

1. 2:00 P.M. Agenda With Fixed Link

Documents:

[2022-05-03 Parks And Commons Agenda.pdf](#)

2. 2:00 P.M. Meeting Materials

Documents:

[Trails Report For Parks_And_Commons.pdf](#)

[Pccresolutionsapril5th2022.Pdf](#)

[Landcurrent-Yachats-Greenspace-Rfp-FINAL.pdf](#)

[Meeting Summary 02.01.22 Parks And Commons.pdf](#)

[Meeting Summary Draft 04.05.22 Parks And Commons.pdf](#)



**CITY OF YACHATS
PARKS & COMMONS COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
Meeting to be held via ZOOM
Tuesday, May 3, 2022 at 2:00pm**

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81851871661>

Meeting ID: 818 5187 1661

One tap mobile

+16699006833,,81851871661# US (San Jose) 12532158782,,81851871661# US
+(Tacoma)

Dial by your location

- +1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)
- +1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)
- +1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)
- +1 929 205 6099 US (New York)
- +1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC)
- +1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

Meeting ID: 818 5187 1661

Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/u/kscsdp4tW>

REGULAR MEETING

- I. Call meeting to order
- II. Correspondence/Communications
- III. Reports
 - 1. Trails
 - 2. Little Log Church

IV. Ongoing Business

- 1. Pocket Parks
- 2. Green Space Project
- 3. Commons Painting
 - a. Interior update
 - b. Exterior
- 4. Commons re-opening

This meeting is open to the public and all interested persons are invited to attend. This meeting will be audio taped. All items to be considered by the Commission must be submitted to City Hall no later than one week prior to the meeting. Minutes of all public meetings are available for review at City Hall, or on the City website at www.yachatsoregon.org.

In accordance with ORS 192.630, City of Yachats will make a good faith effort to provide accommodations for any person desiring to attend a public meeting, if the request is made at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting time. The meeting room is physically accessible to persons with mobility devices; a sign language or foreign language interpreter may be available, with advance notice. Call City Hall at 541-547-3565 or Oregon Relay 1-800-735-2900 (TDD) two days in advance.



V. New Business

- a. 2022/2023 Budget
- a. Master Plan
- b.

VI. Commons Other Business

- a. From Commissioners
- b. From Staff
- c. For the next agenda

VII. From Floor: Topics not listed on the agenda: 5-minute limitation per person

Next regular meeting: Tuesday, June 7, 2022, at 2:00 pm via ZOOM
Commission meets the first Tuesday of each month

*******NOTICE OF POSSIBLE CITY COUNCIL QUORUM*******

This meeting is open to the public and all interested persons are invited to attend. This meeting will be audio taped. All items to be considered by the Commission must be submitted to City Hall no later than one week prior to the meeting. Minutes of all public meetings are available for review at City Hall, or on the City website at www.yachatsoregon.org.

In accordance with ORS 192.630, City of Yachats will make a good faith effort to provide accommodations for any person desiring to attend a public meeting, if the request is made at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting time. The meeting room is physically accessible to persons with mobility devices; a sign language or foreign language interpreter may be available, with advance notice. Call City Hall at 541-547-3565 or Oregon Relay 1-800-735-2900 (TDD) two days in advance.

TRAILS COMMITTEE REPORT – Parks and Commons Commission – May 3, 2022

Name changes – We would like to change the Yachats Trails Committee to Yachats Trails Team and Yachats Invasive Plants Subcommittee! to Yachats Invasive Plant Squad! and will appreciate your assistance in whatever official steps are necessary to accomplish this.

Work sessions –

Trails work has been at the Amanda Gathering Area (see section below) and Gerdemann Public Trail. At GBP, we have installed some new steps and replaced rotten posts that have been holding directional and informational signs. We plan to place more gravel on slippery parts of the Ya'Xaik Trail soon.

YIPS! continues to push back against blackberry and ivy in the Commons Wetland Park. Wally reports that he noticed Scotch broom along Yachats River Road. Even though there haven't been any work sessions since he noticed it, needless to say, those plants are now in Scotch broom "heaven". Perhaps, even more noteworthy, Bob noticed and removed several flowering Scotch broom plants N of town. The point being that these plants are flowering at this time of year making them very noticeable.

Walkway project – After your approval and positive vote last month, the design team will be making a presentation to the City Council at March 5 CC meeting. We hope for a similarly positive response followed by a vote by CC members to authorize Rick to contract for Engineering Design Services.

Amanda Trail Suspension Bridge Project – Restoration and improvements to the bridge area continue with work multiple work sessions in addition to the normal crew days. A Spur trail with bench has been completed, approximately 150 additional plants are now in the ground, Job Corps students have completed trunk benches, portals are being built, and railings are almost completed on the upper stairs.

The dedication plans are moving along well with support from the City of Yachats, OPRD, OCVA, and View the Future. We appreciate the ongoing and strong support of the Parks and Commons Commission. Special thanks to Doug Sestrich of OPRD for his consistently valuable input and help.

If you have not seen the bridge site yet, please take a look.



101 delineators – ODOT is preparing an IGA (Inter Governmental Agreement) and, once it has been signed by the City, Rick will look for a contractor to do the installation. Installation is probably a several months out but is going to happen.

Evacuation Trail from Ya'Xaik Trail to the Fire Department – FD and SNF are working to finalize agreements necessary before work can begin.

Parks & Commons Commission Resolutions adopted at April 5th, 2022 meeting

Resolution #1

The Parks & Commons Commission recommends the Yachats City Council instruct Yachats Public Works to contact the PUD to arrange undergrounding of utility lines from Beach Street to Hwy 101. To take place concurrently with the Boardwalk Project construction.

Resolution passed unanimously by all 7 members of the Commission.

Resolution #2

Parks & Commons Commission, after listening to a presentation from the boardwalk design team, encourages the Yachats City Council to ask for a similar presentation from the design team and to authorize City staff to contract for engineering design services for the Boardwalk Project.

Resolution passed unanimously by all 7 members of the Commission.



Response to Greenspace RFP

April 04, 2022
Proposed by:



April 04, 2022

Attn: Yachats City Manager

RE: Response to Greenspace RFP

Dear City Manager and other interested readers,

LandCurrent
1754 Moonshadow Lane
Eugene OR 97405

PH: 541.912.5753

www.landcurrent.com

LandCurrent is a dba of
A. Van Asperdt, P.C.

LandCurrent is a Registered
Landscape Architecture firm
in the state of Oregon
Lic. # L195

LandCurrent is Certified as a
Women Business Enterprise.

LandCurrent is delighted and honored to respond to your RFP for Yachats Greenspace. We read your RFP request and took especially note of your list of considerations. Those considerations and the eco-consciousness of your community align strongly with LandCurrent's values. As noted in the RFQ response we are a climate-positive company, meaning that our company operates on a net-zero+ carbon footprint, meaning that our business operations do not add greenhouse gases to the atmosphere and might even reduce greenhouse gasses. We do this by working locally, driving electric, using low carbon footprint materials, and monetarily subscribing to carbon sequestering technologies.

Our strong values around protecting the climate through local action are reflected in our designs. We aim for construction materials and methods that have a low carbon footprint and that are eco-friendly.

LandCurrent's designs have won praise from the general public as well as from colleagues and received numerous awards. We are highly experienced in listening and engaging with diverse clients and have expertise in facilitating community input. LandCurrent can help you create a design for Yachats Greenspace that the community will call its own. Our technical expertise combined with the expertise of our team, will ensure that the design will ultimately lead to a beautiful, sustainable, and functional park landscape that respects the local community, ecosystem and the planet.

We love working with small communities where we can speak and work directly with citizens, senior officials and decision makers. This direct engagement between a small responsive firm and a small Oregon town leads to creative and can-do solutions that reflect the community.

We operate from Eugene Oregon, working not too far from Yachats will allow us to visit your community on a regular basis which will help with ongoing project understanding as well as ad-hoc visits needed for the project.

When working with LandCurrent you will work directly with me, Anita Van Asperdt, principal landscape architect and owner of LandCurrent. I have over thirty-five years of experience in Landscape Architecture. Direct engagement with a senior level landscape architect throughout the design process and construction period, is a huge advantage. It is



LandCurrent
1754 Moonshadow Lane
Eugene OR 97405

PH: 541.912.5753

www.landcurrent.com

LandCurrent is a dba of
A. Van Asperdt, P.C.

LandCurrent is a Registered
Landscape Architecture firm
in the state of Oregon
Lic. # L195

LandCurrent is Certified as a
Women Business Enterprise.

something that larger firms typically do not offer; larger firms typically relegate much of the work to junior staff members.

Our team includes The Dyer Partnership. Dyer has extensive experience working along the Oregon Coast including in Yachats. The Dyer Partnership and LandCurrent have an excellent ongoing working relationship. We are currently working on projects in Yoncalla and Sutherlin Oregon. We also have Pacific Habitat Services Inc. on our team. Pacific Habitat prepared the wetland inventory in your community. Having a wetlands specialist on the team is very important as the wetlands provide important habitat for many species, help clean stormwater and act as a carbon sink. Ensuring that the wetlands function well and that the common space park area enhances the wetland function is of the utmost importance.

Besides reading your RFP carefully we read the online information on your wetland and boardwalk, studied the aerial photos and visited the site in December 2021. The Dyer Partnership followed up with a site visit in March this year.

As a team, we believe we have a good understanding of your wishes and consideration. We hope you will select our team and allow us to sit down with you to further enhance our understanding of your project.

With warm regards,

Anita Van Asperdt MLA, BSLA, RLA
anita@landcurrent.com
541.912.5753

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Project Approach	page 4
Park Design Layout	page 4
Wetland Assessment	page 5
Park Furniture	page 6
Planting Plan	page 6
Signage and Lighting	page 7
Time frame	page 7
Design phases	page 7
Pre-Design	page 8
Schematic (Concept)	page 9
Design Development	page 10
 Fee estimate phases 1-3 plus wetland assessment	 page 12
 Fee estimate construction cost estimate	 page 13
 Fee estimate construction drawings and specifications	 page 13
 Fee estimate construction administration	 page 14
 Fee estimate topographic survey	 page 15
 Fee estimate hydrographic insights	 page 15
 Appendix A	
 Hourly rate schedule	
LandCurrent	
Pacific Habitat Services Inc.	
The Dyer Partnership	

PROJECT APPROACH

Park design layout

We understand that you are requiring landscape architecture design services, a wetland and boardwalk assessment and other related services for a beautiful Greenspace in Yachats. The new park will be small, about 180 by 120 feet. The vision is that the new park will be truly inviting for the community and for visitors, be aligned to the natural world and be a park that effectively uses native plants.

The community prefers plantings and an area to gather versus specific uses like a dog park or a ball field. It is our understanding that a design that best serves the community will have flexible multi-functional open spaces. Coastal landscapes can be very windy but also experience sun on windy days. Berms and plantings can be used to create gathering nooks and spaces of different sizes that have their own wind-shielded micro-climate.

The park is in part a classic commons park with important civic buildings facing the space. It is also a unique commons park with a wetland at its west boundary. We will aim to create functional and spatial connections to existing and adjacent elements including the wetland, boardwalk, EV charging stations, the playground, the pavilion, the community center, city hall and the skate park.

Your community survey shows various functions that have been contemplated for the park. The considerations men-

tioned in the RFP give further detailed directions for the park design. Instead of additively inserting functions and spaces, our landscape will take on a sculptural approach where topography and plantings create informal nooks and spaces for gatherings of various sizes including: one space for a larger gathering, possibly an amphitheater, spaces for picnics, spaces for informal games. We understand any cuts into the current grade will trigger a required archeological assessment. As this is a lengthy process, we will aim to avoid the need for such an assessment. Archeological assessment coordination is excluded from our scope but can be added if it is needed.

We aim to create an inclusive park that is enjoyable for everyone. Inclusive design goes beyond making a park adhere to ADA rules; inclusive design aims to make parks accessible and enjoyable for people of all ages, abilities and cultural backgrounds. We are well versed in creating inclusive designs through our extensive experience in designing parks and community spaces as well as our expert expertise in designing children's natural play and learning environments.

We have experience with regards to the unhoused. A park design cannot solve this issue but can and should take it into account. It is a delicate issue that requires deterring people from making the park a permanent home. This can be done through establishing good sight lines and through carefully designed and located furniture. Simultaneously, we will discuss with you how we can humanely point the way to whatever

structural help that your community can offer.

Our design will lead to a park that the community can call its own, can be enjoyed year-round, is environmentally sound, attracts wildlife and is sustainable. Sustainability includes a park design that can be maintained within the capabilities and budget of the community. It also means a park that can be maintained without unnecessarily burning fossil fuels.

Our design will aim to be eco-friendly and carbon neutral. Where possible we will consider recycled, repurposed and low impact materials. We will be very careful in our use of carbon intense materials such as concrete. As part of the design process we will develop a carbon footprint assessment for constructing and maintaining the site after construction. The design will balance higher carbon footprint materials with plantings and soils that sequester CO₂. This process is a balancing act; a high carbon footprint material that is very durable might be a better choice than a low carbon footprint material that requires a lot of maintenance and lacks longevity. It is important to study the carbon footprint and other environmental impacts over at least a ten-year time period and to include maintenance and operations in the assessment.

We have very strong values and design principles but that does not mean we will design in a vacuum. On the contrary, our values include making each landscape feel as a home to the community. In order to make the park 'of the place' we need

you to provide us with feedback so that the design is in accordance with your wishes and visions. We have experience with creative community engagement processes that are not only effective in reaching community consensus but also bring out poetic and creative design ideas.

We will set up the design so that it can be implemented in phases and allow for community donations and perhaps planting by the community. Community involvement will further strengthen a sense of ownership and ensure park longevity.

Wetland assessment

The wetland assessment will document the soils, vegetation, and hydrology of the wetland and the surrounding areas. This task will be completed by Pacific Habitat Services.

Pacific Habitat Services will work closely with LandCurrent on options for ensuring the long-term stability of the wetland, which will include ensuring plant communities are adapted to specific site conditions, non-native and invasive species are controlled, and the hydrology of the wetland is sustainable.

The Dyer Partnership will conduct a daylong field assessment (visual inspection) of the boardwalk and provide recommendations to ensure long-term boardwalk integrity (both the deck walking surface and superstructure). The boardwalk is approximately 600 feet long. LandCurrent will take the recommendations from Dyer under consideration and through discussion with Dyer will develop a memo

with annotated photos of the current state of the boardwalk and recommendations for maintenance and rebuilding, including estimated rebuilding cost. It is anticipated that rebuilding includes new sustainable construction materials and methods.

The Dyer Partnership looked at the boardwalk in preparation for this RFP response and from that visit Dyer preliminary determined that overall, the structure needs some minor upgrades and probably replacement in 10 years if the community performs some maintenance now.

Park furniture

LandCurrent aims to design places that are inclusive, meaning they are accessible and delightful for people of all ages and abilities. Providing ample seating is very important to inclusive design. Elderly people or other people with limited mobility need to be able to sit often and find lots of different places to sit and enjoy the landscape. Seating can be in the form of benches, seating walls, boulders at seating height or creative seating elements such as soma stones.

Many people need the support of a backrest and armrests, the inclusion of seating with arm and backrests is therefore important. This type of seating can be complemented with informal seating elements. In addition, seating needs to be designed so a person in a wheelchair can sit in the chair next to others and have the option to transfer from a wheelchair on a park seat.

Most of our clients prefer a situation where people do not use benches to sleep on, especially not if this means that people essentially start living in a park. Principal landscape architect Anita Van



Asperdt is very aware of this issue, she already designed with this situation in mind decades ago when she worked for the city of Amsterdam. LandCurrent will discuss with the PCC-R to what extent sleeping on benches or tables will need to be deterred in the park.

As with all park considerations the furniture will become an integral part of the overall layout of the park.

Planting plan

Plantings and topography can be shaped to reflect the local environment. Native plantings combined with selected near-natives, specific materials, and local art can further make the park unique to the community that created it. Native plant communities will be selected for their habitat value, eco-services such as stormwater filtering and carbon sequestration. Plants will also be selected for their human

services such as their function as wind shield and for their visual and olfactory delight. We will ensure that the plants are appropriate for your climate with high winds and salt spray.

It is important to consider climate change with the selection of plantings and ensure, as best as possible, that the selected plants will survive in a changed climate.

We have extensive knowledge on local plant communities and will augment our expertise with that of your local plant experts as well as take you up on your offer to visit your local parks.

Signage and lighting

The lighting plan will need to be carefully considered with regards to light sensitive fauna. Lighting can provide safety in the park, however too much light or lighting that is not well considered can produce glare and create unsafe environments. LandCurrent has learned that Yachats has a good understanding of this after

reading your city council's deliberations on your municipal Lighting Ordinance. The lighting plan will include graphic images of proposed lights and locations.

During the design process we will discuss with you the type of signs that you want and need in the park. There can be interpretive signs, relief carved signs that can be read by the visual impaired, signs that include information about help for the unhoused, wayfinding signs and more.

Time frame

The estimated time frame from signing of the contract to the end of design development is 3 months. This time estimate does not account for an archeological assessment, such an assessment may take many months.

Design phases

Below we have broken down our approach to the design in the various



WaterWise Demonstration Garden, Eugene, Oregon

phases and tasks that follow the bullet point outline in your RFP request. We combined this with our own take on the design tasks needed for the Park Design Layout. During our first meeting with the Parks and Commons Commission (PCC-R) we will review these project tasks and revise as needed. The listed consulting budgets are estimates and can be further refined through discussion with you.

Phase 1 Predesign

During the predesign phase we gather all relevant information about the project.

Task 1.1 The LandCurrent team will study all relevant maps and documentation, including: Greenspace Citizen Survey results, City of Yachats Park Master Plan (revised 2019), City of Yachats Lighting Ordinance (revised 2021), previous wetland reports, drawings of existing structures on site, environmental factors, history of Yachats and the site. Much of this information has already been studied in preparation for this RFP response. In addition, The Dyer Partnership (Dyer) and Pacific Habitat Services Inc. (PHS) have previously completed work in Yachats and have a good understanding of the community and the design site. The Dyer Partnership will search their archive to gather previous stormwater study information, and past survey/mapping. PHS has information that they collected during the Local Wetland Inventory.

Task 1.2 During the first meeting the LandCurrent design team will speak with the PCC-R to get detailed project information as well as walk the project site and adjacent areas. We will discuss with you if a regulatory wetland boundary needs to be established along the park. This might be important as changing the topography is likely a key element of the design, legally the topography cannot be

changed much beyond the wetland boundary.

During this first meeting with you we want to gain a comprehensive understanding of the maintenance budget, capacity and capability along with a good understanding of the initial design and construction budget. We will discuss our design tasks and revise the workplan as needed. LandCurrent will prepare a meeting memo, and revised task and workplan.

While visiting Yachats we will tour Prospect Garden and Gerdemann Botanical Preserve with you, as we are curious about these sites and touring these sites with you will give us more insights in the native plant palette that you are envisioning for the design of the commons in Yachats.

Task 1.3 The Dyer Partnership will prepare a topographical survey. We assume that we do not need to research property boundaries as the city owns the Right-Of-Way and adjacent wetland area. The topographical map will be for the landscape area outlined in red on your aerial photo (attached to your RFP) and extend north and east to the road edge and at least 10 feet west and south towards the wetland (or up to the wetland boundary) so that we can integrate our designs adequately within current conditions. Preparing the topographical survey early in the process is critical, since changing topography is likely a key component of the design. Your site is small and changing topography on a small site requires very good topographical information in order to tie the grading into existing surrounding contours.

Task 1.4 The Dyer Partnership and LandCurrent will provide an initial hydrological assessment with regards to surface run-off. The topographical map will reveal current surface run-off patterns. We assume that stormwater run-off that currently enters the wetland/pond will be allowed to continue to do so without the need for environmental permitting. Dyer will provide LandCurrent with their initial opinion on swale shape, size and possible locations. They will take into account that any swales that cut into current grade will require an archeological assessment.

Task 1.5 Pacific Habitat Services, Inc will assist the team with recommendations for the initial park design and initial hydrological assessment and features in the park in so far as this has influence on the optimal functioning of the adjacent wetlands.

Task 1.6 During all phases LandCurrent will keep the team on task, develop and update workplans, prepare internal design memos and meeting memos

Phase 2 Schematic (conceptual) design.

Task 2.1 During the schematic or concept design phase, we develop one or two layout options that show basic character and function of the park. Various park elements, and characters will be visualized through precedent images and or sketches. LandCurrent will spearhead these designs and enlist feedback from our design partners. The early concept plans will show native plant communities with their functions: eco-functions, windshield etc. The early concepts will also show a concept level grading (topography) plan. Grading (changing topography) is likely a key element in the design as this can provide wind shielded nooks and visually shield

unwanted views and enhance wanted views. Grading may also help improve run-off water quality before it enters the wetlands.

Task 2.2 Pacific Habitat Services Inc. will prepare a memorandum with preliminary Wetland Assessment and with LandCurrent develop recommendations that ensure the longevity of the wetland.

Task 2.3 The Dyer Partnership will assess the boardwalk. LandCurrent and Dyer will develop a preliminary memo with annotated photos of the current state of the boardwalk and recommendations for maintenance and rebuilding.

Task 2.4 Once we have developed a concept plan LandCurrent will meet with the PCC-R and provide a PowerPoint presentation with design rationale. We will answer questions from the PCC-R and obtain feedback. In so far, a representative from park maintenance and operations is not included in the PCC-R we recommend that such a representative is included in this meeting. In addition, this will be a good time to discuss our ideas for the public meeting.

Pacific Habitat Services Inc. will present the preliminary wetland assessment to the PCC-R and LandCurrent will present preliminary findings and recommendations with regards to the boardwalk.

This PCC-R meeting will be in-person with LandCurrent with Pacific Habitat Services attending the meeting virtual. LandCurrent will prepare meeting notes.

Task 2.5 LandCurrent will participate in a public meeting to solicit responses to the conceptual design. This meet-

Following the meeting LandCurrent will summarize written annotated findings and points of discussions and/or conclusions and submit these to the PCC-R

from the public meeting to incorporate. This meeting will be with LandCurrent principal Landscape Architect in-person. Dyer and PHS staff will be available for ad-hoc online contacting to provide clarifications or answer questions during the meeting. LandCurrent will prepare written meeting notes.

Task 2.7 During all phases Land-Current will keep the team on task, develop and update workplans, prepare internal design memos and meeting memos.

Phase 3 Design development phase.

During design development the preferred option chosen during the schematic design phase will be refined.

Task 3.1 LandCurrent will incorporate any changes to the park design as



determined by PCC-R (plus city staff) during the previous phase. Our design partners, Dyer and PHS, will provide design review feedback to LandCurrent during this process. The Design Development Plan will include a preliminary planting plan, park furniture locations and choices, and a preliminary signage and lighting plan.

During design development LandCurrent will ensure that the park design is as eco-friendly and low carbon as possible and provide a carbon footprint assessment.

With feedback from your two local native plant specialists LandCurrent will prepare a preliminary Planting Plan.

LandCurrent will submit a draft of the Design Development Plan in PDF format to the PCC-R.

Task 3.2 Pacific Habitat Services Inc. will finalize the wetlands assessment memo with regards to optimal wetland functioning and longevity. LandCurrent will review the document before submitting it to PCC-R.

The Dyer Partnership will provide the boardwalk assessment memo. LandCurrent and Dyer will provide written recommendations.

The wetland and boardwalk assessments and recommendations will be submitted as drafts in PDF format to PCC-R along with the Design Development Plan.

Task 3.3 LandCurrent and The Dyer Partnership will prepare a preliminary construction cost estimate based on current cost. LandCurrent worked with the Dyer Partnership in the past in creating such a joined cost estimate. The

estimate will be submitted to the client as a spreadsheet with line items.

Task 3.4 During a first design development virtual meeting with PCC-R (plus city staff), LandCurrent, Dyer and PHS will go over the draft submittals described above. After the meeting these submittals will be revised as discussed and re-submitted as final documents. LandCurrent will provide meeting notes to the PCC-R.

Task 3.5 During the second design development virtual meeting with the PCC-R (plus city staff), the LandCurrent team will go over the final submittals and highlight changes made as discussed during the first meeting. During this meeting LandCurrent will also discuss the format and approach of the Design Development Public Meeting. LandCurrent will provide meeting notes to the PCC-R.

Task 3.6 LandCurrent will lead a Public Input Meeting to describe the plan and rationale for design decisions.

Following the meeting LandCurrent will provide meeting notes and annotated design changes for the PCC-R to consider. It is anticipated that there will be no or only minor changes at this point to consider. Upon request of the PCC-R the design changes will be incorporated into the final design that will be presented during Task 3.7.

Task 3.7 LandCurrent will attend one virtual City Council meeting describing the plan and rationale for design decisions and answer questions regarding proposed project and budget. It is understood that the goal for this meeting is for City Council to approve

the design and budget and authorize the LandCurrent team to proceed with the next phases and prepare final documents. Final documents are understood to be Construction Drawings and Specifications for Public Bidding, Construction Cost Estimate, Construction Administration.

FEE ESTIMATE PHASES 1-3:

Park Design Layout with Park Furniture, Planting Plan, Signage and Lighting, wetland assessment memo , boardwalk assessment memo.

As requested in your RFP we listed the survey as a separate fee item further along in this document. Please note that LandCurrent proposes that the topographical survey will be completed in the pre-design phase of the project. We want to consult with either or both of your native plant specialists Trevor Griffith and Celeste Lebo. Since it is unclear if these specialists will require a consulting fee, we left this fee blank in this proposal. We anticipate involving either or both specialist for approximately 6 hours.

The estimated budgets are negotiable upon clarification of the scope.

A schedule of charges for LandCurrent, The Dyer Partnership and Pacific Habitat Services Inc is included to this proposal in Appendix A.

Total consulting budget estimate for phase 1-3 with wetland determination (without wetland boundary flagging): \$43,630

Total consulting budget estimate for phase 1-3 with wetland delineation (with wetland boundary flagging): \$49,462



The Ellipse, University of Oregon: Photo by Office 52 Architecture

Breakdown:

Consulting budget: Phase 1-3, Pre-design, Schematic design and Design Development (excluding survey, wetland assessment and boardwalk assessment):

	Consulting fee	Travel Time +Miles	Other reimbursable	Total
LandCurrent	\$ 15,544	\$ 1,104.00	\$ 150.00	\$ 16,798
Dyer Partnership	\$ 13,060	\$ 538.00	\$ 150.00	\$ 13,748
Total	\$ 28,604	\$ 1,642.00	\$ 300.00	\$ 30,546

Additional Consulting budget to include Boardwalk assessment and recommendations:

	Consulting fee	Travel Time +Miles	Other reimbursable	Total
LandCurrent	\$ 896	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 896
Dyer Partnership	\$ 3,244	\$ 1,076.00	\$ -	\$ 4,320
Total	\$ 4,140	\$ 1,076.00	\$ -	\$ 5,216

Additional Consulting budget to include Wetland Determination- no flagging, with memorandum describing results, communication on park design, meeting attendance, wetland longevity input:

	Consulting fee	Travel Time +Miles	Other reimbursable	Total
PHS	\$ 7,372	\$ 421.00	\$ 75.00	\$ 7,868

Additional Consulting budget include Wetland Delineation- flagging, with report that is approved by the Department of State Land: Communication on park design and meeting attendance, wetland longevity input:

	Consulting fee	Travel Time +Miles	Other reimbursable	Total
PHS	\$ 13,129	\$ 421.00	\$ 180.00	\$ 13,730

FEE ESTIMATE PHASE 4: Update cost estimate

Prior to creating the bid documents LandCurrent and The Dyer Partnership will update the construction cost estimate to reflect the final approved design plan (end of design development).

The estimated consulting budget total for phase 4 is: \$1,748.00

This includes travel expenses and reimbursable expenses.

FEE ESTIMATE PHASE 5: Construction drawings and specifications for public bidding.

Following approval by City Council, LandCurrent and The Dyer Partnership will develop construction drawings and the technical specifications pages for bidding. Our fee below is an estimate. We will re-evaluate the fee once the design has gone through design development and we have a very precise understanding of what is needed to prepare construction drawings and specifications. For this fee estimate we are assuming that any irrigation systems and the electrical system will be implemented as a design-built task by the (sub)contractor for the project, albeit

based on performance specifications developed by LandCurrent as part of the park specification package. We currently don't anticipate the need for geotechnical consulting

Our scope of work includes front end services and documentation for the bidding process, Quest CDN, Bid Questions, Addendum-Answers, Contractor calls and assisting the city in the assessment of the bids, contract and its execution.

We understand that the project might be constructed in phases. The proposed fees are based on our 2022 rate schedule, please adjust our fees and hourly rate with 4% per year if the project extends over multiple years.

The estimated consulting budget for phase 5 is: \$22,968.00
This includes travel and reimburseable expenses.

	Consulting fee	Travel Time +Miles	Other reimbursable	Total
LandCurrent	\$ 17,712	\$ -	\$ 300.00	\$ 18,012
Dyer Partnership	\$ 4,656	\$ -	\$ 300.00	\$ 4,956
Total	\$ 22,368	\$ -	\$ 600.00	\$ 22,968

FEE ESTIMATE PHASE 6: Construction Administration

Task 6.1 Pre-Construction meeting with the contractor, LandCurrent, The Dyer and owner's representative.

Task 6.2. During construction LandCurrent will answer contractor questions, review submittals, substitutes and requests for change orders and shop drawings and keep track of construction progress ensuring deadlines are met. When needed LandCurrent will request input from The Dyer or assign certain reviews, inspections and so forth to The Dyer.

Task 6.3 Site visits and inspections are a vital part to ensure that the project is build according to the plans and specifications. LandCurrent anticipates a total of eight (8) site visits. In addition, there will be one site visit with the contractor and owner at substantial completion and one at final completion. The Dyer will join LandCurrent on four (4) of these visits.

Task 6.4 LandCurrent will create construction document revisions or assign the revisions to The Dyer when needed and submit an as-built drawing set to the owner at project completion.

We understand that the project might be constructed in phases. The proposed fees are based on our 2022 rate schedule, please adjust our fees and hourly rate with 4% per year if the project extends over multiple years.

The estimated consulting budget total for phase 6 is: \$20,847.00
This includes travel and reimbursable expenses

	Consulting fee	Travel Time +Miles	Other reimbursable	Total
LandCurrent	\$ 8,960	\$ 2,064.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 11,524
Dyer Partnership	\$ 6,026	\$ 3,047.00	\$ 250.00	\$ 9,323
Total	\$ 14,986	\$ 5,111.00	\$ 750.00	\$ 20,847

FEE ESTIMATE SURVEY

Per RFP request the topographical survey fee is listed here separately. Please note that LandCurrent recommends a full topographical survey to be completed in the pre-design phase of the project. We assume the wetland pond does not need to be surveyed. The survey will include existing vegetation.

The total estimated consulting budget for a complete topographical survey is \$4,300.00

FEE ESTIMATE HYDROGRAPHIC INSIGHTS

Per RFP request this task is listed here separately. Please note surface drainage from and through the site will be an integral part of the topographic pre-design work and the design contouring of the site. As such it is essential work that is part of the overall design process for the new park. To a large extent this work cannot be separated out as an independent task.

The topographical map, historic photos, soil maps, topographical information of adjacent sites and a site reconnaissance during the pre-design phase will uncover surface flow information during pre-design. The consulting fee for this task is wrapped inside the fee for phase 1-3.

Additional Hydrographic Insights can be provided by our design team partner Pacific Habitat Services. For this task the hydrology of the pond and the wetland will be investigated by documenting its water budget, which will include identifying inflows and outflows, estimating seasonal groundwater, and whether septic fields or other factors can be contributing to poor water quality. Factors that may improve water quality could include solar powered paddles and trees to shade the water. LandCurrent can facilitate this additional task or you are welcome to work directly with Pacific Habitat Services.

The total estimated consulting budget for additional hydrographic insights by Pacific Habitat Services is \$5,643.00. Facilitation and coordination by LandCurrent are \$1200.00 if this a later stage additional service, if this task is embedded in the park design services the addition charge for LandCurrent can be reduced to \$384.00.

APPENDIX A BILLING RATES



LANDCURRENT BILLING RATES 2022

\$128 for Landscape Architect - Anita Van Asperdt, MLA, BSLA,RLA
\$98 for Landscape Designer level 2
\$68 for Landscape Designer level 1
\$48 for Landscape Designer Intern
\$30 for Consultant travel time



PACIFIC HABITAT SERVICES INC, BILLING RATES 2022

\$178 for Project Manager - John van Staveren, SPWS
\$124 for Wetland Scientist 2
\$118 for Wetland Scientist 1
\$96 for Graphics Specialist
\$86 for Technical Editor

2022 SCHEDULE OF RATES AND CHARGES

THE DYER PARTNERSHIP ENGINEERS & PLANNERS, INC.

Professional Services

Principal/Manager	\$150.00
Project Manager	\$140.00
Professional Land Surveyor	\$140.00
Project Engineer 2	\$130.00
Project Engineer 1	\$120.00
Engineer Tech 2	\$110.00
Engineer Tech 1	\$95.00
Survey Tech 2	\$95.00
Survey Tech 1	\$90.00
Construction Observer.....	\$95.00
Senior Engineering Designer/Drafter/CAD Operator	\$100.00
Engineering Designer/Drafter/CAD Operator	\$95.00
Technical Editor.....	\$85.00
Clerical 2	\$52.00
Clerical 1	\$47.00
3-Person Survey Crew.....	\$200.00
2-Person Survey Crew.....	\$160.00
1-Person Survey Crew.....	\$130.00
GPS Survey Equipment.....	\$100.00/day
Robotic Total Station Survey Equipment.....	\$50.00/day

All rates are per hour unless otherwise noted.

* Rates are subject to annual rate increases of 4% per year for multiyear projects.

Reimbursable Expenses

- * Reimbursables @ actual cost
- * Mileage @ current federal rate (with automatic adjustments as federal rate changes)
- * Services of Outside Consultants @ actual cost plus 10% if billed through our firm

CITY OF YACHATS
Parks and Commons Commission
Meeting Summary
February 1, 2022

Present: Adam Altson, Craig Berdie, Michael Hempen, Catherine Whitten-Carey, Dean Shrock, Fran Morse, George Mazeika, Chair, Dayna Capron, Neal Morphis, City Coordinator, Joanne Kittel, Bob Langley, James Kerti, Patricia Hettinger, Rick McClung, Ann Stott, Council President

I. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order at 2:06 pm by Chair, George Mazeika.

II. CORRESPONDENCE/ COMMUNICATIONS

III. None.

IV. REPORTS

A. Trails

(0:54) Mazeika apologized that the report did not get included in the meeting packet. He told Langley that the new trail looks good and he always hears good comments while walking it.

(1:43) Langley highlighted the projects Trails has been working on; invasives at the Commons, removal of blackberries at the treatment plant, working on the Gerdeman public trail, whale park and the new trail. The PER was received on Ocean View and decisions are being made on how the project should look. Meeting with the engineer on the 7th and hopefully get that to McClung so he can put in a request for proposal for engineering. The delineator project is the same; the City and ODOT are taking care of the "legal things". Gerdeman Public Trail is still closed due to the tree; have been unable to get in touch with Sean Stephens who is the preferred arborist to work on it. People were seen walking the trail so the gate was locked. Will need to find someone to remove the tree if Stephens doesn't contact them soon. Met with the Fire Department to talk about extending the Ya'Xaik Trail to the Fire Department and they are interested in extending the trail along the north side of the property to Highway 101; it would serve as an additional recreational trail but the main purpose is to serve as an evacuation trail.

(4:12) Kittel advised the Peace Hike was a modified version caused by limitations due to Covid. It was a great success; there were over 150 in attendance; two fires, one attended by Wake and Kinlen Wheeler and the other by Kittel and Lisa Norton from the Siletz Tribe. Kittel was surprised that over 70 people hiked to the Amanda gathering area. People were impressed with the bridge construction and she reported she was just there and all the cables are now in. Should have a finished bridge by the end of the month.

Kittel thanked Langley for taking the initiative and measuring everything. In doing so he found two additional trails for the Fire District to consider on the Siuslaw National Forest land; one is about 50 feet the other is about

75 feet. Depending what is decided Kittel will request of the Commission that the City take the liability for that trail. The additional cost to insurance would be \$25 or less. Langley explained the location of the trails.

B. Little Log Church

(8:42) Kerti indicated he was not sure what the status was on the Valentine's Day vow renewals as the Board meeting is next Wednesday. He knows Mary Crook has been working on the vows. Since the Little Log Church is still closed the vow renewal s taking place at the Presbyterian Church. Indicated their last meeting they did a recap of the council meeting and also spoke with Larry Thornton. Waiting for the Letter of Intent.

(2:20:15) Carl Miller advised that \$1,200 in donations were received in January. He was unsure of how many couples were signed up for the renewal of vows but last he knew there were six.

(11:43) Chair, Mazeika wanted to make a statement for the record: "Yachats Youth and Family Activities Program has been an amazing contributor to our community and I would like to formally acknowledge that. Not only have they been a great tenant, currently they're paying \$800 a month rent but they're also maintaining their space, they pay for maintenance and upgrades on the playground and a major part of the remodel was paid for out of YYFAP funds. All of those are minor issues. I don't think that people appreciate what a contribution and what a service for our community YYFAP is. Having been a business owner and employer, I appreciate the struggles that working parents, single working parents go through to arrange schooling and care for their children and ever since the county moved school services out of Yachats we have had nothing here. Over 28 years ago YYFAP stepped in and in all that time has filled a really important niche in our community. I know business owners who have sent their children through the program both the preschool and the activities program. I know single, working mothers who are doing that now, working couples with young children and over the years I think it's a good example of how in our small community any activity influences and effects the whole community," He went on the make the motion: **That the Yachats Parks and Commons Commission acknowledge YYFAPs contribution of over 28 years and thank them for their service to this community and congratulate them on getting ready to move into the new space.** Seconded by Morse.

Vote: Altson, yes; Berdie, yes; Hempen, yes; Whitten-Carey, yes; Shrock, yes; Morse, yes; and Mazeika, yes. **Motion carried unanimously.**

C. YYFAP Update

(14:45) Hettinger thanked Mazeika for his words and advised she appreciated the community support and support from Parks and Commons.

*The licensing inspection is one week away and at that point YYFAP will get the official number the space can accommodate and the kids will move in that afternoon full time.

*The two offices were moved last week and 95% accomplished. She contacted SeaRose to help with last minute things like hanging coat hooks, etc. She is excited to go forward in the new space and looks forward to the next adventure.

*The kids have been up to help move some things and have some ownership of the space and they are very excited.

*The handles on the xylophone outside have been repaired and are now attached with weatherproof chain.

*Will be getting an estimate for more bark for the playground.

*Will look into loose rail on tree house.

*Getting an estimate for the vent hood in the basement.

(19:11) Whitten-Carey asked if the antenna cord was gone. – Hettinger advised it was taken care of by cutting the cord and putting a plate over it. Whitten-Carey then asked who was responsible for the repairs at the playground.

(20:24) McClung indicated that starting a week ago a Public Works employee goes over weekly to work on maintenance items for City Hall and the Commons. Told Hettinger to put a work order into City Hall and it will be taken care of.

(21:05) Hettinger advised that to her knowledge the playground was financed by a grant through the State, funds from the City and YYFAP partnered to select and purchase the equipment and volunteers put it in with help from the City.

(21:33) Kittel indicated it was Milo Gramaans Dad (Chris) who did the tree house with his own funds and the playground was funded by a grant written by the Friends of the Yachats Commons and in conjunction with the Parks and Commons. McClung indicated there is a drainage system beneath the playground as the area flooded. Discussion was held regarding the correct bark chips to use.

(23:23) Altson raised the issue of the children being upstairs while there is painting going on. Mazeika advised the painting is not taking place in the YYFAP section of the building. The only issue would be when they paint the hallway adjacent to YYFAP. Mazeika advised Morphis that SeaRose was unable to access the City calendar to determine what rooms would be available for painting. Morphis advised he would get that to them. Hettinger advised they asked Searose to make sure the painting in the hallway where the preschool is to take place when the children aren't there.

(25:33) Mazeika asked Hettinger about fund raising indicating he missed the big dinner. Hettinger indicated the dinner would be put off until 2023, but is getting the fund-raising committee together to determine what they can do in the spring and summer.

Mazeika addressed the commissioners indicating YYFAP would give an update and report on a regular basis and Hettinger is getting back to that. Hettinger advised that YYFAP values and appreciates the support from Parks and Commons.

D. Green Space Project

(27:20) Berdie indicated there were five (5) proposals in response to the request for qualification (RFQ). They are located in the document section of the website, select Parks and Commons and then select Greenspace RFQ results. He gave an overview of the different companies. He felt the

responses were impressive and next steps are: 1. Decide who to send a Request for Proposal (RFP) to, including pricing and general outlines of how to proceed. 2. Get City Council's assurance that this project will be funded before going forward for the RFPs. The RFQ was to give the Finance Committee time to give the Council information on where the funds would come from for this. That hasn't happened so Parks and Commons needs to go to City Council and ask them to supply the funds. He discussed the different areas of the budget funds could be obtained and indicated he had spoken with Tom Lauritzen regarding line items and the Operating and Capital Budget. Berdie felt that there were several funds to take monies from to comfortably go forward with a request for funds from Council. Discussion was held on how to pick which of the five (5) firms should be sent an RFP. Berdie suggested sending RFPs to four (4) of the (5) companies. Mazeika said he was comfortable with that. Shrock brought up the question of the difference a company more local would make versus one further away. Berdie indicated that the most local was from Eugene and further stated that there will be travel costs but didn't think that was a big consideration. Berdie went on to say the Landcurrent has done a lot of playgrounds and integrating a play space into the project would be nice. He went on to say that being in Eugene they would have the most knowledge of coastal conditions (38:28) Whitten-Carey indicated her definite "yes" was Landcurrent from Eugene, she thought it was more creative, Carbon neutral and more natural. She felt Greenworks was "stodgy" it was very formal and felt like it could be a park in any other US city. She felt Integra from Santa Rosa would be unfamiliar with the climate and too far away. She had no specific comments on PCD or Range Studio. (39:48) Altson advised he had no preference, he was impressed with all of the companies. His main focus was having experience working on the coast. He was impressed with Greenworks via their document but the others were no less qualified. (40:55) Morse advised she felt the same way and that at least three (3) needed to be chosen and agreed four (4) was a good decision. She felt Integra should be dismissed due to the distance and travel. (41:18) Shrock was impressed with how one took into consideration concerns of the unhoused people camping and drainage and many other things they took into account. He felt the Commission needed to take those things into account also, not just the beautiful landscaping. (41:48) Hempen felt all the companies had good experience and some had decades of experience. All were knowledgeable about what would grow on the coast, he was more interested in a company more local due to travel and the ability to respond quickly. His top choices were Greenworks and PCD, but all seem experienced. (43:03) Mazeika said he was impressed with all the companies but he liked PCD. He's leery about Greenworks because of their size but if the Commission requests RFPs from four (4) companies then there will be good information to provide the City.

Discussion continued on the different companies and Hempen advised he would feel more comfortable if the City Council was more firm in their support of this. He hopes to get that in the meeting next week. Morse questioned if a Letter of Intent would be required for this project. (49:04) Berdie indicated he would like to meet with McClung after the meeting with City Council to determine what would be involved in creating an RFP. Will need to be clear on what it is they are being asked to bid on. (46:16) Hempen brought up that he thought two companies brought up wetlands and how to deal with that and potential it will become. He said a company's ability to deal with that would definitely be a factor (46:51) Berdie indicated that the two smaller companies actually suggested using a consultant who done the hydrology report for the waste water plant. He said that no one addressed the infrastructure of the boardwalk. It was built in 2004 so that is 18 years for the infrastructure and it needs to be determined how long that is going to last. Discussion was held regarding including the boardwalk into the green space plan. (49:29) Whitten-Carey brought up that Landcurrent had a wetlands stream expert and that they also talked about plants surviving climate change. (51:26) Berdie summarized: (1) bring RFQs to City Council; (2) insure there are funds; and if necessary a Letter of Intent; (3) Work with McClung to determine what needs to be included in an RFP to minimize the effort on the vendor's side. (52:06) Mazeika asked if it was realistic to think an RFP could be ready to send out before the next meeting Berdie wanted to know if he and McClung could come up with an RFP would the rest of the Commission want to see it before it went out. He explained what an RFP was. (53:13) Morse said she felt no one was more knowledgeable than McClung in this area and she wasn't going to second guess his work. She is fine if it can be done and sent out. Everyone else agreed. (54:09) Altson asked if anyone remembered working with the person who did the hydrology work on the waste water plant. McClung advised he worked with him and he still has a good relationship with them and he would be happy to work with them again.

V. ONGOING BUSINESS

A. Commons Painting

(56:07) Mazeika gave an update on the painting. Polly Plumb will only need the hall Friday, 2/15 through Monday, 2/18. Only concern was that quilts don't pick up any paint smell; there are quilts from France and other countries on display. SeaRose advised that they most likely won't be able to paint after the 15th.

(57:29) Whitten-Carey advised she contacted SeaRose before the meeting and was told there was still no signed contract. Whitten-Carey advised that Searose should hand-deliver the contract for signature since Guenther is overwhelmed with all the emails she gets.

(58:10) Capron advised that Guenther did receive the email and contract and is planning on signing it but they are in the middle of taxes and billing.

(58:36) Whitten-Carey went on to say that there was a concern regarding the contract, (1) the preschool ceiling was not on it and (2) none of the interior doors were included to be painted. Mazeika advised he had told SeaRose to do an “add on” for the ceiling and as far as the doors the contract needs to be looked at. SeaRose advised if they got the contract some of the painting could start over the weekend and then next week continue but not paint during the quilt show.

(59:36) Mazeika advised Guenther said she would pop in from time to time to check on the progress of the painting and by the time of the March meeting it should be close to complete.

(1:00:21) Shelly Shrock indicated there was a lot of “stuff” in the storage area off of the multi-purpose room and she and some other volunteers would like to clean it out. Discussion held on cleaning out the storage room and other areas.

(1:03:05) Stott explained the process of putting unused items into surplus. She advised since the value of the items is so low, nothing formal needs to be done, they can just be cleaned out. McClung said anything under \$500 doesn’t have to go through the process but the items given away still need to be recorded. Mazeika suggested Habitat, Goodwill or St Vinnie’s as they will come and pick it up. Hettinger advised there is some old furniture that they would like to dispose of. Discussion continued on cleaning up and disposing and when to do it.

(1:11:27) Berdie said that ultimately this is the City’s responsibility and that the Parks and Commons Commission and volunteers do a lot of work but at some point the City needs to step up and get some things done. McClung said he would take care of getting the computers out of the way and make sure no confidential or City information is on them.

B. Pocket Parks

(1:13:25) A week away from the response period for SHPO Shrock and Whitten-Carey provided information in the meeting packet about signage. Whitten-Carey went over the information. Question of type and size of sign the Commission would like as well as where the signs should be located. Discussion held on signs. Altson brought up a cross walk from Ocean View to 4th and discussion was held on pros and cons. Stott brought up that any signs on 101 need to be approved by ODOT. Everyone agreed to having a crosswalk across Ocean View to 4th Street. Whitten-Carey indicated the drawing shows four benches in that area. Discussion ensued and it was decided that three was a good number.

6th Street – talked about beach access, Whitten-Carey indicated the beach access is “a slippery slope” and could be a liability. Want to move current bench back, add an additional bench and then plant salal to discourage people going down the rock cliff.

(1:45:24) Stott advised she used the beach access quite often. She uses her cane and goes carefully but has not had a problem. She felt the public needs to be able to make their own decisions about beach access.

Discussion was had regarding safety and signage for beach access.

Whitten-Carey continued talking about the benches indicating there was another very good spot for a bench in "Peace Park".

(1:52:17) Altson pointed out the dilemma: indicate beach access to keep people from climbing down the rocks or not indicating beach access and having people continue to climb down the rocks. Hempen said beach access says "come here" and he doesn't think it is necessary. He also felt that the park should be officially named and perhaps have signage as such. Berdie indicated that in 2019 it was officially named Peace Park. He continued the discussion on the signage for "No Beach Access" and "Public Access" at Peace Park. McClung suggested the signage say "Peace Park Entrance" while Mazeika stated his view was that anything that says access means it is a maintained access point.

(1:58:21) Whitten-Carey advised she had enough input and would get together with Shrock and put together a more detailed signage presentation. Langley also suggested indicating that is not where the 804 trail goes.

C. Commons Front Landscaping and Stairs

(2:00:20) Morphis spoke with a company out of Lincoln City about upgrading the skate park and they've done a number of local skate parks, Toledo, Kaiser, Newport and they are associated with a "prolific" skateboarder that lives in the Seal Rock area. Sent pictures of our skate park and is waiting to hear back from them. He thought they might be willing to come to then next Zoom meeting. Mazeika indicated he wasn't sure that's how to proceed. The original discussion was to replace the piece that rotted. Discussion held on how to proceed.

(2:05:00) Stott indicated the skate park is "near and dear to her heart" because she spoke to some 15 year old girls who used the park daily in the good weather. She indicated even the ramp that is still in good condition is not safe because it has a lip on it. Also, the features are so close together She would love to see what this company could do from a skate boarder's point of view with that small space.

(2:07:20) Morphis said he would research other companies and get more information.

(2:07:39) Berdie raised the concern of getting this done this year as there are so many other projects on the P&C plate.

D. Commons Re-opening

Nothing at this time Mazeika wants to meet with City Manager to see what she thinks.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

(2:09:20) Mazeika wanted to remind everyone about the obligations under the open meeting and public information regulations and laws. The agenda is his responsibility and Commission members contact him if they want something on the agenda. He reminded commissioners that any communication between commissioners to include Dayna so it can be part of the public record. Any email sent to another commissioner or council member also gets sent to Dayna.

(2:12:32) Berdie suggested a class or self-study on public meeting law as a refresher. Discussion held regarding public meeting requirements. He felt it would benefit the City to modernize the public meeting laws.

VII. COMMONS OTHER BUSINESS

A. From Commissioners

(2:16:51) Hempen asked about the status of the budget and what projects could be funded. Groth advised the supplemental budget is still being worked on. Discussion was held regarding moving monies from line items, etc.

B. From Staff

C. For the Next Agenda

VIII. FROM THE FLOOR

Mazeika moved to adjourn the meeting, it was seconded by Altson. Meeting adjourned at 4:27 pm.

Transcribed by Contractor, L.F. Barrett on April 6, 2022.

CITY OF YACHATS
Parks and Commons Commission
Meeting Summary
April 5, 2022

Present: Adam Altson, Fran Morse, Catherine Whitten-Carey, Michael Hempen, George Mazeika, Chair, Craig Berdie, Dean Shrock, Tim Gross, Civil West, Rick McClung, Loren Dickinson, Joann Kittel, Bob Langley

I. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order at 2:14 pm by Chair, George Mazeika.

II. CORRESPONDENCE/ COMMUNICATIONS

(0:28) None.

III. REPORTS

A. Trails

(2: Mazeika referred to the report included in the meeting packet. Kittel advised the work at the Amanda Trail being done by the Trails and Job Corps is progressing very well and will be complete soon. Langley said the extension of the Y'Xaik Trail has been completed at the north end.

B. Boardwalk Project

(2:52) Presentation made by the Trails Committee along with multiple documents included in the meeting packet. Langley gave a summary of what has been done so far in the process. They asked for a workup from Civil West for a boardwalk using, composite material, LED under the rail lighting and composite rail with stainless steel wire.

(6:06) McClung indicated the project will cost \$900,000 - \$1M not counting the undergrounding of power. He advised grants will be pursued and most of the costs will end up being covered by grants. \$710,000 of "hard costs" with a 30% contingency of \$213K. Advised Civil West is currently working on the cost of undergrounding the power.

(7:32) Gross indicated the boardwalk can be done with or without undergrounding the power. He knows it is preferred to have the poles gone but right now one of the poles has a light on it so they are working to resolve that issue.

(8:36) McClung indicated that the Commission should indicate that the poles should be removed and the power put underground. McClung stated the cosmetics would be much nicer.

(9:06) Kittel talked about indicated sources of funding: the Visitor Amenities Fund, the 804 Mitigation Fund, Local Government Grant (Annually) will be applied for in 2023 and it funds projects up to \$700K with matching from the City at about 10%, Recreational Trails Grant every January which is \$100K with a 20% match, Also looking at a grant from

1 Travel Oregon and OCVA (Oregon Coast Visitors Association); View the
2 Future started a fund for the boardwalk last year and there is \$26K in that
3 fund. She advised there are also smaller grants available that could cover
4 "extras".

5 (12:47) Dickinson agreed when Langley advised the timeline for the
6 project is not locked in stone. He referred to the estimated timeline
7 included in the packet. He advised it will be updated as the project goes
8 through its different phases. He indicated things that would affect the
9 timeline are: getting on City Council's agenda and timelines set between
10 McClung and the contractors. He stressed the timeline is very general and
11 will change.

12 (15:03) Berdie asked what type of payment structure there was on a
13 project such as this. Dickinson explained that they presented the design
14 aspect but this project is more CIP and McClung can answer those
15 questions. McClung referred to Gross of Civil West.

16 (16:30) Gross explained the bidding process and how contractors may
17 structure their payments, usually monthly payments with a percentage
18 retained. He did indicate that payments requested should match the
19 amount of work that has been completed. McClung and Gross continued
20 to discuss how payments may be structured. Gross discussed the
21 undergrounding of power and that it is a totally separate project and PUD
22 will request their costs up front. They also discussed timing of PUD work
23 depended on what type of transformer would be needed ranging from two
24 to three months to a year. McClung referred to the sale of the Landmark
25 property and advised that had a three-phase transformer and the
26 purchase of that property would save money on the boardwalk project.

27 (21:08) Mazeika asked if the boards were running parallel or perpendicular
28 to the street. Langley said that has not been determined yet as there are
29 ADA considerations. Mazeika then asked about lighting choices.

30 Dickinson responded saying lighting will depend on the new City
31 Ordinance and went on to say project lighting is different than street
32 lighting and the team has yet to determine if street lighting is needed.

33 (22:28) Mazeika then asked about the impact of the undergrounding of
34 power on the timeline and who was paying for the archaeology. McClung
35 responded that the City would be responsible for the archaeology and that
36 he did a walk through with PUD a couple months ago. He advised if the
37 need for a three-phase transformer could be eliminated the cost of
38 undergrounding would be significantly less. Langley advised SHPO
39 doesn't want to weigh in until engineering is at least 80% complete.
40 Discussion was held regarding timing of the boardwalk versus
41 undergrounding the power.

(25:52) Stott interjected that it seemed like two separate projects and that the undergrounding perhaps needed to go first. She recommended that it be presented to Council as two separate projects.

(26:39) Berdie asked about the length of railing for the boardwalk and then a separate amount for an overlook. Gross addressed why it was presented in the manner it was.

(28:30) Quinton Smith of Yachats News asked about the superstructure/pilings under the boardwalk and how far out they would go. Gross explained the construction and location.

(30:33) Langley then asked the Commission if they were comfortable with what has been presented if they would go to City Council and ask Council to approve McClung to obtain engineering services.

The Commission after listening to the presentation from the design team, recommends that the City Council do the same and subsequently authorize city staff to contract for design engineering services through the project board, to be considered separately and independently from any undergrounding. Discussion was held and Gross indicated that approving and moving ahead with the undergrounding is good, but actually doing it before the boardwalk would be a mistake as it would get in the way. The two projects need to be coordinated.

(37:02) Mazeika made the motion that: **Parks and Commons recommend to City Council to approve move forward with the undergrounding of electricity utilities from Beach Street to Highway 101 and take whatever steps necessary to find out what the cost will be to facilitate compliment the Boardwalk Project.** Discussion was held on wording of motion (changes indicated above via strikeouts and red print). Further discussion was held regarding possible costs and wording of motion

Vote: Altson, yes; Berdie, yes; Hempen, yes; Morse, yes; Shrock, yes; Whitten-Carey, yes; Mazeika, yes. **Motion Carried unanimously.**

(39:53) Langley restated his wording for a motion: **The Parks and Commission after listening to the presentation from the Boardwalk Design Team, recommends that encourages the City Council do the same to ask for a similar presentation from the Design Team and subsequently authorize city staff to contract for design engineering services. through the project board.** *Note: This did not actually come from a Commission member; is it considered a viable motion pursuant to Oregon Public Meeting Law?*

Vote: Altson, yes; Berdie, yes; Hempen, yes; Morse, yes; Shrock, yes; Whitten-Carey, yes; Mazeika, yes. Discussion was then held on the best way to getting the motion in front of City Council in a timely fashion.

(42:53) Hempen thanked the Design Team for the many hours they put into the Boardwalk Project and advised they did a great job.

C. Little Log Church

(43:36) Mazeika advised he has heard nothing from the City and Miller also advised he has heard nothing. He asked to set up a meeting with Mazeika and Lambert on how to go forward. Gross interjected he has been talking with Lambert regarding structural evaluation of the church. Discussion was held on the value of another structural evaluation. Gross advised the last evaluation was apparently not structural and he felt the costs associated with rehabilitating that structure seem out of line. Miller also advised that fund raising for this year has already exceeded what was raised last year.

(46:11) Berdie indicated there was now a porta potty at the Little Log Church, assuming it was placed there due to human waste being a problem. He also mentioned there was someone camping out in the front doorway making it “visually unappealing”. Discussion held on how to deal with the issue. Smith brought up code enforcement and it should be handed off to the City Coordinator and Facilities Manager. Further discussion was held regarding unhoused camping in the wetlands and other places.

IV. ONGOING BUSINESS

A. Pocket Parks

(49:31) Mazeika advised he spoke with the archaeologist and was told it was about a week out from filing for permits.

1. Plant Pickup and storage

(50:43) Berdie advised he needs help, picking up plants on April 15th. The nursery suggested getting 2x4s for put in the van to help separate levels of plants and then delivering them to Beaver Creek Nursery. Giving Berdie their key code so he can go weekly to insure the irrigation system is working. Discussion on commission members helping get plants and supply 2x4s. Discussion held regarding MidCoast Watershed and the great volunteers in Yachats that also go outside their community.

2. Archaeology Study

(55:04) Mazeika indicated that information from the archaeologist indicates he should hear back from SHPO by the middle of May and be able to start the archaeology on the pocket parks. Asked about discussing benches and signs.

(55:33) Whitten-Carey said she never got feedback from her last presentation so she and Shrock have questions. She presented a mockup of a cliff edge danger sign. It was determined that multiple bids

are not required for a project like this. She also presented a sign for Peace Park, since on maps it is called Oceanview. Berdie advised Whitten-Carey that she could investigate price and recommend a vendor but the final decision comes from the City.

(1:00:52) Hempen advised Morse, Berdie and he have a good idea what they want to recommend for benches as to size, if they are good size for discouraging sleeping, how they would last in the environment and they can make a firm recommendation at the next meeting. Berdie said the main thing is if they need to be reinforced into the ground is that a SHPO question so that will make a difference in what they select. Whitten-Carey asked if archaeology would also affect putting stakes in the ground for the signs. She then asked about time frame. Berdie thought the benches and signs could proceed so they would be ready after the archaeology report came through.

(1:04:03) Altson asked if the benches for the boardwalk would be the same or complimentary to the pocket park benches. Discussion ensued, especially getting styles that discourage sleeping on them.

B. COMMONS PAINTING

1. Interior Update

(1:09:18) Mazeika asked if Whitten-Carey has heard any more from SeaRose. He knows the family was dealing with Covid but thinks they are back to work now. She has not heard anything further. She advised what information she did have regarding the painting. Whitten-Carey indicated she was frustrated as there are repairs and such that need to be done while SeaRose is there “with paint in their hands” and none of them have been done. SeaRose also wanted to know the schedule for the Commons to make sure they work around them. Discussion was held regarding Big Band on the 7th and things being stored on the stage.

(1:13:40) Shrock talked about the wonderful communication they Commission had with Heather Hoen and if that was going to be picked up by the new person. Also felt that the Facilities Manager and City Coordinator should sit in on these meetings to facilitate communication.

(1:17:02) Hempen brought up that there was no resolution regarding the Big Band using the Commons on the 7th and what was going to happen with items stored on the stage. Mazeika indicated he didn't want to get involved with it. Discussion on lack of communication.

(1:19:32) Morse suggested putting together a list of what the Commission needs from a facilities manager and ask that one of those things be that they attend the monthly Commission meetings. This led

to further discussion on who is responsible for clearing the stage.
Whitten-Carey advised she would check out the stage tomorrow and
advise what needed to be moved.

2. Exterior

3. Commons Re-opening

V. NEW BUSINESS

VI. COMMONS AND OTHER BUSINESS

A. From Commissioners

(1:22:49) Berdie wanted to address his Green Space project. RFPs were
sent to four vendors on March 14th and he hopes to get those back soon.

(1:23:23) He also brought up the bike racks. Mazeika said he knows
they've been ordered he saw the invoices; he didn't remember if there was
a delivery date on them.

(1:24:24) Altson had a thought for a future meeting and brought up the
osprey pole in the green space. There is no platform on the pole.

B. From Staff

C. For the Next Agenda

VII. FROM THE FLOOR

(1:26:29) Hempen brought up the difficulties in getting onto zoom meetings. It
happens every month and wants to know how to get it fixed. Discussion had
and Hempen asked if that could be put on the list to speak with Lambert.

(1:28:24) Smith advised the Commission to pressure the City Manager to
have in person meetings. He stated that all meetings throughout the county
are being held in person.

(1:29:09) Hempen made motion to adjourn and Mazeika adjourned the meeting at 3:43
pm.

Transcribed by Contractor, L.F. Barrett on April 15, 2022