BRAINERD PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT
Special Park Board Meeting
June 2, 2020 at 4:00 p.m.
WebEx Teleconference Meeting
Toll-free 844-992-4726 Access Code – 962 719 631

Pursuant to due call and notice thereof, the special meeting of the
Parks and Recreation Board was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by Board President Schaefer.

Upon roll call, the following members were noted as present: Boeder, Parks, Yeager and Schaefer. Director Sailer, City Administrator Bergman and Mayor Badeaux were also noted as present. Rushmeyer was noted absent.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion to approve the agenda made by Yeager and seconded by Parks. Upon roll call, members Boeder, Parks, Yeager and Schaefer voted "aye". No member voted "nay". The Chair declared the agenda approved.

OLD BUSINESS

A. Concerts in the Park

Following the May 26 discussion about Concerts in the Park the Park Board directed staff to ask The Center director DeAnn Barry how she would handle restrooms since they are closed, and social distancing guidelines. Ms. Barry responded that if they would have the concerts, announcements will state that park restrooms will be closed and social distancing will be stressed. The governor's Executive Order issued on May 27 states that gatherings of more than ten people are prohibited except for members of the same household, even if social distancing can be maintained. The prohibition includes indoor and outdoor public gatherings, and concerts were specifically named. Staff recommends at this time that we do not allow Concerts in the Park to begin until the governor changes his executive order regarding social gatherings. Mr. Parks made a motion that we adhere to the governor's recommendations and if and when the governor says that Concerts in the Park can proceed we will let The Center know. Mr. Boeder seconded. Upon roll call, members Boeder, Parks, Yeager and Schaefer voted "aye". No member voted "nay". The Chair declared the motion carried.

Ms. Schaefer requested that board members have agenda items to Mr. Sailer by noon on Thursdays prior to meetings so that information can be included with meeting materials. She added that the last round of park evaluations is due on June 5.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Memorial Park Project RFPs

Ms. Schaefer turned the floor over to Mr. Sailer and Mr. Yeager. Mr. Sailer introduced Chris Sonmor from WSB and Joe Dubel from Widseth who were in attendance to answer any questions board members may have regarding the RFPs. RFPs were sent to five companies and two were received back from WSB and Widseth. Mr. Sailer turned the floor over to Mr. Yeager. Board member Rushmeyer joined the meeting at 4:10 p.m. Mr. Yeager thanked Mr. Sailer for his work on creating the RFPs that made his job of reviewing them easier.

Mr. Yeager said that the Board should not focus on the scope of the project today. What the Board is attempting to do today is hopefully select its partner on the design and engineering side to create the scope of work, to be able to obtain competitive bids. He explained there were two parts to the RFP. The first part included the ice rinks and pavilion, and the second was the future splash pad and walking trail. The RFPs are for the cost of the design work of the two parts. He explained what "not to exceed" meant in the RFPs. He praised both companies as potential partners. For the design work portion of the RFP, Widseth turned in a not to exceed number of $143,000 and WSB turned in a not to exceed number of $124,220, a difference of $18,780 to get through the work that was described in the RFP. He pointed out that most likely the Board will be designing the project with not just the scope that was in the RFP but also including the splash pad and walking trail which were identified in the RFP as a secondary item. Numbers submitted for the RFP plus the splash pad and walking trail were not to exceed $227,000 from Widseth and not to exceed $170,732 from WSB for a difference of $56,268. He reiterated that these numbers are not reflective of the scope of work. It is a global macro view of this project, not individual specifics of the items contained within.

Mr. Parks asked for a little more explanation of what the numbers as presented included. Mr. Yeager stated that the two teams presented their RFPs a little differently; Widseth in three phases and WSB in two phases, which he broke down into the numbers he presented. The bottom line numbers he gave is for the engineering, design and construction management portion of the project. They will help create documentation and specifications that will allow the Board to seek competitive bids on the hockey rinks, warming house, etc. Mr. Yeager said that both teams have expressed concern with the schedule and need to begin working on this as fast as possible. Both teams would like to have a kick-off meeting within a week to 10 days. He asked for discussion and would like to see a motion to hire one of these teams today.

Mr. Sailer reported that the City Council voted the previous night to go ahead with the bond sales of $1.3M for the project, with $223,000 of that used for purchasing the parking lot. He hopes to hear within a couple of weeks on the Outdoor Recreation grant.

Mr. Rushmeyer commented that the cost difference between the RFPs is pretty substantial. Ms. Schaefer opened the floor for questions on the proposals. Mr. Dubel thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak and gave a brief presentation on Widseth's RFP numbers. He specifically commented that a $100,000 splash pad would cost considerably less to design than a $500,000 splash pad, and without knowing what that splash pad was going to be other than a 50' diameter it was a little difficult to give a solid design cost on that. Mr. Sonmor said WSB appreciated the opportunity to submit, and they have a very good strong group of landscape architects. Park projects is all they do. There are a lot of little details that go into these that a lot of people don't think of and they would bring a lot of value to the project. He thought they broke down the phases similarly to Widseth. Ms. Schaefer asked if there were any other questions. Mr. Dubel strongly recommended the project proceed with phase one and phase two and look at the splash pad after you've done this part of the work. Mr. Boeder agreed that they kind of just threw the splash pad in here within the last few months and still dealing with a $1.3M bond, and have already lost one-third of that roughly for the parking lot. He would like to see the splash pad not be included at this time. Mr. Rushmeyer asked if a lot of specifications were given for the splash pad. Mr. Yeager said what was listed in the RFP was a 50' diameter splash pad which would have a pump and dump system, or non-recirculation. The second part of that was an eight-foot wide paved pathway looping around the outer portion of the park. That is what both teams turned in numbers for, estimating what their fees would be. He thinks the Board should factor in what both teams have provided for numbers to design the splash pad a little bit, but he would also say that it is important that they include it in the design work now. He said it would be the intelligent thing to do, in his opinion, to design the entire campus at once with our dream list, and then systematically buy the pieces as we have the money to do so. Ms. Schaefer had Mr. Yeager explain "not to exceed" again. Mr. Sailer asked for confirmation that these numbers will include them doing all the bidding. Mr. Yeager said yes, these numbers include preliminary design, construction documentation, bidding scenario and construction administration. He also explained the purpose for the contingency line item at Mr. Sailer's request and the supplemental material testing fee at Ms. Schaefer's request. Upon discussion it was discovered that Widseth included material testing in its RFP and WSB had it as a supplemental fee that Mr. Yeager did not include in the totals he provided. Mr. Yeager did a quick calculation and indicated that $7,500 should be added to WSB's RFB for a total of $131,720, a difference of $11,280 on the RFP portion; the entire project difference would be $53,768. Mr. Rushmeyer received clarification that the RFPs include time spent meeting with the Board on the design process. After further discussion, Mr. Parks asked Mr. Yeager if he had a recommendation. He said we have two potential partners who are excited to be involved with this project, they offer a very similar scope of work, a very similar working acumen, so he feels we are literally looking at a difference in money. He would have a difficult time going to any taxpayer and explaining why we made a decision not on money. Based on his experience and findings here, he would recommend to move forward with a building partner of WSB at this time. Mr. Parks said that based on the information presented here and looking at the bottom line, he would make a motion to go with WSB. Mr. Rushmeyer seconded. Before the vote, Mr. Yeager expressed his appreciation to the time and effort from both parties. Mr. Rushmeyer concurred. Ms. Schaefer asked if there was any more discussion. Upon roll call, board members Boeder, Parks, Rushmeyer, Yeager and Schaefer voted "aye". No board members voted "nay". The chair declared the motion passed.

PUBLIC FORUM

There was no public forum.

NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, June 9, 2020, at 4:00 p.m. WebEx Teleconference Meeting to be established.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was made at 5:21 p.m. by Mr. Boeder and seconded by Mr. Parks. Upon roll call, members Boeder, Rushmeyer, Parks, Yeager and Schaefer voted "aye". No member voted "nay". The Chair declared the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Kim Finch, Administrative Specialist