

CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION Minutes of the September 4, 2012 Meeting

Page 4

DRAFT

forum for this discussion would be the Board of Supervisors. Commissioner Westergard thanked Ms. Vance for airing her concerns even though this Commission could not take any action.

B. DISCUSSION ONLY REGARDING AN UPDATE OF NEW AQUATIC FITNESS PROGRAMS CURRENTLY HELD AT THE AQUATICS FACILITY. – This item was addressed along with agenda item 4A.

(7:31:13) – Chairperson Lehmann announced a short recess.

(7:41:49) – Chairperson Lehmann called the meeting back to order.

C. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: REGARDING PROPOSED DESIGN OPTIONS FOR THE MULTI-PURPOSE ATHLETIC CENTER. (7:41:53) – Chairperson Lehmann introduced the item. Mr. Moellendorf gave background and noted that the previous design had been downsized due to budget constraints, and this Commission had expressed concern that the gymnasium size had been reduced and the walking track had been eliminated. He added that Staff had met with the architect and would present additional options per the Commission's request. Mr. Moellendorf clarified that four options had been presented, one of which had been eliminated because it was only a point of reference. He presented an additional option and responded to Commissioner Walt that two of the options would not support the current budget, but were included as reference points. Discussion ensued regarding consideration of options that were over budget. Commissioner Walt suggested getting bids from local contractor since the nature of the project had changed from a recreation center to a gymnasium; however, Mr. Moellendorf reminded the Commission, that was not agendaed for discussion. Mr. Moellendorf referred to a Staff Report and showed a PowerPoint presentation depicting the four options. Discussion ensued regarding cost variances, and Mr. Moellendorf noted that these costs were estimates. Commissioner Walt questioned whether this new facility would be outgrown in a few years. Discussion ensued regarding accommodating different age groups in different size courts. Chairperson Lehmann received confirmation that youth could play in the larger size courts because they could be resized by age group. Mr. Moellendorf added that many adults preferred the smaller courts. Commissioner Walt explained that the community needed additional gym space as the high school gym was not available during the basketball season, and expressed frustration towards the estimates. Mr. Moellendorf clarified that construction prices in Northern Nevada were significantly higher than the nationwide rates. Mr. Moellendorf stated that the budget was "finite" and more elaborate plans could not be considered. Commissioner Walt noted that the Edmonds Sports Complex was popular because tournament participants did not have to "drive all over town" for games. In response to a question by Commissioner Long, Mr. Moellendorf explained that Reno did not have a large enough facility like this one. Chairperson Lehmann noted that given the budget constraints, options four and five were the only viable choices, and was in favor of choosing option five, the one with the walking track. **Commissioner Walt moved to recommend the option five MAC design to the Board of the Supervisors, with some cost estimates presented to the Board of Supervisors. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Myers.** Commissioner Adams questioned spending \$500,000 for a walking track in exchange for a smaller gym. Mr. Moellendorf reminded the Commission that the project budget was \$5.7 million and the current construction estimate for option five was \$5.6 million. Commissioner Westergard received confirmation that should additional funds become available, that Staff would re-agendaize the item. Chairperson Lehmann entertained public comments, and when none were forthcoming, a vote. **Motion carried 5-2.**

D. DISCUSSION ONLY REGARDING THE ACTIVE STRATEGY QUARTERLY REVIEW. (8:38:30) – Chairperson Lehmann introduced the item. Mr. Moellendorf presented the second quarter's "Quarterly Business Review", which had also been presented to the Board of Supervisors. He clarified that this was an evolving document, and some of the data and its methodology would be changed. In response to a question by Commissioner Westergard, Mr. Moellendorf noted that a portion of the data was collected by the Public Works Department. He also stated that Staff had taken this on without additional headcount. Mr. Moellendorf showed a PowerPoint presentation, incorporated into the record, depicting Parks and Recreation Department trends, such as use of the Bob Boldrick Theater, Community Center Meeting Rooms (including fitness classrooms), Community Center Gym, tournament use of facilities, and taxable sales. He explained that tracking averages had not resulted in good metrics, therefore usage times would be tracked instead. Commissioner Long received confirmation that similar metrics would be used for the Aquatics Facility. Mr. Moellendorf also noted that the reduced numbers for the aquatic facility could be due to the reduction of the pool

**Parks and Recreation Commission
Staff Report**

Meeting Date: September 4, 2012

Agenda Item Number: 4C

Applicant: Roger Moellendorf

Request: For Possible Action: Regarding proposed design options for the Multi-Purpose Athletic Center.

General Discussion:

During the May 1, 2012, Parks & Recreation Commission meeting staff brought an alternative conceptual Multi-purpose Athletic Center (MAC) plan to the Commission for approval. This plan, developed by Brent Tippets of VCBO, was an alternative to a larger 41,533 square foot facility with a second story containing an elevated walking/running track. The estimated construction budget of this facility was \$6,917,980 which exceeded our project budget of \$5,769,492. The alternative MAC plan is 27,410 square feet and does not have an elevated track. The reductions in square footage and the elimination of the elevated track were made to bring the project within budget. The Parks and Recreation Commission rejected the alternative plan and asked staff to explore other options with Mr. Tippets. The Commission felt that the elevated walking track was an important feature, and there was concern that a smaller gym would reduce the tournament potential of the facility.

The project staff met with Mr. Tippets and requested four options with associated cost estimates. The first option was the original 36,154 square foot Recreation Center which contained a double gym, elevated track, child care facility, exercise studio, lockers with showers, fitness center, bouldering area, and administrative offices. This project is estimated at \$8,111,600. The next three options were all variations of the MAC. Option 2 is the 41,533 square foot facility with a double gym, locker area, and two stories with an elevated track. Option 3 is the same facility without the elevated track and consists of 33,793 square feet. Option 4 is the above mentioned 27,410 square foot single story facility without the elevated track.

After reviewing these options with Mr. Tippets, staff decided to include a fifth option which would be the Option 4 with an elevated track. Staff rejected Option 1 as the estimated cost is unrealistic in terms of affordability and due to the fact that the current emphasis for this project has evolved from a Recreation Center to a MAC concept.

Exhibit A is a summary of the four options. Staff is still prepared to recommend Option 4 as it is closest to the available budget; however, staff would like the Commission to discuss and prioritize the four options.

Recommended Action: I move to recommend the following MAC design options in priority order.

EXHIBIT A

MULTI-PURPOSE ATHLETIC CENTER OPTIONS

Details	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
Stories	2	1	1	2
Total Square Feet	41,533	33,793	27,233	32,135
Double Gym	27,056	27,200	21,200	21,200
Spectator seating	590	425	425	425
Admin. Offices	460	500	500	460
Lockers -number	630	630	630	630
Elevated track	Yes	No	No	Yes
Total Costs	\$6,984,826	\$6,450,982	\$5,148,931	\$5,648,931

Project Budget: \$5,769,892