

Capital Projects Meeting March 11, 2020

The meeting was called to order at 6:35 by Committee Chair Gonzales. Other members present were Jeff Deluca, Pat Norris, Bill Smith, and Rick Hudak. Jim Hardy, Procurement Specialist was also present.

Motions were made, seconded and unanimously approved to name Mr Smith and Mr Hudak as advisors to this committee for the 2020 committee year.

Mr Smith gave a brief review of the Capital Projects work completed in 2019 which included the completion of phase one of the lower dam and revitalization of the waste water treatment plant. Gannett Flemming was complimented for their work and the savings they afforded our project in preparing our dam for a 500 year flood. Black Horse Construction was complimented both by Mr Smith and by Mr. Hardy for their good work as well. The dam project was reported to have cost less than \$800,000 for Phase One.

Mr Smith then reviewed the work done on the waste water treatment plant which is now complete and ready for operation needing only to have inflow in order to activate the plant and test for proper operation.

Mr Deluca reviewed work that still needs to be done regrading the wells and maintenance being done on the sewage lines feeding the waste water treatment plant. Man hole covers are being raised to mitigate storm water infiltration. The road will be raised and pitched to accommodate the new man hole levels.

General discussion migrated to phase two of the dam project, which includes surface patching and repair of the dam faces, filling the hollow structures of the lower dam with grout, dredging of the lower lake, valve replacement/repair for the lower lake drain valve mechanism and possible replacement of the pedestrian bridge at the upper dam.

There was lively discussion by all participants regarding these topics. Mr Hardy shared the details of rejecting the dredging bids for the lower lake. A large piece of the unexpected costs was related to the disposal of the sediment dredged from the lake. The dredged material would have to be removed from the property and can not even be stored on the property for later disposal according to the EPA per Mr. Deluca. All bids have been rejected because of the excessive cost over runs.

Further discussion of phase two of the Dam rehabilitation was introduced by Mr. Deluca and migrated to and through topics which included the public bid and procurement process, the potential involvement of the Ohio Operating Engineers in the process as they had volunteered 18 months ago, the sale of sediment to local firms like Kurtz Brothers, stream reparation, grant writing, fund raising, dredging behind the cobblestone dam to provide a sediment trap for the entire steam system, and ended with discussion of the possibility of separating the dredging from phase two of Dam rehabilitation. One thought was that later dredging from a small dredging barge would be less cumbersome regarding EPA restrictions and perhaps less expensive for the dredging work itself.

After much discussion it was agreed that Mr Deluca would email the correspondence from Gannet Fleming to Mr Smith and that Mr Smith would make contact with Gannet Flemming to set up a time to conference with interested members of our committee. It was agreed that we should direct Gannet Flemming to remove the dredging piece of their specifications for the time being, that they should

retain all the concrete and grouting work, that they should retain the specs for manual preparation and construction management and retain as optional the replacement of the drain valve for the lower lake and the pedestrian bridge at the upper dam for further discussion at the conference call. This new approach has the potential of saving important capital funds for work required to bring revenue producing improvements to the park on line in a more expeditious manner.

Discussion then migrated to water well detail and ingress egress park design at the Oviatt and Broadview entrances and signage for both. Burgess and Niple will do the design work for well the project. The total cost for the well project will be below the \$50,000 price required for the formal bidding process or further involvement with the Capital Projects Committee. We will anticipate that work will be complete by mid August or before if we have no surprises.

Mr Deluca reported that BW is working now on documenting their 2 year stream study. He reported that the Ohio Operating Engineers are going to be spreading and grading 200 tons of gravel at the Pack Out Parking Lot in the coming week. The cost of gravel from Ontario Stone will be at the same cost per ton as that company gives Cleveland Metro Parks. The Operating Engineers will be providing equipment and labor for no cost to the park.

Mr Deluca discussed the “concept design” done in 2014 by GPD to promote further discussion. The Oviatt entrance was discussed first. Discussion of the concept design ended with the Broadview entrance and the public areas around the parking lots by Gund and the Pack Out Building. All discussion was conceptual and emphasized long term planning. The suggestion was that parking improvements in particular should be completed prior to the expiration of our current operating levy in three years in order to promote community pride and to improve the parking experience of our Gund Hall rental clients. These entryway improvements then should be considered as 2021 or 2022 projects and would most likely require fund raising in order to pay for these improvements.

Ingress egress signage was then discussed in general terms and it was suggested as an expense against our remaining 1.5 million dollar capital funds balance. The drawings were conceptual and intended to promote further discussion.

Mr Norris provided detail on the difference between our existing operating levy funds and our existing Bond issue residual balance. Mr Hudak promoted the fact that a vote from the community for either operating or capital funds needs to pass each of the supporting communities individually in order to pass as an issue at the ballot box.

Mr Gozales then directed discussion back to entryway signage. He suggested that bids be obtained for the conceptual signage drawn up by Becker Signs and alternatives that conform more to park like signs as seen in the many parks we enjoy locally as well as the CVNP. Mr Norris volunteered to provide photos of some of these park signs for committee members to consider. Mr Gonzales suggested that we get pricing on conceptual examples that we will be discussing prior to having the board make a decision on the sign design and installation.

Mr Norris presented a suggestion by Ms Cynthia McWilliams, who was unable to attend this meeting, that the entryway drives be separated from a short section of exit drives in order to provide a space for the sign in similar fashion to the entry and signage at Richfield Woods for example. This approach would provide greater definition to our signage, would provide greater impact and visibility for passers-by, would move the signs closer to the road and separate the ingress and egress traffic for greater safety and control.

Mr Hudak suggested that signage be improved sooner rather than later or risk criticism from the public, perhaps suggesting that revitalizing the signage was part of a levy renewal campaign rather than simply exemplifying good stewardship and park pride. Mr Deluca agreed that bigger and bolder and closer to the road were as important in his mind as doing it sooner rather than later.

Mr Gonzales reiterated his suggestion that we get a few estimates on what a new entryway sign might cost the park. Mr Deluca offered that signs similar to the example he presented at the Board meeting would cost in the neighborhood of between 15 and 25 thousand dollars per sign. Mr Norris asked that whatever sign design might be chosen that it be park like and that he would provide a short portfolio of park signs to the group so that we might understand the recent community criticism of the Becker Sign example presented at the Board meeting.

Mr Hardy suggested that the community stakeholders be involved in selecting the signage. Mr Hudak presented some of the restrictions presented by the Village and the Township related to signage. The general consensus was that the base of the sample sign was attractive but there was some pushback on the sign carving itself. The discussion ended with Mr Gonzales asking Mr Norris to provide the group some additional sign samples and some estimate on design / build cost as well as installation .

In other business Mr Hardy asked for an update on The Oviatt. Mr Gonzales brought the group up to speed on the Board's request to the Save Oviatt Group to provide our board details about their proposal for fund raising, stabilization, timeline, maintenance and potential uses. As of that date our Board was still awaiting details on Mr Gonzales request.

There was a great deal of discussion about the concepts surrounding the Oviatt stabilization project. The bottom line of the discussion was that we would always retain ownership of the building and that our board would consider the Oviatt Group's proposal and that we would accept, reject or alter the proposal once it is in hand. There was agreement that Mr Gonzales would discuss with Mr Becker how much Mr Hanna has been involved in this conceptual process and whether or not he should be consulted further.

The meeting adjourned at 8:50.

Submitted: Charles P. Norris

Approved: By unanimous vote June 1, 2020