



SURPAC MEETING MINUTES

MEETING TITLE	SURPAC Meeting Notes
DATE & TIME	March 16, 2011 6:30PM
LOCATION	Sherwood Civic Building – Community Room
FACILITATOR	Charlie Harbick – SURPAC Vice-Chairman
NOTES TAKEN BY	Tom Nelson

ATTENDEES

	Name of Board or Group	City Staff
Absent	Cam Durrell (Chair) Charles Harbick Vacant Bob Silverforb Mark Cottle	Tom Nelson
Absent	Ken Marlow Scott Johnson	
	Others In Attendance Lee Weislogel - BOOTS Linda Henderson	Council Liaison Matt Langer

MEETING NOTES

Approved: Charles Harbick

1. The meeting was called to order at 6:30pm by Vice-Chair Harbick
2. **Approval of Minutes** – Mr. Cottle moved and Mr. Harbick seconded the motion to approve the January 13, 2011 minutes. The vote was 4-0 in favor.

3. New Business

a. Cannery Square Design Elements:

Mr. Nelson began the discussion by reminding the committee that they had seen many of the drawings, budgets, and features of the Cannery Project over the past two years, as they were being developed since he reported on the project at each SURPAC meeting. He also said he had thought that there was general consensus among the committee that the URA Board should approve the design, and that the URA Board had actually approved the design elements at its June 1, 2010 meeting.

He said that some members of the council had questioned the wisdom of the art and grass elements at a recent Council Work Session, and had subsequently asked that

staff request recommendations from SURPAC and the Parks Board which led to the scheduling of this special meeting.

Mr. Harbick asked to first discuss the art, and asked why it was being reconsidered. Mr. Nelson responded that some councilors expressed that in these economic times, it may not be a good time to be spending \$50,000, the budgeted amount, on art, and that waiting might be a better option. Mr. Nelson told the committee that the art element was recommended by the City's landscape architect because it was something that was included in most public places that the firm designs. He described that a selection process had been developed, a committee had been identified to get public input, and that a consultant to lead the process (Regional Arts & Culture Council) had presented the City with a proposal, and that organization had experience in that work throughout the metro area.

Mr. Harbick stated that if the City did not do the art element at this time, it probably wouldn't get done. There was general consensus that art was an important element of the project, and that it should be done. Mr. Nelson pointed out that the URA has loan funds to pay for art during the development of the project, but once the loan was closed-out with the State, those funds would not be available. Mr. Cottle moved and Mr. Silverforb seconded a motion to include the art element in the project, but to wait until the end of the project to commission the artist. The motion carried 4-0.

Mr. Cottle indicated that he liked the grass element, but stated concerns about maintenance and wear during the rainy season. He offered a diagram from the handouts with a "checkerboard" look, indicating that intermittently placing pavers or concrete in the grassy area would eliminate the wear. There was general discussion among the committee on various options. Mr. Harbick and Mr. Silverforb both indicated that they didn't feel comfortable changing designs at this time, and said that should be left to the experts. Mr. Nelson explained that a Plaza Design Committee had met with architects in several meetings over a year's time, that there had been at least one Open House to get public input, and that the design was based on that input. He also explained that the architect had designed other plazas in the metro area that included grass, and that they also included a drainage system that had proven to work in other areas.

Mr. Harbick mentioned that Veterans Park gets a lot of use during festivals, and it often is raining during those times, but that while the grass gets a little matted, it comes back, and that it does not get muddy. Mr. Nelson reminded that it also doesn't have a drainage system like the one planned for the Plaza. After considerable discussion, Mr. Harbick summarized the discussion by stating that it appeared that each person on the committee endorses the idea of grass in the plaza. Mr. Cottle moved and Mr. Silverforb seconded a motion to include the grass element in the plaza, but to suggest that pavers or concrete be placed intermittently throughout the area.

Mr. Cottle expressed concern with the trees in the plaza. Mr. Nelson responded that he did not remember the type of tree, but that the landscape architect had selected a type of tree that has minimal shedding.

Mr. Cottle also remarked something about blue poles, but the rest of the committee immediately voiced that they didn't want to discuss that. Mrs. Henderson did indicate the type of pole that was in the design. Mr. Cottle indicated that he hoped they didn't have expensive bulbs, and Mr. Nelson responded that the pole would have customary bulbs.

Mr. Cottle asked why we weren't using stamped concrete rather than pavers due to the problem the City has experienced with pavers in the downtown streets, and his assumption that concrete would be less expensive.. Mr. Nelson said that the only pavers the City had problems with were those that moved because of buses turning over them, and that stamped concrete could not be made to look like a paver. Mrs. Henderson indicated that stamped concrete would detract from the look the design committee had envisioned for the plaza. Mr. Harbick and Mr. Silverforb, again, expressed discomfort in making those kinds of changes to the design at this time, indicating that the committee should leave that to the experts.

Mr. Harbick asked if that was all that needed to be discussed, and everyone agreed that it was.

4. Adjourn – The meeting was adjourned at 7:24 p.m.