

CITY COMMISSION AGENDA MEMO
May 25, 2021

FROM: Jason Hilgers, Deputy City Manager
MEETING: June 1, 2021
SUBJECT: Aquatic Facility – Design Agreement
PRESENTER: Jason Hilgers, Deputy City Manager

BACKGROUND

On May 3, 2021, the City Commission received a letter (attached) from the “Aquatics Group” focused on the realization of an indoor aquatic center. They have assembled a team of professionals (local and national) who have generated a scope and fee to generate a process and design for a new indoor aquatic facility in Manhattan.

DISCUSSION

The team of professionals is led by Anderson Knight Architects; they are joined by McCown Gordon Construction and Counsilman-Hunsacker (aquatics specialists). The scope prepared (attached) highlights a process to ultimately develop an Opinion of Probable Cost for the pool and building associated with an indoor aquatic facility. The team will prepare a feasibility study outlining the expenses and revenues associated with construction and operations. In addition, a conceptual plan will be developed for the proposed site, location, and general layout of the facility.

The professional team has offered these services at a discount of \$15,000. Traditionally a scope and fee of this magnitude would cost the City around \$100,000 - \$120,000.

FINANCING

City Administration has identified the Special Park and Recreation Fund to finance this \$15,000 study.

ALTERNATIVES

It appears the Commission has the following alternatives concerning the issue at hand. The Commission may:

1. Approve the request and authorize City Administration to finalize and the Mayor and Clerk to execute a professional services agreement.
2. Deny the measure.
3. Modify to meet the needs of the Commission.
4. Table the item.

RECOMMENDATION

City Administration recommends the City Commission authorize City Administration to finalize and the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a professional services agreement with Anderson Knight Architects.

POSSIBLE MOTION

Authorize City Administration to finalize and the Mayor and City Clerk to execute an Agreement for Professional Engineering Services with Anderson Knight Architects, of Manhattan, Kansas, in the amount of \$15,000, for an Indoor Aquatic Center.

JH
21026

Enclosure:

1. Aquatic Group Letter and Scope of Services



May 03, 2021

City Commission
1101 Poyntz Avenue
Manhattan, KS 66502

Re: Manhattan Community Indoor Aquatics Center

Dear Commissioners,

The Aquatics Group is a group of Manhattan citizens focused on the realization of an indoor aquatics center to serve the needs of the Manhattan community. As I am sure you are aware, Kansas Sate University has permanently closed the Natatorium which served as our community's only access to indoor water since 1975. While the Natatorium served the purpose of indoor water, it did not provide access to the entire community and was limited in its availability and functionality.

In 2014 the City embarked on a Strategic Facility Improvement Plan with the help of a consultant to identify the most urgent priorities for Parks and Recreation for the City of Manhattan. Those priorities were identified in the 2015 Strategic Facility Improvement Plan document as:

1. Creation of indoor space geographically located to meet unmet needs in the community
2. Improvement to safety and playability of exsistng field playing surfaces
3. Improve availability and condition of community parks, trails, and neighborhood parks
4. Development of new indoor aquatic facilities

With the first three of those priorities well under way and in some cases completed, we feel that it is now more urgent than ever before for Manhattan to have an indoor aquatics center that meets the needs and demands of our growing community.

We have engaged a local consultant team to provide a scope of work and proposal for performing a feasibility study for an indoor aquatics center. The scope of work and fee proposal are attached.

We urge the commission to approve the City to authorize the feasibility study to determine how to meet the community's need most effectively for access to a public indoor aquatics center.

Respectfully submitted,

The Aquatics Group

John Balman
Chad Bungler
Tim Steffensmeier
RJ Youngblood
Chris Spooner

Vern Henricks
Linda Cook
Tracy Anderson

Manhattan Indoor Aquatic Center - Feasibility Study

Scope of Services

1. NEEDS ANALYSIS:

A. Review the 2015 Strategic Facility Improvement Plan (SFIP) focusing on Priority 4: Development of Indoor Aquatic Facilities. The data below indicates the need that was determined during the study and this was at a time when the K-State Natatorium was serving a portion of the community's needs.

1. The following data was originally published on page 261 of the 2015 SFIP.

- 47% or 9,404 households identified a need for indoor aquatic facilities.
- 34% or 6,875 households indicated less than 50% of their indoor aquatic facility needs are currently being met.
- 37% or 7,402 households indicated 0% (none) of their indoor aquatic facility needs are currently being met.
- 41% or 8,203 households indicated they would utilize indoor aquatic facilities the most of any indoor program space if developed.

B. Review the 2017 Facility Feasibility Study focusing on Priority 4: Development of new Indoor Aquatics Facilities.

C. Meet with the steering committee, plus any designated community groups and/or individuals involved in the project to analyze needs and determine objectives. The Consultant will conduct individual interviews as necessary with, for example, local education administrators and/or athletic directors, chamber of commerce representatives, business leaders, K-State Recreation, private and public recreation providers, health professionals, competitive swim groups, swim coaches, instructors, activity programmers, youth and seniors groups, and others if requested in order to ascertain existing levels of service and the perceived needs of various user groups in the community.

D. In addition to individual meetings, The Consultant will participate in a public or by invitation civic meeting to discuss the various issues concerning the proposed facility. This discussion will include images and/or video presentations with commentary on features of other aquatic centers similar to that being considered for this project, background information on historic and contemporary issues in the industry, and an open-forum question-and-answer session to discuss concerns and needs of those individuals and groups attending the meeting. A matrix of programming priorities will be developed and discussed to prioritize programming and facility features. The Consultant will use the results of the interviews and public workshop to develop a needs profile.

E. Conduct research and compile demographic information necessary to appropriately evaluate the proposed facility, including population, age distribution, income, weather analysis and economic considerations that could affect the project's viability.

F. Develop a web-based survey to gather community input for the preferred aquatic facility features.

G. Prepare and submit an outline of a Design Program of spaces and features for the proposed aquatic center describing the natatorium, pool size, shape and support spaces based on preliminary discussions and meetings noted above.

H. Based on the first meeting and committee's review of the outline program, develop with the Owner a Design Program for the aquatic facility with recommendations on the size and shape of the pool(s) and support spaces.

2. COST ANALYSIS:

- A. The Consultant will prepare an Opinion of Probable Construction Cost for the pool(s) and building. Recent project bid figures of similar projects will be used as well as national estimating guides and local cost adjustment factors. The hard **construction cost** figures will be supplemented by a development cost factor, which will include such "soft" costs as professional fees, survey, geotechnical report, document reproduction, advertisement for bids and all anticipated expenses related to the administration of the project. The sum of these two cost figures will be the **total project cost** so that the Owner will have a comprehensive overview before making an informed decision about the project.
 - B. The Consultant will prepare a Feasibility Study and will develop an opinion of operations protocol for the proposed project. The following will be researched and analyzed:
 - 1. Operational data including attendance levels and trends, visitor mix, per capita expenditures, revenue, operating expenses, net operating income and net income after capital costs.
 - 2. Proposed marketing strategies, pricing policies and sponsorship efforts.
 - 3. Analysis of market penetration and compilation of demographic trends in the market area, including population levels and trends, incomes, age distribution and ethnic composition based on the Consultant's demographic data bank.
 - 4. A review of local school year schedules.
 - 5. A review of competing aquatic facilities in the area.
 - 6. Projections of attendance potential.
 - 7. Projections of design level attendance figures and required capacity requirements.
 - 8. Projections of facility operational expenses including, personnel, chemical demand, operating supplies, maintenance and repair, utility demand, marketing, food and beverage and retail.
 - 9. Projections of financial performance
 - 10. Preliminary estimates of warranted investment levels based on projected net operating income.
 - C. The Consultant will make a final presentation to the project committee outlining the methods and results of the study.
3. CONCEPTUAL PLAN:
- A. The Consultant will provide a conceptual plan based on the agreed upon program. The purpose of the plan will be to illustrate ways to organize the spaces in a functional arrangement and to confirm that the facility footprint will contain the areas proposed in the Design Program.
 - B. The Consultant will meet with the committee to participate in a design workshop. Preliminary concepts and program features will be reviewed and confirmed. A public meeting may or may not be held as a part of this visit.
 - C. Following the meeting, the Consultant will revise the selected plan and send it to the Committee for review.
 - D. Once the committee has reviewed and made a recommendation to the City Commission, the Consultant will present and take direction from the Commission to develop schematic plans for the preferred option.
4. FEE PROPOSAL:
- A. The Consultant will provide the above-described scope or work for a lump sum of: \$15,000.00 (Fifteen-Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents). This fee is valid for 60 days from May, 04, 2021.