake itself, do the channels or harbor provide an opportunity for placing a beach that would be easier to maintain? *(T, L, CE, R, E)*

§5. Boardwalk: Several members of the LPEC were very excited by the romantic idea of running a boardwalk along the entire Lake Winnebago shoreline. Not only would this bring park users right to the Lake, but would add a distinct and iconic look to the Park. Others note that a multi-use trail will be running parallel to the proposed boardwalk just a short distance away, and that boardwalks tend to be very expensive to install and maintain. There are also concerns that ice shoves may damage the boardwalk each winter. As an alternative way to bring park users to the lakefront, a handful of viewing platforms connected to the multi-use trail are planned for 2016. There are also pontoon boardwalks that can be removed and stored over the winter months. The consultant should provide a recommendation as to whether a boardwalk is a feasible and cost-effective addition to the Park. *(CE, R, S, C, G, E)*

§6. Bridge: Many of the goals of the LPEC and City are furthered by connecting Lakeside Park and Lakeside Park West. A location on the Fond du Lac River about 800' south of the Lake has been roughly chosen for this structure, but more details concerning the span, height, and likely costs for this bridge are desired. *(T, CE, R, S, C, G, E)*

§7. Marsh Walk: Supples Marsh is a naturalist's dream, covering most of the 245-acre Lakeside Park West, and offering water quality benefits and varied wildlife habitat. Unfortunately, viewing and exploring the Marsh from the land is difficult. While we plan to use City crews to grade and mow

walking trails on the high ground north of the Marsh, we would like to extend at least three trails to the Marsh itself, and construct viewing platforms for the public to enjoy. (*L, CE, R, S, C, P, G, E*)

§8. Ice Rink/Splash Pad: The LPEC envisioned a splash pad in the Park as a popular destination for children and families. As part of their goal of increasing year-round use of the Park, they also would like to see an ice rink provided. Their research showed that there are companies that combine these two types of facilities. The consultant should consider a few questions when advising the City on this idea. Is there a significant benefit to *combining* these two facilities? Should a splash pad recirculate its water, conserving water but costing more to construct and maintain? Can it only run when in use? Should a splash pad be located near the Lake to provide a breathtaking view, while the ice rink could be set back from the Lake due to harsh winter winds? Does a splash pad have to be staffed or fenced to prevent vandalism or liability concerns? Would a splash pad compete with—and take revenue from—our two City pools? It should be noted that an ice rink could be placed just southeast of the Park shop with very little expense, as a parking lot, lights and heated bathrooms are already there and a warming area could be easily added to a 2016 building project. (*L, CB, CE*)

§9. Shelters: While the consultant considers the look and feel of a possible new Pavilion, it should also review whether the number and style of the Park’s shelters are adequate. Although the City may not want to spend significant capital in rebuilding existing shelters, if there is demand for more shelters, where and how should they be constructed? (*T, L, CB, CE, S, C*)

4. Deliverables

- a. Meetings: The consultant should expect to meet with a small group of City staff, elected officials and major stakeholders no less than five times during the master plan process. The consultant should also expect to be present at a public information meeting and City Council meeting to offer professional insight and background, as requested.
- b. Plan: Ten copies of a written Master Plan shall be provided to the City after adoption by the City Council. The Plan should include a review of the process the consultant used to reach his or her conclusions, and a professional justification for the final recommendations of the Plan. An electronic version of the Plan shall be provided to the City for use at its discretion.
- c. Map: The Plan shall include an overall map of the Park including current relevant features and new infrastructure and facility ideas. Hard copies of this map shall be included in the printed Plan, as well as made available electronically to the City for use at its discretion.

Evaluation and Selection Process

The City will review the qualifications of the respondents and uniformly evaluate them.

Project Schedule

Selection of a consultant should be completed in early January, 2016. The Plan should be presented to the City Council for final approval no later than its meeting on May 25, 2016.

Project Team & Reference

Please include a list of the personnel expected to be on the planning team and include a brief summary of comparable projects in your proposal.

Cost Proposal

The cost of proposed services shall be submitted as a lump sum total for the scope of work outlined above. Should the consultant feel that simple architectural renderings may be helpful to explain his or her ideas, please indicate the additional cost of preparing and incorporating each rendering would add. Also include an hourly rate sheet for the expected personnel on the project. If the consultant has ideas for additional ways to improve the Park, he or she may propose that to the City along with a price for the additional work, only proceeding if directed.