



CITY OF CANNON BEACH

AGENDA

Meeting: City Council Work Session
Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2024
Time: 6:00 p.m.
Location: Council Chambers, City Hall

CALL TO ORDER AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA

PUBLIC COMMENT

The Presiding Officer will call for statements from citizens regarding issues relating to the City. The Presiding Officer may limit the time permitted for presentations and may request that a spokesperson be selected for a group of persons wishing to speak.

DISCUSSIONS

- (1) **Addressing Concerns About the Cannon Beach Elementary School Rejuvenation Project**
- (2) **Good of the Order**

ADJOURNMENT

To join from your computer, tablet or smartphone

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/99261084699?pwd=TkpjbGcxS0pCOGIMOCtSbSsxVWFMZz09>

Meeting ID: 992 6108 4699

Password: 365593

To join from your phone:

Phone: 1.669.900.6833

Meeting ID: 992 6108 4699

Password: 365593

View Our Live Stream: View our [Live Stream](#) on YouTube!

Public Comment: If you wish to provide public comment via Zoom for this meeting please use the raise your hand Zoom feature. Except for a public hearing agenda item, all Public to be Heard comments will be taken at the beginning of the meeting for both Agenda and Non-Agenda items. If you are requesting to speak during a public hearing agenda item, please indicate the specific agenda item number as your comments will be considered during the public hearing portion of the meeting when the public hearing item is considered by the Council. All written comments received by 3:00 pm the day before the meeting will be distributed to the City Council and the appropriate staff prior to the start of the meeting. These written comments will be included in the record copy of the meeting. Written comments received at the deadline will be forwarded to Council and included in the record but may not be read prior to the meeting or appear on the city's website.

Please note that agenda items may not be considered in the exact order listed. For questions about the agenda, please contact the City of Cannon Beach at (503) 436.8052. The meeting is accessible to the disabled. If you need special accommodations to attend or participate in the meeting per the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), please contact the City Manager at (503) 436.8050. TTY (503) 436-8097. This information can be made in alternative format as needed for persons with disabilities.

Posted: 2024.03.14

From: [leslie sinclair](#)
To: [City Hall Group](#)
Subject: Concerned about our "Concerned Citizens"
Date: Tuesday, March 5, 2024 10:25:00 AM

Thank you Mayor and City Councilors.

Let me lead off with my objection to accepting any comments from un-named sources. As such, I am only responding to those questions submitted by Paul Dueber and Sam Steidel.

Several comments I felt had merit, although in most cases they involved design details that have not yet been considered.

- the composition of the gym floor. it may well be beneficial to look at alternatives to traditional wood since the gym is intended to be used for a multitude of activity types.
- The size of the kitchen. I doubt that the chamber kitchen could adequately serve 200 people, but the point is worth considering as I have not seen any kind of detailed kitchen layout or equipment list.
- The required A/V equipment. Fully wiring the facility as part of the renovation makes financial sense but as far as I know, no equipment has been decided.
- Many of Sam's comments are directed at construction details which are outside my abilities. I would hope Bremik will respond to these. Particularly questions concerning the abandonment of existing doorways that already pierce the quonset shell vs the addition of new doors in other locations.

Several comments seemed to be based on out-dated design elements.

- The garage door at the north end of the gym has been eliminated for some time.
- Likewise the notion that the north end of the gym is the "gateway" to the tribal experience is wrong. The north doors leading out of the lobby would be the logical gateway.

The primary discussion point seems to be about allowed uses of the gymnasium space - how it is to be used leads directly to how it should be renovated. I am speaking only for myself, but as a member of the Ne'Cus Advisory Committee I can tell you that we were unable to reach a consensus. One camp wanted the gym left essentially as is and no "large" events such as weddings, conferences, trade shows allowed. I suspect that this view would support leaving the north end alone - with or without ADA compliance, and would also support moving the catering kitchen to a location closer to the classrooms.

Alternatively, to use the gym as an event center requires the mods suggested in the current design plan. Adding windows to both the north and south ends allows in natural light and fresh air, the kitchen is well placed to serve either the gym event space or the lobby/classrooms. Gymnasium restrooms are required as I expect the gym space to be available outside lobby hours for recreation, inclement weather and winter activities, etc.

I suggest that the council endorse the intended use of the gym as a multi-purpose event / recreation space and the design as presented by CIDA. These uses align with the results from the Community Outreach initiative and I believe, are necessary to ensure that this facility meets the usage requirements of the TLT money we are funding this project with. Further, private events such as weddings, conferences, etc. are likely to be the most significant source of income to fund day to day Ne'Cus operations.

Once again, thank you for all you do.

Respectfully,

Les Sinclair



CANNON BEACH CITY COUNCIL

STAFF REPORT

ADDRESSING CONCERNS ABOUT THE CANNON BEACH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL REJUVENATION PROJECT

Agenda Date: March 19, 2024

Prepared by: Bruce St. Denis, City Manager

INTRODUCTION

The city received 11 pages with over 100 comments, questions and suggestions regarding the CBE project on February 26, 2024. This staff report will take the points made most often (major themes) and address those.

The matrix title CBE Citizens Pricing Questions (Attachment A) is intended to address comments as received from Paul Dueber (on behalf of a group of concerned citizens) and Sam Steidel. These letters were submitted in response to City Council's decision at February 20th City Council Meeting to grant these concerned citizens represented by Mr. Dueber with an opportunity to pose questions regarding the current CBE Rejuvenation Project design and consider possibilities for cost reductions. The project team including city staff, CIDA and Bremik have made a concerted effort to review both letters received and from them derive a comprehensive list of actionable questions or considerations. Comments found to not have actionable items are not represented in the attachment.

Attachment B and C are matrixes that address the responses to comments in the letters from Paul Dueber and Sam Steidel with responses to each.

Attached D is the unedited questions that were submitted.

MAJOR THEMES RAISED IN QUESTIONS

1. A major cost element of this presentation alleges that significant cost savings could be realized if the north wall of the gym and the associated mezzanine could be left intact so that the restrooms located there could be reused with the existing plumbing or using the existing plumbing trench for potable and waste lines.

The flaw of this logic is that there are up to seven floor levels below and within the mezzanine. Some are separated by as little as 1 inch and others are 2 to 3 feet. All parts of the mezzanine must meet the accessibility code for it to be accessed by the public. If accessibility is not accomplished, no part or room underneath the mezzanine may be used by the public, including re-created restrooms.

2. Other potential pertinent points regarding the north end restrooms:
 - a. There is no plumbing “trench” from this location. The lines appear to come out the north side of the gym and are buried on the east side of the building and out into Beaver St.
 - b. Because of the routing of the water and waste lines, this option requires more potential disturbance of the artifacts to make the connection from the north side of the gym out at Beaver Street and difficulty in maintaining adequate slope for wastewater.
 - c. It is not feasible to make the existing mezzanine meet code.
3. The proposed orientation of the dominant side of the structures towards the water is based on the tribe’s spiritual connection with the water and estuary and not on seeking a view.
4. There is discussion about putting restrooms and kitchen in a “central” location. The gym is on the east, classrooms on the west and the “lobby” is in the middle. The lobby is restricted on those two sides and is not large enough to take on a kitchen and/or restrooms.
5. In many cases it may not be possible to determine the final cost of an improvement if only the cost of what is to be demolished or the cost of what will be built in its’ place is known. You only have half of the equation.
6. Many of the comments were not related to cost and construction ideas and are noted as such.

TERMINOLOGY

SD = Schematic Design

DD = Design Development

CD = Construction Drawings

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Pricing and Design Questions
- B. Response to Steidel Submittal
- C. Response to Dueber Submittal
- D. Original Questions Submitted from Steidel and Dueber

CBE Citizens Pricing Questions:

This memo is intended to address comments as received by Paul Dueber (on behalf of a group of citizens) and Sam Steidel in their respective letters received by City Manager Bruce St. Denis on February 26th, 2024. These letters were submitted in response to City Council's decision at February 20th City Council Meeting to grant these concerned citizens represented by Mr. Dueber with an opportunity to pose questions regarding the current CBE Rejuvenation Project design and consider possibilities for cost reductions. The project team including city staff, CIDA and Bremik have made a concerted effort to review both letters received and from them derive a comprehensive list of actionable questions or considerations. Comments found to not have actionable items are not represented below.

| Writer | # | Question | Response |
|--------|---|---|---|
| Letter | 1 | There is a large sum allotted to the projection screens when it seems no operations or management plan has identified the need for this component. If there is a rare opportunity for the need for this item, would it be more economic to rent the equipment or require the short-term user/renter of that space to provide their own equipment. Most media intensive groups generally maintain that type of equipment, just as major musical productions have their own group defined PA systems. Adequate power sources are usually the only required contribution from the facility. | The projection screen purchase has been removed as part of a value engineering process for a total reduction of \$(47,397) |
| Letter | 2 | What is the difference in cost to demolish and rebuild the gym north wall and install a proposed viewing area to the Park compared to the cost of applying that same "view" opportunity to the north wall of the lobby? In creating the lobby as the focal point for tribal heritage and display it would seem logical that the lobby be the point for that view and, as previously stated, creating access for pedestrian flow through the lobby and into the Park. The gym is predominantly to be used for activities not normally associated with quality viewing to the exterior amenities. | The specific cost would require redesign and exploration. The gym is considered a multi-purpose event and community space. The design aligns with the community outreach feedback. The cost for demolition is \$(35,987). |
| Letter | 3 | Cost comparison of the bathrooms in the gym in various locations: Cost to refurbish and upgrade the existing bathrooms on the north end VS. Cost to create a new bathroom facility on the south end. | Existing infrastructure and layout does not support reusing the existing restroom locations |
| Letter | 4 | Cost to create a new bathroom facility on the south end. | Cost for bathrooms to be built on the North End of the gym \$228,374 |
| Letter | 5 | Cost and value of proposed elimination of the 2nd floor area on the north end vs. use of 2nd floor space as storage or other non-ADA compliant usages. | Current mezzanine configuration cannot be safely accessed by the public. The COE feedback asked for a view to the estuary from the gym. |
| Letter | 6 | What are the costs and financial benefits of installing solar arrays as structurally possible. Are there funding sources available to make that enticing and viable? | We have been working with Energy Trust of Oregon since the schematic design phase to determine viable solar and green energy measures. |
| Letter | 7 | If the bathrooms on the north end can be refurbished and plumbed at reasonable cost and a smaller kitchen located more central to the entire project, would that result in substantial saving? | Existing infrastructure and layout does not support reusing the existing bathroom locations. The new bathroom and kitchens are located to reduce the amount of new trenching needed. If existing bathroom locations were to be reused, it would require extensive trenching work to lower the existing drain lines. |
| Letter | 8 | What consideration is being given to acoustical engineering in the gym? This is highly desired and could be costly. | An allowance of \$100,000 has been included in the design development estimate for gymnasium acoustic treatments. |
| Letter | 9 | Do lower cost and lower maintenance options exist for the proposed new wood floor? | GERFLOR Resilient Flooring has been designed and priced in the gymnasium for durability and lowest cost maintenance. |

| | | | |
|--------|----|---|---|
| Letter | 10 | Does the partition previously discussed have a well-defined reason for its use that supports the cost of this feature? Have the costs related to any demolition, structure, materials and installation been identified? | The folding partition has been removed from the project as part of a value engineering process. The total deduction is \$(63,329) |
| Letter | 11 | We have lost one classroom to an expanded lobby area. Would there be cost savings in a slight reduction of the lobby size to accommodate a smaller kitchen that would be more centrally located? | The kitchen size and location is based on City Council review of the function of the space. It can service both the gym and the lobby from its current location. |
| Sam | 1 | Is the folding wall decided? Big cost reduction if not. | See letter #10 |
| Sam | 2 | Early on, solar panels on the roof was a big deal, no one has mentioned this in a while. Are solar energy thoughts still in the mix? Is it in the accounting? Why are we not touting this as a progressive value in light of it potentially finding good grants and lowering utility costs? | See letter #6 |
| Sam | 3 | Possible cost reduction of close to a million or more if not. This one idea causes demolition of the interior layout as it is today. | See letter #4 |
| Sam | 4 | Is media blasting of the Gym necessary, how will it affect the acoustics? Is this simply for clean up and neatness or is there a structural reason? The quaint patina of the old paint to some folks is charming, would a clear coating be an idea to avoid unnecessary insult to the ceiling? Possible cost reduction if so. | The media blasting has been replaced with painting the structure as part of a value engineering process. The total deduction is (\$42,783) |
| Sam | 5 | There is extensive demolition of the east end of the classrooms, if the fourth classroom could be retained is it possible to reduce a percentage of the demolition costs? Possible cost reduction if so. | Reducing demolition at the east end of the classroom building was prioritized the during design development phase. As such, the lobby and adjacent toilet rooms were re-imagined in order to maintain the east load bearing wall of the easternmost classroom, reducing the projects demolition costs while preserving the adjacent roof structure. |
| Sam | 6 | The north wall garage door is listed as \$50,000 plus? | City Council approved an alternate design option in lieu of the cost of the overhead doors. |
| Sam | 7 | The north 'Reception area' canopy is listed as \$50,000 if I read it correct. Bremik to Verify This could be a portion of the combined main plaza walkway roof system. | The estimated price for the North Gym Canopy is \$48,594. City Council approved an alternate design that reduced the height. |
| Sam | 9 | What is the pre-cast concrete veneer paneling? This treatment is not identified on the presentation images. For \$70,000 it might be nice to call this out so folks understand what and why. | The precast paneling element has been reduced as part of a value engineering process. The panel provides protection from surface water and accidental damage to the gym metal roofing. The total deduction is \$(37,656) |
| Sam | 10 | Acoustical ceilings are proposed in appropriate places but there is no mention of how acoustical engineering in the Big room will affect the costs. This is highly desired and could be costly yet it is unspecified. | See letter #8 |
| Sam | 11 | A new wood floor is called for in the big room, which is great. That said it would be nice to see if lower cost, lower maintenance options existed. | See letter #9 |
| Sam | 12 | There is \$40,000 for projection screens when as yet no operations or management plan has identified the need for this component. The desire for projection screens in the gym and some/all for the classrooms was identified during the COE process. | See letter #1 |

| | | | |
|-----|----|--|--|
| Sam | 13 | Tele-data cabling and AV/sound systems are not delineated enough to merit a \$100,000 decision of their value, that said some will be necessary but since operations and management are not consulted as to the need how can this amount be clearly judged. | The construction document phase will further refine the design of this. |
| Sam | 14 | In today's Wi-Fi world a single hub might serve the whole facility and eliminate tedious cabling and built in equipment. Do we need this level of cabling? | The construction document phase will further refine the design of this. |
| Sam | 15 | There seems a lot of earthwork, up to \$800,000 of it. This seems harshly contrary to the heritage preservation respect of this precious location. Savings could be found when Heritage care is prized over ad above standard operating procedures. What is the nature of the earthwork? | \$800,000 was the rough cost of the SD estimate for earthwork. The earthwork package is made up of building excavation, site development, utility upgrades, and street upgrades. |
| Sam | 16 | The new landscaping plan needs to reveal how much of a savings it has brought so folks can judge for them selves the value between old and new or new and more reduction. My guess is around 40,000 from noting what has been removed, which would be a noteworthy effort if I am close. | The landscape and site furnishings design has been reduced at Council's direction and in response to community feedback for a total reduction is \$(216,147) |

Sam Steidel Response Matrix

| Writer | # | Question | Response |
|--------|----|---|--|
| Sam | 1 | Cost cutting is the main focus because no one seems to understand that reducing design impact makes for a better design in this unique facility. A facility for the future that enhances the vision of this town. | Not a specific question related to cost. |
| Sam | 2 | The revision of the landscaping/site plan is a marked improvement. The Story circle is much more approachable and the garden less contrived. | Not a specific question related to cost. |
| Sam | 3 | Could the positive approach of community inclusion by how the landscaping was rethought be a signal that other discussions might improve the interior decisions toward a better layout as much? | Not a specific question related to cost. |
| Sam | 4 | The impact of the problem now seen as dividing the community is one of degree. The proposal has rolled over expectations and gone into a realm of development this community planned to avoid, read the comp plan. | Not a specific question related to cost. |
| Sam | 5 | Will taking the time to reduce and form a design that has better community acceptance be that much more difficult than working a little longer to create a project we all are proud of? | Not a specific question related to cost. |
| Sam | 6 | The Garden is much better, though is it as much a garden as it is landscape feature? | Not a specific question related to cost. |
| Sam | 7 | Was the big desire in the community for a presentation garden or a working garden for heritage education? | presentation |
| Sam | 8 | Critical to the garden component of the site is who will be caring for the growing portion, the maintenance? | Staff or contract |
| Sam | 9 | How do we affirm some future contract landscaper won't switch out hard to care for unattractive plants for the current fad flower? | Strong contract management |
| Sam | 10 | Is the public awareness of this new 'garden' a reminder of the natural setting as known a hundred generations ago? | Not a specific question related to cost. |
| Sam | 11 | Who will use The Southeast 'Cornerstone' Plaza? How? Is it simply a nice thing to see as you drive into town? Is this location being defined as an cornerstone entry point for good reasons? | Not a specific question related to cost. |
| Sam | 12 | Could the garden be the center of attention? Perhaps with a curious gate and pleasant statue begging for discovery and become grander through subtly and less costly, perhaps allowing more allocation for the statue's creation? | Not a specific question related to cost. |

| | | | |
|-----|----|---|--|
| Sam | 13 | Are the existing trees in the proposed garden area who have struggled to survive to be inclusive or killed? | some will be replaced with more appropriate species. |
| Sam | 14 | The Reception courtyard North of the gym, is it a courtyard or a porch? It borders a plaza, a lawn playing field, a garden and the singular reason it is offered is that it opens into the big room. | Not a specific question related to cost. |
| Sam | 15 | It is constantly shaded and windy area. How often will this space get sun? How will the wind affect this space? What is the view from this location. Who will ever stand there for any length of time in the shade and wind during an offseason festivity and think it pleasant? | Not a specific question related to cost. |
| Sam | 16 | Is the need for this feature solely evolved from opening the North end of the gym and is that truly a need? Could this be a future add on, giving the supposition that reducing total cost now might allow a capital reserve to be built up for future improvements as the future proposes the concept? | Tribe stated that their buildings open to the water in recognition of their spiritual connection and the current buildings are incorrectly oriented in terms of tribal practice. |
| Sam | 17 | Do we truly understand how the big room having northern exposure might best be enjoyed? Is it possible the lawn untouched would naturally better serve the message we want? (and thus less costly, and thus less compounding on other impact/costs noted below) | Not a specific question related to cost. |
| Sam | 18 | Have other possibilities for recreating the north end of the big room been discussed in light of costs verses desires and dreams verses practicality? | Tribe stated that their buildings open to the water in recognition of their spiritual connection and the current buildings are incorrectly oriented. |
| Sam | 19 | The designed faux river and playground feature is, happily, removed, is this as appreciated as I believe it to be? Is this not evidence that some designs on paper look great but after careful consideration, not so much? | Not a specific question related to cost. |
| Sam | 20 | Does the facade offer a pleasant face while being a subdued coastal ideal? | Don't understand where the writer is going with the statement. |
| Sam | 21 | Is the entry locatable? Does the entry add to the welcomeness we wish to portray? | Don't understand where the writer is going with the statement. |
| Sam | 22 | Yhe Beaver street sidewalk is what it is given the limited immutable established footprint of the structures. Is parking along Beaver optimized though or is it standard inefficient? | Successful for the space available. |

| | | | |
|-----|----|---|--|
| Sam | 23 | The exterior facades is what it is, a nice upgrade of a simply shaped building, the central, new, entry/lobby treatment bears the weight of many folks' discontent. Could this be akin to how the faux river was viewed? Could toning it down some both improve community respect while cutting cost? | Not a specific question related to cost. |
| Sam | 24 | Could over done grandeur be overkill? | don't understand where the writer is going with the statement. |
| Sam | 25 | Could subtly be charming to discover? | don't understand where the writer is going with the statement. |
| Sam | 26 | Could charming subtly be the definition of the Cannon Beach aesthetic? | don't understand where the writer is going with the statement. |
| Sam | 27 | That the bulk of cost overreach is in the construction/engineering of the buildings needs to be understood by all, but is it not possible that changes in non essential construction/engineering be altered to aim costs toward other less exaggerated aspects? | don't understand where the writer is going with the statement. |
| Sam | 28 | Do cost reducing strategies, in any way, need to diminish the Heritage expression or for that matter Environmental or the Arts as primary facility focus points? (Even though the Arts and Environment are not substantially expressed in design components.) | don't understand where the writer is going with the statement. |
| Sam | 29 | Do The Classrooms need a south side door by code? Possible cost reduction if not. | Yes. Life/safety code. Two means of egress. |
| Sam | 30 | Does each room need a sink and counter? Possible cost reduction if not? | Included for max flexibility of the space. |
| Sam | 31 | Does each room need the same level of appointment, flooring, lighting and other fixtures? Possible cost reduction if not. | basically, yes until the core use of each room is decided. |
| Sam | 32 | Could one room be available for messy art or dirty nature walk presentations? If not we are losing potential quality uses for the facility. | Yes, if council choice if that is a desired activity. |
| Sam | 33 | Is the folding wall decided? Big cost reduction if not. | currently below the line due to cost of escalation |
| Sam | 34 | Why is the folding wall, if needed, connecting the western rooms (being furthest away from the kitchen)? | recommendation of management committee |
| Sam | 35 | Early on, solar panels on the roof was a big deal, no one has mentioned this in a while. Are solar energy thoughts still in the mix? Is it in the accounting? Why are we not touting this as a progressive value in light of it potentially finding good grants and lowering utility costs? | This is being evaluated by a state group. |

| | | | |
|-----|----|---|--|
| Sam | 36 | Might delay cost more? Sure it might. Better to ask - Since we will have this facility in our community for generations to come, is it the right facility for the community we want the future to inherit? To portray our community with? Is it how we want the future CB to relate to the past CB? | Not a specific question related to cost. |
| Sam | 37 | The Lobby, looks great but is it functional for much more than a walk through? What is the Lobby for specifically? Cost reduction might be calculated in the flexibility of the space and potential for revenue and alternate uses functions. | Space is a walk through with exhibit options. |
| Sam | 38 | How many alternative functions will the lobby easily serve? | featured displays (permanent and changing) congregating, waiting space, meeting/gathering space, teaching space, pass through. |
| Sam | 39 | Or is the lobby simply to be an adjunct space for the other rooms? | no |
| Sam | 40 | Does the lobby have available walls for art rotation or for displays of detailed timely topics? | Wall space is flexible for wall presentations and floor is intended to be a premier exhibit showing tribal location in the PNW and reinforces the Thunderbird story. |
| Sam | 41 | Does the lobby have a traffic flow amenable for day to day visitors while other functions are currently in the gym and/or classrooms? | Yes. Provides separation. |
| Sam | 42 | Is there serviceable floor space for static displays of art or artifacts in the lobby? | yes |
| Sam | 43 | As a lobby it works, but what other functions does it serve while being so large? | featured displays (permanent and changing) congregating, waiting space, meeting/gathering space, teaching space, transition space. |
| Sam | 44 | Is it only a static interpretive reception area? | no |
| Sam | 45 | Could one of the classrooms fill the interpretive task better than a lobby? Both can serve that use. | Either can be made to work but "better" is a subjective term |
| Sam | 46 | How might this static display draw, every busy season, year after year, draw in those sleepy heads in beds, or, would a pleasant workable flexible space with perhaps fresh new seasonal offerings better inspire sleepy heads to return each season? | static displays will be central to parts of the mission – others can be changed. |
| Sam | 47 | Would a classroom be just as capable as an actual interpretive and versatile space? | Either can be made to work but "better" is a subjective term |
| Sam | 48 | What is best, a static years long display or several, each month or two, nice fresh displays throughout the year? | depends on what is being displayed. |

| | | | |
|-----|----|---|---|
| Sam | 49 | Is the Kitchen located at the optimum place in order to serve the classroom, the doubled classrooms or the plaza? Operational benefits come from a central location, and thus operational costs may benefit as well. | kitchen is considered to be centrally located given the geometry of the repurposed existing structure. Bigger events would likely be in the gym, which is where the kitchen is located. |
| Sam | 50 | How well will the kitchen serve folks in need if there is a disaster (other than the least likely, a tsunami)? | depends on how the kitchen is equipped. a generator is planned to allow it to serve as a warming center. |
| Sam | 51 | Does any one truly believe reducing scope means a reduction in quality? | Not a specific question related to cost. |
| Sam | 52 | True or false - If the costs were reduced perhaps some recovered value could be placed back into improved materials and craftsmanship? | Depends on compromises associated with cost reductions. |
| Sam | 53 | Is it not true for a facility such as ours, that flexibility in all the possible uses offered, there are many opportunities to gain or support heads in beds? | not a specific question related to cost. |
| Sam | 54 | Does this not then presume that any space with a less overt specialization serves the project better? | not a specific question related to cost. |
| Sam | 55 | Scope is a sweep, a purview not a size: Scope could be how many different things can this facility offer. How best can it offer as much as possibly? | Read but not understood. |
| Sam | 56 | Does having the archeologists poke a few holes imply that breaching the soils of the site any more than already done does not disrespect the impression of preserving the history of the site? | The city is working with the tribe and State Historic Preservation Office to protect artifacts. 'Poking holes' was only the first step. |
| Sam | 57 | The intention originally was to refurbish and old building into serviceable order offering multiple uses without anyone overt distinctive use being paramount, the direction changed mid course and in changing accumulated costs, when is it time to question the course change in relation to the generated costs these decisions made? | Once started, the process and the design progressed steadily through two councils and 7 Community Outreach Events without a "correction". |
| Sam | 58 | In doing so, would not lessening any enforced direction and change back toward a simpler layout not only reduce costs but also answer resident anxieties about excessive commercialism? (Not becoming devoid of commerce, only the excessive perception of unwanted commerce) | unclear as to what the "perception of unwanted commerce" means. |

| | | | |
|-----|----|--|--|
| Sam | 59 | Since the only place actually needing new foundation work is the gap between the two structures and that there is a responsible decision to join the buildings for code reasons, why then is the gap to be an open room while utilities and services are being imposed on currently open spaces? | statement not understood. |
| Sam | 60 | Where is new plumbing being proposed? | Proposed in converted east classroom, gym and kitchen. |
| Sam | 61 | What is in the those proposed locations now? | Classrooms – old restrooms and gym, Nothing |
| Sam | 62 | If you are seated in the center of the new marvelous big room and need to go to the restroom which do you decide to use, since they are equidistant? | The one with the shortest line. |
| Sam | 63 | What is the reasoning that divides the costs of installing separate restrooms? | Separate components of the facility (gym, classrooms) can be in use without having the entire facility open. |
| Sam | 64 | How is it acceptable to put new trench work under undisturbed floors while laying new floor where trenches already exist? Possible cost reduction if not. | Existing trenches are not where they need to be. Pipes in those trenches are 60+ years old. |
| Sam | 65 | Has the council discussed the sacred nature of the preserved soils under the surface? | Yes. |
| Sam | 66 | Have the planners discounted the history and chosen to violate the soil with added foundations and plumbing? Possible cost reduction if not. | No. They have been very successful and worked with the tribe and State Historic Preservation Office. |
| Sam | 67 | Will the Council, Staff and planners openly approve an assault on the Heritage preservation that allows violation of the soils below the surface even though they have implicitly done so by approving the design? | Decisions have been and will continue to be made in close collaboration with the tribe and State Historic Preservation Office. |
| Sam | 68 | The existing east classroom has been replaced with an office, hall, storage and restrooms; the existing office, furnace room and restrooms are being replaced with a big empty lobby - is there any justifiable economic reasoning to warrant this? Possible cost reduction if not. | Existing restrooms spaces will not meet code, furnace room has been located to the gym, lobby is designed to be a dynamic space. |
| Sam | 69 | How might changes in internal design applications affect how the heritage may be presented? | Lobby space has backlit photos of the tribe, and the floor is a representation of the tribal locations from north of the Columbia to south of Clatsop. Display reinforces the Thunderbird story. |
| Sam | 70 | How do we best honor and preserve the site of such historic value and use the good bones of the old building? | bones of the building are being preserved with the current design. |
| Sam | 71 | Would it be a good idea to research several design options in light of how much various other options might cost? | Multiple designs were developed leading up to the current design. |

| | | | |
|-----|----|--|---|
| Sam | 72 | What might cost more? Demolish the existing interior structure of the gym leaving only the shell, then build new structure all across the opposite end with added utilities, kitchen and restrooms? Demolish the existing interior structure of the gym leaving only the shell, build new lobby/gallery at the south end? Fix up the old existing interior structure into a nice fully functioning big room? | Hypothetical with inadequate information available. Demolishing a feature has a certain cost that can be compared. There are a wide variety of things which can create the replacement. Without the replacement a "net cost" cannot be established. |
| Sam | 73 | Would an entrance into the big room from the SE cornerstone plaza be a feature that helps define the cornerstone plaza? | Design iterations proposed this but South façade location was chosen. An entry from the DE to the gym is not considered desirable. |
| Sam | 74 | The view from the big room out toward the North grass was considered desirable, is it a good view? | Tribe stated that their buildings open to the water in recognition of their spiritual connection to it and the current buildings are incorrectly oriented. |
| Sam | 75 | Is a view reason alone to cause total alteration in the big room? | Tribe stated that their buildings open to the water in recognition of their spiritual connection to it and the current buildings are incorrectly oriented. |
| Sam | 76 | By considering the dominoes caused by the North garage door idea, is this single feature worth all the added costly consequences this concept begs? | It is important to the tribe and the mission. All their structures were open to the water signifying their spiritual connection to it. The first "dominoe" is that it is not feasible/possible to re-use the mezzanine on the north end. |
| Sam | 77 | Possible cost reduction of close to a million or more if not. This one idea causes demolition of the interior layout as it is today. | Mezzanine is currently unusable/unsalvageable due to structural and accessibility issues. |
| Sam | 78 | It causes the South side interior to impose all new construction. It causes the kitchen location. | incomplete sentence/thought |
| Sam | 79 | It causes an added restroom location. It causes ill thought out traffic flow from kitchen to classrooms. | existing restrooms and kitchen will not meet code so how is cost being compared? |
| Sam | 80 | (Rooms as likely to use the kitchen as the big room) It negates any south east entrance into the Gym from the outdoor feature cornerstone SE plaza now left hanging as a orphan, a place in which a door already exists while motivating new doors to be cut thru the structure elsewhere. | access point to gym at southeast is not desirable. access points are being added where control can be exercised. |
| Sam | 81 | If a limited version lobby worked in conjunction with a classroom could the classroom bear the expectation of the interpretation duty equally well? Possible cost reduction if so. | Question not understood. |
| Sam | 82 | How much would internal design rearrangements alter the exterior facade designs? | depends on the internal design rearrangements. |

| | | | |
|-----|----|---|--|
| Sam | 83 | If costs were reduced, in light of the fact we seem to have plenty of funding to work with, could not some time be spent finding acceptable cost reductions while searching for more community consensus with funding to spare? | <p>a. Funding is in fact limited.</p> <p>b. Tradeoff is \$50,000 per month in escalation plus re-design.</p> <p>c. Any affected spaces would need to be redesigned.</p> <p>D. Current design came about through a very public process that</p> |
| Sam | 84 | How much has the management and operations been incorporated into the traffic flow and layout of the project? could these be line out in a traffic flow pattern drawing for clarity? | Office is in a central location in the lobby for management control. The lobby has direct access to the outside, classrooms, kitchen and gym. |
| Sam | 85 | How have the real world potential uses been considered in comparison with the hopes and dreams not fitting the CB aesthetic? | Other than a connecting lobby the gym and classroom structures have been part of the CB landscape and aesthetic for over 60 years. |
| Sam | 86 | If desired how fast could a project like this be concluded if town support was universal? How best to gather town support? | Not a specific question related to cost. |

Paul Dueber Letter Responses

| Writer | # | Question | Response |
|--------|---|--|---|
| Paul | 1 | Is there a well-defined plan for the specific uses that the kitchen might be utilized? A simple kitchen area, as is in use at the Chamber building, uses only about 150 sq. ft. and provides both minimal on-site food prep as well as catered food service for up to 200 occupants. | Kitchen was added and sized based on COE Events. Refinement of spaces can happen in next stage of design if Council sees a need to adjust. |
| Paul | 2 | Would a kitchen centrally located between the gym and the classrooms be more logical in location and provide less development cost as associated with the proposed kitchen in the gym which is far more remote to the classrooms? | kitchen is considered to be centrally located given the geometry of the repurposed existing structure. Bigger events would likely be in the gym, which is where the kitchen is located. |
| Paul | 3 | The lobby is a large room with limited wall display areas. It appears that the north wall of the lobby could provide more interest and better visual access to the Park as desired by tribal input. From entering the main lobby entrance, the visitor is treated to tribal wall and floor display fixtures and then logically invited to pass through that north wall into the Park itself and all the rest of the tribal presentation. That would entirely eliminate the gym north wall restructuring to accomplish that same objective. I have been responsible for retail display and customer flow patterns for a number of years and one of the primary rules is to create a flow pattern from the entrance to the exit of the retail floor space. That continuity of experience is best established by pulling all the enticing display and eye candy into an uninterrupted experience. Putting the Park view on the north wall of the lobby takes the visitor from entrance and out into the park in a logical flow and interest pattern. Putting the "view" in an area unassociated with the tribal heritage experience would seem to diminish the overall effect desired. Most of the anticipated use of the gym does not include those visitors that would be interested in anything other than pickle ball or a musical concert. | Tribe stated that their buildings open to the water in recognition of their connection and the current buildings are incorrectly oriented. |
| Paul | 4 | There is a large sum allotted to the projection screens when it seems no operations or management plan has identified the need for this component. If there is a rare opportunity for the need for this item, would it be more economic to rent the equipment or require the short-term user/renter of that space to provide their own equipment. Most media intensive groups generally maintain that type of equipment, just as major musical productions have their own group defined PA systems. Adequate power sources are usually the only required contribution from the facility. | The projection screen purchase has been removed as part of a value engineering process for a total reduction of \$(47,397) |

| | | | |
|------|----|---|---|
| Paul | 5 | Cost comparison of the bathrooms in the gym in various locations. | Bathroom location was decided in COE outreach and by City Council |
| Paul | 6 | Cost to refurbish and upgrade the existing bathrooms on the north end. | Existing infrastructure and layout does not support reusing the existing restroom locations |
| Paul | 7 | Cost to create a new bathroom facility on the south end. | Cost for bathrooms to be built on the South End of the gym \$228,374 |
| Paul | 8 | Cost and value of proposed elimination of the 2nd floor area on the north end vs. use of 2nd floor space as storage or other non-ADA compliant usages. | Current mezzanine configuration cannot be safely accessed by the public. The COE feedback asked for a view to the river from the gym. |
| Paul | 9 | What is the difference in cost to demolish and rebuild the gym north wall and install a proposed viewing area to the Park compared to the cost of applying that same "view" opportunity to the north wall of the lobby? In creating the lobby as the focal point for tribal heritage and display it would seem logical that the lobby be the point for that view and, as previously stated, creating access for pedestrian flow through the lobby and into the Park. The gym is predominantly to be used for activities not normally associated with quality viewing to the exterior amenities. | The specific cost would require redesign and exploration. The gym is considered a multi-purpose event and community space. The design aligns with the community outreach feedback. The cost for mezzanine demolition is: \$(35,987) |
| Paul | 10 | What are the costs and financial benefits of installing solar arrays as structurally possible. Are there funding sources available to make that enticing and viable? | We have been working with Energy Trust of Oregon since the SD phase to determine viable solar and green energy measures. |
| Paul | 11 | There appears to be a need for access to the gym separate from the lobby. There are existing doors that might offer that access and allow the elimination of cutting into the south gym wall. | Design options were provided to City Council and the current configuration was chosen. |
| Paul | 12 | If the bathrooms on the north end can be refurbished and plumbed at reasonable cost and a smaller kitchen located more central to the entire project, would that result in substantial saving? | Existing infrastructure and layout does not support reusing the existing bathroom locations. The new bathroom and kitchens are located to reduce the amount of new trenching needed. If existing bathroom locations were to be reused, it would require extensive trenching work to lower the existing drain lines. |
| Paul | 13 | What consideration is being given to acoustical engineering in the gym? This is highly desired and could be costly. | An allowance of \$100,000 has been included in the DD estimate for gymnasium acoustic treatments. |
| Paul | 14 | Do lower cost and lower maintenance options exist for the proposed new wood floor? | GERFLOR Resilient Flooring has been designed and priced in the gymnasium for durability and lowest cost maintenance. |

| | | | |
|------|----|---|--|
| Paul | 15 | Does the partition previously discussed have a well-defined reason for its use that supports the cost of this feature? Have the costs related to any demolition, structure, materials and installation been identified? | The folding partition has been removed from the project as part of a value engineering process. The total deduction is \$(63,329) |
| Paul | 16 | We have lost one classroom to an expanded lobby area. Would there be cost savings in a slight reduction of the lobby size to accommodate a smaller kitchen that would be more centrally located? | The kitchen size and location is based on City Council review of the function of the space. It can service both the gym and the lobby from its current location. |

2-26-24

Cost cutting is the main focus because no one seems to understand that reducing design impact makes for a better design in this unique facility. A facility for the future that enhances the vision of this town.

The revision of the landscaping/site plan is a marked improvement. The Story circle is much more approachable and the garden less contrived.

Could the positive approach of community inclusion by how the landscaping was rethought be a signal that other discussions might improve the interior decisions toward a better layout as much?

The impact of the problem now seen as dividing the community is one of degree. The proposal has rolled over expectations and gone into a realm of development this community planned to avoid, read the comp plan.] will taking the time to reduce and form a design that has better community acceptance be that much more difficult than working a little longer to create a project we all are proud of?

The Garden is much better, though is it as much a garden as it is landscape feature? Was the big desire in the community for a presentation garden or a working garden for heritage education?

Critical to the garden component of the site is who will be caring for the growing portion, the maintenance? How do we affirm some future contract landscaper won't switch out hard to care for unattractive plants for the current fad flower? Is the public awareness of this new 'garden' a reminder of the natural setting as known a hundred generations ago?

Who will use The South East 'Cornerstone' Plaza? How? Is it simply a nice thing to see as you drive into town? Is this location being defined as an cornerstone entry point for good reasons?

Could the garden be the center of attention? Perhaps with a curious gate and pleasant statue begging for discovery and become grander through subtly and less costly, perhaps allowing more allocation for the statue's creation?

Are the existing trees in the proposed garden area who have struggled to survive to be inclusive or killed?

The Reception courtyard North of the gym, is it a courtyard or a porch? It borders a plaza, a lawn playing field, a garden and the singular reason it is offered is that it opens into the big room. It is constantly shaded and windy area. How often will this space get sun? How will the wind affect this space? What is the view from this

location. Who will ever stand there for any length of time in the shade and wind during an offseason festivity and think it pleasant?

Is the need for this feature solely evolved from opening the North end of the gym and is that truly a need? Could this be a future add on, giving the supposition that reducing total cost now might allow a capital reserve to be built up for future improvements as the future proposes the concept? Do we truly understand how the big room having northern exposure might best be enjoyed? Is it possible the lawn untouched would naturally better serve the message we want? (and thus less costly, and thus less compounding on other impact/costs noted below)
Have other possibilities for recreating the north end of the big room been discussed in light of costs verses desires and dreams verses practicality?

The designed faux river and playground feature is, happily, removed, is this as appreciated as I believe it to be? Is this not evidence that some designs on paper look great but after careful consideration, not so much?

Does the facade offer a pleasant face while being a subdued coastal ideal?
Is the entry locatable? Does the entry add to the welcomeness we wish to portray?
The Beaver street sidewalk is what it is given the limited immutable established footprint of the structures. Is parking along Beaver optimized though or is it standard inefficient?

The exterior facades is what it is, a nice upgrade of a simply shaped building, the central, new, entry/lobby treatment bears the weight of many folk's discontent. Could this be akin to how the faux river was viewed? Could toning it down some both improve community respect while cutting cost?

Could over done grandeur be overkill?

Could subtly be charming to discover?

Could charming subtly be the definition of the Cannon Beach aesthetic?

That the bulk of cost overreach is in the construction/engineering of the buildings needs to be understood by all, but is it not possible that changes in non essential construction/engineering be altered to aim costs toward other less exaggerated aspects?

Do cost reducing strategies, in any way, need to diminish the Heritage expression? or for that matter Environmental or the Arts as primary facility focus points?
(Even though the Arts and Environment are not substantially expressed in design components.)

Do The Classrooms need a south side door by code? Possible cost reduction if not.

Does each room need a sink and counter? Possible cost reduction if not.

Does each room need the same level of appointment, flooring, lighting and other fixtures? Possible cost reduction if not.

Could one room be available for messy art or dirty nature walk presentations? If not we are losing potential quality uses for the facility.

Is the folding wall decided? Big cost reduction if not. Why is the folding wall, if needed, connecting the western rooms (being furthest away from the kitchen)?

Early on, solar panels on the roof was a big deal, no one has mentioned this in a while. Are solar energy thoughts still in the mix? Is it in the accounting? Why are we not touting this as a progressive value in light of it potentially finding good grants and lowering utility costs?

Might delay cost more? Sure it might. Better to ask - Since we will have this facility in our community for generations to come, is it the right facility for the community we want the future to inherit? To portray our community with? Is it how we want the future CB to relate to the past CB?

The Lobby, looks great but is it functional for much more than a walk through? What is the Lobby for specifically? Cost reduction might be calculated in the flexibility of the space and potential for revenue and alternate uses functions.

How many alternative functions will the lobby easily serve?

Or is the lobby simply to be an adjunct space for the other rooms?

Does the lobby have available walls for art rotation or for displays of detailed timely topics?

Does the lobby have a traffic flow amenable for day to day visitors while other functions are currently in the gym and/or classrooms?

Is there serviceable floor space for static displays of art or artifacts in the lobby?

As a lobby it works, but what other functions does it serve while being so large?

Is it only a static interpretive reception area?

Could one of the classrooms fill the interpretive task better than a lobby?

How might this static display draw, every busy season, year after year, draw in those sleepy heads in beds, or, would a pleasant workable flexible space with perhaps fresh new seasonal offerings better inspire sleepy heads to return each season?

Would a classroom be just as capable as an actual interpretive and versatile space?

What is best, a static years long display or several, each month or two, nice fresh displays throughout the year?

Is the Kitchen located at the optimum place in order to serve the classroom, the doubled classrooms or the plaza? Operational benefits come from a central location, and thus operational costs may benefit as well.

How well will the kitchen serve folks in need if there is a disaster (other than the least likely, a tsunami)?

Does any one truly believe reducing scope means a reduction in quality?

True or false - If the costs were reduced perhaps some recovered value could be placed back into improved materials and craftsmanship?

Is it not true for a facility such as ours, that flexibility in all the possible uses offered, there are many opportunities to gain or support heads in beds?

Does this not then presume that any space with a less overt specialization serves the project better?

Scope is a sweep, a purview not a size: Scope could be how many different things can this facility offer. How best can it offer as much as possibly?

Does having the archeologists poke a few holes imply that breaching the soils of the site any more than already done does not disrespect the impression of preserving the history of the site?

The intention originally was to refurbish and old building into serviceable order offering multiple uses without anyone overt distinctive use being paramount, the direction changed mid course and in changing accumulated costs, when is it time to question the course change in relation to the generated costs these decisions made?

In doing so, would not lessening any enforced direction and change back toward a simpler layout not only reduce costs but also answer resident anxieties about excessive commercialism? (Not becoming devoid of commerce, only the excessive perception of unwanted commerce)

Since the only place actually needing new foundation work is the gap between the two structures and that there is a responsible decision to join the buildings for code reasons, why then is the gap to be an open room while utilities and services are being imposed on currently open spaces?

Where is new plumbing being proposed?

What is in the those proposed locations now?

If you are seated in the center of the new marvelous big room and need to go to the restroom which do you decide to use, since they are equidistant? What is the reasoning that divides the costs of installing separate restrooms?

How is it acceptable to put new trench work under undisturbed floors while laying new floor where trenches already exist? Possible cost reduction if not.

Has the council discussed the sacred nature of the preserved soils under the surface?

Have the planners discounted the history and chosen to violate the soil with added foundations and plumbing? Possible cost reduction if not.

Will the Council, Staff and planners openly approve an assault on the Heritage preservation that allows violation of the soils below the surface even though they have implicitly done so by approving the design?

The existing east classroom has been replaced with an office, hall, storage and restrooms; the existing office, furnace room and restrooms are being replaced with a big empty lobby - is there any justifiable economic reasoning to warrant this? Possible cost reduction if not.

How might changes in internal design applications affect how the heritage may be presented?

How do we best honor and preserve the site of such historic value and use the good bones of the old building?

Would it be a good idea to research several design options in light of how much various other options might cost?

What might cost more?

- a. Demolish the existing interior structure of the gym leaving only the shell, then build new structure all across the opposite end with added utilities, kitchen and restrooms?
- b. Demolish the existing interior structure of the gym leaving only the shell, build new lobby/gallery at the south end?
- c. Fix up the old existing interior structure into a nice fully functioning big room?

Would an entrance into the big room from the SE cornerstone plaza be a feature that helps define the cornerstone plaza?

The view from the big room out toward the North grass was considered desirable, is it a good view?

Is a view reason alone to cause total alteration in the big room?

By considering the dominoes caused by the North garage door idea, is this single feature worth all the added costly consequences this concept begs?

Possible cost reduction of close to a million or more if not. This one idea causes demolition of the interior layout as it is today. It causes the South side interior to impose all new construction. It causes the kitchen location. It causes an added restroom location. It causes ill thought out traffic flow from kitchen to classrooms. (Rooms as likely to use the kitchen as the big room) It negates any south east entrance into the Gym from the outdoor feature cornerstone SE plaza now left hanging as a orphan, a place in which a door already exists while motivating new doors to be cut thru the structure elsewhere.

If a limited version lobby worked in conjunction with a classroom could the classroom bear the expectation of the interpretation duty equally well? Possible cost reduction if so.

How much would internal design rearrangements alter the exterior facade designs?

If costs were reduced, in light of the fact we seem to have plenty of funding to work with, could not some time be spent finding acceptable cost reductions while searching for more community consensus with funding to spare?

How much has the management and operations been incorporated into the traffic flow and layout of the project? could these be line out in a traffic flow pattern drawing for clarity?

How have the real world potential uses been considered in comparison with the hopes and dreams not fitting the CB aesthetic?

If desired how fast could a project like this be concluded if town support was universal? How best to gather town support?

specific cost questions using the 2/23 Bremik estimations

There is a half million allocated for supervision, is all that necessary? Could a less demanding project reduce the collection of bosses? Possible cost reduction if so.

Is media blasting of the Gym necessary, how will it affect the acoustics? Is this simply for clean up and neatness or is there a structural reason? The quaint patina of the old paint to some folks is charming, would a clear coating be an idea to avoid unnecessary insult to the ceiling? Possible cost reduction if so.

There is extensive demolition of the east end of the classrooms, if the fourth classroom could be retained is it possible to reduce a percentage of the demolition costs? Possible cost reduction if so.

By a rough calculation the demolition of the old interior structure on the gym north end is loosely \$60,000.

The north wall garage door is listed as \$50,000 plus.

The north 'Reception area' canopy is listed as \$50,000 if I read it correct. This could be a portion of the combined main plaza walkway roof system. Is a view of the lawn worth the combined \$160,000 let alone the other added expensive implications it brings?

I found nearly \$100,000 in concrete foundation work for the lobby and gym south end added features. If these features were reconsidered cost could be reduced as well as the ground penetration insult.

What is the pre-cast concrete veneer paneling? This treatment is not identified on the presentation images. For \$70,000 it might be nice to call this out so folks understand what and why.

The metal fabricated elements of the lobby and breezeways could be highlight features, but if the lobby is scaled back some so might the expense of these, which does offer that a gain could make for purchasing improved artistic features.

Same as for the metal fabrication the wood features, if eased back on the scale and drama, perhaps more Cannon Beach and Heritage flair could be incorporated with less but better subtle quality craftsmanship.

Some portion of the wood interior construction, mostly the south end proposed restroom and kitchen add costs, but being they must go somewhere these costs are hard to judge for savings or not.

Cabinets and countertops could be cut some if the discussion of necessity was made.

Acoustical ceilings are proposed in appropriate places but there is no mention of how acoustical engineering in the Big room will affect the costs. This is highly desired and could be costly yet it is unspecified.

There is \$16,000 allocated for a new opening between big room and lobby. An opening piercing the structural strength of the arch shape while an existing opening is boarded up.

The lobby has \$100,000 of interior finishing alone. Some percentage of this could be dialed back if the lobby was reconsidered, but the same might be added to a classrooms if the plan was modified in that direction.

A new wood floor is called for in the big room, which is great. That said it would be nice to see if lower cost, lower maintenance options existed.

The restrooms are a simple math problem, one larger central unit or two separated units, which combined, result in duplication of effort and materials. The \$20,000 of toilet accessories and partitions could be reduced by some degree, as would the plumbing to serve them.

The folding partition seems to be around \$60,000+ after demolition, structure, materials and installation. This feature needs open discussion about its value as a fixture as it relates to the expense.

There is \$40,000 for projection screens when as yet no operations or management plan has identified the need for this component.

Plumbing and electrical are big expenses, if changes were considered there is no knowing if savings could be realized. The only obvious possibility would be by concentrating plumbing in a close cluster for more efficient use of effort and materials.

If the engineering estimates are studied it is evident that electrical and plumbing are a major cost factor, is it not good planning to concentrate these essential elements where efficiencies can benefit costs?

Tele-data cabling and AV/sound systems are not delineated enough to merit a \$100,000 decision of their value, that said some will be necessary but since operations and management are not consulted as to the need how can this amount be clearly judged. In today's wifi world a single hub might serve the whole facility and eliminate tedious cabling and built in equipment.

There seems a lot of earthwork, up to \$800,000 of it. This seems harshly contrary to the heritage preservation respect of this precious location. Savings could be found when Heritage care is prized over and above standard operating procedures.

The new landscaping plan needs to reveal how much of a savings it has brought so folks can judge for themselves the value between old and new or new and more reduction. My guess is around 40,000 from noting what has been removed, which would be a noteworthy effort if I am close.

My cursory investigation could easily remove 1M and keep much of the proposed plan intact, if the layout of the buildings were reconsidered perhaps 2M plus could be found to cut.

To repeat... yes much of the costs are in structural engineered construction, but by dialing back the more dramatic changes substantial savings could be found without hindering the presentation of valuable Arts, Heritage and Environmental experiences for residents, visitors and everyone in between.

It is obvious we could pay for an over the top proposal. Why becomes a question, when many view it as not appropriate for the community aesthetic and some do. This then begs the question who decides the community aesthetic? Perhaps the Comp-plan comes to mind?

Could we have more and more consistent funding for programming and operations (thus not relying on competitive grants and for that matter not competing for them)?

Since we know we have the funding, could, at a lowered overall project cost, could we could pay off the loan quicker and insure future funding for quality programming?

Does lessening scope need to have any affect on how the heritage Arts and environmental goals of the project are put forward to visitors and residents?
Do construction dollars spent have direct affect the message we wish to portray?
How does reducing the physical orientations of the project cause us to diminish the impact of the message we wish the project to present?

Should building more variety, more depth, more growth and enhanced quality of the presentations offered, to resident and visitor equally, be the primary goal of the design?

You asked for questions concerning costs and concerns about the design.

Kitchen:

Is there a well-defined plan for the specific uses that the kitchen might be utilized? A simple kitchen area, as is in use at the Chamber building, uses only about 150 sq. ft. and provides both minimal on-site food prep as well as catered food service for up to 200 occupants.

Would a kitchen centrally located between the gym and the classrooms be more logical in location and provide less development cost as associated with the proposed kitchen in the gym which is far more remote to the classrooms?

Lobby:

The lobby is a large room with limited wall display areas. It appears that the north wall of the lobby could provide more interest and better visual access to the Park as desired by tribal input. From entering the main lobby entrance, the visitor is treated to tribal wall and floor display fixtures and then logically invited to pass through that north wall into the Park itself and all the rest of the tribal presentation. That would entirely eliminate the gym north wall restructuring to accomplish that same objective. I have been responsible for retail display and customer flow patterns for a number of years and one of the primary rules is to create a flow pattern from the entrance to the exit of the retail floor space. That continuity of experience is best established by pulling all the enticing display and eye candy into an uninterrupted experience. Putting the Park view on the north wall of the lobby takes the visitor from entrance and out into the park in a logical flow and interest pattern. Putting the “view” in an area unassociated with the tribal heritage experience would seem to diminish the overall effect desired. Most of the anticipated use of the gym does not include those visitors that would be interested in anything other than pickle ball or a musical concert.

Gymnasium:

There is a large sum allotted to the projection screens when it seems no operations or management plan has identified the need for this component. If there is a rare opportunity for the need for this item, would it be more economic to rent the equipment or require the short-term user/renter of that space to provide their own equipment. Most media intensive groups generally maintain that type of equipment, just as major musical productions have their own group defined PA systems. Adequate power sources are usually the only required contribution from the facility.

Cost comparison of the bathrooms in the gym in various locations.

Cost to refurbish and upgrade the existing bathrooms on the north end.

Cost to create a new bathroom facility on the south end.

Cost and value of proposed elimination of the 2nd floor area on the north end vs. use of 2nd floor space as storage or other non-ADA compliant usages.

What is the difference in cost to demolish and rebuild the gym north wall and install a proposed viewing area to the Park compared to the cost of applying that same “view” opportunity to the north wall of the lobby? In creating the lobby as the focal point for tribal heritage and display it would seem logical that the lobby be the point for that view and, as previously stated, creating access for pedestrian flow through the lobby and into the Park. The gym is predominantly to be used for activities not normally associated with quality viewing to the exterior amenities.

What are the costs and financial benefits of installing solar arrays as structurally possible. Are there funding sources available to make that enticing and viable?

There appears to be a need for access to the gym separate from the lobby. There are existing doors that might offer that access and allow the elimination of cutting into the south gym wall.

If the bathrooms on the north end can be refurbished and plumbed at reasonable cost and a smaller kitchen located more central to the entire project, would that result in substantial saving?

What consideration is being given to acoustical engineering in the gym? This is highly desired and could be costly.

Do lower cost and lower maintenance options exist for the proposed new wood floor?

Classrooms:

Does the partition previously discussed have a well-defined reason for its use that supports the cost of this feature? Have the costs related to any demolition, structure, materials and installation been identified?

We have lost one classroom to an expanded lobby area. Would there be cost savings in a slight reduction of the lobby size to accommodate a smaller kitchen that would be more centrally located?