

CITY OF McMinnville
MINUTES OF WORK SESSION
of the McMinnville City Council
Held at the McMinnville Community Center
McMinnville, Oregon

Wednesday, July 17, 2019 at 5:30 p.m.

Presiding: Scott Hill, Mayor

Recording Secretary: Melissa Bisset

Councilors:	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
	Adam Garvin	Remy Drabkin
	Zack Geary	
	Kellie Menke, Council President	
	Sal Peralta	
	Wendy Stassens	

Also present were City Attorney David Koch, City Manager Jeff Towery, Human Resources Manager Kylie Bayer-Fertterer, Intern Magen Boegli, Parks and Recreation Director Susan Muir, Parks and Recreation Manager Janet Adams, Parks and Recreation Manager Steve Ganzer, Parks and Recreation Manager Katie Noyd, Parks and Recreation Manager Rob Porter, Planning Director Heather Richards, Jerry Eitchen – MCM, Tom Henderson, *News Register*

1. CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Hill called the meeting to order at 5:38 p.m.

2. FACILITIES AND RECREATION MASTER PLAN

Parks and Recreation Director Susan Muir introduced the Parks and Recreation managers in attendance. They had set up a website, whatdoyouthinkmac.org, which would have the information presented tonight plus regular updates on the project. There was a point of discussion that needed to happen on the return on investment in maintaining facilities. It was an opportunity to decide if the City invested in the current facilities or looked at something different. There was 93,000 square feet of indoor space in McMinnville used for recreation and she provided examples of the amount of space. They needed to think creatively and openly about what they needed to do in the next 20-30 years for recreational space. There was a lot of opportunity and a great list from the community on what they would like to see.

Ken Ballard, Ballard King and Associates was the project manager. He stated that the consultants had been gathering information on the City's parks facilities.

Cindy Mendoza, MIG, explained her role on the project was to understand the community's priorities and use those to prioritize the recommendations from the study.

Jim Kalvelage, Opsis Architecture, stated their focus had been the physical assessment of the three facilities including the functionality of the facilities.

Mr. Ballard reviewed the project goals:

- Physical assessment of existing indoor facilities
- Development of a Recreation Program Plan
 - Public Engagement Driven
 - Program and Facilities Implications
- Funding Analysis
- Partnership Assessment
- Operations and Staffing Requirements of the Plan
- Implementation

The project tasks that had been completed were the recreation facilities physical assessment, recreation program analysis, and public engagement.

Mr. Kalvelage reviewed the physical assessment of the Community Center. It was originally build in 1924 as an armory. He stated that they found:

- Infrastructure issues – numerous physical issues as noted in the Facility Conditions Assessment in 2018.
- Lack of ADA access throughout the facility.
- Circuitous circulation that was disorienting, compromised supervision, and was unsafe.
- Downstairs restroom/locker room that was shared with other youth programs.
- Lack of controlled access and security.
- Small and dispersed administrative suite with lack of controlled public access.
- Inadequate and dispersed fitness spaces.
- Proportions of the rooms were not like what would be built today.
- Childcare location was remote from supervision.
- The gym is a good size gym but it was also a theatrical performance space which limited its use.
- Parking and drop off/pick up area was not addressed well in the current location.

Initial cost estimates were \$450-\$500 per square foot (\$32-35 million) to renovate the building. New construction cost was similar, \$500 to \$550 per square foot (\$35-39 million). They recommended that the building be replaced and relocated somewhere else. It was noted that the cost was based on 2019 numbers.

Discussion ensued regarding escalation of the cost of construction.

Councilor Stassens asked if the cost was based on building the same size facility as the current one. Mr. Kalvelage stated that it was, but new construction would provide for more usable program space.

Councilor Geary asked what the cost per square foot included. Mr. Kalvelage explained it included contingencies, legal fees, and 30% for construction costs.

The findings for the Aquatic Center were presented as follows:

- Numerous physical issues as noted in the Faculty Conditions Assessment in 2018.
- Lack of ADA access to the second level administrative offices and spectator seating balcony.
- The public lobby and public gathering space were significantly undersized.
- Inadequate changing rooms with lockers and lack of individual shower stalls. No family changing rooms.
- Undersized and remote weight/fitness space.
- Inadequate and dispersed space for staff.
- Lack of parking and the impact on the adjoining neighborhood.

The cost to renovate the building was \$550-\$660 per square foot or total project cost of \$20-22 million. To replace the building would cost \$700-\$750 per square foot or total project cost of \$25-27 million). They recommended new construction and replacement of the building.

The findings for the Senior Center were presented as followed:

- A few physical issues as noted in Facility Conditions Assessment in 2018.
- No place to work-out with specialized fitness equipment.
- The Facility had a few large activity spaces, but the rooms were undersized to accommodate the program offerings.
- Isolation in park presents perceived vulnerability at night. Windows facing park create a fishbowl effect at night.
- Dining Commons was the main general activity space, but it was also used for circulation to other spaces (back multi-purpose rooms).
- Inadequate and dispersed space for staff.
- Location of the four outer activity rooms was challenging to supervise and monitor.
- Kitchen was adequately sized to serve future expansion of Dining Commons. Desire to enlarge dining room to 80 people (currently holds 60).
- Main entry door was not visible from the front desk.
- More exterior lighting would improve general safety.
- The Center had poor street presence due to its location at the edge of Wortman Park.

It was recommended to renovate this building, which would cost \$100-125 per square foot or total cost of \$1-2 million.

Councilor Geary asked how late activities ran at the Senior Center. Anne Lane responded that two days a week activities went until 8 p.m.

Mr. Ballard then provided an assessment of existing programs. He stated that they inventoried what the City was doing in terms of programming. There was programming in most areas except for teens.

- The Parks and Recreation Department provided a wide variety of programs from traditional recreation services to a significant number of drop-in activities, rental opportunities, and social service program.
- It was nearly impossible in this day and age to provide all of the services that were desired by the public.
- Programming strengths were directly related to the facilities that were available for use.
- Some activities (gymnastics, fitness, etc.) did not have adequate facilities to support their needs.
- McMinnville was a regional provider of recreational services with approximately 30% of participants coming from outside the City.

General areas of recreation program strengths included:

- Youth
- Youth sports (primarily outdoor)
- Aquatics
- Seniors
- Self-directed

General areas of recreation program weaknesses included:

- Cultural arts
- Educational Programing
- Special needs
- Outdoor recreation
- Adult
- Family (intergenerational approach)
- Teens

Ms. Mendoza discussed why public engagement mattered. She stated that it was important to recognize that when they were looking at new buildings they were looking at 20-30 years into the future. They needed to look at what people wanted to be doing for recreation. The buildings had to be effective to meet the needs desired by the community. They also needed to look at potential partnerships and if the public had a willingness to support new facilities. City staff did a good job in getting a high level of participation.

The three main types of public engagement were: online questionnaire which was completed by 1,456 people, key leader interviews with 15 participants, and focus groups with 17 participants.

The online questionnaire gave the following results:

- They found that the most popular facilitates were the Aquatic and Community Centers.
- They found that there was a need for indoor active recreation and arts. Indoor swimming, sports/fitness and cultural, performing, and fine arts were the top priorities.
- They found that more youth programs were needed. Responses favored more programs for all ages, but especially youth, families and more intergenerational opportunities.

- Priority activities for the entire community included afterschool programs, camps, sports and performing and cultural arts.
- There were many priority future senior needs (senior aquatics, fitness) that would not be met in a traditional senior center. They were looking for social and support programs, aquatics, swimming or water fitness, and fitness classes.
- They found that there was a lot of interest for more gymnasiums and indoor active recreation space which conflicted with the existing uses as reservable event spaces. More indoor/outdoor recreation space was also needed.

She then shared the lowest choices from the surveys. The lowest priorities included general reservable community space. Space was needed for new or different activities, not passive uses.

A new multi-use building was only slightly more popular than renovating existing facilities – but residents did not appear to be aware of current facility conditions and renovation costs. There were mixed opinions on the location. New locations should be explored. The city center was the least accessible for many residents, but supported economic vitality. They needed to find the best space for the type of facility that was desired and to work with potential partners on that decision.

She stated that they found facilities were key to McMinnville’s identity and future. There were strong opinions about facilities, a community “hub” was needed, it was key to serving future growth, shifting demographics meant changing needs new to McMinnville, there were potential economic impacts by attracting tourists and non-residents, key to attracting employees and new businesses, and there needed to be a partnership coalition for McMinnville’s future.

The facility implications for the community included social implications for people who were low income, racially diverse, or unhoused, implications for youth wellbeing, development, safety, childcare, and school readiness, and opportunity for emphasis on community health, therapeutic recreation, and student health training.

Most partnerships were in agreement to some sort of venture including:

- School District
- Willamette Valley Medical Center
- Linfield College
- Chemeketa Community College
- See Ya Later Foundation

She shared the facility vision and values they heard: recreation for all, collaboration, multipurpose/ multiuse, heart of community, health, wellness, fitness, cost efficiency/wise investment, indoor/outdoor enrichment, community livability, spirit of McMinnville, safe, active, accessible, affordable, diverse, high quality, inclusive/inviting, multigenerational, and year-round.

She displayed a list of questions that should be considered in the future such as:

Who is your market?

- McMinnville
- Region
- Tourists

What programs and services would facilities provide?

- Passive programs/reservable space only
- Expanded recreation programs (sports to arts)
- Indoor events, performances, large group gatherings
- Social services (homeless, low income residents, childcare)

How important is site?

- One vs. multiple locations
- Indoor and outdoor space for programs
- Downtown
- Accessible by foot, bike, car, transit

What should the City's roles be?

- Facility owner
- Facility operator
- Partner in community-wide project

What is City's level of financial commitment?

- Lowest cost solution to meet current needs
- Best/wisest investment to address future needs
- Need for equity partners for capital costs
- Need for programming collaboration/partner operational support
- Dependent on voter-approved funding measure

Councilor Garvin asked what could be looked at as far as cost savings with combining a community center and an aquatic center. Mr. Ballard stated that there would be two cost savings, on the capital side and operational side. There would also be additional revenue opportunities.

Mr. Kalvelage stated there would be efficiencies in terms of construction, shared parking, less access points, site development, building envelope, public restrooms, lobby area, and staffing.

Mayor Hill asked if there were examples in other communities where these facilities were combined.

Mr. Kalvelage said an example was in the city of Vancouver, Washington. In terms of filling everyone's needs in one space combining the facilities was good for the community as the entire family could go there. Other examples were the Cascade Park library addition and Oak Lodge in Milwaukie. Creating a civic campus was an exciting proposition.

Mr. Ballard stated that there was a history in Oregon of stand-alone aquatic facilities but this was not the case in many other places in the country. He stated that combined facilities worked well.

Parks and Recreation Director Muir stated that field trips to other communities could be a part of the process.

Mayor Hill commented on how some communities did this very well and often were a result of timing. They could create something phenomenal for the community and a source of revenue.

Council President Menke stated that aquatic centers were typically not revenue generators and if there was an opportunity for greater cost recovery with a combined facility. Mr. Ballard stated that it would improve cost recovery. It was a more economical approach.

Councilor Peralta asked about staffing level trends for parks and recreation programs. Mr. Ballard stated that staffing was still in a level of recovery from the recession as many departments had been cut deeply during that time. Staffing was slowly coming back. For any facility, the number one cost of operation was staff. They wanted to maximize opportunities and minimize staffing requirements. Running three different facilities was more costly from an operational standpoint.

Ms. Mendoza stated that in communities that were interested in providing a higher quality of life and community livability, they would invest more in staffing. Recreation programs were typically fee based and so there was a higher level of cost recovery associated with a community center. To some extent investment in staffing in revenue generating programs could increase revenues to offset the costs of the staffing. As they committed to a facility like this, they committed to more staffing and the right kind of programming spaces to be able to generate the revenues to reinvest back into the community and quality of life.

Councilor Peralta was concerned about sustaining programs over a length of time. Were there certain types of programs that penciled out better than others?

Mr. Ballard stated that aquatics in its very nature was more difficult and its inherent costs were greater in terms of pure cost recovery. He explained that some projects did not move forward because of community size and income levels. It also depended on the project either being driven by costs or service.

Mayor Hill asked about the current percentage of cost recovery. Parks and Recreation Director Muir stated that would be discussed more at the Council meeting on July 23rd. Generally they had a 50% cost recovery.

Mayor Hill stated that the level of volunteerism was very high in McMinnville. He applauded the community for their volunteer efforts.

Mr. Ballard provided some possible scenarios.

Option 1 – Status Quo

- Existing facilities were improved but still remain.
- Recreation programs and services were mostly the same.

He stated that the pros were that it had the least financial impact but the financial impact was still significant and the current recreation services remained.

The cons included: lack of long term solution for facilities, little growth in recreation programs, still operated out of three facilities, no key partners, and safety/security issues remained.

Option 2 – New/ Old

- Community Center and Aquatic Center were replaced with one facility.
- Recreation programs and services were expanded/ improved.

The pros included:

- New facilities
- Operational efficiency
- New recreation programs and services
- Possible partners

The cons were:

- Higher capital cost
- Senior Center remained a separate facility
- Site was an issue

Mayor Hill asked about going vertical. Mr. Kalvalege explained that they typically saw two story buildings which had merit. It would keep the facility from sprawling and there could be opportunity for more parking, courtyards, and outdoor amenities.

Option 3 – All new

- Community Center, Aquatic Center, Senior Center were replaced in one facility.
- Recreation programs and services were expanded/improved.

The pros included:

- All new facilities
- Maximum operational efficiency
- New recreation programs and services
- Increased opportunity for partners

The cons were:

- Highest capital cost
- Facilities were all at the same location
- Site was an issue

Councilor Stassens asked what factors should be considered when choosing where to locate a building.

Mr. Ballard stated that a lot of the decision was driven by what was available. In many cases the land needed to be in public ownership as well. Some partners might be equity partners in helping with site requirements.

Mr. Kalvelage stated that street appeal and being located on a major arterial were criteria. He had also seen examples of facilities that were remotely located but suffered because of that. If there was other commercial development around it, such as restaurants and other activities or adjacent to a school or park, that could be mutually beneficial.

Ms. Mendoza stated some other criteria could be bike and pedestrian access, parking and adequate drop off space, street appeal, bus and transit access, looking at where low income residents were in the community, where new growth was happening in the city, equity partners also came into play, and indoor/outdoor space.

Council President Menke asked if any were ever located near airports. Ms. Mendoza stated it depended on the circumstances around noise and chemicals. An idea that came up was Joe Dancer Park, although that site flooded. Perhaps there was some adjacent space that could be used. A County partnership could be considered or a land swap. Criteria for the site would be important.

Mayor Hill noted that cost was a big issue but there were greater needs as described in the facilities assessment. He suggested thinking strategically about City needs and possibly including the Fire Department or Library in the facility. They should be thinking strategically and about economies of scale of bringing other facilities together.

Ms. Mendoza stated that the broader the utility across the board for the community, the more likely they could get community support.

Councilor Peralta asked about the costs if some of the facilities were combined.

Mr. Kalvelage explained that the costs would go down if combined.

Councilor Peralta asked how much the costs could go down. Mr. Kalvelage thought perhaps it would be 10-15 percent. It depended a lot on the site. Every scenario was unique.

Councilor Peralta stated that the most public feedback he received was to increase the density of the facilities, which fell into Option 2. His preference was to have it more in the downtown core.

Council President Menke stated that there would be development on Three Mile Lane and putting a facility where there was new development might be advantageous.

Councilor Geary was onboard with Option 2. He was thinking about how to reuse the existing facilities or sell them and use the funds for the new facility.

Councilor Garvin was most interested in Option 2 and liked the idea of incorporating the Library. He also liked the idea of locating the facility on Three Mile Lane. He would be interested in possibly reusing the facilities or selling them to help with the cost.

Councilor Stassens thought that Option 2 was the best option at this point for the community. She agreed with the economies of scale. It would be challenging for facilities to travel and she would be interested in having it stay closer to downtown. It should flow with how the community was moving. She also wanted to look at the existing buildings to see how they could contribute.

Councilor Geary stated he was in favor of moving away from old facilities into new facilities. The capacity for events in the Community Center had taken up a lot of time and energy and the focus should be on core services. He would like hear more about events and where the City was going and the Council's and consultant's opinions on a timeline for going forward with Option 2.

Council President Menke also thought that Option 2 was a good option and liked the idea of combining the Library and Fire Department. She thought Joe Dancer was an option, but not downtown as there was too much congestion.

Mayor Hill suggested using Wortman Park which had a lot of space and assets.

Mr. Ballard stated that it would realistically take three to five years to get to opening a new facility. He explained that there would need to be funding, finding a site, design, and construction. They would move forward with Option 2 with the potential of adding the Library.

City Manager Towery thought that evaluating a new or emerging neighborhood like Three Mile Lane had some value. The City owned some properties downtown. One potential partner was Linfield College. Combining patron services could create capacity to influence cultural assets somewhere else as well. There would be a series of community conversations regarding sites.

Parks and Recreation Director Muir stated that each potential site had things that would need to be looked at. There were also federal restrictions related to grants that had been received. There were many layers that needed to be looked at. When looking at the Strategic Plan and core services, the current buildings had spaces that were not programmable for the core services. She struggled with whether or not events were a core service. The focus should be more on inclusion services and there were currently no resources to do that because they were focused on getting rooms ready for events or bringing in more revenue. She thought they could focus on the other things the community expected and wanted if they had less to do with space rentals. The question would be how did they transition and identify resources.

Discussion ensued regarding the differences between renovating the pool or a new pool and adding the community center to the current aquatic center and what that might look like.

Mr. Kalvelage thought that if a new aquatic center was built it would likely have a warm leisure pool and lap pool. The current aquatic center site was challenging, especially regarding parking, and he thought it would be undersized to add a community center to it.

Ms. Muir stated that they were excited about combining facilities and thinking creatively.

Mayor Hill adjourned the meeting at 7:27 p.m.

s/s Melissa Bisset

Melissa Bisset, City Recorder