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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

It is acknowledged that the report presented here includes a substantial amount of information for consideration and is intended to provide the reader with an understanding of the issues and challenges involved in making a decision about the future of the Pier. In reviewing all of the information provided, the following findings and recommendations are considered to be the most significant:

- The existing Pier Head and Approach is approaching the end of its useful life and will need to be replaced in the near future.
- Before determining if the City should make an investment that involves retaining the inverted pyramid, substantial analysis is required to ensure the worthiness of such an investment.
- A causeway alternative was explored for replacement of the Pier Approach, and it has been determined that this alternative would present challenges in both construction cost and permitting feasibility/scheduling requirements.
- Ample public input was received, and from those comments, there was a split regarding renovating the current Pier and creating a new Pier.
- Although a new Pier will result in operating efficiencies and improved financial performance, it is likely that the Pier will continue to require some level of subsidy support from the City.
- The building should be an iconic structure, with programming starting as close to the upland as possible to provide a seamless connection to the City with comfortable walking distances.
- The amount of leasable space versus community space and common areas provided in the new Pier Building directly impacts the amount of revenue and resulting subsidy support required.
- The amount of development over water, total amount of building square footage, and proximity of parking areas to activity program areas also have impact on the financial support required by the City.
- The Pier needs to be a destination, regionally and internationally. The Pier program selected focuses on restaurants and other food service programming. This approach was found to be most successful in pier case studies reviewed and affords waterfront views and gathering spots for the community.
- There is great potential for an upland based family entertainment/amusement type of project, which could generate additional demand for retail and restaurant business.
- There is a lack of boating access to the Pier/Upland areas. Transient docks should be considered as a future enhancement.
INTRODUCTION

As a result of prior workshops and Pier studies performed over the years, City Council and the Board of County Commissioners approved an amendment to the City's Intown Redevelopment Plan in 2005 to provide $50 million in Tax Increment Financing (TIF) funds to rebuild the Pier Approach, Pier Head, and related Pier improvements. The majority of these funds, $45 million, will not be available until 2012.

In March 2009, the Mayor and City Council of St. Petersburg selected a 20 member Task Force to analyze the St. Petersburg Pier following a community visioning process. The Pier Advisory Task Force, selected based on business experience and community involvement, embarked on a lengthy analysis of not only the current Pier but its history during the 14-month, 63 meeting review including site studies, market analysis and financial review.

Following objectives laid out by the Mayor and City Council, four subcommittees were created to delve further into critical areas. Ultimately, the Task Force was able to get both direct and indirect feedback from the citizens and visitors of St. Petersburg via public forums on alternatives that were identified. Additional input via emails from the public were distributed to the Task Force, and a number of citizens spoke during open forums held at every meeting. This report includes recommendations both broad and specific, and should be used as a tool towards the next step, “taking the process from vision to design” as outlined in the Task Force objectives.

The following consultants were utilized by the Task Force throughout this project:

- Bermello Ajamil & Partners, Lead Consultant, Miami, FL
- Moffatt & Nichol, Engineering, Tampa, FL
- Lambert Advisory, Market & Economic Analysis, Miami, FL
- Professional Services Inc., Property Condition Assessment, Orlando, FL
OVERVIEW

The recommendations of the Pier Advisory Task Force included in this report are intended to be used as a resource to assist the City in taking the Pier redevelopment project from a community vision to the design process.

The main components of the recommendations presented include:

♦ Summary and evaluation of the existing condition of the Pier Building and Approach
♦ Description of the Pier redevelopment project area and its components
♦ Presentation of four alternatives for redevelopment of the Pier and two concepts for redevelopment of the adjacent upland area
♦ Summary of the advantages and disadvantages of each alternative recommended
♦ Estimated construction costs of each Pier alternative
♦ Discussion of a causeway for the Pier Approach and outline of the perceived benefits and challenges of this concept
♦ Projected general timeline for the completion of the project
♦ General programming guidelines for the Pier and adjacent Upland area
♦ Broad design concepts for the Pier Building, Approach and Upland area
♦ Ideas to improve Pier accessibility and transportation
♦ Suggestions for funding of the Pier redevelopment project

In preparing their recommendations, the Task Force utilized public input received from the community, as well from their own study of the data outlined in this report. The plans presented for the redevelopment of the Pier and adjacent upland area were coordinated with City's 1987 waterfront park plan and are intended to complement the accomplishments made by the City to date.
OBJECTIVES

In December 2008, the Mayor and City Council developed the objectives for the Pier Advisory Task Force, the members of which were selected in March 2009. The objectives outlined below are intended to provide direction and frame the discussion for this most important portion of the City.

TASK FORCE OBJECTIVES

- Create action plan to take the project from community vision to design process
- Provide multiple redevelopment alternatives including construction costs and business proformas associated with each scenario
- Evaluate economic viability and feasibility of design alternatives for each business model including base case scenario utilizing existing funding available
- Utilize current community input and solicit additional community feedback during evaluation process
- Identify funding concepts for each design alternative
- Coordinate with City’s Waterfront Plan
- Minimize Operating subsidy

Discussion Topics and Presentations

- Pier Visioning Overview
- Waterfront Master Plan
- Codes & Land Use
- Other Piers & Waterfront Parks
- Charter Restrictions/Past Referendums
- Pier Park Review (1984 Alternative)
- Site Tours
- Historical Pier Design
- Plaza Parkway/Streetscape Program
- Marinas
- Transportation & Parking
- Market & Economic Development
- Marine Discovery Center
- Dock Facilities
- Sailing Center
- Maritime Museum/Aircraft Carrier
- International Pier
Background & Analysis
The City of St. Petersburg has always had a pier. The City’s first pier dates back to 1889, when the Orange Belt Railway constructed the “Railroad Pier” as a railway-accessible sightseeing and recreational resort for locals and tourists. Several piers followed, and the most significant was arguably the “Million Dollar” pier with construction completed in 1926. Its Mediterranean revival architecture was significant, but more relevant for this analysis is that many of its original Pier Approach and Pier Head pilings are still being utilized by the current pier and their deteriorating condition is the genesis for this entire project.

- 1889 - Railroad Pier built off of Demen’s Landing, a sightseeing resort for locals and tourists
- 1906 - Electric Pier along 2nd Avenue N, extending 3,000 feet into the bay
- 1913 - First Municipal Pier - Voters approved a $40,000 bond to build next to the Electric Pier
- 1921 - Hurricane destroys all piers
- 1926 - Million Dollar Pier opens
- 1967 - 41-year old Million Dollar Pier Building demolished
- 1967-73 - Pier closed for renovations
- 1973 - Inverted Pyramid opens

The City's first pier dates back to 1889, when the Orange Belt Railway constructed the “Railroad Pier” as a railway-accessible sightseeing and recreational resort for locals and tourists. Several piers followed, and the most significant was arguably the “Million Dollar” pier with construction completed in 1926. Its Mediterranean revival architecture was significant, but more relevant for this analysis is that many of its original Pier Approach and Pier Head pilings are still being utilized by the current pier and their deteriorating condition is the genesis for this entire project.
PIER STUDY AREA

Given the unique physical location of the Pier Approach, Pier Head and Building as it relates to the bay and city’s waterfront edge, it was determined in the early stages of the pier visioning process that the project site or “Pier Visioning Area” needed to include the following components:

PIER BUILDING
The Pier Building consists of both the distinctive 5 story “inverted pyramid” structure and the single story commercial retail spaces that surround the base of the inverted pyramid building. The total gross square footage of Pier Building is approximately 78,900 square feet, with 49,800 square feet of leasable space.

PIER HEAD
The Pier Head consists of the rectangular pier base that surrounds the Pier Building. It’s overall dimensions are 426 feet long x 300 feet wide (2.9 acres). The existing building footprint (44,049 square feet) encompasses 34.5% of the total Pier Head footprint.

PIER APPROACH
The Pier Approach provides vehicular and pedestrian linkage between the upland area and Pier Head/Building. It’s overall dimensions are 100 feet wide and 1,026 feet long (2.3 acres).

UPLAND AREA
The upland area totals approximately 21 acres and is divided into three parcels:

A. WEST PARCEL
Connects directly back to the city and includes the Museum of History, north Pier parking lot and primary vehicular roadway to the pier. The west parcel borders the North (Vinoy) Basin and Central Basin.

B. SOUTH PARCEL
Includes the south Pier parking lot, primary vehicular roadway to the pier and some open space. The south parcel borders the mouth of the Central Basin, Pier Approach, bay and Spa Beach.

C. NORTH PARCEL
Includes most of the uplands open park space to the north. The north parcel borders the north (Vinoy) Basin, bay and Spa Beach. It also faces directly across from Vinoy Park.

VISION ESTABLISHED BY TASK FORCE

“Our vision is for a vibrant Pier Complex that appeals to both local residents and visitors throughout the year. It should speak to our city’s beautiful aquatic setting, and offer spectacular views of our cityscape and the Bay. The Pier should complement the larger downtown waterfront and serve as its front door, centerpiece, and anchor. The architecture of the main building should reflect our history and unique identity as a place and City, and be a worthy symbol of our great City.”
PIER EXISTING CONDITIONS

Structural Components of the Pier:
- Pier Building—5 story Inverted Pyramid Building
- Pier Head—426 ft. long x 300 ft. wide & 22,821 sq. feet of single story retail space
- Pier Building Foundation—Five main caisson foundations made of steel piles encased in concrete
- Pier Approach—1,026 ft. long x 100 ft. wide bridge

PIER APPROACH

There are components of the Pier Approach and Head that date back to its original 1926 construction. Today, the Pier suffers from concrete and structural deterioration due to corrosion of the reinforcing steel causing concrete spalls, cracks and delaminations. Despite repairs, superstructure elements continue to deteriorate due to the elements and age. Structural repairs have been performed at the pier across the superstructure over time, and in 2002, three major structural expansion joints were replaced. Continued general repairs do not increase the load carrying capacity of the structure, and are not seen as a viable long-term solution.

All Pier structural and support systems require continuous maintenance and repair. Although safe for general use, the last twenty years have reduced the live load capacity of the Pier Approach to a three ton limit with truck traffic now restricted to the center lane. This prohibits larger vehicles such as garbage trucks from servicing the Pier Head. These load bearing conditions were last confirmed in a report by Parsons Brinckerhoff in May 2003 (Exhibit B).

BUILDING FOUNDATION

The inverted pyramid building does not rely on the 1926 original Pier Head for support, rather it is supported by an independent foundation which consists of a “superstructure”. The Pier Task Force hired the Moffatt & Nichol firm to provide a summary evaluation of this superstructure supporting the inverted pyramid foundation (Exhibit A). This structure consists of four foundations, called caissons, which are approximately 20 feet by 20 feet square plus a fifth caisson below the elevator shaft. Moffatt & Nichol findings include:

- The first floor of the building utilizes the deck of the concrete pier constructed in the 1920s. It is important to note that the pier is approximately 50 years older than the building and associated building foundations.

- As the condition of the mass concrete and load-bearing piles could not be observed, remaining service life of the building cannot be directly calculated. However, a reasonable estimate of service life can be determined based on experience with similar structures.

- Typical marine structures are designed for a 50 year service life. Based on this assumption, since the caissons were constructed circa 1970, the structures are expected to be in serviceable condition until 2020. At the end of the estimated 50 year service life, tests are recommended to further diagnose the condition of the structure including chloride penetration tests and concrete compressive strength test of mass concrete.
PIER EXISTING CONDITIONS [Continued]

1973 - INVERTED PYRAMID

The Task Force hired the Professional Services Industries (PSI) firm to provide a property condition assessment of the inverted pyramid building. (Exhibit D). Findings include:

- The inverted pyramid central core portion of the building is approaching 40 years of age which is generally considered the expected useful life of a building.
- This generally requires gutting the existing structure and installing new finishes, mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems.
- PSI generally does not believe that renovating the existing building systems is economically feasible.

1987-88 RENOVATIONS

In August 1988, after 19 months of repair and renovation work to the original 1973 inverted pyramid building, ground floor retail space was added at a total cost of $12.5 million dollars and the Pier re-opened. From its creation in 1926, the Pier was not programmed for substantial retail at the head. This ground floor retail was added to support market demand at the time which could help offset operational costs.

The Pier continues to draw many tourists and remains an important destination and icon to the City of St. Petersburg. However, like its predecessor the Million Dollar Pier Building, after years of exposure to salt water, air and humidity, as well as constant wave action, the Pier Head and Approach (portions of which are 83 years old) are showing signs of reaching the end of their useful and productive life.

SUMMARY

- The Pier Approach and Head surrounding the inverted pyramid building require replacement. The Pier Head superstructure will also need to be replaced, which will require the removal of the existing retail space on the ground level of the Pier Building.
- The inverted pyramid building appears to be structurally sound based on cursory investigation and an assumed 50 year service life for typical marine structures. Since the structure will have achieved approximately 50 years of service life by 2020, it is recommended that the concrete encased, steel caisson foundations be tested to better determine the remaining service life of the inverted pyramid foundation.
PIER VISIONING

The Pier visioning process was implemented to develop concepts intended to serve as a guide for the renovation or replacement of the existing Pier. The first phase of the visioning process, Community Visioning, was implemented to gather input from the community, as well as the existing Tenants of the Pier. The first question that needed to be answered was “Do you want to keep the Pier?” After receiving that validation, the process continued to develop a community-based vision of what the new Pier should look like and how it should be programmed. In addition, it was important to determine how the Community wanted the Pier upland area to be utilized in conjunction with this redevelopment. Following Council’s approval of the appointment of Collaborative Labs at St. Petersburg College as a consultant, the project was underway.

The objectives of the Pier Community Visioning process were to:

- Solicit community input as to the future of the Pier, including validation of support for the future renovation or replacement of the Pier.
- Gather basic information from Pier visitors/patrons as to details of their historical use to assist in future plans for the Pier.
- Develop community-based vision of potential design criteria and concepts intended to serve as a guide for the future renovation or replacement of the Pier.
- Determine community preferences for the future intended use of the land areas supporting the Pier.

Beginning in August and concluding in December 2008, a series of four collaborative meetings were held to gather input from Pier tenants and the local community. In addition, an on-line survey was also implemented to gather input from the public who couldn’t attend the meetings. The meetings included one half-day session with existing Pier tenants and three half-day Community forum sessions held at various locations throughout the City and also at the Epicenter in Largo. Over 100 citizens attended the Pier Visioning sessions during 2008. A final written report was presented to City Council in December 2008 to review the ideas that emerged from the collaborative sessions, as well as from the online survey to date.
One of the basic objectives of the Task Force was to utilize Community input in developing these redevelopment alternatives. From the initial feedback received, opportunities for additional public input continued by including public forums at every Task Force and Subcommittee meeting.

The Pier Advisory Task Force held a total of three town-hall style public forums in January and February 2010. In addition to providing a detailed PowerPoint presentation that included a variety of design options, the hearings provided the opportunity for citizens to speak their minds on the Pier and its future.

While this was the first time the public had seen the alternatives developed to date, (Pier & Upland), there was no lack of opinion.

Approximately 300 citizens attended the 3 public forums, with 80 speakers.

The summary below generally characterizes the captured opinions as a favorable or unfavorable view of the current Pier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Input Received</th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Unfavorable</th>
<th>General Comments*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coliseum (1/19/10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enoch Davis Ctr. (2/02/10)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.W. Cate Ctr. (2/16/10)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Line Survey (thru2/06/10)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*General Comments

“General comments” are public comments that did not specifically state a favorable or unfavorable opinion of the current pier. These were broader comments regarding the pier in general.
PUBLIC ACCESSIBILITY / TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES

One of the most challenging aspects of the existing pier is its physical distance from Bay Shore Drive Northeast and the downtown edge. The entry to the existing pier bridge structure is 1,857 feet from Bay Shore Drive Northeast, the existing building almost 3,000 feet. Analysis prepared by Bermello Ajamil & Partners determined that desirable target walking distances for this project are no more than 1,250 feet for attractive, non-weather protected walking for no more than 5 minutes. Ideally, a range of 600 to 1,250 foot distances between “destinations” provides ideal walking conditions.

The Task Force explored the balance between the physical distance between the City and the Pier and the impact on views from the Pier. The farther from the City, the more difficult to access but the better the views. The closer to the City yields the opposite effect. The objective is to find an acceptable balance between easy access and great views.

Accessing the Pier, whether it be under current conditions or future development, starts with the fundamental question of “how one arrives”? The Pier Advisory Task Force analyzed vehicular driving, pedestrian walking and public conveyance determining that all types of accessibility need to be carefully accommodated for any future development, whether it be over water, on the upland or a combination of both to be successful.

- The Task Force feels a drop-off / front door style experience for optimizing accessibility by way of cars, trolleys and/or other public transportation is important.
- The creation of comfortable and attractive pedestrian walkways and pathways ensures the Pier will remain a fully integrated experience into the existing fabric of the downtown urban core, park and waterfront.
- Public conveyances should be explored as they can be used as a means to transport people from the city to the upland and Pier and can greatly enhance the overall experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Highly attractive</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5,000′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Weather protected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Climatized environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Highly attractive</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2,500′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Sidewalks protected from rain and sunshine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Attractive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,250′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Not weather protected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Unattractive (parking lot, garage, street)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>600′</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CASE STUDIES

Although the St. Petersburg Pier is truly a one of a kind pier, there are many other piers throughout the world that have become significant attractions and destinations. Understanding how other piers work and what makes them unique, successful and memorable attractions can provide additional insight on the future of the St. Petersburg Pier.

Case studies of seven substantial piers (five domestic, two international) were performed (Exhibit E). These piers were studied as each has physical, programmatic and/or other similar qualities and characteristics to the St. Petersburg Pier. The primary objective in studying other piers was to explore the following; history, size, program and their success as a destination.

These were studied not to copy or emulate, rather learn and understand what makes them special in the context of their surroundings.

CASE STUDY CONCLUSIONS
The full detail of these studies are included in Exhibit E, and some key conclusions gained included that:

- All are directly tied back into their waterfront / urban fabric
- All program starts directly at the main entry of the Pier
- All program is located throughout the entire pier
- All are true “destinations”
- All are “one of a kind and unique” relative to their adjacent surroundings
- All have either amusement type program or very specialized program as the predominant draw
- All have no more than two public levels; most program only one level
- All layouts provide short walking distances between attractions
To assist with the market and economic analysis, Lambert Advisory provided research on the regional and local market in relation to existing and alternative Pier concepts (Exhibit G). The following overriding conclusions can be drawn from this analysis with additional detail within the Appendix:

**VISITOR MIX. Local participation is mandatory.** In order for a revenue generating activity on or adjacent to the Pier to flourish, it must be attractive to both visitors and locals over the life of the Pier. A visitor attraction which brings a small number of locals to the Pier on a once-a-year basis is unlikely to support the capital and operating costs associated with enterprise activities.

**RESTAURANT & RETAIL.** Without substantial other activity which drives traffic to the Pier (i.e. entertainment use), restaurants are the only retail oriented use which can perform reasonably well on or adjacent to the Pier. There is an opportunity to support three types of food and beverage facilities going forward:

- Quick Service Restaurants (QSR) which provide the opportunity for grab-and-go at low cost for visitors;
- Destination upscale restaurants potentially with a banquet component which by being elevated would capitalize on the views back to downtown and out to the bay; and,
- Ground floor restaurants and bars which capitalize on being out on the water and adjacent to marina slips.

**PROGRAM SIZE.** It is recommend that any reconfiguration of the existing Pier structure or new structure’s on the Pier or upland be planned to accommodate between 30,000 and 40,000 square feet of restaurant, bar, and banquet space. Further expansion of this program or additional demand for retail space will depend upon other traffic generating uses driving expenditure at the Pier in the future.

**PROGRAM DYNAMICS.** There is substantial opportunity to incorporate family entertainment elements into the Pier redevelopment program, including water park type features. . . . The lack of competition in Pinellas County enhances the market potential for success.”

“Lambert Advisory

**PERFORMANCE VENUE.** While an amphitheatre style performance venue with capacity between 4,000 and 5,000 could be quite successful at the Pier, success is defined as covering operating expenses and in a Florida context, being booked between 12 and 24 days out of the year. Given the limited utilization of such a facility, it is recommended that this type of venue be considered only in conjunction with another, more heavily utilized entertainment use.
**BOATING OPPORTUNITIES.** As a result of the growth in demand for larger boats and tremendous regulatory constraints on supply, there is long term rationale for adding additional wet slips at or adjacent to the Pier for larger vessels. Additionally, transient slips and the expansion of available short term courtesy slips in the Pier area will only enhance the ability to attract and accommodate boaters who would otherwise not be able to dock adjacent to the Pier and visit associated activities on and adjacent to the Pier.

**CURRENT MARKET—OCCUPIED SPACE.** The Lambert analysis provided a variety of metrics to review the current market downtown, captured below. The Task Force ultimately selected a 36,000 square foot facility to analyze for a future project.

### Downtown Space Inventory

- **Movie Theater**: 72,000 SF
- **Pier**: 48,650 SF
- **Supermarket/Liquor Store**: 38,074 SF
- **Restaurant/Coffee Shop Bar**: 26,000 SF
- **Community/Flexible Space**: 21,201 SF
- **Retail**: 12,620 SF
- **Professional Services**: 38,228 SF
- **Salon/Beauty**: 9,787 SF
- **Food & Beverage**: 5,732 SF

Approximately 383,000 sq ft of occupied space Downtown

The following Downtown Notables are highlighted:

- $25.60/sf quoted rent for restaurant space
- $35.00/sf quoted rent for retail space
- There are more than 3,000 hotel rooms in 37 hotels/motels within 5+/- miles, 1,275 of which are Downtown
- Full service Marina

**A New Pier Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant/Banquet</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/Flexible Space</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Square footage selected by Task Force for alternatives study.

“The Pier” would not be The Pier without a pier, and thereby the City would lose a major drawing card for Downtown St. Petersburg. What the configuration, size or length of the pier is less important from a marketing/positioning perspective than the fact that a pier in some form or fashion continues to exist.
One of the primary goals of this report was to explore multiple redevelopment alternatives that allowed the Pier Advisory Task Force to consider a variety of creative ideas. This exercise was divided into two primary areas of study, Pier Alternatives and Upland Concepts.

In early January 2010, Bermello Ajamil & Partners, Inc., presented 23 initial options for consideration. These options explored a variety of both over water and upland master planning alternatives. Since the initial alternatives were presented, numerous meetings and discussions helped to narrow options even further. Throughout this process, the Task Force stayed focused on the objectives originally established by the Mayor and City Council. In the following pages you will see how the alternatives are identified while showing the advantages and disadvantages of each.

PIER ALTERNATIVES

Out of the fourteen alternatives illustrated below, four were ultimately chosen by the Task Force for further evaluation and refinement, which are illustrated on pages 18-21. These are diverse, and most meet many of the original stated objectives assigned to the Task Force by the Mayor and City Council.

Each alternative provides a framework for further development if the subject alternative is selected. All have the ability to ultimately compliment and provide further economic development and recreational enrichment for the City’s already spectacular downtown waterfront.

One program element that is consistently illustrated in all four final options is the inclusion of new transient docking located directly west of the existing breakwater and south of the Pier Approach, a necessary and important component recommended by the Task Force. Funding for the transient docks as described may be funded by the Marina as they will ultimately be responsible for the maintenance and upkeep. For options 2, 3 and 4 the new building program is directly tied to the financial target which has allocated a total of 36,000 S.F. It is however, recognized by the Task Force that additional building program may be desired per future project and program demands.
PIER ALTERNATIVE 1

Pier Option #1: Widen approach and renovate existing Inverted Pyramid building

- Pier Approach dimensions at 152’ wide X 1,026 long (matches existing length)
- Pier Head reconstructed to current dimensions
- Provide space for additional program along approach
- New design of Pier Approach will allow parking on approach
- Pier Building square footage is 78,909sf with 36,000 SF of programming

_Rough order of magnitude construction costs estimated up to $87M **_

[** Note that the cost may be reduced by narrowing portions of the pier width in certain areas or incorporating “undulations” along the approach as recommended by the Pier Task Forces’ Design Subcommittee.]

Advantages:
- Retains existing iconic Pier Building and provides maximum views of cityscape and bay
- Widens Pier Approach to accommodate program to be added along length in future phase, as demand warrants and funding becomes available
- Additional space on the 5th floor may be enclosed at a future date
- Maintains bay views

Disadvantages:
- Existing functional design flaws of Pier building will continue to present challenges to Pier operational efficiency and transportation
- Estimated cost of construction exceeds existing funding available ($50M)
- Life cycle operating and maintenance costs will be greater than other recommended options
- Permitting issues associated with net increase over submerged land and or filing of submerged land
PIER ALTERNATIVE 2

Pier Option #2: New Building, wider and shorter Pier approach

- Approach dimensions at 152’ wide X 758’ long
- New Pier Head dimensions and new Pier Buildings totaling 36,000 S.F.
- Provide additional program along Pier Approach as market warrants
- New design of Pier Approach will allow parking on approach

Rough order of magnitude construction costs estimated up to $71M **
[** Note that the cost may be reduced by narrowing portions of the pier width in certain areas or incorporating undulations along the approach]

Advantages:
- Widens Pier Approach to accommodate program to be added along length in future phase, as demand warrants and funding becomes available
- Programming along the approach will reduce negative impression of walking distance to Pier Head—walking distance overall is shortened
- Completely new design and construction of Pier will provide energy efficiencies and offer more functional operational design of building and approach, with potential for new iconic structure
- Wider and shorter approach will result in dramatic changes to appearance of Pier Approach and new Pier Building
- Provide significant view of the cityscape and bay

Disadvantages:
- Estimated cost of construction exceeds existing funding available ($50M)
- Life cycle operating and maintenance costs will be greater than on-land construction design (option #4)
- Loss of existing iconic inverted pyramid and longer pier
PIER ALTERNATIVE 3

**Pier Option #3: New Pier Building, shorter Pier Approach**
- Approach is 758’ long x 100’ wide
- New Pier Head dimensions for new building
- New Pier Building totaling 36,000 S.F.

*Rough order of magnitude construction costs estimated at $59M*

**Advantages:**
- Completely new design and construction of Pier will provide energy efficiencies and offer more functional operational design of building and approach, with potential for new iconic structure
- Reduces walking distance to Pier Head
- Adds nearby upland future program space as demand warrants and funding is available
- Lower estimated construction cost than options #1 and #2

**Disadvantages:**
- Estimated cost of construction exceeds existing funding available ($50M)
- Life cycle operating and maintenance costs will be greater than on-land construction design
- Loss of existing iconic inverted pyramid and longer pier
PIER ALTERNATIVE 4

Pier Option #4: New building on upland and new, more narrow pedestrian Pier structure

- Pedestrian pier structure to be 500’ long X 34’ wide, with distinctive structure at end
- Construct new building to allow unobstructed views from upland, along 2nd Avenue Northeast corridor
- New Pier Building totaling 36,000 S.F., iconic element at Pier Head

Rough order of magnitude construction costs estimated at $42M

Advantages:
- Negative perception of walking distance to Pier Building will be significantly reduced from elimination of Pier Approach/replacement with pedestrian pier
- Maintenance costs of Pier will be dramatically reduced from elimination of Pier Approach, as well as new Pier Building design with simple pedestrian pier, with potential for new iconic structure
- Existing project funding should be adequate to provide required resources to address all immediate needs of new Pier
- More efficient program building may be constructed which may be adjusted to different program use in the future
- This alternative would have the lowest subsidy impact

Disadvantages:
- Deviates from historical precedent of major Pier Building structure over water; may lose differentiation from other major waterfront structures
- Pier complex may no longer stand out as the centerpiece of the waterfront.
- Loss of existing iconic inverted pyramid and longer pier
- Reduced view of cityscape
CAUSEWAY INFORMATION

PIER APPROACH CONSTRUCTION ALTERNATIVES

CURRENT CONSTRUCTION. Historically, the Pier Approach, or portion that connects the upland area to the final destination or Pier Head, has always been constructed of concrete piles which allows the free flowing movement of water underneath.

CONSTRUCTION METHODOLOGY. Although this type of construction method is typical for piers and bridges, there is another construction method that was discussed by the Task Force for consideration; the construction of an in-fill causeway to link the upland to the Pier Head.

There are three types of soil retaining structures that could work for a project of this type:

- Steel sheet pile bulkheads
- Parallel concrete bulkheads
- Cellular cofferdams

The advantage of cofferdams is their mass—they are gravity structures which help resist lateral loads, and are currently used as the foundation to support the existing inverted pyramid building. While steel sheet piles are an option, parallel concrete sheet pile bulkheads would be a better alternative if funding for a cofferdam system could not be justified.

MAINTENANCE CONSIDERATION

- An analysis was performed by Moffatt & Nichol (Exhibit H) to provide a framework review of piling over water versus in-fill causeway which identified a number of issues for consideration.
- The primary reason for considering an in-fill causeway in lieu of over water pier construction is the potential to reduce future maintenance costs on the Pier Approach, however, regardless of which option is chosen, maintenance costs will still be required.

FILL MATERIALS/AVAILABILITY

- Historically, fill of quality to support the uses on a causeway is cheaper than the cost of pile construction. However, this assumes that quality fill is locally available and does not require long distance transportation, which can significantly impact cost. This is also factored by the required depth to fill, which in the case of this project, may be significant as the average water depth is approximately 12 feet.

"...no discharge of dredged or fill material shall be permitted if there is a practical alternative to the proposed discharge which would have less adverse impact on the aquatic ecosystem, so long as the alternative does not have other significant adverse environmental consequences."

Section 230.10 of the Code of Federal Regulations 40

Moffatt & Nichol

Note: The environmental permitting impact on the Pier Approach has not been assessed as of yet.
CAUSEWAY INFORMATION (continued)

PERMITTING STUDIES. Another significant issue is the ability to permit in-fill construction versus over water construction, which can add a minimum of 24 to 36 months to the project timeline following multiple study requirements which may result in permit approvals or denials. Historically in the State of Florida, the environmental permitting for over water construction is significantly faster and is preferred to an in-fill construction.

The size and impact of a potential causeway will require a variety of regulatory agency reviews, and those agencies will require the following studies, which would not be required for an in-kind pier replacement:

- Bathymetric Survey
- Environmental Resources Survey
- Wave Analysis
- Sediment Transport Analysis
- Hydraulic Model and Study for Water Quality

In 2006, Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc. (Exhibit C) studied the practicality and logistics of supporting the St. Petersburg Pier by installing concrete sheet piling around the Pier, and then filling the void under the pier with sand, thus converting the pier into a soil-supported peninsula. In the report many challenges were noted including;

- Fill cannot be taken from the bay bottom. The fill must be clean A-3 material that possesses a high permeability rate.
- The time needed to complete the project in this study was estimated to be 26 months.
- Permitting Requirements include: Environmental Resource Permit—FDEP, Section 404 Dredge, Fill Permit—USACE and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit—EPA/FDEP and a Pinellas County Water and Navigation Control Authority Permit—PCWNA for dredge and fill.
- The costs estimated in 2006 from this study for this type of in-fill project were estimated at $30.7M.
- It is reasonable to assume that a higher than usual contingency will be added for this rehab-into-causeway due to the unique construction methods required.

ESTIMATED COSTS. Further analysis and study will be required to understand the differences between each construction method as it relates to the following factors:

- Cost
- Longevity
- Maintenance
- Environmental impacts
- Permitting
- Overall schedule

Until a system is fully designed and engineered, costs can only be estimated on a rough order of magnitude basis. An order of magnitude of probable costs to replace the Pier with a Causeway per the Moffat Nichol study (2010), not including mitigation, any land acquisition costs, contingency or future building costs depending on type of causeway fill structure are:

- Solid Fill—Steel Sheet Pile Retaining Wall: $47M
- Solid Fill—Concrete Sheet Pile Retaining Wall: $60M
- Solid Fill—Cofferdam: $92M

Rough estimates of causeway options vary. To create the causeway anew by constructing an Approach and Pier Head similar to Alternative 1 outlined previously, without costs for permitting, additional studies, utilities, mitigation improvements or land acquisition for mitigation required, ranges from $47 million to $92 million.
Out of the nine upland concepts illustrated below, the Task Force narrowed the list down to two. The upland concepts are a reference for future master planning of the site. While the focus of this report is on the Pier, the connectivity via a relevant and engaging upland area is critical to creating the sense of arrival at the Pier and an overall destination at the downtown waterfront. It is important to note that however the upland is ultimately master planned, it must complement not only the Pier alternative chosen, but the overall waterfront area.

Like the Pier alternatives, a program element that is consistently illustrated in both upland concepts is the inclusion of new transient docking, potentially located directly west of the existing breakwater and south of the Pier Approach, a necessary and important component recommended by the Task Force Committee.

A second component shown in both concepts is the addition of direct pedestrian linkages from Vinoy Park and North Straub Park. Both concepts illustrate this important linkage by way of a pedestrian bridge spanning over water that allows easy, direct pedestrian access from adjacent parks. It is conceived that the bridge connecting Vinoy Park shall be “operable” in way that always allows boat access to the north basin.
UPLAND CONCEPT 1

Upland Concept #1: New buildings with new active & passive parks

- Operational pedestrian bridge linking Vinoy Park to Spa Beach Park
- New buildings and docking facilities located adjacent to North basin
- Maintain parkland at northeast quadrant
- Specific Family Entertainment at southeast quadrant to be determined
- Elimination of existing upland parking may need to be mitigated with alternative parking solutions, which could include structured parking, or the provision of enhanced regularly scheduled shuttle service to the Pier or other transportation means

Advantages:
- Adds new program activity to the upland area
- Balances new program building, passive park and new family entertainment element for residents and tourists
- Brings new major program activity closer to Bay Shore Drive Northeast
- Upland programming likely to increase interest and use by local residents
- Compliments potential future development of the North Yacht Basin
- Program on upland area may be phased in as demand increases and additional funding becomes available
- Enhanced pedestrian linkages by way of bridges from Vinoy Park and North Straub Park
Upland Concept #2: New active & passive parks

- Operational pedestrian bridge linking Vinoy Park to Spa Beach Park
- New parkland, family entertainment and amphitheater throughout upland areas
- Vista along Second Avenue Northeast to remain open down Pier axis
- Elimination of existing upland parking may need to be mitigated with alternative parking solutions, which could include structured parking, or the provision of enhanced regularly scheduled shuttle service to the Pier or other transportation means

Advantages:
- Adds new program activity to the upland area
- Balances passive park and new family entertainment element for residents and tourists
- Brings new major program activity closer to Bay Shore Drive Northeast
- Upland programming likely to increase interest and use by local residents
- Compliments potential future development of the North Yacht Basin
- Program on upland area may be phased in as demand increases and additional funding becomes available
- Enhanced pedestrian linkages by way of bridges from Vinoy Park and North Straub Park
ILLUSTRATIVE CONCEPTS

Illustrative Concept—Pier Approach
ILLUSTRATIVE CONCEPTS

Illustrative Concept—Pier Option 3
ILLUSTRATIVE CONCEPTS

Illustrative Concept—Pier Option 4
The current average rental rate at the Pier today of $25.82 per square foot does not provide adequate offset to cover the operating costs of the Pier and this contributes to its continued reliance on subsidy support.

The Pier program selected focuses on restaurants and other food service programming. This approach was found to be most successful in pier case studies reviewed and affords waterfront views and gathering spots for the community. There is great potential for an upland based family entertainment/amusement type of project, upwards of 30,000 square feet, which could generate additional demand for retail and restaurant business. It is recommended that this alternative be explored to help re-establish the Pier as destination and fill a niche generally missing in Pinellas County.

Estimates have been completed to establish relative rough order of magnitude costs to build and operate (construction & life cycle) the selected alternatives. It should be noted the focus of this project is on the Pier component and financials for any future Upland development were not done, given the wide variety of potential entertainment alternatives available and the uncertain timing associated with this phase of the project. These estimates are solely for the Pier Building and Approach, and are for comparative purposes only based on the outlined program.

**Estimated Construction Costs and Operating Expense**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Estimates</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>$87M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>$71M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>$59M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4</td>
<td>$42M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The alternatives developed considered many factors, including both initial construction cost estimates and life cycle cost analysis. The cost estimates are based on engineering, consulting, architectural, and Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) pricing data. To arrive at these cost estimates, a 36,000 square foot building was factored in. The full analysis should be considered a broad-brushed rough order of magnitude only, and is detailed further in Exhibit F. Additionally, these costs are only to be used for comparative purposes: **true cost figures will be subject to detailed design completion and competitive bidding.** The operating expenses of these alternatives, from highest to lowest, also track in the order of their construction cost estimates. Additionally, an estimate of the net operating income is anticipated to be highest coming from the lowest cost alternative.

It should be noted that all of the alternatives assume a pier system composed of a concrete deck above pilings. A causeway could replace the “Pier Approach & Head” component as well. As previously noted, this alternative affords potentially lower long term maintenance costs, but due to its unique nature, there would potentially be a premium initial cost with certain variables unknown and an extended permitting process as outlined in this report.

**PIER BUSINESS PROGRAM**

The Pier program selected focuses on restaurants and other food service programming. This approach was found to be most successful in pier case studies reviewed and affords waterfront views and gathering spots for the community. There is great potential for an upland based family entertainment/amusement type of project, upwards of 30,000 square feet, which could generate additional demand for retail and restaurant business. It is recommended that this alternative be explored to help re-establish the Pier as destination and fill a niche generally missing in Pinellas County.

While revenue production is critical to the success of the new Pier, as a City amenity, the Task Force would recommend consideration for up to an additional 10KSF to be utilized for community space for a use to be determined.
COMMUNITY AMENITY OR BUSINESS ENTERPRISE?

The Pier, while a revenue producing enterprise of the City, is also a community amenity similar to a park. This puts an added expense component (maintenance, transportation, special events) on the Pier not found in a typical commercial facility. The rental rates at the Pier are generally market rates, but cannot overcome this expense burden. The Pier has always been subsidized. Expenses during the last 10 years have exceeded revenues by at least $1.2 million dollars per year. That said, the Pier was also estimated in 2001 to provide annual economic benefit back to the City of $42 million in a study by the Klages Group.

35% or $1M of the current $2.8M annual operating expenses of the Pier building are devoted to maintenance. Another $250K-$500K is spent by the City to maintain the Pier Approach and Head each year. Over the last ten years, the Pier has required $1.2M to $1.6M per year in subsidy support from the City, which does not include $250K to $500K per year to maintain the superstructure.

FUNDING SUPPORT FOR THE PIER OPERATION

One of the objectives of the Task Force was to look at ways to minimize the operating subsidy support from the City. The reasons the Pier has not been self-sufficient from a funding standpoint are varied and include factors such as:

- Accessibility to users 365 days a year, with access to the grounds and parts of the facility 24 hours a day.
- Pier’s location over the water adds a significant premium to most maintenance costs due to exposure of equipment and mechanical systems to the elements, as well as related accessibility issues.
- Significant transportation needs are required to bring visitors and employees from remote parking areas to the Pier Head.
- Amount of leasable square footage compared to total building square footage limits the operating expenses that are currently reimbursed by the Pier tenants.
- Pier’s unique architecture and iconic nature necessitates a higher level of maintenance and attention to detail in comparison with a purely commercial structure.

FACTORS DRIVING OPERATING COSTS

In deciding upon the recommended alternatives for the Pier, the Task Force considered factors that have a direct impact on it’s operating costs and reliance on subsidy support in the future. These factors included:

- **Amount of development over water** - Because of the maintenance premium of Pier structures located over water, operating costs will be higher than more program/development over land.
- **Building square footage** - The cost to maintain a building is directly related to the size and efficiency of the structure. The smaller the building, the lower it costs to maintain and operate it.
- **Leasable space versus total building area** - While the Pier is a public facility and should include sufficient common areas for the community to enjoy, the percentage of leasable area within a building directly impacts the costs that are allocated between tenants and the City. The higher the ratio of leasable area to the total building area, the more building expenses that can be allocated to the private users of the facility, reducing the reliance on City subsidy.
- **Proximity of parking areas to activity program areas** - If Pier activities are moved closer to the parking areas the transportation needs for the Pier could be reduced, thereby reducing overall costs of operation, reducing the financial support required from the City.
NET OPERATING INCOME

One of the Task Force objectives included providing a general estimate of what the net operating income or loss ("NOI") would be for each of the redevelopment options recommended. This metric can be utilized to gauge whether the revenues estimated for each option are sufficient to cover its projected expenses or will require subsidy support from the City. The NOI amounts projected here only consider operating revenues and expenses and were developed only as a tool to help compare the estimated financial performance of each alternative against each other. It should be noted that the true financial picture of the alternative chosen will also include other financial requirements, including reserves for capital maintenance and debt service.

In order to develop these estimates, many assumptions had to be made about the resulting business operation of each alternative. In making these assumptions, many factors needed to be considered and impacted the outcome of the calculation, including:

- **Program Type.** Regardless of the design or location, the ultimate program, or uses, recommended in this report are just that—a recommendation. The City's leadership, citizens, and market will ultimately determine what program or use is ultimately worthy and successful at the Pier. The type of program and amount of leasable versus community building space will directly impact the revenues, expenses and NOI of the new facility.

- **Use of Assumptions.** In order to estimate NOI, assumptions have been applied equally to all alternatives. Other than the factors already mentioned, consideration was given to things such as transportation costs, marketing, promotion and special events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Estimated Operating Income/(Loss) Per Year</th>
<th>Estimated Debt Service Per Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>($323K)</td>
<td>$7.8M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>($239K)</td>
<td>$6.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>($223K)</td>
<td>$5.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>($86K)</td>
<td>$3.7M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **NOI (Loss) Estimates.** The NOI amounts reflected here present the estimated operating loss in year three of operation, which is anticipated to be the first year that depicts a stabilized operation without any distortion from one-time opening expenses or partial revenue streams.

- **Capital Maintenance.** Although any new project will require capital maintenance expenses or a reserve for replacement, it is not anticipated to be substantial in the first 10 years of operation.

- **Debt Service.** Annual debt service to cover estimated construction costs is provided here for comparison purposes only, based on a 20 year amortization schedule, and is dependent upon financial and other variables that exist at the time bonds are issued. The current TIF funding allocation for the Pier and probable debt service payments for Option 4 are covered in the established program in 2012. Funding beyond that base debt service level would be required from yet to be determined sources.
Summary Considerations
CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Regardless of the final options selected, the following are recommendations the Pier Advisory Task Force feels strongly should be considered. It is the Task Force’s recommendation that the Mayor and City Council consider one of the four Pier alternatives previously noted and the factors noted below as a framework for finalizing the scope of the Pier redevelopment project.

PIER & PROGRAM
- Pier needs to be a destination, not only for the region, but internationally as well
- Pier should be integrated into waterfront as its anchor and centerpiece
- Preserve views to and from City, as well as outward into the bay
- Design should be efficient, flexible - allowing for phasing of future development
- Program for Pier should begin as close to upland as possible if not on upland to reduce walking distances between points of interest
- Differentiation as an attraction is critical to Pier success
- Program must attract both visitors and locals
- Further exploration of a Marine Discovery Center

BUILDING
- Building should be an iconic structure, a worthy symbol of our great City
- Pier vista should remain unobstructed to allow for maximum views
- Once an alternative is selected, an International design competition is recommended to encourage creativity
- Potential for 26KSF restaurant and 5KSF retail for revenue production, with additional 5-15KSF potential for non-revenue producing community flexible space
- Green/LEED certified structure, energy efficient design and equipment

UPLAND
- Water park and/or family oriented entertainment for children should be considered
- Restaurant/cafes should be adjacent to docks, providing excitement upon arrival
- Pedestrian bridge connecting Spa Park to Vinoy Park would provide a vital link
- Transient docks should be provided for access by boaters
- Installation of a breakwater system in the North basin would allow access for all boat sizes
- Incorporate pedestrian/bike trails into the design of the upland and link to downtown

“The Pier is in the entertainment business and needs to address a primary unfilled niche for family entertainment.”
Randy Wedding—Chair
CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

ACCESSIBILITY & TRANSPORTATION

- Transient docks immediately south of Pelican lot would provide better access for boaters
- Enhanced trolley service is needed to create or supplement linkage to Pier
- Enhanced tram/trolley or sky ride type of system connecting to Downtown, BayWalk, and Mid-Core Garage could help Pier’s success
- Accessible and convenient for disabled persons
- Potential for Port of Call
- Further study required for North basin Mega-yacht concept

FINANCIAL INFORMATION

- Plan to utilize existing $50M TIF funding available, but consider phasing of additional development in plan if supplemental funding becomes accessible at later time
- Focus on restaurant based program to provide maximum contribution to Pier overhead
- Continue to pursue all state and federal grants
- Strong consideration required regarding long-term maintenance costs of both Pier and building alternatives ultimately selected
- Retail should be considered only to support the family entertainment objective

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- If the alternative selected includes potential rehabilitation of existing inverted pyramid, structural testing should be performed on both the inverted pyramid and its foundation
- Additional detailed assessments are needed on the environmental impacts of all recommended Pier and Upland options
PROJECTED TIMELINE & SUMMARY

The final timeline, while difficult to fix at this point, is estimated in the chart below. Following the City's selection of an alternative, an international design competition is recommended. On a project of this nature, it is anticipated that studies, including environmental, will be required which will contribute to the completion of a permitting process. Due to the continued deterioration of the Pier Approach, it is recommended that if possible, construction start as close to the availability of funding, approximately $45M of which is anticipated to become available from bond proceeds as early as March, 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ACTION TAKEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 2010</td>
<td>Alternatives &amp; Recommendations To City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>City Council Decision - Replace, Renovate, Demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>Issue RFP for Selection of Architectural Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>Establish program elements for Pier &amp; Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>Receive Bids and Review Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>Award Design Contract; Negotiate Terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>Design Completed - Permit Process Begins (1 year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2013</td>
<td>Issue RFP for Selection of Construction Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>Receive Bids and Review Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2013</td>
<td>Construction Contract Awarded - Negotiate Terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>Permit Process Completed - Construction Begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>Selected Programming Solicited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Pier Construction Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The above schedule assumes the selected design alternative does not result in environmental impacts that would lengthen the permitting process.

SUMMARY

The conclusions in this report apply to multiple alternatives and master planning opportunities that reach beyond the Pier and surrounding areas. The Pier has been a vital part of St. Petersburg since its founding, and while the alternatives are many, the Task Force believes that action is required soon to implement the agreed upon solutions. In the end, Lambert Advisory may have summed it up best:

“The Pier would not be The Pier without a pier, and thereby the City would lose a major drawing card for Downtown St. Petersburg. What the configuration, size or length of the pier is less important from a marketing/positioning perspective than the fact that a pier in some form or fashion continues to exist.”

~ Lambert Advisory ~
The following are additional reports, studies, etc. provided as reference support to this report:

A. Moffatt & Nichol—City Pier Building Foundation Evaluation March 1, 2010
B. Parsons Brinckerhoff—Alternatives Study May 2003
C. Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc.—Modification Analysis Report July 2006
D. Professional Services, Inc.—Property Condition Assessment April 15, 2010
E. Case Studies
F. Cost Estimates
G. Lambert Advisory—Pier Redevelopment Business/Market Assessment & Summary of St. Petersburg Pier Real Estate Market Assessment
H. Moffatt & Nichol—Causeway Report May 6, 2010
I. Adjacent Property Uses
J. View Studies on Pier
K. Public Input
L. City of St. Petersburg website: www.stpete.org/news/the_pier