GLENCOE PARK DISTRICT
SPECIAL PROJECTS AND FACILITIES COMMITTEE MEETING
Tuesday, November 6, 2018 | 7:00pm
Takiff Center

Consistent with the requirements of the Illinois Compiled Statutes 5 ILCS 120/1 through 120/6 (Open Meetings Act), notices of this meeting were posted.
Meeting Location:  Takiff Center, 999 Green Bay Road, Glencoe, IL 60022

A G E N D A

I. Call to Order

II. Roll Call

III. Matters from the Public

IV. Discussion on IT Infrastructure

V. Update on Current Year Capital Projects

VI. Discussion on Three Year Capital Projects Plan

VII. Other Business

VIII. Adjournment

The Glencoe Park District is subject to the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Individuals with disabilities who plan to attend this meeting and who require certain accommodations in order to allow them to observe and/or participate in this meeting, or who have questions regarding the accessibility of the meeting or facilities, are asked to contact the Park District at 847-835-3030.
Executive Director Email: lsheppard@glencoeparkdistrict.com
IV. Discussion on IT Infrastructure

Glencoe Park District
November 6, 2018
Special Projects and Facilities Committee Meeting
To: Board of Park Commissioners  
From: Carol Mensinger  
cc: Lisa Sheppard  

Date: October 30, 2018

SUBJECT: Discussion on District’s Information Technology-Moving Forward

In 2012, after careful consideration and analysis, the District staff and Park Board made a commitment to invest in the IT infrastructure and software systems of the District by approving a multi-year System IT Plan. Vacarro Consulting Inc. was hired in May 2012 to evaluate the current systems and configuration, identify IT system requirements, and identify needed system enhancements to enable the District to meet operational and efficiency demands. In doing so, the District made a plan to upgrade existing infrastructure and to convert both the registration and financial software systems. As a result of that analysis, a System IT Plan was approved by the Park Board in August 2012 which identified implementation of hardware and software systems over a five year period. We have now completed those 5 years, and must now look forward to invest future monies to insure a smooth and seamless impact to users of our systems.

In the past year, there has been discussion during both the budget and strategic planning meetings with the Park Board regarding potential savings of moving our software systems to the cloud. As such, staff and Excalibur felt it important to discuss the viability and cost of that option, as compared to the continuing investment in replacement of some of the District’s aging hardware. In moving forward, the implementation decisions of the last five years, can give additional information. The following is a timeline as it relates to the District’s current information technology systems:

- May 2012 – Vacarro Consulting Inc. was hired to provide analysis and recommendation. System IT Plan was approved in August.
- September 2012 – Given the requirements of the newly identified hardware and software systems, Excalibur Technology was hired to replace the current IT maintenance provider/consultant.
- Sept/Oct 2012 – Plan Phase 1-Purchased all new hardware workstations, additional server and switches were purchased; utilized two current servers.
- Oct 2012-Mar 2013 – Plan Phase 2-Purchased on premise version of Rectrac 10.3 registration software system. Internal staff Rectrac Committee created with goal to set-up database and train to implement for first spring registration.
- March 2013 – Successful first lottery registration using the RecTrac and WebTrac systems.
- Oct-Dec 2013 – Plan Phase 3-Analysis on financial software systems, including option of “sharing” system with the Village, which was not feasible and more costly.

- May-Nov 2014 - Purchased new on premise version of Incode 10 financial software system; internal set-up and training, including new chart of accounts.
  - Implemented own mail exchange server which allowed for synchronized email between mobile devices, Outlook and webmail; online archiving and journaling for FOIA requirements.
  - Implemented virtual server which enhanced security and minimized downtime if network issues.

- July 2014 – First real-time registration was conducted. Due to WebTrac setting issues and internet speed, it was problematic. With the assistance of Excalibur who worked with VSI to re-configure and test WebTrac, and the upgrade of Internet speed at Takiff, problems were resolved. No current issues.

- January 2015 – Successful launch of the Incode financial software system

- July 2015 - Upgraded phones to VoIP phones throughout District

- Sept/Oct 2015 - Added Wi-Fi throughout Takiff Center

- April 2016 – Added replication server for disaster recovery purposes. (This was especially helpful in 2018 when to utilize to complete shut down and repair one of the main servers. Allowed beach to remain operational for weekend, which otherwise would have been down.)

- November 2016 – Launched pass system at Watts Ice Center

- May 2017 – Launched pass system at Beach and added POS and credit card at Beach

- February 2018 – Purchased web-based time clock system

In summary, the District has invested approximately $400,000 in the past five years in consulting, hardware including our own mail exchange server and a replication server for disaster recovery, software system for recreation program registration, a financial software system, Wi-Fi throughout Takiff, and integration for real-time processing at remote facilities including Watts Center and the Beach. The District continues to utilize Excalibur to maintain and secure all IT systems, as well as provide consulting/expertise to continue to stay on top of issues.

Given that some of the current infrastructure (i.e. network servers) is now 5 years old, there will be a need to include monies in the next FY19/20 capital budget in Fund 65 to replace and reconfigure the network. Moving forward, staff was directed to look at the option of moving current systems to the cloud as an option to save on eventual replacement, as well as saving on
monthly maintenance costs to maintain infrastructure. Please see the attached spreadsheet for an analysis of the options for moving forward.

In summary:

- The District’s current registration and financial systems are both on premise versions, relatively new, and options to move to the cloud are not offered by VSI and Tyler.

- Costs to move to the cloud including the increase in fiber internet speed and monthly cloud costs outweigh the cost to upgrade the current infrastructure.

- Moving to the cloud for governmental agencies, especially agencies that have already made a commitment to purchase the infrastructure (network, servers, switches, HVAC, back-up generator access, disaster recovery, etc.). is not currently commonplace.
## Scenario: Current Upgrade

### MONTHLY COST:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hosting</th>
<th>PS in 2020</th>
<th>PS / O365</th>
<th>Azure / O365</th>
<th>Full Cloud</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hosting GPD Server</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$583</td>
<td>$583</td>
<td>$731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting GPD AppS01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$492</td>
<td>$492</td>
<td>$731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting GPD-EXCH01 (60 users)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$612</td>
<td>Email Server</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting GPD-DC01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,152</td>
<td>$1,152</td>
<td>$731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPD-MGMT01</td>
<td>Hosting WebTrac + TSS Support</td>
<td>$749</td>
<td>$749</td>
<td>$749</td>
<td>Excalibur Managed Services (Support)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSS for 5 OnPremise servers</td>
<td>$2,495</td>
<td>$2,495</td>
<td>$2,495</td>
<td>$1,996</td>
<td>$1,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O365</td>
<td>$210</td>
<td>$210</td>
<td>$210</td>
<td>Office 365, this would replace Exchange on premise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RecTrac / WebTrac</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>RecTrac/WebTrac fully hosted with VSI (not possible at this point)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incode</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>Incode fully hosted with TylerTech (not possible at this point)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Email Archiving/Backup Solution</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>Office 365 does not include backups of email. This would be done by a different cloud solution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP cost</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd ISP line</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>A 2nd internet connection would be required for failover when everything is hosted/cloud based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total Monthly</td>
<td>$4,744</td>
<td>$4,744</td>
<td>$9,283</td>
<td>$9,330</td>
<td>$8,709</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ONE TIME COST:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAN (7/2014)</td>
<td>$21,249</td>
<td>Device that handles all the data storage for all servers (OS, software, data, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INHOST (01/2016)</td>
<td>$20,499</td>
<td>Failover host that can handle all functionality for productivity in case the main server room has a disaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOST1 (02/2016 and HOST2 (06/2016)</td>
<td>$15,442</td>
<td>Hosts that run VMware (Operating System that makes it possible to run virtual Windows servers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGMT SERVER (03/2017)</td>
<td>$4,224</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDS License PS</td>
<td>$4,785</td>
<td>Microsoft Licensing for running Remote Desktop in case of hosting servers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM LICENSE</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>Licensing to run VMware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCHANGE LICENSE</td>
<td>$4,675</td>
<td>$4,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS OS/SERVER/ CALS</td>
<td>$6,013</td>
<td>$6,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total One-Time</td>
<td>$77,102</td>
<td>$10,688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scenario Notes

- Existing setup with current TSS Diamond maintenance agreement with Excalibur. Excludes TSS for workstations/laptops
- Upgrading aging hardware and upgrading to current software licensing
- Moving current infrastructure to cloud hosting (Excaltech datacenter)
- Moving current infrastructure to cloud hosting and removing email server. Office 365 would be used with a cloud backup solution for O365.
- Moving current infrastructure to cloud hosting and removing email server. Office 365 would be used with a cloud backup solution for O365. This would be hosted with Microsoft Azure.
- Incode and RecTrac would require a cloud based solution, which is not possible at this moment as the vendors are not offering this solution. On premise versions were purchased in 2013 for RecTrac and 2015 for Incode.
V. Updates on Current Year Capital Projects

Glencoe Park District
November 6, 2018
Special Projects and Facilities Committee Meeting
Attached are the project cost tabulations for three 2018 completed capital projects. For detail on the Hacienda Construction cost, refer to the blue tab on the bid tabulation sheet.

- Old Elm Park is complete

- Vernon Park needs a change order to add the installation of a “Glencoe Swing” as requested. This is estimated at a minimum of $10,000. This will use the remaining budgeted funds

- Takiff Parking Lot is almost complete. We just need to install the solar lighting in the “skate park lot” and directional arrows on the pavement.

- Woodlawn is not yet complete so the final costs have yet to be determined. Estimated completion date (weather depending) will be early December.

Any unused funds allocated for projects go back into Fund 69 for future Capital Projects.
# Tabulation of Project Costs

**Date:** 10/22/2018  
**Project:** Old Elm  
**Budget:** $225,000

## Design Costs (Altamanu)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Paid</th>
<th>Due</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design/Civil Engineering/Construction Support</td>
<td>$28,349.21</td>
<td>$598.39</td>
<td>$28,947.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## By Owner Items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Paid</th>
<th>Due</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permitting/Inspection Costs *waived by VoG</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plat of Survey</td>
<td>$1,900.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Borings</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Benches</td>
<td>$1,662.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,662.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>$1,772.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,772.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Cans</td>
<td>$1,346.22</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,346.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park ID Sign</td>
<td>$1,079.98</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,079.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Removal/Maint.</td>
<td>$3,982.50</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,982.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Fountain</td>
<td>$3,608.33</td>
<td>$495.00</td>
<td>$4,103.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Fence</td>
<td>$2,149.48</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,149.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Surface EWF</td>
<td>$2,384.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,384.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental</td>
<td>$4,288.60</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,288.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal Fees</td>
<td>$1,351.41</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,351.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grass Restorations</td>
<td>$1,366.55</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,366.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Plaque</td>
<td>$675.00</td>
<td>$580.00</td>
<td>$1,255.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total Owner Items</strong></td>
<td>$28,641.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total Owner Items:** $28,641.07
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hacienda Construction Costs</th>
<th>Paid</th>
<th>Due</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Bid Construction + Alt 1</td>
<td>$ 120,973.14</td>
<td>$ 19,386.46</td>
<td>$ 140,359.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiated Contract Credit</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ (3,500.00)</td>
<td>$ (3,500.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hacienda Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 136,859.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total All-In Materials/Contractor Cost Old Elm Playground Renovation</th>
<th>$ 194,448.27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget Remaining</td>
<td>$ 30,551.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Tabulation of Project Costs

**Date:** 10/22/2018  
**Project:** Vernon Playground  
**Budget:** $225,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Paid</th>
<th>Due</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design Costs (Altamanu)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Civil Engineering/Construction Support</td>
<td>$28,349.21</td>
<td>$598.39</td>
<td>$28,947.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By Owner Items:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitting /Inspection Costs *waived by VoG</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plat of Survey</td>
<td>$1,450.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Borings</td>
<td>$2,600.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$2,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Benches</td>
<td>$2,294.25</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$2,294.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>$1,772.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,772.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Cans</td>
<td>$1,346.22</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,346.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park ID Sign</td>
<td>$850.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Removal/Maint.</td>
<td>$3,575.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$3,575.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Fountain</td>
<td>$3,799.86</td>
<td>$495.00</td>
<td>$4,294.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Fence</td>
<td>$2,576.60</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$2,576.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Surface EWF</td>
<td>$2,384.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$2,384.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental</td>
<td>$2,644.92</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$2,644.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal Fees</td>
<td>$3,239.45</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$3,239.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grass Restorations</td>
<td>$1,968.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,968.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Plaque</td>
<td>$675.00</td>
<td>$580.00</td>
<td>$1,255.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split Rail Fence</td>
<td>$2,680.66</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$2,680.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perimeter Landscaping (Est)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total Owner Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>$38,930.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total Owner Items:** $38,930.96
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hacienda Construction Costs</th>
<th>Paid</th>
<th>Due</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Bid Construction</td>
<td>$132,625.96</td>
<td>$16,736.22</td>
<td>$149,362.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiated Contract Credit</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$(2,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hacienda Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$147,362.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total All-In Materials/Contractor Cost Vernon Playground Renovation | $215,240.74 |

| Budget Remaining                   | $9,759.26 |
# Tabulation of Project Costs

**Date:** 10/30/2018  
**Project:** Takiff Parking Phase II  
**Budget:** $480,520

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Costs (Altamanu)</th>
<th>Paid</th>
<th>Due</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design/Civil Engineering/Construction Support</td>
<td>$46,111.97</td>
<td>$2,408.03</td>
<td>$48,520.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Owner Items:</th>
<th>Paid</th>
<th>Due</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permitting/Inspection Costs *waived by VoG</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plat of Survey</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Borings</td>
<td>$1,100.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$1,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Docs/Admin Exp.</td>
<td>$458.66</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$458.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Fence</td>
<td>$2,646.93</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$2,646.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total Owner Items</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,205.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbey Paving Construction Costs</th>
<th>Paid</th>
<th>Due</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Bid Construction</td>
<td>$213,768.37</td>
<td>$198,814.04</td>
<td>$412,582.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Tile Removal ADD</td>
<td>$1,089.00</td>
<td>$121.00</td>
<td>$1,210.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 LF 6in Pipe ADD</td>
<td>$1,588.95</td>
<td>$176.55</td>
<td>$1,765.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp. Stripe Lot ADD</td>
<td>$540.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stripe Directional Arrows Est.</td>
<td>$3,200.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$3,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Abbey Fee</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$419,357.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total All-In Materials/Contractor Cost Takiff Parking Phase II</th>
<th>$473,083.50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget Remaining</td>
<td>$7,436.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2017 Glencoe Playgrounds Site Improvements - Bid Analysis

**Glencoe Park District, Glencoe**

Note: All items and quantities as shown on drawings and specs. Any items not listed here are considered incidental to the project. Bidding/performance terms, usage, and conditions herein, if not specified, shall be in accordance with Glencoe Park District's specifications.

#### Old Elm Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Unit Qty</th>
<th>Price/Unit</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Vernon and Jefferson Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Unit Qty</th>
<th>Price/Unit</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**
- Units and quantities as shown on drawings and specs.
- Any items not listed here are considered incidental to the project.
- Bidding/performance terms, usage, and conditions herein, if not specified, shall be in accordance with Glencoe Park District's specifications.
### Wooden Park
#### General Setting
- **Furnish and Install swing set**
  - **Cost:** $5,000.00
- **Excavation, grading, fine grading and fill for site improvements, such as concrete pavement, concrete pad and playground base.**
  - **Cost:** $16,500.00
- **Furnish and Install Concrete Ramp to Lawn Area**
  - **Cost:** $995.00
- **Paving and Surfacing**
  - **Cost:** $46,515.00
- **Utilities**
  - **Cost:** $22,005.00
- **Playground**
  - **Cost:** $17,719.05
- **Playground Equipment**
  - **Cost:** $234,910.80
- **Site Furnishing**
  - **Cost:** $6,300.00

#### Other Costs
- **Subtotal Removals and Site Preparation**
  - **Cost:** $1,995.00
- **Subtotal Paving and Surfacing**
  - **Cost:** $69,530.00
- **Subtotal Utilities**
  - **Cost:** $15,221.25
- **Subtotal Playground**
  - **Cost:** $19,455.73
- **Subtotal Playground Equipment**
  - **Cost:** $229,600.00
- **Subtotal Site Furnishing**
  - **Cost:** $10,125.00

#### Grand Total
- **Total Base Bid:** $605,023.15
- **Total Alternate #1 Bid:** $1,400.00

---

### Woodlawn Park
#### General Setting
- **Furnish and Install swing set**
  - **Cost:** $3,000.00
- **Excavation, grading, fine grading and fill for site improvements, such as concrete pavement, concrete pad and playground base.**
  - **Cost:** $2,489.40
- **Paving and Surfacing**
  - **Cost:** $21,008.70
- **Utilities**
  - **Cost:** $12,700.00
- **Playground**
  - **Cost:** $21,000.00
- **Playground Equipment**
  - **Cost:** $24,350.00
- **Site Furnishing**
  - **Cost:** $21,000.00

#### Other Costs
- **Subtotal Removals and Site Preparation**
  - **Cost:** $5,370.00
- **Subtotal Paving and Surfacing**
  - **Cost:** $192,583.00
- **Subtotal Utilities**
  - **Cost:** $19,450.80
- **Subtotal Playground**
  - **Cost:** $19,455.73
- **Subtotal Playground Equipment**
  - **Cost:** $203,615.00
- **Subtotal Site Furnishing**
  - **Cost:** $15,221.25

#### Grand Total
- **Total Base Bid:** $867,764.00
- **Total Alternate #1 Bid:** $3,640.00

---

### Verona & Jefferson Park
#### General Setting
- **Furnish and Install swing set**
  - **Cost:** $2,580.00
- **Excavation, grading, fine grading and fill for site improvements, such as concrete pavement, concrete pad and playground base.**
  - **Cost:** $2,500.00
- **Furnish and Install Concrete Ramp to Lawn Area**
  - **Cost:** $2,500.00
- **Paving and Surfacing**
  - **Cost:** $24,350.00
- **Utilities**
  - **Cost:** $3,000.00
- **Playground**
  - **Cost:** $30,000.00
- **Playground Equipment**
  - **Cost:** $30,000.00
- **Site Furnishing**
  - **Cost:** $98,000.00

#### Other Costs
- **Subtotal Removals and Site Preparation**
  - **Cost:** $3,640.00
- **Subtotal Paving and Surfacing**
  - **Cost:** $203,615.00
- **Subtotal Utilities**
  - **Cost:** $15,221.25
- **Subtotal Playground**
  - **Cost:** $19,455.73
- **Subtotal Playground Equipment**
  - **Cost:** $276,395.00
- **Subtotal Site Furnishing**
  - **Cost:** $10,125.00

#### Grand Total
- **Total Base Bid:** $1,216,715.00
- **Total Alternate #1 Bid:** $98,000.00
VI. Discussion on Three-Year Capital Projects Plan

Glencoe Park District
November 6, 2018
Special Projects and Facilities Committee Meeting
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
FROM: LISA SHEPPARD, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
SUBJECT: DISCUSSION ON THREE-YEAR CAPITAL PLAN
DATE: 10/31/18

Attached is the updated Summary of Capital Plans based on the discussion from the last Board meeting. The Board needs to continue discussion started at the last committee meeting to reach a consensus for approval by the December Board meeting.

There have been questions from commissioners on various aspects of capital project funding, capital projects, and designs. I felt it best to review all these questions with the entire Board:

What is the annual transfer from Corporate to Fund 65?
The transfer from Corporate to Fund 65 has remained $500k the past 5 years or so. Prior to that it was $450k, and prior to that it was $400k. This transfer is due to the philosophy of using the Corporate tax levy to fund annual capital projects rather than non-referendum debt (i.e. additional costs for interest). We had no such authority after the tax cap. This account typically funds “keeping the lights on” purchases and projects such as roof replacements, vehicle/equipment replacements, plumbing repairs, painting, software updates, flooring, computer replacements, and boilers, etc.

What is the annual transfer from Corporate and Recreation Fund to the Master Plan Capital Fund 69?
Transfers from Corporate and Recreation to Fund 69 are completely based on fund balance levels OVER and above the 50% guideline per our fund balance policy. Annual amounts have NOT been consistent in the past 6 years we have been making the transfer. Below is the history for the past four years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Fund</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Fund</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$1.1 million</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does spending on capital improvements/facilities directly reduce Master Plan Capital Fund 69?
Yes. The funding is contingent on the transfer from Corporate and Recreation Funds. With the rise in minimum wage and potential for property tax freeze, our desire to keep programs affordable as well as increased expectations from the community on excellence in programs and facilities, we can expect that the transfer may not be as high in future years.
Question: If we have money left over from a prior’s year project, do we add that to our future playground projects resources and if so, how does this appear?
We carry over any unused amount to be used for future year Master Plan Capital Projects in Fund 69. Our Fund 69 master plan projects are not totally funded, as shown in the current 3-year Master Plan.

Why do we use a Landscape Architect to design our playgrounds instead of the Playground Manufacturer?
We require a landscape architect/civil engineer to design the park and create the bid package. Manufacturers can only design playground equipment not parks. This can be done when Districts are replacing code compliant infrastructure in existing parks with new equipment or when the playgrounds you are replacing can reuse the existing curbing and sidewalk because it meets the current regulations for fall zones. All of our parks are non-compliant and require redesign to accommodate new equipment and regulations. Manufacturers can’t design drainage, sidewalks, curbs, ADA ramps etc.

Professional design services are required for the following:
- Develop project bid specification/construction documents/CAD Documents
- Apply for MWRD permitting
- Manage the submittal process
- Drainage piping-Village storm water system tie-in details, playground drainage is required by CPSC code
- To design ADA accessible flat work (sidewalks/curbs/ramps)
- Ensure that land grading is designed/executed in a fashion that improves site conditions and does not detract from the park
- To design potable water supply systems (drinking fountain)
- To design a storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPP) as required by law
- To transfer liability to outside firms away from the park district
- To use professional expertise to design a visually appealing project
- To manage supply vendors

The Landscape Architect is design fee is a percentage of what?
- A design fee is a percentage of the total project budget/scope. Project components trigger additional design costs. Experienced landscape architecture firms charge between 10.5%-14% of the total project budget based on size, complexity, owner/community input needs, necessary revisions, and project components. The Glencoe Park District Board interviewed, negotiated and chose the current landscape architect, Altamanu, in 2016.

Can we negotiate equipment with Playground Manufacturers?
Equipment can be purchased in two ways:

1. Equipment is specified by the landscape architect in the legal bid and included in the contractors bid package. The contractor pays for the equipment, manages delivery, and is liable for the condition of the equipment prior to install. The contractor is then responsible if equipment is damaged, delivered/ordered wrong or shipments are incomplete. This is the preferred method for districts that can’t install their own equipment. The legal bid process is required by law.
2. The park district sends out a general RFP for equipment with a fixed budget. Playground suppliers provide designs that meet the criteria of the RFP and the budget. This ensures apples to apples bids, and avoids bid rigging. All manufacturers submit an equipment package that costs the same amount. The park district then purchases the best possible design in the staff/board opinion. The district is then responsible if equipment is damaged, delivered/ordered wrong or shipments are incomplete. This is typically done by Park Districts that install their own playgrounds.

- There is very little to negotiate, as costs are public record and playground companies do not want to undermine the value of their product by charging Districts different prices for the same piece in the same timeframe.

What is the explanation for playground equipment cost (i.e., why does an additional piece cost $30,000)
Difficult to answer, it all depends on the scope of what is asked. For example, a new play area between the existing play areas at Vernon would require design, curbing, drainage, subbase, safety surface, equipment, and install. Most of the cost is labor. If a new piece is added during design the costs can be variable. Typically install costs are 40%. So a piece that can be delivered for $10,000 will cost $14,000 total installed. That’s without curbs, subbase, drainage, design, safety surface and accessibility.

Mini Project Budget 35’x35’ area (1225 square feet):
Assumptions (Adding a piece of equipment during an existing project like Vernon): No additional bonding fees. No connecting sidewalk necessary, bordered by curbs on two sides. Excavated topsoil can be moved onsite (no hauling or certification costs), no barrier fencing required. Small piece of playground equipment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Piece of Playground Equipment</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Drainage 20 LF @ $25.00 ft</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation/Grading Estimate</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion Control Fence</td>
<td>$640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Ramp</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.25 cubic yards stone base $110 CY installed</td>
<td>$1,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GeoFabric</td>
<td>$210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Curb 35ft (estimate) @$30 LF</td>
<td>$1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground Safety Mulch 36.75Cubic Yards</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$22,747</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contractor/Change Order Markup 15% Total Cost  $26,159
Design Fee @ 11.5%  $2,615
Total Install Cost  $28,774
The cement ramps in our playground pods:
1. Are they required?
   Yes. Engineered playground mulch is considered ADA accessible when a ramp is included.

2. Is this paid out of the Special Recreation Fund?
   We have typically paid a portion of each capital project out of Fund 30 (Special Recreation). This covers a portion of the project costs without being specifically tied to one specific component. The historical transfer of approximately $125,000-$150,000 to fund 69 (Master Plan projects) per year covers some of the cost of ADA required elements.

3. Would we expect to see these in all new area playgrounds, what is the cost of one ramp?
   Yes. They have been included in every single project so far that has a wood fiber safety surface. Typically they are more visible on new builds because they haven’t been covered with chips. In this particular bid cycle the park district paid $500 per ramp.

Information on the Takiff playground and the best process to determine the “what and when” for this project:

Why is staff recommending the replacement of this playground next year?
In 2010, the Takiff Community Center playground was built as part of the community center renovation project. Like most of the playground structures in our system, it is a wood playground with an estimated life of 10 years. By law, wood playgrounds can no longer be constructed from chemically treated lumber, outside of playgrounds, treated lumber is an industry standard for outdoor construction. Untreated lumber quickly rots and splinters when exposed to the elements, by constructing the playground of wood there is a significant reduction in the lifespan of the equipment when compared to other construction materials, such as the coated metal/aluminum posts and rubber coated steel decks in use throughout the district’s new playground equipment inventory.

While the playground may look “ok” on the surface, posts have already begun to rot below grade which will eventually impact the integrity of the structure. Additionally, a number of pieces are splintering in the play area. Due to the high volume of use and the original material used for the safety surface, the surface is at its end of life and needs to be replaced within the year. Repairing the surface wear points is not a viable option. The surface has not failed based on use patterns; it has suffered a total material failure across the entire playground.

A playground is a requirement of a DCFS program, so it is imperative that we strategically plan the replacement of this playground and not wait until it has to be removed due to failure or serious safety concerns.

How did we determine the recommended budget amount for this playground?
Below is a breakdown of the original cost for the Takiff playground. Ten years later, the amount we are predicting for a high use playground is not unrealistic. In addition, we now have more children and younger ages using the playground due to our recent Children Circle expansion.
Takiff Community Center Playground Actual Cost Breakdown:
(This does not include professional fees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excavating</td>
<td>$15,096</td>
<td>PR Grading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>$94,594</td>
<td>County Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>$26,864</td>
<td>Vacala Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>$5,865</td>
<td>Benson Electric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground Package</td>
<td>$322,448</td>
<td>Great Lakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$464,867</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shade Structure – added in 2013</td>
<td>$16,795</td>
<td>Cost does not include installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$481,662</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shouldn’t ELC, CC and GJK pay for this playground since they are the prime users?
Children Circle Full Day Preschool, ELC, and GJK have been contributing the Recreation fund balance, and as such Fund 69 for years. These three programs meet all their direct expense, and also contribute to the indirect expenses associated with running the program, such as Takiff Facility repairs/improvements, utilities, cleaning, etc. while still adding fund balance for the eventual replacement of the playground at Takiff. Below is the net surplus that has added to the Recreation fund balance for the last four years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>FY14/15</th>
<th>FY15/16</th>
<th>FY16/17</th>
<th>FY17/18</th>
<th>Total By Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Circle Daycare</td>
<td>$170,204</td>
<td>$154,418</td>
<td>$171,379</td>
<td>$226,616</td>
<td>$722,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELC</td>
<td>$172,154</td>
<td>$185,747</td>
<td>$191,357</td>
<td>$169,121</td>
<td>$718,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJK</td>
<td>$180,339</td>
<td>$196,868</td>
<td>$160,649</td>
<td>$169,662</td>
<td>$707,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total – Program Surplus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2,148,514</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How will we determine what is in this Playground?
• As this playground serves primarily as a program space, the first step is to develop an understanding of the programmatic need of the space. This is not just a community or neighborhood park, the design must reflect the needs of the programs that use the space.
  o Quantify the current use of the space, future use?
  o How does the current space function, what works well, what doesn’t?
  o Will our new design accommodate future growth, changing program/community needs?
  o How can we make the space easier to manage from a maintenance perspective, program perspective, parent/community access?
  o How does this play space differ from other parks? Surfacing, frequency of use, type of use, parent expectations?
  o Age of users? This playground was originally designed for youth 2 – 5 and now we need to consider elements for younger children as well.

We will utilize our landscape architects to work with staff including ELC, CC, GJK, and Board representatives to give input for design elements. We will set a “not to exceed budget amount.” The landscape architects will then develop a plan in cooperation with Chris and me based on the above criteria and input. They will provide a couple of designs for review. The designs will then be presented to the community, parents, and Board for feedback.
How do our costs compare to published reports of other area playgrounds?
That is a difficult question to answer due to the many variables that go into playground design and how they are publishing their final cost. For example, Winnetka Park District has a landscape architect on staff. Do they figure in that staff member’s salary and benefit costs into the overall cost of the playground? Are they just replacing equipment in an area that meets all other CPSC codes? What type of equipment are they purchasing, do they include other elements in their published reports such as benches, mulch, staff time, etc.? If a Board member sees a published report, please forward it on so I can ascertain if all those intangibles are in the report.

What is the reason the GB Linear path came in at 800K? Is it ½ mile?
- Actually, the 800K amount was given in error because the demolition and excavation costs were listed separately due to how it was displayed for the OSLAD grant. The amount for the trail estimate was $845,665 and excavation and site work was $362,406 for a total of 1.2 million. It is based on the square footage identified in the master plan process and the expenses necessary to make adjustments in the intersections. As the intersections are all part of the public sidewalk, improvements have to be done in hardscape that is ADA accessible. These costs are based off real construction estimates. The trail is ½ mile long, is 31,000 square feet of trail, and crosses seven streets each with two unique intersections. This is a very large jobsite, which has triggered additional costs; estimates include $40k in construction fencing alone.

Is the Village responsible for the improvements to roads/crosswalks and does this include drainage?
- The Village would not be responsible for changes at the intersections, this is park improvement. The Village is responsible for maintaining the existing sidewalk and intersections, these improvements are specifically related to the trail system. While the Village could pay for the improvements, they are not obligated to. They are not obligated to even allow the Park District to make these intersection improvements.
- The estimates include everything necessary for a turnkey project including drainage.

How is cost impacted by alternative design of path that involves tree saving measures?
- Anywhere that root aeration is included increases the costs. Alternate path routing in Sculpture Park could save between 20k-50k. Currently, root aeration is estimated at $150,000 in the project scope.

Why did it come in at 40% more than the original estimate?
- There was no original construction estimate; the number in the capital plan was a budget place holder to allocate funding to the project. An estimate cannot be created without a scope of project. No scope existed before the site’s master plan process.
The image contains a document page with a table and text describing the proposed 3-year Master Plan for Lakeshore Park in Chicago. The table outlines various projects, estimated funding, and other financial details. Here is the table content in a plain text format:

### Proposed 3YR Master Plan - Staff Recommendation

**Estimated Beginning Balance, 3/1/xx**: $2,480,432

**Proposed Funding Sources:**
- Transfer from Corp Fund: $150,000
- Transfer from Recreation Fund: $250,000
- Transfer from Impact Fund: $24,040
- Donations: $10,100
- Sale of Linden house: TBD
- Interest income: $925
- Annual ADA monies - Special Recreation Fund: $150,000
- New bonds (Non-Referendum - Watts Debt retire 12/1/2020): TBD

**Total Funds Available**: $3,065,497

**Projects To Be Funded:**

- **Design Services-Dog Park (for potential donor)**: $15,307
- **Central Park/Berlin Project**: $824,593
- **Shelton Park Playground**: $263,856
- **Kalk Park Project**: $279,504
- **Watts BB Court Project**: $9,823
- **Design Services-Astor Park**: $3,246
- **Design Services-Lakefront**: $1,383
- **Design Services-West Playground Renewal**: $16,105
- **Design Services-Takiff Parking Lot**: $1,102
- **ADA Monies-Special Recreation Fund**: $150,000

**Playground - West School (approved base bid/design svc)**:
- Less: SD 35 contribution: $506,076
- Less: SD 35 contribution for Alternates 1, 2, and 3: $165,805

**Playground - Astor Place (appvd bid/design svc/owner items)**: $162,987

**Fitness Center including Fitness Equipment**: $392,821

**Lakewood Park Improvements - sold for this year - wait for geotech**: $130,000

**Takiff Parking - Phase A,B,C**: $637,495

**Takiff Parking-UST**: $40,435

**Beach Geotech and LT Maintenance Plan - moved from 18/19**: $951

**Shelton Pathway (grading and minor drainage)**: $20,000

**Playground Replacement - Lincoln & Crescent**: $2,160

**Playground Replacement - Vernon and Jefferson**: $21,267

**Playground Replacement - Old Elm (Behind Takiff)**: $19,117

**Takiff Parking Lot-Phase D**: $9,102

**Playground Replacement - Woodlawn**: $41,520

**Secret Garden Park and WLC Park Retaining Walls**: $200,000

**Lakefront - North Scheman Overlook**: $315,000

**Lakefront - Center/South Bluff**: $302,000

**Lakefront - Halfway House**: $156,000

**Lakefront - Tennis Court**: $150,000

**Lakefront Park Entry/Pathways**: $1,250,000

**Bluff and Beach Surface Water Management**: $265,000

**Pier Replacement**: TBD

**Beach House Improvements**: TBD

**Park Maintenance Garage**: $3,000,000

**Watts Ice Rink/Board Replacement**: $300,000

**Old Green Bay Linear Parks - Trail**: $65,000

**Old Green Bay Linear Parks - Other Components**: $1,208,000

**Replacement Skate Park**: $1,000,000

**Kalk Park - Phase 2**: $350,000

**Sports Fields at West Park**: $300,000

**Sports Fields at Watts Park**: $400,000

**Park Areas That Retain Water**: TBD

**Lighted Tennis Court**: TBD

**Contingency**: $2,945

**Design Fees for the FOLLOWING Year Projects**: $100,000

**Design Fees Old Green Bay Linear Parks**: $250,000

**Annual - ADA Improvements, per ADA Transition Plan**: $100,000

**Annual Takiff Roof Sinking Fund - replacement in 2026**: $50,000

**Feasibility Study-Fundraiser**: $25,000

**Fundraiser Consultant-Annual, if feasibility study warrants**: $45,000

**Dog Park**: TBD

**North Field (Takiff) Athletic Field**: TBD

**Total Projects**: $1,564,928

**Ending balance, 2/28/xx**: $1,500,569