

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION QUESTIONS May 27, 2020 MEETING

Item 3 – Approval of Minutes

1. For item 6.1 (Dedication of Park Land Funding), in the first vote, could the amounts for Sand Volleyball (\$435K) and the Trellis (\$600K) be broken out, so that readers can see the separate costs of those items, rather than just the overall total?
Minutes will be updated and distributed to include voting results.

Item 6 – Rengstorff Park Aquatics Center Replacement, Design, Project 18-38-Conceptual Design Options

1. Can you describe in detail the type of fencing anticipated for the project? If at some point there were a preference to create more privacy between the pool and the parking lot, would some kind of modification (or perhaps a mesh screen similar to tennis courts) be possible with the fencing currently envisioned?
The design of the perimeter fence has not been completed at this phase. However, the proposed direction is to maintain a similar "open" look to the current fence to provide views of the larger park and open spaces to the patrons of the aquatic center. If greater privacy were desired, modifications to the open rail fence could be explored to introduce screening materials at strategic locations.
2. Can the "play" portion of the Leisure Pool be accessed without traversing the lap lanes? For example, by just dropping in from the side of the pool (if it's shallow enough)?
Yes. The recommended Concept A Leisure Pool has been studied for an more optimal layout to avoid the heritage tree and to have the shallow "zero-beach" entry point be accessible without traversing the lap lanes. See page 4 of Attachment 1.
3. Which elements of the pools increased in going from 6,400sf to 8,000sf, and what drove that change?
With selection of the Scope "Option 2" by Council on February 25, pool surface area increased from the original scope of 6,200 square feet to 9,600 square feet for the two pools combined. That increased the volume of water that will need treating and heating and thereby increased the corresponding pool equipment room size in the building. Also, with the increased pool sizes, the building code requires that the facility support a greater number of occupants for restrooms, showers and sinks. Therefore the buildings increase in size was driven by the larger pools and corresponding number of anticipated users of the facility.
4. The estimate has increased by \$5.9M (from \$15.3M to \$21.2M). For that \$5.9M, can you approximate the breakout of that increase into A) Due to increased square footage of pools/buildings, B) Due to new 2020 codes/ordinances (Silver to Gold, etc), and C) Other (cost escalation, administrative, contingency, etc)?

The approximately \$5.9M increase in the construction phase estimate can be broken down as follows:

<i>A) Increase in Building & Pool areas:</i>	<i>\$3.8M</i>
<i>B) Code / Ordinance Changes:</i>	<i>\$0.6M</i>
<i>C) Other:</i>	<i>\$1.5M</i>

5. Where is the London Plane heritage tree located?

The London Plane heritage tree is located outside the current fence line and next to the existing pool equipment and storage shed. See attached mark-up of PRC Memo Attachment 2

6. The "Preferred Concept" drawing seems to show 5 parking lot heritage trees in the area where the Attachment 2 Plan Options show 6 heritage trees. Should we presume that 6 is the accurate number and that either I'm misinterpreting the "Preferred Concept" drawing, or that drawing isn't intended to be a precise replica?

The "Preferred Concept" drawing does not illustrate the number of existing trees that could be impacted by Concept A - it only shows how that concept might be integrated into the surrounding park. The trees shown in the illustration are either existing to remain or new. See attached mark-up of PRC Memo Attachment 2 for related tree impact information related to the parking lot heritage trees.

7. How much open green space is being enclosed by the aquatic center fence? Can a similar amount of open space be recouped from other hardscape areas in the park?

Approximately 20,000 square feet of green space is enclosed in the concept "Option A". This amount is preliminary and staff has not identified an equivalent amount of hard-scape that can be removed elsewhere in the park. Please see the answer to Question 9 below for a related response.

8. Will this project receive the moneys for public arts from the city (the money used for public art in parks, which the Council recently increased from 1% to 2% of costs)?

Yes, the public art for this project will be funded by the City. The City has not updated the Public Art Policy to increase the allocation to 2% of construction costs. The two percent was being discussed on a project by project basis when either the one percent resulted in a very low public art budget or Council requested to increase the public art budget for a specific project.

9. Is there a difference between the three options in the quantity of deck area vs. green space offered inside the fence?

There are differences but they are not significant nor are they set in stone. Further development of any of the Concepts may result in modest changes to the "deck area" / "green space" ratio inside the fence line. The fence-line itself may also be adjusted as

required to balance the optimal programming of Aquatics Center with the competing goal of minimizing impacts to the park's open spaces adjacent to the Aquatics Center.

The premise of all three concepts is that inclusion of the currently un-programmed green spaces within the fence-line of the proposed aquatics center enhances their utility and usability by the public for leisure and recreational uses. By maintaining an open "see-through" fence system like the one intended by the designers visually ties together the green space within and outside of the Aquatics Center.

10. Do all three options preserve the same number of heritage trees?

Yes.

11. Is the valley oak at the very edge of the current building, facing the playground, being retained?

Yes.

12. How is the deck space between the pools in Option A planned to be used?

The deck space between the two pools doubles as the main traffic corridor from the building to green space as well as an observation area for attendees and staff alike. This space can be used by patrons to observe swim lessons, recreation swim or swim meets. In the preferred concept, gradual stairs are shown leading from the deck to the lap pool. These stairs can double as seating for swim meets and practices, swim lessons, and other aquatic programs. Lastly, this deck space will be utilized as a clear emergency pathway for lifeguards to access and provide proper surveillance while both pools are in operation.

