



We bring our clients' stories to life.

SPOKANE
203 N. Washington
Ste. 400
Spokane, WA
99201
P 509.838.8568
alscarchitects.com

Project No.: 2019-048
Project Name: Covington – Maple Valley Aquatics/Recreation Center Feasibility Study
Subject: Steering Committee Meeting Minutes #2
Virtual Meeting
November 17, 2020
By: Andrew Leeper

Attendees

Core Planning Group:

Matthew Keough

Dave Johnson

Ethan Newton

Rachael Drury

Tim Morgan

Michael Dean

Ken Ballard

Andrew Leeper

Rustin Hall

Steering Committee:

Rosie Boelens

Chris Brestle

Les Burberry

Brock Deady

Mani Dhami

Sarah Duffy-Clinton

Linda Johnson

Marita Ledesma

Laura Morrissey

Mark Pursley

Jim Scott

Kristina Soltys

Jeff Wagner

Allison Warner

Representing

Project Manager/Project Administrator, Covington/Maple Valley

Maple Valley Parks and Recreation Director

Covington Parks and Recreation Director

DH Account Manager

Ballard * King, President

ALSC Architects, Project Manager

ALSC Architects, Principal

This report is not intended to provide a transcript of proceedings, but rather to record the general content of the discussion that took place.

Action

Item



Action

Item

- I. Rustin Introduction of Meeting Objectives; Viable sites, Programming and Cost Recovery methods:
 - A. Review of agenda topics and goals:
 - B. Brief review of SC Charter “Mission Statement”
- II. Drew - requested feedback on first SC meeting report or survey data:
 - A. Phone survey is currently available via the Re-Create and Recreate website. Situational survey distributed via social media.
 - B. Other ideas on getting the word out to community who aren't tech savvy. COVID has made out-reach more reliant on social media.
 - C. How are we reaching out to people who are non-English speaking, to be more inclusive of the entire population? The situational survey is not a statistically accurate and used for color. Phone survey was a random sampling of the community which is statistically accurate.
 - D. We will look for more opportunities to reach out to the public/community as the study advances.
 - E. A one-page document / flyer with specific items captured to break down the topics, would be a good way to reach out to a larger group.
 - F. Email of survey to senior communities and other HOAs.
- III. Steering Committee Public Outreach Report back for the Larger Committee:
 - A. Laura – Receiving questions from general public. Generally indicating a need for an aquatic/recreation facility in the community. Would be a positive addition to the community and it will get used.
 - B. Mani – Positive thoughts and hope for cost effective addition to the community. Concerns with future protocols for future pandemics.
 - C. Jim – Discussing regional recreation draw. Ask where and when it will be built. Sharing information and desires of phone survey. People are excited to hear about the potential.
 - D. Allison – Echoing the positive feedback. People questioning the funding and Partnerships, public, private. Concerns over locations and what goes into it.

Action

Item

- Competitive swimming community is anxious of what goes into it and where it is located.
- E. Brock – Has been talking to coaches, who are excited to hear about it. Want gymnasium space.
 - F. Sarah – Similar comments. Questions on timeline and past experiences from Maple Valley previous efforts, “believe it when I see it attitude.”
- IV. Ken Ballard reviewed Market Area and Amenities and process of determining initial Market Area.
- A. Reviewed all four maps explaining the service market areas and likelihood of which map represents the best catchment area. Drive time map changes catchment area based on preferred site location. Adjustments to catchment area will likely be small. 15 minutes is ideal for local uses minus very specialty uses; field houses, ice sheet, etc.
 - B. ESRI Demographic information for different populations based on the initial market areas.
 - C. Census and Comp plans reviewed for future growth. 76,000 people in the three communities.
 - D. Characteristics of population have not been started, need to have service area determined to drill into these specifics, (age distribution, income level ethnicity, and a variety of other factors) relative to use of public recreation facilities and uses.
 - E. Have we explored what other option (public and private) citizens in the community have available to them from the hand drawn area map. There are a decent number of other providers. This will help determine the potential of supporting a new facility.
 - F. Questions:
 - 1. What is the feasibility benchmark to make project self-sustainable?
 - a. Self-sustainable if that is the measure of success, A population of 50,000 is generally the base line to make self-sustaining. Each project is unique and determined based on uses. By 2030 population numbers place the community above the threshold, and nearly there now.
 - 2. Does it make sense to overlay the 15-minute drive time, map on to the 6 tentative sites?

Action

Item

- a. Most of the sites would not make much if any difference. Sites within a couple miles of each other likely won't change the data substantially. If you pull a drive time map from both cities, it might impact it slightly more but still likely not too significantly. Could look at a couple sites and see if raw numbers change drastically. If not changed significantly, we can begin the deep dive knowing that the numbers will be close for the different sites.

V. Partnerships are a critical part of most projects, with 50% of current projects having a partnership.

- A. Ken reviewed the importance of evaluating a potential Partnership "Partnership Assessment" document.
- B. A bad partnership is often worse than no partnership. You also need to continually re-evaluate partnerships to make sure they continue to align with the project goals.
- C. Equity Partnerships is a Partner that bring value to the project, monetary or real-estate for the project
- D. Development and Operational cost. Generally, projects have looked at securing funding for a project but haven't focused on the cost to operate the facility. Industry has improved in the past 10 years.
- E. Reviewed list of presented partnering opportunities.
- F. Next steps are digging into the potential partnerships and how many may be available.
- G. Partnership opportunities are broadening, healthcare facilities becoming tenants in the facility. In approaching these stakeholders, the project needs something to sell to the prospective tenant. We now have the early information to take to stake holders.
 - 1. Two other communities in the region are also looking to build a similar facility which will add competition to the market of securing prospective partnerships.

Five Minute Break 7:00 – 7:05 pm

VI. CBRE – Don Moody to present the process used to determine potential sites for the project.

- A. Currently have six sites that meet the initial criteria set forth.

Action

Item

- B. Sites identified are just the starting point. Will continue to look for more sites and possible combinations of projects.
- C. Sites may come on and off the available market based on current market trends.
- D. It is not uncommon for multiple sites to be placed in holding while owners evaluate feasibility of sites.
 - 1. Scoring of the sites will change as time goes on. Results are a snapshot in time
 - 2. Alternate sites: Does it make sense to have the recreation facility split amongst the three cities at existing sites?
 - a. Positive and downsides of multiple sites: Starting 30 years ago, facilities began to consolidate operations to reduce cost and increase revenue. It is difficult to separate facilities as families are wanting to only go to one location for everyone to be able to participate.
 - 3. Is the Ownership model set for simple ownership or leased?
 - a. There is no set site use opportunity at this point. This will be a factor in the feasibility study.
 - 4. Is site F only being offered in parceled lots or in entirety?
 - a. Site F is being looked at being parceled at 25-acre parcels with one site being on forefront of possible sale.
 - b. Different uses might accelerate sale of property.
 - c. Sewer and water might be a developmental cost. Topography on site might also be an issue on a portion of the site.
 - 5. Is acreage significantly different on the sites evaluated?
 - a. Sites A, B, and D are smaller lots with C, E, and F being the larger sites.
 - 6. Scorecard of six sites reviewed. Sites A and F ranked the highest out of all sites (one in each of the two cities). Changes to scorecard ranking from first Steering Committee meeting reviewed.
- E. Programming Worksheets 1 and 2:
 - 1. Worksheet 1 is a summary based on phone survey
 - a. Some Situational survey data is included in right hand column where it reinforces the Phone survey.
 - b. Indoor aquatics was highest ranking use listed in the phone survey.
 - i. Recreational swimming highest sub-use with competitive / lap swimming as lowest sub-use. *(Lap swimming and recreational swim don't need to be mutually exclusive and can support each other. Water temperature and depth are major concerns when working on multi-use pools. Did*

Action

Item

- the phone survey title drive responses toward aquatics over recreational?
Need Steering Committee members thoughts on what the facility should be named.)
- ii. Gymnasium second highest desired use.
(High demand in Black Diamond, 3 courts is gut feel on what is needed. Can theater or performing arts be incorporated into the planning, stage?)
 - iii. Indoor walk/jog track rounded out the top three.
(Indoor space to allow for indoor activities is crucial to a successful project.)
 - iv. List and rankings available through project documents on project website.
 - v. Need to start processing information collected to begin the programming process. This needs to begin tonight.
 - vi. Ice rinks being built in regional market. Might put Cov., M.V. in competition.
(Possible NHL team in a year plus which will accelerate demand on the need for ice sheets in Puget Sound region.)
 - vii. Multiple spaces are listed that appear to be capable of being combined. Is the goal to have space for each listed use or begin to combine?
(We will need evaluate combining several uses into a multi-use space as budget/feasibility dictates. Demand will drive this need to consolidate these uses. Possible uses that could be combined, climbing walls inside gymnasium, Community space directly off entry lobby to allow for larger events and community gathering with sub-dividable spaces. Walk/jog track suspended above the gymnasium on perimeter. Arts and crafts teen, senior spaces are all options for combined spaces. Moveable storage is critical to allow quick transition between spaces. Items in green are hardest to combine uses. Salmon color spaces are more apt to be combined.)
 - viii. Are there any items on the list that are more conducive to private facilities vs a public facility or items missing from the list that need to be brought to the SC attention?
(Indoor turf and indoor ice sheet area are not typical of public facilities, not out of possibility. These might be best served as a public/private partnership. Aquatics take different tracks depending on the communities needs and desires.

Action

Item

*Water for competition and lap swimming is normally separated from the recreational pool use. [B*K will present information on emerging trends as part of study documentation to assist in market area desires.]*

- ix. Performing arts stage and facility in the Tahoma High School. Might be able to use that facility for performing arts. What would school districts do if there is no competition pool facility available to them?
(Key Stakeholders include school districts to determine their needs and use of the current facilities. We will also be in contact with Rachael Drury, Covington Aquatics manager for City of Covington. To determine the needs and ramifications of the current facility not being available.)
- x. Need to make sure that existing facilities baseline services currently offered are not reduced. Need to build upon and augment the existing programs provided.
- xi. Senior yoga and classes at the existing communities, “senior center” compete with teen programs for space in the summer months. Yoga is in a non-quiet space during the summer months. Senior aquatic aerobics classes are offered early in the morning precluding some seniors from attending. Need to understand how scheduling affects attendance of different groups.
(Feasibility study will look to determine if a senior center is a need.)
- xii. Kent / Meridian pool facility has been demolished, which has likely impacted the Covington Aquatics Center.
(The study will be looking to incorporate lap lanes into the facility. It will be a matter of what the magnitude of competition lanes in the facility pencil out in the study.)

- F. Recreation Amenities vs Revenue potential summary: The majority of public facilities don't pencil out based solely on fees they charge. Need to look at expense to operate vs revenue potential of each space. B*K will construct a revenue model as part of the study.
 - 1. Have we surveyed children/teens or is this only representative of the adults? Would be great to see what the children have to provide as input for the facility. *(Yes, the phone survey is only representative of adults. Teen councils from both Covington and Maple Valley have been*



Action

Item

provided with documentation for there inputs. We will also be reaching out to the school districts through the electronic flyer program which will promote our public workshops. Trying to drive attendance from the school districts to those meetings.)

- G. Funding options overview of what will be delivered as part of the study and percentages of amount that can be obtained from these different sources.
 - 1. Capital funding
 - 2. Operational funding
 - 3. Public funding
 - 4. Special District taxation funding

- H. Virtual Public Workshop No. 1 agenda overview.
 - 1. Please attend to hear what the public has to say about the facility.
 - 2. Lots of polling to occur during the course of the meeting.
 - 3. Aquatics presentation to inform the public as to what is available to them.

If you have any additions or corrections to these minutes, please bring them to the attention of the editor within two weeks of the date of this meeting.

DL/skm:2019-048

Attachments: 2020-1117_SC MTG 2 Agenda - Public Document Email No maps.pdf

Distribution:

Matthew Keough for CPG Distribution	
Michael Dean	DH Account Manager
Ethan Newton	Covington Parks and Recreation Director
Dave Johnson	Maple Valley Parks and Recreation Director
Ken Ballard	Ballard*King & Associates LTD, President

RH/AL/File