

FMRP Oversight Team Meeting 11/23/16

Members Present : Barbara B., Andrew C., Pat O., Chris L., Donna G., John W.

Absent: Dale Bickell (provided proxy vote to Barbara)

Others: Vickie Z, Mark K., Shirley K, Neil Miner, Larry F. Lisa M., Eric S, representatives of the The Land Group available on phone.

Meeting called to order by Chair, Barbara.

Projects Team Presentation

Neil provided a brief update on Project Team efforts and work since the last meeting.

Neil presented a Powerpoint to provide explanation of Projects Team efforts to deliver a Phase II bid package that fits within the project budget.

Project Financial sheet – With VE and other deduction to date, the project is approximately \$215k over budget. With left over contingency expected from Phase I, which will carry over to Phase II, the gap will be about \$116k. However with expected additional deductions, as described in the Powerpoint and below, the team is confident we will get in budget.

The Powerpoint provided a reminder of the decision making criteria used to determine project scope and deductions.

Neil reviewed the list of items reduced throughout Phases I and II of the project to meet budget targets. This included VE (value engineering) and deductions.

Neil summarized the expectations from Softball User Groups , which included displacement from the Fort for only one season, five lighted fields and scoreboards on all fields.

Neil outlined the current information on Phase 2 Bid Alternates Need/Warrants further discussion,

Lights

One bid alternative is to change the sports lighting from HID to LED. Cost is approximately \$200k. Current data from Northwestern Energy show a payback of 6 to 6.9 years on LED. Additionally there is an expected rebate that varies from \$6k to \$60K – currently the rebate estimate is \$50k. This rebate would reduce the overall upcharge to \$150K, and would bump down the payback time.

Tennis Courts

Tennis court needs – geotechnical analysis suggests courts are failing. Bid alternatives included options to address the courts, based on options provided by design team. The base bid for the project includes resurfacing the courts for \$ 70K. Life expectancy of resurfaced courts is approximately 5 years.

A bid alternate to reconstruct tennis courts, with striping for pickleball, as post tension construction (concrete) is \$930k to \$950k, including CMAR and other costs.

Neil presented additional Phase 2 VE items that are still under evaluation, with potential cost savings to the project:

Inclusive playground – \$75k

Shell-out maintenance building – \$50k

Northeast playground bathroom – change to vault to reduce sewer/lift station and grinder pump – \$80k, but will impact maintenance demands.

Reduce sports field lighting – \$150k, which would mean going with a different manufacturer (not Musco) and construction experts suggest installation costs will increase with this options.

Dog park vault toilet – \$37k if we order directly through community purchasing program.

Scoreboard sponsorship opportunities to address funding gap for scoreboards

Projects Team Recommendation

Neil presented the Projects Team recommendation to move forward with Phase II Bid Award Discussion items – Furnishings – picnic tables numbers throughout the park, sound system for five-plex; AI cost – construction manager on site.

Oversight Team Discussion

Pond – can we reduce size? Neil and Mark K. outlined the challenges to reduce scope of pond. Some costs are realized regardless of size. Mark K., from Jackson, expressed concern and reservation about constructing the pond given public safety and liability. Donna provided an explanation of the Knife River ponds and how they could be used for dog use in the future. Timeframe to develop this site is uncertain at this time. But City is working with DEQ.

Covered bleachers – removed early on due to costs related to the architecture needs to meet historical requirements for design. Sunshades could be installed on a seasonal basis for certain fields.

Concession stand – why is the building cost so high? If we want to prep to the volume for softball league, tournaments, and other events and provide fresh produce, meat, poultry, etc, we need a commercial kitchen including grease traps, stainless steel appliances, etc. These features, required to meet health and safety, result in additional costs to the building. The kitchen can be used to provide food for the Parks and Recreation Food trucks that will service the entire FMRP and possibly other parks in the system. City Parks and Recreation has site specific enterprise accounts that are used to keep track of revenues from kitchens to ensure facilities/programs are whole. For example if Splash, MT prepares food for the Wellness Program, the Wellness Program is charged for the costs. Same idea will be used here, so if the FMRP kitchen is used for food prep elsewhere in the system, FMRP will be reimbursed the costs.

Headquarters/maintenance facility – staff explained that one external bay was removed from the project and current recommendation is to shell out a portion of the building to finish either at a later date, or if contingency funds are left over in the project those funds could be directed to finishing the building. Additionally, current plans call for a slight redesign of the conference area to allow for a rentable year-round space to off-set revenue loss from the removal of the shelter near the tennis courts. The shelter was approximately \$180k, and the proposed design modifications to the building will be considerably less. The maintenance/headquarters will allow a space for permanent staff at the FMRP.

Shell out proposal includes the office area and conference room.

Scoreboards – can we find a way to get these in the project? Staff is looking at sponsorships as a means to pay for an electronic reader. Jackson Construction Group and staff have ideas to get this item back into the project.

Barbara asked a clarification about what is dollar amount we are voting on for Bid Package #4?

Remaining Bid package 4 bid items = \$15,360,355.25

Set aside for South Avenue - What are the plans for spending this money? Will it be needed? Donna suggests this is an agenda item for next meeting to include Kevin and Dale as part of the discussion for South Avenue.

Chair asked for a motion to approve bid package 4.

Motion

John Wilson moved; Barbara Berens seconded.

Further discussion – Can the maintenance building be pulled from the project and decision on it delayed? This would require going back to all the bidders and asking them to deduct the portions of the bid associated with the building.

Clarification sought on what the approval means for the maintenance building: As approved, maintenance building is in the bid in its entirety (full build-out). The project team, along with JCG will further analyze extent of shell portion, and we will deduct from project as an ongoing VE item.

Voted yes – 5

Voted no – zero

Abstained - 2

Motion passes.

Chair request that discussion on Bid Alternates is scheduled for a subsequent meeting.

Meeting adjourned.

Approved by Barbara Berens (Chair) *Barbara Berens* on this day: 12/15/16
(Signature) (Date)