

Minutes of a Meeting of  
Recreation and Parks Improvements Committee  
Held Monday, February 10, 2014  
7:35 p.m.

Members Present: Councilman Tom Henderson, Chair  
Councilman Paul Vincent  
Councilman Dwight Clark

Also Present: Law Director Ebert, Recreation Director Enovitch, Service Director  
Thomas, Operations Manager Landers

Audience: Lawrence Kuh, Denny Wendell

Mr. Henderson called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. He thanked everyone for their attendance.

**Hartman Field Lighting (Exhibit A attached)**

Mr. Henderson distributed and reviewed a document he prepared concerning the Hartman Field Lighting.

The existing lighting system has been in place for more than 30 years. Some of the lights do not work, and there are electrical issues. Hartman Field is heavily used; three to four nights per week in the summertime.

Mr. Enovitch commented that the Hartman Field is used six nights per week in the summertime, if not longer. The field is used six nights per week starting in late March for baseball season, and it ends in November with the football teams.

Usage fees are paid for the travel baseball tournament. A check is received from the Travel Baseball Commission annually for field usage over the Fourth of July weekend. We also receive fees from the Travel Teams, as well as the In-House Programs, both boys and girls, for usage on Saturdays and some Sundays. These fees amount to about \$5,000 annually. The majority of the fees are from the Travel Baseball Program. The collection of these fees began in 2012.

A budget estimate from Musco Lighting Company was reviewed (Exhibit B attached). Mr. Henderson stated that when he reviewed the document the electricity costs looked good, and the usage estimate looked good, perhaps even a bit low, based on the usage just quoted by Mr. Enovitch. The mathematics on the energy piece makes total sense. Mr. Henderson explained that the section he had a hard time following was "Group Relamp" which has to do with replacing the lights and their useful life being 5000 hours versus 3000 hours and the cost differential between the different kind of lights. It appears that this analysis calculates out what the cost to do the typical flood lighting equipment is (\$10,625) but it doesn't calculate the cost for the LED. The savings shouldn't be the \$10,625; it should be the \$6,875 because there is still a cost to replace the LED lightings.

Mr. Enovitch stated that with the purchasing of lights through Musco, the city gets twenty-five years of service and supplies. There will be no cost to us for replacement of bulbs, or manpower for service of the bulbs. They will come in and replace and repair everything for twenty-five years.

Mr. Vincent asked if Musco Lighting has done work for any other municipality. Mr. Enovitch stated that he spoke to the cities of Westlake and Avon recently about their systems. Many municipal and school fields use Musco Lighting.

Mr. Clark asked Mr. Henderson if he would like the fact that the ongoing maintenance and supply costs should be included in the contract. Mr. Henderson stated that he would just like to understand the financial rationale for going with what he assumes is a more expensive system than a traditional system. If we are talking about a savings over 20 years of \$42,553 he just wants to understand how they have derived those numbers. Mr. Henderson stated that when he tried to repeat the analysis he saw that there is still a \$3,750 cost to replace the bulbs if they had a 5,000 hour life. Mr. Enovitch's response to that is that under this contract we will not pay for this bulbs or the labor to install them. That is included in the up-front price of a product. Mr. Clark noted that it would make sense that we have that written in the contract.

Mr. Henderson asked what Controls-Energy in the amount of \$10,326 refers to. Mr. Enovitch stated that he believes it is the setting of the bulb for the duration of the life of the bulb. This is something that can be asked of Musco Lighting Company representatives when they come in on February 24<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Vincent asked if they have to switch the energy source. Mr. Enovitch stated that they will come in and analyze the existing system. We will know more in the next week to ten days. Assistant Service Director Sears did provide to them the current electrical set-up.

Mr. Henderson stated that he understands the cost savings on the operating side over the 25 year life of the asset. As far as the initial cost, are there alternatives that are lower cost up front that we are comparing this to? And, if so, what would those costs be? Mr. Enovitch stated that he does not know what those relative costs would be but there are other lighting systems available. Mr. Henderson asked the rationale to go with this one rather than any of the other systems. Mr. Enovitch stated that the rationale was the fact that they do 80 to 90% of all fields, it is the top lighting system out there, and the 25-year life cycle alone justifies the premium cost of going with Musco Lighting. Mr. Enovitch distributed a list of references. He noted that the cities of Westlake and Avon speak very highly of Musco Lighting.

Mr. Kuh asked if there is a situation where Musco would give a recommendation for other areas such as the skate park when they are coming in to evaluate the Hartman Field Lighting. Mr. Enovitch stated that he asked them to give estimated costs on the tennis courts, Play-in-Bay area and the basketball courts. Mr. Kuh stated that the skate park users keep asking about lighting, and if lighting is in the future plans. Mr. Kuh feels that this may be a good time to ask.

Mr. Clark asked Mr. Enovitch if he knows who does the lighting work at the Bay High School fields. Mr. Enovitch will check with the schools.

Mr. Henderson asked about the process for procuring these contracts. He asked for an explanation on the difference between cooperative purchasing relative to the standard bid process.

Mr. Enovitch stated that with the cooperative purchase, which is recommended, it would be the same as the process used to purchase the Reese Park Playground Equipment. When joining the Cooperative, we get their pricing and purchase through them. Musco becomes the GC on the contract and it becomes a total turn-key operation. The other standard bid process would be probably six weeks longer. This is a time-sensitive matter because we want to get those lights up as soon as possible for the spring sports. The standard bid process would probably delay the project by six weeks or so.

Mr. Henderson asked how this fits in relative to the things discussed last week at the Finance Committee regarding the process with bids, such as the newspaper ads, opening of the bids in public space, etc.

Service Director Thomas stated that when you look at a cooperative purchasing process it is similar to a state bid. The cooperative will go out and look at best practices. From best practices they send out their own specifications and then people will submit proposals on their specifications. They will pick the best in a review panel. This is standard procedure of how they do it across the state. A project like this is turn-key and it ends up working very well because it is time-sensitive when you talk about lighting projects and the time frames. For us to go with a cooperative in this instance works very logically for the city.

Mr. Clark noted that it has to do with the limited number of people with the capability to do a project of this scope.

Mr. Enovitch is recommending meeting on February 24, 2014 and have the cooperative agreement and the project on the agenda for that date. Mr. Clark asked the latest date for contract approval in order to be prepared for spring use. The lead-time is eight to ten weeks for ordering and installation time is two weeks. Permits are issued for the fields in April.

Mr. Clark noted that he is supportive of passing the legislation on one reading on February 24. Mr. Henderson stated that he would like to be sure that the project is being done in the most cost-effective way. If we are not going to do the multiple bid process and go with the cooperative purchasing agreement he wants to make sure that he understands what alternative things were looked at before we decide to go with that option. Mr. Clark suggested that Mr. Ebert and Mr. Lee review the proposed contract to be sure everything is in order and the insurances and warranties are in place.

Mr. Clark stated that he is curious to see the information concerning the lighting at the Bay High School football field. Mr. Enovitch will follow through.

Mr. Kuh noted that there are lighted recreation areas in the city that need to be put on timers. Mr. Clark stated that there have been purchases through cooperatives before. Given the unique nature of the work and the timing to have the project done, we've approved funding through the budget year, and making sure we get our answers before the 24<sup>th</sup> of February, going through one reading and getting it done is the right thing to do. Mr. Vincent expressed agreement.

### **Cahoon Memorial Park Fitness Trail**

Mr. Henderson stated that his understanding of the project is that there is a proposal to install a fitness trail in Cahoon Memorial Park, just north of the Dover Road/Lake Road intersection where the walking trail is located. Mr. Barry Tyo and Mr. Clete Miller were involved heavily in this proposal last year. The idea is to install nine stations in three locations, or what is perceived to be groups of exercise types of equipment including cardio, strength training, and resistance training. The rationale is that there is a variety of options in Bay for young people and active adults, but this would give people who are not as interested in "sports" more activity options in Bay Village.

Mr. Kuh stated that he spoke with the Varsity Soccer Coach, Mr. Doraty, and asked him if it is something that the soccer teams would use. Mr. Doraty stated that high school level soccer players and higher would definitely use it as part of their training.

Mr. Henderson stated that his understanding is that the cost of the project is about \$20,000, and the intent is not for the city to fund it but it would be privately funded. Mr. Kuh stated that his concern is the number of \$20,000. Originally it was \$10,000 and when they got into mulch and borders it popped to \$20,000. Mr. Kuh stated that he could probably raise \$10,000 through the different means we have in the city, but \$20,000 might not be doable. Mr. Clark stated that he seems to recollect we were talking \$13,000 to \$15,000; \$20,000 seemed to be on the high side. Mr. Clark noted that what you don't want to do is just build part of it and not complete the project. It is really an all-or-none type project.

Mr. Henderson asked how this project works procedurally. He would imagine that there is some sort of fund raising effort, some sort of time boundary, e.g., 12 months, and then what happens at the end of that time boundary if the fund raising does not raise enough capital for the project. Mr. Kuh stated that with the skate park project they put in their by-laws that if they did not meet the required date the funds would be given directly to the Recreation Department. In this situation, it is not a non-profit organization raising the funds. The skate park is a non-profit 501c3 organization. They created by-laws that went with the organization specifically for the skate park.

Mr. Henderson asked why the distinction between using a 501c3 for the skate park, but not for this project. Mr. Kuh stated that when a 501c3 is collecting funds they have to spell out in their by-laws exactly how those funds are going to be used. It has to be part of the plans if you are not going to reach your mission, how those funds will be dispersed. Mr. Kuh stated that they determined to proceed as a 501c3 because of the large amount of money to be collected, and the resulting tax benefit to donors. Mr. Ebert noted the need for funds to maintain and improve the project through the years going forward. He stated that he is assuming the fitness trail would be

Recreation and Parks Improvement Committee  
February 10, 2014

a one-time project. Mr. Clark noted that a 501c3 organization avoids paying sales tax on materials. Any concrete, signage or benches or other materials would not be subject to the 7.25% sales tax.

Mr. Clark commented that he would surmise a project such as the fitness trail would need a significant benefactor that is going to stand behind this with a gift. Mr. Kuh stated that they have approached a couple of individuals but were waiting for approval within Council before starting. Within the civic organizations in Bay Village there is probably access to \$3,000 to \$5,000 that would probably come from organizations like the Village Foundation, Kiwanis, PTA, etc. If those organizations contributed \$6,000 that would mean only another \$4,000 is needed and that may be a more doable chunk.

Mr. Henderson stated that the \$20,000 is the more realistic estimate now. It was specifically the price Mr. Miller got on the mulch and the composite material that would outline the wood chips. Mr. Kuh stated it was a rough estimate so as a committee he would require the group to really nail down the exact costs. The extra \$10,000 changed the project in Mr. Kuh's mind. He noted that they haven't met yet about that. That is a big difference on this sort of project.

Mr. Vincent asked if there is concern about having long-term care on this type of project. The mulch is going to get torn up every winter. Mr. Clark stated that it was represented that because of the composite material it would have a very long life-style to it.

Mr. Enovitch stated that the mulch surface will get worn out. It might be more feasible to put a cement pad down. We really have to look at what type of surface you are putting down because people are working out and exercising on the surface and the last thing you want is to have something that can slide out from under you or get worn down to the point of what is underneath it. Mr. Enovitch commented further that they really need to take a look at the mulch surface that was recommended.

Mr. Vincent stated that his thought if you have the 501c3 funding for the skate park, maybe this is the same type. Everytime you make an estimate on things it is always more expensive. The maintenance on this is probably going to be worse than what is expected. If you have a bunch of 17-year olds in our community always exercising on these things there will be maintenance needed. Mr. Kuh stated that he does not think there will be any maintenance issues on the actual items themselves. The maintenance is just literally going to be the mulch surface. The equipment is very high quality. Mr. Ebert noted that the composite material is theoretically maintenance free, but it is very expensive. Mr. Kuh stated that in his mind that is the issue that has come up that has made this potentially a non-feasible project, because of the surface and what it is doing to the expense. Mr. Kuh stated that he has not yet met with Mr. Tyo and Mr. Miller but it is something he fully intends to discuss with them. It is an issue that has to be addressed because it could make or break this unless there was a benefactor that would chip in \$10,000. Mr. Vincent asked if we are thinking all individual sponsors. Mr. Kuh stated there are lots of different ways to go about that. With three different stations you could get sponsorship on each station. If you have nine different individual things you could get sponsorship for each one. They are looking at the Columbus Crew for sponsorship.

Recreation and Parks Improvement Committee  
February 10, 2014

Mr. Henderson noted that there was concern expressed about disturbing the view of the lake with signage. The solution was expressed to orient the signs to north/south.

Mr. Kuh stated that during the initial presentation to the committee, that concern was brought up specifically to say that is an important piece to a lot of people in Bay. The three specific locations that they propose putting this in are behind trees, behind the sailboat, and places so that there is limited obstruction of the view. It will change the view slightly but any signage will be put in a north/south orientation, everything is 4x4's, everything is thin, and there is no solid structure to hide signage. The sign at the far east end would be put as close to the woods as possible. The other one, behind the trees. Every effort would be made to minimize the issue.

Mr. Henderson asked what would be the major series of the next steps to be undertaken to continue to explore this project. Mr. Henderson's list of the next steps include deciding what exercises (locations) would be most desirable for Bay's target audience, getting input from the Parks and Recreation Commission, and the development of a fundraising strategy. Mr. Henderson would like to get Mr. Kuh's thoughts since he was instrumental in the fund raising for the skate park, and if he is concerned that the amount of \$20,000 would make it a non-feasible project.

Mr. Kuh stated that his thought is that Mr. Henderson should ask Mr. Tyo, Mr. Miller, and himself to come back with a finalized proposal. They did come in at one point with some variations, brought the model and showed the different maps. The final piece is to determine the exact cost.

Mr. Clark suggested having some tangible idea as to preliminary ideas on development efforts. Who would be the potential builders because we would be running through the traps of trying to get this approved. Mr. Kuh added that a proposal of potential funders would be helpful. If they can get \$5,000 or \$6,000 from organizations, how much more will be needed. It depends on how much enthusiasm can be created for the project.

Mr. Clark suggested that an estimate be obtained of what it would cost to replace the mulch pads for each of the three stations. He noted that the Bay High Football Field rubberized pellets cost \$25,000 to \$35,000 each year to replace.

Mr. Enovitch stated that we should also be cognizant of what the schools are doing as far as fund raising and what they are trying to get done as far as timing. There are scoreboard efforts at this time. Mr. Enovitch stated that he wants to be careful on who we are looking to for funding for this project if there is other fundraising underway.

Mr. Henderson noted that the Village Foundation is also working on the fireworks project this year.

Mr. Kuh stated that he believes the proposal is very solid. The only piece that is missing is the ground cover.

Mr. Henderson asked if the specific exercises influence the cost. Mr. Kuh stated that you can change from their recommended model. As soon as changes are made the prices may go up.

Mr. Enovitch stated that this needs to be analyzed further as well: what choices are being proposed and taking a closer look at that.

Mr. Henderson asked Mr. Enovitch to work with him and the three individuals who make up the team that is proposing the project. (Mr. Tyo, Mr. Miller, Mr. Kuh).

Mr. Kuh stated that he also wants Coach Doraty to review with his opinion as well. There are a lot of potential users and with the nine stations you want to make sure you are getting the largest use possible.

Mr. Vincent asked if getting some sort of corporate sponsorship with this is going to be a problem with the Cahoon Memorial Park grounds. Mr. Clark stated that it might be what they would require in terms of signage, whether that meets Architectural Board of Review and Planning Commission. Mr. Kuh stated that typically what has happened on the different things he has worked on within the city is as long as it is similar to what is currently done. Most have been very tasteful, somewhat subtle. Mr. Vincent stated that it would seem to fit in with sporting equipment sales.

### **Survey of Residents Regarding Parks and Recreation**

Mr. Enovitch distributed a revised survey prepared by the Recreation Department after the Recreation and Parks Improvement Committee meeting of December 9, 2013, and receiving input and recommendations from the committee.

Mr. Clark noted that discussion at the December 9 meeting included assistance by the *Westlake/Bay Village Observer* in implementing the survey and using the city's website as well.

Mr. Henderson stated that he has not had an opportunity to review this new version of a survey and would like to make sure everything is in order before rolling this out to the residents. He noted that he is concerned about the length of the survey, and suggested that some of the information may be able to be obtained from city records. If the survey is shortened it will increase the likelihood of people completing it, with the result of providing a better data set.

Mr. Enovitch stated that the possibility of conducting a survey was brought up when the expansion of the Community Gym was discussed. Mr. Clark added that the community lacks a capable facility for residents to work out. The concern is that we are chasing residents to go elsewhere for their physical exercise and activities and we thought of this as a way of getting a set of data points to figure out what exactly we are missing.

Mr. Henderson stated that he agrees with the approach but one thing he would be concerned about is one particular question: "What is the reasonable cost you would be willing to pay for membership to use the gym/facility?" Obviously, a lot of people would check off the lowest one. There might be a clearer ways to look at this. There was some preliminary research on pricing

on facilities around the area. Mr. Henderson suggested looking at the market in more detail and studying the pricing rather than asking people what they would like to pay.

As to the point of Recreation Facilities, Mr. Henderson stated that his understanding from last year is that the two paths that we can consider going down, and not necessary exclusive, are enhancing the existing Community Gym and the other is exploring the idea of an indoor recreation facility/indoor pool. As to the later, Mr. Henderson stated that this is something, in general, that he thinks is very interesting to consider. As a resident of Bay he thinks it would be great. All of the areas around us have very nice recreation facilities. As a taxpayer here in Bay, one of the key things I'd want to have as a guiding principle is that we approach this the same way that you would as a company, with a business plan. My intent would be to see a business plan where revenues would exceed our expenses, at least on an operating basis if not a whole fully-loaded capital basis as well. Many facilities in this area, anecdotally I am told that they lose money. I would like to do some research on that front. But, I also know there are for-profit companies out there including some publicly traded fitness companies that have very healthy operating margins, upwards of 20%. It seems that there has to be some sort of disconnect between what's happening with recreation facilities that are owned by public entities, which, if it's true they are losing money, and what's happening on the private side with companies that make 20% margin. I want to understand the difference and figure what those drivers are. I can get behind a project where it is financially self-sustaining, but I have a hard time getting behind a project where we are asking the taxpayers to subsidize the operating expense.

Mr. Vincent stated that with a lot of these places the cost if you are a resident is one thing and it's ridiculously low, and a non-resident pays another price. Why make it any better for Bay residents' costs than someone else who lives one house outside the city?

Mr. Enovitch stated that it has to do with what type of facility you are building and the price point.

Mr. Henderson stated his strategic level would be guiding principles such as revenue exceeding expenses, and a way to get residents input. He is not sure if a survey at this time is the right time because he prefers to present something more concrete and say "What do you think of this?" then "Would you like to have a recreation facility?" The latter is a little too open. Mr. Henderson suggested that maybe he and Mr. Enovitch can work together on doing some sort of public records request and getting some granular detail on pricing, revenues, expenses, up-front capital expenditures, how they are being paid off with bonds, nearby facilities, and then figure out the national best practices out there. Mr. Henderson stated that he has read newspaper stories about public versions of these facilities that are financial self-sustaining and he would like to see what the differences are. The ultimate culmination of that would be heading toward feasibility study, or business plan, not necessarily jumping in to recommending to build something or not but getting to the point of understanding what the implications of building one would be financially.

Mr. Enovitch suggested that he also thinks we should look at collaborating possibly with the schools if we are considering a pool; let's look at getting some help or assistance from the schools.

Mr. Clark stated that there is plenty of history of the two things you don't want to operate as a city: an indoor pool or an ice rink. Very expensive and they are money losers. This is one of the exercises we'll try to run through. What we are facing is a lot of other communities building new facilities that rim Bay Village and a declining enrollment. As we have 25 to 30% of our population as seniors that are not willing to spend significant amounts of money, the concern we have is how we cover the cost of capital, let alone the operating. We could probably afford something from the city's standpoint but if you are going to build a stand-alone recreation facility you have to think about the cost of capital, and where would you put it because we don't have a lot of buildable land here.

Mr. Henderson stated that one of the topics that was brought to his attention six months ago was that we co-own with Avon Lake the Walker Road Park. There are open spaces on that property that aren't being fully utilized. The idea in my mind that makes some sense is that if Bay Village has some demographic issues that might preclude financial models from working out, if we collaborate with Avon Lake that might balance out some of those demographic issues and it is a large population base across which to spread the cost. That is just an option, and the idea of a financial feasibility study or business plan would be part of the process we look at.

Mr. Clark stated he does not think there is any wrong idea that has surfaced here. Mr. Enovitch and he have had this discussion before. The impetus to at least having a better facility period; we all agree that what the city has to offer in terms of over-all programming with the vernacular of what we have available is poor at best. We've seen the number of Community Gym memberships dwindle each year over the past three or four years because we don't have adequate capabilities to be able to do that. What we've tried to do is at least is how to retrofit the Community Gym which is underutilized. There are some pros and cons of doing that. It would certainly come at a much smaller cost of capital to us as well. It is somewhere in the range of anywhere from the high side of \$200,000 to the low side of \$125,000 or \$150,000 and you could co-op this with the schools because we are both putting money away into a Community Gym fund which we really haven't touched other than putting in new LED lighting over there. That is one of the options, and running down the path at looking at a stand-alone facility, although financially may not be feasible today, is something we need to take a look at because maybe five or ten years down the road it may be reasonable, at the point in time we pay off the Aquatic Facility. Our share of the Community Gym is paid off in three or four years; the pool is paid off in eight or nine years. So you might see some revenue flows there as well. It is too early to say. For example, Five Seasons, which is a facility a lot of Bay people belonged to, they all had to go somewhere. It would have been great to have a facility for them to go to, but they have probably gone to neighboring facilities. There's a lot of competing facilities out there.

Mr. Vincent noted that Karen Derby, Public Information Officer at the Bay Schools is very good with surveys and could help with trimming up the survey and getting it on line.

Mr. Lee asked how much land is available at Walker Road Park. Mr. Enovitch stated that there is quite a bit of land available because there was supposed to be two large baseball fields as part of that project that were tabled because of the cost of clearing out those trees southwest of the parking lot.

Recreation and Parks Improvement Committee  
February 10, 2014

Mr. Henderson noted that there are consulting firms that help with these kinds of analyses and when we get to that point we can look at that kind of approach.

There being no further business to discuss the meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

---

Tom Henderson, Chairman

---

Joan Kemper, Clerk of Council