

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CITY OF JERSEY VILLAGE 2024 BOND
COMMITTEE**

June 24, 2024, at 6:30 p.m.

THE CITY OF JERSEY VILLAGE 2024 BOND COMMITTEE MET ON June 24, 2024, AT 6:30 P.M. AT THE CIVIC CENTER MUNICIPAL CENTER MEETING ROOM, JERSEY VILLAGE, TEXAS 77040.

A. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. and the roll of appointed officers was taken.

Committee members present were:

Beverly Petersen
Edward Lock
Krista Guerrero
Curtis Haverty

Susan Edwards
Jennifer Withner

Staff in attendance: Robert Basford, Assistant City Manager; Isaac Recinos, Recreation and Events Manager; and Maria Thorne, Administrative Assistant. George Deines joined us by zoom.

- B. CITIZENS' COMMENTS** - Any person who desires to address the 2024 Bond Committee regarding an item on the agenda will be heard at this time. In compliance with the Texas Open Meetings Act, unless the subject matter of the comment is on the agenda, the City staff and Committee members are not allowed to discuss the subject. Each person is limited to five (5) minutes for comments to the Bond Committee

Ernie Hewett 15917 Lakeview Dr. – Mr. Hewett questioned the necessity of the bond committee meeting. He argued that the existing pool could be repaired for significantly less money and could last for another 10 to 15 years. He pointed out that the city had a \$20 million fund but spent \$9 million on building the golf course clubhouse. They see no reason to commit to a bond issue for a pool that can be fixed with the remaining funds. Drawing on his experience as a pool manager, he noted that a new pool would only last around 40 years, with major repairs likely needed within 20 years.

C. Consider approval of the minutes from the meeting held on June 18, 2024.

A request was made to remove the names of the members who were not present from the approval section the minutes. A request was made to correct the amount of the proposed bond amount that had been suggested by one of the members. __

Edward made a motion for approval of the minutes, and Krista seconded the motion.

The vote follows:

Ayes: Beverly Petersen, Edward Lock, Jennifer Withner, Krista Guerrero, Curtis Haverty and Susan Edwards

Nays: None

The motion carried.

D. Discuss and take appropriate action on potential bond items. *Robert Basford*

Robert began the meeting by summarizing the requested features for the 4th pool concept within a \$6 million target budget, which included a Z-shaped pool, an offset shallow end, wide steps, a zero-entry, a large shade area with no temporary umbrellas, a diving board, eight lanes, no rock wall, a slide, a yard pool while keeping the dive well and shallow area the same size, chillers and heaters, air conditioning in the bathrooms and bathhouse, and a room for lifeguard training. He mentioned that he had discussed

these features with George, who had since created the 4th and 5th concepts, and George was attending via Zoom to address any questions from the committee members.

Curtis inquired if the ancillary costs for non-pool items like furniture, fixtures, and support spaces would be consistent across different pool sizes. George explained that costs are generally based on industry-standard percentages and would be similar for projects between \$7.5 to \$8.5 million. However, for projects between \$7 million and \$10 million, costs would vary more significantly, particularly for the mechanical room, which increases with pool size. Locker rooms and other buildings' costs would remain fairly consistent.

Beverly asked about the placement and designation of bathrooms in the new concepts. George confirmed that the locker rooms and family changing rooms were grouped with the restrooms, and were typically allocated 1200 to 1400 square feet. Beverly noted a discrepancy between the size of bathroom and front desk areas in the drawings and their costs. George explained that the drawings might appear off-scale due to budget adjustments but advised trusting the provided numbers. Beverly asked if they could eliminate the office or front desk to save space, and George agreed, emphasizing the need for about 3600 square feet for the bathhouse.

Susan questioned the quoted square footage for changing rooms and bathrooms, noting a discrepancy with the new concepts. Robert clarified that the 3500 to 4400 square feet covered all support spaces combined, including the front desk, offices, locker rooms, and family changing rooms. Susan then asked if eliminating locker rooms would significantly reduce the dollar amount. George explained that doing so would only reduce the space by 50 to 100 square feet, resulting in minimal cost savings. Beverly asked for a dollar estimate, and George suggested that reducing 200 square feet could save around \$100,000 based on current square foot costs.

Beverly queried about the specifics of overhead lighting, questioning whether there were existing lights outside in the pool area or parking lot. Isaac clarified that there were lights already in the pool area, located near the back corner and next to the pump. Susan then asked where the new outdoor lighting was planned. George explained that the overhead lighting was intended for security and safety, particularly for after-hours events when it gets dark. He noted that some facilities choose not to install overhead lighting if they don't operate after dark, but it's typically coupled with pool lighting for safety. Susan sought clarification if the new lighting would replace or add to existing lights, expressing concern over the \$20,000 cost. George clarified that it would be a complete replacement based on square footage costs, with specific details to be finalized during the design phase by the electrical engineer. Susan acknowledged the importance of adequate lighting given the darkness at night towards the end of the pool season, emphasizing the necessity while questioning the cost effectiveness of the proposed \$20,000 expenditure.

Beverly asked George to clarify what was included in the line item for furniture, fixtures, and equipment beyond tables and chairs. George explained that this category covers a wide range of items, including lifeguard safety equipment like AEDs, backboards, and rescue tubes, as well as necessary safety and cleaning tools such as robotic vacuums. It also encompasses office furniture and computer systems used at check-in windows, along with lounge chairs, lifeguard stands, PVC wheelchairs, and any other fixtures not initially included in the building's construction. George noted that the estimated cost included ADA chairs, but the recently purchased ones which cost \$14,000 could be reused.

Susan raised a question regarding concept number 5's 8-lane pool, specifically asking about a black rectangle near the slide. George explained it as the clearance zone required for the water slide's plunge area. Robert inquired about an area marked on the expanded layout where the existing baby pool was located. George clarified that it was a new baby pool with a play structure, absent in the base concept.

Beverly then observed that the front desk, lifeguard offices, and other facilities seemed to overlap with the splash pad mechanical room on the expanded layout. George acknowledged the issue, suggesting adjustments to either the shape of the building or enclosing the mechanical room.

Beverly also noted the outdoor mechanical room's increased size on the extended layout compared to the existing one, attributing it to the addition of the baby pool and an 8-lane configuration. Krista asked about the feasibility of incorporating a zero-entry pool if the baby pool was removed. George mentioned it could be possible but might affect other design elements. Krista also questioned if the pool could be converted from meters to yards. George assured it was feasible with a simple adjustment. Susan then asked about a blue blob in the deep end concept drawing, which George confirmed was an existing slide shown in the aerial view but not planned for the expanded layout. Susan inquired about reusing the existing slide, to which George noted it was possible pending an assessment of its condition during disassembly. Beverly sought clarification on a water slide tower mentioned in the plans, confirming it was indeed a new addition separate from any existing slides, ensuring they wouldn't need to reuse the old one.

Susan expressed concern about the measurements of the shallow and deep ends in relation to converting the pool from meters to yards. She questioned if the dimensions would remain the same or if adjustments would be made due to the change in measurement scale. George explained they hadn't finalized those details yet but assured it was possible to either adjust or offset the dimensions, as shown in the expanded layout. He mentioned the potential for multiple design iterations if the project progressed to the design phase. Susan emphasized the importance of maintaining the current size of the shallow end, as it's favored by everyone. She also stressed the need to preserve the width of the deep end, crucial for accommodating both the diving board and slide simultaneously. Susan requested that the six-lane pool be redrawn as a yard pool with an offset shallow and deep end to retain the current width.

Beverly expressed concern that the two new pool concepts presented exceeded the \$6 million budget she had hoped for, questioning if it was feasible to achieve a new pool within that amount. George clarified that to meet the \$6 million budget, they would need to reduce the pool size to approximately 4000 square feet, which would necessitate eliminating either the shallow or deep end of the Z-shaped pool and reducing it to six lanes with an offset. Beverly referenced the initial cost estimate of \$425 per square foot discussed at a previous meeting, expecting a lower total cost based on that figure for a 5400 square foot pool. George explained that the \$425 per square foot figure encompassed various components beyond just the pool area, including decking, lighting, plumbing, and more, each with different cost implications. Edward queried about provisions for chemical storage in the mechanical room diagrams, which George confirmed, specifying separate ventilated rooms for chlorine and muriatic acid, typically around 30 to 40 square feet each.

Curtis raised concerns during the meeting about the condition and lifespan of various components related to the pool project. He first questioned George and Robert about the mechanical room, restroom facilities, and pool deck, seeking their expert opinions on whether these elements were at the end of their usable lifespan. George confirmed that the mechanical room was indeed deteriorating with significant corrosion and ventilation issues, suggesting it needed replacement. Robert echoed this sentiment regarding plumbing issues affecting the restroom facilities, indicating it was also nearing the end of its functional life. Regarding the pool itself, George and Robert agreed that it had surpassed its expected lifespan and was showing signs of critical failure, needing immediate attention. However, they noted that the pool deck, while requiring ongoing maintenance due to heaving and cracking, could still be patched and maintained for some time. Curtis then queried George about community practices regarding pool renovations versus replacements, with George explaining that communities often faced decisions based on cost, lifespan, and community support, sometimes opting to repair existing facilities

despite ongoing maintenance costs. Susan sought clarification on the deck's condition, prompting George and Curtis to elaborate on recent repairs and ongoing maintenance needs. Curtis concluded the discussion by requesting a detailed list and cost estimate for amenities in the pool designs, emphasizing the desire for inclusive features without excessive costs, which George agreed to provide promptly.

Susan inquired about the type of toddler equipment that would be included if they chose the six-lane, 25-yard pool with offset shallow and deep ends. George explained that options ranged from simple play structures to vertical spray features or water cascades similar to those found in children's museums. These installations are typically permanent and vary in size, depending on the specific amenities chosen. Jennifer sought clarification on the design iteration process once a concept is selected, to which George explained that after funding and during the design phase, there are opportunities to refine and adjust the layout based on input from the wider design team, including architects and landscape architects who consider site constraints and survey data before finalizing the project design.

Jennifer raised concerns about the timeline and community engagement regarding the proposed pool project. She sought clarification on whether the committee should seek citizen input before making a dollar amount recommendation to the City Council for a November election. Robert emphasized the need to have a concept prepared soon if aiming for a November bond, suggesting that while the exact details don't need to be finalized immediately, having a representative concept is crucial to inform voters. George highlighted that once funded, there could be further iterations and adjustments during the design phase based on ongoing community feedback and site constraints.

Edward brought up previous citizen input gathered through surveys and feedback forms, acknowledging the need for continuous engagement throughout the design process. Jennifer expressed caution against assuming unanimous community preferences without substantial evidence and proposed additional community engagement strategies to ensure diverse perspectives are considered. Robert emphasized the importance of presenting a framework rather than a specific plan to Council, allowing flexibility for adjustments while maintaining transparency with voters. The committee discussed blending different concepts and maintaining flexibility in design choices to accommodate varying community preferences and ensure clarity in the election process.

Jennifer inquired about obtaining data on current pool usage demographics such as age ranges, resident versus non-resident pass holders, and day pass usage. Robert explained that the city uses Amelia, a recreation software, to gather analytics which include details like pool rentals, day passes sold, and demographic breakdowns. He mentioned that a mid-year pool report will be presented to the Council in July, which will include comprehensive data on these metrics. Robert assured Jennifer that the information shared with the committee will also be made available on the city's website for public access.

Curtis then asked George for insight into the typical cost range for constructing new pools in cities similar in size to theirs. George mentioned that historically, community pool projects ranged from \$4.5 to \$6.5 million about five to eight years ago, but costs have since increased to the \$7 to \$10 million range. He noted that pools exceeding \$9 million often serve as regional attractions or are the only facilities in their area, anticipating larger visitor draws from neighboring communities. Overall, George indicated that their project's size and cost estimates align with those seen in comparable communities.

George explained that the price per square foot for the various pool concepts ranges between \$325 to \$375 for construction costs, with some variations based on specific elements like the pool deck at \$25 per square foot, fencing at \$180 per linear foot, and locker rooms around \$600 per square foot. He noted

that these costs are part of a comprehensive cost estimation process that considers different categories such as bathhouse construction, amenities, lighting, fencing, site costs, and furniture, fixtures, and equipment (FF&E). Each component is priced differently based on its specific requirements and materials, making it challenging to apply a simple multiplier across the board due to the complexity of the cost breakdown and estimation methodologies used by different design firms.

The group discussed the upcoming bond issue deadline for presenting to the Council. Susan emphasized the need to finalize both a clear dollar amount and a preferred concept for the new pool. Edward reiterated his preference for Concept 3, advocating for separate areas for lap swimming and recreational use, proposing a budget of \$10 million. Krista stressed the importance of accommodating the swim team's needs, including 8 lanes and suitable facilities, suggesting a budget range between \$9.5 to \$10 million. Curtis expressed openness to various pool sizes but highlighted the necessity of considering all user groups, particularly toddlers, kids, and teenagers. Beverly supported the idea of a new pool but emphasized selecting a budget that would garner community support, suggesting around \$7.6 million. Jennifer highlighted the progress made in community engagement and education since the last bond attempt, leaning towards a \$9 million budget for the new pool. Robert facilitated the discussion and suggested that once everyone settled on their preferred concept and budget, they could move towards a vote or further discussions. The group agreed to take a few more days to finalize their decisions, ensuring thorough consideration of the new pool concepts and community feedback before proceeding.

E. Select next meeting date.

Monday, July 1st at 6:30

F. ADJOURN

There being no further business on the agenda, a motion was made to adjourn the meeting by Edward Lock and was second by Krista Guerrero. The meeting was adjourned at 8:21 p.m.



Maria Thorne, Administrative Assistant