

LAKE OSWEGO RECREATION AND AQUATICS CENTER PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING 4 SUMMARY

Date: April 26, 2021

Time: 4:00-6:00pm

Place: Zoom Meeting

Purpose: Share additional information on the designs and overall site plans.

Outcomes: Update PAC; gather feedback on overall site, competition and recreation pools, and traffic and parking.

Attendees

PAC Attendees:

Lainie Decker

Sandy Intraversato

Jahzeel Ormeno

Chris Duncan

Cassidy Miller

John Wallin

Sarah Ellison

Cole Olsen

John Wendland

Staff Attendees:

Ivan Anderholm, City of Lake
Oswego

Tony Vandenberg, Lake
Oswego School District

Ken Ballard, Ballard*King

Jenny Anderson, City of Lake
Oswego

Erica Baggen, Scott Edwards
Architecture

Michael Morehart, Counsilman
Hunsaker

Bruce Powers, City of Lake
Oswego

Jennifer Marsicek, Scott
Edwards Architecture

Ken Rehms, PBS USA

Jan Wirtz, City of Lake Oswego

Sid Scott, Scott Edwards
Architecture

Allison Brown, JLA Public
Involvement

Ariella Frishberg, JLA Public
Involvement

Welcome and Introductions

Allison Brown, JLA Public Involvement, began the meeting. She reviewed Zoom tools and etiquette and reviewed the meeting agenda and purpose.

The group reviewed the PAC Meeting 3 Summary. The summary was approved with no additional edits.

Review of overall design

Ivan Anderholm, City of Lake Oswego, began with a presentation on the background to the project. This included reviewing the items to include in the Recreation and Aquatic Center agreed upon in the Memorandum Lake Oswego PAC Meeting #4 Summary

of Understanding between the City of Lake Oswego and the Lake Oswego School District. He outlined how each of these spaces evolved during the initial design phases, especially the refinement of the competitive pool details.

Ken Ballard, Ballard*King, continued the presentation with details on the proposed recreation and aquatic amenities will fit with the budget constraints and identified needs of the community, the City and the School District. Highlights from this presentation included:

- The competition pool was an early need identified for both partners
- The dry recreation amenities were identified as a goal for the City
- Early planning identified three potential options:
 - An aquatic-centered facility with a 4,000 sq. foot recreation/program pool, with a multi-purpose room but no dry recreation facilities.
 - This option did not generate enough income, and put more pressure on the School District and City to operate and maintain the facility.
 - A facility with the competition pool, a smaller, 3,000 sq. foot recreation pool, a gymnasium, group exercise and fitness/weight room and two multi-purpose rooms.
 - This option generated more income to offset operational costs but sacrificed some of the recreation pool space.
 - A facility with the competition pool, a 2,600 sq. foot recreation pool, a gymnasium, larger group exercise room, larger fitness/weight room, and one multi-purpose room.
 - This option has the best cost recovery possibilities, with an emphasis on dry recreation facilities that can generate the most income.
 - The recommendation from the project team was that the second option is the best approach, since it meets the needs of both the City and the School District, while also serving aquatic and dry recreation needs.
- The proposed spaces in the Lake Oswego Recreation and Aquatic Center are all either small or medium sized amenities (when compared to public recreation centers nationally), which means that none of the options are oversized for the intended market.

Questions and comments from these presentations included the following:

- What kind of communities do you use small, medium or large facility spaces for?
 - Rather than community size, it has more of a relationship to what the community values. It depends on the focus of the project, and the needs of the operating partners.
- If we build something that is too small, it's hard to go back and change it. The recreation pool seems too small, and we want to be sure this capital investment is meeting the needs of our community. Can you accurately project what our recreation needs will be?
 - Very few projects actually build to need, but rather to the budget constraints of the project. You may want to larger spaces, but the challenge is making sure that the cost recovery can offset operational costs, while also designing to fit the size constraints of the site.
- What's the cost breakdown between the different kinds of recreation spaces?
 - It's roughly a two to one difference, meaning for one foot of aquatic space, you can get two feet of dry recreation space. Competitive pools generally have the lowest cost recovery in these kinds of recreation spaces.
 - *Chat comments during this explanation included the following:*
 - So adding 1k sf to rec pool means losing 2k dry space to be cost neutral, roughly
 - Assuming the estimate holds for marginal square feet, right? (e.g., the mechanics, pool deck, etc. wouldn't change much for 10 extra square feet)

- I think the very simple question we are trying to ask is: how can we get a slightly larger rec pool to fit in the existing footprint. We're talking about <1000 sq ft larger. And what would the extra cost be.
- I would agree with that John ... this is what I understand the question to be have we done any surveys to find out whether the larger pool would be better received than the rec dry area by the community?
- We have not. However, Ivan probably has data on gym utilization that the parks dept schedules.
- This information would be important to ensure we have 'balanced' areas for the site
- I think the question can also be can we leave the dry side alone and expand to accommodate a 4k pool, and what would the cost be?
- I'd like to see larger dry side too if we are going to expand. I would love to do that 'leave the dry side alone' ;)
- My takeaway: to add 1k rec pool space, we have site room, we could find parking, but we don't have budget and it hurts operational cost efficiency...
- Does the design team have any thoughts on how much bigger the recreation pool could be, considering the other needs of the site (parking, the golf course, etc.)?
 - We have what we call the best build area on the site. We don't think we can go further into the golf course, and we need the parking space. There is potential to push a little between the building the clubhouse, or toward the maintenance side. If we're talking about going from 3,000 to 4,000 sq. feet for the recreation pool, we do think that could be possible. There will be additional needs for parking, and we will need to review it closely and look at the site differently to make that possible.
- What's the rule of thumb for square feet to parking?
 - 2.1 stalls per thousand square feet. We currently have 163 parking spaces in the design, and we're looking to add about 10 more spots. If we had another 1000 sq. feet, that will take another three parking spaces and we'll need to get creative with the parking. If we did cut things out on the dry recreation side, that would have a big effect on the overall function of the center.
- Another value expressed by the community would be to add another gym.
 - Gym space is highly valued in many communities.

Sid Scott, Scott Edwards Architecture, continued the discussion by sharing more information on costs. Highlights included:

- Initial calculations indicate that to add 1,000 sq. feet to the recreation pool would cost between \$1 million and \$1.125 million.
- Currently, the project has a \$30 million budget, with \$24 million allocated for construction.
- The current plan, based on the MOU and Ken Ballard's analysis on minimum sizes, would cost between \$27 - \$28 million to construct.
 - This number will be finalized at the end of schematic design.
- There's a gap between the scope and the budget right now, so the project team is recommending doing 'just what's needed' right now, to create the most program area for the lowest cost.
 - The project team is hoping to provide the most community benefit for the lowest cost.

Jennifer Marsicek, Scott Edwards Architecture, continued the presentation by reviewing the refined site plan. Highlights from that review included:

- The main entry would be at the corner, with an entry lobby with a reception desk.
- The park staff office space would accommodate about 20 staff.

- The multi-use space would be 1,600 sq. feet.
- The weight and cardio space would be 3000 sq. feet.
- The gym would be 7,200 sq. feet.
- The design team is also looking at connections to outdoor space, including garage-style doors that would open to the outside in various spaces.
- The preferred option for the recreation pool that we discussed last time would be about 3,000 sq. feet.
- The aquatic side also includes support spaces for pool activities.

Questions from the group included the following:

- Could the competition pool be used for recreation purposes?
 - Yes.
- Could the recreation pool generate income to help offset operational costs?
 - Ken Ballard noted that typically, when aquatic facilities are indoors, they lose money. Both the competition and recreation pool will lose money operationally and will need to be offset by other recreation activities.
- What's the cost-benefit analysis for increasing the size of the pool? It seems like folks are interested in increasing the size of the recreation pool. Is there any survey data to confirm that?
 - Jenny Anderson, City of Lake Oswego, clarified that the surveys administered in this phase of the project didn't ask specifically about the size of the pool. However, there were mixed responses: comments about budget concerns, comments hoping that the project would be 'right sized' and also comments hoping for larger facilities.
 - Ivan Anderholm noted that when the City did the initial survey (before the May 2019 bond), they did ask about development, and specifically on a recreation pool. The recreation pool was the highest-ranking facility desired to be built through bond dollars. In subsequent surveys, the recreation pools continued to be of significant interest to the community.
- How was the size of the pool (3,000 sq. feet) determined for our community?
- It sounds like we may potentially be able to increase the recreation pool to 4000 sq feet. Would there also be room for more dry recreation facilities (to help offset the additional operating costs of the pool)?
 - Sid responded that he did feel that the size could be increased. Ken could provide additional insight into what areas could be expanded to best offset costs. This will require additional investigation, but the design team believes it could be possible.
- Even if the dry recreation spaces are increased, would a larger pool still lose money for the facility overall?
 - Ken responded that it's possible, but also likely that the dry recreation could offset those costs. It depends on the overall size of expansion, and the team will have to run more numbers to see what may be possible. The difference between the increased revenue and the increased cost will probably be between \$50,000 and \$75,000 a year. There will be a difference between revenue and costs with the current design plan, but it would likely be less.
- How much would it cost to add 1000 sq feet of additional dry recreation?
 - Sid responded that it would probably be about \$400,000.
- Who decides if this project expands and goes over budget? What is the role of the PAC in this project?
 - Allison clarified that the PAC is charged with acting as a sounding board and does not need to come to a recommendation. The project team will be reviewing all of the feedback from this group.
- This project should serve the community for a long time, but we also want to be sure that it is balanced between aquatic and dry recreation. We don't have a market analysis to know exactly what people

want, but anecdotally it seems like there is community interest in dry recreation (including gyms, pickle ball courts, etc.). I'd advocate for making the dry side as large as possible.

- Are there opportunities to expand toward the golf clubhouse? How does that fit with the plan for the site (including the golf course plans)?
 - The design team is just starting to look into this, but is proposing a multi-use space (that could be rented for events), some of the food service space and outdoor space for gathering near the clubhouse. There would be support space for the golf course, as well as additional storage for the recreation and aquatic center.
- This center is going to be at the heart of Lake Oswego. We should consider the added benefit of adding space to this site, even if it is going over budget. It would be helpful for City Council to understand how this overall space will add benefit for the community.
- If City Council is interested in pursuing it, it seems best to increase the size of the facility overall: both aquatic and dry recreation.
- What are the food and beverage service options for this site?
 - Ken Ballard noted that typically, facilities like this don't have food and beverage service unless they are really large (much larger than this project). However, having a gathering space in this kind of facility can become a community 'living room,' which is important. Food and beverage services would likely not be utilized enough to warrant taking space away from other programming options.
 - Sid Scott noted that there is space for vending machines and retail in the center, but it is not a large lobby.
 - Contracting with food carts would be a more feasible option.
- It seems like maximizing and expanding the pool and dry recreation is the best long-term option for the community. Would City Council be interested in finding alternative funding for this?
- Additional spending from the parks bond would also need to be brought to the Parks Board for review.
- Could the building be built with the possibility of a second-story expansion?
 - It could, but it rarely works well. The design preference would be to build second story facilities, which could be developed later.
- Additional analysis and information on what the community has expressed interest in would be really helpful for the Parks Board and the PAC to understand community priorities.

Most PAC members expressed interest in more space at the recreation and aquatic center, especially a larger recreation pool and potentially more dry recreation options. Some expressed concern on how this could be paid for, and whether that would compete with other projects identified for funding through the parks bond.

Traffic and Parking Plans

Ken Rehms, PBS USA, continued his presentation (begun at the last PAC meeting) on the recently completed traffic study, and provided additional information on parking and access to the recreation and aquatic center.

Highlights from this presentation include:

- While traffic counts have lowered recently due to Covid-19 did turn up in the study, the traffic study did not use that data and instead focused on pre-Covid traffic information.
- The study examined an area from the Atherton roundabout north to South Shore above the site, it looks like traffic volumes will continue to increase with this project, or without it.
- The Atherton roundabout was found to be the most deficient at handling traffic, and there will be increased traffic and delays due to that deficiency.
- The study also proposed other pedestrian updates, which the project team will need to discuss with the City to determine appropriate actions.

- The parking study looked at parking for both the golf course and the recreation center (individually and collectively).
 - City code gives a formula for parking spaces at the recreation center.
 - The study also compared the proposed number of stalls with other recreation centers across the Metro region.
 - The exact number of stalls is still being determined, and the team is looking for ways to accommodate as many stalls as possible.
- Hazaleia Field, the high school and the church south of the site are options being explored for overflow parking options for events at the center.
- The pedestrian connections to the site are a part of the City's land use requirements and are reflected in the plans.

Questions from the group included the following:

- Did the traffic study take into account the New Seasons that will be going in soon?
 - The team will look into that and confirm if it has been reviewed.
- How far north did the traffic study look?
 - It extended north to South Shore.
- Did the traffic study look at increased traffic on any of the neighborhood/local streets?
 - The study did not look specifically at local streets, but there is an understanding that there will be an increase in traffic overall with growth in the area (and growing traffic on Stafford Road).
- Did the study include analysis on Overlook Drive?
 - Yes, the study did look at Overlook Drive, and found it to be sufficient.
- Does the proposed parking code for centers like this support the proposed use? It seems low, and I want to be sensitive the neighbors and people who might be parking outside the center.
 - It can be low, so the team is looking to maximize parking on site as much as possible.

Next Steps and Closing

Allison thanked the PAC members and project team members for their participation in the meeting. The details on the next PAC meeting will be circulated via email.