Norwood Young America Special Parks and Recreation Commission
Tuesday, September 13, 2016 at 6:00 p.m.
Oak Grove City Center ~ City Council Chambers, 310 Elm St. W.

AGENDA

Sharilyn Feltmann

Lori Trocke

Jim Zellmann

Karla Hormann

Julie Kuenzel, School District Rep.

JR Hoernemann Planning Comm. Rep.

Craig Heher Council Liaison, Chairperson

1. Call to Order
2. Adoption of Agenda
3. Approve Minutes of August 16, 2016 meeting
4. Old Business
   A. Willkommen Memorial Park
      1. Restrooms Project
      2. Joint Meeting with City Council
5. New Business
6. Miscellaneous Updates
7. Commissioner Reports/Updates
8. Adjourn

UPCOMING MEETINGS

September 20th	5:30 p.m. – Parks & Recreation Commission meeting
September 26th	7:00 p.m. – City Council meeting
October 10th	6:30 p.m. – City Council meeting

NORWOOD YOUNG AMERICA
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
AUGUST 16, 2016 MINUTES

Present:	Commissioners Karla Hormann, Sharilyn Feltmann, Lori Trocke (6:07), JR Hoernemann, Planning Commission Rep., and Craig Heher, City Council Liaison.
Absent:	Jim Zellmann and Julie Kuenzel, Community Education Rep.
Staff Present:	Steve Helget, City Administrator and Brent Aretz, Public Works Director.
Others Present:	Bill Grundahl, John Rodeberg and Justin Black of Short Elliott Hendrickson.

1. **Call to Order**
   Heher called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m.

2. **Adopt Agenda**
   Motion was made by Hormann to approve the agenda which included the change of order of the items under Old Business. Seconded by Hoernemann and unanimously carried.

3. **Approve Minutes of July 28, 2016 Meeting**
   Motion was made by Feltmann to approve the July 28, 2016 minutes. Seconded by Hormann and unanimously carried.

4. **Old Business**

   A. Willkommen Memorial Park Old Town Buildings

   Helget stated the Commission met at Willkommen Memorial Park for its April 19th regular meeting and reviewed and discussed the Old Town Buildings. At that meeting the Commission directed staff to solicit proposals for conducting mold mediation of the buildings. Brent Aretz, Public Works Director has solicited two proposals which are as follows:

Mavo Systems	$3,350
ProCare Systems	$14,400

   Aretz stated the proposal from ProCare Systems is to remove and replace areas of the buildings where the mold is evident. This includes framing removal and shoring up. In addition, the proposal discusses changing the elevations of the concrete on the outside of the buildings so the water will drain away from the buildings but it doesn't provide what the new elevations would be. In comparison Mavo Systems proposals to spray over the mold and will remove water damaged and mold contaminated building materials as needed.

   Bill Grundahl stated he met with ProCare Services at the Old Town Buildings and they said they could mediate the mold.

   The Commission directed staff to contact both contractors to provide more information about their methodology and structure longevity we could expect to receive after they've completed the mediation.

B. Willkommen Memorial Park Restrooms Project

Helget stated one bid was received for the Restrooms Project which came in over the Engineer's estimate which the City Council ultimately throughout. The Council's discussion lead to a decision to do the project in 2017. Proposed is to the review the plans and specifications in the next few months leading up to bidding out the project early next year.

John Rodeberg, SEH Engineering, was present to review the plans and specifications they designed for the Restrooms project and to address questions that arose during the bidding process. Such questions included the need to hire an architect; did the structure need to be constructed to the standards that were proposed such as lighting, finish and materials, and utility room, water service, site improvements, and facility size. Mr. Rodeberg reviewed his letter which addressed each item.

Mr. Rodeberg stated their project estimate was $200 per square foot and the bid came in at $245 per sq. ft. or about 20% higher. The tight timeframe for project completion attributed to this. If desired to add another fixture unit to each side it would add about another 70 sq. ft. and would cost about an additional $14,000 to $17,000. If the structure was changed to wood frame versus concrete block it would reduce the cost down to about $150 per sq. ft. The building elevation will be about 18" higher which will be at the same elevation as the sidewalk next to Central Avenue. The toilets are proposed to be 15" high with the handicap toilets at 18" high.

Mr. Grundahl asked if a lumber yard could complete the design. Mr. Rodeberg stated they could if they have staff that could determine the footings, plumbing, ADA design, etc. Mr. Grundahl stated licensed contractors could be directed to be responsible for their component of the project which would include meeting the code requirements. Mr. Rodeberg stated bidding the project that way is certainly an option, but in this case there wasn't time to do it that way and the City would still needed to pick out certain components.

Mr. Grundahl stated the vapor light LEDs is the most expensive type of lighting and suggested florescent lights could be utilized. The interior block wall could be changed to a wood wall possibly saving in the plumbing labor. Mr. Grundahl also suggested the storage/utility room could be removed.

Mr. Grundahl suggested going with the original design which was about $125 per sq. ft.

Mr. Rodeberg stated if there are any substantial changes to the plumbing plans the City will have to apply to state for a review again which could possibly take up to six weeks.

Trocke suggested inviting in contractors into a meeting to review respective components of the project and seek their suggestions for the specifications. Helget also suggested that SEH could provide similar suggestions. Mr. Rodeberg stated they could provide ideas but suggested seeking contractor input first.

Some discussion was held on whether or not to pursue completing the underground work this year. Following some discussion the Commission consented to do the project all at one time.

Heher stated the Commission needs to set parameters for the structure such as number of fixture units. Mr. Rodeberg stated they can provide some ideas as far as cost savings options.

The Commission discussed scheduling a special meeting to continue its discussion on the Restrooms project.

Motion was made by Feltmann to schedule a special meeting for 6:00 p.m., September 13, 2016. Seconded by Trocke and unanimously carried.

5. **New Business** – None.

6. **Miscellaneous Updates** – None.

7. **Commissioner Reports/Updates**

Feltmann asked if the windows in the Old Town Buildings will be cleaned. Aretz stated he's hoping to do this week as well as the bottom of the buildings. The sign at the 5-way stop will be replace after Stiftungsfest. Feltmann also stated some weeding needs to be completed around the trees at Willkommen Park.

Heher stated the purchase of the pool cleaner was approved by the City Council. The Council has also started working on the 2017 Budget. In respect to the proposed Highway 212 underpass, the City may have a booth at Stiftungsfest. The Minn-e-Rodd Pull will be held this coming Saturday.

8. **Adjournment**

There being no further business, motion was made by Trocke to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Feltmann and unanimously carried the meeting was declared adjourned at 7:00.

Respectfully submitted,

_____

Steven Helget, City Administrator

NORWOOD nya YOUNG AMERICA

TO: Parks & Recreation Commission Members

FROM: Steve Helget, City Administrator

DATE: September 13, 2016

SUBJECT: Willkommen Memorial Park Restrooms Project

==========

As discussed and consented to at the August 16th regular meeting, the Commission needs to review the plans and specifications more in depth to ensure everyone agrees on all the components of the project. It was suggested to request local contractors be invited to a meeting and asked to provide their input on the specifications. I've contacted three local contractors who've graciously agreed to attend the meeting and share some of their insights. Pat Shanahan, Lenny Hilgers, and Bill Grundahl will be present.

I'm attaching a copy of the letter that SEH distributed and reviewed at the August 16th meeting.

Proposed is to also consider scheduling a joint meeting with the City Council to discuss the Restroom Project and possibly other future parks and recreation related projects.

SEH

Building a Better World for All of Us®

MEMORANDUM

TO: Steve Helget, NYA City Administrator

FROM: John Rodeberg, PE
Brian Bergstrom, AIA

DATE: August 16, 2016

RE: Willkommen Park Restroom Building
SEH No. 137595 14.00

Based on our discussions, here are responses to some of the questions we understand have been raised.

Did the City need to hire an architect?
No, an architect is not required. However, the City does need to meet building, electrical and plumbing codes as well as American with Disabilities Act (ADA) design requirements. The City also likely needs to provide signed drawings (structural, electrical, mechanical) in order to get a building permit. Sometimes this work is completed by the Contractor, but the City also needs to provide enough information to identify their needs and expectations so bids are all based on similar work, and the Contractor would add these costs into their bid. With this understanding and a limited expected time to construct the restrooms, the City engaged SEH to expedite the work.

Did the structure need to be constructed to the standards that were proposed?
The number of fixture units (toilets and urinals) and other basic design elements were based on direction received from the City. As discussed during plan development, there were many choices related to materials and other features. The City has the ability to select the type of structure that they feel fits their needs. Based on the feedback we received, the design as proposed was based on providing a quality, low maintenance structure that would meet the expectations of the city while providing the best long-term value.

Specific issues/questions noted:

- **Lighting:** The type of LED lighting was proposed due to its quality and lower long-term costs (the payback is likely 2 – 4 years). It is now the industry standard. The number and type of lights can be revised, understanding that maintenance costs would likely increase and lower lighting levels may be expected. 2 lighting fixtures on each side, instead of 3 as proposed, may be acceptable. Minimum lighting levels are recommended/required in public buildings. The City needs to determine what lighting level they are comfortable with.
- **Finish and materials:** Integrally colored block was proposed due to its quality and reduced long-term maintenance. Split-faced block was proposed for exterior walls. Burnished block was originally proposed around the top of the structure to allow for ease of soffit/facia construction, however this was revised to split-faced block to reduce costs. Painted block was discussed, but it was determined to stay with the integrally colored due to aesthetic and maintenance considerations. Some interior wood frame construction was discussed, but it was determined that the cost difference was negligible (small quantity, separate specialty work, etc.).
- **Utility Room:** A separate utility room was proposed for added security and to reduce the susceptibility to vandalism. The space includes a floor sink, water heater, electrical box and water meter. The first two could be integrated somewhere in the open space and the last two could hang on the outside of the building, but the space savings would be minimal.

- **Water Service:** The current site is served by a ¾" water service. Plumbing codes dictates the size of the water service based on quantity and type of fixtures being used. A 2" water service is required to for the commercial fixtures being utilized on this project. The units proposed are the industry standard for public restrooms.
- **Site Improvements:** Although the restroom building may be able to be constructed without constructing the drainage improvements, the close proximity of the drain lines to the building would make it much more difficult and expensive to construct those improvements later. We would recommend constructing the drainage work prior to the building, or in coordination with the building.
- **Facility Size:** As noted earlier, discussion on the size of the building varied, from 2 stalls on each side to 4. It was decided to move ahead based on 3 fixtures on each side. The bid came it at approximately $245/SF, which is higher than the expected $200/SF, likely significantly due to the tight time frame. If it was desired to increase the restroom to 4 fixture units on each size, the increase in cost based on those costs would range from $14,000 – 17,000 additional cost.

As noted earlier, the City has significant leeway in the type of building they would like to construct. Please let us know if there is anything we can do to help. Thanks for your trust and consideration.

FYI: Bid Received	
Restroom Building	$141,900
Site grading, utilities, sidewalk	$ 11,900
Storm Drainage Improvements	$ 11,900
Total Bid	$165,700

s:\ko\n\norwo\137595\1-genl\14-corr\seh memo to sh 081616.docx