

**MINUTES**  
**DeKalb Park District**  
**Public Meeting of the Pool Advisory Committee**  
**June 2, 2022**  
**Ellwood House Visitor Center, DeKalb, IL**  
**Public Meeting 5:30 p.m.**

**I. Meeting Called to Order**

Committee Chair Patrick Fagan called the meeting to order at 5:33 p.m.

**Committee Members Present:** Chair Patrick Fagan, Vice Chair Gail A. Kremenec, Dawn Baker, Janine Cochrane, Peggy Dlabel, Steve Irving, Michelle McGill, and Julie Vander Bleek.

**Absent:** Rukisha Crawford, Steve Lekkas, Carolyn Morris, Barb Parness, and David Story.

**Ex-Officio Members Present:** Dag Grada.

**District Staff Present:** Executive Director John Shea, Superintendent of Recreation Andrea Juricic, Superintendent of Parks and Development Mat Emken.

**II. Action on the Agenda**

Steve Irving made a motion to approve the agenda, seconded by Michelle McGill. Motion carried by voice vote.

**III. Approval of Minutes from the May 5, 2022, DeKalb Community Pool Advisory Committee Meeting**

Steve Irving made a motion to approve the May 5, 2022 DeKalb Community Pool Advisory Committee meeting minutes, seconded by Dawn Baker. Motion carried by voice vote.

**IV. Public Comments**

Park District Commissioner Dag Grada introduced himself to the committee members.

**V. New Business**

**a. Review of DeKalb Community Pool Design Options Survey**

i. Amenities

ii. Features

iii. Renovation Option

iv. Replacement Option #1

v. Replacement Option #2

vi. Hybrid Option

vii. Ranking of Design Options

viii. Committee Feedback and Alternate Designs

Executive Director John Shea presented results of the survey sent to the committee members after the last meeting.

## VI. Open Comments from Committee Members

After the executive director's presentation, Chair Fagan asked whether there may be options to consider other than those presented. Should there be other amenities so people would drive to our community to use the pool. Vice Chair Krmenek suggested that the committee learn what the park district itself needs in terms of a pool. For example, the District provides swim lessons, and not all the design options will accommodate swim lessons. A committee member raised the question of whether we want a water park type pool or features to accommodate a broader group of pool users. It seems the focus is on families, when there is also at least one other group of pool users, specifically lap swimmers. Safety was mentioned as a key concern for the pool. Chair Fagan said we want a community pool, not a water park. One member was concerned about the length of pool so that the swim team can use the pool for long course (50 meter) swimming.

Director Shea shared his thoughts on the District's pool needs. He wasn't 100% sure on the need for a 50 meter pool, but 25 meter lap lanes are needed. A kiddie pool is needed, but the kiddie pool in the hybrid option design is only 1 ½ feet deep. A zero depth pool is desirable, but we need more than 1 ½ feet of water. A zero depth pool that goes to 3 ½ - 4 feet is desirable, but then we'd be missing the little kid pool. Perhaps there is a design with a fenced off area to the side, maybe with spray features, for the kiddie pool. These are two different elements. Having 6000 square feet devoted to 1 ½ feet of water is not a wise use of space. The District has 8 levels of swimming, from putting your face in the water to diving off the diving board. There's only 1 diving board in the hybrid option design. If we're looking at the pool to accommodate all age groups, we need a diving board area with at least 3 meters height, a zero depth pool that goes to 4 feet, perhaps connected to the main pool, and an area for little kids, maybe 1 ½ feet. The slides are great. A key theme from the pool surveys has been consideration of all age groups. He thought we should keep all the amenities that are already present at the current pool. He didn't agree with having water basketball, nor locating the entrance near Route 23 because of the distance to reach the entrance from the parking lot, especially for people using a wheelchair or those who have difficulty walking. We can either keep the entrance where it is or perhaps move it to the south side, but there must be designated ADA parking spots near the entrance. These are a few ideas, but not everything. A concession stand is desirable, especially one where you can order from outside the pool, which allows someone to go outside to eat, or other people in the park to order food. He wasn't in favor of the natural area inside the pool area. Maybe we offer more shade structures or seating areas outside the pool where people could go. He reiterated that a zero depth pool that only goes to 1 ½ feet of water takes up too much space for the pool. The district needs amenities that accommodate toddlers to older age groups.

There was a discussion about popular features at other pools. Splash pads were mentioned, although committee members shared that many kids actually use the pool, not just splash pads. Water slides are very popular.

Construction material shortages were mentioned as a concern with regard to the proposed schedule (fall of 2022 into the spring of 2023, with a planned opening for Memorial Day 2023). Vice-Chair Krmeneč suggested the committee first determine which pool features/amenities were desired so the committee could provide recommendations. Commissioner Grada contributed that the more fanciful things like the climbing wall that had been discussed in the previous pool study were very low cost with respect to the overall cost of the pool. The natural areas had been added to the pool design with the intent of lowering the heat footprint of the pool. Mr. Fagan asked whether Councilman-Hunsaker could provide what other park districts have done so the committee could review those projects. Ms. Krmeneč mentioned that the aquatic user groups for pools was included in the original presentation from Councilman-Hunsaker. Committee members have access to the presentation.

Chair Fagan indicated the desire to include the recommendations and concerns from the committee on the next park board meeting agenda.

Budget was discussed, in terms of knowing the maximum amount of money available to build the pool. Vice Chair Krmeneč said she thought the money was an issue for the board. She thought the committee should recommend which features and amenities should be included in the pool. Then based on the recommendations, the board would decide what the district can afford. Chair Fagan recommended that on big ticket items, you first determine what you want, and then go out for bids. If the bids come in over what was projected, then the project can be adjusted. There are also professionals who can tell us what the District can finance through bonding. There will also be future tax income.

Director Shea acknowledged that the current timeline is aggressive based on construction material concerns. It was pointed out that the schedule will be impacted by the pool rebuild location, whether it is in the current location or the tennis courts location.

Committee members, not including the chair and vice chair, were polled on retaining the current pool location or moving it to the tennis court area. They each thought the pool should be relocated to the tennis court area. Krmeneč commented she thinks the committee is going by gut reaction, and she thinks consideration should be given to the pros and cons of the pool location options. Everyone seems to be focusing on the pros. There are a number of cons to moving the pool, not the least of which is the cost, loss of greenspace, what happens to the maintenance building, what does the District do for a parking lot, what does the District do with the empty space left in the current building, relocating the tennis courts, cutting down trees, consideration of the District's Strategic plan and the District's mission with regard to greenspace. The committee is proposing to pave over a significant amount of greenspace. Grada questioned whether it was really worth the price of paying an extra 30 – 40% to move the pool to the tennis court area. Are the benefits worth the potential costs? Steve Irving said things needed to be priced out for the two sites for objectivity.

Chair Fagan indicated the committee will need direction from the board on whether it needs firmer numbers on the options. When Mat Emken was questioned about his thoughts on

pool location, he offered that we should weigh the pros and cons of moving the pool. Chair Fagan indicated that the committee's ideas would be brought to the Board. It seems no one really likes the 3 current plans.

**VII. Adjourn Public Meeting**

Steve Irving made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Dawn Baker. Motion carried by voice vote. Meeting adjourned at 6:53 p.m.

DRAFT