

MINUTES
DeKalb Park District
Public Meeting of the Pool Advisory Committee
July 14, 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 5:32 p.m.

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

Absent: Rukisha Crawford, Barb Parness, and David Story.

Ex-Officio Members Present: Dag Grada and Joel French.

District Staff Present: Executive Director John Shea.

II. Action on the Agenda

Dawn Baker made a motion to approve the agenda, seconded by Peggy Dlabal. Motion carried by voice vote.

III. Approval of Minutes from the June 2, 2022, DeKalb Community Pool Advisory Committee Meeting

Michelle McGill made a motion to approve the June 2, 2022 DeKalb Community Pool Advisory Committee meeting minutes, seconded by Julie Van Der Bleek. Motion carried by voice vote.

IV. Public Comments

None

V. Old Business

a. Discussion Reminder of Open Meeting Act Training Requirement

Director Shea reminded committee members that they must complete the Open Meetings Act training by August 2, 2022.

b. Discussion of Upcoming Meeting Dates

Director Shea indicated that upcoming committee meetings are scheduled for August 4, probably at the Ellwood House Visitor Center, and September 8, tentatively at the Hopkins Terrace Room. Committee Chair Fagan indicated that the September 8 meeting should be the last committee meeting.

VI. New Business

a. Discussion Regarding the Design Layout of New Pool

i. Entrance

Director Shea requested and received confirmation that the committee consensus was to not locate the pool entrance near Sycamore Road. The entrance should either be in the current location of the flagpole or on the back half of the administration building.

ii. Locker Rooms

There was discussion about locker room location: either inside or outside. Outside lockers would be weather-proof; they could also be half-lockers. A limited amount of lockers was suggested because most people keep their belongings with them. But because people could see their lockers, they may be more willing to use them. The question of security/locks was broached, with the idea of depositing quarters for rental, patrons bringing their own locks, or checking out a lock at the front desk. The committee overall preferred outside lockers.

iii. Main Pool

iv. Baby Pool

v. Diving Pool

Director Shea stated that there was consensus at the last meeting for 25 meter lap lanes. There was a discussion about the different types of pools at the facility. Pool capacity in the rebuild was raised as a concern since the pool has been very full. There was also a discussion about whether there should be 50 meter lap lanes to accommodate the swim team. There was a question about whether a dump bucket and a tidal pool might be options. Mr. Nelson of Larson & Darby indicated it can be done, but those features require a certain amount of area, must be independent of other pools, and are very expensive. The idea of a splash pad was raised. Mr. Nelson said a splash pad could be incorporated if considering a four pool concept. The splash pad could be incorporated into a true baby pool, with half the area as very shallow water and the other half for a splash pad with play features. This would not be a kiddie pool. It was noted that zero depth entry is great, but a ledge for parents to sit on as they watch their children was desirable. The possibility of adding the splash pad in a future construction phase was raised. Director Shea indicated that once all the elements desired in the facility have been identified, then a bid can be created with the base bid for the various elements and the add-ons. Affordability can be determined, with donations or future budget designation as options to support the items that couldn't be funded right away. There was a discussion regarding location of the splash pad in Hopkins Park, but outside the pool area facility. Water logistics to support the splash pad as well as lost revenue for the pool facility were identified as potential drawbacks. Additional features such as shade features and a concession stand were brought up. Traversing items, where patrons can travel across a pool area, were discussed. A vortex feature rather than a lazy river was suggested. Director Shea informed the group that in all the surveys taken, a vortex or lazy river feature was an interest. It was noted that space requirements and the number of lifeguards required for a lazy river are significant. It was stated that we don't want to build something that we can't afford nor staff. Dag Grada suggested the idea of a vortex or current channel, which could also be used for water exercise.

Director Shea suggested that the lazy river might be something added in a future phase, since the zero depth pool, 25-meter pool, the slides and diving well would take precedence. Ms. Morris shared that the lazy river at the Champaign pool was designed so that it could be non-operational while the remainder of the pool was open.

vi. Slides

A public audience member asked what kind of slides there would be in the pool rebuild. Mr. Nelson of Larson & Darby indicated the latest plan only specified 3 slides, not the type of slide nor whether they would be open or closed.

vii. Additional Features

viii. Concession Stand

There was consensus that there should be a concession stand which would serve patrons both inside the pool area and outside in the park area. Bathrooms would still be inside the pool area.

b. Discussion of the Pool's Location within Hopkins Park

i. Current Location

ii. New Location: Where the Tennis Courts are Currently Located

Committee Chair Fagan said this is a major consideration for the board. Cost is the number one factor. Another factor is the tennis/pickleball courts relocation, including what nature will be lost. Mr. Lekkask asked what happens to the administrative building if the pool is moved, to which Chair Fagan indicated the building would stay and the tennis/pickleball courts would move to the current pool location. Mr. Lekkask pointed out that two sets of infrastructure, existing and new, would be needed, which doubles cost. Vice Chair Krmenecc indicated she had compiled a list of advantages and disadvantages for both locations, based on comments made by the committee. She stated the list may not be complete nor accurate, anything can be added or deleted, but it is a start for the group.

VII. Open Comments from Committee Members

Steve Irving was concerned that the board wasn't paying attention to the committee about locating the pool near the tennis courts. Both Chair Fagan and Vice Chair Krmenecc disagreed. Mr. Irving suggested that the tennis courts could be left and other areas in Hopkins Park considered for pool location. Steve Lekkask didn't think the committee recommendation to move the pool was unanimous. He brought up the costs associated with a move from the current location. He was interested in the associated costs and what the features would be for each site. He would be in favor of the move if it cost effective, result in a better project, and make more sense. Mr. Nelson indicated his firm had previously done rebuild comparisons between the current pool and tennis court area locations based on the largest of the previous pool options. For scale comparison, he can complete 2 new pool footprints for each location based on recent discussions of the features desired. Dag Grada mentioned the costs of moving the pool. Mr. Nelson said that operational costs should also be considered.

VIII. Adjourn Public Meeting

Steve Irving made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Michelle McGill. Motion carried by voice vote. Meeting adjourned at 6:42 p.m.

DRAFT