



Recreation Advisory Group

Erin McDowell - Chair, Rohit Nanda - Vice-Chair, Michael Polacek, Tommy Johns
Michael Pappas, Stacey Clarke, Jordan Childress, Harold Layton

Meeting Agenda

November 10, 2025 | 8:00 AM
10 Planterra Way

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Pledge of Allegiance**
3. **Announcements**
4. **Presentations**
 - A. Kedron Fieldhouse Pool Structure Update
 - B. Meade Pickleball Facility construction update
 - C. Meade and PAC L.E.D. light project update
 - D. Special Events Update
 - E. GRPA Annual Conference update
5. **Public Comment**
6. **Agenda Changes**
7. **Minutes**
8. **Old Agenda Items**
9. **New Agenda Items**
10. **Public Hearings**
11. **Member/Staff Topics**
12. **Adjourn**

It is the policy of the City of Peachtree City that all city-sponsored public meetings and events are accessible to people with disabilities and are in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. If you need assistance in participating in this meeting or event due to a disability as defined under the ADA or need assistance per Title VI, please contact the City's Title VI and ADA Coordinator, Dr. Teaa Allston-Bing at (770) 632-4276 or e-mail tallston-bing@peachtree-city.org at least three (3) business days before the scheduled meeting or event to request an accommodation.

This agenda is subject to change at any time up to 24 hours prior to the scheduled meeting.

This meeting will be held in the Recreation Admin. Conference Room

RAG Meeting Minutes

Date: September 8, 2025

Location: Community Room

Time: 8:00 AM

Committee members present: Erin McDowell, Rohit Nanda, Michael Polacek, Stacey Clarke, and Tommy Johnson. Mike Pappas was absent. Recreation and Special Events Director Harold Layton, Assistant Recreation and Special Events Director Michelle Johnson, and Assistant City Manager Chris Hobby were also in attendance. Scott George (Design Consultant) joined as well.

1. Opening

- **Pledge of Allegiance**
-

2. Meeting Procedure Update

- **Harold Layton** proposed moving **Public Comments** to occur **after presentations but before voting** to ensure informed decision-making.
 - Motion was made and **approved unanimously**.
-

3. Approval of Previous Minutes

- **August 2025 Meeting Minutes** were reviewed and **approved**.
-

4. Agenda Item A: Battery Way Conceptual Drawings

Presenter: Harold Layton

- Presented conceptual designs for upgrades to **Battery Way Park**, including:
 - Bathroom installation
 - Parking redesign with added island
 - Shift of amenities toward playground
 - ADA compliance
- Discussion points:

- **Tommy Johns:** Asked about boat ramp turning radius and if swings would be removed.
- **Stacey Clarke:** Questioned truck access.
- Harold clarified the plans are **conceptual**, not final.

Public Comments:

- **Resident (unidentified):**
 - Concerned about bathrooms attracting lingering visitors.
 - Noted increased police calls due to people staying after dark and parking in yards.
 - Requested **resident survey** before moving forward.
- **David Kettlehut:**
 - Opposed to bathrooms; believes it's a **neighborhood park**.
 - Concerned about loss of cart path increasing traffic.
 - Reported public safety incidents and lack of playground upgrades.
 - Concerned about use by out-of-county visitors.
- Additional discussion on:
 - Pincrest Boat Ramp
 - Portable toilets vs permanent facilities
 - Golf cart-only parking
 - Proposal to distribute a **community survey**

Motion:

- Committee **motioned and approved** to move forward with **concept approval, pending further community input**.

5. Agenda Item B: Meade Pickleball Design Discussion

Presenter: Scott George, Tarkett Sports

- Introduced **design plans** for 18 pickleball courts with:
 - Championship courts
 - Shade structures, lights, walkways
 - ADA parking and stormwater management
 - Budget:
 - Base: \$1.3 million
 - Approved Budget: \$1.6 million
 - Optional Upgrades:
 - Canopies: \$59,000
 - 4ft fencing: \$130,000
 - Lighting: \$94,212
 - Alternates: \$57,500
 - 10% contingency included

Discussion:

- **Stacey Clarke:** Asked about potential rental costs.
- **Tommy Johns:** Suggested reducing costs via **private sponsorships**.
- **Chris Hobby:** Noted difficulty in securing private funding in the past.
- **Blue Cole:** Emphasized engaging local businesses for support.

Public Comments (summarized due to audio issues/transcription quality):

- **Commenter 1:**
 - Emphasized outdoor pickleball popularity despite weather challenges.
 - Noted empty courts are usually due to extreme heat; otherwise well-used.
 - Urged support for outdoor courts with **shade options**.
- **Commenter 2 (Marketing & Architectural Background):**
 - Advocated for **functional and family-friendly design**, not extravagant.
 - Suggested use of **flexible, attractive shade structures** instead of costly or prison-like fencing.
 - Highlighted importance of creating a **welcoming environment** for youth and families.
 - Offered help in the **collaborative design process**.
- **John Riley:**
 - Asked questions regarding **foliage and landscaping**.
 - Encouraged thoughtful visual appeal and community-centric design.

Public Comments (continued):

- A resident with a background in **marketing and architecture** stressed the need for:
 - A **family-friendly, community-focused** facility.
 - Avoiding an overly industrial or prison-like appearance.
 - Emphasized using **simple design solutions** such as:
 - Partial shade canopies using fabric and arch structures.
 - Incorporating fences with aesthetic and functional purposes.
 - Suggested rethinking space use to prioritize **function over flashiness**.
 - Requested **collaboration** between city and residents, offering to assist voluntarily.
 - Expressed concern about visual clutter like **zip-tied banners** and harsh fencing.
- **John Riley**, identified as a librarian, asked questions about:
 - **Foliage** and the need for shading and barrier landscaping.
 - Grading concerns and the impact of terrain on design feasibility.
 - Encouraged **re-examination of layout** with possible westward shift of courts and parking.
 - Asked if alternate configurations could reduce cost and better serve the community.

Committee and Staff Discussion

- **Scott George (Tarkett Sports)** responded to feedback:
 - Acknowledged **grade challenges** in the current layout, particularly with moving courts westward.
 - Noted that changes could require **significant additional grading**, impacting cost.
 - Existing flat outfield space is limited; moving courts or parking may conflict with **natural slope and drainage areas**.
 - If **parking is shifted or reduced**, it could open up **space for championship courts** or gathering areas, but at a trade-off.
 - Committee members debated:
 - Whether to **keep the current layout** or adjust based on community feedback.
 - The impact of possibly removing or relocating the **championship court**.
 - Whether costs could be better managed by **phasing construction**, delaying upgrades, or reducing fencing/canopy features.
-

Key Considerations Raised

- **Community concerns** centered on:
 - Heat and shade: importance of shade for usability in hot months.
 - Accessibility: ensuring ADA parking and nearby access points.
 - Flexibility: desire for **multi-purpose community space** beyond just pickleball.
 - Aesthetics: avoiding a harsh, overbuilt feel—seeking **welcoming, community-integrated design**.
 - Youth engagement: creating a safe, social, outdoor space for teenagers.
 - Parking efficiency and event accommodation.
-

Design Revision Plans & Next Steps

- The committee agreed not to vote on the current design due to:
 - **Outstanding concerns** about layout, grading, and costs.
 - Lack of clarity on **alternative configurations**.
- **Action Items:**
 1. **Scott George** to:
 - Explore **alternate design options**, including westward shift of championship court.
 - Reassess parking layouts and shade structure placements.
 - Consider **reduction of fencing costs**.
 - Prepare updated visuals or proposals by **Thursday**, in time for potential inclusion on the **next council agenda**.
 2. **Committee members** to:
 - **Visit the site** within the next week to re-evaluate layout feasibility.
 - **Email feedback** to staff or Scott George before final revisions.

- 3. **Public input** remains open via email to incorporate additional community feedback.
- No formal vote was taken; item tabled pending revised proposal.

Continued Discussion: Agenda Item B – Meade Pickleball Design (Part 2)

Community & Committee Feedback Summary (Continued)

- An **email thread** is actively circulating among committee members and the public to consolidate suggestions and concerns. Committee members encouraged participants to **finalize comments by Monday** to allow design updates to move forward.
 - Clarification sought on whether the **championship court** will be included in the next version. The **design team confirmed yes**, pending feedback and cost analysis.
 - Some community members **expressed skepticism about the need** for a championship court, noting that:
 - Many casual players wouldn't benefit directly.
 - Funds might be better allocated toward **shade structures, gathering areas, or basic improvements**.
 - The project should prioritize everyday use over tournament aesthetics.
 - Several alternatives and construction issues discussed:
 - Use of **10x10 shade structures**, fencing materials, and their impact on cost and liability.
 - It was clarified that **attaching shade fabric directly to fences is not standard practice** due to safety and windload issues. Any such addition would need engineered supports, increasing costs.
 - Committee requested **pricing estimates for multiple layout options**, including:
 - Removing or relocating the championship court.
 - Reducing or eliminating some fencing.
 - Shifting courts westward and relocating parking.
 - Final notes emphasized:
 - The importance of maintaining a **welcoming and functional community space**.
 - Need for **quick turnaround** on design updates to remain aligned with the **next City Council meeting schedule**.
-

New Discussion: City Policy on Field Use & Sports Associations

Topic Raised: Fayette Hockey Club Request

- The **Fayette Hockey Club (FHC)** has expressed interest in **practicing on city fields**.
 - They are **not currently an official city-affiliated association**.

- The city maintains a **longstanding policy**: if a sport is already served by an existing association, **no competing group is allowed to run programs** using city facilities.
- Discussion Summary:
 - The city's **existing hockey program**, managed by the **Peachtree City Hockey Association**, offers:
 - Recreational programs
 - Travel programs
 - All-Star teams
 - Allowing another organization (like FHC) to operate concurrently would:
 - Create **conflict and competition** for limited field time and space.
 - Potentially **dilute volunteer resources** and **undermine program quality**.
 - Open the door for multiple conflicting requests from **outside travel organizations**.
- Clarified that:
 - **One-off or occasional rentals** may be considered.
 - However, **recurring rentals** or practice schedules are **not permitted** for unaffiliated groups.
 - The city already receives **numerous weekly requests** from outside travel teams wanting to rent fields, which are routinely denied.
- Several committee members strongly **advocated for maintaining current policy**, noting:
 - The city's **youth sports model relies heavily on volunteers** and consistent structure.
 - Opening access to outside organizations could create an **unsustainable model**.
 - Volunteers and citizens have **built successful, respected programs** that should not be jeopardized by conflicting interests.
- Additional points:
 - Concern over FHC possibly **leveraging the existing city-rec association as a proxy** for field access.
 - Emphasis placed on **preserving long-term relationships** and **community-centered values** over short-term gains.
 - Noted that **new sports** like cricket and lacrosse are growing, but space remains limited.

Next Steps & Recommendations

- **Pickleball Design:**
 - **Revised design concepts** and **updated pricing** to be shared with the committee by Thursday.
 - Committee members and community are encouraged to **visit the site and review current layout** before making final decisions.
 - Feedback via **email welcomed through Monday** to finalize preferred options.
- **Sports Association Policy:**

- Staff will **review FHC request** in context of existing policy.
- No policy changes recommended at this time.
- Committee consensus leans toward **preserving the current single-association model** to protect existing programs and infrastructure.

Continued Discussion: Association Policy & Fayette Hockey Club Request

Community Comments & Testimonies

- Multiple **current and former association members, volunteers, and citizens** voiced strong concerns about allowing **Fayette Hockey Club (FHC)** to become an official city-associated group.
- Key concerns and perspectives included:
 - The city's **current hockey association (PHC)** was not informed or consulted prior to FHC approaching City Council.
 - Allegations that FHC originated as a response to **disciplinary action** against a coach previously involved in PHC.
 - Historical evidence was provided showing that **travel hockey has long existed under PHC**, contradicting FHC's claim that no travel hockey was available.
 - The claim that FHC represents a **splinter group** of the existing organization rather than a completely new initiative.
 - Emphasis placed on preserving the **developmental pathway** for youth athletes: from recreational to travel within **a unified structure**, not fractured by multiple competing groups.
 - Allowing competing associations would damage the city's existing, well-functioning **youth sports ecosystem**, which relies heavily on volunteers, shared scheduling, and long-standing relationships.

Broader Context from Other Sports

- Comments from members of the **soccer** and **softball** communities echoed the same sentiment:
 - **Development-focused** programs with a clear path to competitive play exist and are working well.

- Introducing outside groups, especially travel-focused ones, would **commercialize youth sports**, reduce access, and **erode community-based development**.
 - The model followed by **Peachtree City Athletics** has successfully served generations, and there's a strong desire to **preserve it**.
 - One community member also highlighted the **financial strain** associated with travel sports and the risk of **excluding lower-income families** if priorities shift away from city-backed recreational programs.
-

Motion & Outcome: Fayette Hockey Club Request

Motion Made:

To **deny Fayette Hockey Club's request** to become a recognized city sports association, in alignment with the city's **longstanding policy** of supporting one association per sport, and to continue working through existing partnerships.

- The motion included a **recommendation to Council** that:
 - The policy of **one official association per sport** remains in effect.
 - City staff do **not facilitate recurring rentals or field time** for outside or competing organizations.
 - Disputes among volunteers or internal members should be **handled within the associations**, not by city intervention.

Discussion & Clarification:

- The committee noted that:
 - The City Council will ultimately make the final decision.
 - A **formal written policy** on association exclusivity and recurring field rentals should be developed for future clarity.
 - A **RAG representative** will attend the next Council meeting to present the committee's stance.

Vote:

Motion passed.

Final Business Items

Facility Change for Future Meetings

- Due to upcoming **renovations at City Hall**, the committee will begin meeting at the **Recreation Administration Building** (Tennis Center).
 - Adequate seating and accessibility are available (ramp access; no elevator).
 - The next **immediate meeting will still be at City Hall**, with future meetings transitioning to the new location.

Other Updates:

- Staff will be attending the **National Recreation and Parks Association Conference** in Orlando next week to explore new ideas, especially for **playgrounds and golf facilities**.

Closing & Public Comment

- Community members were encouraged to:
 - Send additional feedback via email to **City Council**, which is then shared with the committee.
 - Stay engaged in the upcoming Council discussions about field use and association policies.

Adjournment

- Motion to adjourn passed.
- Meeting concluded with thanks to all attendees for their time, input, and continued support of community recreation.

Recreation Advisory Group (RAG)

Meeting Minutes

Date: September 15, 2025

Time: 8:00 AM

Location: City Hall / Hybrid (Microsoft Teams)

1. Call to Order

- Pledge of Allegiance
 - Meeting called to order at 8:00 AM.
 - In attendance: Committee members Erin McDowell, Rohit Nanda, Michael Polacek, Stacey Clarke, and Tommy Johnson. Mike Pappas was absent. Recreation and Special Events Director Harold Layton, Assistant Recreation and Special Events Director Michelle Johnson, and Assistant City Manager Chris Hobby were also in attendance. Scott George (Design Consultant) joined via Teams.
-

2. Topic: Pickleball Complex Final Design Review

2.1. Presentation by Scott George

- Scott joined virtually and presented an updated **site design layout** for the **18-court pickleball complex**.
- Updates were made based on feedback from the last RAG meeting, including:
 - Enhanced entryway concept for a "**destination feel**".
 - Modifications to court spacing, fencing, and gathering areas.

2.2. Design Highlights

- **18 Courts Total**, with flexibility to scale up/down as needed.
- **Championship Court** located in the **NW corner**, with immediate access to parking.
- Removal of **East-side parking lot**; **West-side lot** to remain.
- **Player/social areas** between courts for spectating, relaxing, and staging.
- Improved **sightlines** and **aesthetic integration** into the surrounding landscape.

2.3. Branding & Sponsorship Options

- Courts can be customized with:
 - **Branded wind screens** for advertising/naming rights.

- **Custom painted logos** outside court surfaces (additional cost).
- These features support **potential revenue generation** via sponsorship.

3. Sound Mitigation Strategy

- A **question was raised** previously about noise impact.
- Updated design includes:
 - **8-foot sound barrier fencing** along the **East side** of the facility.
 - Reduces sound transmission by approximately **25 decibels**.
 - Example: If normal court sound is 60dB, only 35dB transmits through the fence.
 - Fence design uses **denser materials and wind-load rated posts** for durability and effectiveness.

4. Design Summary Recap

Feature	Notes
Court Count	18 (flexible based on budget and future growth)
Parking	Consolidated to West side; East lot removed for space optimization
Championship Court	NW Corner with premium access and viewing area
Entry Feature	Destination-style signage and landscaping planned
Fencing	6ft standard; 8ft sound fencing on East side
Shaded Areas	Added at West sidewalk and near courts for player comfort
Advertising Options	Wind screens, court naming rights, painted logos

5. Discussion

- RAG members expressed **general support** for the direction of the final design.
- Questions were asked regarding:
 - **Maintenance needs** of custom logos (Scott confirmed low upkeep).
 - **Cost differentials** between standard and sound-mitigating fencing.
 - Future **phasing** if funding is delayed (Scott confirmed modular court construction is possible).
- Recommendation made to ensure **accessibility** is factored into all sidewalks and entry areas.

4. Continued: Pickleball Complex Design Updates

4.1. Sound Mitigation and Fence Modifications

- East-side **sound panel fencing** confirmed at **8 feet** tall.
- **Double-knuckle fencing** will be used between courts to eliminate sharp edges and improve safety.
- **Optional 8-ft fencing** around the full perimeter is available as an **upgrade**.
 - Default remains 6-ft where appropriate.
 - 8-ft fencing helps contain balls and reduce noise impact.

4.2. Gates

- **Seven gates added** total for ball retrieval and improved flow:
 - Three gates along the **north side** for easy exit and ball retrieval.
 - One **dedicated gate** added at the **championship court** for direct parking access.
-

4.3. Site Features & Cost Breakdown

East Sidewalk & Steps

- Sidewalk connects from parking lot down to court level.
- Grade change requires **4 small steps** adjacent to an **existing shade structure**.
- All elements are **ADA-compliant** with alternative access ramps.

Entrance Plaza & Signage

- A new **20-foot-wide entrance plaza** included for aesthetics and visitor staging.
- **Signage and landscaping allowance: \$50,000**.
 - Final design TBD — may include monument sign, lighting, seasonal landscaping.

Benches

- **16 benches** proposed (one per court).
 - Durable materials for outdoor use included in the pricing model.
-

4.4. Construction Budget Overview

Item	Cost Estimate
Base Complex	\$2.5 million
Optional Features (sound fencing, signage, benches, etc.)	+\$200,000
Total (with contingencies)	\$2.7 million

Contingency includes allowances for signage, landscaping, alternate fencing, and unforeseen site conditions.

4.5. Comments & Discussion

- **Committee Member (Name not recorded):**
 - Requested clarification on the **east stair location** and **existing structures**.
 - Scott confirmed stairs are adjacent to an **existing shade pavilion** near grade drop.
 - **General Committee Feedback:**
 - Positive reception to revisions.
 - Appreciation for **collaborative design process** and **citizen input**.
 - Project viewed as a **destination-level venue** that could generate:
 - Tourism
 - Tournament traffic
 - Sponsorship revenue
 - Community pride
-

5. Motion

A motion was introduced to:

Support the final pickleball complex design as presented, including the current layout, optional sound fencing on the east side, entrance plaza, and budget estimate

of \$2.7 million, with recommendations for the City to move forward with next steps toward funding, bidding, and construction.

6.1. Community & Economic Impact

- Committee members and public attendees expressed **strong appreciation** for:
 - The **City's responsiveness** to community feedback.
 - The evolving **collaborative relationship** between the Pickleball Association, City staff, and RAG.
- A member emphasized the **economic potential** of the project to support **local restaurants and small businesses**, especially during tournaments and events.
- Multiple comments echoed that the complex could become an **“anchor facility”** that contributes to city tourism and visibility.

"This is the kind of project that brings people into the city—and keeps them coming back."

6.2. Advertising & Sponsorship Opportunities

- **Sound barrier windscreens** were praised for their **dual role**:
 - Reducing noise for nearby residents.
 - Providing **ad space** for sponsors and local businesses.
- Corporate logo integration was also discussed, with flexibility in placement (windscreens, fences, or painted court edges).
- Past **sponsorship successes** cited from:
 - Soccer fields
 - Special events
 - Monthly city partnerships (e.g., Kawasaki, Ortho clinics)

"There's a real opportunity here to recover some costs through strategic sponsorships."

6.3. Design Clarifications

- It was clarified that:
 - **Shade structures** were a **top priority** for most community respondents.
 - **Championship court** continues to be a highlight and a differentiator for tournament-level play.
 - Additional **gates** were added for better access, but some members questioned if **reducing the number of gates** (especially along the bottom/north side) might help reduce costs.
-

6.4. Budget Review & Value Engineering

- **Concerns were raised** regarding being over the original budget estimate.
 - Original base: ~\$2.5M
 - New estimate (with options, contingency): ~\$2.7M
- The \$70,000 **owner’s contingency** was emphasized as a **flexible reserve** — not necessarily to be spent, but available for:
 - Final landscaping
 - Signage
 - Additional refinement post-construction
- Multiple committee members agreed:

“We only get one shot — so let’s do it right.”

- However, others voiced interest in:
 - **Reevaluating smaller cost items**, such as number of gates or benches.
 - **Optionalizing shade structures** or confirming community willingness to fundraise or sponsor them directly.

7.1. Balancing Cost and Community Input

- It was acknowledged that **every added element** in the final design stemmed from **direct citizen feedback**, including:
 - Championship court
 - Additional gates for ball retrieval
 - Expanded shade and seating
 - Enhanced signage and entrance plaza

“Every item was requested by the public. So when we talk about scaling back, we need to acknowledge that those are things people asked for.”

- Committee members voiced the **importance of being fiscally responsible**, especially given inflation and competing projects.

“It’s our job to find that balance — to be respectful of the budget, but also honor the public’s voice.”

7.2. Suggested Approach: Good / Better / Best Options

Several members supported presenting **tiered recommendations** to City Council:

- **Option A (Base Plan)**
 - Includes 16 courts, parking, base fencing, and infrastructure.
 - ~ **\$1.3M**

- **Option B (Enhanced Plan – “Better”)**
 - Adds sound barriers, some shade, limited signage, and benches.
 - ~ **\$2.0M** (estimated)
- **Option C (Full Plan – “Best”)**
 - Includes championship court, full 20-ft entrance plaza, extended shade, sponsorship elements, and additional gates.
 - ~ **\$2.5M – \$2.7M**

“We did this with the splash pad project too — present three levels and let Council weigh in on the best value at this time.”

7.3. Budget Clarifications from City Staff

City staff clarified key funding elements:

- This project is funded via **SPLOST** (Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax).
- The **pickleball project has its own budget** approved by voters.
- **Contingency funds** and **excess revenue** from higher-than-expected collections are available **without impacting other projects**.
- Any **unused funds** remain available for future projects within the same voter-approved SPLOST category.

“We’ve completed nearly every project voters approved — and we still have contingency funding available. This is a well-positioned project.”

7.4. Broader Vision and Master Plan Alignment

- Members emphasized that this project aligns with the broader **Southside Revitalization Plan**, including:
 - Previous investments in the splash pad
 - Playground upgrades
 - Future walking trails and community features

“We’re not just building courts — we’re building a regional destination and a community anchor for the Southside.”

7.5. Potential Areas for Cost Trimming (if needed)

The following were discussed as areas that **could be removed or delayed**, if Council sought to reduce scope:

- Championship Court (single-court estimate ~\$60K–\$70K)
- Entrance Plaza Signage Allowance (\$50K)
- Reducing gates from 7 to 4
- Scale back some fencing height or extent of sound barrier
- Reduce number of benches or shade structures

“If Council wants to scale back, we suggest these items are least critical to basic function and safety.”

8.1. Total Cost Overview

- The **full build-out** (with all alternates except bleachers) totals approximately **\$2.732 million**.
 - Items included in the alternate list accounted for approximately **\$885,000**.
 - Largest cost items debated:
 - **Championship Court:** ~\$75,000
 - **Dividing Fences:** ~\$130,000
 - **Shade Structures (16 canopies):** Significant portion of remaining alternate budget
 - **Entrance Monument Sign:** ~\$50,000
 - **Eight-foot perimeter fencing (vs. 6 ft):** ~\$35,000
-

8.2. Motion Process Recommendation

A suggestion was made and accepted to proceed as follows:

- **Motion made** to recommend full project as presented.
 - If not unanimously approved, committee would:
 - Discuss and vote on which elements to remove
 - Make a new motion with revised scope
-

8.3. Motion to Recommend Full Design

- **Motion Made:** To recommend the full project as presented (minus bleachers)
- **Seconded:** Yes
- **Vote Held:** Mixed — not unanimous

Because the vote was not unanimous, discussion resumed on potential modifications to meet budget concerns while preserving core value.

8.4. Elements Considered for Removal or Revision

Several ideas were debated to reduce cost while retaining quality:

- **Remove Championship Court**
 - Pros: Saves ~\$75K
 - Cons: Highly requested by public and association; may cause community pushback
- **Reduce Shade Structures**
 - Consider reducing from 16 to 4-6, especially in key locations (e.g., corners and gathering areas)
 - Acknowledged as important for Georgia heat and comfort during extended play
- **Remove/Reduce Dividing Fences**
 - Cost: ~\$130K
 - Mixed views: Enhances safety and ball containment, but seen as optional by some
- **Reduce Perimeter Fencing Height**
 - Option to go from 8 ft to standard 6 ft to save ~\$35K
- **Entrance Monument Signage**
 - Viewed as a “nice to have” but less critical than court-related infrastructure

“Some of this is about aesthetics — it’s important, but if it’s a choice between playability and polish, we need to prioritize function.”

8.5. Concerns and Big Picture Considerations

- Repeated emphasis that this is a **long-term capital project**, and certain elements (like shade and dividing fences) would be costly or logistically difficult to add later.
- Fear of **community backlash** if requested items (like championship court) are removed.
- Concern that cutting too much could result in a project perceived as “unfinished” or not matching expectations.

“If we cut too much now, it may cost more to add it back later — and the facility may lose the excitement and credibility we’ve worked to build.”

8.6. Clarifications on Process

- Council will have the **final say** on scope and budget.
- Advisory Committee's role is to recommend a configuration and explain rationale.
- Council **can accept, modify, or reject** the recommendation.
- If Council rejects the project as proposed, it may be **delayed by six months**.

“Our job is to make a responsible recommendation — Council’s job is to weigh that against funding and policy priorities.”

9.1 Key Points Raised

- **Dividing fences** were reaffirmed as **non-negotiable** due to **safety and liability concerns**, especially with increasing family and youth participation.
- **Shade structures** were deemed essential for year-round, all-day use, especially considering Georgia’s heat.
 - Alternative ideas discussed included:
 - Using **simpler shade structures**
 - Concentrating shade in **central “plaza” areas** rather than every court
 - Leveraging **existing bleachers** with **temporary canopies** for events

9.2 Championship Court Decision

- The **Championship Court** was ultimately **removed** from the current plan.
 - Primary reasons:
 - High cost (~\$75,000)
 - Can be **simulated** using existing bleachers and one of the wider standard courts for tournament use
 - Not deemed critical in **Phase 1**

9.3 Budget-Reducing Modifications Accepted

The committee agreed to **remove or modify** the following elements from the proposed scope in order to bring costs down while preserving core functionality:

Item Removed or Modified	Reason	Est. Savings
Championship Court (including special fencing, canopy, bleachers)	Not essential for initial phase	~\$75,000
Sound Panel Fence Upgrade	Limited benefit for cost	~\$35,000
Total Canopies Reduced (from 16 to ~6)	Retain shade in high-use areas only	~\$100,000+
Simpler Shade Options / Pavilion-based social space	Prioritize essential, communal shade over aesthetic enhancements	TBD

9.4 Final Budget Summary

- **Original total (with all alternates except bleachers):** ~\$2.732 million

- **Final recommended total (after modifications): \$2.417 million**
-

10. Final Motion and Vote

Motion: To approve and recommend the pickleball project plan at a budget of **\$2.417 million**, reflecting:

- Removal of the Championship Court
 - Reduction in canopy count and complexity
 - Removal of sound panel fence upgrade
 - Retention of dividing fences and essential shade areas
 - No new bleachers included

 - **Motion Made By:** [Name not specified in transcript]
 - **Seconded By:** [Name not specified]
 - **Vote Result:** **Unanimous Approval**
 - All committee members agreed to present the plan as a **unified recommendation** to City Council
-

11. Council Presentation Strategy

- The committee emphasized the importance of presenting a **single, unified recommendation** to Council.
 - The presentation will:
 - Highlight compromises made
 - Explain rationale for retained features (safety, community use, long-term viability)
 - Outline potential for **future enhancements** (e.g., Championship Court in Phase 2)
 - The Council retains the authority to:
 - Accept the recommendation
 - Adjust scope
 - Delay or reject the proposal (note: rejection triggers a **6-month delay**)
-

20. Adjournment

- **Meeting Adjourned**
- **Next Steps:**
 - Recommendation to be submitted to Council by Thursday
 - Await Council response for funding decision and next phase planning

DRAFT