

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 Destination St. Pete Pier

1. Please demonstrate how the identified modes of transportation on the approach and pier head can adequately serve the proposed programs within the building from an operations, safety and logistics standpoint. This question emanates from the unique features of a restaurant in the building, cars, pedestrians, bicycles, tram and valet services utilizing the approach and building access limitations including the width of the approach bridge.
2. Notwithstanding many concept details to be addressed during schematic and preliminary design, please elaborate on the buildings feasibility to adequately incorporate the “back of house” support space for anticipated programs.
3. Given the likely high occupant loads of the pier building based on the proposed uses and peak occasions, please demonstrate how the proposed number and width of the pedestrian access bridges would meet egress requirements from the pier building.
4. 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 possible need to expand the approach to accommodate traffic and also about unforeseen costs associated with reusing the existing structure. If these concerns turn out to be well-founded and costs are indeed underestimated, which program elements would you eliminate first in order to stay on budget?
-

1. I'm concerned about the lack of shade and rain protection at the drop-off at the pier head. Is there room for a protective structure and seating for those who are waiting for a tram/trolley/valet? How much would this cost?
2. How long is the 12 foot wide bridge that serves as the main entrance to the pyramid? I'm concerned about how narrow and unprotected this approach is.
3. Is there room for bump-outs for trolleys and trams at the pier head (like those along the pier approach) where vehicles could get out of traffic for loading and unloading? Is there room for a second lane of traffic at the turnaround loop?
4. Is there any potential for allowing trams/trolleys/wedding limos/etc. to drive around the main deck loop to the back entrance where the bridge is wider, shorter and better covered by the pyramid overhang?
5. How many restrooms (and actual toilet fixtures) are available within the pyramid itself? Where are these located?
6. Where is the "back of house" space to support the casual restaurant in the pyramid, along with the ice cream shop, and sunset grill? Will service vehicles be able to drive to the party deck? If not, how will the grill and ice cream shop be restocked and garbage removed?
7. How many people can comfortably sit on the event lawn at the NE corner of the pier head? (I see 150 in some documentation and 600 in others. I'm not sure what the correct number is after the value engineering was done).
8. How many toilet fixtures at the bait shop?
9. Can a window washing arm lift reach the lower glass levels where the arm would be parallel to the water surface and extend a considerable distance.

-
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 11th, 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 the size and function of the Grill at Spa Beach.
8. The City has raised significant concerns regarding driving on the pier as planned in your proposal, noting issues regarding queuing, use conflicts, access by emergency vehicles, etc. Please detail how traffic patterns will work in your concept, noting any changes or resulting budget implications of the need for additional structure to support a wider vehicular approach.
9. Please confirm how all back of house operations will be addressed for all functions proposed at the pier head.
10. In your opinion, what is the driver of the identity of a renovated pier?

-
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. Provide clarity on the integration of vehicular traffic and how it will interface with pedestrians and ensure safety

6. How would the vehicular access management be envisioned?