



Edwin M. Lee, Mayor  
Philip A. Ginsburg, General Manager

## Lake Merced West Request for Proposals Public Questions and Answers

Q1: Where do we submit the "Letters of Interest" to?

A1: You can submit them by email to [Cassandra.Costello@sfgov.org](mailto:Cassandra.Costello@sfgov.org). Please make sure they are in PDF form and they will be uploaded to the Recreation and Park Department's website upon receipt.

Q2: What is the purpose of the prebid tour?

A2: The prebid tour is an opportunity for interested parties to tour the Lake Merced West site, ask questions, learn about the opportunity and meet other interested parties.

Q3: Our firm will be interested to provide interior design services for this project if any needed. What would be the next step for us to be part of this project?

A3: You are welcome to attend one of the prebid conferences. You can also see who attended the prebid conferences as we will post the attendees of the prebid conference on our website. You can then contact them to see if your services fit with their needs.

Q4: What is the climate at Lake Merced?

A4: San Francisco is a city of ever changing micro climates. The Lake Merced area is one of the colder and foggier areas in a very mild general climate.

Q5: Is the area heavily wooded?

A5: There are trees in the Lake Merced West area, but it is not heavily wooded. You can get a better sense of the area through tools such as Google Earth or a site tour.

Q6: Is the property available for purchase?

A6: No. This opportunity is for a lease only.

Q7: Are there other types of uses besides recreational that could be considered?

A7: The use must meet a recreational purpose. However, ancillary supportive uses to a larger use such as office space may be considered.

Q8: We are a SBE/LBE firm in San Francisco and are interested in the project at Lake Merced.

Would it be in our interest to attend the event on Friday (the January 22<sup>nd</sup> Prebid Conference)? Are we required to register or bring any documents to attend?

A8: Anyone interested in the opportunity is welcome to come to the prebid conference. No advance registration or documents are needed.

Q9: Should we submit the letter of interest directly to you via email, or is there a means to post the letter online?

A9: The letters should come to [Cassandra.Costello@sfgov.org](mailto:Cassandra.Costello@sfgov.org) and they will be posted on our website upon receipt.

Q10: Is it acceptable to include general information about our firm such as firm profile, relevant experience, resumes etc. with the letter for the benefit of parties reviewing?

A10: Yes.

Q11: Will it be possible to receive a list of attendees at the first prebid conference without having attended the conference?

A11: We will post the attendees of the prebid conferences on our website.

Q12: Can you please share an example of a selected RFP Park & Rec. has awarded. Please also forward or share where I might find the RFP for Lake Merced?

A12: Here is a link to the RFP: <http://sfrecpark.org/about/partnership-opportunities/lake-merced-west/>

Here is a link to a proposal that was eventually selected for Stow Lake:

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/w9dwpz8sz50n213/Ortega%20Proposal%20Merged.pdf?dl=0>

Q13: It is challenging for any potential respondents to submit a proposal without having access to the buildings and thoroughly understand the conditions they are in. When can we get access to enter the buildings and assess their conditions?

A 13: Buildings will be available for limited inspection on Feb. 5<sup>th</sup>, 2016 at approximately 11am.

Q14: Since the soil under the buildings has not been touched, if it was determined that the buildings will have to be torn down, who will pay for the cleanup of the soil contamination under the buildings?

A14: Any residual contamination resulting from former PPRGC activities will be remediated by the SFPUC.

Q15: Has determination been made about the clean of the lake bed on the property? When will the department do that and decide if cleanup is needed?

A15: The SFPUC is currently conducting studies to determine if any additional remediation of lake sediment is required. The Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) will make a determination based on results of the ongoing study by late 2016/early 2017.

Q16: Does the PUC have any info on the viability of dock space on this property? Specifically on the viability and demand for docks?

A16: No

Q17: What is the condition of the water for use? Is it safe for a swimming program?

A17: The SFPUC maintains Lake Merced as a non-potable emergency water supply for San Francisco to be used for firefighting or sanitation purposes if no other water sources are available. Swimming is not allowed in the Lake.

Q18: What is the Department's reason for setting a 20 year term? This does not allow much for capital investments to be recouped. Is the Dept open to a longer term?

A18: The Department recently issued an amendment to the RFP to allow for respondents to propose extensions that could be negotiated. Please visit the website for the text of the amendment.

Q19: Will proposals get posted as they come in or all at once? If latter, when will it be available for public viewing?

A19: The proposals will be posted all at once and shortly after the due date.

Q20: IF further down the road, additional contamination from former tenant is discovered, and was not addressed by this cleanup, will the future tenant be responsible for the clean up?

A20: Any residual contamination resulting from former PPRGC activities will be remediated by the SFPUC.

Q21: Will the City pick up the cost of CEQA?

A21: Should the selected respondent from this RFP wish to remove some or all of the existing buildings on site, the SFPUC will negotiate a cost share with the respondent to pay for the portion of the environmental review (CEQA) associated with the removal of the buildings.

Q22: Has the PUC's clean up addressed any of the conditions of the buildings?

A22: No.

Q23: Programmatically, does the Dept need any facilities in this side of town? Does the Rec and Park Dept have alternative use for the Boathouse if all boating was relocated to this property?

A23: The Department has heard from the community that a boating facility is needed as the existing boathouse is over capacity. In the RFP we have listed opportunities to store and offer boating access to the lake as a possible use for the site in addition to other uses including, but not limited to fishing access, picnic areas, food and beverage, hiking trails and ecological education. The Department would like to offer boating programs and would expect to use portions of the Boathouse.

Q24: Are there any reports available that specifically addresses the specific uses requested by the public?

A24: Please see the Lake Merced Watershed report,  
<http://www.sfwater.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentID=7139>

Q25: Where is the link to the Watershed Report? Can we get a printed copy?

A25: The link to the Watershed Report is here,  
<http://www.sfwater.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentID=7139>. You may request a printed copy and arrange to pick it up from either the Recreation and Park Department or the Public Utilities Commission.

Q26: Is the water level affected by the tide fluctuation? Is the current level of water considered low or average? Impacted by the drought? Is there historical data available for the water level?

A26: Lake Merced is a terminal lake and not influenced by tidal fluctuations. Lake levels are dependent mostly upon precipitation and small amounts of runoff from the surrounding watershed. Lake levels have been impacted by the drought and are relatively low compared to historical data, but recovering due to the recent rains. Historical water level data is available upon specific request from the SFPUC. Lake Merced water levels could potentially increase following implementation of the Vista Grande Drainage Basin Improvement Project. This project will result in the rehabilitation

of the Vista Grande Canal and tunnel, as well as construction of a new diversion structure which will divert approved filtered stormwater flows into the lake. Temporary maximum water levels 5-7 ft higher than current lake levels. However this is not expected to impact use of the upland areas of the site.

Q27: This is a significant site for the City and anything proposed for the site should have a thorough review process. Who will preside over the process of what is built here?

A27: The review process will involve the Recreation and Park Department, the Recreation and Park Commission, the Public Utilities Commission, the Planning Department and possibly other regulatory agencies such as the Coastal Commission.

Q28: Is this all clean soil on the site? Where did the soil come from?

A28: Clean soil was imported from various local quarries etc. following sampling and testing to confirm quality.

Q29: What will the site look like post remediation?

A29: Site will generally be planted with native grasses for erosion control, and young tree shoots will be planted along the south and western fence line.

Q30: What is this fabric by the water?

A30: Erosion control barrier.

Q31: I notice there is fencing all around the property, is this the official boundary of the property?

A31: Yes.

Q32: Is the topography of the property available somewhere?

A32: Final site grade/topography will be available following completion of site restoration.

Q33: Where are the actual property lines? I know that there is state and federal wetland boundaries around here, how do they overlap with the properties? And how does this potentially impact the building of docks?

A33: State and federal wetland boundaries were delineated as part of SFPUC's remediation. Some remediation extended into State jurisdictional wetlands under permit from the RWQCB. The SFPUC's wetland delineation is effective for five years. Future projects will most likely be required to conduct updated wetland delineation. Construction activities that may impact State or Federal wetlands must be approved by the State and Federal agencies with jurisdiction over wetlands and waters, including RWQCB, California Coastal Commission, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and United States Army Corp of Engineers (USACE).

Q34: Is the temporary irrigation recycled water? If not, is recycle water available to this property? Can you connect into recycle water for this property? Is it via Daly City? How big do pipes need to be to irrigate the entire site?

A34: No recycled water piping is currently available at the site. Consequently temporary irrigation is not recycled water. Sizing of irrigation pipes depends on many factors including, proposed site use, desired coverage, target vegetation etc. and is the responsibility of the bidding entity or team. If requested SFPUC will provide as-built drawings for the temporary irrigation system currently being installed onsite once this task has been completed.

Q35: Are there big partnerships being discussed? Is the Dept helping to facilitate these conversations with interested parties?

A35: The Department is administering the competitive bidding process set forth by the San Francisco Administrative Code and therefore is not able to facilitate conversations between interested parties. However, the Department has set up the "Interested Parties" section on our website which is a venue to publically post letters from interested parties who are looking to team up with others to put a proposal responsive to this RFP together.

Q36: As far as I know, the buildings were constructed without permits, and are still left on the property. Will PUC remove them if the new lessee does not want the buildings?

A36: No.

Q37: Have the buildings been tested for lead paint?

A37: No.

Q38: If the approved lessee wishes to use the buildings, will PUC then remediate the lead issue and connect the buildings to sewer service?

A38: No. Also note however that the issue of lead based paint becomes more of a primary concern if and when the buildings are demolished or during renovation, modifications etc that might disturb painted areas. During demolition, certain basic protocol must be followed, including proper permitting, and disposal of resulting materials at an approved location. Should lessee decide to use the buildings, lessee will be responsible for establishing utility service to the buildings.

Q39: Do the buildings have proper City required sewage pipe hook-ups for the toilets and sinks, or if the Gun Club simply installed septic tanks?

A39: There are no septic tanks onsite. All connections to utilities with the exception of the Restrooms located at the northwestern portion of the site were cut and capped in order to complete the cleanup.

Q40: I e-mail you to obtain a bit more clarity regarding text in your December 3, 2015 memo to the Commission Operations Committee titled "Issuance of the Lake Merced West RFP."

I have copied the language I have questions about below. Several smaller community organizations and groups that operate child and youth focused programs are likely interested in responding to this RFP in partnership. The concern expressed by some RFP readers relates to the expressed "respondent will be expected to" ... "remedy deficiencies as it is applicable to proposed use". The feeling is that the restoration (or removal) of the (non-permitted?) buildings left behind on the site should simply be included as part of the ongoing clean-up and restoration of the lands. Many of us are very familiar with, and thus hesitant, regarding the massive costs and regulatory challenges associated with meeting current City Planning Dept, Building Department and Historical Preservation standards.

It would be very helpful if the Recreation and Park Department (or the PUC) could, up front, acknowledge these cost challenges and offer to fund these city mandated repairs and improvements as part of the ongoing overall remedial activities and restoration efforts already being funded via City public agencies.

Text from your Dec 3 memorandum:

"Lake Merced West is being offered in an "as is" condition and will require substantial investments. The selected respondent will be expected, among other things, to work with city agencies to determine conditions of existing infrastructure and remedy deficiencies as it is applicable to proposed use. This will include, but not be limited to, replace or repair mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems, address ADA issues, replace or repair public restroom and construct any other improvements needed to meet the City's building code requirements as well as other regulatory requirements, including consistency with the historic preservation standards."

A40: The SFPUC has funded a \$20 million cleanup of the site to return the property to a clean and useable standard. The City acknowledges that the existing buildings are in subpar condition. However, there are not any additional funds available for this property to do any upgrades to the existing site. Furthermore, it is not clear what buildings will be retained in the long term as it will be dependent on the proposals received and uses identified in the responses to the RFP.

Q41: Why do the buildings that, as far as I know, were constructed without permits, are still left on the property? Will PUC remove them if the new lessee does not want the buildings?

A41: The primary focus of ongoing work was to remediate contaminated soils from the site.

Q42: If the approved lessee wishes to use the buildings, will PUC then remediate the lead issue and connect the buildings to sewer service?

A42: No. The SFPUC will not be removing any buildings. Four of the buildings including: The Clubhouse, The Caretakers House, The Rifle Range Building and the Shell House have been determined as significant historic resources. If the new lessee does not want the buildings, they are free to demolish them as long as they conduct appropriate CEQA review and obtain approvals from relevant federal and state regulatory agencies.

Q43: I have reviewed your website and sample letters of interest. I'm still unsure whether it is appropriate for our landscape architecture firm to post a letter of interest. We would not technically be "offering a service(s) at Lake Merced West" as your request indicates, but rather would be interested in serving as a design consultant to the prime bidder. Could you please let me know if it would be typical for landscape architects to post a letter of interest?

A43: We think it is reasonable for an architecture firm to post a letter of interest. It is a venue to connect with others who are interested in the opportunity. Someone may want to engage your company now to be part of their proposal vs. after they are chosen to move forward with their proposal.

Q44: What impact does the "Significant Historical Resources" mean with respect to city planning codes and general environmental review?

A44: See answer to question number 45.

Q45: How does the Cultural landscape protection status work? Does its protection end as soon as the Planning Dept makes a determination?

A45: Four of the buildings including: The Clubhouse, The Caretakers House, The Rifle Range Building and the Shell House have been designated as significant historic resources. If the new lessee does not want the buildings, they are free to demolish them as long as they conduct appropriate CEQA review and obtain approvals from relevant federal and state regulatory agencies. Demolition of the structures would most likely result in the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report, which is the most comprehensive level of CEQA review. In San Francisco, the

Planning Department is the lead agency for CEQA. Also note that any proposal for site reuse would require CEQA reviews and permits.

Q46: Why did the PUC leave the buildings alone and only address the soil? Why not assess the condition of the buildings too?

A46: The required cleanup and subsequent project implemented by the SFPUC was conducted to address contamination in soils onsite.

Q47: How detailed does the Architectural plans need to be for the proposals? What percentage of detail?

A47: The Department wants drawings that clearly show proposed new buildings or alternations to existing buildings, dimensions, and how the interior of the buildings will be used. We would like to see a layout of each proposed use indicating how much of the exterior and interior spaces, in approximate square footages, will be used for what use. If the respondent wishes to retain the current structures, please show the proposed improvements, if any, to the existing buildings.

Q48: Will the review process include an in-person interview?

A48: Very possibly.

Q49: Will you host a contractor's tour so that we can do accurate measurements?

A49: Yes. The SFPUC and the Department will coordinate to arrange for an additional site tour of the buildings. The next site tour is scheduled for Friday, February 26<sup>th</sup> at 10am at Lake Merced West.

Q50: I am concerned that no private contractor will have the capacity to fully invest and develop this project. With little to no revenue generating from this project, who can afford it? Why does the city not develop and activate the site themselves?

A50: The Department is encouraging proposals that activate the property and provide for public access. The Department is open to negotiating a rent credit structure with the selected respondent to help amortize investment in the site.

The City does not have funding to activate and manage this parcel of property. This particular parcel has historically been managed through a lease agreement and the City is looking for a third party to continue to provide activation and access to the public through a financially sound proposal.

Q51: When is the next RPD revenue bond? Any plans to allocate resources from that bond for this site? This is a complex and low revenue project best funded by something like a bond.

A51: The next Recreation and Park Bond is scheduled for 2018. The Planning Process has not started for the 2018 Bond, therefore no projects have been identified.

Q52: For the remainder of the soil under the buildings, what level of risk is the soil to people?

A52: Assuming that the building is not demolished, the remaining soil beneath the Rifle Range Building poses a low risk to people. If the building were to be demolished as part of site development, the SFPUC will implement additional cleanup to address this material.

Q53: Do you know if Asbestos present in the building?

A53: An asbestos survey has not been conducted on the existing buildings onsite.

Q54: Are the buildings built to code, with Permits?

A54: No.

Q55: If the tenant does not want to deal with the buildings, can they leave them the way they are? Does the future use of the buildings require Commission / other bodies of government approval?

A55: Should the buildings be kept onsite, they would need to be used and brought up to current code. The Department is prioritizing activation of the entire 11 acre site. Future use of the buildings would need approval from the Recreation and Park Commission. Alterations to the buildings would require Environmental Review.

Q56: Are there plans to parcel a few of the acres for Department use?

A56: Not at this time.

Q57: How many acres of land does this opportunity cover?

A57: There are 11 acres of land as advertised in the RFP.

Q58: If the boating community moves out of the Lake Merced boathouse and relocates to Lake Merced West, is there a master plan on what will happen to the Lake Merced Boathouse? Will the Dept issue a RFP for this site to activate it?

A58: The Department would like to directly offer boating at Lake Merced through its recreation division and would possibly use the boathouse to do so.

Q59: Can you explain the relationships between all the City Departments and how they work together to provide oversight for this property?

A59: The PUC owns the property. Through an MOU, the Recreation and Park Department manages the recreation. Oversight for the management of the lease agreement will be performed primarily by the Recreation and Park Department.

Q60: Where is the water in the watershed from?

A60: Lake Merced is mainly replenished by rainwater runoff from the surrounding watershed.

Q61: If people are interested in collaboration, how can they get in contact with one another?

A61: Interested parties can review the prebid attendee list posted on our website or submit a letter of interest. Parties can also review other already submitted letters of interest which are posted on our website.

Q62: How much soil was excavated from the site?

A62: Approximately 88,000 tons of contaminated soil was excavated from the site.

Q63: Do you have a report on the toxins removed from the property?

A63: Contaminants of concern in excavated soil included lead, arsenic and carcinogenic polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons.

Q64: When will the clean up conclude?

A64: The remediation project should be completed by April 2016.

Q65: Has anything come out of the lawsuit with the former tenant, the one regarding the former tenant's insurance liability?

A65: SFPUC is still in negotiations with PRGC attorneys and insurance counsels regarding the pending lawsuit.

Q66: Can you build wharfs and docks along the edge of the land?

A66: The Department and the PUC are open to proposals which propose docks or wharfs along the water's edge. However, any such encroachment into the watershed jurisdictional waters will require an adequate level of environmental review including approval of various regulatory agencies including the US Army Corps of Engineers, State Lands Commission, Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the California Coastal Commission.

Q67: What do people want to see on the property? In particular, what do the residents across the street say? Would they like to see shopping and food at this location?

A67: The Department does not have information about what the neighboring apartment residents wish to see as a result of this RFP process. However the use needs to meet a recreational purpose.

Q68: Have you been contacted by other developers?

A68: The Department has posted a list of all of the interested parties and questions asked throughout the process thus far.

Q69: Is there a site plan that shows the layout of the existing building?

A69: There are site plans located in the Mitigated Negative Declaration, which can be found at the following link:

[http://sfmea.sfplanning.org/2013.1220E\\_FMND.pdf](http://sfmea.sfplanning.org/2013.1220E_FMND.pdf)

Q70: How big is the lake?

A70: Lake Merced is between 200 and 300 acres depending on the water level.

Q71: How many people live across the street? What is the demographic make-up? Families, seniors, etc?

A71: The Department has been advised by management at the Lakewood Apartment complex that approximately 1,400 people currently reside in the Lakewood Apartment building. The manager of the building, Haley Gonzaba, has provided her email address for anyone who wishes to contact her regarding the Lakewood Apartment building, [haleyg@calamerican.com](mailto:haleyg@calamerican.com).

Q72: In the last couple of weeks, my neighbors and I are wondering why are the shooting range structures such as green wooden shacks and fences are being put back. At the meeting we were told that some of the structures left from the shooting range may have historical significance and had to stay, but it looks like all of their structures are being preserved. Is the shooting range coming back? Have they submitted a proposal? If they have, why it is not made public? If they have not submitted a letter, what is the purpose of restoring their infrastructure?

A72: The structures are required to be put back per the environmental review conducted in conjunction with the cleanup of the site.

The Recreation and Park Department is in middle of a competitive bidding process to find a new use and master tenant for the site. Proposals are due this May. We have not yet received any proposals at this time.

Q73: Can you clarify whether the project developer will be required to provide a park that is free and open to the public and of at least 2 acres in size? That is large enough to throw a Frisbee or a football, play fetch with your dog or spread out on the grass to enjoy the view? What about a tot lot for all the young families in the area?

A73: Our focus in the RFP is to activate the space with a recreational use. We have not required any use in particular, just that it meets a recreational purpose.

The Department put together a list of possible uses, not meant to be exhaustive, but simply to provide some guidance as to what would be acceptable at the site:

- opportunities to store and offer boating access to the lake
- fishing access
- picnic areas
- food and beverage
- hiking trails
- ecological education
- other recreational activities that would not adversely impact the watershed, wildlife and other recreational uses

Q74: Please explain about what you mean by the following criteria for selection of the winning bid:

- Compatibility with the entire Lake Merced Watershed
- Meaningful Public Access
- Recreational Opportunities
- Surrounding Neighborhood
- Project Feasibility
- Financial Capacity
- Proposed Financial Terms

A74: The evaluation criteria and possible points that will be used to score the responsive proposals received can be found under Section V "Evaluation and Selection Process" of the RFP.

Q75: Who gets the revenue from this opportunity?

A75: The City would receive the negotiated revenues generated from this opportunity. It has not been determined if the revenue would go to the SFPUC or the Department.

Q76: We are looking for the original DWG or a vector active PDF of the site plans prepared for this proposal. The PDF we have obtained seems to be a bitmap picture of the original drawing in PDF form.

A76: There are no topographical maps available at this point. Topographical maps will not be available until the SFPUC completely finishes with current site restoration. Once that's done and the final topographical map is prepared, it will be posted on Rec Park website Site.

Q77:What is the soil near the high low buildings are different color. Why is that?

A77:The soil around the high low houses is simply aggregate base rock placed around each structure to ensure proper installation. This material is clean.

Q78: Does the Police still actively shoot next door? Do they have an outdoor range?

A78: To the knowledge of the Department, the San Francisco Police Department has an active semi enclosed shooting range adjacent to Lake Merced West. The shots are contained within the building.

Q79: If the buildings get demolished and lead and asbestos is found in the buildings, who will be responsible for those costs?

A79: If buildings or other site structures get demolished, any lead based paint or asbestos contained in the building materials is the responsibility of the lessee

Q80: Will the PUC turn over the GIS program, Trimble, when the cleanup is complete?

A80: The SFPUC will provide final topographical elevations which will be shared on the Rec/Park website once the final survey has been completed, data reviewed and processed.

Q81: Has it been established that the Pacific Rod and Gun Club will NOT be allowed to return as tenants? If not, is there a place where concerned citizens might voice their opinions about future tenants?

A81: The Department and the SFPUC are looking for a recreational purpose that protects the watershed and activates the property. There are no prohibited uses at the site so as long as they meet the Department and the PUC's requirements, which are more specifically listed along with other important information in the RFP which can be found on our website along with supporting documents, <http://sfrecpark.org/about/partnership-opportunities/lake-merced-west/>.

The property objectives are:

- Take advantage of the lakeside's unique setting and assets
- Enhance public enjoyment and appreciation of the watershed's resources
- Maintain water quality and watershed health
- Preserve the lake's park-like, open space character
- Be compatible with the site's particular physical characteristics and environmental sensitivities
- Provide a balanced range of uses and facilities that serves and provides access to San Francisco residents of all ages and abilities
- Provide publicly available restrooms
- Promote uses and facilities that are complementary to both upland and aquatic areas.
- Minimize the obstruction of views of Lake Merced through landscape design and planting that is integrated with the surrounding natural landscape, with buildings, structures sited to be sensitive to scenic views from and into the watershed
- Not contaminate the site or result in any restrictions on future use of the site
- Result in selection of a financially viable tenant under a long term lease agreement that will provide valuable services and amenities to the public
- Result in selection of a tenant with a business model and plan that is financially sustainable for the long term and provides for continued and ongoing maintenance of capital assets constructed on the property
- To provide opportunities for local workers , local nonprofits and /or local businesses during the design, construction and operation phases of the project.

You are welcome to provide our commission with your comments at:

[Recpark.commission@sfgov.org](mailto:Recpark.commission@sfgov.org).

