

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
PARK & RECREATION BOARD
MINUTES – APRIL 9, 2013

The regular meeting of the Park & Recreation Board of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on April 9, 2013. Chairman Fritchey called the meeting to order at 8:00 p.m.

Those present:

Park & Recreation Board: David Fritchey, Chairman
Patricia Bunn, Secretary
Dave Gordon, Member
Dave Malinowski, Member

Others: Terry Fedorchak, Township Manager
Donna Liney, Park & Recreation Director
Kristin Tyler, Supervisor Liaison

Absent: Fran McDonald, Vice Chairman Park & Rec Board
Andrew Newbon, Member Park & Rec Board
Dennis Wysocki, Member Park & Rec Board

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Gordon moved, Mr. Malinowski seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of March 12, 2013 as written.

DISCUSSION OF BID AWARD FOR SAMOST TRACT BALLFIELD
CONSTRUCTION

Ms. Judy Goldstein and Ms. Maryellen Saylor, Township engineers, were present. Mr. Fritchey stated one of the concerns that has arisen is about the slope of the fields going from foul line to foul line. He stated there is some concern that the slope shown is more than they would like to have. He stated looking at the corners of the large field there is 161.25 in the left field corner and 172.80 in the right field corner, and it is a developing consensus that they want to reduce that if possible from a 10' to 11' grade down to possibly a 7' grade. He stated there are a number of options for this, and he understands that this can probably be done as a grading Change Order. Mr. Fritchey stated there are also a number of Bid Alternatives that have been outlined for the Township including water service, parking lot paving, walking paths, landscaping, site amenities, etc.; and they should discuss these. He stated there are also PAA representatives present this evening who he feels would like to discuss what they feel would be the most important Alternates.

Ms. Goldstein stated in addition to proceeding with the Base Bid itself, they would also recommend incorporating two items from Bid Alternate. One is under #5 – Site Amenities and would be spreading the topsoil in the amount of \$9,600. The other is the 3” electrical conduit for the parking lot and security lighting for future lighting that might go in. She stated it would be prudent to put the conduit in at the time of construction at a cost of \$17,500. She stated they would also recommend Bid Alternate #6, the porous asphalt walking path, at a cost of \$8,592.

Ms. Goldstein stated the reason they are not recommending the other Alternates was because there were trying to get the cost down to something reasonable for the Township yet incorporate the basics that are needed for the fields. She stated they were also considering being practical. She particularly noted paving the parking lot is not necessary at this time since they are not going to be playing on the fields this year so there is no reason why this could not wait until the Township does the Paving Bid for next year when they could take advantage of the quantity and cost and do it at a future time since it would not impact the playability of the fields or the usability of the Park. She stated this cost was over \$100,000.

Mr. Fritchey asked how much it would cost to do the Change Order on grading.

Ms. Goldstein stated after doing some quick calculations if they changed the grade foul pole to foul pole to a 1 ½% slope it would be a grade change foul pole to foul pole of 6.75’ which would mean they would take one corner down 1.125’ and one corner up 1.125’ although they would still have to look at the cut and fill. She stated there will be some increase because of the additional fill most likely. She stated at 1.125’ it should not be too much to grade that.

Ms. Bunn stated there are drainage problems on Field #3 and at 1 ½% it will be relatively flat so that there will not be proper drainage. She stated proper drainage is 2% for grass. Ms. Goldstein stated while she agrees with Ms. Bunn, the apparent low bidder is a company that they have dealt with in the past; and they are “artists” on their equipment, and she has seen them grade at 1%. She stated she has gone back to their projects twenty years later, and they are still draining and playing well. Ms. Bunn stated there are problems with drainage currently at the Township fields. Mr. Fritchey stated he is concerned about a field tilting 10’ from one foul line to the other. Ms. Bunn stated while she understands this, you will not see it at 2%. She stated 2% over 400’ is not a problem. Mr. Fritchey stated he went to the field and it was very noticeable. Ms. Goldstein stated she agrees that 2% is good for drainage; but in this case, she would not argue about not having 2% because it is a good contractor.

Mr. Greg Caiola, PAA, stated they would like more details from Ms. Bunn about what the impact would be on the grading when they try to make the field look more equal. He stated if there is a slight difference between the right and left field, that is understandable; but they do not want to get it to a point where it negatively impacts the drainage. Ms. Bunn stated when they built Macclesfield, it was flat; but this is not a flat site, and they are trying to push a ball field on a non-flat site. She stated there are drainage problems at Roelofs and on Fields #2 and #3, and now they are trying to make this new field be on a flat site when it is not. She stated there is clay on the site, and she wants to caution everyone since she does not want them to be in a situation where they come back to the engineer with complaints about the flat fields not draining.

Mr. Fritchey stated there is a considerable amount of grading that will be going on.

Mr. Bob Smith, PAA, asked what was the percentage of grade of the outfield in the original Bid, and Ms. Goldstein stated in the Bid Plans they were just over 2%; and they did a little sketch in the office at 1.99%; and in the proposal they just discussed the large field would be 1 ½% and the small field would be 1 ¾%. Mr. Smith stated some members of PAA had looked at the Plans and expressed concern with the slope from left field to right field being too much. He stated they all understand that there are drainage problems, and they do not want flat fields that do not drain. He stated he feels somewhere between there is too much slope and flat fields that do not drain, lies the answer. Ms. Goldstein stated 2% is a comfortable slope on grass for drainage. She stated on ball fields with good contractors, they can grade as flat as 1%. She stated there is soil that is not as “friendly” for drainage in some areas, but somewhere there is a happy medium. She stated what is on the plans works from an engineering standpoint, meets all of the standards for Cal Ripken and Babe Ruth, and adheres to the design principles.

Ms. Bunn stated where they have built the ball fields previously it was virgin soil, but this area being discussion has been used for a mulch pile for years, and there is compacted soil that will not drain as well.

Ms. Tyler asked if they checked the grade on the existing Stoddard Fields, and Ms. Saylor stated they are relatively flat. Mr. Fritchey stated they are certainly not 2%. After reviewing the Plan, Ms. Goldstein stated she feels they are less than 1%. Mr. Fritchey stated the Girls Softball fields are a little more sloped, but he does not feel it is 2% there either. Ms. Goldstein stated she can get figures on these fields.

Mr. Smith stated they wanted to get to a point where there is not too much slope, but they do not want insufficient drainage. Ms. Tyler stated while it is good they have a great contractor, she feels they need to have a margin of error; and they should determine where it should be between 1% and 2%. Ms. Goldstein stated it should be something greater than 1% recognizing that 2% would be ideal for drainage but not ideal for

playability on the field. Mr. Fritchey stated they need to strike a balance between drainage and playability. Mr. Fritchey stated he feels 1.5% is a happy medium, and Ms. Goldstein agreed.

Mr. Fritchey stated Ms. Liney provided something from the Internet about standards of landscaping and design. He stated there was a question about the standard slope for a college baseball field, and the answer was the standard outfield slope is no less than 1% and no greater than 2.5% slope away from the diamond – not across wise. Ms. Bunn stated they cannot achieve this because of the topography of the land. Mr. Fritchey stated the point is that in terms of playability, 1 ½% is reasonable; and he feels it is a reasonable compromise for drainage purposes.

With regard to the warning tracks, Ms. Goldstein stated the Plan has the Cal Ripken recommendation of 15' which she feels is far. She stated she feels 10' would be better for playability, and Mr. Fritchey agreed. Ms. Goldstein stated this would be a Change Order which would be a deduction and not an addition.

Ms. Tyler asked for an estimate of the cost of the grade change; but Ms. Goldstein stated she did not have that figure, although she noted they will be coming up in one part and down in the other, so it will not be as great if they were just filling more on one side.

The Park & Recreation Board were in favor of including the conduit as recommended by Ms. Goldstein.

Ms Goldstein stated they are recommending that they defer the landscaping since there could be donations or other methods to get the landscaping in. She stated this does also not effect the playability of the fields, and it can be added later.

Mr. Malinowski asked about the water service; and Mr. Caiola stated they do want this, and PAA did discuss this and indicated that if there was something they felt was critical, they would be willing to pay for this. He stated he would like to discuss this with Mr. Fedorchak. Mr. Fritchey stated it appears this would cost approximately \$20,000.

Mr. Caiola stated he does agree with the Bid Alternates being recommended to be included. He asked about bleachers, and Ms. Liney stated the Township usually pays for amenities on the fields so she feels they would pick up the bleachers and the bases. Ms. Goldstein stated there is the difference between the Township picking up part of the Bid. She stated the Bid is what the contractor is responsible for; and if the Township wanted to do this, they could purchase them at a much greater savings than having the contractor purchase them and put them in. Ms. Goldstein stated this is why they are not recommending that it be part of the Bid itself. Ms. Goldstein stated they also do not need to purchase them in the first year while the grass is growing.

Mr. Caiola stated they are appreciative of having the opportunity to come to the meetings and work with the Township. He stated they want to see a finished product that will result in two great fields. He stated they appreciate the give and take and having the opportunity to come in and discuss this project with the Township.

Ms. Goldstein stated if the Township directs them to do a Change Order for the grade change, it will not be a lengthy process or effect the time schedule. She stated this will be an internal Change Order if they are authorized to do this.

Mr. Caiola asked about the back stop. He stated he understands that 24' is the minimum standard, and there was discussion about it being a little bit higher because of safety issues. Ms. Goldstein stated a 30' back stop was used at Macclesfield Park because of the adjacent parking; but at this location there is no parking adjacent to it, and they feel the 24' back stop is adequate. She stated if they go to 24' rather than 30', it would be a cost savings of \$23,000. A number of people questioned why the 30' back stop was so much more expensive, and Ms. Goldstein stated the 30' back stop is customized with a whole different design and support structure.

Mr. Caiola asked about the use of the less expensive in-field mix; and Ms. Goldstein stated they are not changing the mix, rather there was an error in the unit cost by the apparent low bidder and it will take it down even lower once corrected. She stated they are already the low bidder even without the correction. Ms. Saylor stated they will be using the product that was requested in the Bid.

Mr. Fritchey stated there will infield drains on both fields, and Ms. Goldstein agreed.

Ms. Tyler asked if they are requesting that the water be part of the Base Bid or is it being done at a later date. She stated she felt the contractor would have to come and water the grass for a period of time until the Township takes over. Ms. Goldstein stated the contractor is required to provide their own water for the period of the warranty. She stated if the Township has water, they could tell the contractor that they can use the water; however, the Bid included bringing water in. Ms. Goldstein stated the water is for the Township's long-term maintenance of the fields, and it is not needed for the first maintenance period of the Contract; but there should be some means to water the fields in the future. She stated trucking water in is not a long-term solution. Mr. Fedorchak stated he would like to have the time to look at whether it is feasible to have a well on the property. He stated he does not feel PAA will want to pay the water bill after they start watering the fields in a few years, and the Township may have to pay this expense.

Ms. Goldstein stated once you start watering a field, the field becomes dependent on water. Mr. Malinowski stated they do need water for long-term maintenance of the field; however, Mr. Fedorchak stated the issue is whether it is going to be a well or a public water supply.

Ms. Tyler stated they also need to consider when they are going to put the water in. She stated it would not have to be done during the build because the contractor is required to water the grass. Mr. Smith asked if it would be more cost effective to put in the water lines when they are doing the grading and the general construction; and Ms. Goldstein stated the water line does not have to traverse the actual playing field, so it is not a problem to put the water line in later and trench it, and this is done all the time.

Mr. Fedorchak stated he will work with the Township engineers and then report back to the Board of Supervisors.

SUPERVISOR LIAISON'S REPORT

Ms. Tyler stated at the last Board of Supervisors' meeting, they authorized pursuing the Associate Membership for the Pool. She stated Ms. Liney laid out very clearly the continuing drop in the membership, and the problems they face going forward.

Ms. Tyler stated they are working on the software program to be prepared to accept the Associate Memberships. She stated the Board unanimously approved that there could be an Associate Family Membership when sponsored by a Member Family. Ms. Liney stated they will e-mail all Pool Members by the end of this week or early next week and invite them to participate in this program. Ms. Tyler stated they are also considering other ways to market the Pool.

There being no further business, Mr. Malinowski moved, Mr. Gordon seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Patricia Bunn, Secretary