

Lake Park Friends Minutes: Special Board Meeting

Tuesday, June 29, 2010 • 5:00 p.m. • Location: **Warming House**

Present: Jim Cope, Mary Richards, BG Hook, Steve Duback, Steve Morse, Tom Cheney, Phil Schultz, Anne Booth, Alice Wilson, Jennifer Grasse, Sarah Zimmerman, Dennis Buettner, Brian Hansen, Ann Wollmer (Administrator)

Excused: Brian Desplaines, Susanna Mortara, Katie West

- The meeting was called to order at 5:09 p.m.
- Approval of June 8th minutes was carried over to the next regular meeting.
- Performance Structure Presentation: James Dallman of the La Dallman firm
Mr. Dallman distributed an estimated budget for the project. He noted that he, Grace La, and Eric Walsh have been working on the performance stage design since the beginning. Tom Cheney gave a brief recap of the genesis of the project with a \$100,000 grant and the process of issuing a request for proposals and hiring an architectural firm. The main criteria for the project were cost, value added to the park, appropriateness of the design for the park, and durability. The initial budget set out in the RFP was \$90,000 including architectural fees.

Steve Duback asked what has caused the budget to swell from \$90,000 to \$150,000.

Mr. Dallman noted that the roof covering (cladding) and roof structure and install alone total \$70,000 and stated that during the design process, all parties together arrived at a design that required a higher budget. Mr. Dallman presented slides of the site to show the history of the project and the evolution to the current proposed design.

About eight performers could fit underneath the covered portion with instruments. La Dallman explored fabric for the cladding, but it was expensive and didn't seem durable enough to be worth the investment. They considered the acoustic properties of the different coverings. Translucence is a goal for the cladding. Glass was considered but would not fit the County's criteria. The team is now considering high-quality polycarbonate, which is a plastic that is highly resistant to cracking but can be scratched. If it extends near the ground, it will be vulnerable to graffiti. In that case it could be replaced but not repaired. La Dallman would recommend we choose a less transparent version which wouldn't show scratches as well. The polycarbonate should be low maintenance material (except in case of severe damage).

The wood structure would probably be cedar because it weathers well: it could be given a clear finish and allowed to gray out. The pieces will be composed of laminate layers and glued together, which will strengthen them. A poured concrete platform is the most cost-effective way to do the stage. Colored concrete is possible but more expensive.

The width/depth of the steps at the front was discussed: they should not be so deep that people feel too far from the performers.

The question of viewing from the side and the angle toward the stage were discussed.

All aspects can be tweaked.

Projected timeline: once there's a complete set of documents and the bidding process is over, two to four months. Bidding would take four weeks or so. Approval on the other hand is a wild card.

Mr. Dallman was asked how firm the budget numbers are. The roof structure and install is the firmest number, and three bidders have already come in close to it. The structural engineering bid is firm as well.

Mr. Dallman displayed options for addressing the risk of climbing: (1) bring latticework part up completely; (2) bring up partially and use hoops (but both are not as structurally sound); (3) concrete walls with the dome sitting above it; (4) incorporate different materials in lattice structure; (5) use filter to reduce hand-hold potential; (6) close off lattice spaces on lower section; (7) vegetation to keep people naturally away from the edge; (8) asymmetrical design with concrete bottom portion on the West and an open portion with stilts on the East.

Mr. Dallman showed another simple structure on columns that overhangs a playspace at Milwaukee Montessori, which is another direction we could go.

Mr. Dallman wrapped up at 6:17 p.m. After a break, the board reconvened at 6:29 p.m. Phil Schultz posed the questions (1) do we like the design and (2) are we willing to allocate unrestricted funds or do additional fundraising to build it. A number of directors expressed reservations about the contemporary nature of the design, while others expressed the view that selecting a contemporary design is appropriate. Those members of the board who were present appeared approximately split as to whether we should proceed with the current design at the estimated price.

It was noted that Mr. Dallman only presented one design at the beginning of the project, rather than presenting numerous options with different costs, with no design that fit our budget. However, other architects presented more traditional structures at the time they were bidding for the project, and we chose La Dallman with the notion that they would be more creative in the design of the structure. The donor representative likes the design and is willing to wait if we want to raise additional funds.

It was noted we have about \$130,000 in unrestricted funds. What upcoming projects are competing for our funds? The playground might not cost us much, unlike what we thought, because of the \$350,000 the County is putting into it.

Phil Schultz suggested that Tom Cheney should go back to La Dallman and ask them to put the project on hold. The board agreed with this approach. The board also agreed to explore other design options for the performance structure.

Tom moved we pay the outstanding \$2500 bill from La Dallman, Steve Duback seconded, and the motion carried unopposed.

Sarah Zimmerman moved to adjourn the meeting, Brian Hansen seconded, and the motion carried unopposed.

- The meeting was adjourned at 7:27 p.m.