

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING

The Finance Committee of the City of Norfolk, Nebraska met in the City's Conference Room, 309 Madison Avenue, Norfolk, Nebraska, on Monday, June 27, 2005, beginning at 7:05 p.m.

Mayor Gordon D. Adams called the meeting to order.

Roll call found the following Committee members present: Mayor Gordon Adams and Councilpersons Kaspar-Beckman, Brenneman, Lange, Leshovsky, Saunders, Van Dyke, and Wisnieski. Absent: Fauss.

Staff members present were City Administrator Mike Nolan, Public Works Director Dennis Smith, City Clerk Beth Deck and Human Resources Officer Sheila Schukei.

The media was represented by Jim Curry, WJAG/KEXL; Greg Wees, Norfolk Daily News; and Corinne Deuel, KUSO.

Notice of the meeting was given in advance by publication in the Norfolk Daily News, and notice of the meeting was given to the Mayor and all members of the Council prior to the meeting.

The Mayor presided and the City Clerk recorded the proceedings.

The only item on the agenda was discussion about the proposed **water park**.

Public Works Director Dennis Smith briefly reviewed a proposed survey with Finance Committee members. The survey was discussed at the 7:00 a.m. Finance Committee meeting on June 27, 2005. The survey has several typos to be corrected. The handicapped accessible question will be deleted since a facility will need to comply with those requirements anyway. The wording "Central Park" will be added to spray park and Skyview Park will be added as an option to Question No. 19.

Staff distributed a summary of daily fees and the cost of seasonal passes at Grand Island, Hastings, Lincoln, Lexington and York. The seasonal pass fees are as follows:

Grand Island: youth, \$60; adult, \$70; family (1 parent), \$130; and family (2 parents) \$160
Hastings: youth, \$70; adult, \$80; family, \$150; after July 15, 1/2 price
Lexington: individual, \$50; family, \$110
York: child, \$20; adult, \$35; family, \$60

Councilman Lange questioned how the City of Norfolk's current pool prices compare to the information distributed.

Kristen Smith, 3601 Rolling Hills Drive, stated the City's current pool prices are \$2.00 for a daily pass and seasonal passes are: \$40/individual and \$80/family.

Councilwoman Saunders moved, seconded by Councilman Wisnieski to move forward with the water park survey. Roll call: Ayes: Councilpersons Kaspar-Beckman, Brenneman, Lange, Leshovsky, Saunders, Van Dyke, Wisnieski and Mayor. Nays: None. Absent: Fauss. Motion carried.

Nancy Ronto, Burbach Aquatics, reviewed the design proposal for the water park. The Swimming Pool Advisory Committee has been working for several years on design of a water park. Ronto also provided a cost estimate of the proposal.

The proposal includes:

Competitive Swimming Pool: 50 meter/8 lane competitive swimming pool with a dive hopper and two 1 meter diving boards. There are tent units where the swimmers line up for competition.

Gazebo Party Rental

Concession area with embedded tables and chairs, as well as large umbrellas

Bathhouse located on the outer edge of the property.

Parking spaces

Sand play area with embedded wet play items and a sand wash-off area

Zero Depth Entry – walk into pool just as you would on a sandy beach

Water Geysers embedded into the concrete

Mushroom Unit where water cascades down

Toddler/Pre-School Slide

Water Walk – floatation units that are cabled to the floor of the pool. A cargo net is used to try to stay on the floatation devices

Catch Pool for 2 of the 4 slides--One slide is open flume and one is closed flume.

Lazy River – the third slide enters into this area. The lazy river can be used with or without an inner tube. The lazy river is also used as an instructional area for youth swim lessons and/or walking classes for senior citizens/persons with arthritis.

Speed Slide

Mechanical building

The design also contains a strategic plan to add a wave pool at any time without intruding into the existing facility. If the wave pool isn't constructed with the initial project, the area will remain grass. The wave pool area contains its own mechanical building as well as a second gazebo.

Ronto stated there are chaise lounges and 20 foot diameter shade umbrellas located around the decking. The parameter is surrounded with chain link fencing.

Councilman Leshovsky questioned whether the wave pool is included in the \$10 million proposal.

Ronto stated the wave pool is part of the \$10 million proposal.

Councilwoman Saunders questioned whether the Swimming Pool Advisory Committee has a favorite location in mind for the water park.

City Administrator Mike Nolan stated the Advisory Committee came to consensus on a central location for the water park. The site at 1st & Benjamin is probably the most central location. However, at the last Advisory Committee meeting, several members felt the West Hwy 275 location, closer to shopping and motels, might add an economic benefit to the water park.

Councilman Van Dyke questioned how the number of parking stalls is determined.

Ronto stated a formula is used to determine the number of parking stalls. The formula is based on square footage of water surface, green grass and decking. The maximum capacity is slightly over 2,000 at any given time. Ronto stated the facility is a little bit larger than is probably necessary, based on the population of Norfolk. However, the number is larger because of the 50 meter/8 lane swimming pool. Burbach Aquatics is generous with parking spaces. One parking stall is generally allowed for every 3-5 people, depending on the site available. Ronto stated elected officials may want to add a unisex restroom to the design.

DJ Denn, 320 Valley View Drive, questioned the size of the proposed water park.

Ronto stated the design covers 9.6 acres of land.

Denn questioned whether the City's water system is adequate enough to provide water to the site as well as continue to satisfy the needs of the community. Denn feels a requirement in the site selection process should be the availability of City water and sewer.

Public Works Director Dennis Smith explained that the water park vessels will only need to be filled once a year. The amount of water used on a daily basis is small.

Ronto said the water park may have about one inch of evaporation on a very hot, windy day with a large bather load.

Denn questioned what percentage of the total construction cost is attributed to annual maintenance. Denn feels maintenance of such a facility is as important to a bond issue as construction cost.

Ronto stated the numbers are listed in a feasibility study but aren't available at this meeting. Ronto stated the cost of operation in this type of facility isn't isolated. The revenue stream

versus the cost of operation is used to reach a zero based budget or, better yet, a profit.

Nolan stated the concept is that fees would generate enough revenue to cover operating costs with the City of Norfolk amortizing the bond debt.

Ronto stated revenue is generated from a combination of daily attendance and season passes as well as instruction and programming. Concessions will also generate revenue for the City. Ronto suggests the water park be open from 11:00 a.m. until 9:00 p.m.

Councilwoman Saunders questioned whether the water park will require more maintenance than is spent on the existing, outdated City swimming pools.

Ronto stated maintenance may be more because it is a larger facility. However, the water park will be more economical to operate because it is engineered in zones. The equipment will adjust accordingly to requirements in each zone. Ronto stated there will also be more revenue generated from the new water park. Ronto stated the chemical usage is conservative and there won't be the mechanical breakdowns that are associated with a 40-year-old pool. Ronto stated Burbach Aquatics now designs water parks for a 50 year life span.

Nolan stated the water park will require more staffing than the traditional swimming pool; however, the revenue will support the additional staffing.

Smith stated Grand Island and Hastings pay for operating costs from gate fees but there isn't enough revenue to pay for construction or debt service.

Wisnieski questioned how often the Swimming Pool Advisory Committee has met. Wisnieski wondered what feedback Committee members are getting regarding a water park.

Nolan stated the committee has met 8-10 times during the last year.

The Committee has received positive input from citizens regarding construction of a water park in the City of Norfolk.

Denn stated the "concept that is being discussed must absolutely be done. To pour more money into the existing pools is not going to cater to a new clientele." "This is cutting edge for this part of the country." Denn questioned the number of jobs created by a new water park. Denn said, "I can sit here and think of 100 that it's going to create and it's going to be young people in our community that are going to get jobs, fun jobs for them. When you talk about this building, when you talk about senior citizens, you talk about young people, the existing pools don't cater to them. To sell this to the community, you are going to be selling to every living, breathing being in the community and that it's going to be fun. We need to get that back into the City of Norfolk, fun for the kids, fun for senior citizens, fun for disabled and fun for the community. Elected officials need to talk about these types of things."

A Swimming Pool Committee member questioned how many staff would be needed for the water park.

Ronto explained Burbach Aquatics figures the number of staffing by looking at the layout of a water park. Ronto estimates 22 lifeguards at any given time on a full day. Staff would also be necessary for admittance, concessions, break guards, pool guards, etc.

Ronto reviewed the cost estimates for a 21,147 square foot water facility, as follows:

1.	Pool Vessels	\$1,780,000
2.	Surge Tank	110,000
3.	Pool Piping System	340,000
4.	Pool Filtration and Backwash System	126,000
5.	Recirculation Pump Assembly	175,000
6.	Pool Disinfectant System	72,000
7.	Chemical Control and Sampling System	72,000
8.	Pool Finish	63,000
9.	Decking	320,000
10.	Deck Drain System	75,000
11.	Deck Equipment	95,000
12.	Pool Enclosure (fence)	40,000

13.	Pool Water Heaters	45,000
14.	Mechanical Building	350,000
15.	Bathhouse Structure	910,000
16.	HVAC Systems	10,000
17.	Electrical Service	155,000
18.	Utilities	85,000
19.	Safety Equipment	8,000
20.	Site Work	
	a. Site manholes, sanitary & storm systems	80,000
	b. Site fill, grading, sod and seeding	40,000
	c. Parking lot (460 spaces)	700,000
	d. Pool area night lighting system	98,000
	e. Parking lot lighting	75,000
21.	Site Amenities	
	a. Zero depth tot slide	18,000
	b. Concession Area equipment	30,000
	c. Deck umbrellas (17)	59,500
	d. Public address system	14,000
	e. Double flume water slide	240,000
	f. Inner tube slide	190,000
	g. Speed slide	175,000
	h. Vacuum system	9,000
	i. Floor geysers	15,000
	j. Raindrop	12,000
	k. Sand play area	39,000
	l. Inner tube hut	20,000
	m. Starting block sun shades	35,000
	n. Competition equipment	30,000
	o. Site furnishings (30 trash, 6 benches, 33 tables and 288 chaise)	75,000
	p. Floating water walk	80,000
	q. Food Court Shelter	18,000
	r. Concession awning	12,000
	s. Gazebo	30,000
	t. Lazy River dumping buckets	38,000
	u. Lazy River bridge	27,000
	Probable Opinion Construction Cost	\$6,990,500
	Professional Fees	926,242
	Contingency Fund	200,000
	Total Opinion Probable Construction Cost	\$8,116,742

OPTIONAL Alternate Wave Pool:

1.	Wave Pool	\$465,000
2.	Wave Pool mechanical equipment	175,000
3.	Wave Pool mechanical building	120,000
4.	Surge Tanks	42,000
5.	Pool piping system	125,000
6.	Pool filtration and backwash system	42,000
7.	Recirculation pump assembly	32,000
8.	Chemical control and sampling system	29,000
9.	Chemical control and sampling system	21,000
10.	Pool finish	18,000
11.	Decking	115,000
12.	Deck drain system	15,000
13.	Deck equipment	12,000
14.	Pool water heater	15,000
15.	HVAC system	3,000

16. Electrical service	25,000
17. Utilities	9,000
18. Safety Equipment	2,000
19. Deck Umbrellas (2)	6,600
20. Gazebo	30,000

Probable Opinion Construction Cost	\$1,301,600
Professional Fees	172,462
Contingency Fund	50,000

Total WAVE POOL Alternate Opinion Probable Construction Cost	\$1,524,062
--	-------------

OPTIONAL CENTRAL PARK SPRAY PARK:

1. Splash pad assembly	\$225,000
2. Site improvements	24,000
3. Equipment enclosure	20,000
4. Electrical service	16,000

Probable Opinion Construction cost	\$285,000
Professional Fees	37,763
Contingency Fund	15,000

Total CENTAL PARK SPRAY PARK Alternate Opinion Probable Construction Cost	\$337,763
---	-----------

TOTAL OPINION PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST FOR 21,147 SF PLUS ADD ALTERNATES	\$9,978,567
--	-------------

Councilwoman Saunders questioned the time line for the project if approved by voters.

Ronto stated the proposed opening of the water park is the summer of 2007. The best case scenario is that voters pass the bond issue in September and then the engineering can begin. The target date for completed engineering is January 2006. Bids would be let in March 2006 and construction would begin in April 2006. A project this size generally takes 13 months to complete.

Denn questioned whether local contractors will be used for the project.

Ronto stated the project is divided into three separate contracts which encourages local contractors to bid. The three contracts are: pool vessels, mechanical and general contractor.

Wisnieski questioned whether the spray park would compete with the water park.

Ronto stated Central Park has a history of wet play for children and the Swimming Pool Advisory Committee felt it is important to preserve that history. The wet play area requires no attendant.

A member of the Swimming Pool Advisory Committee stated the group extensively discussed the subject of a wet play area at Central Park. Many day care providers use Central Park and it is another way to retain some type of water facility in the middle of town.

Ronto stated a water park also provides an opportunity for the highest risk age group of pre-teen and early teen youth to recreate in a controlled environment. Ronto stated the next step is to have everyone get out and educate the public regarding the water park.

Public Works Director Dennis Smith explained a resolution will appear on the July 18, 2005 City Council meeting for consideration. The bond election will be on September 13, 2005. Smith requested input from elected officials on whether to have both of the items, a water park and the field turf at Memorial Field, as a combined ballot issue or separate issues.

Councilman Van Dyke feels the issues should be separate on the ballot.

Mayor Adams feels having the issues considered separately is more appropriate and fair.

Councilman Van Dyke moved, seconded by Councilwoman Kaspar-Beckman to adjourn the meeting at 8:24 p.m. Roll call: Ayes: Council members Kaspar-Beckman, Brenneman, Lange, Leshovsky, Saunders, Van Dyke, Wisnieski and Mayor Adams. Nays: None. Absent: Fauss. Motion carried.

Elizabeth A. Deck
City Clerk