TO: TOWN COUNCIL

FROM: TOWN MANAGER

RE: BLUE ANCHOR PARK PLANNING

**ISSUE**
Council Member Ucovich wanted an update as to what has been done at Blue Anchor Park and what is yet to be done.

**RECOMMENDATION**
Discuss and give direction to Staff.

**CEQA**
There are no CEQA issues at present but there could be depending on whether additional work may be desired at the park. The projects noted in this report do not need any further CEQA review.

**MONEY**
An estimate of costs and funding is developed further on in the report.

**DISCUSSION**
The Blue Anchor Park has been an exercise in addressing competing interests in an era of budget uncertainty.

What has been done is:

1. Underground work that nobody sees but must be grateful for when lights are needed, water is turned on and maybe someday when a toilet gets flushed.

2. Grass planted even though buffalo grass isn't supposed to be walked on and should have been planted in the planter areas rather than between the playground structure and current sand pile which is an actively trod area of the park.

3. Water friendly landscape installed – at least according to some arborists and pseudo arborists.

4. Concrete paths put down including a section with pervious pavement to indicate which area of the park is greener, sustainable, and more earth friendly than another.

5. Shade structure built and has conduit running to the Depot so that if one day solar becomes cost effective it could be installed on the shade structure and power the Depot and other things around the park.

6. Trees got planted, including the Phoenix like re-incarnation of the "Founder Tree" that Council might recall was a sort of gift that got paid for by the Town. The Founders Tree plaque, also paid for by the Town, was moved and moved back to its present location. PGE gave the Town a grant for some trees as did Sac Tree Foundation.

7. Large stones got placed around and kids have apparently enjoy climbing on them.

8. Water fountain installed for man, woman, child and beast.

9. Plastic bag dispenser installed so man, woman and child can clean up after beast.

10. Fencing installed at the RR right of way line and at the south end of the Depot building.

11. Some new unplanned work needed at Walnut Street and around the cul-de-sac to accommodate needs of the CCD Expo and to get ready to push on toward the High Hand Shed with more parking and park projects. (More particularly described in a consent item on tonight's agenda.)

12. Public Works currently working on clearing out the project punch list from the first phase (see attached from Omni-Means) and will be working soon on the punch list for the second phase.

Projects going forward that are currently being discussed by the PROS Committee who Council asked to develop a recommendation, in due time, if some or all work could get done through volunteers and/or donations. There are also some project thoughts from other people. There is no priority order to the list.

- **BATHROOM** – no construction ready plans and specs; may be required if a water feature is built; estimated cost 12/3/10 $66,240 to $121,170. Do not do this unless Council fully understands how it will be maintained, even on holidays and weekends, and where the money for maintenance will come from.

- **MULTI USE PLAZA** – construction ready plans and specs available; estimated cost 12/3/10 $126,028 to $249,663

- **WATER SPRAY FEATURE** – no construction ready plans and specs; depending on how built may require a circulating water treatment system; will likely require the building of the bathroom according to law; estimated cost 12/3/10 $36,905 to $97,772. This could be a

maintenance problem logistically and financially. If the bathroom is unaffordable, then don't plan a water feature.

- **TABLES AND BENCHES** – under shade structure as well as other benches, trash containers and other park furniture – have $5,000 grant in hand from Cal Recycle to acquire park furniture. PW Director working on tables and benches for under the shade structure as of this writing.

- **HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION SIGNS** – ideas being developed by PROS Committee and Historical Society. Estimated cost today is estimated to be between $10,000 and $15,000.

- **BUFFALO GRASS** – as noted before this grass isn't really the type of grass recommended for heavily trod areas. It may be better to plant a fescue or some such grass that can be used by people. The buffalo grass has been complained about since day one. The contractor has agreed to replace the buffalo grass and will do so with whatever grass mix may now be favored by the Town. Some people have mentioned planting instead with fescue.

There may be some other things people would like to see. There isn't much room however for too many more things.

Some features (bathroom, water feature, multi use plaza) could make good grant projects depending on what might be available from State Parks & Recreation assuming the projects don't get built with volunteers and donations. Grants tend to take a lot of time to process and get going.

The Town could also complete plans and specifications where needed (bathroom and water feature) and go out to bid on everything and pay for most everything with the current capital funds that are available as shown in the chart below. There would have to be some choices made however because the current revenue and expense, whether figured on low or high side bids, is showing a negative balance. To do everything would require that the park funds be augmented with money from reserves.

| BLUE ANCHOR PARK PROJECTS AND FUNDING | LOW SIDE ESTIMATE | HIGH SIDE ESTIMATE |
|---|---|---|
| **FUNDING (as of 8/31/11)** | | |
| Park Fees (Quimby Act money) | 311,260 | 311,260 |
| Park Development Fees | 103,391 | 103,391 |
| Less Cal Trans grant match for parking lot **(1)** | -125,000 | -125,000 |
| Less Walnut St cul-de-sac added expenses **(1)** | -26,924 | -26,924 |
| **TOTAL** | **262,727** | **262,727** |
| **PARK PROJECTS** | | |
| Bathrooms **(2)** | 66,240 | 121,170 |
| Water Feature **(2)** | 36,905 | 97,772 |
| Multi use plaza & skate feature | 126,028 | 249,663 |
| Historical description signs | 10,000 | 15,000 |
| **SUB TOTAL** | **239,173** | **483,605** |
| Engineer, bid & inspection @ 15% **(3)** | 35,876 | 72,541 |
| Miscellaneous @ 10% **(4)** | 23,917 | 48,361 |
| **TOTAL** | **298,966** | **604,506** |
| **BALANCE (5)** | **-36,239** | **-341,779** |

## NOTES:

1. The less revenue amounts are the $125,000 match for the CalTrans parking lot grant of $195,000; and the estimated cost of sidewalk and drainage improvements needed at the bulb end of Walnut St that were added as a result of the CCD Expo stage and that would be added one day anyway being attributed to the overall park improvements envisioned in the Downtown Plan.

2. The bathroom and water feature may be packaged units, set in place products that could be less costly, possibly less than the low side estimate.

3. Engineer, bid & inspection @ 15% may seem a little high but as comparison CalTrans uses 25%.

4. The miscellaneous expense is for those things that tend to surface after the project gets underway. It may be that none of that money gets spent.

5. The low and high side estimates result in a deficit and that would mean deferring some of the projects until funding is available or augmenting the funding with Reserve Funds.

omni · means
ENGINEERS · PLANNERS

# PROJECT PUNCH LIST

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **To:** | Brain Fragiao, Town Engineer | **Date:** | 8-18-11 |
| **EMAIL:** | bfragiao@loomis.ca.gov | **Project:** | Loomis Downtown Park |
| **From:** | Scott Robertson / Charles Rutter | | |
| **Pages:** | 10 | **Job No.:** | 25-4490-10 |
| | | **File No.:** | R1444PPL001.DOC |
| **CC:** | file | | |

**Original(s) sent by:** ☐ **Overnight** ☐ **Mail** ☒ **Not Sent Unless Requested**

A project completion review was performed on August 17, 2011 and August 18, 2011 (planting and irrigation) for the first phase of the park project and the second under-construction phase including the parking areas and cul-de-sac. The following punch list items were discussed or identified in the field.

***ATTENDEES:***

OMNI-MEANS: Scott Robertson, LLA and Charles Rutter, PE, Town of Loomis Engineer, Brian Fragiao.

***PUNCH LIST ITEMS:***

1. The grass installed **is not the *UCVerde Buffulo 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.

*Picture of UC Verde Buffalo grass 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.



943 Reserve Drive, Suite 100, Roseville, CA 95678 ~ (916) 782-8688 fax (916) 782-8689

*Picture of grass installed – **not** UCVerde Buffalo Grass*

**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.

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' (Coyoite 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 arborvity 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.

   It also appears the Toyon was planted from 1-gallon containers vs. 5-gallon as specified. The Arborvitae planted also appear to be 1-gallon size vs. 5-gallon as specified. This was determined by pulling out two dead plants and observing the root ball size related to the standard container size.



943 Reserve Drive, Suite 100, Roseville, CA 95678 ~ (916) 782-8688 fax (916) 782-8689

*This is the plant material installed (Sea Thrift)*

*This is the plant specified (Coyote Mint)but not installed*

*Arborvite installed*

*Western Red Cedar Specified but not installed*

*'Eve Case' installed*

*'Mound San Bruno specified'*

943 Reserve Drive, Suite 100, Roseville, CA 95678 ~ (916) 782-8688 fax (916) 782-8689

*Typical Toyon installed*

*Toyon 'Davis Gold' Specified*

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

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.

4. Arctostaphylos x 'Emerald Carpet' planted to 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.

5. Plant material signs do 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.

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



943 Reserve Drive, Suite 100, Roseville, CA 95678 ~ (916) 782-8688 fax (916) 782-8689

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.

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.

*Exposed irrigation tubing and thin mulch covering*

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.

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.



943 Reserve Drive, Suite 100, Roseville, CA 95678 ~ (916) 782-8688 fax (916) 782-8689

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

*Overspray on tot-lot*

**Action Suggested**: Contractor to adjust sprinkler heads accordingly 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.

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.

13. Covers missing on some irrigation outlet boxes.

*Missing covers on outlet boxes*

**Action Suggested**: Contractor to install covers.

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



943 Reserve Drive, Suite 100, Roseville, CA 95678 ~ (916) 782-8688 fax (916) 782-8689

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

15. Some boulders not placed close to the locations indicated on the plan. A large boulder in the north-west corner is approximately 8-ft from the location illustrated on the plan. Consequently a large hole in the landscape is created and the boulder my 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.

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.

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.

*Examples of poor concrete workmanship*

**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.

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



943 Reserve Drive, Suite 100, Roseville, CA 95678 ~ (916) 782-8688 fax (916) 782-8689

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.

*Retrofitted outlet box*

**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.

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.

20. Sidewalk under-drain box located on west side of cul-de-sac is framed with the sidewalk sloping back toward the street. This approach is opposite to the design on the plans.

*Sidewalk slope not per plans*

**Action Suggested**: This issue was discussed in the field with the contractor and the solution to form the bottom of the drain box to slope down away from the top back of walk is acceptable to the design engineer (Charles Rutter, PE). **However,** upon further review we note that the drop off behind the



943 Reserve Drive, Suite 100, Roseville, CA 95678 ~ (916) 782-8688 fax (916) 782-8689

back of sidewalk will be greater than 6-inches creating a fall hazard area for pedestrians or bikes and does not meet ADA requirements. In order to provide protection along the edge of the side walk where there is a drop-off or recovery area not flush with the sidewalk, the contactor should install a 4-inch minimum high and 6-inch wide concrete curb. Contractor should provide a shop drawing of the area proposed for the curb and a detail of the curb for the design engineer and Town Engineer's review/approval before completing the sidewalk pour.

21. Outfall at retention basin not completed. A rock outfall should have been completed as a part of the erosion control plan (see sheet EC1 note 5), that was a part of phase 1 construction. The plans for phase 4 (currently under construction) also include a concrete base with inset river run rock. The expectation was that the erosion control rocks would be used in the final outfall set in concrete. The drainage pipe was not finished per the plans.

*Outfall structure not installed*

**Action Suggested:** Contractor should credit back for rock mulch not placed as a part of the SWPPP process during construction and the non-finished drain pipe that will need to be completed by the new site contractor.

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.

23. Cul-de-sac / curb gutter was not constructed per slope on plan, and connection to the existing curb/gutter at Walnut Street will require a retrofit to match grade. The curb/gutter pour should not have occurred without checking forms and all tie-in points.



943 Reserve Drive, Suite 100, Roseville, CA 95678 ~ (916) 782-8688 fax (916) 782-8689

*Curb and gutter not installed per plans*

**Action Suggested:** Contractor to provide a written explanation as to change and provide a shop drawing design (with grading) to illustrate how the issue will be resolved. ADA requirements should be indicated on the design to verify compliance.

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.

*These punch list items shall not release the contractor of the responsibility of completion of any and all contracted work or warranties in accordance with the contract documents and specifications. The governing agencies for this project may have additional comments, punch lists, corrective work, or other criteria that must be satisfied prior to granting final acceptance of the project.*



943 Reserve Drive, Suite 100, Roseville, CA 95678 ~ (916) 782-8688 fax (916) 782-8689

## PLANT SCHEDULE STATE GRANT AREA

| TREES | BOTANICAL NAME | COMMON NAME | CONT | QTY |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Acer rubrum 'October Glory' | Redpoint Maple | 24"box | 5 |
| | Cercis canadensis 'Oklahoma' | Oklahoma Redbud | 24"box | 4 |
| | Prunus cerasifera 'Mount St. Helen' Fruitless (or nearly so) | Mt. St. Helen Flowering Plum | 24"box | 2 |
| | Quercus ilex Evergreen Tree | Holly Oak | 24"box | 2 |
| **NATIVE TREES** | **BOTANICAL NAME** | **COMMON NAME** | **CONT** | **QTY** |
| | Cercis occidentalis Deciduous Flowering Tree | Western Redbud Multi-trunk | 24"box | 2 |
| **SHRUBS** | **BOTANICAL NAME** | **COMMON NAME** | **CONT** | **QTY** |
| | Anigozanthos x 'Big Red' | Big Red Kangaroo Paw | #5 | 10 |
| | Berberis thunbergii 'Rose Glow' | Rosy Glow Barberry | #5 | 5 |
| | Dietes bicolor | Fortnight Lily | #5 | 9 |
| | Pennisetum rubrum Grass (non-seeding) | Red Fountain Grass | #1 | 7 |
| | Rosa x 'Flower Carpet Red' | Rose | #2 | 11 |
| | Salvia greggii 'Coral' | Autumn Sage | #1 | 10 |
| **NATIVE SHRUBS** | **BOTANICAL NAME** | **COMMON NAME** | **CONT** | **QTY** |
| | Arctostaphylos x 'Emerald Carpet' Low Spreading Shrub | Emerald Carpet Manzanita | #1 | 27 |
| | Heteromeles arbutifolia 'Davis Gold' Large Evergreen Shrub | Toyon | #5 | 2 |
| | Juncus patens 'Carman's Grey' Grass Like - Bio-filter | Spreading Rush | #1 | 59 |
| | Monardella villosa Coyote Mint | Coyote Mint | #1 | 23 |
| | Muhlenbergia rigens Grass | Deer Grass | #1 | 15 |
| | Rhamnus californica 'Mound San Bruno' Evergreen Shrub | California Coffeeberry Mound San Bruno | #5 | 2 |
| | Thuja plicata 'Hillen' Tall Evergreen Shrub | Western Red Cedar | #5 | 10 |
| **GROUND COVERS** | **BOTANICAL NAME** | **COMMON NAME** | **CONT** | **QTY** |
| | UC Verde Buffalograss Hybrid Variety Use 72-tray plug (8" O.C.Planting) www.ucverde.com | "UC Verde" Buffalo Grass | Plugs | 2,457 sf |

these plants not installed as specified

X plants missing or dead

wrong plants installed

# Loomis Downtown Park PLANT PUNCH LIST ISSUES
August 18, 2011