

From: [Jacob Patterson](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Public Comment -- 9/11/23 CC Mtg., Item No. 8B
Date: Friday, September 08, 2023 2:03:01 PM

City Council [via BCC],

I have mixed feelings about this agenda item. On the one hand, the recommended firm seems appropriate, particularly because of their landscape architecture expertise, but I would like to see the proposals included in the agenda materials so you (and the public) can actually have something to evaluate rather than just assuming that staff did an adequate job evaluating the proposals (staff might have had different considerations than you would as well). For example, there could be significant details that are problematic but if the relevant documents are not provided for review, you can't make informed decisions. In fact, I think that the Council or at least some of you have asked staff to include RFP responses for agenda items like this. Why is that not being done? Can they be added to the packet prior to the meeting?

Regarding the substance, I think the contract should include alternatives because the preliminary design in the excerpt from the recommended firm includes a couple of items that are contingent on things happening but which might not happen. If they design assuming everything will align with that but something differs, we will likely have to pay them again to revise the plans. Addressing those possibilities up front is simply a better contracting practice.

Specifically, I am speaking about the City's remodel and use of the Veterans' Building. I understand the County is in the process of evaluating transferring surplus property but I don't think that has actually occurred yet. The City Council certainly hasn't formally accepted any property transfers so what happens if that doesn't come to pass for one reason or another?

The other contingent item is the all-weather soccer field. I think that portion needs to have alternative design options for several reasons. First, the City adopted the Bainbridge Park Master Plan as the planning document for park redevelopment and it does not include that component. Although a Council majority has informally expressed support to add an all-weather soccer field to the park, no one has taken any action to amend the Bainbridge Park Master Plan. The Council certainly has the power to do so but you actually have to do that in order to build out the park in a manner that is consistent with the master plan. Second, that may trigger environmental review if it will use artificial turf because there have been many studies that have shown artificial turf can be dangerous and unhealthy, particularly for children, and exposing future users to health hazards can be a significant environmental impact under CEQA. (There also might be light and glare concerns depending on the lighting details.) That was not studied when the Bainbridge Park Master Plan was adopted by a prior City Council because it was not a component of the master plan--I assume the City relied on a CEQA exemption but that might not apply to a significant change like replacing natural grass open space with artificial turf that can cause cancer. Why would we pay a firm to design the park around a component that might end up having issues and which is not consistent with the Bainbridge Park Master Plan? I think alternative designs need to be considered (e.g., using natural turf) and that should also happen up front and should be incorporated into the contract terms.

Regards,

--Jacob