

Below are our comments on the draft RFP for the Fort Ward Master Plan, based on the draft from Laura Durham and the one from Tom Fulton. Our comments primarily focus on items III and Item VI of the draft RFP. Our general comments and questions are in **orange**, suggested additions in **blue**, and suggested deletions are strike-outs in **black**.

Linda Ries and Ellen Stanton

**Our comments on Tom Fulton's additions.** The Scope of work should be considered what we expect as an outcome or result. Some of Tom's additions may be considered as process or resources, not desired outcomes. We feel that most of the additional items are not needed as the professionalism of a contractor should be expected as part of the selection process. In addition the information we are assembling in chapters should be used as resources not necessarily within the main body of the management plan. Items like #5 – including guiding documents don't make sense. For example, storm water mitigation plan could be referred to as guidance but a tree inventory should be considered as a resource or reference. The information we have previously collected should be incorporated as appropriate within the master plan.

### III. Scope of Work

In recognition of the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Civil War (2011-2015), this request for proposal anticipates integration of historic context and contemporary goals (**NOTE: what are contemporary goals??**) with current information so that Fort Ward and its resources may be sustained, maintained and interpreted. It is anticipated that a response proposal to this request will include an inventory based analysis of existing conditions as well as both natural and cultural resources; code compliance, identification of threats and opportunities and prioritized Outcomes and recommendations. Extensive public input is expected to be a part of a community-based project process. (**Note: Tom wanted to strike this previous sentence, but we feel it is essential to keep it in the RFP. Formal input should include not just a public meetings but surveys by current park users at the park during various times of the week**)

It is anticipated that the Park Management plan will ultimately:

1. Serve as a ~~guide and policy~~ **policy and guide** document for current and future park staff, other partnering agencies, elected officials, and interested members of the public.

2. **Identify all stakeholders that are affected by management and use of the park.**

~~Guide~~ **Balance** management of natural, cultural, and recreational resources as well as **define** needed actions to mitigate any adverse effects.

3. Provide a framework for monitoring, preserving, protecting, and maintaining resources at the park, including the earthwork fort, archaeological resources, interments, **natural features** and ~~basic~~ landscape management of the park.

4. Identify park enhancement opportunities including possible upgrades related to historical education and interpretation, recognition and demarcation of graves/cemeteries, park facilities, museum **additions and** improvements, recreation infrastructure, public accessibility and plantings, etc. **Suggest appropriate themes to give the park a more consistent look and feel and increase aesthetic quality of the park.**

5. Provide estimates of probable costs and overall project priority. Provide costs for future work phases based on anticipated Consumer Price Index adjustments. **Integrate sustainable practices.**

6. Serve as a guide for future park budget allocations and annual funding requests.

## **VI. Citizen Input and Participation**

Under B, General Public and Appointed Bodies. Comments elicited through surveys from people actively using the park should be utilized in writing the master plan.

Under C, Final Approval

Draft master plan documents will be reviewed and approved by the Ad Hoc Advisory Group at regular intervals and prior to submission to the Alexandria City Council.