

Meeting Minutes

Date: November 8, 2021

Date of Issuance: November 29, 2021

Location: 2000 Denison Avenue

Project: Manhattan Aquatic Indoor Feasibility Study

Project No.: 21-010

Comments, additions, or corrections to this memo should be communicated to Anderson Knight Architects. If no comments are received, this memo will be interpreted accurate and filed as a part of the permanent record for this project.

Meeting Minutes

1. Introductions were made by Tracy Anderson of Anderson Knight Architects starting at 6:30pm.
 - a. Consultant team: Heather Peterson, AKA, George Deines of Counsilman-Hunsaker; Tucker Peddicord with McCown Gordan Construction
2. Meeting Minutes from October 11th meeting were approved with an amendment to add that an 8 lane, 25 yard pool is the minimum required for high school competition.
3. Anderson Reviewed the Agenda for the meeting.
4. Anderson reviewed the process of the Recreation Centers showing the conceptual diagrams from the 2017 Parks and Recreation study and showed the results from the Feasibility Study vs what was actually constructed.
5. Deines briefly reviewed the Stakeholder notes that were obtained in October.
6. Deines reviewed concept Options for Consideration
 - a. Two bodies of water: 1) 8 lane 25 yard pool with 1 & 3 meter diving and spectator seating. 2) Leisure element with three 25 yard lap lanes, current channel, kids play feature, indoor water slide into a runout on the deck. Support spaces: lockers, lobby, administration, mechanical, storage, multi-purpose room.
 - b. Two bodies of water: 1) Stretch 25 yard would allow for 16-17 25 yard lanes with bulk head and diving well. Leisure element would be similar to above. The additional lap lanes would allow for multiple uses/greater capacity. Competition and rec swimming and/or diving could all be going on at the same time.
 - c. Two bodies of water: 1) 50 meter by 25 yard. This would have 2 bulk-heads. Bulk heads could be moved around in multiple configurations to allow for multiple user groups and greater capacity all at once. For example it could be up to 2 separate 8 lane pools with 2 additional warm/up cool down lanes. Spectator seating for around 800 people or up to 1000 for regional meets could be expanded. Leisure element would be similar to other two options. Mechanical, storage, and locker rooms would be increased for the additional capacity.
7. Discussion
 - a. Is there enough room for swim lessons with the appropriate water depth? There were discussions around how the leisure element could be modified to incorporate in some shallower spots via ledges for the smaller kids. As shown there could be around 25-30 kids in the 3 lanes of the leisure pool at a time, in addition to room for water babies and tots classes.
 - b. The committee would like to see additional leisure options. The pool should be tailored to meet the community needs. Features such as additional shallow water, basketball goal,

water polo goal, more open water, larger children's area. There should be additional space for leisure in addition to rec swimmers.

- c. It appears that most needs could be met by someone who walked in. There was a variety of option available based on the concepts shown.
 - d. The aquatic facility needs to meet the needs of the community but have the desire to bring in meets/tournaments, similar to the recreation centers. What is the community access during meets? The aquatic facility would be open approximately 5400 hours per year. Based on a handful of meets per year it would only be 'closed' for approximately 24 hours of that 5400 hours. The leisure element could stay open during the competitions.
 - e. It might be good to have more than one multi-purpose room for meets and birthday parties at the same time.
 - f. Could a hot tub or sauna element be incorporated into the design. The design team will look into it.
 - g. The facility needs to offer some unique amenities/programming that no one else does that draws from rural areas or other community members.
 - h. Repeat use of the community members would be the biggest pull not necessarily swim meets. Many people in this community said they would use the pool if we had it.
 - i. KSU clubs could be a user group for revenue.
 - j. Where should the aquatic center go? Where is a site that it could fit? The design team will look at sites and the Committee is encouraged to share site ideas with the design team. A few that were mentioned: the mall, CiCo, behind the 9th grade center, near the airport. Many sites from the 2006 study are no longer available.
8. Capitol Cost of each option
 - a. Deines gave an overview of the capitol cost for each option
 - b. The budgets included support spaces, pool spaces, site costs, project costs, FFE costs
 9. Facility Schedule
 - a. Deines reviewed some concepts for scheduling the facility
 - b. When is maintenance done on the pools if people are there 5am to 8pm?
 - i. Close off parts of the pool to do maintenance/cleaning or during low use times.
 - ii. May have to adjust scheduling
 10. Operational Cost
 - a. Deines reviewed operational cost
 11. Pricing Structure
 - a. Deines reviewed example pricing structures
 - b. Anderson reviewed a chart showing a pricing schedule based on ability to pay
 12. Revenue Opportunities and Summary of cost recovery
 - a. Deines reviewed revenue opportunities
 - b. 8 Lane cost recovery of 45-52%, 14 lane 43-50% cost recovery, 50 Meter 39-48% cost recovery.
 13. Discussion:
 - a. 8 lane option shouldn't be an option---go big or go home --think long term, not 'now'
 - b. All images were single level with overhead spaces, tuck admin under grandstands to help with spaces,
 - c. General consensus of the group is to remove the 8 lane pool option from the table.
 - d. Hot tub could be something to consider, but not a necessity

- e. Zero depth entrance adjacent to where water aerobics would be programmed.
 - f. Have ADA compliant entrances
 - g. Ramp and stair access
 - h. Handrails on both sides of stairs and wide
 - i. Expansion to an indoor facility is hard
 - j. How do we balance the size of the pools with what the community needs and balance the maintenance?
 - k. Rec centers, trail improvements, and CiCo park improvements are/will be funded with the .25% sales tax. The City is building up funds and then tackling the projects as funds are available.
 - l. Cap of \$27-35M for the Aquatic Facility
 - m. 2 pools you only have 2 temperatures, if you had 3 pools then you could have 3 temperatures. The additional body of water comes with additional maintenance.
14. Next meeting:
- a. Additional leisure components and hot tub
 - b. Remove smallest option
 - c. Look at 20 years ahead, what are our needs then?
 - d. What are other programs/revenue opportunities for the 50-meter pool?
 - e. Show additional cost recovery options to get it closer to 50%
 - i. Need to look at this very carefully and critically so the group feels confident with the recommendation to the Commission.
 - ii. Look at options to get to 50-60% cost recovery.
 - 1. 'Gold Standard" would be 70-80%.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:46pm

END OF MINUTES