

*Eddon Boat Park Minutes*  
*City of Gig Harbor*

August 29, 2005

5:30 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Council member Steve Ekberg, committee members John McMillan, Chuck Hunter and Lita Dawn Stanton were present. Guy Hoppen was excused. Staff members John Vodopich, Dave Brereton, Steve Misiurak, Bud Whitaker, Jennifer Sitts and Sonia Billingsley were present.

Joan Tenenbaum	11609 41 <sup>st</sup> Ave. Ct. NW
Fred & Virginia Owen	2406 50 <sup>th</sup> St. Ct. NW
Rosanne Sachson	POB 71, GH 98335
JoAnne Belanich	3510 Harborview Drive
Robert Winskill	3711 Harborview Drive
Linda Gair	9301 N. Harborview
Hal Palmer	7421 Rosedale St. NW
Tom & Barbara Harris	9508 Johnson Lane
Jesse Fan	8109 66 <sup>th</sup> Ave.
Sally Perkins	11820 16 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NW
Robin Paterson	7311 Stinson
Steve Ekberg	7411 Stinson
David Templeton	1423 3 <sup>rd</sup> Ave, Seattle, 98101

**OLD BUSINESS:**

None.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

Steve Misiurak the City Engineer. Explained that part of the purpose of this meeting is to go over and bring everyone up to date on where we are at on the Eddon Boat project. There is a presentation on the buildings and there was an inventory and a structural survey done on them. Steve's role is actually to project manage the cleanup of the Eddon Boat site which includes coming to a conclusion with the demolition of the buildings. Basically the City met with Ecology the permitting authority for authorizing any cleanup on site back in June and we actually entered the project into a voluntary cleanup program. We are formulating a proposed cleanup schedule to Department of Ecology as we speak. We will go through the schedule and have an in depth discussion

on that a little bit later on, but one of the questions is what to do with the existing buildings out there. In order to facilitate our plan, we have to have a reconciliation of that to present to the Department of Ecology.

What we did about six weeks ago is went through the three existing buildings and did an interior/exterior walk through, and did an evaluation of what it would cost to bring them up to code. As you are aware there are three buildings there, the first one is Wild Birds. Here are two pictures that represent the condition of the building. Some of the highlights are that the roofing is beyond serviceable life, replacement needed. Deck and exterior stairs are in desrepair and are non-conforming. Repairs will require upgrades per code. Estimated demolition cost is \$12,700.00.

The second building on site is the tudor house. Basically the things that we found is the oil burner needs to be replaced, the brick veneer is failing, repairs or replacement is needed. The interior plumbing and fixtures need replacement. The roof framing is sagging, this is a structural problem. The electrical system is outdated and unsafe and needs replacement. Possible asbestos and lead abatement. The insulation is inadequate.

Estimated demolition cost is \$9,500.00 includes foundation. To bring it up to code it would cost \$191,000.00 and that is just for the tudor house only.

Pandora's Box has major structural problems too. There are large cracks in the masonry, I believe this happened from the Nisqually earthquake. This is an unreinforced building, there is no re-bar in it and it is actually considered an unsafe building by our Fire and Building Marshal. The rear roof framing is over-spanned. It is not bolted to the wall at all, which is a problem and the rafters are toe-nailed to the ledgers.

Estimated demolition cost is \$9,300.00, which includes foundation and asphalt removal. The cost to bring it up to current codes to re-build it completely is \$212,000.00.

Wild Birds building has issues with the joists, the rear deck is unsafe, the electrical, plumbing, exterior siding. This building is also considered unsafe. Demolition costs are estimated at \$13,000.00. Remodel estimate to bring it up to current code is \$182,000.00.

This is how we arrived at the estimated remodel costs; we dimensioned the floor plan and there is an evaluation of code you can put it into and it comes up to these numbers. Basically if you add all of the remodel estimates together it comes up to \$585,000.00, and the building value is \$349,000.00.

Where we are at with the permitting, we need to get to the point where we can clear and grub the site. Just remove the blackberry bushes, and also we need clarification on the buildings. Certainly from a cost benefit analysis Steve's recommendation and others is to proceed with removal and demolition of all three structures on site.

Questions:

Did you receive different bids on this?

Steve: Yes, we received a couple of bids, an informational bid from a independent analysis, and the seller, unknown to us, had received a bid from the same contractor which was a very similar cost. It was the same contractor that demolished the Borgen Hardware Store.

Will you save and protect all of the large trees?

Steve: Yes, we intend to keep the large trees, we intend to remove the scotch broom and small shrubbery around the property.

Someone handed Steve a picture of the tree that they want to stay.

There is another large tree on the site.

Steve: The only exception there would be is that if the tree is in an area of contamination. The original environmental reports we had done identified some contaminated areas on site of the uplands and I am not sure where that is.

Rosanne Sachson explained that she is a member of the Design Review Board and she was appointed as one of the two for the historic preservation, so this is something so very nearly dear she was very active and said she went to every meeting that had to do with this. She said she is also very active in the Washington Trust for Historic Preservation. She read an article in the latest publication and would like to share a portion of it; "Public focus groups will start to meet soon and share their visions of how the property should be preserved and developed for the publics best use". She said we haven't seen that happen. This is the first meeting. She said a lot of people are here because she called them, she doesn't feel that it was publicized very good. She feels it needs to go out to the press. She said we had such wonderful turn out for everyone who came out for the photos and that were out putting out signs and doing everything. She said she thinks the house is a wonderful house, she said she has been in it. She knows it needs some work. If the cost to do a remodel on this is under \$200,000 and the cost of the home at this point is \$119,000, what can you buy in Gig Harbor for \$300,000. John did a wonderful sketch with an idea for a park, but that is just an idea. There is a lot of people that want to put their two sense in about what they would like to see happen to Eddon Boat as a park and she asked if we could please wait to tear down the house until we know how it going to be used.

Allen Anderson explained that he runs the youth kayak program in Gig Harbor. He would like to make a proposal, if he were able to obtain outside financing to either save one of these buildings or construct another like building on the site. He is proposing a recreational kayaking boating facility. He said he just wants to throw that out, if there is interest he said he has financial backing and he said he is running a really good program for the kids and its grown way outside of our parking lot that they are using. He said he would like to be part of any planning.

Steve Ekberg explained that he is with the City Council, and the reason people are sitting up here is that this is really a joint meeting with the mayor appointed Ad-Hoc Committee for the Eddon Boat which was going to be the main vehicle to go to get public input for the design of the finished park. The committee consists of Lita Dawn, John McMillan, Chuck Hunter, Steve Ekberg and Guy Hoppen, whom is not here. The council also has a Parks Committee for the City which Steve is a member and Frank Ruffo and John Picinich are also members. What prompted a lot of this is that we

wanted to get an assessment on the site to see what we have. We think that most everyone would realize that what we were buying as a city was the Eddon Boat property. It came along with these other properties that are being assessed. Our main concern was that the citizens that purchased the piece of property that we were not going to get any real access to because we have a clean up issue. There is pollution on the water side and there is pollution on the land side. And if we could identify those areas and move forward on the land side as quickly as possible, because the site is not safe now. We need to get the uplands site as safe as possible and not focus on waiting until the whole cleanup is done. If we can come to an agreement that the buildings one, two or all three of them are not economically feasible to spend the taxpayers money on them to upgrade that's one thing, to carry on what you are saying is the phase of the park, we had John do a nice little rendering of it. There are all kinds of ideas from the committees what to do with it, but the first focus it to try and look at the non boat yard site and that can be the boat yard, the house, the dock or the rest of the site. Somehow clear and keep the substantial trees, which the city has a policy to do and get that site open to the public, open access, if nothing else open a grassy area. And then as the community comes together and says we would like to do this with the Eddon Boat building and we would like to do this with some of the other part of the site and hopefully the dock facility will be able to be utilized. There is all kinds of potential there. We hope that we wouldn't have vacant buildings sitting there a long time being tied in the whole process of waiting for the wetlands being cleaned up. There is going to be more than adequate time for public input to both the Ad-Hoc Committee and the Council on future designs and uses for the park.

Bill Fogerty explained that he is active in the galleries and waterfront merchants with Linda Gair and also a lot of the art including the salmonchanted sculptures in the harbor. He commented that couple of things that they want to see is merchants, residents and people that want to return back to the community, this site in particular. He commented that they would really like to see a visiting art program in the boatyard. They would like to put it into an educational wainswrite facility and maybe a public park where we could have an area where we can have salmon cookouts and things like that, where we really can't do those things at Skansie Park today. He suggested that the house can be turned into a commercial community kitchen, and possibly turn it into a bonafide public park and maybe a teaching facility with visiting students. He said he agrees with Rosanne, that this tudor home could be salvaged and it could be used as some kind of public structure to have a lot of these events. He also suggested moving a lot of that stuff inside the Eddon Boat Yard building itself. He said that Peninsula Art League would pay rent to have their league there and maybe they could have events like Lita Dawn is doing at Skansie Park.

John McMillan commented briefly that just because the buildings are taken down doesn't mean that we won't entertain all of these proposals in the future for any future structures or proposals as they go forward with ideas of the space whether it may or may not be cost effective that is certainly something that could be looked at.

It was asked if there a site plan that we can look at to see where the tudor house is on the property and see where the open areas are.

Steve Ekberg showed an aerial picture of the house and it showed how it is primarily up against the Eddon Boat Park.

Steve Misiurak presented that what you have in front of you is basically the proposed schedule of some of the highlights. He said the city did make application to the Dept. of Ecology back in June. The city had an initial meeting with them about three weeks ago and he said in order to move forward we need a resolution on each of the buildings. The DOE wants to know how we are going to handle each one of the buildings. In our report we have to have that finalized for them to have our clean up action considered. David Templeton is here and he is our environmental clean up consultant with Anchor Environmental. He will briefly go through the schedule with us and indicate what some of the milestones are how this is crucial to moving forward on the cleanup of the park site.

David Templeton explained that the process working through the state law is a very defined process. What Anchor Environmental has tried to do is layout what they anticipate that process is going to look like over time. He presented the schedule and explained that under line 9, they have tried to put together what they think is the strategy for taking care of both the waterside contamination and the upland contamination. He said they tried to formalize the strategy after they had discussions with Ecology. They turned in an application to Ecology to do the cleanup with the EPA oversight and the key part of that is we want Ecology's concurrence of each of the steps. We want their approval through that process so at the end of this the City can feel that they have some closure regulatory wise and that there are not any more environmental risks left over. That is a key step for Anchor, and that application was submitted back in late June. Anchor has compiled all of the existing information on the site to put that strategy together and they have also had a meeting with Ecology to present that information to the site manager to talk about what Anchor thinks the site cleanup is going to look like. He said that they had some positive feedback from DOE, and later in the week they will be submitting a report with that approach formalized to DOE and then Anchor will be sitting down with DOE discussing the data and what that means in terms of the cleanup. Once that process is complete, we will have a conceptual idea of what Ecology is willing to sign off on. That is going to be a critical step because once that is done, we can enter into a formal permitting process and that includes endangered species, includes issues about fish and issues about disturbing inner tidal habitat. It is not a simple process, and it could take ten to twelve months. The schedule has 10 months on it. To have the permitting process start, it is going to be really important that we have a conceptual plan together with Ecology's concerns. Once that concurrence is on that plan, they can go through some of the final design and get all of those documents approved with Ecology. Anchor has laid it out here where the process is going forward, and they have all of the cleanup being done in one time period which they think that it can be done in the fall a year from now. One of the things that is an option is doing certain upland activities separate from the in water work. The in water work definitely triggers a lot more permits, and it definitely triggers a lot more tension from the resource agencies and rightly so. But there are certain things we can do to the uplands if necessary to keep that process moving ahead.

Steve Misiurak suggested that the issue indicated of ten to twelve months should be addressed, but if there is additional information that DOE is looking for then the schedule could be pushed out further.

David Templeton explained that on line 35 and 40 on the schedule, there is Ecology's review and on line 35 and if Ecology came back and said they want additional data on the site, then we would have to go through another process with them as far as getting plans approved and going out and doing sampling, and this would add a number of months to the process. If you look at the bottom two lines you can see that if we end up pushing out too many months we will end up having to go to the next construction week. If we just get some feedback here within the next few weeks from Ecology as to whether or not they are going to require us to get additional data. By additional data this means the collection of the sediment portion and how decontamination might go.

Bob Winskill asked if the demolition of the uplands theoretically has anything to do with what Ecology would say about the water side?

David Templeton responded no, with the exception if we have to do environmental remediation that is removal of soils that are within x feet or would be construed as an impact on the sediments. It is going to depend on what we propose here, so far we are thinking very limited soil removal.

Bob Winskill asked if the concrete bulkhead by Wildbirds be removed and also graded as part of the upland part.

The upper area involves removing the two buildings and remove the bulkhead, fill it in and grade it to open up the area. Removing the bulkhead could give the city points with Ecology, there might be a possibility that we can avoid the dredging and remove the wooden bulkhead instead.

Chuck Hunter said he has been pushing to get the upper area cleaned off and graded to show what a wonderful park we have, then we can do more planning. He doesn't see a problem keeping the house but it needs to be fenced off.

Steve Ekberg said to do as much upland work for public access and the end result might be to eliminate the bulkhead on the beach and Ecology may love that. Just because we are a city we do not get any benefit from Ecology, we get treated the same as everyone else and the permitting can take a long time. As a council member we try to see what is the best return for the citizens tax dollars. If it is restoring the building if it is restorable that is fine or if it is putting the \$300,000 toward something newer that would be fine too. If the house was left out of the initial demolition he does not see a problem with that.

Rosanne asked what is the next step and who is going to make the decision of which building go.

Steve Misiurak commented that we are trying to get the consensus of the Ad-Hoc Committee and the parks department and certainly the group here and take the recommendations to the City Council.

Roseanne said she was so surprised by this meeting and the scheduling of the demolition. She asked if we can slow down the demolition of the houses, maybe we can separate them from the clearing and grading.

Steve Misiurak said we would like to move the project along so we can get it opened up to the public. We should be able to open up the upland area up while we are still working on the water side.

Bob Winskill feels that one of the most important things on everyone's mind is John McMillan's illustration. He said people like the image of a wide open space park. He thinks that if the house is saved, that this will take away from the wide open space image that the people want. Numerous people in the harbor have expressed interest in the house, like a boat house, kayak club, gallery, etc. I don't feel that the house would be the right building for it. I don't think that we want to spend \$200,000 to remodel the house. He said it is his own personal opinion that the people want a wide open space park.

Jesse suggested that they could have a working historical boat shop in the house. He feels that the house is a very critical part of the project. The working boat shop has multiple ideas that you can do with it like classes. This should be a real focus.

Hal Palmer said they have done a lot of brainstorming on the boatyard in the last 18 years. Remember the bond issue passed on "Save Eddon Boat Yard" that was it. It didn't say save the other building on the property. The open space is one of the nice things that were going to be a bonus. So removing the structures on the property focuses your attention on the boat yard which is really what the people want and I think that if you clear as much vegetation and trees as possible and open it up like everyone has expressed and continue on with future plans of extending the dock and making a community place where Gig Harbor Yacht Club could have a junior sailing club. This is what the place should be a focus on boat activities. Cleaning the buildings out of there will do wonders for opening the visual impact and to see Eddon Boat Yard and to see a new structure put up there like Bob's suggestion of a boat house where you keep boats and keep it low so the view is not obstructed.

The house was built in 1946. John McMillan said the wide open space offers the best use for everyone.

Roseanne said she is on the DRB and she is trying to assist business owners into preserving what we have. She says to slow it down and let the citizens have their say.

Steve Misiurak asked if this meant that it is O.K. to take down the other structures?

Rosanne responded "yes".

Lita Dawn asked if it would be smarter and cost effective to remove all three buildings at once.

Steve Ekberg said once you have buildings, you have usage and cost issues. How do we want to use Eddon Boat building?

Bill Fogerty asked if we could put a community kitchen in the Eddon Boat building.

Bob Winskill responded there is room, but structurally it is not feasible. It would be a juggling act to have a working boat yard and a kitchen. You could have the kitchen in a pavillion in the park.

Lita Dawn asked if it worth putting public money into a small home. She said to open up the space. She said as much as she wants to save historical structures, that she thinks the house should be taken down.

Roseanne said we should get the citizens input. She thinks we need to plan some meetings.

Chuck Hunter explained that to convert the house to another use it would have to have a lot of work done to it.

Chuck Hunter asked "How many people feel strongly one way or the other"? The majority of the people said to tear it down.

Eddon Boat structure:

Dave Brereton explained that part of the conditions of the sale was to repaint the Eddon Boat building. We have talked about this before in our meetings with the Parks Committee. We had the paint tested and it is lead based paint. Discussion was how we want to repaint it, do we want to repaint it right now at this time, can we wait and do it later. Dave looked at the Eddon Boat building today with Bob and there is a lot of siding that needs to be replaced. Dave asked if we just wait a little bit and take our time and look at the whole structure before we go through the cost of repainting it.

Steve Misiurak responded that there were contractual obligations that within four months of the close that we were to paint the structure. It seems that it was more of a maintenance issue to preserve it from further deterioration. The building is being maintained by Bob and he is doing a nice job cleaning it up and painting it on a routine basis.

Dave Brereton explained that we received three bids for lead paint removal and they range from \$60,000.00 to \$120,000.00 depends on the process used to remove the paint. He asked if we want to leave it alone right now and paint it later. He said we should look at the whole structure and determine what the ultimate use is going to be.

Chuck Hunter said that he thinks that we need to fix the siding and paint the building per what the city agreed to on the contract. He said it will look better and it will help it from



weathering any worse. He said he doesn't think we need to re-side it, but just repair what needs to be repaired.

Lita Dawn asked if it is an issue in its current state or is it a public hazard? She asked if we can just put a layer of paint over what is there and get it through this next year so we can do more comprehensive plan on the site.

Bob Winskill said the lead in the paint becomes a giant public health issue. He suggested re-siding the entire building instead of paying \$60,000.00 to \$120,000.00 to remove the lead paint. He said the building is just an open structure with studs inside, no insulation.

It was discussed if there is a requirement to take the paint off. Lita Dawn suggested sealing it in with a \$10,000.00 paint job. For the building to go into the historical registry and the historical requirements may not include removing all the siding and replacing it. So it came to the conclusion that the city will just repair what is there now.

It was asked if the interior of the building is contaminated and it is not.

Bob Winskill asked if the city is obligated to clean up the lead once we find it, or can we seal it?

It was discussed and came to the conclusion that it can be sealed with paint.

It was asked what color should it be, should it be? Half of the building is in good shape and half of the building is in bad shape. The building will have to be pressure washed to get the loose paint chips off.

Roseanne suggested putting kills over as a primer after it is cleaned.

Steve Ekberg commented that what he is hearing is that we want to look at a way to fix what needs to be fixed and preserve it and not do a fullblown overall repair of it until we look at the whole structure.

Lita Dawn did get some paint chips and came up with two colors for the building. Williamsburg blue or wedgewood blue are good colors and the second color was off-white.

Mark Hoppen said that in 1951 it was 60% navy blue from the bottom up and the top was white. We have an old picture from the museum that shows the two tone colors.

Lita Dawn would like to keep the color scheme to what the community is use to. The community is used to a certain tone and color, It might be a slight difference.

Roof Structure:

Dave looked at the roof with Bob and the oldest part is the roof over the walkway which covers the stairs. The original was a red 3-tab roofing. He asked if we want to go with the original red 3-tab or rolled roofing, we just want to make sure that if you want to

keep it historical we might want the original roofing. He said that a 24 x 60 section over the ways needs to be replaced.

Lita Dawn suggested since it a small part that needs to be replaced, then we should just go with what is there now. If it goes on the historical registry then we can decide if it needs a new roof.

It was discussed and we will match the existing. The cost should be about \$15,000.00, which is a high estimate.

Chuck Hunter thinks the rolled roofing would be better.

Bob Winskill said the roof is in pretty good shape. It doesn't leak accept for the flashings, all of the vertical flashings are starting to fail. The roofing is only about 7 years old. It has been hard to keep the ceiling dry because the flashings are leaking.

Steve Misiurak concluded the meeting and thanked everyone for attending.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

None.

**NEXT REGULAR MEETING:**

To be announced.

**ADJOURN:**

Respectfully submitted,

***Sonia Billingsley***