

# REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION



BOARD MEETING DATE: December 13, 2007

TITLE: **PARK PROGRAMS – SCHEMATIC DESIGN PRIORITIES**

  
Interim Chief Executive Officer

## **RECOMMENDED ACTION**

1. Approve Park Programs listed in Part I of Attachment A for advancement through Steps 2 and 3 of the Program Selection Process<sup>1</sup> and incorporation into Schematic Design.
2. Approve the Park Programs listed in Attachment B for feasibility studies and return to the Great Park Board of Directors with the study findings for further direction.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Great Park Design Studio (Design Studio) was tasked with creating a structure and process for evaluating park programs to determine their suitability for inclusion in Schematic Design. (For the purposes of this report, park “programs” refers to any activity, use and/or feature that could be included in the park). Beginning with a Vision Statement and Guiding Principles, the Design Studio developed a Program Selection Framework and evaluation criteria to serve as a basis for the program assessments. The Design Studio reviewed over 100 program concepts that were proposed by the Board of Directors, stakeholder groups, through public outreach efforts, and by the designers themselves. The programs were researched by the Design Studio and analyzed and rated by an evaluation team.

The Park Programs that are recommended for Schematic Design by the evaluation team are listed in Attachment A. Programs in Part I of Attachment A can be advanced through Steps 2 and 3 of the Program Selection Process and incorporated into Schematic Design. Programs in Part II require more study and/or proposals before they can be promoted for further design.

---

<sup>1</sup> STEP 1: DOES IT WORK? An examination of the relationship of the Park Programs to value criteria.  
STEP 2: HOW WILL IT WORK? An examination of the Park Program from the perspective of capital and operations costs; cost/benefit relationships; location and traffic/parking and EIR implications.  
STEP 3: WHERE IS IT LOCATED? An examination of the Park Program’s compatibility with adjacent uses.

The Design Studio is proposing to conduct feasibility studies on those programs in Part II of Attachment A that they consider to warrant prioritization. These programs are identified in Attachment B as Priority Programs. Also proposed for feasibility studies are the National Archives and Orangewood Foundation programs, not included in Attachment A because they are specific proposals rather than general program concepts. The remaining Park Programs in Part II of Attachment A that are not being recommended for further design at this time, may be represented on the Schematic Design with a "bubble" or placeholder until further information is available.

## **STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES**

### **Background**

At their meeting of July 24, 2007, the Irvine City Council authorized the City Manager to execute a contract with the Great Park Design Studio for Schematic Design and related services. The contract Scope of Services requires the Design Studio to "develop a comprehensive structure for the selection of the Park Features and Programming to be included in the Great Park."

On September 27, 2007, the Corporation Board of Directors approved a Vision Statement, Guiding Principles, and Framework for Park Program Selection. The Design Studio was directed to initiate an analysis of park programs, to prioritize programs for inclusion in Schematic Design, and to return to the Board with recommendations.

At a study session on November 8, 2007, the Design Studio presented the methodology that would be used in the Park Programs Selection Process and discuss how it would be applied in evaluating specific programs. In a second study session on November 29, 2007, the Design Studio presented preliminary results of the Program Selection Process and indicated that they would return to the Board with program priorities for Schematic Design in December.

### **Park Program Selection Process**

#### **Step 1: Does it work?**

Step 1 of the Park Program Selection Process has been completed and a report on the process and findings is contained in *Orange County Great Park: Program Evaluation Summary* (Attachment C).

Over 60 program uses and features were evaluated by a team of professionals to determine whether they were suitable for the Great Park. Using an evaluation framework and assessment criteria approved by the Corporation Board of Directors in September, the programs were studied to determine how well they related to value indicators associated with design, health, culture, community service, recreation, education, and environment.

The evaluation process began with researching the proposed program concepts and compiling information related to design, operations, sustainability, capital cost, parking, location, precedents, and constituencies. Using the research data, the team members examined each program from the perspective of their area of expertise using the value indicators. Once the initial evaluations were completed, the team convened to discuss the results. This group review included another level of analysis. Programs were examined to determine their potential intensity of use and ability to fit into a balanced park-wide program system.

Ultimately, the programs were assigned ratings reflecting their relative connection to each of the value criteria (described in Attachment C). Programs showing connection to and/or compatibility with the value criteria are recommended by the evaluation team for advancement to Steps 2 and 3 of the Program Selection Process. These recommended programs are listed in Part I in Attachment A.

**Step 2: How will it work?**

**Step 3: Where is it located?**

With the Board's approval, the Great Park Design Studio is prepared to advance the park programs listed in Part I of Attachment A through the Schematic Design once they are vetted through Steps 2 and 3 of the Program Evaluation Process. In Step 2, programs will be studied to determine their financial feasibility and potential impacts with regard to the City's regulatory framework and the Great Park's Environmental Impact Report. Some of the issues addressed in Step 2 include: capital costs for construction, cost/benefit comparisons, operations costs, operational models, location and impacts to regulatory framework, traffic and EIR implications.

In Step 3, the programs will be considered in terms of their fit within the Park. Questions asked will include: Is the program compatible with the Fields & Memorial Park, Habitat Park or Canyon Park? Is it compatible with adjacent uses?

Once this last phase of the evaluation is completed, the program will be ready to move forward through the design process. The Board will have the opportunity to review the design progress at the 70% Milestone.

### **Priority Program Feasibility Studies**

Part II of Attachment A includes recommended programs that require more study, more direction from the Board and/or proposals from developers/operators before they can be advanced through the Schematic Design process. The Design Studio is seeking direction from the Board to proceed with feasibility studies for those programs in Part II of Attachment A considered to be priorities. Those programs are described in Attachment B.

Programs in Part II of Attachment A that are not being recommended for feasibility studies, will not be further analyzed at this time unless otherwise directed by the Board. The Design Studio may show these programs as a "bubble" on the Schematic Design until further information is available.

Specific scopes of work and budgets for each feasibility study will be developed if the Board adopts Recommended Action #2. Following are examples of the types of questions that may be addressed in a feasibility study:

#### Entitlements

Does the program fit into the Master Plan as approved? If not, what is the scope of the change?

Does the program fit within the current EIR parameters? If not, what is the scope of the change?

What is the scope of the approvals / permits to facilitate the development?

#### Site Planning

What are the acreage requirements?

What district does the program fit in?

Are there complementary elements that can occupy the same space or have overlap?

#### Backbone Utility Requirements

What are the basic internal utility requirements?

What are the utilities that need to be delivered to the site and how does that impact the current design?

#### Benefits

What are the benefits to the park as a whole?

What are the benefits to the community?

Would the program compromise any other regional efforts in place?

#### Cost

What are the implementation costs?

What are the operational costs and who bears the responsibility?

#### Business Plan

Is there a beneficial relationship between the proposed program and core park elements and/or districts?

Is there base park development required to be in place prior to funding proceeding with the proposed program?

Is there a business plan in place?

What is the source of funding?

Are the funds readily available or are funds available conditionally?

What are the major obstacles? Solutions?

Will this be a public/private partnership?

### **Public Outreach and Research**

To assist the Board of Directors with their decisions regarding the selection of park programs, the Design Studio contracted with Dr. Robert Meadow, a partner in the Washington, D.C. based polling firm of Lake Research Partners, to prepare a survey to reveal the public's interests and preferences with respect to park

features and uses. The survey was made available on the Corporation's website the week of December 1 – 8, 2007 and was also distributed at an Open House event held on December 1 and 2, 2007. Over 500 surveys were collected at the event and another 1300 were completed online.

A complete report on the survey and the survey results is anticipated to be ready for distribution to the Board of Directors at their December 13, 2007 meeting.

### **Future Program Evaluations**

It is recommended that the Corporation employ an evaluation process similar to the one used for screening programs for Schematic Design to assess programs for later phases of the Park's design and development. A Proposal Evaluation Questionnaire (Attachment D) has been prepared for use in the future. A regular schedule of proposal review should be included as part of the phasing plan.

### **FISCAL IMPACT**

The implementation of Recommended Action # 2, performing Priority Program Feasibility Studies for programs listed in Attachment B, is expected to require a change order. While a Scope of Work and cost will need to be negotiated, the Design Studio's initial estimate for the work is 25% to 50% of the contingency fund. The contingency fund currently contains \$2.6 million.

Should the Board initiate the Priority Programs Feasibility Studies and subsequently decide to include any of the programs into the Schematic Design, there may be additional costs incurred by the Design Studio for redesign. These potential costs will be noted in the Priority Programs Feasibility Studies to assist the Board in its decision-making process. Every effort will be made to include selected programs within the existing budget.

### **ALTERNATIVES**

The Chief Executive Officer (CEO) has the authority to negotiate the Scopes of Work related to the studies and execute the changes to the Design Studio contract and budget. Alternatively, the Board may direct the CEO to return to the Board for approval of the recommended Scopes of Work and budgets.

Report prepared by:                      Marsha Burgess, Manager of Public Affairs,  
Orange County Great Park Corporation

**Attachments:**

- A. Programs Recommended for Schematic Design**
- B. Priority Program Feasibility Studies**
- C. Orange County Great Park: Program Evaluation Summary**
- D. Evaluation of Proposal: Questionnaire**

## **Attachment A**

### **PARK PROGRAMS RECOMMENDED FOR SCHEMATIC DESIGN**

#### **Part I. Programs recommended for Program Evaluation Steps 2 & 3**

##### **SPORTS + RECREATION**

Badminton Courts  
Basketball Courts  
Bark Parks  
Bike Criterium Course (event)  
Bike Trials Course (event)  
Bocce Courts  
Camping Sites for Small Groups  
Casting Pond  
Chess Tables  
Cross Country Running Course  
Equestrian Trails + Rest Stop  
Exercise Circuit  
Frontenis  
Geo-caching  
Horseshoe Pitches  
Lawn Bowling  
Meditation Gardens: Tai Chi / Yoga / Reflexology Path  
Playgrounds for Tots / Children / Youth  
Sand Volleyball Courts  
Soccer Fields (Pick up Fields)  
Softball Diamonds  
Star Gazing Room(s)  
Tennis Courts  
Trails: Hiking / Walking / Bike / Running  
Youth Baseball Diamonds

##### **CULTURAL + SOCIAL**

Butterfly House  
Farmer's Market  
Outdoor Performance Spaces

##### **ECOLOGICAL, INTERPRETIVE, + EDUCATIONAL**

Aviary/Hummingbird Haven  
Community Gardens  
Community Supported Agriculture (CSA)  
Edible Landscape  
Field-to-Fork Agriculture  
Heritage Agriculture  
Nature Trails + Overlooks + Bird Watching

##### **OPERATIONAL**

Park Transportation: Bicycle Stations

## **Part II. Programs that require further study and/or proposals**

### **SPORTS + RECREATIONAL**

Aquatic Center: Olympic / Wading / Diving Pools  
Climbing: Rock Climbing + Ropes Course + Zip Line  
Day Camp  
Field House / Gymnasium / Community Center  
Paddle Boats + Rowboats  
Skateboarding (Skate Park / Street Skating)  
Special Attractions: Miniature Railroad / Carousel / Model Boat Basin + Others  
Swimming Lagoon  
Water Park  
Wave Pool

### **CULTURAL + SOCIAL**

Amphitheater  
Arts Incubator  
Botanical Garden  
    Nature Discovery Gardens  
    California Native Garden  
    Multicultural Gardens  
    Home Gardens  
    Children's Discovery Garden  
    Vineyards/Industry Focus  
    Event Spaces  
    Interactive Workshop Space  
    Botanic Garden Visitors' Center + Store  
    Conference Center  
    Café  
    Restaurant  
    Skybar  
Center for Community Organizations  
Cinematic Theater  
Environmental Art / Installation Art  
Library  
Military History  
Multicultural Center  
Museum(s)  
Outdoor Cinema  
Specialty Museum(s)  
Tea House  
Arts Expo (Munster/Documenta)

### **ECOLOGICAL, INTERPRETIVE, + EDUCATIONAL**

Living History Village  
Living Park Center: Citizen Scientist + Research / Visitor's / Education / Nature Center +  
    Residency Program  
Visitors Center

### **OPERATIONAL**

Events + Festivals

## **Attachment B**

### **Priority Program Feasibility Studies**

#### **Sports + Recreational**

##### **Equestrian Center**

A facility devoted to horsemanship possibly featuring boarding stalls, training rings, outdoor and indoor show arenas, grass fields, riding academy, professional trainers, and vehicular access for horse trailers.

##### **Sports Park**

To understand the potential for public/private partnerships in realizing the vision for the Great Park Sports Park, and to identify the key issues related to programs and uses within the Sports Park such as the field house, and aquatic center.

##### **Water Park**

An amusement park that features water play areas, such as water slides, splash pads, spray grounds, lazy rivers, or other recreational bathing or swimming. Water Parks typically includes concession stands and changing rooms.

#### **Cultural + Social**

##### **Amphitheater**

A vibrant outdoor performance space at the Great Park uses the park's landscape as the backdrop and provides a venue for the community to enjoy a variety of music and theatrical performances.

##### **Botanical Garden + Demonstration Garden**

A place of beauty and learning that advances the relationship between people, plants, and the natural environment by enriching landscapes, nurturing the variety and abundance of plant and animal life, promoting healthy stewardship of the land, and creating a template for a healthy, sustainable future.

##### **Center for Community Organizations**

A multi-tenant center for nonprofit organizations, consisting of a building or campus where community organizations are located to benefit from mutual cooperation and interaction.

##### **Great Park Sculpture Project (Munster)**

A globally oriented exhibition of outdoor, site-specific sculpture and art installations on a rotating basis every five years, commissioning 10 or 15 pieces of which two or three could be kept permanently; the first phase could include funding three site specific embedded works.

**Library**

A collection of information, sources, resources, and services organized for use by the public proposed as an anchor-institution on the Cultural Terrace; this facility could be a significant resource to the surrounding Communities.

**Military Heritage Museum**

A facility recognizing the importance of the military history on this land, the people who made that history and the importance of the infrastructure inherited from the El Toro Marine Airbase – which could include an Eternal Flame, the Veteran’s Memorial, an outdoor installation of military aircraft, and equipment.

**Multicultural Center**

A community center providing an opportunity to celebrate the rich diversity of cultures in Southern California. - the goal is to make these cultures and their histories be a vibrant element in the Great Park for people from all walks of life and all parts of the world to learn, celebrate, and share through cultural experiences.

**National Archive**

A facility for the National Archives and Records Administration that safeguards and preserves important documents for the United States Federal Government; a place primarily for the public to view exhibits of documents with historical significance and national interest and, possibly, document storage.

**Ecological, Interpretive, Educational****The Agriculture Plan**

Central to the legacy of Orange County’s agricultural history, food and agriculture programs at the Great Park include a Community Farm and other agricultural features. These will be at the forefront of urban agriculture by creating a new model for urban farms providing opportunities for education, food growth, and well-being for the county.

**Orangewood Academy**

A comprehensive high school campus with comprehensive education and boarding facilities at the Great Park, dedicated to foster the youth population of Orange County. Depending on the location of the facility, the academy could use athletic facilities at the park.

**Visitors Center**

The Great Park Visitor’s Center is a facility to orient visitors to the park’s programs and features - the recreational, sustainability, ecological and cultural dimensions of the park will be highlighted. The purpose of the facility is to allow park visitors to better understand what the park has to offer and what choices are available to visitors on any given day for events, festivals and daily activities.

**Attachment C**

**Orange County Great Park: Program Evaluation Summary**

**ON FILE WITH THE CLERK OF THE BOARD**

## Attachment D

### Evaluation of Proposals: Questionnaire

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

1. **Proposed Program:** Describe proposed program for the Orange County Great Park including mission statement.
2. **Applicant:** \_\_\_\_\_
3. **Contact Information:**
  - a. Contact Person, Title
  - b. Organization/Contracting Entity
  - c. Address
  - d. Phone Number
  - e. Fax Number
  - f. Email Address
4. **Appropriateness:** Describe how this proposal is aligned with the guiding principles and vision of the Great Park.
5. **Key Design Criteria:**
  - a. Please attach conceptual site plan, if available.
  - b. Provide area required.
  - c. Describe critical dimensions.
  - d. Describe access required.
  - e. Describe parking required.
  - f. Describe traffic impacts.
  - g. Describe issues related to public safety, if any.
6. **Precedents:**
  - a. Describe similar facilities/programs existing and/or proposed locally, regionally and/or nationally.
  - b. Please attach plans or photos, drawings of examples.
7. **Operational Criteria:**
  - a. Describe staffing and operations requirements.
  - b. Describe outsourcing scenarios, if applicable.
  - c. Describe anticipated hours of operation.
  - d. Describe maintenance expectations.
  - e. Describe anticipated life of program elements.
  - f. Describe necessary equipment to support the program, if applicable.
8. **Market Research:** Provide justification for the proposed program:
  - a. Please provide feasibility study results to include the following in summary:
  - b. Anticipated demand/audience (Constituency for the Program), including visitor projections for the first five years of operation.
  - c. Competing area programs (direct and indirect). Please provide proximity to nearest similar program.
  - d. Expected lifespan of the program.

**9. Construction Costs:**

- a. Anticipated cost to build in current fiscal year values.
- b. Describe primary construction/cost elements.
- c. Describe funding source(s) for construction.
- d. Anticipated duration of construction from pulling the permit to completion to occupancy/use by constituency.
- e. Describe proposed means of budget management.

**10. Operating + Maintenance Costs:**

- a. Anticipated annual operating costs in dollars and maintenance costs for first 5 years of operation.
- b. Describe primary cost elements.
- a. Describe funding source(s) for operations and maintenance.
- d. Describe proposed means of budget management.

**11. Cost/Benefit:**

- a. Is program for profit or non-profit?
- b. Anticipated annual revenue in current fiscal year values, and anticipated annual revenues for the first five years of operation.
- c. Anticipated years of operation.
- d. Names of owners or directors.
- e. Describe meetings you or your representatives have had with Corporation staff, Park Directors or Design Studio staff. Please provide dates, names and meeting notes if applicable.