

MINUTES OF MEETING

**UNIVERSITY PARK RECREATION DISTRICT
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WORKSHOP MEETING**

Tuesday, October 26, 2021

9:30 a.m.

**University Park Varsity Room
7671 The Park Blvd, University Park, FL 34201**

Board Members present at roll call in person or via phone:

James Case	Chairperson
Bill DiPaolo	Vice Chairperson
Steve Ludmerer	Treasurer
Karen Pagano	2nd Vice Chairperson
Sally Dickson	Assistant Secretary

Also, Present in person or via phone:

Vivian Carvalho (via Zoom)	District Manager - PFM Group Consulting LLC
Venessa Ripoll	Assistant District Manager-PFM Group Consulting LLC
Kourtney Dinkins (via phone)	Assistant District Manager-PFM Group Consulting LLC
Mark Barnebey (via phone)	District Counsel- Blalock Walters Law Firm
Curtis Nickerson	Director of Properties & Facilities- Country Club
John Fetsick	General Manager- Country Club
John Tice	GHA (via Zoom)
Various Members of the General Public	(present and via Zoom)

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Organization Matters

Call to Order and Roll Call

The workshop meeting was called to order at 9:39 a.m. by Mr. Case. Ms. Ripoll confirmed quorum to proceed with the meeting. Those in attendance are outlined above.

Public Comments

Mr. Garland urged the Board to reconsider the dimensions of the croquet court. Mr. Garland stated a regulation sized court would allow a more comfortable play, so it was requested the Board add to the current dimensions of the court. Mr. Case stated consideration for the size of the court came from player surveys. Players reported concerns about having the court too close to the pond. There were also engineering concerns, as it pertains to ball protection, that would not permit a competition sized court.

Sherry Smith questioned the cutting of trees around the croquet court. Mr. Nickerson explained the dimensions of the old court as it relates to the dimensions of the new court. If the new court were to increase in size, there would be infrastructure and safety concerns.

Ms. Smith asked Mr. Nickerson to reiterate the dimensions of the court and surrounding area. Mr. Nickerson explained the size of the spaces, specifically the dimensions of the sidewalk.

Ms. Smith asked about storage of equipment. Mr. Nickerson stated they are planning an entirely different construction for storage. The equipment storage will be located along the Fitness Center retaining wall.

Peter Pizzi asked questioned the sign at the entrance not including the phrase "Country Club". Mr. Case stated that "Country Club" is coming off the signs that are controlled by UPCA. The Recreation District will retain two signs on University Parkway that will continue to include "Country Club" in the name of the District.

Sally Dickson confirmed name signing was discussed during the UPCA Marketing meeting and the topic is a part of the rebranding plan. The marketing plan has not yet been presented. Mr. Case stated he is unsure if the UPRD Board has a role in the rebranding decision. Mr. Fetsick asked the Board if they refer to the neighborhood they live as "University Park Country Club". Mr. Case stated University Park is the postal address. The Board is in agreement to be identified as "University Park Country Club". Mr. Ludmerer explained the trademarks for the two names. Mr. Case urged Mr. Pizzi to bring his concerns about naming to the UPCA Board.

Ms. Van Brunt made a comment about providing a safe bike route into the Country Club. Ms. Van Brunt asked the Board to examine the outdoor dining plan and extend the plan in both directions. This would allow for events in the space as membership numbers increase. Mr. DiPaolo asked Ms. Van Brunt about the feasibility of hosting the Art in the Park event in both outside and indoor spaces. Ms. Van Brunt responded the event was successful when hosted inside but would like the option to host the event outside.

There were no other public comments at this time.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion

Update on the Croquet Lawn Construction Project

Mr. Fetsick stated the update has been discussed during the public comment period. Mr. Nickerson explained the project is underway and it may seem like a slow and cumbersome process. The irrigation has been installed with drainage beginning in the next couple of days. There is still 6-8 weeks, with ideal weather, left of construction.

Ms. Van Brunt asked about those who play croquet being members of the club and questioned if there was a way to verify membership. Mr. Fetsick stated there is a fee structure and verification process for all croquet players NOTE: I DO NOT THINK THIS STATEMENT ATTRIBUTED TO MR. FETSICK IS ACCURATE, sd. Mr. Ludmerer stated there should be a few events on the court to grow popularity for membership before charging for a croquet pitch.

Update of the Phase 1 Restaurant Renovation Project

Mr. Fetsick reported that the interior renovation project was making great progress. Several people are checking in with the space renovations throughout the day. Mr. Fetsick outlined items that have been completed within the project and the upcoming work that is set to begin in the next week. The project is on target for the indoor dining renovation to be complete by mid-January and the outdoor dining renovation completed after the high season.

Mr. Case noted he was happy to see two new traffic signs at the entrance to the Country Club. Mr. Fetsick acknowledged the signs are up as a temporary guide for pedestrians and traffic. There are also speed bumps that have been installed and have received mixed reviews from residents. The speed bumps are slowing traffic but are also an eye sore. The addition of a bike rack has been communicated and will be addressed at a future time.

Ms. Pagano asked if delivery of materials for the project were delayed. Mr. Fetsick stated all materials are still on schedule and there were no concerns with receiving materials.

Mr. Fetsick presented two different roof structure renderings to the Board that included a canopy structure and a more permanent roof structure. Specifications and details for both options were presented to the Board. Ms. Dickson questioned the maintenance that would be required for the options. Mr. Fetsick outlined the costs for both options and estimated the cost difference would be approximately \$300,000. The canopy roof options would require more maintenance and would need to be replaced every 8-10 years while the permanent roofing structure would last about 25-30 years before needing replacement. Mr. Tice explained the canopy maintenance details and stated the structure holding up the canopy would outlast the actual canopy.

Mr. Case asked about the insect and climate controls for each option. Mr. Fetsick asked to present all renderings before answering further questions. All renderings were presented and explained to the Board. Mr. Tice stated the canopy structure would transfer more heat than the permanent roof structure. Mr. Fetsick stated shades and insect control can be included in either design. There will be more heat and less lighting with the permanent roof structure.

Mr. Ludmerer asked about including solar panels in the permanent roof structure plans. Mr. Nickerson stated he is working with firms about adding solar panels to other areas in the Country Club and the aesthetics of adding solar panels to the dining renovation poses concerns.

Mr. Ludmerer expressed a concern about capacity of the space and adding seating. Mr. Tice stated either structure would support seat expansion however, he does not support adding seating. Adding seats to the North can become repressive and alter the character of the dining experience. Mr. Fetsick encouraged the Board to think about alternative ways to provide enhanced dining outside of the roof structure.

The Board took a 10-minute recess.

Mr. Case announced the Board will now look at financials for the roofing structure options. Mr. Fetsick presented financials for various projects to the Board. THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT IS NOT ACCURATE! THE CANOPY COST IS ESTIMATED TO BE \$300K LESS EXPENSIVE THAN A PERMANENT ROOF STRUCTURE. \$1 MILLION AND \$1.3 MILLION REFERENCES IN NEXT SENTENCE NEED TO BE DELETED. The canopy cost will be \$1 million dollars while the permanent roof would cost \$1.3M. In totality, depending on the outcome of the roofing structure, the total dining renovation would increase to either \$2.2M or \$2.5M.

Mr. Fetsick presented several other renovation and repair plans where capital funds can be allocated. It was suggested the Pro Shop be relocated to the Varsity Club. A discussion ensued about the potential shortage of capital operating funds. Mr. Fetsick

stated the operational and aspirational goals of the Club will not be supported by current operations. Additional funds will be needed in the next 18-24 months.

Mr. Case asked about the benefit of spending \$300k extra on the permanent roof structure as opposed to the canopy structure. Mr. Tice stated the permanent roof structure would sustain through hurricane wind forces while the canopy may get damaged through hurricane force winds. On an intangible level, the permanent look, feel, and stature of the permanent roof structure is different than the canopy. Mr. Nickerson stated the maintenance of both options are another big factor in the decision. Ms. Pagano stated membership numbers are increasing and the Board should pay more on the onset to help grow membership numbers. The permanent roof structure is not dated, has a cleaner look, and more of what is seen in newer built Clubs. Ms. Dickson stated the canopy look is temporary and has a circus look that would not fit with what is being done on the interior. Mr. Case stated the Board should have a solid explanation of funds spent to justify the spending to residents. Mr. Ludmerer stated that dining is the amenity that is most relevant to residents and putting in an enhanced ambiance in dining space is favorable. Mr. DiPaolo asked if using the extra \$300,000 for the roof structure would impact the completion of the dining project. Mr. Fetsick stated both projects can be done simultaneously. The decisions made now would not prohibit the Pro Shop REDESIGN or relocation. The permanent roof structure can have a lifespan of 3 times more than the canopy. Mr. DiPaolo suggested the Board consider Requests for Proposals to move forward with the Pro Shop relocation. Mr. Ludmerer requested additional information about the Pro Shop to set business goals for the potential revenue for the Pro Shop. There was a question about the potential space use of the Pro Shop. Mr. DiPaolo suggested the Request for Proposals would ultimately answer most of those questions. Mr. Fetsick urged the Board to be prepared to decide on the Pro Shop relocation once the dining renovations are complete to keep the momentum for the completion of projects.

Ms. Dickson asked about the timeline to reveal projects. Mr. Fetsick stated the plans should be presented at the November workshop. The capital expense details will be ready at the next workshop.

Discussion of Supervisor's Roles

There was no discussion.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment



Secretary / Assistant Secretary



Chairperson / Vice Chairperson