

STAFF REPORT
COUNCIL MEETING OF OCTOBER 3, 2011
CONSENT ITEM

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE TOWN COUNCIL

FROM: BRIAN FRAGIAO, DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS/TOWN ENGINEER



DATE: OCTOBER 3, 2011

SUBJECT: BLUE ANCHOR PARK PUNCHLIST ITEMS ADDRESSED

RECOMMENDATION:



Accept completed punch list items and release the remaining retention to Koch Excavating, Inc.

BACKGROUND:

At the September 13, 2001 Town Council meeting, staff submitted the punch list that was prepared by Omni-Means for review. Council directed staff to direct the Contractor to complete the punch list items and to hold on to any retention money remaining on the project until the work was completed.

Below is the Omni-Means punch list with comments addressing each item.

FINANCIAL AND/OR POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

There was no cost to the Town for this work.

PUNCH LIST ITEMS:

1. The grass installed is **not the UC Verde Buffalo Grass material** as specified on the plans and in the specifications. *UC Verde Buffalo grass* is not available in sod or seed form anywhere due to how it grows. It is only available via plugs.

The grass installed was installed via sod. This fact leads us to believe that the grass installed is some other variety buffalo grass not suited for the situation intended. *UC Verde Buffalo grass* is a patented hybrid grass designed to be low water use, low maintenance, and accepting of foot traffic. The grass installed is dying out, appears overwatered, and is not accepting of foot traffic.

Action Suggested: Contractor should remove the grass installed, and install the grass specified on the plans and in the specifications. Area around grass should be fenced for at least eight weeks to allow proper establishment. Contractor is responsible for maintenance during the establishment period. Per the specifications, the contractor is responsible to guarantee all plant materials for 1-year. See page 120 of specifications for exact language.

Council created a sub-committee made up of Miguel Ucovich and Janet Thew. They agreed on a Fescue 90-10 blend to replace the installed Buffalo Grass. The grass was installed on September 23, 2011.

2. Plant material substitutions made without Landscape Architect's knowledge / approval. Specifically, shrubs approved as part of the 'native' plant palette were substituted for non-native or different varieties with varying characteristics: **1)** *Armeria splendens* (Sea Thrift Mint) was substituted for *Monardella villosa* 'Coyote Mint' (Coyote Mint). The Sea Thrift Mint does not meet the design intent (size, character, native species, etc.) of the plant originally selected. It is the Landscape Architect's experience that the plant material installed will not perform well in the situation associated with this high foot traffic area. These plants are already being crushed and are dead in many locations. **2)** *Thuja orientalis* 'Aurea Nana' was substituted for *Thuja plicata* 'Hileri'. The *orientalis* 'Nana' variety is an arborvitae and will grow slowly to maybe 4-ft. tall, is not a California native, is not suited for full sun in this climate and does not meet the design requirements of being a medium height tall evergreen to provide vertical height and screening along the railroad tracks. The *plicata* 'Hileri' variety is a western red cedar selected after much discussion with the council and involved citizens. **3)** *Rhamnus California* 'Eve Case' was substituted for *Rhamnus California* 'Mound San Bruno'. The characteristics of each plant are different. 'Mound San Bruno' was selected for its medium height and wide spreading. 'Eve case' is a medium round shrub. **4)** *Heteromeles arbutifolia* was installed instead of the specified 'Davis Gold' variety. The 'Davis Gold' variety was selected for its contrasting grayish leaf color and golden berry color, not red. Growth characteristics are also a little different.

Suggested Action: Contractor to install plant materials specified in the container size identified.

Omni-Means and the Contractor discussed and agreed on the following plant material:

Please note that Nick from Cephas Landscape was able to locate all but a few of the native plant materials proposed. However, we agreed that the following native substitutions, that are available, were satisfactory:

- **Heteromeles arbutifolia ' Davis Gold'** may be substituted with the standard variety **Heteromeles arbutifolia** (red berries instead of gold)
- **Juncus patens 'Carmen Grey'** may be substituted with **Juncus patens 'Blue'**.
- **Monardella villosa** may be substituted with **Monardella odoratissima** using (2) "liners" to equal a (1) 1-gallon size (1-gallon unavailable)

PS Nick was able to find all of the other plants on the list.

Regarding Don's recommendations see below:

Monardella villosa Coyote Mint, change to Lantana or Rosemary -
NO Mondardella is only about 2'x2' in size. The Lantana and Rosemary have very different growth characteristics - much larger and spreading. USE Salvia x superba (a small salvia - blue or purple flower variety) or Grey or Green Santolina virens if the variety above can not be located.

Salvia greggii "Coral", change to "Pink" -
YES

Thuja plicata "Hileri", change to T.O. Emerald -
YES, if they mean Thuja 'Emerald Green Abrovitae'. Although non-native, it is drought tolerant and will have the same shape characteristic. However, the ultimate width less (3-4 ft. vs. 8-ft.) and shorter (8-12 ft. vs. 15-20 ft. Can they space at 3.5-ft and provide two more per same area proposed fopr a total of 7-plants vs 5) in each location (two locations)? If not there will be gaps in what was suppose to be an evergreen screen.

Heteromeles arbutifolia "Davis Gold", change to Ligustrum gold -
NO, Ligustrum is privet. An ornamental problem plant (allergies, medium to high water, not a native!). The characteristics are not remotely the same. Can they not find the standard variety Heteromeles (Toyon)? See above. This should be pretty common native. The "Davis Gold" variety referred to the berry color not the leaf color (as in the privet).

Juncus patens "Carmen Grey", change to "Rush".
NO- More info needed. "Juncus patens" is a rush (common name). What variety are they proposing? This can make a difference in character, longevity, growth, etc. The design intent is to use a grey or blue grey variety. See above.

Rhamnus californica "mound San Bruno", change to "Coffeberry.

YES. I assume they mean the standard variety, since Coffeeberry is the general common name?

All plants have been planted or replaced.

3. Many plant materials missing or in need of replacement throughout the landscape. See **attached plan** indicating location and plant materials in question.

Suggested Action: Contractor to install / replace plant materials in the numbers and species specified on the plans.

Contractor has installed and replaced all plant material specified and agreed with Omni-Means.

4. Arctostaphylos x 'Emerald Carpet' planted too close to sidewalk in "circular" planter next to shade structure. Many other plants buried in the bark mulch.

Suggested Action: Set plants back to allow growth up to, not over sidewalk edge (long term maintenance trimming issues). Expose buried plants, and / or replace with larger plants so that they have a better chance of survival.

Contractor adjusted plants on 9/30/11.

5. Plant material signs do not meet specification regarding size and type of stake/embedment. See sign notes on Sheet LP1. The installed sign (already broken in one instance) is on a very short stake, embedded in concrete set in an old plant container and then buried in the ground. The sign is so low and flat that it will not be observable in the immediate future. The intent by the Council is to use the signs as an education about plant materials.

Action Suggested: Contractor to provide correct staking, correct the angle of the signs on the stake to be visible for reading, locate the signs where they can be read, replace broken signs and embedment per plans and specifications.

Contractor provided correct staking and replaced any damaged signs on 9/30/2011.

6. The irrigation controller/cabinet and support equipment (rain sensor and weather based manager cartridge) specified on the plans was not installed. This equipment was designed to be expandable and meet a specific need to be in compliance with the State of California's recent expansion of the landscape irrigation water conservation law. The controller installed appears to be an Irritrol controller of unknown model (inside a locked Irritrol cabinet). The Landscape Architect was never contacted regarding a change in equipment, nor did I receive cut sheets of the proposed equipment, as specified in the specifications.

Suggested Action: If contractor believes that the controller currently installed meets all of the specifications and design intent of the one identified on the plans and specs, then contractor should provide written backup to support claim. If contractor can not support their claim, contractor should install controller and support equipment per the plans and specifications at no

expense to Client (Town). Contractor should also provide actual costs for installed equipment and prove to Town Engineer that the cost for the Irritrol Equipment is the same or more than the equipment specified. If not, contractor should credit Town for difference.

The proposed Irritrol has the required expandable forty-eight station system with twenty-four stations in use. The system also has the required rain station sensor set-up and the weather based manager system. The cost of the irritrol is roughly the same price as the Rain Bird.

7. Irrigation tubing is exposed in many planters. Bark mulch is very thin. Notes and details direct the contractor to spread a minimum of 3-inches in depth of the specified bark mulch throughout all planters. Note: Contractor did not provide the landscape architect with samples of bark mulch for review/ approval as specified on the plans and in the specifications. The Town arborist was very particular about the type of bark much utilized.

Action Suggested: Contractor to provide landscape architect with written verification that bark mulch used is per specification. Contractor should also install more bark mulch to provide a minimum 3-inch layer of mulch. Contractor should also verify that the specified (see detail 3, sheet LSi3) "pinning" was utilized to hold the drip tubing in place. If not properly pinned, the tubing will rise up over time and become unsightly in the landscape and a trip hazard.

Contractor added additional bark and pinned tubing on 9/30/2011.

8. Drip irrigation tubing along fence in the north-west corner of the site is changed from in-line drip irrigation (specified in the area) to a single tube with emitter insert at the shrub.

Suggested Action: Contractor to explain change, and correct to the satisfaction of landscape architect/ Town Engineer if deemed needed.

Contractor changed the tubing format on 9/30/2011.

9. Grass spray irrigation not installed properly to assure adequate coverage. The large boulder in the grass area along the edge of the walkway was not located per plan and is offset approximately 18- inches – 2-ft. Instead of compensating for this field change, the contractor placed a spray head behind the boulder creating a rain shadow on the opposite side of the boulder. Unclear if the remaining heads are properly placed.

Suggested Action: Contractor to correct spray head location and demonstrate to Town Engineer that coverage of grass area is adequate and per specifications / plans.

Contractor relocated the boulder to allow better grass spray coverage.

10. Overspray on to tot-lot from grass area.

Action Suggested: Contractor to adjust sprinkler heads accordingly to minimize overspray.

Contractor adjusted the heads to minimize overspray.

11. Irrigation control valve boxes not located per plan notes (see sheet Li1 general note 13). Valve boxes for grass area are not located within 12-inches of the edge of the pavement, curb or header boards as per note. Instead they are placed into the grass area in a random fashion. Along with being unsightly, the box can create a slip hazard in the active grass area. Valve boxes also lack the gravel base identified in the detail.

Suggested Action: Dig out valve boxes, install gravel drain rock per details/notes, re-install valve\boxes.

Valve boxes have been relocated on 9/30/2011.

12. Valve box with control valve in planter with roses next to drive aisle – what is this used for? Control wires do not appear to be connected and are exposed. The valve box says irrigation control valve.

Suggested Action: Contractor to connect wires as needed (?), and/or encase exposed wires in water proof casings. Contractor to provide an as-built drawing of the entire irrigation system (as per specs) and identify all changes (materials, configuration, etc.) made to system design if any.

Contractor connect wires on 9/30/2011.

13. Covers missing on some irrigation outlet boxes.

Action Suggested: Contractor to install covers.

Contractor added additional irrigation covers on 9/30/2011.

14. Berm in planter next to drive aisle not created per plans (see call-out notes on sheet LP1)

Suggested Action: Contractor to credit back to Town for work not completed.

There is roughly a six inch mound at the base of the planted trees. This area is very small in width and a two & a half foot high berm would conflict with the planted trees, drainage, electrical and irrigation boxes and backflow.

15. Some boulders not placed close to the locations indicated on the plan. A large boulder in the northwest corner is approximately 8-ft from the location illustrated on the plan. Consequently a large hole in the landscape is created and the boulder may be in conflict with the future area for the spray pad equipment and the future restroom foundation. Some of the boulders located on the northeast edge of the tot-lot are located in the tot-lot, not in the planter as illustrated on the plans. Consequently a large hole in the landscape is created and boulders are in the play area.

Suggested Action: Not much can be done now to relocate the boulders. Plant materials should be added to fill in the holes left in the landscape. Town Engineer to determine if credit for poor workmanship is warranted.

The current location of the boulders do not cause any future issues. There is adequate space along the fence line of the park to route future conduits for the spray feature.

16. Unclear if root barriers were installed per specifications and as noted on the plan (sheet LP1).

Suggested Action: Contractor to provide proof of purchase regarding barriers and excavate one of the locations to prove barriers were installed.

Contractor installed barriers as specified. Installation was verified by the Town's inspector.

17. Per execution of concrete flatwork throughout project area. Issues include many cracked curbs/concrete edging, very uneven curves in concrete layout, poor finish work around bike rack embed, poor alignment of concrete bases for light poles along pathways, and poor color representation in concrete.

Action Suggested: Town Engineer to with hold of a percentage (to be determined by Town Engineer) of retention to compensate for poor workmanship and broken concrete. Contractor should repair, where possible, cracked curbs and other cracked concrete to the satisfaction of the Town Engineer unless contractor can show evidence that cracked areas existed before the start of construction.

Contractor grinded concrete areas that were uneven and aligned the light pole base with the adjacent sidewalk.

18. Outlet boxes not constructed per design illustrated per detail 1, on sheet E-21. Contractor attempted to correct the mistake of not placing the outlet box inside the post. This led to the outlet box being vandalized. Contractor attempted to mitigate the issues by welding on a protective metal covering after the fact. Weld on covering is of poor quality, not ground smooth before painting, and contains gaps between the weld where water can leak causing future corrosion. Corrosion will lead to maintenance issues for the Town and present a poor appearance in the project.

Action Suggested: Negotiate a credit back from the contractor for the poor construction. Contractor should also install lockable covers per detail callout (all outlet boxes everywhere), and contractor should fix the welds, grind smooth, prime and re-paint.

The design of the outlet boxes was discussed with the Town's inspector and the construction of the boxes were set under the cover to prevent water from entering the electrical area and damage to the lid.

19. Electrical conduit for future use at the shade structure is designed to be located at the base of the structure in a pull box on the east side of the structure (see sheets E-10 and E-12). A review of this area shows no pull box. However, a pull box is located on the west side of the structure in the planter area. Unclear regarding this pull box and contents.

Action Suggested: Contractor to provide an as-built drawing of all electrical to verify locations of all conduit, and confirm that the electrical system was constructed per plan.

The Contractor incorporated the future electrical conduits within the installed electrical outlets on the shade structure poles. This eliminated the exposure of any conduits on the outside of the shade structure, providing a better aesthetic look.

22. Tot-structure is specified to come with a variety of additional items to be provided to the Town for its use in future maintenance.

Action Suggested: Town Engineer to verify that items were provided. If not, contractor should provide items as indicated on the plans.

All Tot-Structure material was installed.

24. Material Verification / Approvals not provided to Landscape Architect: The specifications and notes on the plans make many references to providing or contacting the landscape architect during the construction process. However, except for very few RFI's before construction, the landscape architect was not contacted or provided material samples for review and approval. For example, the irrigation specifications required contractor to provide cut sheets of all materials for landscape architect's approval, provide an as-built of installed system including any changes made to the design, and other deliveries.

Action Suggested: Contractor to provide all submittals and tests where applicable per the specifications before releasing final retention. Note: The submittals in question may have been delivered to the Town Engineer / project inspector without the Landscape Architect's knowledge. Town Engineer to confirm as needed.

The As-Builts to the project was submitted and the irrigation and electrical installations tested. Per Council direction, staff was to minimize cost by providing construction management, inspection and plan review in-house. Omni-Means was used sparingly and was asked to field finalize the project before the retention was paid.