



**OAK RIDGE PARKS & RECREATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
JANUARY 27, 2021 - 6:00 P.M.
(Held electronically via the Zoom platform)**

MINUTES

Members Present

John Garrett, Co-Chair
John Browning Co-Chair (arrived at 6:37 p.m.)
Phyllis Anders
Mike Kimel, Alternate (sitting)
Kelly Riddle, ORYA Representative
Maureena Shepherd, Alternate (not sitting)
Tracy Street
Brady Young

Staff Present

Terry Lannon, Parks & Recreation Director
Ashley Royal, Deputy Clerk

CJ Annunziato, Teen Advisor

Members Absent

Kyle Anders

Note: This meeting was conducted remotely under N. C. Gen. Stat. § 166A-19.24 by use of simultaneous communication using the Zoom online platform and in which Parks & Recreation Advisory Board members participated by simultaneous communication. Committee members were joined and participated in the entire meeting, unless otherwise noted.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Co-Chair John Garrett called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

2. APPROVE AGENDA

Kelly Riddle made a motion to approve the agenda. Tracy Street seconded the motion, and the agenda was passed unanimously (6-0).

3. OLD BUSINESS

A. Discussion and selection of engineering/design firm for design and construction administration services for new Park property. Board members reviewed and discussed the presentations that were made at the January 21, 2021 regular meeting. A lengthy conversation ensued regarding Board members comments about each firm. The comments were incorporated into a document that compared each firm which is hereby named by reference and made a part of the minutes.

Kelly Riddle made a motion to recommend McGill & Associates, as their first choice, to Town Council to provide the design and construction administration services for the new Park property. Brady Young seconded the motion, and it was passed unanimously (7-0).

Mike Kimel made a motion to recommend Benesch, as their second choice, to Town Council to provide the design and construction administration services for the new Park property. Tracy Street seconded the motion, and it was passed unanimously (7-0).

The Board agreed by consensus that Stewart would be their third choice to recommend to Town Council to provide the design and construction administration services for the new Park property but not before meeting with Stewart again to clarify concerns that the Board had with their original presentation.

B. Discussion regarding the charge from Town Council to name the new Park property.
Board members agreed by consensus to solicit name suggestions for the new Park property from residents before a recommendation is made to Council. Garrett suggested contacting community groups first to ask them to submit their name suggestions to either Ashley Royal or himself. Garrett recommended that the Board review the submitted names at the March regular meeting in order to select the top three name choices. The Board agreed by consensus to select the top three name suggestions and create a survey to share with residents via the Town's Facebook page and website. The name that receives the most votes will be the one that the Board recommends to Council at their April meeting. Garret asked Board members to come to the March regular meeting with 2-3 names that they would like to suggest as names for the new Park property.

C. Selection of signs and an opening date for the Whitaker Property perimeter trail.
Lannon shared new signage suggestions for the Whitaker property perimeter trail with the Board. A lengthy conversation ensued regarding whether the new signage should have consistent wording with what is currently at Oak Ridge Town Park. The Board agreed by consensus that the signage should be consistent between the existing and new park locations.

Lannon told the Board that he would order the new signage and that he anticipated that it would be installed by the first of March.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

5. ADJOURNMENT

Tracy Street made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:33 p.m. John Browning seconded the motion, and it was passed unanimously (7-0).

Pros/Cons List for Engineering/Design Firms for new Park property

Stewart

1. Presentation was poor
2. Did not address their experience and list successful projects.
3. Did not address or include a timeline.
4. Presentation disjointed
5. Clustered utilities would be cost effective.
6. Some of their team members had experience with ORTP
7. Project mgr. seemed disorganized
8. Not a good answer to a question regarding a proposal in their plan that we did not request.
9. They did Phase 2-Emily was the project mgr.
10. Issue with electrical contractor during Phase 2
11. Emily was responsive and good to work with during Phase 2 construction.

Benesch

1. Presentation was clear and concise.
2. Good examples of project experience.
3. Described in 6 phases how to complete project and included timeline.
4. Communication with stakeholders
5. Clear objectives
6. Project mgr. seemed the most organized and good experience with ORTP
7. Liked that architect was brought in.
8. Jon Wood was the project mgr for Phase 1 when he was with Stewart
9. Grading company was the only major issue with Phase 1
10. Jon seemed very eager and excited about the project.

McGill

1. They did the masterplan and have good experience with this property.
2. Good experience and listed references.
3. Well prepared to do grants and have grant experience.
4. Good with community involvement
5. Ready by 9/2021
6. Creative ideas with grants
7. During Q&A they had a lot of passion about the project
8. They have a good connection with ORTP.
9. They are full service except for architectural work.
10. Knowledge of LWCF/PARTF grants-liked LuAnn's experience
11. No experience with project mgr., Doug Chapman