MEMORANDUM

TO: Michael G. Herring, City Administrator

FROM: Mike Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works

SUBJECT: Planning & Public Works Committee Meeting Summary
Thursday, August 19, 2010

A meeting of the Planning and Public Works Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held on Thursday, August 19, 2010 in Chambers.

In attendance were: **Chair Matt Segal** (Ward I); **Councilmember Bruce Geiger** (Ward II); **Councilmember Mike Casey** (Ward III); and **Councilmember Connie Fults** (Ward IV).

Also in attendance were: Mayor John Nations; Councilmember Lee Erickson (Ward II); Councilmember Randy Logan (Ward III); G. Elliott Grissom, Planning Commission Chair; Wendy Geckeler, Planning Commissioner; Michael Herring, City Administrator; Libbey Tucker, Assistant City Administrator for Community Services and Economic Development; Mike Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works; Aimee Nassif, Planning & Development Services Director; Steve Jarvis, Assistant Director of Parks & Recreation; Jeff Paskiewicz, Civil Engineer; Kristian Corbin, Project Planner; Mary Ann Madden, Office Manager; and Kristine Kelley, Administrative Assistant.

The meeting was called to order at 5:33 p.m.

Chair Segal explained to the audience the meeting procedures that would be followed.

I. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

A. Approval of the August 5, 2010 Committee Meeting Summary.

Councilmember Casey made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of August 5, 2010**.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

II. OLD BUSINESS - None

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Ordinance Adopting the 1997/2008/2009 Codes as Amended and Adopted by St. Louis County.

STAFF REPORT

Aimee Nassif, Planning & Development Services Director explained that in 1988 the City contracted with St. Louis County for enforcement of their Building, Mechanical, Plumbing, Electrical and Explosives codes within the City of Chesterfield. When St. Louis County updates the codes, the City prepares legislation adopting the updates. Starting in November 2010, the County will begin using the 1997, 2008 and 2009 adopted codes.

Councilmember Fults made a motion to forward Ordinance Adopting the 1997/2008/2009 Codes as Amended and Adopted by St. Louis County to City Council with a recommendation to approve. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Geiger and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

Note: One Bill, as recommended by the Planning & Public Works Committee, will be needed for the September 1, 2010 City Council Meeting.
See Bill #

[Please see the attached report prepared by Mike Geisel, Director of Planning and Public Works, for additional information on Ordinance Adopting the 1997/2008/2009 Codes as Amended and Adopted by St. Louis County].

B. Eberwein Park Development Phase III – Recommendations and Report

Chair Segal recognized all Staff in attendance and thanked them for all the professional work that has gone into the Phase III and the Supplemental Reports.

STAFF REPORT

Aimee Nassif, Planning & Development Services Director, stated that she is representing the whole Project Team and then acknowledged and thanked the following Staff members for their assistance on the project; Steve Jarvis, Ben Niesen, Jeff Paskiewicz, Kristian Corbin, and Mindy Mohrman.

Ms. Nassif gave a PowerPoint Presentation outlining the following:

Topics for Discussions

- Update on issues introduced at previous meeting.
- Commentary on the dog park site plan.
- Feedback on the projected costs.

- Direction on the disposition of the existing structures.
- Initiate discussion relative to funding the desired improvements.

Issues from June 10, 2010 Committee meeting

- Monuments will be placed at various locations throughout the park. A historical marker with photos and information on the family will be created for the interior of the park.
- The intent is to provide an open play area where park goers can participate in such activities as kite flying, walking, or having a ball game. A backstop and minor grading will be included in the design to encourage play.
- Rain gardens/native plantings are planned for the park, which satisfy water quality requirements with the St. Louis Metropolitan Sewer District (MSD) while adding to the overall scenery.
- Staff was asked to continue looking for funding to assist with the preservation of the existing structures and to include other area parks, such as Town and Country's Drace Park and the Longview Farmhouse in the research. The Longview Farmhouse original structure, along with a 1,500 square foot addition, was restored at an approximate cost of over $1,000,000. The farmhouse is now rented out several times a month.

Zoning Map Amendment

Staff has initiated the change of zoning process so that the 18.78 acre Eberwein park site is zoned Park and Scenic District. The Public Hearing is scheduled for Monday, August 23, 2010. The zoning amendment will then be forwarded to the Planning & Public Works Committee and on to Council for final approval.

At the last meeting, Staff was asked to look at the two-acre dog park component of the park and to obtain projected costs.

Resources

Staff utilized the following resources in its research:

- Association of Pet Dog Trainers
- National Park and Recreation Association
- Dog Parks USA
- American Kennel Club Association
- Dr. Paul Schifano of Petropolis
- Plus information on materials/supplies from local businesses

Site Plans

- Rendered Site Plan includes the conceptual idea for the entire 18-acre Eberwein Park. Staff is waiting for a decision on the disposition of the buildings before moving forward.
- Rendered Site Plan – Dog Park shows the basic site plan for one section of the Eberwein Park. Amenities or other non-necessary infrastructure and improvements may be added in the future.

Dog Park Amenities

- Dog Park section would maintain the natural, farm like setting that is designed for the entire site with the addition of horse rail fencing, along with seating and agility equipment comprised of natural materials.
- Potable water would be provided. Access to water is necessary to prevent injury, health problems to the dogs.
- Covered shelter can provide a shaded area to relax while dogs are at play. Staff spoke with pet owners throughout the area and found out that in most dog parks there's not adequate seating for social activity. A proposed pavilion would straddle both sides of the dog park.
- Walking trail for the entire site wraps around the perimeter of the dog park section. The trail would provide connectivity with the rest of the park and would be landscaped.

Eberwein Park Projected Costs

Item	Unit of Measurement	Quantity	Cost per unit	Total Cost
Parking Lot	Allowance		$ 160,600.00	$ 160,600.00
Entry Pavers	Square Feet	330	$ 26.06	$ 8,600.00
Restrooms (for new structure)	Allowance		$ 200,000.00	$ 200,000.00
Trails (From Parking Lot to Entry Area)	Square Feet	1500	$ 6.53	$ 9,800.00
MSD Required Stormwater Quality	Lump Sum	1	$ 80,000.00	$ 80,000.00
Entrance Monument Sign	Allowance		$ 4,300.00	$ 4,300.00
Permits	Allowance		$ 8,000.00	$ 8,000.00
Totals				**$ 471,300.00**

Dog Park Projected Costs

Item	Unit of Measurement	Quantity	Cost per unit	Total Cost
Vinyl Fencing	Linear Feet	1550	$ 28.65	$ 44,400.00
Gates	Each	5	$ 460.00	$ 2,300.00
Locks	Each	4	$ 100.00	$ 400.00
Site Grading (Dog Park)	Lump Sum	1	$ 39,000.00	$ 39,000.00
Benches	Each	6	$ 650.00	$ 3,900.00
Trash Cans	Each	3	$ 466.67	$ 1,400.00
Mutt Mitt Waste Stations	Each	2	$ 500.00	$ 1,000.00
Granite Sand (Lining the Fence)	Tons	50	$ 26.00	$ 1,300.00
Drinking Fountains	Each	1	$ 4,400.00	$ 4,400.00
Potable Water	Each	1	$ 30,000.00	$ 30,000.00
Information signage	Each	1	$ 600.00	$ 600.00
Totals				**$ 128,700.00**

The total estimated cost for both the Eberwein site and the inclusion of the Dog Park is $600,000.

Funding for the project will be sought once the master plan is complete so Staff may complete necessary grant applications.

Future Amenities – not projected in the overall cost

- Community garden
- Disposition of the existing structures
- Grading for the open field
- Historical plaques/signage
- Landscaping
- Native area (plantings)
- Natural theme playground
- Park trail system for the entire park
- Pavilion
- Picnic areas
- Water quality area (wetland pond)

Staff obtained an analysis by a third party contractor regarding minimal necessary actions and estimated costs associated with preserving the farm house or barn.

- Referred to Robben Contracting to provide costs for a non-functional use, which would include securing and sustaining both the farm house and barn. Costs were also obtained for a functional use for the two structures. Ms. Nassif noted that additional contractors were contacted to determine the scope of the project but they were not available to do the work.
- Robben Contracting not only has experience working on historic and century homes, they were also the 2009 Winner for City of Webster Groves Award of Excellence for Craftsmanship.

Ms. Nassif explained that the figures listed below are based off of cost projections from Robbens Contracting.

Eberwein Park required site improvements	$ 471,300
To include a dog park section	$ 128,700
To remove structures	$ 90,000
Total	$ 690,000

Supplemental Report projected costs:

	Projected costs for Park	**$690,000**
1	Projected costs to build park infrastructure, to include a dog park, retain the barn (n/f)	$771,385
2	Projected costs to build park infrastructure, to include a dog park, retain the farmhouse (n/f)	$886,615
3	Projected costs to build park infrastructure, to include a dog park, retain the farmhouse (f)	$926,615
4	Projected costs to build park infrastructure, to include a dog park, retain the farmhouse (n/f), retain barn	$969,000
5	Projected costs to build park infrastructure, to include a dog park, retain the farmhouse (f), retain barn	$1,009,000

Chair Segal then recognized former Mayor Greenwood. He stated that he would now ask for comments from (1) the Mayor, (2) Committee members, (3) Non-committee Councilmembers, and (4) the public.

MAYOR'S COMMENTS

Mayor Nations commended Staff for the Phase III Report and stated he is interested in hearing comments from the public.

He stated that it appears there is clearly support for a dog park. The main issue is whether the City should spend approximately $300,000 to preserve the white house and the barn. He noted that the Eberwein farm has been a priority for the community for the past two decades. Passage of Proposition B in 2004 made it possible to obtain the property. He feels that for $300,000, the City has the opportunity to preserve the Eberwein's legacy by keeping these two structures on the property for the people of Chesterfield.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS COMMENTS

Chair Segal stated that when the Committee last met on this subject, they instructed Staff to provide cost estimates for non-functional and functional uses of the white house and barn. He was surprised to see that the costs for keeping these structures as non-functional uses were significantly higher than what he anticipated; and the costs for the functional use were about 50% less than what he thought they would be. He feels that every decision made should be done with the thought of "what's the best use of our money for the greater good of Chesterfield and the community."

Mr. Geisel, Director of Planning & Public Works clarified that the functional use would be a limited use of the first floor of the white house only for restroom purposes – it is not a re-use of the entire building.

In reviewing the cost projections, it was noted that to retain the barn and white house as non-functional uses would be $969,000; while retaining the barn and the white house as functional uses (restrooms) would be $1,009,000 – a difference of $40,000. Mr. Geisel explained that the barn is gutted and once the exterior is restored, it becomes a functional use for storage.

Councilmember Geiger stated that he would like to see the barn and white house preserved if funds allow for it. However, he is looking at development of the entire park – not just Phase I. He wants to have a usable park with amenities for both adults and children. He has concerns about the current financial situation and rather than preserve the structures, he would prefer to spend the funds for amenities in the park that families would utilize.

Councilmember Fults stated that she wishes that funds were available for the preservation of these structures but feels spending $200,000 to retain the structures as non-functional uses is not warranted. She thinks the $300,000 necessary to retain them as functional uses could be better utilized for a pavilion, playground, and walking trail, which would be more interactive for the community than restrooms.

Councilmember Casey questioned whether "there is a compelling case to have the structures on the site for the cost – or is that money better spent on other usable items". He would like to see the white house retained on the site but he is still undecided on whether the City should spend additional money for restrooms inside the structure. He is interested in hearing what the other Councilmembers and the public have to say.

NON-COMMITTEE COUNCILMEMBERS COMMENTS

Councilmember Logan stated he reviewed the projected costs with the idea of what the City would get for the money. He noted that for the costs, the City is not getting an historic/landmark house. The City would be "getting a house that would have Hardie board siding and vinyl soffits and one floor that would be usable". He would really like to have the barn retained so the City has a "real memory and piece of history on the property that shows that this was a working farm area". He noted that the Eberwein family does not consider the white house as the "Eberwein house" - they consider the house on Old Baxter as their family home. He does not feel utilizing the white house for restrooms justifies the cost.

Councilmember Erickson stated that while the white house and barn are not considered "historic", they are "an image of Chesterfield". He feels that families could stroll around the park and "see a part of Chesterfield that is not torn down". He is convinced that there aren't that many places in Chesterfield "that have a sense of history and a sense of place". He likes the idea that you could take a non-functional house and make it functional by utilizing it for restrooms. He feels that the City "has the opportunity to preserve that very tangible part of what is Chesterfield for generations to come – to get that full farm feel at this location".

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speakers

1. Mr. Esley Hamilton of the St. Louis County Parks and Recreation Department. On behalf of the St. Louis County Historic Buildings Commission, he stated the following:
    - The Commission is a statutory advisory body to the St. Louis County Council, which dates back to 1957 and is the oldest local preservation body in the State of Missouri.
    - Over the years at least 250 buildings have been designated County landmarks.
    - At a special meeting held earlier this week, the Commission voted to declare the Eberwein House a County landmark.
    - Mr. Hamilton then read the criteria established by the Commission in designating the Eberwein House as a County landmark. That information is listed below:

The property has significant character, interest and value as part of the development and cultural characteristics of the County, particularly the fundamental history of the County as a farming community. This characteristic is enhanced by the excellent state of preservation of both the house and the barn and by the surviving contents of 18 acres of field and woodland. The Eberwein family was among the early 19th century settlers of the area and played a representative role in the establishment of local institutions including the Catholic Church and the Farmers Club. The Property contains elements of design, detailed materials and craftsmanship, which represent a particular style and period of County history and are increasingly rare. The Property is an established and familiar visual feature in its community.

When Mr. Hamilton had the opportunity to tour the house and barn with Ms. Nassif, he was surprised at how much of the original material remained. He feels that if the original exterior materials and front porch are removed from the house, it would be "pointless to consider the house as an historic building". He stated that the buildings could be 'mothballed' until funding is available. In 1988, Mr. Hamilton compiled a complete historic inventory for the City of Chesterfield. At that time, over 100 buildings of various ages were identified as being significant to the community. Of all the buildings over 100 years old, 64% have been demolished leaving only 16 buildings.

DISCUSSION

Councilmember Fults asked for clarification as to whether the building would still be considered a County landmark if plans to improve it and add bathrooms are completed. Mr. Hamilton replied that the County does not have these kinds of criteria but it would have to be reviewed by the Commission. Adding a restroom is not the issue; the concern is tearing off the entire exterior. If the house was listed on the National Register of Historic Places and was privately owned, removing the exterior would disqualify the owner from the tax credit.

Councilmember Fults asked whether the County Historic Buildings Commission offers any kind of funding to save such a structure as the Eberwein house. It was noted that there are no funds available. Mr. Hamilton pointed out that over the last 22 years, the St. Louis County Parks Department has created the Village in Faust Park and spent funds to preserve the existing buildings.

Chair Segal noted that Staff presented the project to the Faust House curator but there was no interest in preserving the home and he inquired as to why. Mr. Hamilton stated that Faust Park "is not the home of last resort for old buildings". He added that the Eberwein house is dated later than the other buildings in the village and that the County has the same budget restrictions as the City. He feels that the City needs to consider taking responsibility for its own heritage.

Councilmember Logan asked whether the barn would remain a County landmark if it is made structurally sound. He then added that the focus of the park is to emphasize the natural farmland factor and the barn is an essential part of the project. Mr. Geisel responded that the effort would be to restore the building to a similar appearance but constructed of modern materials. The exterior is being removed because of the lead paint on the barn. The lead paint could be abated in place but is more expensive.

2. Lauren Strutman, Lauren Strutman Architects stated the following:
    - She has been involved with several historic preservation projects in the area such as; the Pond School project and the Ballwin School House.
    - She feels it would be a detriment to lose the farm-like setting by the demolition of the barn.
    - Information on the house was forwarded to Debbie Shields, who is the preservation consultant in Columbia, Missouri. Based on that information, Ms. Shields felt that the house would qualify for the National Register of Historic Places.
    - She asked how Robben Contracting based their bid with respect to the exterior – were they given drawings or instructions? Ms. Nassif responded that Robben Contracting was requested to provide figures based on functional and non-functional uses.
    - She feels that there are reasonably priced abatement companies that specialize in lead paint removal, which would be an option to removing the exterior. If this is too expensive, she would opt to save the buildings with new materials rather than raze them.

Councilmember Fults noted that due to the current budget crunch, all options have to be considered.

.

3. Joan Schacht, member of the Chesterfield Historic Commission and Landmarks Preservation Commission stated the following:
    - She felt that the report is inaccurate in that it indicates that there was no consensus among the committees. She stated that there was 100% consensus amongst the committee members to save the house and barn. In addition, the Citizens Committee had 100% consensus to save the barn.
    - She indicated that the dog park was not a citizens' idea for the park – it was a City suggestion.
    - Noting the historical significance of the house, she stated that the Eberwein family has been in Chesterfield since 1838 and had a working farm.
    - There are currently 18 century homes within the City of Chesterfield – six of those structures are empty and in danger of collapse.
    - She encouraged the City to obtain more bids for these structures.
    - If the buildings are 'mothballed, she indicated that the Commissions will work on fundraising.

Chair Segal pointed out that six contractors were contacted for bids but only one responded. Mr. Geisel stated that this was not an effort to secure a construction bid, but only to have the contractor provide an evaluation of the existing structures. The evaluation is not the way the City procures construction contractors.

Councilmember Fults questioned Staff as to whether grants were investigated. Ms. Nassif replied that Staff has done extensive research and there are many grants available but as a municipality, the City generally does not qualify unless a non-profit group partners with the City.

There was confusion as to whether the Chesterfield Heritage Foundation is willing to partner with the City as a non-profit organization. Chair Segal pointed out that at the meeting held on June 10, 2010, Jane Durrell, a member of the Heritage Foundation indicated that the Foundation did not have any interest in partnering with the City of Chesterfield due to the scope of the project. However, it was verified that Ms. Durrell has since corrected those comments and that the Foundation is interested in working with the City.

4. Bob DeFer (Ward I), member of the Historical Commission and the Landmarks Preservation Commission asked for clarification on the following:
    - What is the differential cost to tear down vs. 'mothballing' the house? Chair Segal responded that $300,000 is the net number vs. tearing it down.

5. Nancy Greenwood, former Mayor of Chesterfield, 14441 Corallin Drive, Chesterfield, MO stated the following:
    - A city is more than shopping centers, strip malls, and subdivisions.
    - She feels that part of a City is providing its heritage to the residents.

- She understands the budget situation and how difficult it is to make those hard decisions. She suggested constructing the park in phases and seeking out grant funds.
- She stated that in a recent phone call, Jane Durrell clarified that the Heritage Foundation is a 501 Foundation and is more than willing to partner with the City in terms of seeking and raising funds.
- She feels that the Eberwein Park should be represented by more than a sign or plaque. She encouraged the Committee to preserve the heritage of the farm for future generations.
- She noted that the farmhouse represents a "green" building and would be an opportunity to show children how farmers had the foresight to build their homes in a certain way.
- The Chesterfield Historical Commission and the Heritage Foundation are specifically requesting that the farm house and barn be retained.

6. Alice Fugate, 14165 Cross Trails Drive and member of the Landmarks Preservation Commission stated the following:
   - She feels that one itemized bid is not adequate information and is asking that the City get at least two more bids.
   - Once the house was deemed structurally sound, she toured it with Esley Hamilton, Lauren Strutman and qualified professionals to evaluate its condition. The contractor indicated that because of the good condition of the home, it would cost 30% less to renovate than other homes of that period. It was suggested that the trash be cleared out to control the vermin; add an alarm system to keep it secure; repair or replace the gutters; and "mothball" the house.
   - However, at the end of the tour she was informed that she should not produce a written report because the Commission is considered an arm of the City and the City didn't want competing reports.
   - It was noted that Faust Park has limited space and is currently looking for a mercantile building to add to the village. The criteria for Faust Park are very select at this point
   - She would be happy to share the report provided by the Contractor to the Committee.

7. Planning Commissioner Wendy Geckeler (Ward IV) stated the following:
   - Speaking on behalf of the resident who lived around the corner from the Eberwein property, Ms. Geckeler noted that she wanted to see the house and barn preserved.
   - Ms. Geckeler feels that the Eberwein property will provide children with a sense of history and continuity.

Councilmember Fults asked Staff what it would take to 'mothball' both the farmhouse and barn. Chair Segal indicated that $175,000 would provide for a non-functional use of the white farmhouse and would create a non-maintenance residence. Mr. Geisel noted that the lead paint issue and other defects would need to be addressed at some point.

The goal was to identify the cost of creating an aesthetically pleasing, similar appearance, low maintenance, rehabilitated (not restored) structure.

Councilmember Fults noted that there are three choices with respect to the barn and farmhouse: (1) razing them; (2) saving them with new materials; or (3) preserving them historically. Mr. Geisel stated that both of the structures have been modified several times with modern materials. He also advised that there is a major difference between restoring a house to its original historical significance using original materials as compared to aesthetically rehabilitating a house to have an historic appearance.

Councilmember Geiger feels that the lead paint on the structures needs to be dealt with immediately or the structures should be fenced off, but asked whether the buildings can be 'mothballed' without doing anything to the exterior. Mr. Geisel recommends against putting up a fence around the buildings as he feels that the rehabilitation costs are nominal. He recommends spending the money immediately to take care of the known capital defects so that the City does not incur annual operational costs. Mr. Geisel added that whether removing or rehabilitating the structures, the City should address the lead paint issue within the next year. However, if a significant amount of money or effort is spent to rehabilitate the structures, the City will be required to abate the lead paint as part of any permit review. He does not feel that there is an urgency to address the lead paint, but is not something to be left for the long term.

Mayor Nations pointed out that the peeling paint violates the City's Property Maintenance Code. If the residents are required to maintain their homes, then the City should do the same. Mr. Geisel stated that Staff needs direction in order to move forward with the development.

8. Lynn O'Connor provided her observations to the Committee:
   - She feels that the dog park needs to be at a safe distance from residential homes.
   - A lot of the people who bring their dogs to these parks are sedentary people or individuals, who have physical difficulties and are unable to keep up with overactive dogs.
   - Parks are now including handicap access and parking areas next to the fenced area for immediate entry into the park.
   - She feels it is important for the dogs to be able to get to the dog park component quickly so as not to interfere with the other park uses.

The Chair called for a seven-minute recess.

Chair Segal stated that the Committee would (1) review the Site Plan, (2) give Staff direction on the dog park; and (3) discuss disposition of the structures.

SITE PLAN

Chair Segal stated that the Committee gave Staff a vision and they came back with information relative to that vision. The initial projected cost for the dog park is $128,700.

The required site improvements for the park are $471,300 bringing the total to $600,000. He finds the pavilion component of the dog park to be "very innovative" and a necessity for the park. He feels that the $50,000 cost for the pavilion should be included for a total budget of $650,000 for the dog park component of the site.

Chair Segal made a motion to accept Staff's Site Plan for a dog park with required site improvements, excluding the disposition of the houses and adding the pavilion component of $50,000, for a total projected cost of $650,000, to be funded by a transfer from Parks Fund Reserves. Councilmember Fults seconded the motion.

Discussion on the Motion

Height of the Fence

Councilmember Logan inquired as to the height of the proposed fence Ms. Nassif stated that the fence is five feet high, which is the recommended height for a dog park.

Pavilion

Councilmember Logan had concern about the location of the pavilion with respect to the west sun. Ms. Nassif stated that the pavilion was designed to straddle both sides of the dog park – the area for small dogs and the area for all dogs. She explained that if the pavilion were placed in another location to avoid the west sun, it may require the construction of an additional pavilion to accommodate both small dog owners and large dog owners. It was noted that the pavilion will not be wired for electricity.

Rain Garden

Councilmember Logan referenced the path running through the rain garden and asked about the height of the path above the water and the overflow measures. Mr. Kristian Corbin, Project Planner stated that the path running through the rain garden is raised about one foot above the garden to allow the water to run underneath. Ms. Nassif added that the rain garden is a depressed bed of landscaping, which controls the stormwater runoff. The native plants will absorb most of the water so that the trails are not under water. Mr. Geisel explained that the rain garden will be equipped with sub-surface infiltration beds with a gravity outflow.

It was noted that the dog park is fenced off from the rain garden to prevent dogs from entering this area.

MSD Required Stormwater Quality

Councilmember Geiger noted that $80,000 is projected for *MSD Required Stormwater Quality* and asked if this is an early estimate or whether it's a "good number" as to what MSD will be requiring. Ms. Nassif replied that Staff has met with MSD several times and today received additional comments from them on what will be required for stormwater quality. More information will be forthcoming once MSD is given a complete Site Plan. The $80,000 includes permits, the rain garden requirements, and other stormwater requirements and is considered a reasonably sound estimate based upon the current level of information.

The motion passed by a voice vote of 4 – 0.

DISPOSITION OF THE RANCH HOUSE, CHICKEN COOP, AND WHITE SHED

Councilmember Geiger made a motion to raze the ranch house, chicken coop, and white shed for the budgeted amount of $30,000 to be funded from Parks Funds/Fund Reserves. The motion was seconded by Chair Segal.

Discussion on the Motion

Time Estimates
Councilmember Casey asked what the timing would be to raze the structures and construct the parking lot and restroom facilities. Mr. Geisel replied that Staff would immediately proceed to get permits to demolish the buildings and then design efforts would be initiated for the parking lot and all of the related infrastructure. Razing the buildings could be accomplished in approximately sixty days. Construction on the improvements (dog park and parking lot) would start in early Spring, 2011.

Mr. Geisel added that he believes that the dog park core, such as the fencing, could be built without impacting the site to the extent that MSD permit review would be required. Once construction is started on the parking lot, MSD permit review is required. The parking lot would be constructed as part of the latter portion of the development.

The motion passed by a voice vote of 4 – 0.

DISPOSITION OF THE FARM HOUSE AND THE BARN

Councilmember Casey made a motion to secure and 'mothball' the farm house and the barn in a state that can be re-evaluated at a future point with funds coming from Reserve Funds. Councilmember Fults seconded the motion.

Councilmember Casey added that he feels a decision should be made with respect to mitigating the lead paint on the structures.

Discussion on the Motion

Clarification of the Motion
Mr. Mike Herring, City Administrator asked whether the Committee is directing Staff to seek competitive bids to accomplish the motion.

Councilmember Casey amended the motion to direct Staff to obtain competitive quotes to secure the structures in a 'mothball' state and to bring an update back to the Committee at its next meeting.

Mayor Nations asked for clarification on the motion with respect to whether the motion related to Item 4 of the Projected Costs included in Mr. Geisel's Eberwein Supplemental Report memo, as noted below:

> Build dog park, required park infrastructure, retain barn and white house (non-functional use): $969,000

Mr. Geisel stated that the difference between the item noted above and the motion is that none of the interior defects or maintenance issues would be addressed at this time – they would be evaluated at a later date.

Councilmember Casey stated that his intention is to give representatives of those organizations in attendance "the opportunity to partner with the City, to bring funding to the table, and to take the structures to the next step. But in the interim, the structures would remain" and Staff would get quotes to place them in a 'mothball' state.

Mr. Geisel noted that the amount to 'mothball' the structures is vastly different than the $969,000 noted above. The buildings are basically secure now but whatever costs are involved to 'mothball' the structures for an interim time period are in addition to whatever actions Council decides to take at a later date.

Chair Segal noted that the area where the barn is presently located had been previously identified for a potential restroom; and asked whether the motion on the table would slow down the permitting process. Mr. Geisel stated that Staff would be able to proceed with building the dog park but would not be able to start on the restrooms unless directed to find another location for them. The dog park could be opened without restroom facilities.

Lead Paint

Mr. Geisel asked whether the motion is directing Staff to abate the lead paint or to simply secure the buildings. Councilmember Casey stated that he is not asking to have the lead paint abated at this time – he feels, however, that it will have to be addressed at some point. When quotes are being obtained on securing the buildings, he would also like quotes on the lead paint abatement.

White House and Barn

Councilmember Logan is of the opinion that if the two structures are kept, they should be preserved in a historically-appropriate manner – not Hardie board and vinyl soffits. He feels that the bids should reflect such costs. He is not in favor of spending money to hold the structures. If the structures are going to be removed, then a vote needs to be made in the very near future to have them razed so the park plans can be finalized.

Councilmember Fults agrees with taking a little more time to explore the costs involved in preserving the structures in an historical fashion.

Chair Segal suggested amending the motion to table the disposition of the farm house and the barn for sixty days, or until Staff can provide costs for a 'mothball' state.

Councilmember Geiger pointed out that costs are needed for historically preserving the structures. Mr. Geisel stated that the structures, as they stand today, are not considered historical because of the modifications that have been made to them over the years. He added that sixty days is not an adequate time to procure bids for an historical preservation because of the process involved. In addition, he feels that in order to get a competitive cost for the historic rehabilitation, the services of a preservationist architect will have to be engaged for drawings in order to acquire bids. These services could easily cost $30,000-$40,000.

Chair Segal asked if there was any interest from members of the Heritage Foundation to provide expertise on this matter. Ms. Strutman stated that she would be glad to provide "ballpark figures" on the restoration.

Mr. Geisel stated that he is comfortable with the ballpark figures that Staff has already provided the Committee but competitive costs for a historic exterior rehabilitation will require signed, sealed architectural drawings and funds will have to be appropriated for this cost.

Instead of obtaining bids, Councilmember Fults suggested getting estimates to abate the lead paint and replacing the boards on the structures.

Mayor Nations then asked Staff for their recommendation. Mr. Geisel stated he would like to see the buildings saved at the projected cost of $300,000, which is the lowest cost for retaining the structures, noting this would be for appearance-only but would achieve a low to no maintenance facility. Any historical restoration will be an additional cost. Mr. Geisel further pointed out that utilizing $300,000 for retaining the structures would prohibit spending the funds on other park amenities.

Mr. Geisel suggested compensating contractors for their time to provide an evaluation and cost estimate to achieve a historical renovation of the two structures. He feels that two or three evaluations could be obtained for a total cost of $10,000. Councilmember Fults suggested that any historical preservation costs could possibly be offset by grants, funding, or fundraising.

Councilmember Erickson stated that his perspective of the park is that it is to represent an historical farm. He feels that the Committee is putting value on the dog park component of the park and holding off on "the decision-making on the other side and doing it in isolation". He disagrees with this approach and feels that Council needs to be "thinking holistically about the property" and deciding what the nature of the park is to be. Councilmember Fults stated that she has always supported purchasing the land and the use of a dog park on this land, but noted there was never a vote on making this an

historical-nature park. The houses are a separate issue and she would like a little more time and information before she decides on the historical aspect of the park.

Chair Segal stated that he puts more value on the dog park component and recreation than the historic structures. He is open to preserving them but not at the expense of the dog park.

Councilmember Casey added that Council's vision was to purchase the land but he does not recall Councilmember Erickson's vision of an historical park being related at any meeting. He made his motion in order to give the Committee more time to evaluate all possibilities.

Councilmember Casey amended his motion to table the disposition of the barn and white house until Staff can provide costs for: (1) functional use of the barn and white house; (2) non-functional use of the barn and white house; (3) retaining the barn and white house in a 'mothball' state; and (4) the historic preservation restoration of the barn and white house, and to allocate funds in the amount of $10,000 from the Parks Funds/Fund Reserve for this effort and to bring the information back to this Committee. The amended motion was accepted by Councilmember Fults and **passed by a voice vote of 4 – 0.**

[Please see the attached report prepared by Mike Geisel, Director of Planning and Public Works, for additional information on Eberwein Park Development Funds].

Councilmember Geiger stated that the last time the Committee met on this project, Jane Durrell indicated that the Heritage Foundation was not able to act in the capacity as a 501(c)(3) partner to the City in this endeavor due to the amount of work and effort that is required. He stated that he is hearing something different from members in attendance this evening and feels that the Committee and members of the Heritage Foundation need to get together to search for funding opportunities.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:13 p.m