

Public Review for the New Aquatic Facility at City Park
Report to the Municipal Administrator
April 2, 2012

INTRODUCTION

A replacement Aquatic Facility was proposed for City Park following six years of surveys, public meetings, focus groups, study and a citizens' advisory board. A levy was approved by voters March 6, 2012 to secure \$ 3.8 million over 20 years to build a new facility at City Park. The 2008 proposed concept plan was provided to the public for the last 4 years to review and vote on.

Following the public review process required under the R-C Zoning code for parkland in the City of Bowling Green, an announcement was made on March 7, 2012 that two public meetings would be held to take public comment on the proposed aquatic facility for City Park: March 14th from 5:30 to 6:30 p.m. and March 17th from 11 a.m. to noon at the Simpson Building. This notice was printed in the local newspaper, publicized through two local television stations, on the department's Facebook site and included in an email blast to park users through our RecTrac registration software. Notice was also given at City Council meeting.

A questionnaire was prepared for the public to submit their written comments concerning any changes they would like to see in the 2008-2009 concept plan for the final Bowling Green Aquatic Facility. Written comments were urged and taken through March 30, 2012 via email, walk-ins to the BG Community Center, attendees at the two public meetings and via the park and recreation website. Notes were also taken at the public meetings to capture comments from attendees.

Tim Stubbs, Facilities Coordinator and our resident aquatics expert, led the public meetings. Rachel Blickensderfer, Administrative Assistant for the department took notes. Michelle Grigore, Director of Parks and Recreation, and Josh Chatfield, Fitness/Aquatics Manager, also attended the meeting to take supplemental notes and assist with audiovisual needs.

This report is prepared to evaluate those comments and how the Parks and Recreation Department did, or did not, include the suggested changes to the concept plan. Justification is given for those comments that were not accommodated in this final recommendation to the Municipal Administrator to help him better determine if they have been adequately addressed.

It is up to the Municipal Administrator to make the final decision on changes to the aquatic facility plan. Such changes will be incorporated into the architectural and engineering design and drawings for the final pool, to be built in 2013.

INPUT FROM PUBLIC MEETINGS

On March 14, 2012 the following citizens attended the public meeting: Tom Stubbs, Joan and Bob Callecod, Jodi and Dave Anderson, John Zarfardino, Ron Zwierlein, Sandy Rowland, Margaret Tucker, Enoch Wu and Jan Larson(Sentinel-Tribune), and Mike Thompson (FOX Toledo). Minutes from the meeting can be found in Appendix A.

A summary of the comments includes:

- Tom Stubbs asked for (and received) confirmation that the new facility would provide areas for recreation, instruction, competition, lap pool, diving and adaptive swimming needs. He asked about water depths to accommodate all levels of swim instruction and if moveable bleachers would still be used for swim meets. Tim Stubbs noted that there was approximately 3,400 sq

feet of 3 foot water and the lap pool (4,800 sq ft) was 5 feet deep at the starting block end and 4 foot deep water at the other end. He also confirmed that temporary bleachers would remain in use during meets to provide adequate visibility and seating. Tom Stubbs further recommended that the 3 meter diving board be reinstated in lieu of a drop slide, especially for Jr. high aged swimmers.

- Ron Zwierlein suggested a bridge between the activity pool and the lap lanes to accommodate officials and better flow around the pool. He also inquired about the width of the diving wells before they transitioned to the shallower lap lanes, urging us to be sure enough deep water exists for safe diving even if someone jumps out far from the boards. Zwierlein also pointed out that the addition of a 3 meter diving board might require water deeper than the proposed 12 feet currently called for in the diving well.
- Bob Callecod spoke about the need to just remove the old pool and replace it with a sprayground, which will cost much less to build and maintain. Lap lanes were something that only the Swim Club would use, not 99% of the other people at the pool. He urged the City to look at the long-term need to have an indoor-outdoor pool at the Community Center, not City Park and noted that building an outdoor pool at City Park would eliminate the possibility of an indoor/outdoor aquatic facility at the Community Center. Callecod also said that a facility geared towards competition should not be in City Park due to the lack of parking and overcrowding of an already popular park. He also feels that competitive swimming and recreational water play are not a good mix.

The Saturday, March 17th public meeting was attended by the following people: Tom and Judy Knox, Scott Sehmman, Rodna Bordner, Joan and Bob Callecod, Monica Dietrick, Laurie Kuehlman, Bill Donnelly, Erick Bucks, Paul (Collings?) and a young girl accompanying him, Wilma Kidd, Dan Rodesky, Bruce Jeffers, Lee Hakel, Carolyn Strunk, Marc Simon, and Barb Lemon. Minutes from this meeting can be found in Appendix A.

A summary of the comments includes;

- Lee Hakel wanted to confirm that the plan being reviewed was not the final plan. Tim Stubbs stated that was correct, and that the plan presented today was the conceptual drawing—the final design would possibly include changes suggested by Staff and citizens during this review process. Hakel asked if the company that did the conceptual drawing would also do the construction and Stubbs said not necessarily, that the demolition/construction phases would require a bid process. Hakel later commented that it was essential that we plan to provide features and activities that would attract the teen population.
- Scott Sehmman asked if a 3 meter dive board had been considered and advocated for it to attract the 12-15 year old crowd to the complex. In later discussions, Sehmman also noted that shade structures, like kite shading, would be a good addition. He also asked the dimensions of the lazy river (8 ft wide and 3 ft deep) and said it, along with the rest of the new facility, would offer many programming opportunities. He suggested lighting for after-hour programming.
- Laurie Kuehner asked if the water depth in part or most of the areas would be deep enough for water exercise programming. Tim Stubbs noted that pool depths varied from 4 to 5 feet in the mail tank. Kuehner suggested that a 6 ft depth be considered in some areas.
- Rodna Bordner echoed the request for 6 feet deep water in order to program classes for all ages. Later, she asked if the facility would be accessible. Tim Stubbs stated that the design and construction would follow the letter of the law relating to ADA. She later indicated there was a need for water exercise classes for an aging population.

- Bruce Jeffers stated that on swim meet days the entire complex is closed and asked if that would differ in the new facility. Tim Stubbs noted that it will be possible to open some of the features, like the spray ground and lazy river.
- Barb Lemon asked if the new facility would create parking issues at City Park. Tim Stubbs stated that the new facility could create some issues, but the present design includes 309 parking spaces. She later stated that it appears the community needs an indoor aquatic facility. She also asked if separate fees would be considered for the areas of use in the new facility, for example, if someone just wanted to come in during evening hours and swim laps.
- Tom Knox expressed concern that the amount of heat-generating concrete in the design and asked about shade options. In the plan there is about 3,400 sq ft of shade planned including perimeter and pool shade structures. Tim noted that the location of such structures would be carefully reviewed with the architect so that it was appropriately located.
- Marc Simon suggested the need for family shade in the zero depth areas to protect young children and babies.
- Barb Lemon asked if the shade structures would be moveable and Tim Stubbs stated they were usually permanent once constructed.
- Monica Detrick urged a balance with equality in usage by different constituent groups including the general public and BG Swim Club. She would like to see designated times for adults only to use the pool and lap swimming during open swim.
- Eric Bucks also indicated a need for parity and stated he would like to see adult time available before and after work. The existing facility hours are not good and the new facility should be open more--- earlier in the morning and later in the evening and run weekends till Labor Day.
- Dan Rodesky presented his thoughts that the community will not get their money's worth out of an outdoor pool. He lobbied for an indoor pool at the Community Center and questioned the survey findings that showed the community wanted an outdoor pool at City Park. He stated that the public didn't have input into this decision. Michelle Grigore said this was not true, that 629 households had participated in the surveys and designed the pool that is being presented today. Rodesky also stated that department reports indicate dropping use at the pool and noted an indoor pool would get more use.
- Bob Callecod expressed his belief that the proposed outdoor facility at City Park will kill an indoor facility at the Community Center. He stated that he has heard comments that indicate the differing uses in the proposed facility won't mingle well. He reiterated his suggestion for just a spray ground at City Park.

INPUT FROM THE PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT

The following comments have been received from Staff concerning the proposed outdoor aquatic facility at City Park:

1. Shallow water swim Lessons. There is not adequate space to provide level 1-3 swim lessons. Need 36" – 42" of consistent water depth.
2. There is not adequate space for spectator seating during swim competitions. Spectators should be seated along the side of the pool rather than at the end where the current design would have them.
3. There does not seem to be adequate space to move bleachers or other large equipment through the pool area between the pool and the shade structures.
4. There should be no 3 m diving board. 1 m only to be included in final design if it is a liability issue
5. The Lazy River and Spray Ground should stay as planned

6. The Guard/Staff room in the bathhouse must be large enough to conduct Training for 20-30 people (room upstairs if building for an observation area).
7. There must be enough storage for equipment. Umbrellas, Guard Tubes, Backboards, Learn-to-swim Equipment, ADA Chair lift, First aid equip and 20 first aid kits during swim season as well as winter storage for 150+ chairs and lounge chairs, Tables, Diving board/boards, guard stands and any other equipment that must be stored during the winter months.
8. Swim Club needs storage for lane lines, kick boards, pull buoys, coolers and other equipment used during their outdoor swim season.
9. Music Throughout the complex included in PA system.
10. Large exit from the guard/staff room to the pool complex. At least double doors as well as windows to allow a good visual of the pool from inside the guard/staff room.
11. Would prefer sand filters, CO2 Ph control and liquid chlorine.
12. Concerned with congestion where the lazy river entry is (splash pad entry, concession entry and zero depth entry all nearby).
13. Prefer no covered slides for maintenance reasons.
14. Benches / seating in splash pad area.
15. Filter building: doors big enough for largest equipment (future replacement), lot's of lighting, hose down area with drain for cleaning stuff.
16. Many deck drains.
17. Fence 8 foot (not 6 foot).
18. Two drink fountains inside the complex.
19. GFCI outlets around entire facility (not just in or on buildings).
20. Designated and signed smoking area.
21. Metal roofing on buildings.
22. Concession area: many outlets on separate subpanel, mop sink, 3 bay sink.
23. Bath house filter room: double doors, lots of lights, ventilation, wash down area with drain.
24. No doors on restrooms; use walls to block view.
25. Restrooms: hidden spigots, auto flush valves, if benches, wall mount.
26. concerned with location of restrooms near front desk; congestion.

NOTES FROM MEETING WITH BG SWIM CLUB

Michelle Grigore invited the BG Swim Club via email to meet as a focus group and review any changes they would like to see in the final outdoor aquatic facility. Carolyn Strunk and Gary Layne met with Tim Stubbs and M. Grigore on March 26, 2012 at the Community Center. Notes from this meeting can be found in Appendix C and recommendations include:

- Suggestion that the starting block end of the pool be 6 feet deep to meet USA Swimming recommendations for deep water instruction
- Added room for swim meet spectators and officials on the long end of the lap lanes, not the starting block/finish ends as currently proposed
- 25 yard or 25 meter lap lanes are fine—swim club encounters both in pool throughout NW Ohio. Generally yards are used indoors and meters outdoors.

- Swim Club will attempt to purchase the starting blocks from BGSU, which plans to replace their blocks this summer. They are in great condition. Swim Club will deliver the mounting specifications for these blocks to the City by the end of April
- Swim Club will also purchase a meet time clock; Parks and Rec is responsible for purchasing a time-of-day clock for general use
- The city is responsible to ensure proper anchoring for lane lines and back stroke poles, mounting a Colorado clock and locations for touch pads are included in the details of the final facility design
- Lane lines will also be purchased by the club. Stubbs urged them to consider donating the old lane lines to the city for use during open lap swimming
- When a final decision is made on 6 or 8 lap lanes, the city will notify Swim Club so they can determine the correct number of lane lines and starting blocks to purchase
- Swim Club will be responsible for building a storage shed on a 20' x 16' concrete apron the city will provide next to the filter building.

COMMENTS FROM THE PARKS & RECREATION FACE BOOK SITE

Appendix B shows the comments cut and pasted from the department's Face Book site relating to the proposed aquatic facility. After the first week, on-line comments ceased through the end of the March 30, 2012 comment period.

WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM THE PUBLIC

As of April 1, 2012, only 4 written comments were received from citizens concerning changes to the proposed aquatic facility. They are included in Appendix D in their entirety.

In three cases, written and/or oral suggestions were made to discard the entire aquatic complex and start over. Two of the oral commenters were past directors of parks and recreation who wanted an indoor/outdoor aquatic complex at the Community Center. Their arguments rest on the fact that they feel a year round complex makes better use of public funds and is better suited to the Community Center. In Dr. Callecod's case, he argues that constructing the outdoor facility at City Park will mean that no indoor facility will be added to the Community Center in the future. He much prefers that a splash pad be placed at City Park for less cost and additional funding be secured to add an aquatic complex to the Community Center. Dr. Callecod also notes that lap lanes were added only for the BG Swim Club and will not be used by 99% of the public. Dan Rodesky suggests that the public has not been involved in making the final decision on placement of the facility nor weighed in on an indoor pool. The third written dissenter, Paul (Collings?), felt that the city bought into an architect's plan with too many frills. The fourth written commenter was supportive of the proposed plan, which the community approved at the polls in March.

In reality, the proposed aquatic facility was designed through public surveys, focus groups and meetings that spanned 6 years. The 2005 and 2010 recreational needs surveys had several questions devoted to the aquatic needs of the community, and a very detailed 2007 survey was utilized to include the elements of highest priority in the two aquatic concepts presented for review in 2008-2009. Results from that 2007 survey, returned by 629 households, is included in Appendix E. When asked what their first choice is for locating an outdoor aquatic facility, twice as many people selected City Park as the Community Center. When asked for their list of amenities to include in an outdoor pool they listed the following top three: 1. Shaded deck and lounge area, 2. Lap lanes for exercise and 3.

Shallow water for wading. All three of these amenities are included in the proposed outdoor aquatic facility. The public reviewed the proposed plan in no less than four public meetings and throughout the levy campaign...indeed, they voted on a levy to construct the proposed facility, which passed by over 57% of the vote.

The fourth written comment concerns the high dive board. In speaking with the architect, such diving boards include a full stairway with railings to prevent slip/fall accidents described in the email.

RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE EXISTING CONCEPT PLAN

After reviewing the public comments received, it is the recommendation of the BG Parks and Recreation Department that the proposed facility be constructed at City Park with the following changes:

- Add a 3 meter diving board, replacing the proposed drop slide IF it is deemed to be prudent from a liability standpoint for the City; be sure to design with full set of stairs and railings
- Examine the cost of building 6 feet deep water at the starting block end of the lap lanes, including the need to sign and rope off water over 5 feet in depth
- Accommodate spectator seating and space for officials on the long axis of the lap lanes as well as attachment points for starting blocks, lane lines, a Colorado clock, touch pads and backstroke poles
- Increase the area of 36" – 42" water depth to facilitate swim lessons, possibly by squaring off rounded sections in the proposed design
- Redesign the bath house so the restrooms are accessible from the main pool
- Add a 16' x 20' concrete pad off the filter building for the Swim Club to construct a storage shed
- Redesign lifeguard area with double doors for better entry/exit and ventilation
- Wire facility for PA system, security cameras, internet and computer terminals, telephone
- Add air conditioning to concession stand
- Install lighting for night use
- Work with staff to include adequate storage and refine final bath house design to accommodate staff suggestions, keeping final cost in mind
- Redesign entry to Lazy River to reduce congestion
- Add seating areas in Spray Ground for adult companions
- Change 6 foot perimeter fence to 8 feet
- Add metal roofs to buildings if cost allows
- Ensure adequate electrical outlets, deck drains and spigots throughout facility
- Plan for two drinking fountains
- Design filter rooms with double doors, lots of light and ventilation as well as ability to hose out the structure
- Look at separating tot pool from main body of water to reduce closure due to fecal contamination

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle T. Grigore, Director - Bowling Green Parks and Recreation Department

APPENDIX A – Public Meeting Minutes

**Public Meeting Minutes
For Aquatic Complex Replacement (per 3/6/12 Levy)
March 15, 2012**

Meeting called to order at 5:35 PM in the meeting rooms of the Simpson building located at 1291 Conneaut Ave., Bowling Green, OH 43402 by Parks and Recreation Department Facilities Coordinator, Tim Stubbs.

Present: Tom Stubbs, Joan Callecod, Mike Thompson, Jodi Anderson, Dave Anderson, John Zanfardino, Ron Zwierlein, Sandy Rowland, Margaret Tucker, Jan Larson-McLaughlin, Enoch Wu and Bob Callecod. Sign in sheets included with minutes.

Others Present: Tim Stubbs, P&R Facilities Coordinator; Michelle Grigore, Parks and Recreation Director; Josh Chatfield, P&R Aquatics/Fitness Manager and Rachel Blickensderfer, P&R Administrative Secretary.

Tim Stubbs welcomed those in attendance and thanked those who supported and assisted in the passing of the Aquatic facility replacement levy.

Stated the purpose of this meeting was to discuss and receive comments relative to the concept design plans for the new aquatic facility. Reiterated that meeting minutes were being taken but asked that comments/suggestions/recommendations also be submitted to the Department in writing. Pointed out a form to do so was included in the handouts provided at check in. Handouts include:

- Summary welcome from Director Michelle Grigore;
- Concept design by Brandstetter Carroll Inc. based on Aquatic Facilities Feasibility Study;
- and Design recommendations for the proposed outdoor aquatic facility based on data compiled during the Needs Analysis, public focus groups and meetings with representatives of the City of Bowling Green.

Tim Stubbs explained that comments/suggested changes introduced at the public meetings and those received in writing would be incorporated into a summary report that would be submitted to the Municipal Administrator for his perusal and final decision on what to incorporate into the final plan for the new Aquatic Complex.

Tim Stubbs then opened the meeting for discussion/comments.

Tom Stubbs asked for confirmation of the basic design and the areas of activity being addressed in the new facility. He stated it was his understanding that the facility would provide areas for recreation, instruction, competition, lap pool, diving and adaptive swim needs. Tim Stubbs responded that yes, those areas would be addressed in the new facility.

Tom Stubbs then stated that the pool had always hosted a very strong swim program during the summer months offering the American Red Cross sanctioned levels and asked about water depths to accommodate all levels of instruction. Tim Stubbs indicated that water in the lap pool would be 4 feet deep with approximately 3400 sq ft of 3 feet deep water in two other areas of the complex. Stated all levels of instruction would be given at the new facility.

Tim Stubbs also indicated that the drawing being referenced was not cut in stone that Staff had identified several areas that needed change, including the lack of deck space on the long axis of the

lap lanes for spectators and officials at swim meets. Further stated that the Lazy River could be used for lessons, aerobics and other water therapy for all age categories.

Ron Zwierlein suggested that a bridge between the Pool Activity area and the Lap Lanes would be a good change. Tim Stubbs agreed and reiterated that this change in the design is needed to allow for previously mentioned additional spacing for officials, for swim meets, and spectators.

Tom Stubbs stated that in the past all seating for swim meets had been temporary bleachers and asked what was planned for the new facility. Tim Stubbs indicated he would be checking with the design team in that regard but bleachers are needed to provide enough height for people to see over others.

Zwierlein asked about the slope and depth of the water for entry and exit when using the 1M dive board. Tim Stubbs stated the dive well was 12 ft and then sloped toward the lap lanes which will be 4 ft at one end and with enough room to accommodate those using the slides and diving board before hitting the shallower water. Tim Stubbs also stated that designs will conform to current building codes and rules.

Tom Stubbs stated that Jr Hi age youth loved 3M boards and noted the absence of a 3M board in the current design. Asked if it might be possible to include a 3M board in the area currently indicating a Drop Slide. Zwierlein pointed out that the addition of a 3M board would necessitate changing the depth of the water in that area to accommodate the 3M board. Tim Stubbs noted that could be done, but it would increase the cost. He will add that suggestion to the list to discuss in final design.

Bob Callecod acknowledged Tom Stubbs and Tim Stubbs as being most knowledgeable in the area of pool operations and specifically with the current City Park pool; but stated concern over whether the Master Plan and future needs for an Aquatic facility were being addressed with the currently proposed plan.

Callecod stated that if the Bowling Green Swim Club were taken out of the equation that 99% of the population using the facility would be satisfied with a water play facility not a swimming facility. Stated a water play facility would be less costly to construct and less costly to operate due to different lifeguard and safety requirements. Proposed that at a time when dollars are at a premium that the current design will require additional staffing and additional expenses that will not be offset by the small bump in revenue which would not be sustainable.

Callecod suggested that the best and most appropriate location for an aquatic facility, an indoor/outdoor aquatic facility, would be the Community Center on Newton Rd. Stated he felt this possibility would be eliminated if an outdoor pool is constructed now at City Park and suggested that a splash pad with no standing water was a better option. Reiterated that a facility geared toward competition should not be and really should never have been in City Park due to the lack of parking and the overcrowding it creates in the Park.

Tom Stubbs countered that the plans and all meetings for the new aquatic facility had always been open and available to the public; and firmly stated this plan being presented tonight is what the voters agreed to on March 6th. Declared that perhaps more emphasis should have been given to the future plan to include an indoor/outdoor aquatic facility at the Community Center when it was originally being planned and constructed several years ago.

Callecod again affirmed that from day one an aquatics facility at the Community Center was part of the package.

Zwierlein proposed that if the current plan for an outdoor facility in City Park satisfied the existing needs of the community; then an indoor aquatic facility could be constructed at a later date at the Community Center if the community supported the concept.

Callecod acknowledged that over the years, the BG Swim Club owned incredible accomplishments but had been significantly aided by the City of Bowling Green and the Parks and Recreation Department. Confirmed that competitive swimming and recreational water play were not a good mix and that the BG Swim Club participants were about 1% of the total users at the facility.

To that point, Tim Stubbs mentioned that meetings were already being planned with representatives of the BG Swim Club to discuss the facility design and to ask them for monetary support for items needed at the facility for their specific use.

Zwierlein agreed that the facility would have multiple uses but stated that much thought had gone into designing a safe, fun facility that would provide an atmosphere where swim lessons and water safety could be taught; this current design would be a teaching facility. Under Callecod's proposal for a splash pad only, there would be no swim lessons.

Callecod suggested the long term is being ignored and the short term only is being addressed. Reiterated that the community needs both an outdoor and indoor multipurpose aquatic facility where swim lessons and water safety can be taught year round– the concern is "Where should this facility be?"

Tim Stubbs thanked Callecod for his input, then presented the Bathhouse design, inside and outside views, and asked if there were any questions/concerns about this feature of the plan.

Hearing no further questions/comments, Stubbs thanked everyone for their attendance and input.

Adjourned at 6:12 pm

Respectfully submitted,
Rachel Blickensderfer

**Public Meeting Minutes
For Aquatic Complex Replacement (per 3/6/12 Levy)
March 17, 2012**

Meeting called to order at 11:00 AM in the Banquet room of the Simpson building located at 1291 Conneaut Ave., Bowling Green, OH 43402 by Parks and Recreation Department Facilities Coordinator, Tim Stubbs.

Present: Bob Callecod, Joan Callecod, Rodna Bordner, Judy Knox, Tom Knox, Scott Sehmman, Monica Dietrick, Laurie Kuehner, Bill Donnelly, Eric Bucks, Paul Collings, Wilma Kidd, Dan Rodesky, Bruce Jeffers, Lee Hakel, Carolyn Strunk, Marc Simon, Barb Lemon and an unidentified gentleman named Paul (no legible last name or address) and young girl. Sign in sheets included with minutes.

Others Present: Tim Stubbs, P&R Facilities Coordinator; Michelle Grigore, Parks and Recreation Director; Josh Chatfield, P&R Aquatics/Fitness Manager and Rachel Blickensderfer, P&R Administrative Secretary.

Tim Stubbs welcomed those in attendance and thanked those who supported and assisted in the passing of the Aquatic facility replacement levy.

Stated the purpose of this meeting was to discuss and receive comments relative to the concept design plans for the new aquatic facility. Reiterated that meeting minutes were being taken but asked that comments/suggestions/recommendations also be submitted to the Department in writing. Pointed out a form to do so was included in the handouts provided at check in. Handouts include:

- Summary welcome from Director Michelle Grigore;
- Concept design by Brandstetter Carroll Inc. based on Aquatic Facilities Feasibility Study;
- and Design recommendations for the proposed outdoor aquatic facility based on data compiled during the Needs Analysis, public focus groups and meetings with representatives of the City of Bowling Green.

Tim Stubbs explained that comments/suggested changes introduced at the public meetings and those received in writing would be incorporated into a summary report that would be submitted to the Municipal Administrator for his perusal and final decision on what to incorporate into the final plan for the new Aquatic Complex.

Tim Stubbs then opened the meeting for discussion/comments.

Lee Hakel asked if she understood correctly that the design being presented today was not necessarily the final plan. Stubbs stated that was correct that the plan presented today was the conceptual drawing and the final design would possibly include changes suggested by Staff and suggestions by individuals at public meetings, in writing or via email.

Lee Hakel then asked if the company that did the conceptual drawing would do the construction and Stubbs advised not necessarily that the demolition/construction phase would require a bid process.

Scott Sehmman asked if a 3M dive board had been considered. He felt the addition of a higher dive board would attract the 12-15 year old crowd to the complex. Stubbs commented that there were additional liability issues with a 3M board but that the idea had come up in other public meetings and

the staff has already discussed the possibility of eliminating a slide and adding the 3M dive board as a possibility.

Scott Sehmman followed up that he was glad the addition was being seriously considered as a “thrill” feature would be appealing to older youth.

Laurie Kuehner then asked if the water depth in part or most of the areas would be deep enough for water exercise programming. Tim Stubbs noted pool depths depending on the area were 4 ft to 5 ft. Kuehner suggested that a 6 ft depth should be considered in some areas.

Rodna Bordner echoed the 6 ft depth was needed in order to program classes for all ages. Stubbs indicated that this could be a possibility in the starting block end of the competitive area.

Bruce Jeffers stated that currently on swim meet days, the entire complex is closed to the public and asked about plans at the new facility. Tim Stubbs stated that because of some of the features in the new complex, it will be possible for them to not only be open during swim meets but most likely longer during the season. He cited the spray ground and the lazy river and the zero depth area as examples of features that could remain open.

Barb Lemon asked if the new facility would create parking issues in City Park. Tim Stubbs stated usage of the new facility could create issues but not severe issues; but definitely the Park will have busy, hot days. The present design includes 309 parking spaces.

Tom Knox expressed concern with the amount of heat generating concrete in the design and asked about the type and amount of shade that would be included. Tim Stubbs mentioned currently there was about 3400 sq ft of shade planned including the perimeter shade structures and umbrellas in the lazy river. Stubbs stated there was some concern as to location of the shade and this would be discussed with the designer to be sure it was sighted for afternoon sun.

Scott Sehmman suggested maybe some kite shading. Stubbs said that could be discussed; however, while functional, kite shading was pretty costly.

Marc Simon suggested the need for family shade in the zero depth areas of the complex to protect young children and babies.

Barb Lemon asked if any of the shade structures were adjustable and Stubbs stated they were usually permanent once constructed and installed.

Stubbs stated all suggestions would be discussed but that ultimately the final design would dictate location of the shade.

Scott Sehmman asked the dimensions of the lazy river and Stubbs advised it would be 8 ft wide and 4 ft deep. Sehmman stated the new facility would provide many programming opportunities. Stubbs agreed indicating the lazy river could be used for swim lessons and water therapy and other features for teen programming. Sehmman also noted that evening lighting for teen after-hour programming would be important. Stubbs stated that while lighting was not in the conceptual design that it would be discussed as an addition depending on cost.

Lee Hakel stated she felt it essential that we plan as best we could to provide features and activities that would attract the teen population.

Rodna Bordner asked if the facility would be accessible. Stubbs advised it would be and that the design/construction would follow the letter of the law.

Monica Detrick stated she was excited about the new facility and that it was long overdue. Her concern is that the facility must remain balanced – with equality between usage by the general public, department and the Bowling Green Swim Club. While her family participated in swim club in the past and she supports the Club and its' accomplishments, she does not want the Club to overrun and monopolize the new facility. Stated she would like to see designated times for adult use and lap swimming during open swim and discussion indicated that could be considered in the design phase.

Tom Knox, who is currently active with BGSC, indicated that the Club would use the facility in the early morning and at noon and for 3 scheduled swim meets during the summer. Further stated that their hours of usage at the BGSU Rec Center were totally different than at the City Park complex.

Eric Bucks too indicated a need for parity and stated he would like to see adult time available before work and after work. Stated the existing facilities hours were not good and that the new facility should be open more – earlier in the morning and later in the evening and run weekends until Labor Day.

Rodna Bordner noted that there was a need for water exercise classes for an aging population.

Barb Lemon said from the discussion, it appeared the community at large needs an indoor facility sooner rather than later.

Eric Bucks expressed that he felt City Park was the ideal location for an outdoor pool. Not only was it centrally located and easy for many to walk to, it was in a good location for many to ride their bikes to.

Barb Lemon stated the Parks were awesome and that their four children had always been participants in swim lessons and many department programs; but while in theory City Park is within walking and biking distance that many, many youth are dropped off. And that an indoor, year round facility for swim lessons would be the best option.

Paul asked about usage fees for the new facility. Josh Chatfield stated the first year, 2013, fees would remain at 2012 rates. Those daily rates are Adult \$5.00; Youth \$3.75 and Children \$3.50. The gentleman asked about subsequent years and Stubbs advised those fees would be determined at a later date after true operating costs were determined.

Barb Lemon asked if separate fees might be established depending on area of use – for example if someone just wanted to come in during evening hours and swim laps. Stubbs first responded “no”; but then said “maybe”. Indicated that programming would dictate and that he did foresee controlled use areas.

Scott Sehmman asked about keeping part of the pool open during swim meets.

Marc Simon asked about programming and extended hours for use of the facility and having just a skeleton staff on duty for adult lap swim times. Stubbs said for sure the Splash Pad could be kept open later in the season with a skeleton crew.

Barb Lemon asked how many staff were needed at the current facility and how many were anticipated at the new facility? Chatfield stated now he was required to have 8 lifeguards and usually at full staff had 14-15 which included managers and front desk attendants. The new facility will probably need two more people dependant on the final design and safety guidelines.

Dan Rodesky addressed those present and asked “Are we going to get our dollars worth out of an outdoor pool?” He then outlined that:

- the proposed pool in City Park would only have 90 days of use each vs. 360 days should an indoor pool be added to the existing Community Center.
- Programming in the proposed pool was limited
- the Master Plan was being ignored as it called for a phase II construction at the Community Center that would include an indoor/outdoor pool complex.

Rodesky questioned the survey and its’ findings and what percentage of responders had wanted an outdoor facility in City Park vs. an indoor/outdoor facility at the Community Center. He suggested that the community had not had a choice or a voice in determining aquatic needs.

Michelle Grigore, Director of Parks and Recreation, stated emphatically that the public did have a say – that not once but twice on surveys they indicated a preference for an outdoor aquatic facility in City Park. In 2007, surveys were mailed to approximately 5000 households, were available online and in various department locations and 629 people expressed their choice. Asked that inaccurate information not be circulated in the public.

Lee Hakel asked why now were these details being debated? The people have voted!

Laurie Kuehner added that City Park is the best – the perfect location.

Marc Simon stated that while everyone may not agree with the outcome that the Community supported the outdoor facility but that both, the outdoor aquatic facility in City Park and an indoor/outdoor aquatic facility at the Community Center could still be a reality.

Stubbs suggested that if there were still strong interest in an indoor/outdoor facility at the Community Center that the community should start a push – stated that through community efforts is the only way it would ever happen.

Dan Rodesky stated that department reports indicated dropping use at the pool and increasing use at the Community Center and noted a year round aquatic facility would get more use.

Monica Dietrick stated the dropping use at the pool was quite understandable but that with the proposed rejuvenation that usage would be up and bring the facility in City Park back to its’ glory days.

Eric Bucks stated it was great that usage continued to increase at the Community Center.

Barb Lemon thought it would be awesome to start an indoor drive. Wilma Kidd felt the outdoor facility and an indoor facility too would be great.

Bob Callecod expressed his belief that if the proposed facility is built now in City Park that the indoor facility at the Community Center is dead primarily because of the cost issues affiliated with construction of both. Further stated that from the comments he was hearing that the proposed facility

will not co-mingle well and will not adequately satisfy the needs for a facility that will host competition, teaching, therapy and recreation. Callecod reiterated the need that should have been addressed was a recreational water facility that would meet the needs of 95% of the users; extend the period of use; and be less expensive to build and operate.

Stubbs thanked everyone for coming and participating by offering suggestions and expressing concerns.

Adjourned at 12:12 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Rachel Blickensderfer

APPENDIX B: Face Book Comments on the Aquatic Facility Concept Plan



**Bowling Green Parks & Recreation
Proposed plan for the new pool by Brandstetter Carroll.**



Like · Comment · March 12 at 3:04pm ·

Bonita M Chatfield, Cathy Litzenberg, Angela Duncum Austin and 7 others like this.



○ 7 others:

- Dianne Pfouts
- Bowling Green, Ohio



Cathy Litzenberg



Jodi Brubaker Anderson



Mary Goble

- Bowling Green Senior High School



Georgiann Smith Berry

- Adjunct Faculty Member at Owens Community College



Leah Pallenik



Bonita M Chatfield

- Bowling Green, Ohio



Sandy Rowland

- Bowling Green State University



Beth Lawson Vollmar



Angela Duncum Austin

- Bowling Green, Ohio
-

Dianne Pfouts it's going to have a Lazy River??? oh my!! my son will really be happy about that!!! when is this supposed to be completed?

March 12 at 3:32pm



Marie Margaret Myerholtz is there going to a time that senior citizen can use it after all we have to pay for it the last time I wanted to swim in the city pool it was so crowded that all you could do is get in and get wet there was no room to swim

March 12 at 3:47pm



Andrea R. Smith 2013 I believe

March 12 at 6:15pm



Bowling Green Parks & Recreation The hope is that the new pool would be opening Memorial Day Weekend in 2013, although that is not for certain. Construction will begin following the regular summer season this fall (the pool closes in mid-August).

Wednesday at 11:05am

Bowling Green Parks & Recreation

Attention, all interested members of the community! There are two public meetings this week to review the proposed Aquatic Facility to be placed in City Park. The meetings will be held Wed, March 14 from 5:30 - 6:30, and Sat, March 17 from 11 - noon at the Simpson Building, 1291 Conneaut Avenue. All are welcome. Your opinions count!

[Like](#) · [Comment](#) · March 12 at 2:11pm ·



Heather Janes

I won't be able to be there, concerns we have are trying to keep the pool open only on weekends until labor day, please!!! After school goes back, it would be nice to use the pool a few more times! Also, is there any way to lengthen the ex...See More

March 12 at 3:51pm



Bowling Green Parks & Recreation Heather, click the link I just posted to print out the questionnaire about the planned pool. You can fill it out and mail it (or bring it) to the Community Center on 1245 W. Newton Rd., BG. Thanks!

Wednesday at 11:53am



• **Bowling Green Parks & Recreation**

Thanks again, Bowling Green, for passing our Aquatics Levy! Keep an eye on this page for frequent updates about the progress of the plans and construction for our new City Park Pool. Start by clicking the link below to see the 2009 Aquatics Survey!

<http://bit.ly/wmBSyF>

www.bgohio.org

Like · Comment · March 12 at 1:44pm ·

○
○ Beth Lawson Vollmar and Jeff Sorrells like this.
○
○



▪ Dianne Pfouts when is this supposed to be completed?

March 12 at 3:40pm



▪ **Bowling Green Parks & Recreation 2013 is the hope.**

Wednesday at 11:03am

APPENDIX C: Notes from Meeting with BG Swim Club

Notes from Meeting with Swim Club about Final Pool Design
March 26, 2012- Classroom A, BG Community Center- 4 p.m.

Present: Carolyn Strunk, Gary Layne, Tim Stubbs, Michelle Grigore

The proposed plan was studied during the meeting by both participants. Strunk asked which side is proposed as the starting block end of the lap lanes and how deep they were. She recommended a 6' depth at the starting block end to facilitate swim lessons in deeper water and to meet USA swimming and teaching recommendations.

Stubbs noted that room for spectators and officials was not accommodated in the current concept plan. It would be addressed in the final version. Grigore mentioned that numerous citizens had recommended replacing the drop slide with a 3 meter board. Strunk and Layne said that the proposed 12 foot depth of water was enough for that high dive per regulations.

Strunk and Layne confirmed that 25 meters or 25 yards were both acceptable and that other NW Ohio pools had meter pools rather than yards. Most had 8 to 10 lanes...so 6 lanes might not be sufficient, especially if we want to keep two lap lanes open for morning exercise during Swim Club use.

Stubbs asked BG Swim Club to cover the starting blocks, lane lines and time clock. Layne noted that BGSU is replacing their starting blocks this summer and BG Swim Club would bid on these. Grigore asked Layne to let the Parks and Rec Dept. know by the end of April what mounting system needed to be included in the final plans for the pool to accommodate the starting blocks. New tops can be purchased for the used BGSU starting blocks and there will be two extras if we have an 8-lane lap pool.

Stubbs suggested that Swim Club look at purchasing new lane lines and consider donating the 40-year old lines to the City for use during public lap swim. He also noted that BG Swim Club would need to build a storage shed to hold the blocks and lane lines when not in use. Strunk asked if they could salvage the lumber from the current bath house storage area and Stubbs said yes.

It was decided to ask the pool designer to add a 20' x 15' concrete pad off the filter building for this shed. We will also watch the starting block anchor installation to make sure they are installed properly and straight as well as permanent hooks for the lane lines in lieu of the screw-in system currently in use. Back stroke poles, a place to hang the timing system, and flat walls for Colorado touch pads also need to be included in the final design.

Strunk asked to be notified once we know whether it would be an 8-lane or 6-lane pool so she could go before the Board of BG Swim Club.

Discussion then turned to the feasibility of offering two lap lanes all day. Swim Club uses 6 lanes each morning, so this may be possible from 6 to 9 a.m. BGSU is very busy with early morning swimmers who do their laps before work.

The meeting ended at 4:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle Grigore

APPENDIX D: Written Comments From the Public

Questionnaire for the Replacement Aquatic Facility at City Park
March 12, 2012

Name: Sandy Rowland (optional)

Contact Information: 419-308-2339 (optional)

1. What features of the replacement aquatic facility are most important to you?

Highly supportive of lazy river and children's area.

2. What would you change in the concept plan?

Let it up to our current experts.

3. Is there anything else you would like the planning team to know?

Return to: Michelle T. Grigore, 1245 W. Newton Road, Bowling Green, OH 43402
mgrigore@bgohio.org

3/17/12

Questionnaire for the Replacement Aquatic Facility at City Park

March 12, 2012

came in late & left early in August

Name: PAU (optional)

Contact Information: 419 574 1304 (optional)

1. What features of the replacement aquatic facility are most important to you?

None

2. What would you change in the concept plan?

Makes it a simple pool not this Adventure Center. This is far too much for this community. A simple pool would suffice. Everything I see is the consultant recommendation. He is lying & he's not you fell for it. Make it a simple pool not this Aquatic Center. This is too much for this comm. A simple pool would suffice. Everything I see is the consultant recommendation that is lining his pockets & you fell for it.

3. Is there anything else you would like the planning team to know?

Cancel the whole thing & start over

COMMENTS REGARDING THE PROPOSED PLAN FOR AN AQUATICS FACILITY IN CITY PARK

A new aquatics facility is needed in City Park, but the facility being planned is inappropriate for the following reasons:

The proposed plan is contrary to the master plan for the development of parks and recreation facilities established less than 10 years ago. That plan called for replacing the present aquatic facility in City Park with a water play area and building a new aquatics facility with an indoor and outdoor complex suitable for swimming lessons, water therapy and competitive swimming at the Community Recreation Center.

The original Community Center design calls for a "Phase 2" which would include an indoor and outdoor aquatics facility being built on the south side of the existing building. The present locker rooms were built and located where they are so they could serve the new aquatics facility and one entryway would be through the existing doorway in the south wall of the facility.

City Park is too small and too heavily used for other purposes to justify adding a facility which possibly would bring even more people and vehicles into the park. Yes, many of the "people" want the facility in City Park, but it is irresponsible to spend taxpayer's money on "nostalgia." Major public facilities should be built on the needs of the future and with consideration of the limitations and capabilities of the resources at hand. The Community Center is ideally located for easy access by both in- and out-of-town visitors and has more than adequate parking.

Well over 90 percent of current City Park aquatic facility users never swim a stroke: they are interested in and will be attracted by water play features such as water jets, sprays, cannons, dancing fountains and zero-depth wading pools. The main advantage of a facility with these features is that they can be operated with far fewer staffing and the majority of the staff need not be certified lifeguards. This would result in a significant savings in wages and operating costs, and would permit much more flexibility in hiring summer personnel. Also, this type of facility would be operable on virtually every "nice" day, thus considerably extending the season for many park users – and, it would cost far less than \$3.8 million to construct.

Although I fully support the BG Swim Club and applaud them for their many accomplishments, they do represent less than 1 percent of the city's population. A significant portion of the cost for implementing the proposed plan would go towards facilities designed for competitive swimming. By statements made by staff and members of the Aquatics Facility Committee, the proposed facility would be less than ideal and would necessitate compromises on the part of the swim team and "public" users. If you know this is not what you need, why build it? I understand that funds are not currently available to fund the "ideal" aquatic facility, but that does not justify compromising the master plan, the real needs of the public, and in the process spending an inordinate amount of levy funds on a portion of the facility that will serve a very small proportion of the users. BGSU has an underutilized competitive pool capable of handling both swim meets and swim instruction. Why not use that facility until the Swim Club and the City determine a way to raise the money to build a facility that will best serve the needs of both populations?

Respectfully,



Bob Callecod, 1234 Brownwood Drive, Bowling Green; 419-352-9453; rcallecod@frontier.com

✓

Michelle Grigore

From: Natalie Pendell [npendell@woh.rr.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2012 10:40 AM
To: Michelle Grigore
Subject: city pool plans - diving board

Dr. Grigore:

We are writing you to express our opinion on the new City Pool plans. Our family is very excited about the new facility as we are frequent users of the current pool. Our concern is with the possible inclusion of a high diving board. Our oldest daughter had a near-fatal accident on the high dive at BGSU. She fell backward off of the ladder and landed on her head on the pool deck below. Thankfully, following emergency brain surgery, she made a full recovery and is a normal, active child.

Having said all that, we don't believe that all diving boards should be eliminated. Our hope is that if the plans include a high dive, all safety precautions will be considered. After the accident, we did extensive research on other facilities and the current products on the market. Some changes could include stairs instead of ladders, extensive matting around the pool deck, and height and age requirement for use.

We understand you are trying to meet the needs of an entire community. This must be a difficult task. We know that you will consider the safety of the facility first. Good luck with the plans. We will be waiting excitedly to use the new pool.

Thank you,

Jeff and Natalie Pendell

APPENDIX E: Results of the 2007 Aquatic Survey

1. If we have only ONE option for a BG aquatic facility, which is most important to you?

Indoor Comm Cntr	Outdoor City Pk	Sprayground City Pk	Indoor/Outdoor at CC	TOTAL Responses
118	245	22	226	611

2. Which is your first choice for an OUTDOOR aquatic facility?

Outdoor at Comm Cntr	Outdoor City Pk	Other- put in notes section
189	382	134

3. Which is your first choice concerning the existing OUTDOOR facility at CITY PARK?

Rehab	Replace	Remove- add Sprayground	Remove- make parkland	Undecided	TOTAL Responses
206	203	84	135	1	629

4. What sorts of amenities would you prefer in an OUTDOOR aquatic facility. Pick top 5 (enter number 5 = top choice)

Exercise lap lanes	1055	Competition lap lanes	543	Diving well and boards	957	Water play areas	933	Water slide	904	Lazy river	483	Shade/deck lounging	1133	Shallow water for wading	761	Concessions	470	Shelter for rental	235	Wave pool, surfing wave	312
--------------------	------	-----------------------	-----	------------------------	-----	------------------	-----	-------------	-----	------------	-----	---------------------	------	--------------------------	-----	-------------	-----	--------------------	-----	-------------------------	-----

5. What sorts of amenities would you prefer in an INDOOR aquatic facility. Pick top 5

Warm water therapy pool	1583	Jacuzzi/Sauna	1034	Water splash/ play areas	1035	2-4 lap lanes for exercise	978	6-10 lap lanes for competition	713	6-10 lap lanes w/out spectator area	447	Lazy river	443	Water slide	649	Other (vortex pool, wave pool)	309
-------------------------	------	---------------	------	--------------------------	------	----------------------------	-----	--------------------------------	-----	-------------------------------------	-----	------------	-----	-------------	-----	--------------------------------	-----

6. Which aquatic program would be the most important for your use (pick one please)?

Swim lessons	68	Water exercise	120	Warm water therapy	76	Open swim	214	Water sports	14	Scuba	2	Lap swim for exercise	90	Water polo	0	Water basketball	1
--------------	----	----------------	-----	--------------------	----	-----------	-----	--------------	----	-------	---	-----------------------	----	------------	---	------------------	---

7. Bowling Green State University has two indoor pools. Please answer the following questions about this aquatic facility:

7a. Would you utilize the pools at the BGSU Student Recreation Center for a reduced fee for Community Center members (\$4/day)?

YES	NO
293	320

7b. If you were to use the pools at the Student Recreation Center, what is your preferred time of day?

Morning	Afternoon	Evening
158	120	256

7c. Which pool(s) would you prefer to utilize?

Cooper	Andrews	Both	Don't know
91	169	179	106

7d. What type of programming would you take advantage of through the Student Recreation Center?

Youth and Family	Open Recreation	Senior	Other: add to note section
156	235	159	65

7 e. Would you be interested in using the BGSU pools if community parking were provided?

YES	NO
397	163

7f. Do you require handicapped parking?

YES	NO
45	543

8. Do you have a current BG Community Center membership?

8a. If no, would you purchase one if there was a pool there?

YES	NO	Yes if pool	No if pool
137	505	260	203

9. Public funding vehicle

10 year property	10 year income	Neither	On-Going Tax
189	295	97	13

10. Demographics

Single, No Children	Single, with children living at home	Single, Children no longer living at home	Couple, no children	Couple with children living at home	Couple, children no longer living at home	Number	At Home	Home		
63	35	41	84	225	187					
						Aged 12 & Under	Aged 12-18	Aged 19-30	Aged 31-54	Aged 55-over
						300	147	136	572	483