

## MEETING MINUTES No. 9

**Date:** February 24, 2016

**By:** Bruce McMillan AIA Architects, P.A.

**Re:** Parks & Recreation Facility Feasibility Study

**Project No.** 15.18

---

### DISTRIBUTION

**City of Manhattan:** Jason Hilgers, Eddie Eastes  
Karen Davis

**Orazem & Scalora Engineering:** Tom Orazem

**Bruce McMillan AIA Architects:** Bruce McMillan  
Cameron Tross, Garric Baker, Dana Williamson

**SJCF:** Brad Biddle, Robert Love, Shannon Bohm  
**Ballard King:** Jeff King

**Dudley Williams & Associates:** Mark McAfee

**Schwab Eaton:** Leon Brown, Chuck May

---

### PRESENT

**See Attached Attendance Roster**

The meeting was held to discuss goals and objectives for Priorities 1-4 with the Steering Committee and Parks & Recreation Staff.

1. Bruce McMillan and Eddie Eastes made opening remarks and thanked everyone for their participation.
2. Introductions of the Steering Committee, Parks & Recreation Staff, and consultant team were made and an attendance sheet was passed around.
3. Jason Hilgers detailed City Staff efforts to meet with USD 383 staff, including the administration at the middle schools to discuss partnership possibilities.
  - Anthony and Eisenhower Middle School sites were toured at that time.
  - School administrators expressed excitement over potential partnerships and provided good feedback.
4. At the last School District Bond Issue in 2008, the budget was cut by over \$20 million and reduced the amount of new/better gym/court space. There was already a need for indoor court space at the time that still needs to be addressed.
5. There are parking challenges at all three sites (Douglass Park and both middle schools) as well as storm water challenges at the middle schools.
6. City and Parks & Recreation Staff will continue to foster partnerships with USD 383 and Kansas State University; this is not part of the consultant team's scope. It is understood that the community wants to see money/facilities/resources being utilized efficiently, so private partnerships will also be pursued by City Staff.
7. Discussion has already begun with one private entity, Genesis Health Clubs. They have design ideas and funding sources but are interested in making sure City facilities do not duplicate theirs.
8. Bruce Snead pointed out Chapter 8 of the SFIP, "Implementation," which details the four priorities in the scope of this study. Bruce Snead asked the Committee and consultant team to think clearly about who is being served and what needs are to be met. Currently a large portion of the community is not affiliated with Kansas State University or Fort Riley and therefore does not have access to those facilities.
9. Extensive site evaluation occurred during the 2006 Indoor Recreation Center study and the SFIP process which has led to the identification of the sites that are part of this study's scope.

### Priority 1:

#### **Douglass Park:**

1. The facility needs at the Douglass Park site are eligible for CDBG funding, so this portion of the study will be run as a separate contract but will be worked on concurrent with the other two neighborhood recreation centers, to be presented to the City Commission on April 26, 2016. There will be a separate report for the Douglass Center submitted to the City Community Development Department in June.
2. Douglass Park existing facilities include: Exterior lighted basketball courts, playground and picnic shelter; an interior non-regulation size basketball court and aerobic/fitness room in the center; and limited weight training and small meeting rooms in the Annex; some parking; and an open field.

3. At the southwest corner, adjacent to the open field, is the fairly busy signal controlled intersection at 10<sup>th</sup> and Fort Riley Blvd.
4. The Breadbasket in the southeast corner of the park could be relocated, but it would be a challenge to find a new location. The existing freezer and maintenance shed between the Breadbasket and Douglass Annex will likely need to be relocated.
5. The existing gym facilities are used on a drop-in basis. Fitness classes are offered for a small fee. Many seniors use the weights and tutoring is offered after school.
6. The primary drop-in user will be the continued focus.
7. There is a \$3 million funding cap as far as CDBG funds are concerned.

#### **Douglass Park Goals & Objectives:**

1. At least one court, if not more, is desired.
2. A walking track is not necessary, however should be explored in the concept designs.
3. Limited parking is needed as the park is a walkable destination; however, zoning regulations will apply.
4. The weight training currently offered can be continued, but there is no need for new/expanded equipment availability. This function could be programmed in the new facility.
5. Multi-purpose, flexible space is in high demand at this location, with an emphasis on being both rentable and programmable.
6. Spaces need to be very flexible, as the neighborhood currently has community BBQ's, neighborhood group meetings, and other community functions at the center.
7. Core design should be similar to that of the centers at the middle school sites, with possibly something specific or unique to this neighborhood.
8. Committee needs to focus at this time on needs for new facility, not enhancements to the existing Center (staff will provide a list of recent/planned improvements to the Center and Annex).

#### **Eisenhower Middle School:**

1. The facility is about 20 years old. It is accessed from Waters Drive which connects to Tuttle Creek Blvd. Although the site plan and building layout is roughly identical to Anthony Middle School, there is less green space available. "Marlatt Ditch" also creates some water control issues.
2. The surrounding green space is used daily by the students, but additional indoor court space could fulfill this need.
3. The adjacent competitive and practice baseball fields are used by MHS and MCC. They all have lighting and scoreboards. With the fields at this location, parking becomes an issue, as does traffic congestion on city streets. If these could be relocated, it would free up more space for indoor facilities. A proposal was rejected a few years ago that would have installed turf on Wilson Field in City Park. Insufficient funds prevented this from moving forward.

#### **Anthony Middle School:**

1. Site plan and building layout are similar to Eisenhower. The facilities were built at the same time.
2. There is more green space available for use that is currently being used by students on a regular basis.
3. There is also a storm drainage issue to work around at this site.

#### **Goals & Objectives (both middle school sites):**

1. Recreation center space could be used by the school and students during the day. Enough new space should be created to relieve current pressure of space needs but not so much that it eliminates use of existing school facilities. Currently there is little, if any at all, adult space available in the evenings.
2. Security and separation of space will be key. There should probably be at least part of the new facilities available for public use during the day that can be completely separated from school activities. If space is available for public use during the school day, the public will need to be made aware of this. The intent is that the new facilities are not just a school building; the community needs to be able to use them at convenient times.

3. An additional 9 courts most likely will still be inadequate. Existing facilities are used nightly until 9:00 or 9:30 but the surveys taken for the SFIP indicate that community needs are not being met.
4. Multiple courts in a gym with divider curtains may be appropriate.
5. Each court needs to be able to accommodate multiple sports and provide flexible spectator space.
6. Spectator space could be tip-and-roll bleachers. Enough space should be planned for 4-6 spectators per child involved.
7. Circulation space is also important. Spectators should not have to walk in front of the teams to get to bleachers. Teams & spectators for the next event should have adequate space to wait, either in the gym or in a lobby space.
8. Courts should be the full 94'-0" length.
9. Thought should be given to possible tournament venues, when teams & spectators may be staying on site all day. Restrooms can provide an area for changing but full locker rooms are not needed. A convenient concessions area should be provided.
10. The core design should probably be similar & familiar, such as the gym area and/or parking, so that there is equity in each design. Each location can have something specific or unique to that neighborhood.
11. A running/walking track would be a good asset.
12. The parking challenge should not be compounded by any new facility. The goal would be to not make the existing parking situation any worse. Both the school district's and the City's needs should be met.
13. Providing cardio/strength training should not be a priority; that need can be met by Genesis and other private entities. There may be a way to provide the space and sublet it to those private entities. There is a high cost to maintain the equipment, but there is a portion of the community that does not have access to the KSU rec center.
14. It would be nice to have racquetball or handball courts at one facility, at least.
15. Multi-purpose spaces are at a premium. The more flexible they can be, the better. For example, a group fitness class, a tutoring session, or a neighborhood meeting could all make use of the same space.
16. Spaces need to be rentable and programmable.
17. Manhattan may be the largest city in Kansas without an indoor pool.
18. Kitchen space for public use is required.
19. P&R currently offer introductory group fitness classes. More advanced classes can be obtained through private providers.
20. The task being asked of the Steering Committee at this time is to prioritize the needs of the community. The consultant team will try to find a solution that provides for as many of those needs within the site constraints.
21. Space is available for repurposing if necessary to increase efficiencies. P&R is already in the process of repurposing existing space. Should this information be included in this study's report?
22. Some part of the new facilities could be built as a safe room or storm shelter, with possible FEMA funding as a resource.
23. Commissioner Mike Dodson emphasized that the annual cost of operation is just as important to consider as the initial building cost. The Commission will want to see options so that the City can move forward with something that the community will approve.
24. The Steering Committee does not want the City to cut out options until the community has had a chance to review and give feedback, but the Committee should recognize what the public will accept. The previous attempt at a fieldhouse in 2007 tried to satisfy too many people and provide too many services in one facility, so the Committee should focus on the needs of most, not all.

25. Ballard King Associates role on the consultant team is to provide accurate cost analysis of both initial building costs and operation/maintenance costs.
26. A key concern from the community to be addressed is that it is thought that current needs can be met if hours at schools were extended. However, that is the situation the community is already in and needs are not being met.
27. How utilized are the current outdoor facilities at the middle schools (the basketball/tennis courts)? Could that utilization move to the new indoor spaces created and take over the outdoor space without any negative ramifications? This study may need to identify how both the schools and P&R are currently using the facilities and how both will use the new facilities.
28. It would be wise to plan for expansion because whatever new facilities get built will quickly become inadequate. The more flexible the space is, the longer it will be usable.
29. P&R only programs for up to 12-year-olds. Everything else is community use.

### **Priority 2/3:**

1. At Anneberg Park, four softball infields and one soccer field are being converted to synthetic turf and should be available for play in April.
2. The current master plan at City Park is on hold for now, about midway through the plan.
3. Is the number of tennis courts at City Park adequate? Too many?
4. There is no current master plan for CiCo Park, but should it be master-planned? It is currently one of the most heavily programmed parks.
5. CiCo Park contains land owned by three different entities: Riley County, City of Manhattan, and USD 383. Riley County owns a majority of the land and has an agreement with the City for the CiCo Park Pool which is on County property but is operated and maintained by the City. The County has expressed interest in working with the City and CiCo Park on a new aquatics center.
6. The Steering Committee needs to determine where the biggest benefit to the community will be and how to enhance what is currently available to the community.
7. Regarding Priority 2, P&R staff has the best insight into where improvements to playing surfaces are needed. The Steering Committee might have better input on Priority 3 concerning trails.
8. Norvell Field at Eisenhower Middle School is on City-owned land. It is good for playing, but terrible for spectators, with the parking and traffic issues and limited seating space. It could possibly be a contributing factor to the fragmented school/athletic support the community shows. Could this be improved by relocating the competitive and practice fields?
9. Amenities are important to improving facilities, such as parking & access.
10. Linear Trail is very underappreciated and underutilized. Is there a way to make it visible, such as paving the unpaved areas or making a "grand" entrance near the neighborhood recreation centers?
11. P&R has a list of 26 improvements that are either recently completed or just beginning, so priority 3 is currently being incrementally addressed. The progress of these improvements should be part of this study's report.
12. The current ¼-cent sales tax can be retired or renewed in 2017. If it is renewed, it would provide \$25 million over the next 10 years that could fund P&R facilities and improvements. However, in November 2016 there will be a 2/10-cent increase for infrastructure put to the public for a vote. This could affect the result of the ¼-cent sales tax renewal if passed.
13. The sales tax renewal could provide a source of funding that can be used to address needs/priorities as they change over the years' .

### **Priority 4:**

1. The lap pool at City Park was specifically designed and located so that an enclosure, either seasonal or permanent, could be possible. No concepts or design studies for what the enclosure would be were completed as part of the design of City Park Pool.

2. USD 383 is a large user of the competitive pool and will be a key partner in determining if an existing pool is enclosed or a new aquatic center is built.
3. Is the City Park location ideal? Will the atmosphere deteriorate by swim meet traffic?
4. The community has indicated that 47% want an indoor aquatic facility. What is currently available is through KSU, is old and programmed out, and isn't meeting the community's needs. Any indoor pool facility would be used, whether it is an enclosed existing pool or a new facility.
5. Evaluation of existing pools and effects of potential enclosure needs to occur before deciding to provide an alternative, something new that can possibly meet more of the community's needs.
6. CiCo Park may have the space needed for new indoor aquatic facility.
7. Enclosing an existing pool limits usage because of the complexity of the different water temperatures needed for competitive versus play.
8. The Natatorium at KSU has a 25-yard competitive pool. The competitive pool at City Park is a 50-meter pool. The Natatorium is currently used by high school and middle school students as well as the Manhattan Marlins competitive team.
9. If the Natatorium had 5-10 years left, the students would need to vote to increase fees to build a new facility. Students may be leery of funding something that would only be partially available to them. The Natatorium is only partially available now but they are not currently directly funding the facility.
10. If the City wanted to discuss a partnership with the University, a good contact may be Jackie Hartman with the President's office. This option probably needs to be explored, even if the answer is no, so that any questions from the community can be addressed. This process should begin before the April 26 work session.
11. Other universities may be able to provide models for a KSU-community shared facility. There may be some skepticism towards school/public or public/private facility because there will be a percent of the community that will not have their needs met.
12. KSU may be willing to work with the community on a shared facility but funding sources will be critical.
13. Students are citizens too and will be able to use the public facility at all times, just like they are able to use the public library. But not all citizens can use K-State facilities.
14. The focus should be on meeting the community's needs rather than working out a successful partnership or shared facility. However, a partnership with USD 383 appears much more feasible than a KSU or private partnership.
15. \$25 million probably cannot completely cover the initial costs of a new indoor aquatic facility the community needs, but there are other funding sources available. A partnership for this facility makes the most sense.
16. A priority at City Park will be to protect the green space. The existing parking in City Park meets the current need.
17. If the pool at City Park is enclosed, will it meet the school district's needs?
18. Genesis doesn't want duplicate facilities or services provided. Their current model generally provides a 5- or 6-lane lap pool, which isn't enough to meet the community's needs.
19. The public has a good memory and will remember that the lap pool at City Park was designed to have the potential to be enclosed in the future. This question needs to be answered within this study

### **Moving Forward**

1. Another meeting with the Steering Committee will need to occur before April 26.
2. The next meeting time will be coordinated by Angie Sutton.

---

The above constitutes the writer's understanding of the items discussed and the conclusions reached. This understanding will be deemed correct unless any additions and/or corrections are made within 7 days of this memorandum.  
BEM/lb/dw