

---

Date: February 7, 2022 Date of Issuance: February 24, 2022

---

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 6:33pm.
  - a. Consultant team: Heather Peterson, AKA, George Deines of Counsilman-Hunsaker; Tucker Peddicord with McCown Gordan Construction
2. Meeting Minutes from December 6th meeting were approved
3. Anderson Reviewed the Agenda for the meeting.
4. CH reviewed the current amount of water area Manhattan has and what is recommended for a community the size of Manhattan.
5. Anderson reviewed a graphic of what a "Day in the life of" the aquatic center could be
  - a. SC: The Steering Committee generally agreed that that was a good graphic to use to when presenting the information on the aquatic facility to the community.
  - b. SC: It was recommended to add the degrees of the warm and cold water to the graphic
  - c. SC: The Manhattan Aquatics Group has classified the uses into three categories: Safety (lessons), Health (therapy) and Wellness (competitive/exercise) to show that it's an **aquatic center** not a pool.
    - i. The design group will update the graphic to show these three categories.
6. SCQ: Which direction will the city grow? What is and will be the center of town? If the aquatic center would go in City Park it would take away green space in City Park.
7. Anderson reviewed NE Community Park options
8. Anderson reviewed City Park options
9. Anderson reviewed CiCo Park options
  - a. SCQ: Would the costs be more or less to build over the top of or around the existing outdoor pools?
    - i. A: The demolition costs would be more but the other factors may break even.
  - b. SCQ: Could the facilities be shared between the indoor and outdoor pools?
    - i. A: The buildings could be designed to share the facilities. Patrons would need to go through the building to get to the outdoor facilities.
10. SCC: Adding a building to City Park would completely take away from the aesthetic of City Park and work against the Master Plan that Parks and Rec has established, and the Commission has agreed to. Green space was a high priority for City Park in previous surveys. CiCo Park seems like the best fit. Getting enough parking in City Park seems to make it hard to fit the facility. People would likely park there that don't need to be there (students and those visiting Aggieville). It could be hard to get busses (transporting teams) in and out of City Park.
  - a. Anderson: Other steering committees for Parks and Recreation studies have had the same comments regarding a large structure in City Park.

11. SCC: The steering committee would like City Park to not be a recommended spot in the final document. The document will show it was studied, but it is not recommended by the steering committee.
12. SCC: CiCo Park is the highest preference of the group. Having the high school sports and adding to the 'complex' for the high school seems like a good fit.
13. SCC: Northeast Community Park would be a good place because there is nothing else there.
  - a. SCQ: Would having the facility in Northeast Community Park attract additional growth to that area if it was located there?
  - b. Anderson: The site would need to be raised by about 3 feet to get it out of the flood zone.
  - c. PC: Nothing was ever done with the Blue river channel. If you could close off the channel then it would help mitigate flooding. There would be less chance of that water be flooding as badly in the area of Northeast Community Park.
  - d. SCC: People need to stop trying to control the rivers—the Blue River or Wildcat Creek. The would not support putting it in Northeast Community Park because of the flooding risk.
  - e. SCQ: What elements would need to be raised if the pool went in that location?
    - i. A: just the building, not any of the existing amenities.
  - f. Wyatt: There has been extensive drainage research that have Master Plans in place to help mitigate flooding. Northeast Community Park is not always dry/protected in all of those scenarios.
  - g. Jason: The 93' flood had a series of unique conditions. Any time the Kansas river water gets high water cannot be pushed out of the community. 93' had threats from both sides, Tuttle Creek and the Kansas river.
14. PC: What are the pros and cons for each location?
15. PC: Is there a design consideration if Northeast Community Park did flood? Could it be designed to be "flood proof"?
  - a. A: The pool can be built to handle the high water table. It can design to help mitigate flood waters. After raising the building the facility would be an island and would be difficult/impossible to get to if the surrounding area was flooded. Flood maps are available on GIS.
16. SCC: The City could possibly partner with USD 383, then the CiCo park site might be more advantageous to them.
17. SCC: Sharing parking cost between the County, City, and USD 383 at CiCo could be an advantage to share cost.
  - a. A: County may not have any interest in helping as they have no plans to pave the parking lot.
18. SCQ: Would Kansas State University reconsider being a partner with new staff turnover?
- 19. SCC: The consensus among the Steering Committee is that it would be hard to sell putting the Aquatic Center in a flood plain. The preference would be to list the sites as CiCo (Option A) as the number one choice, Northeast Community Park as the number two choice and last in City Park.**
20. Anderson read a comment from committee member Gary Schwandt who was not able to be at the meeting and it is attached to these minutes.
21. SCC: The Aquatic Center is not just for today, but what Manhattan might need 20-30 years from now
22. SCC: If the 50M pool was selected then more needs could be met.
  - a. SCC: The middle pool sized option is the preferred recommendation.
23. PC: The ongoing maintenance of the facility needs to be included in the budget numbers. There are many Economic Development options that should be included in the total presentation.

24. SCQ: How do we respond to the Commission comments in paper? When will the 'study' phase end for this amenity? (meaning it has been studied many times and no action has been taken)
  - a. Jason: There is a lot going on in the community right now so it's hard to ask the question of funding right now. USD 383 currently has bonds and Parks and Rec has CiCo improvements through the Quality of Life sales tax. The project could take place in 2024/5/6. Large projects with the City can take up to 5 years. The Steering Committee has to keep up the energy and pressure to keep the dream alive so it can become a reality.
  - b. SCC: It took 3 years of planning for the USD 383 bond that passed in 2018. There needs to be a campaign started for the Aquatic Center and the Steering Committee needs to help sell it to the community.
25. PC: The public has already said that they want an Aquatic Center. How do you present it to Commission/USD 383/County to buy into it? Layout the Pros and Cons for everyone for each site. At CiCo the outdoor pools would have to be closed during construction. The flooding risk at Northeast Community Park is a negative. There are already structures in Northeast Community Park so it could be improvement to an existing park and run a process similar to the Douglas Center. Casement road would need improved if it went in Northeast Community Park. The Steering Committee needs to inform the public.
26. SCC: There is a concern over inflation in the next few years. There is a level of desperation in the community right now that could be beneficial. Slow playing the process could put us at a disadvantage.
27. SCC: The need for an Aquatic Center has been elevated after the closure of the KSU Natatorium.
28. SCQ: Does CiCo connect to Linear trail?
  - a. There is no direct connection to CiCo Park but other trails are near and around CiCo. Northeast Community Park does have direct connection to Linear Trail.
29. SCQ: What involvement has the Chamber of Commerce have in this? A business might not come into the community because of the lack of indoor aquatics.
  - a. A: Right now there have been no conversations, but the Steering Committee could reach out to Chamber
30. SCC: The Steering Committee needs to let Manhattan know what is going on with good, accurate, and consistent information.
31. SCQ: Are there future upgrades planned at CiCo Park?
  - a. A: Yes, there is an upcoming project to redo all of the ball fields on the northeast side of the park utilizing the quality of life sales tax dollars estimated at about \$1.5 M.
  - b. The quality of life sales tax sunsets in 2027
32. SCQ: When is the best time to take this project to the Commission?
  - a. A: The Steering Committee needs to build momentum on the project and keep it top of mind in the community.
33. The Design team needs to compile the report and send to the Steering Committee to review and provide feedback. The Steering Committee will know when this is presented to the City Commission and encouraged to attend the meeting.
34. Manhattan is 1 of 22 communities this size that does not have indoor water.
35. Jason: The Steering Committee needs to harness the energy from the parents of swimmers who are working extra hard to get their kid in water right now. There have been past examples of people who have the mind set of "What can we do for the future generations?" that can be leveraged.
- 36. For the final document the Steering Committee would like to note that City Park was discussed as an option and is not the best choice. CiCo park Option A is the first preference.**
- 37. For the final document the Steering Committee would like to offer Facility Concept 2 or 3 as acceptable solutions with Concept 3 meeting 100% of needs and Concept 2 meeting most of the needs. Concept 1 is the least desirable as it will be inadequate and is not recommended.**

38. SCC: This could be a great economic tool to get people to come to Manhattan and will provide adults and kids with many opportunities in Manhattan. There is already a buzz in town of getting the Aquatic Center up and running.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30pm

END OF MINUTES

## Heather Peterson

---

**From:** Jason Hilgers <HILGERS@cityofmhk.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 7, 2022 1:11 PM  
**To:** Tracy Anderson; Heather Peterson  
**Cc:** Edward Eastes  
**Subject:** FW: [EXTERNAL]: Re: Indoor Aquatics Meeting - Feb. 7th

FYI

---

**From:** Gary Schwandt <gschwandt33@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 7, 2022 12:56 PM  
**To:** Jason Hilgers <HILGERS@cityofmhk.com>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL]: Re: Indoor Aquatics Meeting - Feb. 7th

Jason, I am sorry, but will not be at the meeting tonight. We are down in Florida for the month. As far as my choices, I am in favor of the Cico park site. Feel it is the best location of the four sites discussed. Feel the west side would be better access for swim meets, plus the west side wouldn't have a pool if Cico is closed. Northview has a rec center and 2nd best pool in the city. Second choice would be closer to City Park, but don't feel the those options would work very well.

As far as which option would be best, I am in favor of the middle option with two pools. I am not in favor of just one pool. We definitely need a diving well with diving boards. The diving well is needed for many things besides just diving. Important for safety training and even aerobics. My last discussions with Alex Brown convinced me that we don't really need a 50 meter pool indoors unless someone has several millions to donate.

Please let me know if you want additional comments. Concerned about how we can get this important need funded.

Gary Schwandt  
(785)313-4875

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 1, 2022, at 4:03 PM, Jason Hilgers <[HILGERS@cityofmhk.com](mailto:HILGERS@cityofmhk.com)> wrote:

Hello Aquatics Steering Committee members (blind copied)

Below is a link to the City's web page with the 12.6.21 minutes and 2.07.22 agenda.

MHK Indoor Aquatic Steering Committee Meeting #5

Date: **Monday, February 7, 2022 - 6:30 PM**

Location Fire Station Headquarters 2000 Denison Avenue Manhattan, KS 66502

<https://www.cityofmhk.com/3100/Indoor-Pool-Aquatics-Center-Steering-Com>