

**DeKalb Park District
July 18, 2013
Special Park Board Workshop**

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: President Phil Young, Commissioners Per Faivre and Keith Nyquist. Commissioner Don Irving and Mike Teboda were absent.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Interim Director Lisa Small, Asst. Director Brad Garrison, Colleen Belmont, Todd Bex, Tom Boyce, Josh Clark, Scott deOliveira, Jesus Hernandez, Randy Hjelmberg, Jane Holdridge, Harold Kellogg, Autumn Kelly, Josephine Knoble, Steve Knutzen, Michael Mascal, Sam McRickard, and Roger Olsen.

OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT: David Thomas, Scott Zak, Janice Berkes, Rich Rice and Bessie Chronopoulos.

I. Workshop Called to Order

President Young called the July 18, 2013 special workshop to order at 2:02 p.m.

II. Discussion of Hopkins Pool Planning

President Young stated that approximately two months ago the DeKalb Park District Board decided to table the pool project. He went on to add that the newly elected Board was now in the process of discussing and determining how to proceed.

Interim Director Small stated that in the 1930's the League of Women Voters decided that DeKalb was in need of a community pool; as a result, the DeKalb Park District was founded. The Hopkins pool was constructed in 1935, and later replaced in the 1970's.

Small noted that besides being utilized for practices and swim meets, the Hopkins pool has aided thousands of children in learning to swim. The pool, she noted, was approaching 40 years of age, and thus it was important that the District staff and Board investigate different options regarding its replacement.

In 2008, Williams Architects conducted a facility audit and provided staff with a summary of deficiencies. Based on their recommendations, it would cost over \$5 million to correct the deficiencies, renovate, and bring the current facility up to ADA standards and code. Small also noted that in 2010, the District went to referendum for a \$15 million water park facility, but that the referendum had failed. Small explained that PHN Architects were involved with the schematic planning of the water park during the referendum, and that they had continued with the planning process of the pool up until the project was tabled in April.

President Young thanked Interim Director Small for the introduction and short history of the pool.

Commissioner Nyquist commented that the recommendation and budget of \$715,000 for the installation of two new water slides, as quoted by Williams Architects, seemed a bit high. Asst. Director Garrison replied that Williams Architects must have had a specific type of water slide in

mind when they formulated that quote, but that according to his research, the replacement of two water slides could cost approximately \$170,000.

Commissioner Nyquist noted that the current pool could potentially be renovated at a lower cost if amenities were changed. Asst. Director Garrison agreed.

President Young inquired as to the condition of the pool shell. Facilities Specialist Mike Mascal explained that the pool shell was in good condition and that the walls were approximately 12-14 inches thick. Asst. Director Garrison noted that during some improvements and work associated with the pool, the shell walls were penetrated and staff was provided with information on the thickness and integrity of the shell and gutter piping.

HPCC Director/Marketing Coordinator Scott deOliveira explained that for the past several years, the main pool has experienced water loss due to its gutter system, but agreed that the shell of the pool was structurally sound.

PPD staff, Roger Olsen stated that the water loss from the gutter system could be addressed by replacing the metal piping system located along the perimeter of the pool. This, he noted, would require removal of the concrete deck along the entire perimeter of the main pool.

Asst. Director Garrison stated that the pool has experienced numerous plumbing and mechanical issues over the last few years.

Interim Director Small noted that located in the pool binder was a summary of capital investments in and improvements upon the Hopkins Park Aquatic Center from FY1997-FY2010.

Garrison noted that in 2002 there was a major leak in the main pool and that a concrete section of the deck was removed to allow for repairs. Olsen noted that the PVC pool piping system in the wading pool was in good condition. Asst. Capital Projects Manager Todd Bex agreed with Olsen, but noted that the surface finish on the wading pool needed attention each year. Olsen noted that areas of the wading pool surface were refinished each year, but that a complete resurfacing was needed.

Mascal explained that last year, the water distribution piping located in the filter building had failed two days before opening day, but was temporarily repaired until the job could be properly completed once the facility closed for the season.

President Young asked if the wading pool met current code requirements. Garrison replied that the wading pool, constructed in 1997, met code at the time, but that he was not sure whether it currently did. Garrison noted that the main pool did not meet current standards.

Small explained that some of the piping system for the main pool was located under the concrete deck, and that staff was unsure of its condition.

deOliveira also noted that the filtration system was also poorly designed and did not meet code.

Mascal explained that during backwashes he had noticed metal scaling of piping in the filtration room pit and believed that they originate from the main pool piping system.

Garrison noted that the water quality was great due to close monitoring by Mascal and deOliveira.

Garrison also noted that the entire facility would have to be remodeled to meet code and to address ADA issues.

deOliveira also explained that renovating portions of the facility would not solve the existing poor design of locker rooms, mechanical room and concessions area.

President Young inquired as to whether the north parking would be adequate to accommodate patrons utilizing the pool facility, park, playground and band shell.

Asst. Director Garrison stated that there was a lot of land along the north side of Dresser where the road could be swept to provide additional parking. Olsen agreed and further suggested that staff parking be designated to the north parking lot only. deOliveira noted that that was already being done.

Commissioner Faivre suggested that the parking lot by the Morton building be gravel. Interim Director Small noted that gravel parking lots are no longer allowed in DeKalb.

Commissioner Faivre explained that the design would allow for a segregation of entrances, with the pool entrance leading to the north parking lot and the community center entrance leading to the south parking lot, solving the issue of the comingling of pool patrons with those attending events held in the Terrace Room.

Staff member Autumn Kelly stated that during the summer, pool patrons often park on the grassy shaded areas along the perimeter of the park, and suggested that those areas be paved for parking. Interim Director Small replied that it would be unwise for the District to add additional asphalt paving to the park merely to accommodate the small number of days when patrons might wish to park in the shade.

Small noted that additional accessible parking was also needed by the band shell, and that to her knowledge, the Morton building did not hold any sentimental value to the District. Garrison noted that the Morton building could be relocated.

Commissioner Nyquist asked about pool attendance this season. deOliveira provided the Board with a pass daily visit report from 7/4/13 through 7/18/13.

Commissioner Nyquist noted that on 7/17/13 the pool was visited by 1,068 people, and asked if all 1,068 people were in the pool at the same time. deOliveira replied no, but noted that on that day, there had been approximately 750 people at the facility at one time. He went on to note that the facility is typically overcrowded in the mornings due to various camp groups, but that, depending on weather conditions, overcrowding also occurs at different times throughout the day.

deOliveira also stated that an overcrowded pool is very stressful for the lifeguards. Program Director Belmont agreed and explained that she has been in that position before and that it was

not a pleasant experience and extremely stressful to be responsible for patrons in an overcrowded pool where mistakes could be easily made.

Small explained that PHN Architects calculated the bather load by utilizing a 3'X5' area of water per patron. However, Small went on to add that, in her opinion, a 3'X5' area of water is not a large enough area to swim in.

Small also noted that the term "bather load" utilized by PHN is not an accurate way of determining the capacity of a facility, for the terms "bather load" and "facility capacity" are very different.

President Young asked whether the ramp design was the most efficient way to include a zero depth entry area into the pool. deOliveira stated that he was in agreement with the round design and the zero depth entry ramp design of the pool, and recommended that the area be kept between 3 and 3 ½ feet in depth.

deOliveira then proceeded to describe the "life cycle of a child", moving between the wading pool to the main pool and further on to the diving well; he also described activities within each of those areas.

Commissioner Nyquist asked whether staff felt they would face new challenges if the new pool facility was smaller, especially during extremely hot weeks. deOliveira replied yes and that staff would most likely have to turn people away. deOliveira added that this was not the kind of decision staff would prefer to make.

Staff demonstrated the size of the current pool as compared to the pool designs provided by PHN Architects. Small noted that PHN's largest design, accommodating 1,100 people, would provide the community with a pool that is only 65% the size of the current pool.

President Young inquired about the positioning of the main pool in the PHN designs. Small and deOliveira replied that the main pool was positioned as such to make room for additional deck space to increase the facility capacity.

There were questions as to the proximity of Sycamore Road in the PHN designs as compared with the current facility. deOliveira indicated the proximity of Sycamore Road currently compared to its location in the PHN design.

Commissioner Faivre spoke about repositioning the main pool and diving well as well as the addition of a 30' walk bridge from one side of the facility to the other.

Commissioner Faivre inquired as to whether or not the PHN plan remodeled the entire facility. Garrison replied that it did not take into consideration the wading pool that is already 16 years old.

deOliveira and Garrison also expressed concern with the non-vehicular entrance and admission area and there was also discussion among staff about an area for lifeguards, the location of concessions and of the locker rooms.

Asst. Project Manager Todd Bex suggested that the concessions stand be designed with a walk-up window to also accommodate families utilizing the park and playground, even while not utilizing the pool.

Staff member Kelly recommended that the concessions operation and pool check-in area be housed in the same building. This design, Kelly noted, would not only keep money in the same area, but also allow staff to be trained to support both operations when needed. Food & Beverage Administrator Jane Holdridge was in agreement with keeping both operations in the same building, but for safety reasons suggested that the building entrance not be designed adjacent to the Dresser Road Parking lot.

Interim Director Small explained that staff would discuss other park sites that may be considered for a new pool facility.

Asst. Director Garrison spoke about Kiwanis Park as a possible location and provided four plans showing a different configuration of the referendum design, complete with a lazy river, playground and an expansion of the soccer fields.

This plan, Garrison noted, would allow the District to create a second community park on the south side of town.

Garrison also spoke of Katz Park as a viable location. The first plan was to move and build new softball fields at Kiwanis Park. The current fields, he noted, were built in the 1980's and are currently not in good condition. The second plan was to keep the softball fields and build a new pool facility with a concessions and bathroom facility that could be shared by softball and pool patrons.

Garrison explained that the District owned its own well at Katz Park and would not have to pay for water and other utilities that were available at the site.

Lastly, Garrison spoke about the Irongate subdivision and past plans for a pool to be developed in that subdivision. The subdivision plans provided a nine and ten acre site that could potentially be utilized for a new pool facility.

Garrison stated that staff could explore utilizing the Sports & Recreation Center for programs, since it sits empty throughout the summer and also expand athletics to include outdoor soccer leagues and programs.

Food & Beverage Administrator Jane Holdridge asked about the possibility of constructing an indoor/outdoor pool to be utilized all year round.

Bex noted that with an indoor pool, the District would not have to close its facility during bad weather. Program Director Belmont stated that the Huntley School indoor pool closes during bad weather because the School District cannot guarantee that the pool is properly ground and safe. Asst. Director Small stated that the District might not want to duplicate what already exists, namely that the community has access to indoor pools at Anderson Hall at NIU, Huntley School and the YMCA.

deOliveira stated that instead of trying to squeeze all the amenities within the current footprint, the board should consider the location within Hopkins Park proposed during the 2008 referendum. He also noted that constructing a new pool facility on the other proposed location within Hopkins Park would not interfere with the current pool operation and also eliminate the possibility of having to close the pool early for construction.

Garrison noted that there will be additional cost for utilities if the District decided to move the pool into a different location within Hopkins Park and that the District could encounter unknowns since a TB Sanitarium was housed in that area many years ago.

President Young stated that moving the pool into a new location within Hopkins Park would allow for future expansion. deOliveira stressed that the facility is in desperate need of new locker rooms and that by keeping the pool in the current footprint would only allow for the locker rooms to be renovated, and not re-designed.

On an aerial map, Garrison pointed out that the center core of Hopkins Park was approximately 50 acres in size and that with the possible proposed pool facility, 1/10th of the entire park would be dedicated to aquatics and the community center.

Bex stated that the District could build a second smaller pool on the south side of town.

Garrison also spoke about the condition of the band shell and noted that the shell did not meet ADA code and could possibly be replaced and repositioned away from the sun.

Interim Director Small noted that in the pool binder she also added a summary of operating revenues and expenses for the Hopkins Aquatic Center from FY2008 to FY2012, and also provided a column showing the 5 year average for each operating revenue and expense line item.

Small then noted that in March 2013 the Board looked at financing scenarios for the pool project, and that the spreadsheet located in the pool binder explored scenarios of six different bond totals at four different interest rates for 20 years. Small further explained that the District currently has a non referendum bond debt EAV limit of 0.575% and a tax levy extension limitation of \$1,185,059. Approximately 33% of this bond is utilized annually to pay off the Sports and Recreation bond debt, and the remaining is utilized to fund district-wide capital purchases and improvements. Small explained that the best scenario would be to pay off the Sports and Recreation Center debt in 2019.

Asst. Director Garrison stated that he was not sure how or who determined that the District could afford a five or six million dollar new aquatic facility, but in his opinion, the District should consider building a lower cost facility since the pool is only open for 100 days a year. Garrison also noted that to avoid unnecessary financial hardship, the Board should consider waiting until the Sports and Recreation Center is paid off.

Small noted that if the current pool failed, the Park District could make arrangements with NIU, the YMCA or the School District and utilize one of their indoor pools for a season. Small explained that with a TIF district being established along South Fourth Street, the City might be willing to renovate the current indoor pool located at Huntley School (former H.S.) and possibly

enter into an intergovernmental agreement with the School District for usage of their pool as we did with the Sports & Recreation Center for numerous years.

Small also noted that she provided an outline on how to run a successful referendum and what to do during each phase of the process. The District would have to begin working on the referendum starting January 1, 2014 in order to be ready for the November 4, 2014 elections.

The Board asked that staff look into the cost of having the piping system of the entire pool facility evaluated.

President Young thanked the staff for their comments and suggested that the Board schedule additional meetings to further discuss the pool project.

Commissioner Nyquist stated that he learned a lot and was pleased with the meeting.

Interim Director Small thanked the Board for their willingness to listen to staff comments and recommendations.

III. Adjourn Workshop

President Young adjourned the July 18, 2013 special board workshop at 4:04 p.m.