

September 4th, 2020

Mayor's Blue-Ribbon Committee on Prescott Park Master Plan Implementation

9-10:30am

Online / Zoom Meeting

Meeting Minutes

ATTENDEES

- Nancy Colbert Puff, Deputy City Manager (NCP)
- Peter Rice, Director of Public Works (PR)
- Beth Margeson (BM)
- Councilor Petra Huda (PH)
- Robin Lurie-Meyerkopf (RLM)
- Genevieve Aichele (GA)
- Alan Gordon (AG)
- Tom Watson (TW)
- Cheri Ruane, Vice President, W&S (CR)
- Savy Kep, Landscape Designer, W&S (SK)

SUMMARY OF PRESENTATION AND COMMENTS

Following the regulations of the COVID-19 emergency response the requirement has been waived that a quorum be physically present. Remote attendees will introduce themselves and identify their location; votes will be counted by roll call.

Proposed Public Meeting Presentation Draft (CR):

- Project Team
- Agenda
 - Recap Master Plan
 - Enabling engineering
 - Prescott park updates
 - Introduction to Proposed Phase 1
 - Open Discussion
- Recap
 - We did a lot of public outreach, series of meetings physically in the park
 - Park First Approach was generated out of those series
 - List of Design Tenets
 - Early Concept Renderings
 - Master Plan, 2017 –
 - The stage footprint was not assuming any use and conceptually put in place by the arts festival
 - The stage is the lighter gray and the darker gray is the “back of house”
 - They said with this footprint that they would still need some trailers
 - At the time we saw it as a temporary stage
 - One of the bigger moves was moving the formal gardens
 - The crab apple trees are the backbone of the garden – we want to start the new formal, get it going and make it in line with the path rather than creating a barrier
 - Four Tree Island
 - We proposed to keep it mostly as is

- Shore up the edge to help with erosion control
- Create a boardwalk to view without imposing on the ecological edge
- Master Plan, 2020
 - The lawn rotated to be more in line with the proposed stage being along the rail and parallel to the water
 - This updated area – is a gathering area, mingling and accessible surface but not concrete or lawn
- Enabling Engineering
 - Looking at the flooding from an inundation perspective – flooding at a 100 year storm, sure it is a low likely hood, however what is most important is that the inundation from the storm and high tide – the darkest blue is most at risk, and as you head towards Marcy Street and the Player's Ring it's 2-3 feet higher
 - Its important to note that the 100-year storm is changing from being a 1% chance to 4% chance over time due to climate change
 - The park itself is in a key location that could help protect the assets of the park and the rest of the community ***needs to be emphasized more*
 - Stormwater strategy
 - Proposing capturing any potential for stormwater
 - Temporary stormwater holding area on the Performance Lawn (*update graphic to have in only performance lawn area*)
 - There are pipes that can be upsized that can allow for better flow
 - Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing perspective
 - Redeploy electrical service
 - Upgrade water service to support irrigation
 - Making sure that the sewer lines are up to date and servicing the bathrooms
 - New gas lines
 - The electrical service is in most need of upgrade
 - Historical Building Analysis
 - Historical Industrial Uses
 - The rail parcel was the last place for industrial use, and it shows now why the stage was placed where it is, so now we have the opportunity to propose a design that is a park first approach and place the stage in a more inviting place
 - Here is some of the current uses of the garage and the lean-to, they are old, and they were built in a way that is not the best in efficiency
 - This is the present maintenance shed at Four Tree Island, so we want to consolidate all these items in a more efficient way and a central location, rather than scattered
 - Here is the present-day stage
- Prescott Park Project Updates
 - Updated Project Schedule
 - Public Process Timeline (*update to be cleaner – maybe a couple slides*)
 - Proposed Phase 1 Priorities (*updated "carrying capacity OVER the Performance"*)
 - (*update language to "relocated Maintenance Facility"*)
 - (*reducing chain link is connected to the seawall improvements*) we will update that
 - Design Tenets
 - *We will make it clearer that these design tenets are separate for Phase 1 and future stages for Phase 1*
 - Diagram
 - At "raise and relocate" the stage should be added on to the rail?

- Agreed.
- PH: In the first couple of slides there was a holding area and now in the diagrams there is only in the pipe
 - CR: that holding area is the grading lines so what we can do is align the graphic and put an oval and place the text holding area on it
 - GE: it should be three slides just to clarify the sequence
 - CR: we will clarify the sequence more
- Phase 1 Cost Summary
 - Feedback on the clarified graphic?
 - PR: one question on the stage rental – who is on the book for the stage rental cost? If it is by another entity, then the cost does not need to be in the mix
 - CR: That is a good question, I had heard that the private donor would be offering 1m for a permanent stage but unsure about the temporary
 - GE: It is proposed to have the stage be temporary for the first year correct?
 - CR: Yes because we need to focus on the other priorities first
 - GE: I believe if it is a temporary stage then it should be on the city
 - TW: looking at the slide for regrading for preferential flooding – are we suggesting that that is the final location of the stage?
 - CR: Yes, going back to the phase 1 scope – we are proposing it to be along the rail allowing access to the buildings, whether it is permanent or temporary
 - TW: We also proposed a new addition, will that come after?
 - CR: *Yes, we will make these different colors, so they are different*
 - TW: Previously it was suggested that the stage was in between the Shaw and the new addition, so now that is not the suggestion correct?
 - CR: Yes, we believe it is in the best interest of the masterplan, because of its connection to the Shaw and the accessibility it provides
 - TW: Okay that is preferred for the Shaw but now my concern is taking the space away from the stage storage so would that mean there would be trailers?
 - CR: Based on our last conversation, it is possible that the early years is temporary stage with room for storage/placement
 - TW: I see in the diagram; I was concerned about there not being a building and not having enough room for the stage storage
 - CR: We could change the new addition building into a dashed line. In the raise and relocate diagram we will have the stage and an outline for the stage storage area
 - TW: Will the walkway in front of the stage be installed later?
 - CR: In some cases, we can do a temporary alignment, some of these things will go in phases
 - BM: Assuming we take out the lean to and garage and not have the buildings yet, there may not be enough storage on the 1st floor of the Shaw – we will need to utilize it fully correct?
 - PR: It is currently being used by us for the maintenance administration function. We understand that as this evolves it will be a challenge, but if we must adapt, we will
 - BM: What about the materials placed in the lean to and the garage, where will that go?

- PR: We may have to rent or lease container trailers to provide that space as an interim step
- Questions:
 - TW: The phasing plan was different in 2017, I believe it would be helpful to include so people understand where it has evolved since then (*include the previous phasing plan*)
 - TW: Is the Shaw in its original location?
 - CR: Correct
 - TW: It would be helpful to show how the Sheafe has moved around in the past
 - CR: We will make sure that gets included
 - TW: When I looked at the proposed master plan 2020, the seating bowl it looks like its past the path
 - CR: good catch, we will update it
 - TW: The orange area is some type of a paved area?
 - CR: Yes, the idea is for it to be functional hardscape
 - TW: So that platform or seating will go away?
 - CR: Correct, it is something we need to evolve in detailed design
 - TW: In the previous Master plan 2017 there were these grading berms, why did we take it away?
 - CR: Initially we wanted it to have it sloped up those berms, potentially some integrated seating so you don't have to bring in chairs all the time. We know for sure the profile will be lower near the water street and higher to the back but more design development needs to happen
 - TW: Are those shaded areas representing the berms in the diagram?
 - CR: we will update this and just change it into an oval to align with the other graphic
 - TW: The difference between the 2017 master plan and the 2020 master plan shows the some changes in phase 3 or 4. We had looked at a lot of design elements for the step down area, where people could bring their kayak area – it looks like it may be less so in the new design? Can you explain what is going on in that area?
 - CR: I believe we need to take a closer look at this area and resolve it, we want this pier to connect in a more formal way and we will make this kayak area look similar to the previous plan because it will not change, we will make it more consistent
 - PR: It might be worthwhile for the committee to do a site walk; it would help visualize the changing grade and what it means to the flow of the park. It is difficult to see this from the graphics and it is because you need to make grading work. I would suggest if the committee agrees for a site walk, and we could look at the grade change and the difference in elevation
 - TW: does the city have topographic maps for this? How do people feel about this?
 - *everyone loves the idea*
 - AG: For the first presentation meeting we will have, it strikes me that the stage, dollar cost, and the moving of the formal garden and the Hovey it might generate conversation. *The movement of the Hovey may be the first time the public will be hearing of this change, so it needs to be explained more. Secondly, there was referencing in fixing the stormwater and how it might help the south end, and it would be helpful to elaborate in that statement it would hook more people*
 - CR: thank you Alan those are great points
 - GE: I would agree, any time I mention anything about the formal gardens, people are just really attached. I also wanted to reiterate I really support the trip to the park

- TW: If we wanted to do this before the public meeting, it does not give us a lot of time, how does everyone feel about the following Saturday?
 - GE: I could do this if it is early in the morning
 - CR: I would be happy to join, and could bring up a couple of boards and very happy to come up and walk the site with you all
 - BM: It would be very helpful to see everything visually
 - PR: I will make it work
 - NCP: 9 am?
 - TW: Let's assume 9am (the 12th) and meet at the Hovey fountain
- TW: Welcome Robin, unsure how much you have seen or missed but any thoughts or comments?
- RLM: Apologies, I have been on for a bit and I agree with everything, I like the park the way it is, so I am glad we are addressing all these changes
- TW: Yes, I agree that we should not play down the formal gardens and happy to open it back up to the public for conversation
- NCP: We engaged W&S for the implementation of the phase 1 and they looked at the stormwater and said we need a committee. If the stormwater was not a major influence, then the masterplan would have been more manageable to implement. It is important to show the adjustments to the masterplan are necessary based on the stormwater strategies
- PH: Could Cheri take us back to the part where the utilities were coming, the gas lines etc. On this one I would like to understand that - is this cost going to be on the Prescott Park or the City?
 - PR: It is all infrastructure that supports the park, all these things are intertwined to the park. The infrastructure is part and parcel for the overall park
 - PH: Is the gas line for heating? Are we not extending to the Sheafe?
 - CR: Yes, it is for heating and we are not extending to the Sheafe yet, for the short term. We are not limiting it and the capacity of those lines could support the Sheafe as well in future phases
 - PH: If we wanted it to come down to the Sheafe it would be another phase?
 - CR: Correct
- PR: The Saturday meeting needs to be available to the public?
 - RLM: The members of the public are invited?
 - GE: can we say they need to wear masks?
 - Yes
- AG: Going back to the cost summary, I believe it will generate a lot of conversation. I am wondering about if there is another page that would show other sources of funding, by the city, or the public, or someone else. It would help to show other people sharing the responsibility
 - TW: I am not sure how we can do that. The funding is public private partnerships. I could see some donors would want to donate to the formal garden but not the infrastructure. Are we in a position to point out sources of revenue?
 - NCP: Not really Tom, the CIP was programmed, we don't know yet where this private funding would come from
 - AG: Just the sheer numbers is daunting so just a clarification would be helpful
 - GE: Certain things like renovating the Shaw – there should be ADA funding from the city correct?
 - NCP: Yes, that is an eligible funding source

- TW: So maybe a statement that what Alan is suggesting that the city is approaching the funding of these sources CIP budget, grants, and private donations so people do not think their taxes will go up for this
- PH: The other thing we need to keep in mind is the timing, the CIP is set for a certain amount and the project will go for a number of years – what we have now will need to be used for the seawalls but we need to get the idea of the timing, so it doesn't look as grim as it does now. This is not something that will be done in 6 months. On the slides where you show how things are moving, it could be helpful to create more diagrams, could we make more of that?
 - CR: That is a pretty big undertaking, but we can discuss how to make the movements clearer
- TW: It is a good point, we had discussed last time that we may need to break down Phase 1, and how it could be the cost associated to the different stages. A separate phase that would describe that
- BM: I need to leave early, so making sure that we do not need to vote for anything. And another note, they made a periodic check in with the council, so they be brought along with the process, so the council are not all hit at once with the new changes. I believe it would require 6 votes.
 - PH: That is a good point
- PH: Is there any way to tighten those numbers up because it is almost double?
 - CR: I think what we can predict from historic knowledge, it would average out. The trouble is we have not done the detail design so we do not have enough data to say with confidence how much these improvements would cost. We do not want to kill the project, but we also do not want to set peoples' expectations. It also depends on the bid prices since the pandemic contractors were hungry for work. That is also something we cannot predict
- PH: I would like to give an update to the council around the same time we will be presenting to the public.
- TW: Our public meeting is on the 15th so Petra I can come with you on the 14th and prepare in information with you
- BM: I just thought we were blessing the package today
 - TW: I would like to hear from the public here today before we give it our blessing, do you support presenting this to the public on the 15th?
 - BM: yes
- TW: Any other thoughts or suggestions to the presentations?
 - GE: I have very small specific comments and I will just email it to everyone

Open Public Comment Period

Courtney Perkins

- I'm looking at the phase 1 cost summary slide at the temporary stage rental – I believe it would be helpful to create clarification for the stage piece and also clarity for the movement of the fountain the public would also ask if it would change into a kid water play area. And if you all need chairs or tables for the meeting on the 12th, we can set those up for you

Closed public comment

Motion to approve the public presentation with the changes discussed, seconded

All approved

TW: We will all meet next Saturday the 12th, to understand the visual of the park and then our public meeting will be Tuesday the 15th. Cheri when do you believe that we will receive the updated presentation?

CR: I would like to have it to the committee by Thursday before our walk through on Saturday

Motion to Adjourn, seconded

All Approved

End of Notes: SK