

Monica Lusk

From: Monica Lusk
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2011 10:30 AM
To: 'Chestine Edgar'
Cc: Susan Coles; Lisa Clausen; Michael Lafreniere
Subject: FW: RFP on Parks Master Plan
Attachments: To the Burien Planning Commission-RFP on Park plan.doc

Thank you for your message. It will be provided to the Planning Commission and included in the Correspondence for the Record for the April 4 Council meeting.

Monica Lusk, City Clerk
City Manager's Office

From: Chestine Edgar [mailto:c_edgar2@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2011 10:05 AM
To: Monica Lusk
Subject: RFP on Parks Master Plan

Hello Monica Lusk,

Attached is a letter that I would like to be included in the packets for the Planning Commission and the City Council. It relates to RFPs and the bidding process required of public agencies.

Thank You.

Chestine Edgar

CFTR:04/04/11

To the Burien Planning Commission
To the Burien City Council
Re Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan
March 21, 2011

To the Burien Planning Commission;

This letter is in response to the March 22, 2011 Planning Commission packet-City of Burien /Request for Qualifications to do the Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) plan. I have several concerns related to the information contained in this RFP. They are as follows;

1. The RFP was put out to only a short list of providers and even then the RFP is so specifically written that it appears that it is written for a specific provider. The specifics of the sections on the timelines, survey and draft and final draft documents task sections are what my conclusion is drawn from. This RFP was put out with such short timelines that it suggests that only a contractor that had previously worked with the city would have the time to research and prepare a proposal for this project. **For that reason, this does not seem to be an open and competitive bid process on a public project valued at \$70,000.**
2. **Task 300-page 5-** fails to include interviews with a groups of stakeholders that in close proximity to the parks and open spaces. **It completely overlooks their observations and concerns about parks that impact their immediate neighborhoods, private property and quality of life.**
3. **Task 400- page 5-** suggests that **just the 450 households that are surveyed will form the consensus of this plan. It seems very strange that the input from the other citizen involvement would not also be considered to develop the consensus for the plan also.**
4. **There is no mention of public hearings when this plan is before the Planning Commission or City Council for consideration or adoption.** Again, that seems to be a strange omission in what is supposed to be an open government planning process.
5. **This RFP and intended city plan speaks to inventorying and setting a priority list for acquisition and development of park lands and open spaces in the city. The part of the city that is east of Ambaum is very limited in the number of parks that it currently has.** I find it very strange the city have just given up its and the citizens vested rights to at least 70+ acres of park, open space and public use lands to the Port of Seattle in the NERA neighborhood with no compensation for the relinquishment of these vested rights. The passage of Ordinance 551 gave up the Burien citizens vested rights to this land for open space, parks and public use. **If we did not need that land east of Ambaum for open space, parks and public space, why is the city now talking about acquiring and needing more park and open space land? Rose Clark/Council Member has spoken on numerous occasions about had badly the eastside of the city needs more parks. Plainly state, we just gave away 70+ acres of land designated for park and open space use and now in this new plan we are talking about how to acquired new lands for parks and open space-this does not make sense.**

In conclusion, I am concerned that this RFP is not really an open bid process on a public project and that portions of this RFP do not include appropriate levels of public participation. Lastly the relinquishing of lands that were in the Comp Plan for public use being converted to commercial use concerns me especially when these lands still appear to be needed by the citizens for parks and open spaces. I did speak against Ordinance 551-Amendment 2010-1 when it was up this board.

Sincerely,
Chestine Edgar