



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 No.: 3 March 30<sup>th</sup>, 2021  
**By:** Rustin Hall / Andrew Leeper

---

**Attendees**

**Representing**

**Steering Committee Members:**

Brock Deady	Steering Committee
Mani Dhami	Steering Committee
Rosie Boelens	Steering Committee
Kristina Soltys	Steering Committee
Chris Brestle	Steering Committee
Laura Morrissey	Steering Committee
Marita Ledesma	Steering Committee
Mark Pursley	Steering Committee
Les Burberry	Steering Committee
Linda Johnson	Steering Committee
Jeff Wagner	Steering Committee

**Core Planning Group:**

Matthew Keough	Project Manager/Project Administrator, Covington/Maple Valley
Ethan Newton	Covington Parks and Recreation Director
Dave Johnson	Maple Valley Parks and Recreation Director

**Feasibility Study Team:**

Michael Dean	DH Account Manager
Ken Ballard	Ballard*King & Associates LTD
Chad Heimbigner	Coffman Engineers
Kate Roosevelt	Campbell & Company
Rustin Hall	ALSC Architects
Andrew Leeper	ALSC Architects

Unable to attend the meeting: Allison Warner, Ed Holmes, Jim Scott, Sarah Duffy-Clinton

*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

**I. Introduction**

- A. Provided overview of meeting objectives: Outreach, Facility Program, Project Fundraising, and Site Analysis.
- B. Team introductions of the Core Planning Group Members to Steering Committee.
- C. Reviewed current state of project and work completed, along with next steps to be undertaken.
- D. Feasibility Study graphic presented to Steering Committee.

**II. What project goals have been achieved and which remain?**

- A. Steering Committee Responses:
  - 1. Did we point the focus of the study more in direction of Aquatics vs. Recreation and other needs? Want to be sure it was un-biased.
  - 2. Interested in the site location and narrowing down of location.
  - 3. New Committee on Diversity and Equity: Mani is Committee Chair.
  - 4. Feel the input to date has been successful. Worked from broad ideas and focused in on important needs of communities.
  - 5. How will we be funding in a community that is resistant to increased taxation and fees?
    - a. Noted that this will be discussed briefly later in the evening.
  - 6. Want to be sure that potential layout and ratios of space allocation meet the areas noted in the building program.
    - a. Noted that item will be discussed later in the meeting.
- B. Magnitude of public outreach conducted was presented to the Steering Committee.
- C. Reviewed printed, digital outreach materials produced thus far.
- D. Presented upcoming OTT video for Steering Committee members to view; was well-received.

**III. What are the outcomes you care most about regarding the public outreach in your community?**

Action

Item

**Steering Committee Responses:**

- A. Was noted that word of mouth is a great method in local communities.
- B. Great video. Want to make sure it is known that Aquatics and Recreation are inclusive, not one or the other.
- C. Creating “Buy-in of the Community” is the most important item. Need to get people aware of the study, along with Steering Committee members discussing key elements with their contacts.
- D. Did we get the required input of the “Focus Group” interviews?
  - 1. Ken Ballard explained that while the attendance was less than desired, the feedback was consistent and informative. Several Focus Group sessions were conducted multiple times to gain more input.
- E. Want to make sure that the OTT Video will be shared beyond the OTT Video purchase.
  - 1. Was noted that the video will be available for posting on project, city websites to expand the reach.
  - 2. The video will also have an “evergreen” version that removes the push for the Virtual Public Workshop.
- F. Curious how many impressions are part of the media buy?
- G. The video is professionally done and will add creditability to the feasibility study.
- H. Blue Line Consulting group is working on a study regarding recreation in Black Diamond. Have pointed them to Covington/ Maple Valley study for them to potentially combine efforts.
- I. Felt the video was very aquatics heavy. Was hoping to see other amenities expressed in the graphics.

*Intermission*

**IV. Review of Programming Documentation**

- A. Presented key demographic and market findings from the executive summary.
- B. Next steps are to take the program once approved and evaluate for feasibility. If financial feasibility is favorable, facility program can be larger. Lower favorability will require a smaller facility program.
- C. Presented how findings from information collection have informed the facility program presented in preliminary draft report distributed to Steering Committee members.
- D. Primary focus is for Steering Committee members to determine if the

Action

Item

amenities presented are the correct ones for the facility.

**V. From your perspective, do the current program document findings represent what an indoor aquatic/recreation center should include here? What changes would you like to discuss?**

**Steering Committee Responses:**

- A. There were multiple discussions/comments regarding the importance of Weights, Cardio, and Indoor Track preference. With comments on how the gymnasiums (court sports amenity space) could be utilized for free weights or “Boot Camp” needs.
  - 1. Ken Ballard provided clarity on how weights and cardio spaces are entry-level and increase the market for private gyms in markets where community fitness centers are constructed.
  - 2. Was also noted that weights and cardio spaces make up the majority of space listed as “under-sized” on day one in completed projects.
  - 3. The use of gymnasiums as multi-purpose spaces that house both creates difficulties in scheduling. Peak times for gymnasiums and fitness spaces align, creating difficulty in scheduling and providing equipment for users.
- B. Need to consider safety and inclusivity of community members. Needs to be a safe place for all, parents with kids, individuals, minority groups. Safety of indoor running track for minorities versus running outside was noted.
- C. Need a one-stop facility, where mom can use weight equipment, kids can play basketball and dad can swim.
- D. Indoor track and group/dance studio are both important.
- E. Adding weights, cardio, and indoor track are top priorities. The safety of users is an important topic brought up by a fellow Steering Committee member.
- F. Jeff Wagner brought forward a motion to vote on moving “Facility Program” forward. Motioned was seconded.
- G. No additional discussion was requested by Steering Committee members present. All members present approved the advancement of the

Action

Item

program. No members opposed the motion.

H. The facility program is advanced.

**VI. Introduction to Campbell and Company, Kate Roosevelt.**

A. Kate presented the history and key attributes of Campbell and Company, their role, and the purpose of her role in the feasibility study.

B. Will be looking for synergies everywhere in the community.

1. Public and private funding sources available.
2. Opportunities to leverage funding sources to maximize results
3. What will the community support, what are the pros and cons of the ask (tax increase).
4. Is there sufficient donor capacity and interest to participate in Capital Campaign?
5. Are multiple priorities/projects bundled together to draw a critical mass, need big vision?

C. Need to build a “case for support” amongst possible contributors, using three key elements: Shared Value, Benefits Community, and Not Doing it alone.

**VII. From your perspective, what is the ideal funding mix for a capital project?**

**Steering Committee Responses:**

A. Funding was identified as perhaps the most important (scary) element of this feasibility study.

B. Need to support physical, mental, and emotional wellbeing. There are funding opportunities for these areas. Link the “ask” to research.

C. Multiple finance options help sell the project and ask of taxpayers. Funding largely falls on parents and families.

D. Ideal funding source is the one(s) we can get.

**VIII. Presentation of potential sites:**

A. Reviewed four sites studied and preliminary conceptual site plans.



Action

Item

- B. Importance is not which site is the best today, but what the four sites can inform the communities about in the future final location when funds are available to proceed with the facility.
- C. Important to know that there are sites available in the two communities. The top site today may be gone when funds are available to purchase land. The results of the site analysis should be used to inform future decision on land purchases.

**IX. Given the various types of sites and funding mechanisms, share what you think would be ideal and a fit for our community?**

**Steering Committee Responses:**

- A. A more central site between the communities would be preferred over locating them in the heart of one community; more unified, shared ownership, neutral. Travel time is not that critical.
- B. Need to evaluate and consider land acquisition and development cost, access to main roads, environmental issues/wetlands, earthwork, storm drainage. Compare readiness of sites with versus without infrastructure.
- C. Clarify “Client” versus “Public/Private” title in documents.
- D. Access from a main road is also critical.
- E. Bus access for students needs to be considered.
- F. One of the sites showed a large parking requirement. Maple Valley is considering revisions to their parking requirements.
- G. Clarify: if site A (scored high) were compared to sites B and C (scored lower), what would we lose?

*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.*

RH/skm:2019-048

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
- Kate Roosevelt                      Campbell and Company

RH/AL/File