

MINUTES
DeKalb Park District
Public Meeting of the Board of Commissioners
October 19, 2022
Hopkins Community Center, DeKalb, IL

Public Meeting
6:30 p.m.

I. Meeting Call to Order:

President Patrick Fagan called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Roll Call

Board members present: President Patrick Fagan, Vice President Dag Grada, Secretary Gail A. Krmenech, Treasurer Joel French, and Commissioner Phil Young.

Staff Members Present: Executive Director John Shea, Superintendent of Parks & Development Mat Emken, Superintendent of Recreation Andrea Juricic, Accounting & Administrative Assistant Jennifer Anderson, Mike Siefken, and Dave Kesson.

II. Action on the Agenda

Commissioner Young made a motion to approve the agenda, seconded by Commissioner Krmenech. Motion carried by roll call vote. Aye: Krmenech, Young, Grada, French, and Fagan. (5-0-0)

III. Public Comments

None

IV. New Business

a. Larson & Darby Presentation of Hopkins Pool Replacement Options

Steve Nelson of Larson & Darby presented a summary of the pool replacement options in two different locations: the current pool location and a new location where the tennis courts are. The physical pool amenities were similar for each location. The original concept of an 8-lane lap pool was reduced to six lanes for cost reduction. The bather load for pool replacement at the current location was estimated at 1,025, while the bather load at the new location was estimated at 1,200. The estimated cost for pool replacement at the current location was \$13,200,000. The estimated cost at the new location was \$14,500,000. Items not included in the cost estimates were the renovation of existing building spaces and tennis court replacement. If the new site location is selected, the current pool demolition cost is not included.

V. Open Comments from Commissioners and Director

President Fagan asked where the bather load for each location option was on the handouts. We were originally at a bather load of approximately 600 from the previous pool proposal (in 2020) vs. the cost, the bather load has nearly doubled. Commissioner Young asked about shade for the pool, inquiring whether the umbrellas were just left off the schematic for the existing site. Mr. Nelson indicated there are 8 shade structures (umbrellas) and 1 shade pavilion listed on the cost estimate. He also inquired about the lockers being potentially located outside. Mr. Nelson said the lockers would essentially be the same, regardless of location inside or outside. Mr. Nelson said outdoor lockers promote supervision and reduce likelihood of misbehavior. Commissioner Young requested verification that the onsite base price of \$13.2M includes the demolition of the current pool while the price of new location at \$14.5M does not include the demolition costs. Mr. Nelson said the price of the demolition may depend on what the District plans to do with the space. You may not have to remove the entire pool, but only need to remove to frost depth and leave the rest. Commissioner Krmeneč questioned whether we had actually asked the City of DeKalb if that was permissible, especially since we use chlorine gas in the piping system. Director Shea he spoke with a City official, and unlike a homeowner, the District would own the land in perpetuity. The City said they could work with us on the option of leaving the pipes underneath and filling to a certain depth. Commissioner Krmeneč said she would like to see that in writing before any decisions were made, and also would like to see something from the Illinois EPA, and if necessary, the U.S. EPA, especially because of the hazardous chemicals. Mr. Nelson said the mechanical pit with the chemicals would have to be taken out regardless. Commissioner Young stated that regarding the offsite location, we're talking \$14.5M, then we're also looking at the moving the tennis courts. Do we have a cost for the tennis courts? Mr. Fagan said we're going to need new tennis courts anyway. Commissioner Young said what he wants to see is whether the offsite location is more: there are hidden costs, is the true cost of the offsite location more like \$15 to \$16M? President Fagan said there is also the cost of a new parking lot, to which Mr. Nelson replied that it is included in the \$14.5M estimate. Director Shea indicated that in the budget cycle there was \$300,000 allocated in FY24 just to resurface the courts, not replace them. Commissioner Krmeneč asked if the pool is moved to the new location, does the maintenance building need to be taken down. There is a cost associated with that. She also requested numbers: how much is the cost of demolishing the old pool? Is it a \$1,000,000? Mr. Nelson didn't think it would be that much, but it would depend on the purpose of the new space. Director Shea said the maintenance building would likely not need to be rebuilt. Mr. Emken indicated that the maintenance shed is used for storage, mostly wedding chairs, which may be able to be transferred to some part of the Hopkins building. Commissioner Krmeneč reiterated that she thought the board needs to see more numbers regarding pool costs, especially with regard to moving the pool. This is especially important since all these associated costs are not shown in the plans. She was looking more for an itemized list before making a decision, including the demolition of the maintenance building, the demolition of the old pool, and the tennis court replacement. She said she understood that the tennis courts need to be done at some point, but she wanted to see the cost of replacing them for the pool move. President Fagan said that if the pool remains in the current location, it has to be demoed anyway. Mr. Nelson said the

demolition cost was included in the cost of rebuilding in the same location. President Fagan said you have to demo the pool anyway. Krmeneč pointed out that the \$13.2 M cost included the old pool demolition cost, while the \$14.5 M cost to move the pool did not include the old pool demolition. Commissioner French asked whether there was a way to turn the old pool into a skate park. Director Shea pointed out that during the pool committee meetings discussions included possibly moving the tennis courts to the old pool area. But we really haven't discussed what to do with the old pool area if the pool is relocated. Commissioner Young asked whether there were any additional logistics of having to construct it onsite and post-season. Mr. Nelson said you may need to close a couple weeks early and open a couple weeks late the following season. One advantage of building in a new location is not closing the current pool, but it does cost more money. President Fagan was concerned about the pool bidding process. Since COVID, it has been often difficult to obtain adequate contracting bids. Mr. Nelson indicated that it will depend on which delivery method chosen. This will be a high profile project since it will be a bigger project. There are two methods that can be considered. The design, bid, build, project option goes to the lowest bidder. The advantage of this approach is that you get the lowest bid, but you may not get the best contractor for the job, even though there will be bid qualifications. You also don't know how much profit is built into that bid. The other option hiring a construction manager. They have a set fee, and it's a completely open book to the district in terms of what each pool component costs. A construction manager's fee is usually in the 3-5% range. Then you're not paying the same overhead to all those other managers in the design, bid, build method. He indicated Larson & Darby will be there every step of the way regardless of the delivery method chosen. With the design, bid, build approach there tends to a lot of pressure put on the park district staff to help manage the project and answer questions. The construction manager approach works more like a team, taking the burden off park administration to answer and manage things. It's best to bring the construction manager on early in the process because they will help with pricing. Larson & Darby can assist with drafting a construction manager RFQ if the district decides on that approach, but they will not participate in any interviews nor selection. President Fagan said our situation is that we are a public entity, we have to have guaranteed costs, and we have to open it up to the public to qualify. If there is a lowest bidder, then we need to take the lowest bid. They have to be vetted. Mr. Nelson responded that a construction manager would need to be vetted, too. Mr. Fagan asked whether a project manager would add additional costs, to which Mr. Nelson replied you agree to two fees with a construction manager. There is a pre-construction fee during the design phase before it goes to bid, which is a fixed amount, usually 3-5% of the project, and they send out the bid packages for the various components. The second is a percentage on the project going forward. Mr. Fagan asked whether there was a price difference on the numbers. Mr. Nelson said not in their budget numbers. Commissioner Young asked whether the construction manager is required to come before the Board for bid approval. Mr. Nelson replied that every bid "package" would need board approval. A construction manager, if the board decides on that approach, would handle the bid packages. Young questioned whether bid packages might be denied if the board changes, to which Mr. Nelson indicated it's always a possibility, but unlikely once a project has started. Sometimes individual bid packages are questioned. President Fagan

asked whether the project manager would present a bond, to which Mr. Nelson indicated it's a payment/performance bond. He recommends a construction manager at-risk rather than a construction manager as advisor. President Fagan stated that Mr. Nelson will compile the additional figures as discussed this evening, and then we'll discuss, if the project is feasible, how to finance the project. There has been a substantial increase in costs from the plans presented two years ago. Mr. Nelson pointed out that current plans show a bigger facility than those previously proposed. Commissioner Young inquired whether we would discuss budgets at the next meeting, to which Director Shea indicated that Speer Financial will present financing options at next week's board meeting. Mr. Nelson said, from the perspective of a board member, it would be worthwhile to ensure you have flexibility in the financing, especially due to the recent market volatility. Ensure your bonds are callable, so that you can take advantage of more favorable rates if they become available.

VI. Adjourn Public Meeting

Commissioner Krmeneč made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Commissioner Young.

Motion carried by roll call vote. Aye: Krmeneč, Young, Grada, French, and Fagan.
(5-0-0)

Meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.