

WICOMICO SHORES GOLF COURSE ADVISORY BOARD

August 17, 2005
Meeting Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT: Merrill "Chico" Rivers, Chairperson, Jim Hodges, Vice-Chairperson, Wayne Pettit, Phil Cranford, Robert Richardson and Gloria Tippett.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Rick Smith.

OTHERS ATTENDING: Pat Meyers, Golf Course Manager, Recreation, Parks and Community Services.

CALL TO ORDER

The Wicomico Shores Golf Course (WSGC) Advisory Board meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. at the Maintenance Facility at Wicomico Shores Golf Course.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of August 3, 2005, along with the minutes of tonight's meeting, will be approved during the next WSGC Advisory Board meeting.

GOLF COURSE CLUBHOUSE PROJECT

Chairman Rivers opened the discussion on the Clubhouse project with consideration of the letter of interest process previously discussed with Procurement Manager, Carol Gallagher. He stated that he would like the requirement for a mandatory walk through of the Clubhouse to be included in announcement for the letter of interest. He would like to have at least three qualified firms make presentations to the selection committee. Chairman Rivers did not think the County should put the project out for bid again.

Director Phil Rollins previously outlined in an e-mail message to the Board the process for the letter of interest. First, the County would advertise that it was looking for qualified contractors to either renovate or construct a new facility (to be determined prior to advertising). The County would determine up front and include in the advertisement what qualifications were needed for a contractor to be considered. The County would then review the letters of interest and select the most qualified contractor (perhaps interviewing the top firms before making that decision). After selecting the preferred contractor the County would negotiate a "not to exceed" price for the project based upon the available budget.

Mr. Rollins also provided that this process, while workable within the County Procurement Policy, would only seem to make sense if the building was being done as a design/build project. The advantage of this process is that the County could select a contractor up front based upon their qualifications and work with them to design the building within the budget and then they construct it. The down side is we don't know up front exactly what the renovation or new building (whichever is decided upon) would be. Nor would the construction be competitively bid so we wouldn't know if we're getting the best value for our dollar.

If the Board's recommendation is to renovate the existing building, Ms. Gallagher strongly advises that the County hire an architect up front to design and engineer the work to be done. The architect would be given the budget parameters and told to design the project within that number. The advantages in this scenario are 1) the architect works for the County, not the contractor, and will represent the interests of the County; 2) once designed and engineered and having a set of construction plans in hand, the County can competitively bid the project ensuring the best possible price for the work.

Chairman Rivers stated the architect should design the building within the parameters of the specified dollar amount; if not, he has to go back to the drawing board and do that. He stated that a design/build contractor would make sure his own architect would do that.

Chairman Rivers stated that he thought the Board may want to hold off on voting on the letter of interest option until the

next meeting. Jim Hodges stated that he disagreed with that and should proceed if the group can come to a consensus. Mr. Hodges stated the Board needs to determine the type of project desired (renovation or new building); if renovation, what type of renovation and procedure for selecting a contractor (letter of interest). He stated that the quickest way to get the project done would be to renovate the existing building, keep the current general floor plan, and bring the building up to code.

Wayne Pettit stated that he feels that Board previously voted to renovate the existing building and shouldn't be considering the option of a new building for the letter of interest.

Pat Meyers, Golf Course Manager, stated that if the Board decides to go with the letter of interest, the process to move the project forward would be to present this option to the Board of County Commissioners for approval. Then the advertisement for the letter of interest would specify what the parameters are for the project.

Mr. Hodges stated the letter of interest should say the County is looking for qualified contractors to renovate the Golf Course Clubhouse. The County would determine up front and include in the advertisement what qualifications were needed for a contractor to be considered and require a walk through of the facility. The County would then review the letters of interest and select the most qualified contractor (perhaps interviewing the top firms before making that decision). After selecting the preferred contractor the County would negotiate a "not to exceed" price for the project based upon the available budget.

Phil Cranford stated that the current Golf Course budget can handle the payments on borrowing \$1.2 million for the renovation, with about \$600,000 in the fund balance; that provides for a \$1.8 million project. Ms. Meyers stated that the BOCC parameters were to borrow up to \$1 million with a ten year payback; the Board may also have to ask the BOCC to revisit those parameters.

Jim Hodges motioned, seconded by Phil Cranford, to recommend a letter of interest process where the County would advertise that it was looking for qualified contractors to renovate the Wicomico Shores Golf Course Clubhouse. The County would determine up front and include in the advertisement what qualifications were needed for contractors to be considered. The County will then require a walk through, review the letters of interest and select the most qualified contractor. After selection of the preferred contractor, the County would negotiate a price for the project based upon the available budget. Motion carried 6-0.

Chairman Rivers again stated that if the County hires an architect, they need to design the building within the specified funding limits. Mr. Hodges stated that architectural services are part of the negotiations with the contractor. Mr. Cranford stated that once a contractor is selected, then the parameters for the renovation would be given to the contractor. He said some contractors have their own architects. Chairman Rivers, Mr. Hodges and Mr. Cranford did not agree with the idea of the County hiring an architect for the project.

Mr. Hodges stated that "we need to do something as fast as we can. The fastest and quickest way to get a completed project would be to renovate the existing building as it is." Chairman Rivers stated the project has taken five years so far and he does not want to "rush into something now." Bob Richardson stated that construction prices will just continue to go up. Gloria Tippet stated that "if we can afford it, what's wrong with expanding and making it better than what it is now?"

Ms. Tippet expressed support for bring the building up to code and to renovate and expand on the terrace area upstairs to enable moving the golf pro shop and food operation upstairs. Mr. Pettit was not sure the Golf Course needs the banquet room; Ms. Tippet thought it is needed as a future revenue producer. Chairman Rivers recommended leaving it up to the contractor to determine if all desired renovation/expansion options can be done within the budget.

Mr. Hodges stated that: 1) the existing building should be brought up to code; 2) certain other things should be done if it can be afforded. Mr. Hodges stated that a motion should reflect that the Board recommends Option B, if affordable; if not, then the Board recommends Option A (bring the building up to code only).

Bob Richardson motioned, seconded by Wayne Pettit, to approve the previous Option B, the renovation project to renovate and expand on the terrace area upstairs to enable moving the golf and food operation upstairs.

Motion carried 6-0.

Mr. Pettit recommended that some of the Board members be present for the walk through with contractors.

SCHEDULING OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the WSGC Advisory Board will be held on September 14, 2005.

The meeting concluded at approximately 7:30 P.M.

Kathy Bailey, Recorder