

MINUTES
DeKalb Park District
Public Meeting of the Pool Advisory Committee
August 4, 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 5:36 p.m.

Committee Members Present: Chair Patrick Fagan, Vice Chair Gail A. Kremenec, Dawn Baker, Peggy Dlabel, Steve Irving, Barb Parness, and Julie Vander Bleek.

Absent: Janine Cochrane, Rukisha Crawford, Steve Lekkas, Michelle McGill, Carolyn Morris, and David Story.

Ex-Officio Members Present: Joel French.

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

II. Action on the Agenda

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

III. Approval of Minutes from the July 14, 2022, DeKalb Community Pool Advisory Committee Meeting

Steve Irving made a motion to approve the July 14, 2022 DeKalb Community Pool Advisory Committee meeting minutes, seconded by Barb Parness. Motion carried by voice vote.

IV. Public Comments

None

V. Old Business

a. Reminder of Completion of Open Meeting Act Training

Committee Chair Fagan reminded committee members whom had not yet done so to complete the Open Meetings Act training.

VI. New Business

a. Larson & Darby Presentation of Pool Amenities and Location of Pool]

Steve Nelson of Larson & Darby shared via PowerPoint presentation 3 pool designs from other cities showing different pool amenities. The pools' footprints were shown superimposed on various Hopkins Park locations. These included: 1) Boulder, Colorado, with a 10-lane, 50 meter competition pool, recreation pool, and sprayground, and bather capacity of 1,242; 2) O'Fallon, Illinois, with six 25-yard lap lanes, leisure pool, 600

foot long lazy river, and sprayground, with a bather load of 920 people; and Urbana, Illinois, with eight 25-meter lap lanes, leisure pool, plunge pool, and sprayground, with a bather load of 887 people.

Post presentation, State Irving said he thought the driving force for the pool, regardless of location, was the lap pool. There is a big difference between a 25-meter and a 50-meter lap pool due to the amount of water for what is, for many times, a very low usage, compared to all the other areas that kids would be in. Vice-Chair Krmenc thought so, too, because lap swimming would be during a specific time period, although it would not be used that way all day long. Mr. Nelson of Larson & Darby indicated it could get more use because the slides are emptying into it, although that's one at a time. He liked the idea of an ADA entrance, whether it's shared, a larger or smaller pool, with the slides emptying into that area, where there could be different age kids. There was a discussion regarding whether lap swimming patrons would have the ability to swim laps later in the day if they missed the designated morning lap swim time and what the majority of the usage was between lap swimming and the slides. There was also a concern about whether the water walkers would be accommodated if there are not enough lap lanes. Director Shea indicated that some swim lanes would be kept open throughout the day. Vice Chair Krmenc liked the idea of a run out slide, especially from a safety perspective, and inquired about the cost versus incorporating the slide into one of the other pools. Mr. Nelson indicated it's a bit cheaper to combine it with the lap pool, although it depends on the type of slide being installed: dropping or pushing people "out". It depends on what you want to make it safer. Mr. Nelson referenced one of the example pools, stating that instead of doing the 50-meter lap pool, a 6-lane 25-meter lap pool could be installed so that the fun area could be enlarged to not interfere with the lap pool. Rather than spending money on a 50-meter lap pool, the other areas could be bigger. Water walkers would still be able to use the pool.

Addressing the concern expressed about the water being too deep for water walkers, Director Shea said the water depth could be set at 4 1/2 feet or any depth desired. Chair Fagan said a splashpad is desirable because that's popular. Mr. Nelson indicated there could be a splashpad, no lazy river, or a small version of a vortex, have a 6-lane 25-meter lap pool, with a plunge area off to the side. Could incorporate a couple of the bigger slides in these and perhaps have another activity off one end. In response to Dawn Baker's question whether any larger pools have zero-depth entry, Mr. Nelson indicated no, but there are ADA accessibility features. Director Shea indicated the lazy river could be incorporated in the future, building the piping then connecting the lazy river in the future. There was a discussion regarding the diving boards: there are two diving boards at the current pool. Andrea Juricic indicated that the high dive is very popular. Director Shea said the 3 meter diving board is a need; the climbing wall could be exchanged for the diving board. He envisioned a zero depth area for the little kids. There was a concern whether the area separating the big pool from the little kids' area was a danger. Mr. Nelson indicated said some places install rails, some don't, but in all likelihood, that is where your lifeguard is walking back and forth to monitor the patrons. Director Shea said that in the past we had discussed having a seat wall, so that could be there for parents to sit. Vice Chair Krmenc asked Mr. Nelson about new types of pool

features anticipated in pool design. She was very concerned about a lazy river being built in the future and putting in infrastructure for it now. She agreed with Mr. Irving that that she thought we agreed we didn't want a lazy river because of the amount of water, space, and the number of lifeguards it would require. Chair Fagan also pointed out the cost to run it. Mr. Irving reiterated that there was a lot of cost to a lazy river. There was a discussion of how a splashpad would be more economical, accommodate those that can't swim, offered increased safety, and could be a larger feature in the pool design. Mr. Nelson offered that perhaps a small bucket feature could be incorporated into the splashpad. Director Shea said he had an idea for a splashpad with tube slides. He also said a vortex could be multi-purpose. Mr. Nelson said a pool could be built that was more of a progression: a splashpad into a zero depth area with perhaps a frog slide. Then it progresses into the play structure, then into the deeper water. Irving stated that if you equate the cost of building something shallow like that for the bather load compared to the huge lap pool, it's a much more reasonable cost. Mr. Nelson said it would be wise to have one of the slides be smaller, and then perhaps two larger ones such as the ones in the current pool. When Chair Fagan pointed out the slides being shown seemed higher than ours, Director Shea shared that one of the elements of the hybrid pool model was a drop slide in the deeper water. Mr. Nelson pointed out that if a feature was moved down a bit and small surface area added, there would be room for 1-meter and 3-meter board, a slide, and still have room for a climbing feature. The climbing feature would be 6 or 7 feet off the deck, where the other one was much taller. Fagan brought up the safety of the climbing wall. It was pointed out that the climbers wait off to the side; there is line to take turns. There was a discussion about a run out slide, and consideration of the middle age kids. Both Andrea Juricic, Vice Chair Krmenc, and Director Shea really liked it. Mr. Nelson said that option had not been included in any of the pool designs previously presented. Director Shea pointed out that this feature addresses safety, since a kid can go down it. Ms. Juricic inquired about the cost of the run out slide compared to what is currently in place. Mr. Nelson indicated it's not much more; you're only paying for the run and a little extra piping to keep the water flowing. It can be put into the pool deck which allows you to adjust for laps and other activities. It also provides the option of adding an extra slide because you're not using that entire surface area for bather load. When questioned whether the slides start at the same point so there is only one lifeguard working the top of the deck, Mr. Nelson said that would be the District's choice. Chair Fagan said he felt there was a general idea of where the pool would be located and the features desired. There could be one more meeting or an email could be forwarded to committee to provide their last two cents. Mr. Irving stated that that regardless of the pool location, which could be in three different locations, the big pool makes a difference in terms of what you do with everything else. Mr. Fagan agreed, but also said that the splash pads, the zero depth entry, and what happens with the other space, it comes back to the 25-or 50-meter lap pool. It will be tough decision that Board must make. And there's the feeling of whether it's needed, the cost, and the space. He said let me go further on this; we might not have a pool. Some of the Board members may feel that way. Or, where will the extra money come from? The cost might not be what we thought. Vice Chair Krmenc

pointed out that the facility is used only 10-12 weeks of the year, not year-round. When investing that much of the taxpayers' money, we should be realistic. It was decided that to send to committee members the list of features being considered. Superintendent of Recreation Andrea Juricic and Director Shea pointed out, based on their experience, that amenities were needed for people who don't know how to swim.

b. Discussion Regarding Next Steps

Chair Fagan thought there was no need for another meeting and asked if the committee was OK with just sending an email to the members with a summary of the discussion topics, including the potential amenities, to collect individual responses regarding preferences. Steve Irving suggested another short meeting to recap the responses received. That meeting would provide committee consensus for recommendations to the Board. Another meeting was scheduled for September 8, 2022.

VII. Open Comments from Committee Members

Mr. Irving stated he appreciated the promptness of the meetings, the minutes, and the agendas. Peggy Dlabel thought the minutes were thorough.

VIII. Adjourn Public Meeting

Steve Irving made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Dawn Baker. Motion carried by voice vote. Meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.