

PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT
Micco Park Referendum Committee
Regular Meeting
January 17, 2002

A Regular Meeting of the Parks and Recreation Department Micco Park Referendum Committee was held on Thursday, January 17, 2002 at 7:00 p.m. at the South Mainland Community Center, 3700 Allen Avenue, Micco, FL.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Bill McCready
Ken Tworoger
Diane McCauly
Albert Malerk
Robin Tibbits

MEMBERS ABSENT

Cynthia Slick
Ed Arens

STAFF ATTENDING

Karen Palus, South Area Parks Operations Manager
Denny Bert, Park Supervisor I
Tina Webster, Administrative Secretary

PUBLIC

David Perry, Ivey Harris & Walls (IHW)
Scott Toschlog, IHW
Allen Thorn
Helen Gustafson
Helen Boyd
Lynn Stieglitz
Woody Wagner
Ruby & Wally Kramer
Pat & Ed Lohman
Bruce McMann
Harriet & Robert Washer
Chris & Ron Jaworski
Vicki & Jerry Benoit

CALL TO ORDER:

Mr. Tworoger, Vice-Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:08 p.m. due to the absence of Mr. Arens, Chairman.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Tworoger informed the committee that a change had been made to the minutes since originally distributed to the members. The second page, last four lines is where the changes were made per a conversation between Mr. Tworoger and Ms. Webster. Ms. McCauley made a **MOTION** to approve the minutes with the change as presented. Ms. Tibbits seconded. **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

Mr. Malerk asked if the minutes were being e-mailed because he did not receive any e-mail. Mr. Tworoger mentioned that he was unable to correspond with Mr. Malerk by e-mail because it did not go through and Ms. Webster had the same comment, however she said she would check his mailing address to make sure he receives the information by mail as well.

STAFF REPORTS:

Ms. Palus provided the Committee with calendars as a thank you to their continued service on the committee. Ms. Palus informed the committee that Cynthia Slick resigned from the committee and if the members knew anyone interested in serving to have them contact the South Area Parks office. Mr. Tworoger asked if the committee would vote on the new member. Ms. Palus replied that the South Area Advisory Board appointed the members and she would check to see if there was an alternate selection for Cynthia Slick first.

OLD BUSINESS:

Project Review:

Mr. Perry provided the committee with a plan to review and discuss. He gave a general overview of the existing park mentioning that the man-made lake needs to be addressed. He showed the committee where all the existing elements are. Mr. Perry noted that he took the feedback as discussed at the last meeting and came up with a design for the committee to review, discuss and/or approve. He discussed mitigating the existing pond; it will be filled in due to safety issues. One desire was to increase the canopy of trees throughout the park, which the plan includes, to give the park a more welcoming entrance. Some of the existing canopy will remain in various areas of the

MINUTES APPROVED 3/21/02

park. He noted that the parking lot had been re-organized to develop a more structured area. Removed the fence all the way down to corner of the where the courts are. The courts will be fenced in and the entrance of the park will be a formal gated entrance. Once you've entered through the formal entrance, there are trees that go all the way to the back of the site. Discussion ensued regarding the ballfield. The ballfield could be designed to be a formal diamond or left open, completely grassed and used as a multi-use area. Mr. Perry recommended leaving the area grass to be utilized as a multi-use area and stressed the importance of lowering maintenance issues. Right now the park is just one large open area, so the A&E firm designated activity areas by adding large berms as spacial delineators with a height of about 3' to 4' feet. The playground has been moved; created a designated area of about 80'x100' and it is surrounded by benches and trees. Mr. Perry created a similar opened gathering area north of the playground area; maximized the walking path throughout the park. Discussed the existing basketball court. Mentioned that due to the costs of repairing the courts, the A&E firm re-designed a new court and added a tennis court. The courts will be fenced and accessible by gate. Discussion ensued regarding lighting the tennis courts. Mr. Perry mentioned that the courts were located at the front of the park to allow the courts to be lighted without lighting the rest of the park. The rest of the park would be closed off by a fence and not accessible at night. Mr. Perry noted that they did not propose putting up a new fence around the peripheral of the park. Discussed the placement of the proposed 40x60 pavilion in the designated activity area, north of the playground. This area can be used for many different activities. The pavilion would have tables that can be moved, in order to use the pavilion as a stage of some sort, etc. The restroom facility has been pushed back into the berm area to alleviate the focal point being on the restroom.

Mr. Perry discussed storm water retention in the park. Right now there is no other storm water retention area besides the parking area on the site. He noted that the final design will need some sort of storm water retention. The only areas that we will have to accommodate storm water for are the parking areas and the sport courts; the balance of everything else can be handled with swales.

Mr. Perry asked if anyone had any questions at this time. There was a question regarding vehicle access through the entrance way to the pavilion by the sidewalk. Mr. Perry mentioned that it is possible but not recommended due to irrigation and things like that. Someone questioned putting in another pavilion. Mr. Perry apologized; there is a small 20x20 pavilion in the northeast corner of the plan and there are picnic tables scattered throughout the park. More pavilion or picnic tables could be added in the future if funds are available. A public member stated that three elements that exist in the park now had been eliminated: volleyball nets, horseshoe pits, and backstop. Mr. Perry replied that the committee members did not express the need for those items; however the volleyball nets and horseshoe pits could be easily incorporated back into the park. Mr. Perry noted that the field seemed to have minimal usage, so from a design standpoint, the firm did not prioritize a backstop for the field; trying to create more of a multi-use type area. Mr. Tworoger asked how many cars the firm anticipated would park in the lot and there is a concern about the surface area since the Sebastian River is right across street. Mr. Perry, right now it is hard to tell how many parking spaces are there currently, however the firm has designed it to provide for up to 35 parking spaces. Once again, it is a community park. The carrying capacity is dictated by the park. The parking could be increased, but would require moving elements around within the park. Mr. Perry asked if the parking lot is usually full. The response was, not on a daily basis only during big events (about 2-3 times a year). Mr. Perry recommended not designing the parking for one or two events per year. The current plan is sufficient for this type of park. The surface must meet all the storm water retention requirements. The Water Management District requires the water to be pre-treated before it leaves the site. The A&E firm does not believe there is enough impervious surface designed in the park to have to send water off site; should be able to naturally percolate on site. Mr. Perry proposed using the stabilized shell rock for the surfacing. The sport court areas are going to be a concrete surface, but did not anticipate ever having to pump water off the site. There is a canal which could be used for the run off if needed.

Mr. Dillard asked if there was enough room to have the proposed ballfield in the proposed location. Mr. Perry stated that the field meets all youth ballfield play standards and is almost identical to the current ballfield. It is required to meet a minimum of 300' or more if the firm was going to put in a peripheral walkway and there is more than enough room to meet that requirement. The current field is not big enough for older children and baseball play.

Ms. McCauley asked about the trees and irrigation of the trees. Mr. Perry noted that all the landscaping will be designed within the park to be low maintenance. He is proposing shrub material; would like to re-install native palms, live oaks (native trees/plants) to reduce the maintenance issues required with a lot of irrigation. Irrigation will need to be done and the firm will provide the irrigation plan for the final design. Right now, there is very little irrigation and it is not effective for the proposed park. Mr. Tworoger asked if the firm had a ballpark figure of the cost for the design. Mr. Perry replied yes, but the cost is still being massaged. Mr. Perry noted that the firm didn't anticipate having to build a new basketball court. The cost at this point does not include lights. Mr. Tworoger asked that if the ballfield is made into a multi-use field, would it provide a savings or an additional expense. Mr. Perry replied that there would be a little bit of savings if the committee decides to go with the multi-use field and the maintenance would be less as well. Discussion ensued regarding the landscaping. It was asked why there is only one tennis court rather than two. Mr. Perry stated that the committee discussed that and by past experience, tennis courts are one of the most underutilized elements of a park. They are costly in regards to the maintenance of them as well, but there is room to add one more if that is what the committee would like to do now or maybe in the future if the need is present. It was asked what the surface of the walking path would be. Mr. Perry answered by saying that the paths are designed to be compacted with shell rock and to be more of a passive use area, not to be utilized for inline rollerblading or bikes; designed for walking. Playground surfacing was discussed. The committee will determine the surfacing element for the playground which must meet ADA requirements. The different options to do this would be to use wood fiber mulch and/or poured-in-place rubberized surfacing. There was a request to have some type of wooden floor for dancers, etc. Mr. Perry stated that that has not been considered at this time. The design for the pavilions is for a wide range of users which is accessible by using concrete floors. Ms. McCauley stated that the committee did discuss having an open field area to be able to bring in portable stages and the pavilion would have electric accessibility. It was stated that there is currently a large Live Oak and it was asked what would happen to the tree. Mr. Perry noted that it would have to be evaluated as a budget standpoint to the relocation of that tree. The way the plan is now, the tree would need to be relocated. It was asked if there would be any place for overflow parking and where access from the entry for overflow would be. Mr. Perry, from a maintenance standpoint, he would not recommend driving vehicles into the park due to irrigation and the deterioration of the sidewalk over time; it would destroy the

interior of the park. Ms. Palus replied that the County does not permit that type of activity in the parks. Ms. McCauley suggested that the car show be held at the South Mainland Community Center parking lot rather than Micco Park to alleviate that.

Mr. McCready thought the plan was pretty, but stated that it seems the A&E firm is just moving things around and using up the Referendum funds. A master plan has been in place for many years and Mr. McCready provided a copy of the original plan for everyone to see. Mr. McCready explained the work that has been done in the park in the past years and was not happy with the proposed location of the ballfield. Discussion ensued.

It was asked the width of the paths throughout the park. Mr. Perry answered that the main path is about 10' and the others are about 5'; all the paths are ADA accessible and meet all the standard requirements.

A suggestion was made to put in some type of water fountain for the kids to play in. Mr. Perry informed the public that the committee reviewed a video and material on water amenities. Due to the large maintenance costs and water quality issues, the committee decided not to pursue this type of activity. The funds are not available in the Referendum for this, but the committee could decide to do this in the future should funds come available.

It was mentioned that many of the oaks are loaded with mistletoe, which kills the trees. It was asked what the size of the proposed trees will be. Mr. Perry replied that the trees would vary in size, but along the primary walkway they will be a minimum of 100 gallon trees with a minimum height of fourteen feet. The peripheral trees will be randomly sized; could be anywhere from two to fourteen feet tall.

It was suggested that the ballfield would be softball only. Mr. Perry replied that the field has been sized to accommodate only youth play and with a multi-use it could accommodate many different activities. It was also suggested to provide an additional entrance into the park due to traffic being backed up to get into the park.

A question was asked regarding the time frame for the project. Ms. Palus stated that it is up to the committee. Once the committee approves the plan, the County will then move forward with the technical review and send the committee's recommendation to the South Area Advisory Board and Board of County Commissioners. Will then bring the plan back to the committee with actual costs and make sure everything is ok. If the plan is approved tonight and can move forward, it may take a minimum of about 5-6 months to go through all the reviews and permitting and then about 6 months of construction in which the park would be closed. Discussion ensued regarding the maintenance of tennis courts and the costs of the standard restroom facility.

Mr. McCready asked where the water was going to come from to water the trees. Mr. Perry re-iterated that irrigation would be designed to fit the landscaping of the park and a well would be dug to accommodate the facility. Mr. McCready asked where the funds will come from for the maintenance of the facility. The Referendum also included the operation of the facilities.

PUBLIC INPUT:

A suggestion was made to move the playground and pavilion/open area to the proposed ballfield location and leave the existing ball field where it is. Mr. Perry informed the committee that filling the pond requires that no structure is to be placed upon the old pond area. You can however, put an open multi-use grass area and walkway in that area, but no structures, which is why the plan has been designed in this matter. Mr. Perry also mentioned that one reason the active activities were moved to the other side of the park was to have minimal impact on the residents moving into the area.

It was asked what is going to happen to the mural currently in the park. Ms. Palus mentioned that the committee will need to decide what they want to do with the mural; it currently does not fit into the new design of the restroom.

A public member has a concern with the current fencing. He believes it is inadequate and suggested putting up a 6foot high fence in the southeastern corner of the park. Mr. Perry mentioned that the fence could be addressed if the funds are available, but right now the first thing that has to be addressed is the elements inside the park and then the fencing could be addressed if funds allow. Ms. Palus mentioned that the County would like to see the fence replaced as well. She introduced Denny Bert as the Park Supervisor I for Micco Park.

There was a concern by a member of the public of having more activity on the side of the residents. Mr. Perry mentioned that the berm would provide a buffer and the children that the area would attract, would more than likely not be taller than the berm.

Mr. Malerk voiced his opinion of the project. His thoughts were: the park is losing the \$680,000; getting less parking; no stage; no electrical improvements; looks like exercise trail is shorter; no volleyball court; no horseshoe pits; all oaks trees will be gone; used to have two children areas and now only one; don't see any swings; Lose park during construction; feels there won't be coverage in regards to the pavilions; don't have secure fence, should have 8 foot fence.

Mr. Perry and Ms. Palus stated that everything Mr. Malerk just discussed is elements that are proposed in the plan. The committee decided to eliminate the exercise stations, but can always be added back in if it is a need, same as the volleyball courts. Mr. Perry mentioned that the horseshoe pits will be added to the plan and apologized for not having them in there now. The committee will have to prioritize where the funds will best be spent. Mr. Tworoger noted that the proposed parking lot is not fenced and is concerned about leaving the parking lot open during the night time. Mr. Perry mentioned that a gate could be put up, but the goal was to make the park more welcoming.

There was a suggestion to bring the plan to the Micco Homeowners Association. Ms. McCauley noted that she attends the Micco Homeowners Association and there is not a big attendance. These meetings are publicized and the meetings are open to the public. Where are the people if they are concerned about this park?

Discussion ensued regarding putting in benches around tennis courts, whether a backstop is needed or not, and lighting. Ms. McCauley expressed that she felt the A&E firm did a great job with the plan.

Mr. Tworoger stated that it was his understanding that the proposal was to not light the park. Ms. Palus replied, that according to past conversations of this committee was to not light the ballfield, however it has not been discussed about lighting the tennis courts and that is something the committee would need to decide. Mr. Tworoger raised a concern that if we light the tennis courts it would also light the basketball courts as well. Mr. Perry informed the committee that it depends on how the lighting is installed. There will be a little bit of spillage, but there will be a fence in between the two. Mr. Tworoger asked about deferring the decision to install lights on the tennis court is a possibility. Ms. Palus stated that the committee could decide to do that, however if the funds are not spent now for the lights and are wanted in the future, the funds may not be available. It was mentioned that tennis players typically play in the evening. Mr. Perry mentioned that the tennis courts were proposed where they are with the ability to light the courts without affecting the rest of the park. Mr. Tworoger stated that he was concerned that utilization of the courts at night may cause noise, etc. Mr. Perry mentioned that tennis was not a loud sport and it is really up to the committee to decide how they want to proceed. Mr. Tworoger asked how late the tennis courts would be available. Ms. Palus stated that most facilities go off about 10:00 p.m., but for this facility a timer could be placed on the lights to go off at 9:00 p.m. if that is what the committee wanted to do.

Mr. McCready asked about a ballfield going in at South Mainland Community Center-Micco. Ms. Palus noted that at this time, it doesn't look like a field will be possible due to the environmental issues.

Mr. Tworoger restated that the proposal would be to approve this plan, it would have a multi-purpose field rather than a baseball diamond, no lighting for the park other than the possibility of lighting the tennis courts and security lights, with the idea that the park would continue to close at dusk with the possible exception of the tennis courts subject to further consideration. Mr. Tworoger asked how many members of the public favored the proposal as just stated and how many oppose. One opposed. Ms. McCauley made a **MOTION** to approve the plan with the playfield not a baseball field with clay and the lighting could be deferred on the tennis court and no lighting in the park, the park continue to close at dusk, except for security lighting. Discussion ensued about lighting the tennis courts and where the elements came from. It was emphasized that the elements in the plan were based on the discussion and goal and objectives of the committee. Ms. McCauley restated her motion and Mr. Tworoger interrupted and said, "with the understanding that there will be an all purpose field, not a baseball diamond, there will be no lighting in the park other than security lighting with the exception of tennis court lighting which will be available with a timer to be utilized until 9:00 p.m.. Ms. Palus asked if Ms. McCauley concurred with that information and she replied yes. Mr. Tworoger seconded the motion. **MOTION PASSES 3-2.** Discussion of having the gates locked at night for the parking lot.

Ms. McCauley made a **MOTION** to leave the name of the multi-purpose field as McCready Field. Mr. Malerk seconded the motion. **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

ADJOURNMENT:

There was no further business to discuss. Ms. McCauley made a **MOTION** to adjourn and Mr. Malerk seconded. **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.** The meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.