NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING OF THE
ANOKA PARKS AND RECREATION ADVISORY BOARD

DATE: Tuesday, July 21, 2020
TIME: 7:00 PM
PLACE: Anoka City Hall – Council Work Session Room
2015 First Avenue, Anoka

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVE MINUTES

3. OPEN FORUM

4. NEW BUSINESS
   A. Riverwalk Project - Amphitheater
   B. Riverbank Issue – property north of Woodbury House

5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
   A. Rudy Johnson Park
   B. Akin Park
   C. COVID-19 Update

6. COMMUNICATIONS
   A. Website & CivicRec demo

7. ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETING
   A. Single Track Mountain Bike Trail at Anoka Nature Preserve
   B. Invasive Species Remediation Update Anoka Conservation District

8. ADJOURNMENT

If unable to attend, please call the Parks Department at 763-576-29803.
Auxiliary aids for handicapped persons are available upon request at least 96 hours in
advance. Please call the Administration Office at 763-576-2740 to make
arrangements.
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF THE
ANOKA PARKS AND RECREATION ADVISORY BOARD
TUESDAY, JUNE 16, 2020
COUNCIL WORK SESSION ROOM OF ANOKA CITY HALL
2015 FIRST AVENUE, ANOKA MN

MEMBERS IN-PERSON: Chairperson Steve Nelson, Mary Blankenship, Sam Scott, Mark Beckenbach
PRESENT VIA ZOOM: Julie Huspek, Tim Watson, Teri Poe
PRESENT VIA PHONE: Joe Anderla
MEMBERS ABSENT: NONE

STAFF PRESENT: Lisa LaCasse, Public Services Administrator and Jon Holmes, Public Services Supervisor, Jerry Tri, City Forester

GUESTS: NONE

APPROVE MINUTES
A motion, was made by Beckenbach, seconded by Blankenship to APPROVE THE MAY 19, 2020, REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF THE PARKS AND RECREATION ADVISORY BOARD WITH ONE CORRECTION. 9 ayes – 0 nays. Motion carried

OPEN FORUM
None

NEW BUSINESS
SKATING RINK REVIEW
Jenks reported that the past season was typical in attendance. There were no incidents, she had a full staff and the season ended on a typical time frame. The rinks were in immaculate condition thanks to Holmes’ crew. Blankenship pointed out that in 2018, attendance at Lincoln was a lot higher and asked if Jenks could explain. Jenks responded that it might be due to the general rink being reduced in size. Jerry Tri commented that the dynamics of the Lincoln neighborhood has also changed and there are fewer kids. Jenks also pointed out that if there is a staff shortage on the schedule Lincoln is closed and attendants are scheduled at the other more popular rinks. Rudy and Sorenson rinks have always been popular for hockey/broomball. The rink at Enloe was smaller this year too, but no one questioned it. In past years the kids have been turning the nets to play a shorter rink but then there is risk of pucks flying into the general rink. It was sort of a test this year to reduce the size of the hockey rink as there seems to be an overall preference in playing on smaller rinks. Nelson asked about Franklin’s skate event. Jenks reported that there was no ice at the time so they changed their event and held a sledding party at Enloe.
Nelson asked about skate assist sleds. LaCasse said the City does have some that the crew made out of PVC and we can look at repairing these and purchasing additional. Nelson said one of the rink attendants wanted police patrols at shut down as he noticed cars hanging out in the parking lot. Jenks said Enloe Park is notorious for having parkers throughout the day but she has not heard directly from the staff of any conflicts or problems. LaCasse said her concern would be Lincoln because the school does not want the attendant to park near the building. Nelson said the attendant he talked to was more concerned about the younger kids at the rink and it was for their safety he wanted police patrols. LaCasse said she can talk to the police about patrolling. Nelson said they might have other suggestions for safety as well.

**CITIZEN REQUEST FOR SNOWGUN AT SLEDDING HILL**

In 2017, LaCasse & Holmes were asked to look into providing snow making equipment at Greenhaven as part of their cross country ski program. They did lots of research and even took a field trip to Elm Creek Park and Theodore Wirth Park. They learned what best practices were, the pros/cons of making snow, and found it is not a simple process. In the Park Board packet, LaCasse provided information gathered in 2017. For the sledding hill we would not need six machines, but could certainly use a couple, one at the top of the hill and one at the bottom. Plus we would need a chilling tower and hose system. The citizen who suggested this may have thought it was as simple as connecting a fire hose to a snow gun, but it is more difficult than that. We also do not own equipment that could groom the hill.

Blankenship asked if the person requested this because they were disappointed in the amount of snow we had. Nelson said the request was probably prompted by seasonal changes and events like Winterfest happening with no snow. Nelson said his intention was good and noted that a few years ago Councilmember Weaver had requested a snow machine for Greenhaven.

LaCasse said staff has discussed other ways to improve the sledding hill. Holmes said he might take the steepness out of the hill and make it more gradual. That will also keep it from funneling people into the middle. With this change we might be able to use our cross country ski groomer to run down the hill.

Beckenbach asked if this type of equipment would be portable so you could use it both for the sledding hill and cross country skiing. LaCasse said the snow guns are technically portable but you need the cooling unit and compressor at each location so that makes mobility impractical. Holmes agreed there would be a lot of equipment to haul between the two sites.

Scott asked if there is too much demand on Elm Creek so they are pushing skiers to Anoka. LaCasse said the staff at Elm Creek said the skiers come to the park, participate in their activity and leave. They don’t stay and purchase concessions or spend money at the park. There is wear and tear on the trails so they would be happy to send the skiers to Anoka. Nelson commented that skiers don’t want a bare spot on their trails. LaCasse pointed out that places like Elm Creek have an overnight crew to make & move snow. Nelson said he was hoping for some portability but appreciated all the information. Anderla jokingly suggested implementing fees for skiing and sledding to pay for this kind of equipment.

**COVID 19 Update**

Jenks reported that the pool opened yesterday (June 15) with 50 people using pool passes. People had their temperature checked before entering the pool and signage in front of the building.
reminds people about social distancing. There has been good attendance and registration for swim lessons. Anoka Aquatic Center Exceptional Swimmers (AACES) has filled 20 out of 24 spots for the younger students and filled all 24 spots for the older high school group. Season passes for Anoka Residents sold to date are 212 plus 9 senior passes. Most of the comments on Facebook have been positive although there were a few rude comments from Non-residents that are mad they are not allowed to buy passes and don’t seem to care about the capacity restrictions.

Swim lesson registration opened on Friday and quite a few classes are full already. Right now sessions A, B, C are open and they are all over 50% filled. To help with social distancing, we are having parents in the water with younger children and the families have been very understanding. So far we have over $21,000 in swim lesson revenue.

To limit capacity, we are trying out pre-purchase ticket option to offer a limited number of day passes to both residents and nonresidents. For instance, for June 17 there are 150 day passes available. We are hearing many compliments and appreciation for day passes being an option.

We have cleaning schedule and staff has been happy to help out. Blankenship commented that she drove by and everyone seemed to be social distancing quite well with families staying together. The managers are monitoring the social distancing, it is not the lifeguard’s responsibility to police that. Jenks said it has not been a problem and one guard even joked that he was anxious to blow his whistle but had no reason to. Poe asked if the pool would shut down if people do not continue to follow social distancing guidelines. Jenks said she does not expect that to be an issue. To help with that this year any child that is 10 years old or younger must have an adult with them at the facility. If it becomes a problem, Jenks said they could change back to residents only, period. LaCasse said season passes are only for residents at this time; and likely will not be made available to non-residents this season.

Nelson asked what the limit is. LaCasse said full capacity is 921. So 50% capacity is about 450 would be met if all 221 pass holders came, plus 150 residential and 150 nonresidential daily passes. As the number of pass holders go up, the daily passes available will go down. That is how we can control attendance and keep it well under the 450 maximum. Nelson is concerned for Jenks benefit and her employees. He doesn’t trust the people in the pool to maintain social distancing while they are in the pool laughing, sneezing, etc. Nelson said I understand Council advised open swim but I caution you to be very careful.

Jenks responded that they are taking temperatures and following the CDC guidelines. Part of that is a user agreement that everyone signs when making a purchase. Nelson asked if it was a waiver they sign and LaCasse said there is a set of stipulations everyone must agree to before completing their purchase. Nelson said the temperature check doesn’t necessarily tell you if you have COVID-19. LaCasse stated that it is one of the precautions we can take; per CDC a temperature of 100 degrees is a threshold or indicator.

Jenks said that exits and entrances are separate to keep social distancing, the staff has plexi-glass as well as masks. Interior staff wears masks but not the lifeguards.

Nelson asked if all council members were present at the last meeting. LaCasse said it was a work session discussion and three were present. When the governor announced that pools could open on the 10th, the City Manager said “open the pool”. LaCasse said that her email could have been
worded better to explain this is what we are planning to do. Nelson said he gets it, there is a need to get the pool open and he hopes it goes well.

LaCasse said our focus is serving the community of Anoka. The changes made include requiring parents to be in the classes with younger kids, smaller classes for youth, more equipment for students as suggested by the American Red Cross, no chairs on the pool deck. LaCasse said we have consulted with other aquatic professionals and the American Red Cross. Blankenship asked if we are the only pool open. LaCasse responded that St Louis Park is planning to open July 1st. Also YMCA’s, Maple Grove and Maplewood are considering opening pools associated with their community centers.

Scott said it sounds like we are setting up for success. There was a recent incident at Lake George with 300 people at the beach. It started as a graduation party but the police had to come out and break it up with tear gas. Scott says that would be very unlikely at Anoka because of the way we are set up. It is controlled and safe. Nelson said this is a good point.

Poe asked how staff feels about everything and if they thought they would not be working this summer. Jenks said quite a few are relieved that we are open. Parents were pushing kids to find a new job so when we got word to open for lessons, several signed up to be instructors. They are excited to be working. Young kids sometimes feel they are invincible but they are following the precautions and disinfecting and cleaning. Scott said he was approached by staff to ask if he showered and he was glad they were enforcing the rules. Jenks said 4 of her staff did find a different job. Staff are encouraged to choose their comfort level and can wear a mask behind the plexi-glass if want. Nelson said good job.

**CONCERTS**

LaCasse wanted the Park Board to know about the first summer concert. Jenks said the Shane Martin band was scheduled to play earlier but the first few June performances were previously cancelled due to COVID 19. They are going to have a test concert tomorrow evening at Riverfront Memorial Park. We will put up signage for social distancing. This park has been used a lot recently by people bringing their lawn chairs, spacing out 6 feet and enjoying the park. LaCasse said if this is successful we will reschedule more concerts to occur from now until August.

Scott asked if we are going to have signs encouraging people to wear masks. He noted that the protestors were wearing masks and we haven’t seen a spike in the virus. LaCasse said we will encourage family groups to stay together because little kids running around and dancing might be harder to control. Signage will include recommendations to wear masks.

**RUDY JOHNSON PARK**

Jon’s crew is handling the removal of the playground; and had already removed the skating rink and ballfield fence. LaCasse reported that the contractor is on site and has assisted the City with tree removal and will soon begin grading.

LaCasse explained that there was controversy over the 2 cottonwood trees being removed.

LaCasse said she should have sent out an email before Sauter started taking out trees. Staff had planned to handle the tree removal internally, but Sauter offered to do it free of charge to help
move the project along. That is what led to the events of Monday June 8. A week ago Friday the smaller trees were taken down and the two cottonwoods taken down on Monday.

Prior to Memorial Day, Holmes asked Jerry Tri, City Arborist to review the tree removal plans provided by Bolten Menk. The construction plans originally identified twenty-three trees for removal between phase 1 and phase 2, but Jerry determined that only 14 of those 23 needed to come out. Tri evaluated all the trees in the park and recommended the removal of two cottonwood trees due to decay and overall condition. One of the cottonwoods had damage that was likely caused by a lightning strike. The other tree had a severe lean and deteriorating crown.

LaCasse displayed a map that showed trees identified for removal. Jerry Tri, City Tree Inspector/Arborist spoke to the Park Board. He said his job was to evaluate the tree on this plat. A tree might branch out and on a quick glance look fine, but that is not always the case. The two trees. A few years ago a family was picnicking and when the packed up and started bringing things to their car, a branch fell on the table they had been sitting at. It crushed the grill and damaged the picnic table. They were very lucky they were not sitting there when it fell. Both of these trees have been losing branches but especially the one furthest north. One of the tree that was taken down was leaning to the NE at about 30 degrees. The NE side had a depression in the ground and it was leaning more each year. When branches fall off they create an opening that allows water to enter and decay the tree. The south tree had likely been hit by lightning with 30% decay at the top, which is not easily visible when the lower branches leaf out. This tree also had an indentation on the side showing there is something happening on the inside of the tree. My job was to evaluate and determine their defects. My decision was that since the park was being developed, this would be a good time to take these down instead of having them further decay and cause problems for the public. To avoid a catastrophe I told LaCasse and Holmes that these defects would be a problem further down the line.

Tri also spoke about a Blue Spruce by the hockey rink that was estimated to be 50 feet tall but had purple leaf needle cast. Nelson asked if half the tree removed were ash. Tri responded that 10 were ash trees. Nelson said they would probably have to come out anyway due to ash borer. Tri noted that the cottonwood trees were the tallest trees. They appeared to have a full canopy but there were other notable issues upon closer evaluation. Nelson recalled that we tried to save a cottonwood over by Rice and Levy. It ended up falling down and thankfully no one got hurt.

Scott brought up when the plan was approved there was kind of a bubble about protecting the existing trees. LaCasse said we spoke with the Landscape Architect and it became obvious that with the amount of dirt we were hauling in that some additional trees would need to go. We had not expected as many trees to be identified for removal and that is why we called Jerry Tri to come to the park and evaluate. If our crew had removed trees, we probably would have removed only a few trees per day, but because Sauter offered to assist, with the big excavators, the removals happened all at once. Holmes said we did not take down all of the trees recommended which should show we were not clear cutting.

Scott said he just wants to make sure we stay true to our plan. Tri said the trees that were shaded by the cottonwoods were not able to reach their full height. They will flourish better without the cottonwoods shading them. LaCasse said we have an opportunity add more trees and can place them where they will flourish. LaCasse and Holmes have talked about spading some trees from the cemetery nursery area and other places in the city. We did this at Castle Field and it made an
impact right away. Nelson said wait until you plan the irrigation so you know where you can plant.

LaCasse said we have an opportunity to improve the aesthetics of this park. She said in hindsight she should have notified the board ahead about the 2 cottonwood trees and takes responsibility for that.

Poe asked if there will be a biological survey before the work is done. LaCasse assumes the consultants are doing that. Poe asked what funding is provided to complete this project. LaCasse said only City funding was used. Poe said when you have to follow federal guidelines they look in migrating birds, the environment, etc. Poe wondered why these trees had to come down but Jerry explained very well why. When you do these plans you could include a biological survey and then things would not be very controversial. My job experience involved that. Poe said a typical biological study would recommend not impacting trees within a certain time period to protect migrating birds and the environment. If you take down 16 full canopy trees in June you are taking down dozens of nests. Poe said she is not criticizing but surprised you do not do nest surveys and biological studies at the city level.

Nelson asked how many acres the park was and LaCasse said six. LaCasse said another challenge is we are not paying for engineering a full plan set. We paid for plan sheets for specific aspects of the project we needed. As you recall, funds are limited for this project and the city is acting as the general contractor to save money. Nelson said he is not aware of anyone doing an impact study of a six acres park – just wetlands. Poe said biological surveys are smaller than an environmental impact study. Nelson asked what the cost would be for a city to do the study. Poe said she cannot say as it’s been too long since she has done that work and she has not worked at a city level or in the state of Minnesota. It depends on where the funding comes from. If it is all city funding and city land then you know how it is done. I was just surprised that 16 trees could be taken down in June.

Nelson said we will have a problem at Mississippi Park because more trees will come down there. Blankenship said we have a history in the recent past of reconfiguring parking lots, parks and volleyball courts to save trees. The Riverfront townhome development saved a big tree that was going to be cut down. I think we know this staff wants to save trees. We should have been notified of this impact and maybe Jerry should have looked at this last fall. Then we would have had a chance to have had the conversation earlier. We wouldn’t be so shocked. Blankenship mentioned where she vacations they provide a lot of shade trees, even for their parking lots. She noticed a development in Coon Rapids where it’s a vast wasteland and they took everything down. There is not enough done about preserving trees.

Blankenship acknowledge that cost is a factor but the more knowledge we have ahead of time would be better. Jerry Tri said a lot of spruce trees were left out there and they will create better habitat. The tree replacement plan calls for 18 trees to be replanted. The good thing is we have the resources.

Nelson asked what the schedule is for Rudy Johnson Park. LaCasse said they are doing preliminary grading, laying out the trail. The building has had asbestos and regulated waste removed. We are waiting documentation before the building can come down. Irrigation plan is out for a quote. Sauter will take down the building. We have salvaged as much as we could.
Grading was quoted at $35,000 and for tree removal we do not expect a charge. We have removed AG lime and the playground. Revamping the playground is quoted at $60,000 including installation. Our goal is to grow grass for the fall, have the athletic field established and playable and the hockey rink. Hopefully the playground can also be done by fall.

Scott asked if we are still doing a natural play area. LaCasse said that is in the future, not this phase. LaCasse asked Park Board members do look at the playground and offer suggestions, comments. Scott said he would like to see a rock climbing wall. Watson was asked about a two to five instead of the topsy-turvy swing. He said they do have items that would fit in that space. Scott asked if we could do some of the installation ourselves to save money. LaCasse said we could save $17,000 if our crew and volunteers did the installation. Similar to what was done at George Enloe Park. The concrete border could be done by our concrete contractor. We were told that our playground looks like its 10 years old instead of 18 years old. It is in really good condition and giving it a facelift will make a big improvement. The neighborhood might not even recognize that it is the same equipment with a few new parts.

LaCasse asked Sebesta and Watson, as playground equipment professionals, what their thoughts are. Watson said it is a good plan to salvage the existing equipment and doing a community install would work. He asked when this would happen. LaCasse said it depends on how fast they sandblast, etc. We are hoping for fall. Watson would be willing to help install and agrees it is a good cost savings. LaCasse said the city crew also has the experience. Sebesta agreed cutting out the install fee would be a good thing to do. Lacasse will contact Flagship about replacing the topsy-turvy swing with a play structure for 2 to 5 year olds.

**COMMUNICATIONS**

**LIGHTENING STRIKE**

Lightening hit a big cottonwood tree to the north of the stage at Riverfront Memorial Park. It knocked out our irrigation system controller, but it has been replaced. It knocked out all the lights along the trail and the bridge lights on the arches. We are getting quotes to repair that from Kilmer Electric. Our electric department has been looking at trail lighting. Blankenship commented that she heard the lightening strike and it made her scream. LaCasse said it was caught on video and she will email that to park board members. Two people were on the dam when it struck and you can see their reaction on the video. It also blew out two gas services in the parking structure at 200 Second Avenue and shattered a light globe closest to the strike. It did a lot of damage. Jerry Tri informed that when lightning strikes a tree it turns any water inside the tree to steam and that blows out. The tree is still standing but shows signs of injury.

**MISSISSIPPI SHORELINE RESTORATION**

The area from Benton to the fishing pier is part of this project. There will be some major clearing and replanting going on here. Our trail is pretty close to the Mississippi River and sections will need to be removed and replaced once the restoration is complete. Ben Nelson is overseeing this project with a storm water improvement grant through state funding. Nelson asked if the DNR is involved. LaCasse said there were heavily involved in early planning with the Anoka Conservation District. Blankenship asked if the Army Corps of Engineers had to be involved since it is along the Mississippi River. Nelson asked about an environmental study. LaCasse said yes there are lots of parties involved in the plans and the ACD is leading the project along with heading up the design/engineering. LaCasse has not been overly involved in the preliminary
stages. There will be a direct mailing to all residents along the park and probably several open houses for the public.

MISCELLANEOUS
Akin Riverside Park – Blankenship commented the shelter and playground look wonderful. However she has been doing a lots of walking and the signs at both Akin and Peninsula Point Park do not look very good. In fact, Blankenship cleaned them herself. She will continue do take care of these signs at this time. She also noticed other small items like suckers coming up from some of the smaller trees. Blankenship said she knows the crew is busy but wondered if this is part of what the crew does periodically during the summer. Holmes said everything she mentioned is on our list. Blankenship was glad to hear this.

LaCasse said this is the first time in twenty years that we did not have a football day. Their community clean-up day provided labor to get ready for spring. We did use about a dozen of Nickie’s pool staff to help with mulching around Anoka. Blankenship said she has never noticed it looking this bad and LaCasse said this is the difference we are seeing in not having that work day. We missed out on a lot of free labor. Blankenship said this shows the football players do a great job for the City. LaCasse agreed they have been missed.

ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING
Riverwalk Project / Amphitheater – Anderla requested the findings from the State Historical Society
Bike Trail at ANP & Invasive Species update – LaCasse will invite a representative to come to a future meeting to update the status

Adjournment
There being no further discussion, a motion was made by Anderla, seconded by Scott to ADJOURN THIS REGULAR MEETING.

8 ayes – 0 nays. Motion carried. (Beckenbach was called away to a fire emergency half way through this meeting). Time of adjournment 9:01 pm

Respectfully Submitted,

[Signature]
Lisa LaCasse
Public Services Administrator

Jenny Spooner
Public Services/Recording Secretary
New Business

4. A. Riverwalk Project - Amphitheater
Holmes indicated that we have also spoken to the Anoka Legion and asked for financial support.

Anderla asked if we had a cancellation date if we don’t raise enough funds. LaCasse said that she will talk to city manager if the fundraising doesn’t go well. We need about $100-150 for each lunch, the rest of it will wait. We have the decoys from volunteers.

**B. Amphitheater update**

LaCasse reported that Anderla, LaCasse, Holmes and the City’s consultant from Bolton & Menk met out at the amphitheater with representatives from the State Historic Architect Office, Erik Skogquist representing the Windego Society and their consultants from LHB. We talk about concepts and options regarding the amphitheater trying to determine the best course of action regarding rehabilitation, reconstruction or preservation.

LaCasse indicated that the state would likely not approve any full demolition with reconstruction of the amphitheater without it being removed from the historic registry. They cautioned reconstructing it in the exact likeness, it would be flawed as the original design is clearly flawed. The moment the site is demolished there is no history left. There are no other categories that they felt the amphitheater could be listed under to maintain status on the listing. The architect asked about 169 impacts the amphitheater and if the damage is just from freeze/thaw or if there are road vibrations contributing too. They recommended the City pursue grant dollars for investigating options for stopping degradation. Legacy Grant funds could be used to hire a firm to do more comprehensive tests. Partial demolishing on the north end is probably necessary, but beyond that if we demolish it we lose the history. There are lots of creative ways to interpret the site and celebrate the structure without rehabilitation or restoration. Any future study would determine how best to move forward – do we seal it off reconstruct, leave a ruin or what. Instead of just fencing it off and walking away. We know it’s not structurally sound.

Anderla commented that during the river walk task force meetings, there was no decision to restore or demolish it. He suggests turning it over to the HPC to figure out what to do with it. Some people want to bury it and some people want to preserve it. We’ve been talking about it many years with no decision. Nelson asked Anderla to clarify what he meant by turning it over to the HPC. Anderla suggested that they write the grant for the study and see what they want to do to it. We then can figure out what we want to do with the park/trail. People can look at it as a bypass. We have other locations for concerts or events in Anoka.

Discussion about the West Rum River Trail plan continued. LaCasse said that the property has been in our charge as a park and the adjacent properties were designated as park properties. LaCasse added that since its open space it needs to be a joint venture between Windego, HPC, and Public Services. The trail can go around the bottom or riverside of the amphitheater. The tunnel crossing under 169 is still part of the plan but could be many years out. The HRA owns the Benton Street parcels and is marketing them for sale. We have placed an easement on the property for the tunnel.

Regardless who is in charge of the study or filing for the grant application, Public Services staff should be involved. Ideally, it would be a joint venture between the City and Windego. For all extensive purposes, demolition or reconstruction is not an option as the National Park Service
would require it be de-listed. We could bury it, but we would need to defend why would do it. There seemed to be more of a preference to leave it in a ruin – add decorative fencing, remove the side that is collapsing, and leave the other there with stabilization. A study would reveal what is really happening with the highway.

Sebesta questioned what we gain from it being listed on the historic registry. LaCasse said that it opens up opportunity for grant funding from multiple sources. Regardless of what we decide to do, fill it in, leave it, etc., a future study helps us build a case for it and provides answers for how best to keep it from further deteriorating. We need to know how to minimize future damage. The condition only gets worse. LaCasse has included funding for a consultant to write grants for the trail project; if the budget request is successful we can include grant applications specific for the amphitheater.

C. Enloe Park North Field Construction Update
LaCasse showed the board photos of the progress to date. Holmes’ crew spent 2.5 days to sod cut of the infield and transplanted to the old infield, 1/3 left to sod. May have to move the trail a little bit to account for bleacher seating.

Holmes said they removed 6” of dirt from the infield and base paths that will be replaced with aglime. The old aglime will be reused and then topped off with new aglime. ARAA posting pictures and promoting the field. It’s great!

COMMUNICATIONS

A. Young Artist of Anoka Update
LaCasse: Anoka Halloween has asked Young Artists to wait until the 100-year celebration- next year to paint the tunnel. Still interested in repainting the plow blades on truck for Anoka and Ramsey once school starts.

Final lift of bituminous was added to the tennis court at George Green but it needs to sit for 30 days before being painted. Sunny acres has not be started yet. We will be adding 13’ of concrete to the north end for the added space needed for the court conversion to pickle ball.

The board discussed and determined that the potential items for the August agenda could wait until September and unanimously decided to cancel the August meeting.

Motion to ADJOURN made by Beckenbach and seconded by Husbek.

8 ayes – 0 nays. Motion carries.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lisa LaCasse
Lisa LaCasse
Public Services Administrator
United States Department of the Interior
Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service

National Register of Historic Places
Inventory—Nomination Form

See instructions in How to Complete National Register Forms
Type all entries—complete applicable sections

1. Name

historic Windego Park Auditorium
and/or common Open Air Theater

2. Location

street & number Between South Ferry Street and Rum River
not for publication

city, town Anoka vicinity of congressional district 8th

3. Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Present Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>district</td>
<td>X public</td>
<td>occupied</td>
<td>agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building(s)</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>unoccupied</td>
<td>commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X structure</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>work in progress</td>
<td>educational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site</td>
<td>Public Acquisition</td>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td>entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object</td>
<td>in process</td>
<td>yes: restricted</td>
<td>government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>being considered</td>
<td>yes: unrestricted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X other: not in use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Owner of Property

name City of Anoka

5. Location of Legal Description

courthouse, registry of deeds, etc. Anoka County Courthouse

city, town Anoka vicinity of state Minnesota

6. Representation in Existing Surveys

Statewide Survey of Historic Resources

has this property been determined eligible? yes no

date 1978, 1979

federal X state county local

depository for survey records 240 Summit Avenue -- Minnesota Historical Society

state Minnesota
Windego Park Auditorium/Open Air Theater

Although features of the original design have either been destroyed or have deteriorated, the city of Anoka plans to restore the theater to its 1914 appearance. The Landscape Architecture Department of the University of Minnesota is currently preparing a "restoration" study for the theater.


2 Ibid.
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10. Geographical Data

Acreage of nominated property  

Quadrangle name Anoka

Quadrangle scale 7.5

UTM NOT VERIFIED

Vertebral boundary description and justification

Allards Resurvey

N ¼ Lot 14

Block 1
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</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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name/title Lynne VanBrocklin Spaeth

organization Minnesota Historical Society
date May 1979

street & number 240 Summit Avenue-Hill House
call Denis Gimmestad
telephone (612) 296-9545

city or town St. Paul
state Minnesota

12. State Historic Preservation Officer Certification

The evaluated significance of this property within the state is:

   ____ national   ____ state   X local

As the designated State Historic Preservation Officer for the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-665), I hereby nominate this property for inclusion in the National Register and certify that it has been evaluated according to the criteria and procedures set forth by the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service.

State Historic Preservation Officer signature

Russell W. Fridley
title State Historic Preservation Officer
date 11/1/79
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I hereby certify that this property is included in the National Register

Keeper of the National Register
date 1/8/80
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date 1/2/80

Chief of Registration
United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service
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RESOURCE NAME (HISTORIC): Windego Park Auditorium/Open Air Theatre
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VICINITY OF:
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Nina M. Archabal
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What Can Be Funded

Be sure your project is eligible.
Eligible projects fall into three project categories: history projects, historic preservation projects, and structured grants. Keep in mind that these are guidelines, not a catalog of all possible projects. In addition, some projects might appear to fit under more than one category. If your planned project does not appear to fit into one of these categories, or if you are unsure which category should be applied to your project, call, e-mail, or write the Grants Office before submitting an application. Final product(s) must be held by a Minnesota-based organization or institution with access to the public.

HISTORY PROJECTS

+ Oral History
+ Research and Writing
+ Interpretive Programs and Public Education
+ Publications
+ Collections Care and Management
+ General Conservation Assessment and Long-Range Preservation Plan
+ Historical Organization Self-Assessment Using StEPs
+ Museum and Archives Environments
| + **Evaluation of Building Mechanical (HVAC) Systems** |
| + **Planning For Redesign of Museum Lighting** |
| + **Develop a Disaster Plan** |
| + **Digital Conversion and Reproduction** |
| + **Acquire Primary Resources on Microfilm** |
| + **Acquire Microfilm Reader/Printer/Scanners** |
| + **Minnesota Bookshelf** |
| + **Scholarship to National Conference Hosted in Minnesota** |
| + **Archaeological Collections Assessment** |
| + **Museum Security Survey** |

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROJECTS**

| + **National Register Property Evaluation** |
| + **National Register and Local Designation** |
| + **Historic Preservation Planning** |
Historic Preservation Survey, Identification, and Evaluation

Historic Properties

Projects in this category plan for and/or stabilize, restore, preserve, reconstruct and/or make accessible buildings, structures or sites that are significant to national, state, or local history and that are open or highly visible to the public.

Minnesota Historical & Cultural Heritage Grants received for work performed on a Historic Preservation Tax Incentives project may or may not be considered a qualified rehabilitation expense (QRE) depending on whether or not the grant is considered taxable. The Grants Office recommends applicants consult with a tax attorney to determine the tax implications of comingling financial incentives from multiple programs.

Eligible projects include but are not limited to:

Predevelopment: Research Phase

- Includes research work for National Register–listed and National Register–eligible historic buildings that conforms to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties:
- Preparation of a Historic Building Conditions Assessment and treatment recommendations
- Preparation of a Historic Structure Report (HSR) that will assist the property owner in making appropriate and informed decisions about restoration and maintenance efforts. HSRs must follow the guidance set forth by the National Park Service in Preservation Brief #43: The Preparation and Use of Historic Structure Reports
- Preparation of a Historic Building Reuse Feasibility Study for a threatened or vacant building
- Preparation of a Cultural Landscape Report
- Preparation of a comprehensive Cultural Resource Management Plan
• Damage assessment of erosion at a National Register–listed archaeological site (see “Historic Preservation Survey, Identification, and Evaluation” section for more information about archaeological studies.)

Predevelopment: Working Drawings/Architectural Plans and Specifications

• Includes preparing drawings and specifications for a National Register–listed historic building/structure that conforms to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and is eligible under the grant guidelines for construction:
  • Construction documents and specifications for a project that plans for stabilization, restoration, preservation, or ADA accessibility routes or restrooms
  • Construction Documents should illustrate construction work to stabilize, restore, rehabilitate, preserve, or to achieve ADA accessibility at a National Register listed property.

Note: Construction administration fees are not eligible during the predevelopment phase.

Development: Construction Work

• Includes construction work for a National Register–listed historic building/structure or National Register–listed archaeological site that conforms to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. Work must be completed following prevailing wage laws (see Appendix J):
  • Exterior building preservation work (roof, masonry, siding, windows, doors, soffit, porch, foundation, steps)
  • Interior systems work (updating electrical, plumbing, or climate control systems; installing a fire protection or security system)

Contact Minnesota Historical and Cultural Heritage Grants • grants@mnhs.org • 651-259-3497
June 4, 2018

Erik Skogquist  
President, Windego Park Historical Society  
1815 3rd Ave  
Anoka, MN 55303

WINDEGO AMPHITHEATER  
CONDITION REVIEW

The condition assessment observations of the Windego Amphitheater located in Anoka, MN were completed by Structural Engineer Stephen Hearn, PE, LEED AP on May 24, 2018. We conducted our assessment in accordance with the recommendations contained in ASCE’s Guideline for Structural Condition Assessment of Existing Buildings, (SEI/ASCE 11-99). The scope of work was limited to the following:

- Review of original construction documents
- Review of prior reports and assessments  
  - Collaborative Design Group 2006
  - Kimley-Horn 2017
- Visual inspection of the amphitheater concrete
- Preliminary condition evaluation and recommendations

The conclusions and recommendations found within this report are based on visual observations only; no testing or invasive investigation was undertaken. There are no guarantees direct or implied within this report.

The amphitheater was constructed circa 1914. It is constructed with approximately 3” thick concrete cast directly on grade. The concrete is unreinforced. Based on exposed soil areas it appears the subgrade is primarily sand.

Overall the concrete is in very poor condition. All the exposed concrete surfaces are heavily weathered. The northern most quarter of the amphitheater is completely overgrown. What portions of concrete that are visible in this area are extensively broken and jumbled. Paul Pierce of the Windego Park Historical Society advised that the entire site was overgrown and that they removed vegetation from the southern two thirds of the amphitheater in approximately 1980. Selective repairs were made to the concrete in approximately 1990.
The concrete where it is not overgrown is extensively cracked with significant areas of heaving and spalling. Stair risers and treads are bowing, misaligned, and otherwise displaced. The cracking has allowed water to infiltrate to the subgrade which led to significant freeze thaw action. This combined with vegetation that has grown over the years has led to the significant deterioration that is now evident. Previous repairs that appear to consist of concrete patches over cracked and spalled areas have failed and it is evident there has been significant additional deterioration since these repairs were completed.

Concrete stair steps on top of the main treads and risers appear to have been cast separately. They are not attached to the concrete below. Many of the steps are displaced or missing making ascending or descending the amphitheater difficult.

The walls surrounding the orchestra pit are bowing inwards and are unstable. The concrete is heavily cracked and with significant spalling of the surfaces.

The amount of displacement and movement of the concrete indicates failure of the subgrade below the concrete. This is due to the freeze-thaw action of ice and water and heaving of the soil subgrade below. Where concrete is displaced or lifted we would expect to find large voids under the concrete.

In our opinion the concrete cannot be repaired or salvaged. To restore the amphitheater, the existing concrete would need to be removed so the subgrade can be repaired and provisions for proper drainage of the soils are provided. Then all new properly designed concrete matching the original profile of the amphitheater installed. Selective repairs that involve patching or filling cracks will not hold up due to the very poor condition of the existing concrete. Additionally, without repairing the subgrade the existing subgrade and concrete will continue to move over time creating further deterioration.

Because of the extent of loose, broken and spalled concrete, combined with the missing stair steps, we feel that the amphitheater in its current condition poses a danger to the public. We recommend that until it is restored that access to the area should be restricted.

I hereby certify that this plan, specification or report was prepared by me or under my direct supervision and that I am a duly licensed engineer under the laws of the State of Minnesota.

LHB

STEPHEN W. HEARN, P.E.
STRUCTURAL ENGINEER
MN License # 25409

c: Lisa LaCasse, City of Anoka
LHB File # 180068.00
To: City of Anoka
2015 First Avenue North
Anoka, MN
Attn: Lisa LaCasse
From: Neil A. Groon, PE
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
Date: November 21, 2017
Subject: Condition Assessment – Anoka Amphitheatre, Anoka, MN

To Whom It May Concern:

The purpose of this letter is to report the findings of a structural engineering review of the
distressed cast-in-place concrete amphitheater along the Rum River in Anoka, Minnesota.

ASSIGNMENT

Kimley-Horn has been retained to provide a structural engineering assessment of the distressed
cast-in-place concrete amphitheater along the Rum River in Anoka, Minnesota, as directed by Lisa
LaCasse from the City of Anoka.

BACKGROUND

The above referenced amphitheater was built in 1914, complete with a sound wall and ticket booth
at the top and back of the amphitheater, a steel post and cable supported canvas awning, and
dressing and storage rooms below the upper seats of the north section. It was used for amateur
plays, historical pageants, operettas, recitals, concerts, and other forms of live entertainment, as
well as community meetings, church services, ceremonies and other public events until the late
1930’s. In 1940 it is our understanding that the metal work for the awning was torn down and sent
to the scrap metal yard for the war effort. The amphitheater apparently went unused or minimally
used for the next 40 years. During this time the back wall and ticket booth and many of the
handrails were removed, the dressing and storage rooms filled in and sealed off, the concrete
seating started to deteriorate, and light vegetation started to grow in cracks in the concrete. In
1979 a planning study was done by a University of Minnesota landscape architect student for the
amphitheater and surrounding area to potentially renovate the theater. It was listed on the
National Register of Historic Places in 1980, without the approval of the Anoka City Commission. In
1984, there was an effort by the Anoka City Manager to remove the amphitheater from the National
Register, but the request was denied by the Minnesota Historical Society. The amphitheater
continued to deteriorate through the end of the 1990’s and into the 2000’s. In 2005 a condition
assessment and report was completed by Collaborative Design Group, but none of the
recommended repairs were completed due to economic and political constraints. The City of Anoka
is requesting that an independent structural engineer assess the condition of the amphitheater,
comment on the current structural condition, and provide repair suggestions for the existing structure.

DESCRIPTION

The amphitheater consists of cast-in-place concrete stairs and seating, constructed into the side of a hill, located along the west bank of the Rum river south of the Main Street Bridge, directly adjacent to Highway 169 in Anoka, MN. There are four sections to the amphitheater, separated by aisles of intermediate steps between each seating row. For this report the south section will be considered area A and the north section will be considered area D, with the middle sections B and C, respectively. Sections A and D have 17 rows of seats, and the middle two sections B and C have 20 rows, including the orchestra pit. The orchestra pit lies directly in front of a grass stage. The amphitheater had a reported capacity of approximately 1600 people.

OBSERVATION AND COMMENTS

1. The following information was obtained through site visits on October 16, October 23, and November 9, 2017 by Neil Groon, PE of Kimley-Horn:

   a. The site visits included visual observations of the concrete amphitheater and orchestra pit. No destructive or invasive testing was completed.
   b. There are five rows of intermediate concrete steps. Two line the north and south edges of the amphitheater and three that separate the amphitheater into four sections. Many of these intermediate concrete steps are missing.
   c. In Section A, every row of seating had moderate to severe concrete spalls and cracks and most of the rows had one or more surface offset from the adjacent surface at a crack or joint.
   d. In Section B, every row of seating had severe concrete spalls and cracks, almost all the rows had one or more surface offset from the adjacent surface at a crack or joint, and about half of the rows had moderate to severe outward leaning of the vertical riser of the seating.
   e. In Section C, every row of seating had severe concrete spalls and cracks, offset surfaces at cracks and joints, and severe outward leaning of the vertical riser of the seating. Some rows were deteriorated so severely that large pieces of the concrete were missing and the exposed soil was washing out.
   f. In Section D, every row of seating was severely cracked, spalled, offset, and leaning, and deteriorated so badly that mature vegetation had taken over almost the entire section.
   g. The orchestra pit floor and walls were severely cracked and spalled. The walls had concrete delamination of the exposed surface. The top of the east wall had a severe horizontal crack that allowed the wall to separate from the concrete walk at grade above the wall. The floor drain in the southeast corner of the orchestra pit was noted to be in poor condition, cracked and eroded and can’t provide support for the floor drain grating.
h. No steel reinforcement was found in any part of the concrete construction.

i. The horizontal surface runs of the concrete seating were measured to be approximately 3” thick as measured from the area of missing concrete and soil erosion in section C.

j. The vertical risers of the concrete seating were measured to be approximately 4” – 6 1/2” thick as measured from the area of missing concrete and soil erosion in section C.

k. The orchestra pit walls appear to be approximately 10” thick. The concrete walk at grade at the top of the orchestra pit wall was measured to be approximately 4” thick.

l. There were some handrail posts that were cut off near the concrete surface which showed the handrail posts were embedded in the horizontal surface runs of the concrete seating.

m. The concrete walls along the north side of Section D were severely cracked and in extremely poor condition.

n. Many cracks in the amphitheater seating and orchestra pit walls were epoxy patched sometime in the past, but all the cracks have since reflected through and opened up.

o. It appears there may have been a 3/4-inch repair or maintenance layer of concrete applied over the original concrete throughout the amphitheater. It is unknown when this layer was applied.

2. The following information is noted in regard to the above observed conditions:

a. The current condition of the cast-in-place concrete amphitheater is beyond repair and not suited for occupant loading.

b. The measured thickness of the horizontal surface runs of the seating is too thin and most likely not strong enough to anchor new handrail posts to it. New drilled piers would have to be installed for new handrail posts to anchor to.

c. Many cracks have already been epoxied in the past, but the cracks reflected through and opened up. Repatching and epoxying the cracks would take a tremendous effort to complete and this type of repair is only good to keep water out of the cracks and prevent freeze/thaw cycles. Epoxying cracks does not bring structural integrity back as this repair method is not a structural fix.

d. The bearing capacity of the soils have been compromised with all the water intrusion through the cracks throughout the structure. Soil erosion is likely to have occurred.

e. Aesthetically, patching all the spalls and epoxying all the cracks would not look very nice and this doesn’t repair the offset surfaces or the leaning risers.

f. Section D, the majority of section C, and the concrete walls along the north edge of section D are in such severe condition and are structurally unstable that these areas absolutely have to be removed and replaced.
PROFESSIONAL OPINION

3. It is our professional engineering opinion that the existing cast-in-place concrete amphitheater is not structurally capable of performing its intended functions and there are no reasonable or practical repair and maintenance options available that would restore the structural integrity of the amphitheater such that it can be fully used and occupied. The cost of any repair option is considered too high relative to the desired design improvement attained with complete replacement.

Cost Estimate

4. With this report, we have also included a cost estimate for the construction costs associated with a complete reconstruction of the amphitheater. A detailed list of our estimated costs can be found at the end of this report.

GENERAL

5. The observations and opinions expressed in this report are based on our professional engineering judgment and professional practice, as well as limited visual observations of exposed materials only. No testing or removal of materials was performed to determine physical condition and state of structural components, nor compliance with the present Building Code.

6. This document pertains to the general structural assessment and condition of the exposed existing concrete elements of the amphitheater only and no destructive testing was conducted or requested. Structural design and verification of Code compliance is not part of this report. A cost estimate for the schematic design of a new/rebuilt cast-in-place concrete amphitheater is provided for this project. No other engineering was performed or requested for this project.

7. The conclusions are based on preliminary and limited examination and analysis. We reserve the right to supplement and/or amend these findings and/or opinions should new information become available. Concealed discrepancies and/or defects limit the accuracy and scope of this report. No warranty, either expressed or implied, for any portion of the structure is given.
Area D and North Wall Failure

Area D Unstable Seating

Area C Seating Failure (typical other areas)

Typical Cracking and Spalling (all areas)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope Detail</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Prep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinf. Concrete, demo</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove &amp; Replace soils</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misc. soil stabilization materials</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masonry Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete seating &amp; Risers to match existing (structural flatwork).</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>$845,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised to meet ADA</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>$119,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra floor and walls</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site concrete walk-flatwork</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>$13</td>
<td>$23,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Drive–6° concrete</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressing Room—New CMU construction 200SF. Walls, framed ceiling, skylight, HM door &amp; hwds.</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canopy—fabric cloth, steel cable, stl frame</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>17,600</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$528,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handrails on all risers per ADA</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$38,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage lighting &amp; portable sound</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre power</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications/SECURITY (comm portion), sound</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating lighting</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moisture Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caulking all joints</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches, Flagpoles</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upgraded flat surfaces</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>26000</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$390,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River bank restoration</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site lighting</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayfinding, regulatory, Marquee</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,589,800</td>
<td>$6,211,431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>$261,660</td>
<td>$3,948,780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead &amp; Profits</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$394,878</td>
<td>$4,343,658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conditions</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$494,366</td>
<td>$4,778,024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$1,433,407</td>
<td>$6,211,431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant/Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect/Engineer</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>$745,372</td>
<td>$6,956,803</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Administration</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$695,680</td>
<td>$7,652,483</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid point Jan 2019</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$765,248</td>
<td>$8,417,731</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,417,731</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>