

meeting notes



DATE: September 5, 2018
TIME: 6:00pm – 8:00pm
PROJECT: Fircrest Community Pool and Community Center
SUBJECT: Pool and Community center design
ATTENDEES: Steering Committee:
Andreas Schonger
Amy Hackett
Blake Surina
Bonney Blair
Bonnie Viafore
Brett Wittner
Brian Rybolt
Charelene Laymon
Denny Waltier
Greg Vigoran
Jeff Grover
Joe Barrentine
Karen Reynolds
Kate Owens
Leslie Rider
Mary Ruth Pape
Rick Price
Sarah Viafore
Scott Pingel
Shannon Reynolds

Other:
Emily Wheeler / ARC
Matthew Philbrook / ARC
Stan Lokting / ARC

MINUTE TAKER: Stan Lokting

This was the first steering committee meeting following Public Meeting #2 and the August 28, 2018 City Council meeting. Site, pool and community center design refinements were important issues presented at both meetings and the focus of this meeting.

Input on Design (high level comments)

1. Public Meeting #2.
 - Pool – various comments about the two options, but a number of people spoke up about preference for a separate wading pool.
 - Community Center – youth/teen programming and multi-purpose type uses rated highly
 - Consider use of renewable energy, consider emergency shelter use of the center
 - Roofs – strong preference for the sloped roof option
2. City Council meeting

- Site, pool, community center and bathhouse plans were reviewed in greater detail than at the public meeting. Primary comments were access at the community center kitchen (needs easy access from parking and easy access to park) and using garage doors for indoor/outdoor connections at the meeting room.
 - City council wants to understand the cost implications of the renewable energy and emergency use of the facility.
3. Survey status. To date, about 400 people had responded to the survey.

Site

1. Storm water management. Stan reviewed the design strategy which allows for phased construction of the pool and community center. Other design features: raingarden south of gym for cleaning parking lot run-off, using vault for pool/bathhouse for run-off from new on-street parking, Fox Site independent from rest of project
2. Parking. It was agreed angled parking and Fox Site parking are not part of this project.
3. Water table and spring running through area. Questions arose about whether the project would improve off-site water table issues. Stan noted that it would not; that the project is only focused with on-site issues. The committee noted the impacts the water table would have on foundation and pool design. Jeff and Scott will post the geotechnical report from the study online.

Pool Options

1. Discussion of Option A – Two Pools and Option B – One Pool and Separate Toddlers. There wasn't consensus about which pool to proceed with, committee preferred seeing the survey results before deciding. Comments about A we about it looking more to the future (not repeating what the City has) and more varied programming, which might make it comfortable for adults and seniors to use the pool. Comments about B focused on people wanting what they are familiar with.
2. It was decided that both pools would be carried through schematic design to see the cost impacts relative to the cost for the entire project.
3. Wading pool photos. Committee asked for photos of wading pools that were part of a larger pool and those that were separate. See attached photos.
4. Slide and vortex. It was decided that these could be bid alternates. – bid alternates
5. Water temperature. The committee asked whether new pool mechanical equipment would allow for faster heating and cooling of water temperatures which could make Option B more workable. ARC reached out to Counsilman Hunsaker after the meeting: Their response:

In regards to the pool temp and how fast temperature can be changed, it all depends on how robust the heating system is. Modern heating methods tend to be more effective due to higher efficiencies, however they can be very expensive. Going from lap swim to rec swim temps could mean a 6-8-degree temperature swing. Calculating heating times can be quite difficult, especially at outdoor facilities, due to all the unknowns and is usually handled by the project mechanical engineer.
6. Wall between wading pool and pool at Option B. ARC noted that a wall has code required deck space impacts. ARC spoke to CH after the meeting. They have used moveable stanchions at other

pools. They can be taken up and down and, since they aren't permanent, may be better received by the Dept of Health.

Community Center

1. Kitchen. ARC presented 3 options to address city council's comments about the kitchen location. It was decided to proceed with the original design because it could be accessed from the hallway and it had the best relationship to the gym.
2. Garage doors. ARC presented the idea of 2 garage doors, one on each side of the multi-use meeting rooms.
3. Sustainable design. It was decided to have ARC provide concept level costing for photovoltaics, geothermal, and natural ventilation. Committee asked that ARC look into the Tesla solar roof panes. Solar hot water and radiant heat will not be considered because of cost and pay-back times.
4. Emergency shelter. It was decided to have ARC provide concept level costing for an emergency generator and storage space for emergency supplies.
5. Exercise room. Jeff noted that larger yoga classes be accommodated in the gym. This room will work for smaller yoga, exercise, dance etc classes. ARC noted that there are currently shown restricted views into and out of the room for privacy. Committee suggested that curtains be used to restrict views so that views could be provided when desired.
6. Roof form. Some committee members liked the sloped option, others liked the flat option. This was the same for city council. They asked ARC to provide additional sketches for review and posting online. The committee will vote so see which one is most desired.

Bathhouse

1. Concessions. The plan has the concessions stand to the north where it has easy access to the fields. There was discussion about moving it to the south side of the party room to serve the pool area. The decision was to leave it at the north so that there is good connection between the party room and pools. Vending alcove needs to be added.
2. Party room or covered patio. It was decided to continue with an enclosed party room through schematic design.

Financing

1. Phasing. The committee wants the costs for schematic design to address the two phased approach – pool and bathhouse followed by community center.

END