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SECTION 1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Updated Renewal Plan (June 2009)

This 2009 updated report for the Centre Regional Recreation Authority (CRRA) for the William L. Welch Community Swimming Pool Renewal Plan is based on past aquatic and feasibility studies, which determined the current pool location to be the site of a new pool.

Welch Community Swimming Pool was built in 1959 in State College Borough. The Borough participates as a (founding) member of the Centre Region Council of Governments (COG) that includes the Borough of State College and the Townships of College, Patton, Ferguson and Harris. In 1984, renovations were made to the pool return lines and the wading pool. In 1987, a waterslide was added. In 2002, an Aquatics Feasibility Study and a 2004 Aquatics Feasibility Study Extension were prepared. In July 2006, a State Grant for a Master Site Plan was approved and in Spring 2007, the project consultants were selected by CRRA.

The swimming pool is enjoyed for its community atmosphere, but residents feel that additional amenities for all age groups are necessary. They would like the pool experience updated to make it attractive, fun and safe for all customers; meet newer codes; serve regional needs; keep capital and operating costs reasonable for customers and the five municipalities; and cooperate with the State College Area School District (SCASD) for parking and land use. And finally, they would like Welch Community Swimming Pool to complement, not duplicate, features at Park Forest Community Swimming Pool, approximately 4.7 miles away. The new Park Forest Community Swimming Pool facility opened on June 13, 2009.

CRRA Board Roster 2008/2009

The following is the 2008/2009 roster for the volunteer Board members of the Centre Regional Recreation Authority.

- Sue Mascolo, Chair, Township of Ferguson
- Roy Harpster, Vice-Chair, Township of Harris
- Kathy Matason, Secretary, Township of College
- Donna Conway, Treasurer, Borough of State College
- Chris Hurley, Township of Patton
- Donna Ricketts, D.Ed., State College Area School District

The Authority recognized that Welch Pool had clearly reached the renewal/replacement stage and therefore this study offered new concepts while preserving the community setting. The following Welch Community Swimming Pool Renewal Project Timeline includes the 12-month effort to obtain a shared parking/access agreement with State College Area School District, and the fact that the final agreement(s) are an important part of this plan, including the shared bathhouse agreement requested by SCASD during discussions. The approval of the Master Site Plan...
Plan by the CRRA and the COG General Forum was conditional upon the provisions of the agreement(s). Financing was secured by the CRRA to replace both pools at $7.9M and Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (PA DCNR) announced a $375,000 grant to assist with the replacement of the Welch Community Swimming Pool. In short, the funds are in place to proceed to construction based with the $5.4M cost estimate.

Renewal Plan Timeline

*All documents related to this project and timeline are also available at: [http://www.crpr.org](http://www.crpr.org)*

**September 2005:** With the approval of the COG General Forum, the CRRA applied for a $33,000 grant to prepare a Master Site Plan for the renewal of Welch Community Swimming Pool. The grant will be matched with $33,000 in local municipal funds.

**July 2006:** PA DCNR announced their approval of the Master Site Plan grant. The CRRA will proceed with finalizing the master planning process, selecting the consultant(s), and then developing the Master Site Plan over the next year.

**February 2007:** Working with the participating municipalities, the CRRA developed and presented to SCASD a proposed 25-year lease for the lands under the Welch Community Swimming Pool facility. Once the lease is approved by the district and the CRRA, the Master Site Planning can begin.

**March 2007:** The draft lease for the Welch Community Swimming Pool was approved by the CRRA and the COG Ad Hoc Regional Parks Committee for final presentation to SCASD.

**April 2007:** SCASD Board of Directors unanimously approved the lease of the 3.41 acres of land under Welch Community Swimming Pool to CRRA. The 25-year lease terms are for $1 per year, with an option to extend the lease by 10 years. The lease will be executed, recorded and furnished to PA DCNR. (See Appendix J)

**June 2007:** The CRRA approved contracts to engage the consultant team of HPArchitects and Counsilman-Hunsaker Associates to prepare the Welch Community Swimming Pool Master Site Plan. These firms developed the Park Forest Community Swimming Pool Master Site Plan. The total cost of the Welch Community Swimming Pool plan will be $66,000. The Master Site Plan project is being funded by five Centre Region COG municipalities and by a $33,000 grant from the PA DCNR “Keystone Recreation, Park & Conservation Fund” (DCNR Project #BRC-TAG-12-229). Planning meetings got underway that summer.

**July & August 2007:** Based on the actions to date, PA DCNR approved the planning project to proceed. On Monday, July 23, 2007, the consultants addressed the COG General Forum about the upcoming process to develop the Master Site Plan for Welch Community Swimming Pool. On Tuesday, July 24, 2007, two public meetings were held. *(The Welch Pool Swim Team parents were also invited to this meeting since they were hosting the Park Forest Swim Team that evening.)*

There were six public CRRA and COG monthly meetings open to the public from July 2007 through September 2007. In addition, residents were encouraged to write letters and forward
emails. Emails and letters were received regarding the meetings. In addition, during August, a survey was distributed to Centre Region Parks and Recreation (CRPR), KidVenture Campers, and Welch Pool Swim Team members on their preferences for the renewed Welch Community Swimming Pool.

**September 2007:** On Monday, September 24, 2007, the consultants presented the various plan options and costs to the CRRA and the Project Advisory Committee. The special meeting of the CRRA was held at the COG Building Forum Room, and was open to the public. On Monday, September 24, 2007, the consultants presented the various plan options and costs to the COG General Forum at the Halfmoon Twp. Building. The meeting was open to the public. On Tuesday, September 25, 2007, at 7:00 PM, the consultants presented the various plan options during a Community Meeting at the COG Building Forum Room. Comments were welcomed.

**October 2007:** During October, each of the five participating municipalities reviewed and selected the proposed concepts / costs. They were asked to relay their selection to the COG Executive Director by November 6, 2007.

**November 2007:** During November, the municipal selections were compiled and provided to:

- The CRRA meeting on November 8, 2007, 12:15 PM in the COG Forum Room

The five participating municipalities each selected Option 3 and the COG General Forum approved a motion that authorized Option 3 with a not-to-exceed cost of $5.4 million. The selected concept was then used by the consultants to develop a draft Master Site Plan, which evaluates the various placements (layouts) of the selected concepts onto the site and includes the typical features shown on a Master Site Plan.

With the concept plan selected, work also began on the shared parking and access plan that must be finalized so that the Master Site Plan can be completed by Fall 2008. This schedule was intended to work towards a construction start date of early August 2009, and the reopening of a renewed Welch Community Swimming Pool in May/June 2010.

On November 26, 2007, COG General Forum approved the following motion:

“That the General Forum, based upon the recommendations from the five participating municipalities and the Centre Regional Recreation Authority, endorses Concept Option III for the development of a master site plan for William L. Welch Community Swimming Pool; and, furthermore, that the cost of the project not exceed $5.4 million, which includes an assumption of 5% per year for inflation.”

**January 2008:** Following a re-organization of the SCASD Board of Directors and the abandonment of their high school renovation plans, which included a shared parking lot adjacent to the pool, CRRA and COG were required to change their approach to the parking possibilities and to explore with SCASD other parking options.
March 2008: The architects continued to develop proposed layouts (on the site) involving the approved concepts. Since shared parking and access were prime considerations, in February the CRRA authorized discussions with SCASD (as the landowner) regarding those factors. It was hoped that the finalization of the Master Site Plan and a Shared Parking Agreement could be finalized. Shown below is one of the candidate site layouts based upon Concept #3. [Image: Diagram of a swimming pool layout]

NOTE: The specific locations of the facilities shown in this Concept Plan were modified as the planning process continued.

FINANCING: The COG General Forum and the five participating municipalities approved the necessary ordinances to obtain financing for both pool renewals (Park Forest Community Swimming Pool and Welch Community Swimming Pool). As a result of a public bid process, on March 19, 2008, the COG Finance Committee unanimously approved a bid from Jersey Shore State Bank, Jersey Shore, PA, to finance $7.9 million for 20 years at 3.95% fixed. Prior to that action, they had compared the bank note bids with current municipal bond rates, and elected to proceed with the bank note. At their April 10, 2008, meeting, the CRRA approved a resolution to execute the necessary documents to obtain that capital project financing – secured by the five participating municipalities. A portion of the financing package was then used to proceed with the Park Forest Pool renewal project (August 2008-June 2009).

April 2008: On April 1, 2008, the CRRA hosted a Joint Work Session with the COG Ad Hoc Regional Park Committee and the SCASD Board of Directors to focus on the two pool renewal projects as well as the proposed shared parking and access proposed by the Welch Community Swimming Pool Master Site Plan. A PowerPoint presentation was made that reviewed the long history of Municipal / School cooperation in community parks and recreation and made four specific requests to the district. Discussions on the candidate Shared Parking and Access Plan will now proceed, so that work on the Welch Community Swimming Pool Master Site Plan could continue. The SCASD Board then invited municipal officials to attend their April 14, 2008, meeting to continue those discussions.
On April 10, 2008, the CRRA approved a resolution authorizing staff to submit a grant application to PA DCNR for $400,000 in funding assistance towards the $5.4 million pool renewal project at Welch Community Swimming Pool. It was proposed that construction at Welch Community Swimming Pool begin in early August 2009.

**July 2008:** The SCASD Board of Directors again hosted municipal representatives at their July 14, 2008, meeting to resume discussions about the proposed Shared Parking and Access for the renewed Welch Community Swimming Pool. A updated PowerPoint presentation was presented. The Board agreed to appoint a subcommittee to meet with the municipal officials to discuss and prepare a recommendation for action.

**August 2008:** A joint meeting of the appointed committee representatives by the following organizations was held to discuss the Master Site Plan for the renewal of the Welch Community Swimming Pool (specifically, the shared parking and shared use of the changing rooms):

- State College Area School District Board of Directors
- Centre Regional Recreation Authority
- COG Ad Hoc Regional Park Committee

The meeting was held on Tuesday August 5, 2008, 7:30 PM at the Centre Region COG Building. Following extensive discussions, another joint committee meeting was held with SCASD, CRRA, and the COG Ad Hoc Regional Park Committee to establish a plan to meet the parking requirements. The District also requested shared, off-season use of the bathhouse. As a result of that meeting, a shared access and reciprocal parking agreement was drafted for review and approval by all parties. This agreement addressed the parking requirements for the renovated pool and outlined how all parties will participate to provide parking for the facility.

**November 2008:** The CRRA and the five municipalities continued finalizing draft agreements to be presented to State College Area School District related to (1) shared access and parking on State College Area High School (SCAHS) - South lands for Welch Community Swimming Pool and (2) shared use of the new pool bathhouse by school sport teams.

In response to the grant application submitted in April, PA DCNR announced on November 18, 2008, their approval of a $375,000 grant towards the Welch Community Swimming Pool Renewal. A concept plan (Option #3) had been selected in November 2007 by the COG General Forum with a maximum project cost of $5.4 million. As a result, the CRRA will be able to resume the completion of the Welch Community Swimming Pool Master Site Plan and then start preparing the plans and specifications, so that bids can be received in late-Spring 2009. The planned schedule was to close Welch Community Swimming Pool on Sunday August 2, 2009, so that demolition could begin.

A proposed Shared Access and Reciprocal Parking Agreement was approved by CRRA and COG to be forwarded to SCASD for input and/or approval. With this draft agreement, SCASD will provide (construct) drop off access and handicap parking area for the pool by May 1, 2010, as well as provide priority-access to specified parking in the State College High School South
parking lot when the pool is open (not to conflict with the times that school is in session). By May 1, 2012, SCASD would provide an additional 159 parking spaces adjacent to the pool. Also as part of this draft agreement, CRRA will include exterior doors in the construction of the bathhouse that would permit SCASD use of that part of the facility.

**January 2009:** A Public Hearing was scheduled for 7 PM on Thursday January 15, 2009 at the COG Building Forum Room to receive comments on the final Welch Community Swimming Pool Master Site Plan. The plan had been developed around Concept Option #3 as approved by the five participating municipalities. Since that concept approval, the CRRA has obtained local financing for both pool renewals, continued work with SCASD to finalize the shared access and parking for the new pool, and obtained a state grant of $375,000 for the project.

**February - April 2009:**

During February and March, discussions have continued between municipal and school district officials with respect to finalizing the formal agreements based upon the jointly-approved "Principles of Agreement." After extensive discussions and related revisions, the final versions of two agreements were fully adopted by the CRRA and the SCASD Board of School Directors in mid-April:

1) Shared Parking and Access Agreement (See Appendix K)

2) Bathhouse Use Agreement (See Appendix L).

On April 27, 2009, a PowerPoint presentation was made to the COG General Forum with regard to the status of the renewals for Welch & Park Forest Community Pools

**May - June 2009:**

With the necessary agreements now in place, the Authority officially adopted the Master Site Plan and Report, subject to review and comment by PA DCNR. (See Page 9)

At this same time the detailed planning process continued with respect to the construction and bidding documents. This process also included finalizing the proposed realignment of the Orchard Park Bikeway where it crosses the lands leased by the Recreation Authority from SCASD. The easement for the bikeway was executed in 1995 between State College Borough and SCASD. The relocation of the path was proposed to provide more area for pool patrons. On 15 Jun 09, Borough Council unanimously approved the modifications to the easement agreement to permit the realignment. The proposal is not under consideration by the SCASD Board of Directors.

At their meeting on June 11, 2009, it was necessary for the Authority to adjust the project construction schedule. It is expected that bids will be accepted during August. As a result, Welch Pool will remain open through Labor Day 2009 and construction can begin in late-September. It is now expected that the new facilities will re-open on July 1, 2010.
RESOLUTION NO. 3-2009

A RESOLUTION CLOSING OUT COMMUNITY CONSERVATION PARTNERSHIPS GRANT PROJECT (BRC-TAG-12-229)

WHEREAS, the Centre Regional Recreation Authority has prepared a Master Site Plan for the Wm. L. Welch Community Swimming Pool area; and,

WHEREAS, the purpose of the Plan is to Explore facility options and finalize a community-supported plan to replace and upgrade the pool; and,

WHEREAS, the Plan was financed in part by a Community Conservation Partnerships Program grant under the administration of the Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Bureau of Recreation and Conservation, under contract number BRC-TAG-12-229.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED by the Board of the Centre Regional Recreation Authority that:

a. The project was completed in accordance with the Grant Agreement.
b. All project expenditures have been made and were in accordance with the Grant Agreement.
c. The Plan and related materials are acceptable to the Centre Regional Recreation Authority.
d. The Plan and related materials will be used to guide future recreation, park, open space and conservation acquisition, development, operations, and maintenance.

ADOPTED THIS 11th DAY OF June, 2009, by the

Centre Regional Recreation Authority

(Signature of governing body and name of grantee)

Sue Mascolo

(Signature, name and title of chief official, president, or chairperson) Ms. Sue Mascolo, Chair

Attest:

(Signature and title)

[Signature]

William L. Welch Community Swimming Pool
Master Site Plan Report
Concepts

Five concepts were developed with various amenities for consideration. All five concepts are based on complete demolition of the existing facility and assume new construction for the entire facility. Option 1 replaces the existing swimming pool with the same pool, leaving the size and configuration the same (6 lane 25-meter pool and a 600 sq. ft. tot pool). This will correct existing deficiencies, but will not add or enhance contemporary program opportunities. Option 2 includes a leisure pool, a 6 lane lap pool, and two spraygrounds. Option 3 includes a leisure pool, an 8 lane lap pool, and a spraypad. Option 4 includes a leisure pool with eight lap lanes, a tot pool, and a sprayground. Option 5 includes a 50-meter pool, leisure pool, and a spraypad.

**Option 1: Replace Existing Outdoor Pool**

Project Cost: $4,130,000  
First Year Attendance: 21,169  
Current Attendance: 23,352

- Heated 6 Lane 25-Meter Pool
- 2 Diving Boards
- Waterslide
- Tot Pool (600 sq. ft.)
- 7 Shade Structures

**Option 2: New Bathhouse, Leisure Pool, Fitness Pool, Spray Pad**

Project Cost: $4,600,000  
First Year Attendance: 27,595

- Heated 6 Lane Lap Pool (4,080 sq. ft.)
- Wet Deck
- Waterslide
- 2 Spraygrounds
- Heated Family Leisure Pool (1,046 sq. ft.)
- Current Channel
- Vortex
- Bubble Couch
- Participatory Play Feature
- 5 Shade Structures
Option 3: New Bathhouse, Leisure Pool, Short Course Lap Pool (Selected)

Project Cost: $5,412,000  
First Year Attendance: 46,717

- Heated 8 Lane 25-Yard Pool (4,500 sq. ft.)
- 2 Diving Boards
- Heated Leisure Pool (6,260 sq. ft.)
- Waterslide
- Current Channel
- Participatory Play Feature
- Water Vortex
- Spray Pad (1,150 sq. ft.)
- 5 Shade Structures
- Bathhouse (4,470 sq. ft.)

Option 4: Community Pool with Leisure & Lap, Tot Area

Project Cost: $7,240,000  
First Year Attendance: 42,470

- Heated Leisure Pool with 8 Lap Lanes (12,850 sq. ft.)
- 2 Diving Boards
- Participatory Play Feature
- Current Channel
- Vortex
- 2 Waterslides
- Otter Slide
- Tube Slide
- Tot Pool (1,260 sq. ft.)
- Spray Elements (Raindrop, Lemon Drops, Shower Tunnel)
- Water Sprayground (2,000 sq. ft.)
- Bathhouse (6,228 sq. ft.)
Option 5: Leisure Pool, 50 Meter Lap Pool, Tot Area

Project Cost: $8,413,000
First Year Attendance: 46,717

- 50-Meter Competition Pool (12,640 sq. ft.)
- Leisure Pool (6,260 sq. ft.)
- Two Waterslides
- Participatory Play Feature
- Current Channel
- Tumble Buckets
- Spray Pad (700 sq. ft.)
- 12 Shade Structures
- Pavilion
- Bathhouse (6,660 sq. ft.)

Opinion of Cashflow

In the following table, **Revenue** is generated from attendance potential (determined from facility capacity limits and market penetration levels) with attendance revenue (determined from membership structures and per capita revenues). **Expense** is an estimate of operating expenses concentrating on site-specific rates for operations and maintenance, staffing pay structures, and commodities such as chemicals and operating supplies. **Recapture Rate** is used to define the percentage of operating expenses recuperated by operating revenue. It is common in the parks and recreation industry to judge facility performance using the recapture rate as a benchmark, aiming for a high percentage of recapture.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$4,130,000</td>
<td>21,169</td>
<td>$115,145</td>
<td>$119,296</td>
<td>$123,502</td>
<td>$127,760</td>
<td>$132,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$166,828</td>
<td>$170,998</td>
<td>$175,273</td>
<td>$179,655</td>
<td>$184,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(51,683)</td>
<td>(51,702)</td>
<td>(51,772)</td>
<td>(51,895)</td>
<td>(52,073)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20,700</td>
<td>20,700</td>
<td>20,700</td>
<td>20,700</td>
<td>20,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$4,600,000</td>
<td>27,595</td>
<td>$147,609</td>
<td>$153,010</td>
<td>$158,481</td>
<td>$164,021</td>
<td>$169,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$182,812</td>
<td>$187,382</td>
<td>$192,067</td>
<td>$196,868</td>
<td>$201,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(35,203)</td>
<td>(34,372)</td>
<td>(33,586)</td>
<td>(32,847)</td>
<td>(32,159)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$5,412,000</td>
<td>46,717</td>
<td>$249,399</td>
<td>$258,390</td>
<td>$267,490</td>
<td>$276,699</td>
<td>$286,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$286,058</td>
<td>$293,210</td>
<td>$300,540</td>
<td>$308,054</td>
<td>$315,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(36,660)</td>
<td>(34,820)</td>
<td>(33,050)</td>
<td>(31,354)</td>
<td>(29,738)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27,100</td>
<td>27,100</td>
<td>27,100</td>
<td>27,100</td>
<td>27,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$7,240,000</td>
<td>42,470</td>
<td>$227,813</td>
<td>$235,986</td>
<td>$244,259</td>
<td>$252,631</td>
<td>$261,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$265,606</td>
<td>$272,247</td>
<td>$279,053</td>
<td>$286,029</td>
<td>$293,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(37,794)</td>
<td>(36,260)</td>
<td>(34,793)</td>
<td>(33,398)</td>
<td>(32,078)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36,200</td>
<td>36,200</td>
<td>36,200</td>
<td>36,200</td>
<td>36,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$8,413,000</td>
<td>46,717</td>
<td>$286,449</td>
<td>$295,440</td>
<td>$304,540</td>
<td>$313,749</td>
<td>$323,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$338,799</td>
<td>$347,269</td>
<td>$355,950</td>
<td>$364,849</td>
<td>$373,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(52,350)</td>
<td>(51,828)</td>
<td>(51,410)</td>
<td>(51,100)</td>
<td>(50,903)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42,100</td>
<td>42,100</td>
<td>42,100</td>
<td>42,100</td>
<td>42,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Counsilman-Hunsaker
SECTION 2: INTRODUCTION

The Centre Regional Recreation Authority retained HPArchitects and Counsilman-Hunsaker in 2007 to provide aquatic facility options in regards to the William L. Welch Community Swimming Pool Renewal Plan based on site specific research. This is an updated report which includes new demographic data for 2008.

Methodology

Research processes included:

- Meeting with members of the CRRA, the Study Committee, Centre Region Parks and Recreation staff, elected officials, the community, and other interested parties to determine need.
- Touring the pool site and the region.
- Investigating area aquatic providers to understand the programs, operations, and fees of those facilities.
- Reviewing demographics of the market area.
- Reviewing local construction costs and labor costs.

Project Scope

The scope of the project is to:

- Recommend an attractive and fun aquatic facility that will complement Park Forest Community Swimming Pool, serve regional needs, and meet current safety codes and future community program needs.
- Cooperate with the SCASD for parking and land use.
- Keep capital and operating costs reasonable for customers and the five municipalities.
- Analyze the cost to replace the existing pool and subsequent impact on attendance.
- Analyze the cost of pools with various amenities and subsequent impact on attendance.
- Make projections regarding operating costs and customer demand.
SECTION 3: CONCEPTUAL FACILITY DESIGN

The consultants developed five aquatic facility options, allocating spaces that will meet various goals and needs of the Centre Region aquatic community. All five concepts are based on complete demolition of the existing facility and assume new construction for the entire facility.

Green Technology and Sustainable Construction

Centre Regional Recreation Authority’s operating goals include maximizing sustainable design for efficient operation and being responsible in using natural resources. Evaluations for energy usage include solar heating and high efficiency motors. The consultants determined that for solar heating, redundant back-up gas fired heaters would be required (the costs for redundant systems are not included). The pools will require both filtration pumps and feature pumps for water features. The consultants are recommending the use of high efficiency motors for filtration. It is estimated that the CRRA will receive a seven-year payback on the investment for the high efficiency motors. The feature pumps and motors are recommended to use a traditional efficiency solution. Investing the extra money for high efficiency equipment to support these amenities will result in over a twenty-year payback. The potential to reclaim backwash water for irrigation use is also a consideration. However, the use of Pressure DE filters will reduce the amount of water lost due to backwash and may not contribute enough water to be reclaimed for irrigation. Solar heating may be used to supplement a traditional heater, but with a 3-month operating season it is likely that the payback will not be seen before another large capital investment is required. Pool covers can be used to reduce the heat and water loss due to evaporation. The payback for the investment of the covers can be seen within the first few years of operation; however, the increased labor cost to install and remove the covers each day will not be recovered. The current options that follow do not limit the ability to take advantage of these sustainable design practices.

The following concepts are offered as pictorial representations of space required to meet the programming demands, and are not the actual facility designs or what the concepts, if built, will look like. The models serve as a description of space allocated for the various amenities. All construction cost estimates were based on 2008 information with two years of inflation added for a 2010 project.
Option 1: Replace

Project Cost: $4,130,000

First Year Attendance: 21,169
Current Attendance: 23,352

Option 1 is to replace the existing swimming pool with the same pool, leaving the size and configuration as it is (six lane 25-meter pool and a 600 sq. ft. tot pool). This will correct existing deficiencies, but will not add or enhance contemporary program opportunities. Other features of Option 1 include a pool heater; two diving boards; a waterslide; seven shade structures; and a 3,870 square foot bathhouse, including locker rooms and snack bar.

OPTION 1: CONCEPTUAL REPRESENTATION

NOT TO SCALE
## OPINION OF PROJECT COST: OPTION 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Opinion of Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td></td>
<td>$95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathhouse</td>
<td>3,870</td>
<td>$653,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers Office</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guard Room / First Aid</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Mechanical</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Mechanical</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locker Rooms</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snack Bar</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>645</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>$1,621,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterslide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diving Board</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Heater</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot Pool</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>$328,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Deck</td>
<td>10,080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence</td>
<td>544</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Lighting</td>
<td>18,480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shade Structures</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Building Construction Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2,698,195</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Construction Costs (landscaping, utilities, walks - NO Parking)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$402,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$3,100,495</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation (2 years)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$310,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$341,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$375,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Project Costs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$4,126,758</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Say</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$4,130,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Counsilman-Hunsaker
Option 2: New Bathhouse, Leisure Pool, Fitness Pool, Spray Pad

Project Cost: $4,600,000
First Year Attendance: 27,595

Competitive Component
Option 2 includes a heated 4,080 sq. ft. six lane lap pool with a wet deck and waterslide. The wet deck offers a gathering place in ankle-high water, like taking a beach chair to the shoreline, where families can keep cool while watching children in swim practice and swim meets. The waterslide provides thrills for teens and adventurous families in a separate area of this pool.

Leisure Component
A 3,803 sq. ft. heated leisure pool with zero-depth entry will accommodate recreation swimming with attractions such as a current channel, vortex, bubble couch, spray features, and a participatory play feature. Zero-depth entry provides a safe and easy way for everyone to enter the pool without steps or ladders. The participatory play feature, located near the zero-depth entry, features activities for young children to crawl through tunnels, scamper through spraying water, climb across bridges, and slide down just-their-size waterslides. Meanwhile, the current channel provides a tranquil journey where water travels at approximately three miles per hour and can be used as an ideal water walking setting for fitness classes or non-programmed exercise. The water vortex creates a play area in the pool where the imagination determines the adventure or when the vortex pump is turned off, an excellent instruction area is created. The bubble couch provides a hydrotherapy spa-like area in the pool, while spray features create a water wonderland effect.

Two water spraygrounds add delightful sprays of water while keeping children busy for hours as they zip around the colorful hands-on interactive water play equipment. Five interspersed shade structures protect guests from UV rays while adding a festive touch to lounging areas. A 3,390 sq. ft. bathhouse provides locker rooms, two family changing areas, and a vending area.

Instructional Component
This option provides adult lap swimming, water aerobics/exercise classes, swim lessons for all ages, diving lessons, swim team training, and other aquatic lessons.
OPTION 2: CONCEPTUAL REPRESENTATION

NOT TO SCALE
## OPINION OF PROJECT COST: OPTION 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Opinion of Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td></td>
<td>$95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath House</td>
<td>3,390</td>
<td>$571,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers Office</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guard Room / First Aid</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Mechanical</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Mechanical</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locker Rooms</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Changing Room (2)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vending</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>565</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal Aquatics</td>
<td>10,718</td>
<td>$1,865,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Lane Lap Pool</td>
<td>4,080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet Deck</td>
<td>1,789</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterslide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Heater</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spraygrounds (2)</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spray Features</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Pool</td>
<td>3,803</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Channel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vortex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bubble Couch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Play Feature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot Slide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Heater</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>$333,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Deck</td>
<td>21,436</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence</td>
<td>639</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Lighting</td>
<td>32,154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shade Structures</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>Opinion of Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Building Construction Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,864,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Construction Costs (landscaping, utilities, walks - NO Parking)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$578,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,443,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation (2 years)</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>$344,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>$378,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>$416,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opinion of Project Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,583,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Say</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Counsilman-Hunsaker
Option 3: New Bathhouse, Leisure Pool, Short Course Lap Pool *(Selected)*

Project Cost: $5,412,000  
First Year Attendance: 46,717

**Competitive Component**  
Option 3 includes a heated 4,500 sq. ft. eight lane 25-yard pool with two diving boards. This pool provides short course swim meets and 1-meter diving opportunities.

**Leisure Component**  
A 6,260 sq. ft. leisure pool will accommodate recreation swimming with zero-depth entry, a waterslide, vortex, current channel, and participatory play feature. Children can romp over to the participatory play feature (in the shallow water) designed for climbing, crawling, and sliding experiences. Kids will also enjoy swooshing around in the water vortex where the imagination determines the adventure in this swirling play arena. All ages can enjoy being whisked away on a floating adventure down the current channel or using it as a programmed or non-programmed water walking feature. The waterslide provides thrills and spills for the more adventurous and many times it can be seen from afar as an advertising amenity.

Also included is a 1,150 sq. ft. spray pad to provide the youngest guests with water play equipment in a safely designed area. Five shade structures add colorful retreats from the sun in lounging areas. The new 4,470 sq. ft. bathhouse provides locker rooms, two family changing areas, and a snack bar/vending area.

**Instructional Component**  
This pool provides opportunity for adult lap swimming, water aerobics/exercise classes, swim lessons for all ages, diving lessons, swim team training, and other aquatic lessons.
NOTE: The specific locations of the facilities shown in this Concept Plan were modified as the planning process continued.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Opinion of Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td></td>
<td>$95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathhouse</td>
<td>4,470</td>
<td>$760,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers Office</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guard Room / First Aid</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Mechanical</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locker Rooms</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Changing Room (2)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snack Bar</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics</td>
<td>11,911</td>
<td>$2,282,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Pool</td>
<td>6,260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterslide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Play Feature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vortex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Channel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Heater</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Lane Lap Pool</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diving Board</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Heater</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spray Pad</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UV sanitizer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>$375,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Deck</td>
<td>14,293</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence</td>
<td>648</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Lighting</td>
<td>26,204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shade Structures</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Master Site Plan Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Opinion of Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Building Construction Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,513,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Construction Costs (landscaping, utilities, walks - NO Parking)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$552,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$4,065,839</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation (2 year)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$406,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$447,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$491,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Project Costs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$5,411,631</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$5,412,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Counsilman-Hunsaker*
Option 4: Community Pool with Leisure & Lap, Tot Area

Project Cost: $7,240,000  
First Year Attendance: 42,470

**Competitive Component**
Option 4 provides eight lap lanes and two diving boards for short course swim meets and diving opportunities.

**Leisure Component**
The eight lap lanes are attached to a heated leisure pool in one body of water (12,850 sq. ft). The zero-depth entry leisure pool accommodates recreational swimming with assorted attractions. While lounging in the zero-depth entry, parents can keep a watchful eye on younger children who are playing on a participatory play feature in the shallow water. This “water jungle gym” play feature provides children with climbing, crawling, and sliding experiences. A current channel offers a tranquil journey on a warm afternoon or a water walking excursion. A water vortex offers a segregated area where swirling water propels kids in imaginative adventures. Two waterslides and a tube slide bring excitement to adventurous adults and the teen market’s need-for-speed, while an otter slide welcomes children who are too big for the participatory play feature, but too small for the large waterslides. Spray features, including a shower tunnel and lemon drops, create a water wonderland while a raindrop adds dimension by bringing the water up and then down, offering an individual play station within the shallow end of the pool.

The 1,260 sq. ft. tot pool provides tiny tots a way to get acquainted with swimming in a designated area. A 2,000 sq. ft. water sprayground invites youngsters to play with interactive water play elements that can be turned on and off with timers. Children enjoy darting about the bright, cheery spray features that unpredictably refresh them with bursts of sprayed water as they pass under them, by them or touch them.

Seven shade structures provide a break from UV rays while adding a splash of color to lounging areas. The new 6,228 sq. ft. bathhouse provides locker rooms, two family changing areas, and a snack bar.

**Instructional Component**
This option provides water aerobics/exercise classes, swim lessons for all ages, swim team training, diving, and other aquatic lessons.
OPTION 4: CONCEPTUAL REPRESENTATION

NOT TO SCALE
## OPINION OF PROJECT COST: OPTION 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Opinion of Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td></td>
<td>$95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bathhouse</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers Office</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>$1,058,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recep Office</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guard Room / First Aid</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Mechanical</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Mechanical</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locker Rooms</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Changing Room (2)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snack Bar</td>
<td>475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>1,038</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aquatics</strong></td>
<td>12,850</td>
<td>$3,072,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Pool</td>
<td>12,850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterslide (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterslide (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Play Feature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otter Slide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raindrop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shower Tunnel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Drops</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Channel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vortex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diving Board</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Heater</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tube Slide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot Pool</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprayground</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UV Sanitizer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Heater</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>Opinion of Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>$457,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Deck</td>
<td>19,332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence</td>
<td>753</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Lighting</td>
<td>35,442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shade Structures</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Building Construction Costs**  
4,683,438

Site Construction Costs (landscaping, utilities, walks - NO Parking) $750,060

Subtotal $5,433,498

Inflation (2 years) 10% $543,350

Contingency 10% $597,685

Indirect Costs 10% $657,453

Total Estimated Project Costs: $7,231,985

Say $7,240,000

Source: Counsilman-Hunsaker
Option 5: Leisure Pool, 50-Meter Lap Pool, Tot Area

Project Cost: $8,413,000
First Year Attendance: 46,717

Competitive Component
Option 5 features a 50-Meter Olympic Size Competition Pool for long course swim meets while two springboards offer diving opportunities. This championship pool will accommodate regional swimming events.

Leisure Component
A 6,260 sq. ft. heated leisure pool with zero-depth entry will accommodate recreational swimming with attractions such as a participatory play feature, current channel, waterslides, tumble buckets, and spray pad. A participatory play feature offers a multi-level interactive water play structure for children for climbing, crawling, sliding, and operating valves and sprays for hands-on play activities. A current channel extends an easy-going floating escapade or a water walking opportunity. Two waterslides appeal to the adventurous for plunging excitement while tumble buckets fill up and splash down on top of delighted children.

A 700 sq. ft. spray pad provides children an opportunity to play with interactive water play elements that can be turned on and off with timers. Twelve shade structures provide a break from UV rays while adding a bright, cherry touch to lounging areas. A group pavilion offers a shaded area for special events, picnics, and rentals. A 6,660 sq. ft. bathhouse provides locker rooms, two family changing areas, and a snack bar.

Instructional Component
This pool provides water aerobics / exercise classes, swim lessons for all ages, swim team training, major swim meets, and other aquatics and lessons.
OPTION 5: CONCEPTUAL REPRESENTATION

NOT TO SCALE
### OPINION OF PROJECT COST: OPTION 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Opinion of Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td></td>
<td>$95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathhouse</td>
<td>6,660</td>
<td>$1,122,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers Office</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guard Room / First Aid</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Mechanical</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Mechanical</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locker Rooms</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Changing Room (2)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snack Bar</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics</td>
<td>19,602</td>
<td>$3,556,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Pool</td>
<td>6,260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterslide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Play Feature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumble Bucket</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Channel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Heater</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Meter Pool</td>
<td>12,640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diving Board</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Heater</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spray Pad</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UV Sanitizer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>$650,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Deck</td>
<td>23,522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence</td>
<td>690</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Lighting</td>
<td>43,124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shade Structures</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parking

On-site parking must provide for easy drop-off and pick-up. The parking requirement for the concepts assumes that, on average, three participants will arrive in each car. The final design must also provide service vehicle access to the mechanical areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Square Ft.</th>
<th>Opinion of Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Building Construction Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,424,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Construction Costs (landscaping, utilities, walks - NO Parking)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$896,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,320,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation (2 year)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$632,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$695,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$764,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Project Costs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,412,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Say</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,413,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Counsilman-Hunsaker

**OPINION OF PARKING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td>73,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impervious Structure</td>
<td>47,350</td>
<td>70,544</td>
<td>67,674</td>
<td>99,670</td>
<td>122,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Program Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>72,350</td>
<td>105,544</td>
<td>104,674</td>
<td>157,670</td>
<td>195,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sq. Ft. with Efficiency</td>
<td>144,700</td>
<td>211,088</td>
<td>209,348</td>
<td>315,340</td>
<td>391,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Site Size Requirements (acres)</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>8.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Site Size (acres)</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>13.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Counsilman-Hunsaker
SECTION 4: AREA AQUATIC PROVIDERS

Demand for use of the proposed aquatic facility will be affected by the presence of competing facilities. Generally, competing aquatic providers may include swim clubs, schools and universities, and YMCA’s within the area. This report should assist in exploring any overlap of services currently offered in the area.

State College Area Family YMCA
677 W. Whitehall Road
State College, PA 16801
814-237-7717

Features
8 lane 25-yard indoor pool
30 by 40 indoor therapy pool

Hours
Mon - Fri: 5:30AM – 10 PM
Sat: 8 AM – 9 PM
Sun: 10 AM – 5:30 PM

Fees
Joining Fee $50 adult / $25 youth
Monthly Fee:
Family $51
Single Parent Family $41
Adult $35
Senior $26

Programs
Power Lunch
HS Lessons
Swim Lessons
Power Waves
Swim Team
Water Yoga/ Ai Chi
Aquatic Personal Training
Wet Pilates
Arthritis and More
Water Walking
Gym & Swim
Aqua Senior
Water Fitness
Aqua Mom
State College Area High School Natatorium
653 Westerly Parkway
State College, PA
814-231-4160

**Features**
75 feet by 45 feet indoor pool
Bleacher seating

**Hours**
No public hours

**CRPR Programs**
Currently, the State College High School Natatorium offers programs to the community through two sources: Centre Region Parks and Recreation and SCASD Community Education for swim lessons

Centre Hills Country Club
Branch Road
State College, PA
814-238-0111

**Features**
Private club
80 by 50 outdoor pool

**Hours**
Daily: 11 AM – 8 PM

**Fees**
Private Club – only members can use the pool

**Programs**
Swim lessons
Features

Penn State's McCoy Natatorium aquatics facilities include:

- 6 lane 25-meter instructional pool. This is a shallow (3 1/2 - 5 ft) warm-water (80 °F) pool primarily for instruction, recreation, therapy, and lap swimming.

- 6 lane 25-yard competition pool. This is a deep (6 to 10 ft.) pool maintained at 80° F, designed for members of swim teams and serious lap swimmers. It is also used for water polo, scuba, and synchronized swimming.

- Diving well, a warm (88° F) and deep (14 ft.) pool designed for springboard diving and scuba diving. It features two 1-meter and two 3-meter springboards for competition. Available to the public is one 1-meter springboard, and the Aquaclimb.

- 3- by 3-meter AquaClimb poolside climbing wall. The AquaClimb is a unique new water activity that blends fun and fitness with climbing. The AquaClimb angles over the pool to ensure all climbers fall back with a splash.

- Outdoor 50-meter pool was added in 1968. Open for summer fun only, this heated (82° F) Olympic size pool has four diving boards, and 5-, 7-, and 10-meter diving platforms.

- 5 lane 25-meter pool for general use, is located in the White Building adjacent to the HUB, near the center of campus.

Hours

Outdoor Pool:
Mon – Fri 10:30AM – 9 PM
Special populations, including seniors 59+ and disabled:
Mon – Fri 10 AM – 11 AM

Indoor Pool:
M/W/TH/F 7:30 AM – 9 AM
Mon – Fri 11 AM – 2 PM
5:30 PM – 6:30 PM
8:30 PM – 10 PM
Sat 1:30 PM – 9:50 PM (closed during at-home football games)
Sun 2 PM – 9:50 PM
Fees
Indoor and Outdoor Pool Admission (Daily) $4
Fitness Pass (not including outdoor pool) $41 per semester
Student Family Pass (indoor swimming only) $60 per semester
Outdoor Pool Multi-Pass for 15 admissions $45

Non-Students / Faculty Staff
Individual $60 per semester
Family $115 per semester

Masters Swimming Pass $55 per semester
(for scheduled Masters workouts only)
Aquacise Pass $40 per semester
(for scheduled Aquacise classes only)

Programs
Age group training
Age group diving
Swim Team
Dive Team
Master’s Program
Swim Lessons (group and private)
Aquacise
Birthday Parties
Pool Rentals

Delgrosso’s Amusement Park / Tipton Waterworks & Rapids
Old Route 220
Tipton, PA 16684
814-684-3538

Delgrosso’s is a commercial waterpark with many attractions.

Hours
Memorial Day – Labor Day
Daily: 11 AM – 8 PM

Fees
Daily: $15.95 with slides
$12.95 without slides
Season Pass: $79.95
SECTION 5: POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

Factors that influence attendance of aquatic centers include population characteristics, income, and age groups. Market studies are used to predict how relevant products, services and fees are to residents. In this section, demographics were analyzed per 670 Westerly Parkway, State College, Pennsylvania.

Population by Distance

The following table presents a summary of market area population for the 2000 census year, with estimates for 2008 and projections for 2013. Areas were analyzed according to radii surrounding the site. The total market area (0-25 miles) contained a population of 227,200 in 2000, is estimated at 233,900 for 2008, and expected to continue to increase to 236,700 by 2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance from Proposed Site</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Average Annual Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number (000's)</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>Number (000's)</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 3 Miles</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5 Miles</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 Miles</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>101.8</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15 Miles</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 25 Miles</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>105.1</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>131.5</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>132.1</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (0-25 Miles)</td>
<td>227.2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>233.9</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State College, PA</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DemographicsNow
Income

To a certain degree, the likelihood of residents to use city swimming pools depends on their ability to pay admission and program fees. In the following table, the U.S. national average is set at 1.00. Index refers to the percentage higher or lower than the national average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARKET AREA INCOME</th>
<th>Per Capita Incomes</th>
<th>Median Household Incomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dollars</td>
<td>Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Miles</td>
<td>$18,887</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Miles</td>
<td>$21,237</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Miles</td>
<td>$21,866</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Miles</td>
<td>$22,016</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Miles</td>
<td>$20,991</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State College</td>
<td>$14,854</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL U.S.</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,232</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DemographicsNow

In the 3-mile zone, per capita incomes are 25% below the national average and the median household income is 32% below. The 5-mile zone is 16% below the national average and the median household income is 20% below. The 10-mile zone is 13% below the national average in terms of per-capita income with the median household income at 14% below. From this analysis, incomes are below the national average; thus, many people living within the area may not be able to afford substantial fees. This trend is influenced by the large number of students living in the area who attend Penn State University. The CRRA may want to take into consideration the viability of programs that would support the use of the facility by lower income families.
Age Distribution

Age distribution is another population characteristic used to determine the type and level of use of any type of program. Research has shown that younger age groups are more likely to engage in competitive and recreational activities, while middle-age and older patrons enjoy wellness and fitness programming. The following table provides number of residents and percentage of total population for each age group. The U.S. column identifies national averages for each of those age groups.

### AGE DISTRIBUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>0-3 Miles</th>
<th>3-5 Miles</th>
<th>5-10 Miles</th>
<th>10-15 Miles</th>
<th>15-25 Miles</th>
<th>State College, PA</th>
<th>U.S. Age Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>2,448</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>1,012</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>2,544</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td>2,335</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>1,168</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>1,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19</td>
<td>6,739</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>1,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>14,066</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>3,643</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>5,036</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>6,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24</td>
<td>19,196</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1,353</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>1,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>11,013</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>4,628</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>4,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>4,985</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>2,320</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>4,085</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>3,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>4,835</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>2,325</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>3,619</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>3,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64</td>
<td>3,577</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>2,631</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>3,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 74</td>
<td>2,566</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>2,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 84</td>
<td>1,954</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>1,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 and over</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>63,165</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>15,212</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>23,616</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>27,009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-source: DemographicsNow

The 0-17 age group, as a percentage of the 25-mile population, is below the national average. To support the mission of the updated facility, the percentage of children is preferred to be higher than the national average. We also see a large percentage in the 20 to 24 age group. Again, this is likely due to the large number of students living in the area. However, the number of children in the 0-3 mile area (14,066 children) is sufficient to support an aquatic facility.
Weather

Given the sensitivity of water sports to weather conditions, it is appropriate to include an assessment of local weather patterns in the market analysis of the facilities. These factors are used when determining user days in the financial models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Precipitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>Inches</td>
<td>Days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Weatherbase

The weather patterns suggested in the above figures will not inhibit participation in seasonal aquatics. Mild summer temperatures with cool summer nights prevail, thus, there is a need for heating the pool water for a more comfortable recreation swimming experience.
SECTION 6: FACILITY PROGRAMMING

Activity Programming

After interviewing many of the aquatic leaders in the community, the following list of activities were determined for activity programming consideration for Option 3 developed for the William L. Welch Community Swimming Pool.

**Primary Programming:**

- Swim Team Training
- Dive Team Training
- William L. Welch Swim Team Meets
- Summer Swim Lessons (all levels)
- Aquanastics / Aqua Aerobic Classes
- Fitness Lap Swimming
- Instructional Swim Classes
- Recreational Swimming
- Therapeutic Classes for Seniors
- Wellness and Fitness for Seniors
- Survival Swimming
- Scuba Training
- Lifeguard and Lifesaving Instruction
- Physically Challenged Swim Programs
- Water Safety Workshops
- Deep Water Exercise Classes
- Water Fitness and Wellness Classes
- Aqua Sports
- Master’s Swim Team
- Physically Challenged Swim Programs
- Organization Rentals / Party Rentals
SECTION 7: OPINION OF OPERATIONS

Facility Capacity

Types of spaces and associated capacity will determine the degree the facility will be used.

- Generally, recreational swimmers prefer shallow water of four feet or less allowing participation in a variety of water-related activities while still touching the pool bottom. In estimating capacity for recreational use, a maximum density of 25 sq. ft. per person is assumed. Based on a length of stay of two to three hours, turnover in-house attendance is two and a half times per day for the recreational swimmer.

- For deep water, the maximum density is assumed to be 100 sq. ft. per person. Based on a length of stay of two to three hours, turnover in-house attendance is three times per day for the competitive swimmer.

Additional spaces not listed, such as office space and locker rooms, have no impact on programming and market penetration has not been included in this analysis. Capacity of spaces is directly correlated to attendance.

The following table is one way to view the contribution that the available capacity has to the projected attendance. It is necessary to use the descriptive above to project how many people can be accommodated in any given space using the per sq. ft. guideline.
Projected Attendance by Option

Based on the preceding methodology, the following attendance numbers are projected for the options. It has been well documented that attendance increases as amenities become more diverse and exciting. Attendance is projected to increase during the five-year span due to increasing levels of population in the area. For this analysis, 2008 is considered the first year of operation. The further into the future projections are made, the more limited the accuracy of the data becomes.
## PROJECTED ATTENDANCE: OPTION 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 3 Miles</td>
<td>62,957</td>
<td>63,487</td>
<td>64,017</td>
<td>64,547</td>
<td>65,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5 Miles</td>
<td>15,212</td>
<td>15,328</td>
<td>15,444</td>
<td>15,560</td>
<td>15,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 Miles</td>
<td>23,616</td>
<td>23,805</td>
<td>23,995</td>
<td>24,184</td>
<td>24,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15 Miles</td>
<td>27,008</td>
<td>27,082</td>
<td>27,156</td>
<td>27,230</td>
<td>27,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 25 Miles</td>
<td>105,085</td>
<td>104,872</td>
<td>104,659</td>
<td>104,445</td>
<td>104,232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Market Penetration Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 3 Miles</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5 Miles</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 Miles</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15 Miles</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 25 Miles</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Projected Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 3 Miles</td>
<td>18,887</td>
<td>19,046</td>
<td>19,205</td>
<td>19,364</td>
<td>19,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5 Miles</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>2,299</td>
<td>2,317</td>
<td>2,334</td>
<td>2,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 Miles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15 Miles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 25 Miles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Experience Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Population</th>
<th>Experience Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 3 Miles</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5 Miles</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 Miles</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15 Miles</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 25 Miles</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 21,169 21,345 21,522 21,698 21,875

Source: Counsilman-Hunsaker

## PROJECTED ATTENDANCE: OPTION 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 3 Miles</td>
<td>62,957</td>
<td>63,487</td>
<td>64,017</td>
<td>64,547</td>
<td>65,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5 Miles</td>
<td>15,212</td>
<td>15,328</td>
<td>15,444</td>
<td>15,560</td>
<td>15,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 Miles</td>
<td>23,616</td>
<td>23,805</td>
<td>23,995</td>
<td>24,184</td>
<td>24,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15 Miles</td>
<td>27,008</td>
<td>27,082</td>
<td>27,156</td>
<td>27,230</td>
<td>27,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 25 Miles</td>
<td>105,085</td>
<td>104,872</td>
<td>104,659</td>
<td>104,445</td>
<td>104,232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Market Penetration Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 3 Miles</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5 Miles</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 Miles</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15 Miles</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 25 Miles</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Projected Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 3 Miles</td>
<td>22,035</td>
<td>22,220</td>
<td>22,406</td>
<td>22,591</td>
<td>22,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5 Miles</td>
<td>5,324</td>
<td>5,365</td>
<td>5,405</td>
<td>5,446</td>
<td>5,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 Miles</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15 Miles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 25 Miles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Experience Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Population</th>
<th>Experience Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 3 Miles</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5 Miles</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 Miles</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15 Miles</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 25 Miles</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 27,595 27,823 28,051 28,279 28,507

Source: Counsilman-Hunsaker
## Projected Attendance: Option 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 3 Miles</td>
<td>62,957</td>
<td>63,487</td>
<td>64,017</td>
<td>64,547</td>
<td>65,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5 Miles</td>
<td>15,212</td>
<td>15,328</td>
<td>15,444</td>
<td>15,560</td>
<td>15,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 Miles</td>
<td>23,616</td>
<td>23,805</td>
<td>23,995</td>
<td>24,184</td>
<td>24,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15 Miles</td>
<td>27,008</td>
<td>27,082</td>
<td>27,156</td>
<td>27,230</td>
<td>27,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 25 Miles</td>
<td>105,085</td>
<td>104,872</td>
<td>104,659</td>
<td>104,445</td>
<td>104,232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Market Penetration Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 3 Miles</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5 Miles</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 Miles</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15 Miles</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 25 Miles</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Projected Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 3 Miles</td>
<td>28,331</td>
<td>28,569</td>
<td>28,808</td>
<td>29,046</td>
<td>29,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5 Miles</td>
<td>6,845</td>
<td>6,898</td>
<td>6,950</td>
<td>7,002</td>
<td>7,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 Miles</td>
<td>3,542</td>
<td>3,571</td>
<td>3,599</td>
<td>3,628</td>
<td>3,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15 Miles</td>
<td>2,701</td>
<td>2,708</td>
<td>2,716</td>
<td>2,723</td>
<td>2,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 25 Miles</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>1,042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Experience Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Population</th>
<th>1.10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>46,717</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Counsilman-Hunsaker

## Projected Attendance: Option 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 3 Miles</td>
<td>62,957</td>
<td>63,487</td>
<td>64,017</td>
<td>64,547</td>
<td>65,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5 Miles</td>
<td>15,212</td>
<td>15,328</td>
<td>15,444</td>
<td>15,560</td>
<td>15,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 Miles</td>
<td>23,616</td>
<td>23,805</td>
<td>23,995</td>
<td>24,184</td>
<td>24,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15 Miles</td>
<td>27,008</td>
<td>27,082</td>
<td>27,156</td>
<td>27,230</td>
<td>27,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 25 Miles</td>
<td>105,085</td>
<td>104,872</td>
<td>104,659</td>
<td>104,445</td>
<td>104,232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Market Penetration Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 3 Miles</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5 Miles</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 Miles</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15 Miles</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 25 Miles</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Projected Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 3 Miles</td>
<td>28,331</td>
<td>28,569</td>
<td>28,808</td>
<td>29,046</td>
<td>29,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5 Miles</td>
<td>6,845</td>
<td>6,898</td>
<td>6,950</td>
<td>7,002</td>
<td>7,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 Miles</td>
<td>3,542</td>
<td>3,571</td>
<td>3,599</td>
<td>3,628</td>
<td>3,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15 Miles</td>
<td>2,701</td>
<td>2,708</td>
<td>2,716</td>
<td>2,723</td>
<td>2,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 25 Miles</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>1,042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Experience Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Population</th>
<th>1.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>42,470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Counsilman-Hunsaker
Recreation Program Revenue

Recreation program revenue projections include age-group competitive swimming, swim lessons, school district programming, aqua aerobic, and therapy programming. It is assumed these user groups, because of their high volume of use, will pay a lower fee per person admission. Programming will need to be scheduled so as not to significantly impact community recreation programming. The following tables summarize recreation program demand, per capita spending, and revenue potential for the proposed aquatic center. The table assumes the cost of the program has been deducted from generated fees and shows the “net” program revenue. For example, the revenue projected for swimming lessons is after the instructor cost.

Visits per Program Day: number of participants in a particular activity per day. Swim team rental refers to one swim meet on a particular day.

Programming Days: number of days each activity will be programmed during the summer season.

Per Capita Spending: revenue generated per participant per day of activity after related costs are paid, for instance, the $2.00 assumed for each swim team participant per day is after the instructors are paid.
Opinion of Revenue (Net): the resulting revenue generated by each activity. (Visits per Program Day) multiplied by (Programming Days) multiplied by (Per Capita Spending) = Opinion of Revenue (Net).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visits per Program Day</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swim Meet Rental</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA Swim Team</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Swim Lessons</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Swim Team</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Swim Team</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthday Party</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Rental</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Programming Days                               |          |          |          |          |          |
| Swim Meet Rental                               | 5        | -        | 5        | 5        | 10       |
| USA Swim Team                                  | -        | -        | -        | -        | 90       |
| Summer Swim Lessons                            | 40       | 40       | 40       | 40       | 40       |
| Municipal Swim Team                            | 55       | 55       | 55       | 55       | 55       |
| Masters Swim Team                              | -        | 90       | -        | -        | 90       |
| Birthday Party                                 | 30       | 30       | 30       | 30       | 30       |
| Private Rental                                 | 30       | 30       | 30       | 30       | 30       |

| Per Capita Spending (Net)                      |          |          |          |          |          |
| Swim Meet Rental                               | $250.00  | $0.00    | $250.00  | $250.00  | $800.00  |
| USA Swim Team                                  | $0.00    | $0.00    | $2.00    | $0.00    | $2.00    |
| Summer Swim Lessons                            | $2.00    | $2.00    | $2.00    | $2.00    | $2.00    |
| Municipal Swim Team                            | $0.00    | $0.00    | $0.00    | $0.00    | $0.00    |
| Masters Swim Team                              | $2.00    | $2.00    | $2.00    | $2.00    | $2.00    |
| Birthday Party                                 | $35.00   | $35.00   | $35.00   | $35.00   | $35.00   |
| Private Rental                                 | $50.00   | $50.00   | $100.00  | $100.00  | $100.00  |

| Opinion of Revenue (Net)                       |          |          |          |          |          |
| Swim Meet Rental                               | $1,250   | $0.00    | $1,250   | $1,250   | $8,000   |
| USA Swim Team                                  | $0.00    | $0.00    | $0.00    | $0.00    | $22,500  |
| Summer Swim Lessons                            | $4,800   | $4,800   | $5,600   | $5,600   | $8,000   |
| Municipal Swim Team                            | $0.00    | $0.00    | $0.00    | $0.00    | $0.00    |
| Masters Swim Team                              | $0.00    | $0.00    | $0.00    | $0.00    | $5,400   |
| Birthday Party                                 | $0.00    | $1,050   | $2,100   | $2,100   | $2,100   |
| Private Rental                                 | $1,500   | $1,500   | $3,000   | $3,000   | $3,000   |

| User-Group Revenue                             | $7,550   | $7,350   | $11,950  | $11,950  | $49,000  |

Source: Counsilman-Hunsaker
Fee Structure

In order to project revenue, fee schedules are established. Three general approaches to evaluating the fee structure of an aquatic center include:

1. Maximize revenue by charging what the market will support. Programs and facilities operate with positive cashflow. If excess funds are available at season’s end, they can be used to support under-funded programs.

2. Break-even in the operation of the facility. This approach is increasing in popularity as funding is becoming limited to organizations. Capital funds are used to create the facility; operational funds are generated from the user on a break-even basis.

3. Subsidy pricing historically has been the policy of many community facilities and is currently the strategy of the Authority-operated swimming pools.

A critical component of an enterprise fund management protocol is the revenue and pricing policy. The following tables are sample fee structures developed based on local providers, target markets, and similar existing facilities across the country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Admission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult (18 &amp; 65)</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth and Seniors</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Admission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult (18 &amp; 65)</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth and Seniors</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Pass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Family Member</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth and Senior</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Family Member</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opinion of Revenue

Per capita income is the projection of increased revenues that will be generated from increases in projected annual attendance. The formula reflects the category for admission, the rate of each category, and the percentage of attendance that might be expected from that category.

The following tables take into consideration the revenue streams from programs and classes offered for each facility. Attendance projections reflect the number of people who will attend the facility during the course of operations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Percent of Visits</th>
<th>Per Visit Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Admission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult (18 &amp; 65)</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth and Seniors</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult (18 &amp; 65)</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth and Seniors</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Pass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Family Member</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth and Senior</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Family Member</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal / Average</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following table takes into consideration the revenue streams from special user group and general attendance, resulting in an opinion of revenue for each facility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPINION OF REVENUE: ALL OPTIONS</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>21,169</td>
<td>27,595</td>
<td>46,717</td>
<td>42,470</td>
<td>46,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>21,345</td>
<td>27,823</td>
<td>47,074</td>
<td>42,794</td>
<td>47,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>21,522</td>
<td>28,051</td>
<td>47,431</td>
<td>43,119</td>
<td>47,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>21,698</td>
<td>28,279</td>
<td>47,787</td>
<td>43,443</td>
<td>47,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>21,875</td>
<td>28,507</td>
<td>48,144</td>
<td>43,768</td>
<td>48,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Spending</td>
<td>$5.08</td>
<td>$5.08</td>
<td>$5.08</td>
<td>$5.08</td>
<td>$5.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special User Group Spending</td>
<td>$7,550</td>
<td>$7,350</td>
<td>$11,950</td>
<td>$11,950</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$115,145</td>
<td>$147,609</td>
<td>$249,399</td>
<td>$227,813</td>
<td>$286,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$119,296</td>
<td>$153,010</td>
<td>$258,390</td>
<td>$235,986</td>
<td>$295,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$123,502</td>
<td>$158,481</td>
<td>$267,490</td>
<td>$244,259</td>
<td>$304,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$127,760</td>
<td>$164,021</td>
<td>$276,699</td>
<td>$252,631</td>
<td>$313,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$132,073</td>
<td>$169,631</td>
<td>$286,017</td>
<td>$261,102</td>
<td>$323,067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Counsilman-Hunsaker

Opinion of Expenses

This plan recommends an expense model for estimating probable expenses for major areas of labor, contractual services, commodities, and utilities. User projections are made based on programming. Expenses are estimated, taking into account hours of operation, attendance projections, local weather patterns, local utility rates, and other key items. Operating data from other facilities are reviewed and taken into account to form projections. The table at the end of this section reflects a summary of all operating expenses, assumptions and estimates detailed by the expense category.

Facility Staff

Projected annual payroll expenses are listed by full-time and part-time classifications reflecting benefits and taxes. Scheduling employees is determined by programming demand and management procedure. Wherever possible, pay rates were determined using existing city job classifications and wage scales. Cost for swim instructors and other employees associated with program income are factored in as cost against net programming revenue.
Repairs and Maintenance

The manufacturers of some types of mechanical equipment recommend annual maintenance programs to ensure proper performance of their equipment. Much of this work will be performed by outside contractors. In addition, for daily operation of the facilities, miscellaneous items will need to be repaired by outside firms.

Commodities

Commodities are day-to-day products used to operate aquatic centers. Office supplies, program supplies, custodial supplies, repair supplies and chemicals are included. In determining annual chemical expense, chemical treatment assumes the use of calcium hypochlorite and muriatic acid (pH buffer). Chemical use can depend upon bather load and chemical balance of the water. In estimating annual costs, medium bather load figures are assumed. In the preceding marketing strategy section, mass-marketing and direct-marketing strategies are discussed.

Heating/Dehumidification

In determining utility costs, current energy costs at other facilities in the area were reviewed. Total costs include energy, energy demand and delivery charges. Caution must be used when comparing this cost with operating expenses of other facilities across the country.

Electricity

The calculations below are based on 2007 utility rate information using an amount of $0.07 cents per kWh, including both demand and energy costs. The table conveys the estimated electricity costs for all new facilities.
For the purpose of calculating operation expense, it is assumed that the filter motors for pools will operate 24 hours a day, 100 days per year, and the auxiliary motors will operate 8 hours per day, 100 days per year. Miscellaneous items include chemical feeders, blow dryers, office equipment, timing systems, etc.

### ENERGY DEMAND ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motors</td>
<td>$7,089</td>
<td>$15,510</td>
<td>$22,407</td>
<td>$26,353</td>
<td>$27,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>$3,842</td>
<td>$3,366</td>
<td>$4,438</td>
<td>$6,183</td>
<td>$6,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Electric Costs</td>
<td>$10,931</td>
<td>$18,876</td>
<td>$26,845</td>
<td>$32,537</td>
<td>$34,532</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Counsilman-Hunsaker

**Miscellaneous Electric Use**

Miscellaneous electric use includes chemical feeders, blow dryers, office equipment, etc.

**Water and Sewer**

Water and sewer services will be needed for domestic use and compensation for evaporation and backwashing purposes. Backwash water and domestic water will be released to the sanitary system. This does not include landscape irrigation.

**Pool Heating**

Pool heating assumption is for all outdoor pools and will operate 100 days per year at a temperature of 80 degrees Fahrenheit with a pool cover when not in operation. The leisure pool will be heated at 82 degrees Fahrenheit. The heating expense has been calculated at $16,500 or Option 1; $13,800 for Option 2; $18,200 for Option 3; $18,000 for Option 4; and $41,800 for Option 5. A thermal cover for the pool is strongly recommended.

The following table is a summary of all operating expenses for William L. Welch Community Swimming Pool. It does not include administration expenses or operations at Park Forest Community Swimming Pool or at the high school natatorium.
## OPINION OF OPERATING EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Employment</td>
<td>$73,798</td>
<td>$77,428</td>
<td>$108,101</td>
<td>$104,290</td>
<td>$124,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Labor</strong></td>
<td><strong>$78,798</strong></td>
<td><strong>$87,428</strong></td>
<td><strong>$158,101</strong></td>
<td><strong>$114,290</strong></td>
<td><strong>$125,618</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$11,624</td>
<td>$12,889</td>
<td>$15,368</td>
<td>$20,075</td>
<td>$23,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair and Maintenance</td>
<td>$10,400</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
<td>$13,600</td>
<td>$18,100</td>
<td>$21,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Contractual Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>$22,024</strong></td>
<td><strong>$24,389</strong></td>
<td><strong>$28,968</strong></td>
<td><strong>$38,175</strong></td>
<td><strong>$44,469</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Supplies</td>
<td>$6,240</td>
<td>$6,900</td>
<td>$8,160</td>
<td>$10,860</td>
<td>$12,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals</td>
<td>$13,641</td>
<td>$13,172</td>
<td>$18,294</td>
<td>$21,752</td>
<td>$36,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Commodities</strong></td>
<td><strong>$24,881</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,072</strong></td>
<td><strong>$34,454</strong></td>
<td><strong>$40,612</strong></td>
<td><strong>$64,494</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC</td>
<td>$5,573</td>
<td>$4,882</td>
<td>$6,437</td>
<td>$8,968</td>
<td>$9,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>$10,931</td>
<td>$18,876</td>
<td>$26,845</td>
<td>$32,537</td>
<td>$34,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Heating</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$13,800</td>
<td>$18,200</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$41,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Service</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$4,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>$1,440</td>
<td>$1,440</td>
<td>$2,160</td>
<td>$2,160</td>
<td>$2,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water &amp; Sewer</td>
<td>$4,581</td>
<td>$4,825</td>
<td>$7,393</td>
<td>$7,364</td>
<td>$10,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Utilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41,125</strong></td>
<td><strong>$45,922</strong></td>
<td><strong>$64,535</strong></td>
<td><strong>$72,529</strong></td>
<td><strong>$104,217</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$166,828</strong></td>
<td><strong>$182,812</strong></td>
<td><strong>$286,058</strong></td>
<td><strong>$265,606</strong></td>
<td><strong>$338,799</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement Fund</td>
<td>$20,700</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>$27,100</td>
<td>$36,200</td>
<td>$42,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expense</strong></td>
<td><strong>$187,528</strong></td>
<td><strong>$205,812</strong></td>
<td><strong>$313,158</strong></td>
<td><strong>$301,806</strong></td>
<td><strong>$380,899</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Counsilman-Hunsaker
The following table represents projections of gross operating performance for the William L. Welch Community Swimming Pool based upon revenue projections and expense estimates from earlier sections in this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>$4,130,000</td>
<td>21,169</td>
<td>115,145</td>
<td>166,828</td>
<td>(51,683)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$115,145</td>
<td>$119,296</td>
<td>$123,502</td>
<td>$127,760</td>
<td>$132,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expense</td>
<td>166,828</td>
<td>170,998</td>
<td>175,273</td>
<td>179,655</td>
<td>184,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Cashflow</td>
<td>(51,683)</td>
<td>(51,702)</td>
<td>(51,772)</td>
<td>(51,895)</td>
<td>(52,073)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recapture Rate</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Replacement</td>
<td>20,700</td>
<td>20,700</td>
<td>20,700</td>
<td>20,700</td>
<td>20,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>$4,600,000</td>
<td>27,595</td>
<td>$147,609</td>
<td>182,812</td>
<td>(35,203)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$147,609</td>
<td>$153,010</td>
<td>$158,481</td>
<td>$164,021</td>
<td>$169,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expense</td>
<td>182,812</td>
<td>187,382</td>
<td>192,067</td>
<td>196,868</td>
<td>201,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Cashflow</td>
<td>(35,203)</td>
<td>(34,372)</td>
<td>(33,586)</td>
<td>(32,847)</td>
<td>(32,159)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recapture Rate</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Replacement</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>$5,412,000</td>
<td>46,717</td>
<td>$249,399</td>
<td>286,058</td>
<td>(36,600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$249,399</td>
<td>$258,390</td>
<td>$267,490</td>
<td>$276,699</td>
<td>$286,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expense</td>
<td>286,058</td>
<td>293,210</td>
<td>300,540</td>
<td>308,054</td>
<td>315,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Cashflow</td>
<td>(36,600)</td>
<td>(34,820)</td>
<td>(33,050)</td>
<td>(31,354)</td>
<td>(29,738)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recapture Rate</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Replacement</td>
<td>27,100</td>
<td>27,100</td>
<td>27,100</td>
<td>27,100</td>
<td>27,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>$7,240,000</td>
<td>42,470</td>
<td>$227,813</td>
<td>265,606</td>
<td>(37,794)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$227,813</td>
<td>$235,986</td>
<td>$244,259</td>
<td>$252,631</td>
<td>$261,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expense</td>
<td>265,606</td>
<td>272,247</td>
<td>279,053</td>
<td>286,029</td>
<td>293,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Cashflow</td>
<td>(37,794)</td>
<td>(36,260)</td>
<td>(34,793)</td>
<td>(33,398)</td>
<td>(32,078)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recapture Rate</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Replacement</td>
<td>36,200</td>
<td>36,200</td>
<td>36,200</td>
<td>36,200</td>
<td>36,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 5</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>$8,413,000</td>
<td>46,717</td>
<td>$286,449</td>
<td>338,799</td>
<td>(52,350)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$286,449</td>
<td>$295,440</td>
<td>$304,540</td>
<td>$313,749</td>
<td>$323,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expense</td>
<td>338,799</td>
<td>347,269</td>
<td>355,950</td>
<td>364,849</td>
<td>373,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Cashflow</td>
<td>(52,350)</td>
<td>(51,828)</td>
<td>(51,410)</td>
<td>(51,100)</td>
<td>(50,903)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recapture Rate</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Replacement</td>
<td>42,100</td>
<td>42,100</td>
<td>42,100</td>
<td>42,100</td>
<td>42,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Counsilman-Hunsaker
APPENDIX A: COMMUNITY MEETING ADVERTISEMENTS
William L. Welch Community Swimming Pool
Master Site Plan Report

Centre Region Council of Governments
Centre Regional Recreation Authority
WILLIAM L. WELCH
COMMUNITY SWIMMING POOL
COMMUNITY MEETING
Tuesday, Sept. 25, 2007, 7:00 PM
at Centre Region COG Building, Gateway Drive

Calling all prior, current, and future Welch Pool swimmers... five concept plans for the renewal of Welch Pool will be presented for discussion, so come help plan the future!

If you need special accommodations in order to attend, please call WR at 231-3071 at least 24 hours prior. If you are unable to attend, the proposals will also be published on the CRPR website on Wed. Sept. 26.
Funding for this project has been provided by a Centre Region COG non-potable and by a grant from the PA DCNR "Recreational Promotion Park & Conservation Fund"

Visit www.crpr.org

Display Ad for the Centre Daily Times
2 columns x 3" = 10 column inches
To appear Sun & Mo, 23 & 24 Sept 07
No position guarantee requested.
No proof of publication requested.

Please call Diane Ishler at 231-3071 with a price quotation prior to publication.
Please list PO# 450-4515 on the invoice.

Submitted by: Ronald J. Woodhead, Director
221-3071 rwoodhead@crcog.net
APPENDIX B: MINUTES FROM COMMUNITY MEETINGS

William L. Welch Community Swimming Pool Renewal Project Meetings served the Borough of State College and the Townships of College, Ferguson, Harris, and Patton.

July 24, 2007 Meeting 3:00 p.m.

I. Present

Cindy Solic Patton Twp.
Eric Topp SC Borough
Dan Henning Ferguson Twp.
Anne Lawrence Patton Twp.
Lori Paterno SC Borough
Bernie Ryan Harris Twp.
Shannon Jones SC Borough
Susan Rogacs SC Borough
Cathy Dufour Ferguson Twp.
McKenzie Madore College Twp.
Cory Miller Ferguson Twp.
Karen Foard Ferguson Twp.
Mary Baumer SC Borough
Vivian Baumer SC Borough
Sue Mascolo Ferguson Twp.

II. Summary of Meeting with Project Advisory Committee & Welch Pool Swim Team Parents

Held in the COG Forum Room, Mr. Todd Roth, CRPR Aquatics Supervisor, welcomed everyone to the Public Meeting for the Welch Swimming Pool Master Site Plan. He presented a slide show about the pools and the operations. The Centre Regional Recreation Authority owns and operates both outdoor pools; the five municipalities (State College Borough, and the Townships of College, Ferguson, Harris, and Patton) provide part of the funding. The slides reviewed the history of the pool, the operation figures from 2006, and the goals of this project. He indicated that a Project Advisory Committee had been formed (for both pool renewals) that includes CRRA members, a School District representative, Welch Pool Swim Team parents, Park Forest Swim Team parents, and student swimmers. He also told the group that the Master Site Plan process would be funded by a $33,000 grant from the state and $33,000 from the municipalities. The consultants retained by the Authority are Alan Popovich, HPArchitects (Boalsburg), the lead on the project; Scot Hunsaker, Counsilman-Hunsaker Associates, (St. Louis, MO). HPArchitects has also retained ELA (State College) for landscape architecture and Reese Engineering will provide engineering services.

Mr. Roth then introduced Scot Hunsaker who presented a slide show about his firm, reviewed photos of other municipal pools that they had designed, and outlined how aquatics has changed since Welch Pool was built. He asked those present to think about how the Welch Pool was
being used today and how it could be used in the future. He asked people to dream about what features they would like to have at Welch Pool. He noted that there are two differences between what the competitive swimmer needs and what the wellness group would like: warmth of water (colder for competition) and depth of water (shallower for wellness programs).

III. Public Comments

1) Bernie Ryan asked if Mr. Hunsaker saw trends based on geographical areas since pools in this area can only be open three months of the year. Mr. Hunsaker replied that even in areas where the weather would allow a pool to stay open longer, they still close because the population is back to school, eliminating the patrons and the lifeguards. He also indicated that some states in the country (Ohio, Iowa, Texas, Georgia, Florida, Indiana, West Virginia, etc.) are more aggressive in using more waterpark features while the northeast and far west are usually combined with school districts and are just starting to go with the trends. It seems that it depends on how the population views the role of government. What is important is the expectation of services. What are people expecting out of their local pool?

2) Vivian Baumer - How much space do we have? Do we have restriction in terms of money? Mr. Roth explained the area that is available (a survey map was available to view). He indicated that the Centre Regional Recreation Authority (CRRA) now has a 25-year lease for the property from SCASD that includes provisions for parking off the leased site, but on the same side of Westerly Parkway as the pool. Mr. Popovich indicated that parking is not completely pinned down, but it is included in the lease.

3) Ms. Karen Foard asked: what is the start date of the lease? Mr. Roth stated it was January 2007. Mr. Roth indicated that the cap on the funding would be determined by the elected officials. Mr. Hunsaker related that they take all the ideas collected from the community, make up several options with several price tags, then it is presented to the elected officials and in another community meeting. If someone wants to know why a certain feature was not included in the plans, we can point to the feature saying we looked at it and this is how much it costs. The elected officials then decide what they want to finance. Mr. Popovich indicated that we should focus on programs and then see how much they would cost.

4) Cory Miller asked the committee to recognize that this area lost six lap lanes when the Athletic Club closed. He stated that we should have at least as many lap lanes as we do now and add six more. He also would like to push for a 50-meter pool that would allow a lot of swim meets. He thinks the top priority should be enough swim lanes.

5) Sue Rogacs asked: is the pool definitely going in the same location? The answer was yes, the pool is being planned to be in the same location. She said that the people from the Athletic Club who swam laps have gone to the YMCA so they can swim year-round. She indicated that we need a few more lanes, but she would like to see a large recreational area at the pool.

6) Karen Foard said she would split the difference: Bellefonte YMCA and SPRA have eight lanes. She said that when they were having meetings on the Park Forest Pool renewal last year, they looked at PF Pool as a neighborhood pool and looked to the Welch renewal to bring in
something new and exciting because Welch has more people and more space. Big fun, more parking, the size of the lot makes Welch more regional. Since its right by the high school, it would be the place to attract older kids. Her children like to go to Welch if they want to have fun with the slide, but if they just want to hang out with their friends, they go to Park Forest.

7) Mary Baumer, a swim team coach and Welch swimmer for several years stated that they invited the Park Forest swim team over to Welch for a fun time and the water slide. Scot asked what the upper age group that she thought would use the slide. She indicated the popularity has dropped off because there are amusement slides near here, but the older kids still like to come to Welch because it is bigger, more people, and more parking. She thought that the 50-meter pool would be a waste because it would be too much for the young swim team members and not feasible for Welch Pool. A yard and a meter short course pool would be ideal (sample was shown on screen). If you’re looking for quiet less crowded, you go to Park Forest Pool. Now, if kids want big slides and more thrills, they go to the commercial waterparks.

8) Vivian Baumer thinks the new pool should have lanes available for lap swimming. Question: would you have people lap swimming all day? Yes, it would be great to have lanes available all day. Mr. Ryan agreed that lap lanes were really important; he swims at the university and they are always full. Scot indicated, for those not passionate about lap swimming, that they observed the six lane pool at lap time and each lane was full. However, when you asked adults how many swimmers you can put in a six lane pool, they say five. Mr. Hunsaker stated that it is important to know the difference between needs and wants so that the finished project is a quality family aquatics center that is affordable and will be for the future. Mr. Roth asked if it was correct that when you talk about lap swimming, it isn’t a matter of how many lanes but that lanes are available all day. Mr. Ryan agreed that if a number of lanes could be available that would be great. Mary Baumer indicated that would be good because right now some people cannot swim laps because the lap hours don’t fit the swimmers schedule.

9) Karen Foard was concerned that when you have a lap swimming lane right beside where the young swim team is practicing, you lose half of the pool and have condensed the amount of space for those young swimmers to get out. When her son was 13 he loved the slide, but at 15, he hasn’t been there.

10) Sue Rogacs would like to see more pool, more grass area and more shade.

11) Vivian Baumer would like something beyond water that would attract 15- to 18-year-olds. She would rather have them doing something healthy outside than watching TV or playing computer games. Mary Baumer, a college student, agreed.

12) Cathy DeFour wondered about the cost to participants especially with the added amenities. Mr. Hunsaker indicated that the goal when they did the Park Forest Pool was affordability and sustainability and the same would hold for Welch Pool. Mr. Roth related that a statewide survey indicated that CRRA season pass fees were comparatively low.

13) Lori Paterno thinks of Welch as a neighborhood pool, although it does have people coming from the outlining area. She would not like to see the pool get too big for the local population.
Scot related that the site would probably keep it from being a destination pool, but it can be a
great community pool.

14) Cindy Solic would like a variety of activities, including something for the older youth but it
needs to be separate from the family/young children activities. She visited a facility recently in
North Carolina (outdoor) that cost either $9 or $10 admittance fee and had many of the features
shown on the screen. There were choices for the patron, and it was spread out over a lot of open
space with many amenities, but you could see everyone. Ms. Solic would like to see zero-depth
entry. She thinks a variety of activities would be good even if some of the items had to be phased
in.

15) Eric Topp would like to see a competition pool, but agrees with most of what was said. He
would also like to see a 50-meter pool, but it is really more lanes that are needed. He thinks yard
measurement for pools is good. He would be interested in “What do we look like; who are we
serving; who do we want to serve?” He also thinks it should be affordable. He wondered what
the process would be after gathering information from this meeting today, the one tonight, and
other suggestions that would come in. How will it be prioritized? Scot related that at Park Forest
we documented all the input from meetings and the community, then developed several options
using that information, brought it back to the community and elected officials for review and
comment. The elected officials tweaked it, and then chose the option they wanted to support.
That is the same process that will be followed for Welch.

16) Ms. Solic reminded everyone that when the option came back to the elected officials they did
not select the least expensive, but the one they felt was right for the community.

17) Karen Foard liked when they actually had a concept on paper to look at for Park Forest
because until then it was hard to visualize what was being suggested.

18) Bernie Ryan hopes that we complement Park Forest at Welch. He also wondered if Scot’s
company had ever done a study about getting young kids interested in the water at young age
(whether it be slides or other features) so that they continue as they get older? If you get them
comfortable in the water does it lead to going into swimming as a sport? Scot indicated that it
depended on what your idea of success was. Mr Ryan said that he didn’t mean they had to be an
Olympic swimmer but competitive in their area. Scot said the goal could be “use” or it could be
“everyone is a swimmer.” He named some places where their goal was “everyone is a
swimmer.” They send every child to swim lessons during school time. Scot said that they are
seeing a trend in teenagers going from hanging out at the malls to going to recreational aquatic
centers.

19) Rick Madore said to have amenities would require more water space. He suggested we could
have a 50-meter pool that had so many lanes and then the rest of the amenities could be in the
other sections, but have it convertible so it could be changed. Also push the fence to the limit. He
also suggested that the water level be raised about two feet (complex level) to keep the pool from
getting flooded.
20) McKenzie Madore said that an issue will be affordability. If it gets too expensive, swimmers will instead visit the free swim sites like state parks. The current swim schedule is not good for someone with small children. It doesn’t allow time for small children’s nap time. If it opened earlier, there would be more families with small children that would attend.

21) (?) One of the best things about Welch Pool is that it is bright and sunny; one of the worst things about Welch Pool is that it is bright and sunny. She would like to see more shade (umbrellas, etc.).

22) (?) Would food be allowed in a new facility or would there be a concession stand? That discussion was held for Park Forest Pool as to whether they would have a concession stand, but it was not cost effective. There, the decision was not to have a concession stand. There was no discussion about not being able to bring in food.

23) (?) Likes the pavilion at Park Forest Pool. Would rather not have a concession stand, just the machines. She would like to have a pavilion at Welch where families could bring in food making it more affordable. Scot indicated the lack of staff control if they cannot tell what food is coming in.

24) (?) Liked the idea of 50-meter pool, but have amenities that could be portable and that would turn into lanes. Water sports.

IV. Adjournment

Attendees were encouraged to email or call to add anything they had forgotten. Scot indicated that they would be taking all the information they have gathered and return in September with some concepts.
I. **Present**

Jim Myers Harris Twp.
George Vlismas SC Borough
Ron Woodhead SC Borough
Paul Gabel Harris Twp.
Michelle Rowland SC Borough
Rebecca Hirsch SC Borough
Janice Voigt SC Borough
Alvi Voigt SC Borough
Donna Conway SC Borough
Kim Faulds SC Borough
Carol Nollau Halfmoon Twp.
Alan Sam SC Borough
Margaret Higgins SC Borough
David Johns SC Borough

II. **Summary of Public Meeting with Pool Patrons**

Held in the COG Forum Room, Mr. Todd Roth, Aquatics Supervisor, welcomed everyone to the Public Meeting for Welch Swimming Pool Renewal. He presented a slide show about the pools and the operations. The Centre Regional Recreation Authority owns and operates the two outdoor pools; the five municipalities (State College Borough, and the Townships of College, Ferguson, Harris, and Patton) provide part of the funding. He then reviewed the history of the pool, the operation figures from 2006, and the goals of this project. He indicated that an Aquatic Advisory Committee had been formed (for both pool renewals) that incorporates CRRA members, a School District representative, Welch Pool swim team parents, Park Forest swim team parents, and student swimmers. He stated that the Master Site Plan process would be paid from a $33,000 grant from the state and $33,000 from the five municipalities. The consultants hired were: Al Popovich, HPArchitects (Boalsburg), the lead on the project; Scot Hunsaker, Counsilman-Hunsaker Associates (St. Louis, MO) the aquatic consultants. HPArchitects has also retained the ELA Group, Inc. (State College) for landscape architecture and Reese Engineering (State College) will provide engineering services.

Mr. Roth then introduced Scot Hunsaker who presented a slide show about his company, showed photos of other municipal pools that they had designed and outlined how aquatics has changed since the Welch Pool was originally built. There are two differences between what the competitive swimmer needs and what the wellness group would like: warmth of water and depth of water. He asked those present to think about how Welch Pool was being used today and how it could be used in the future. He asked people to dream about what they would like to see when they would come to Welch Pool. Scot displayed a picture of the current pool, emphasizing the boundary of the leased space.

III. **Public Comments**
1) (?) Since Welch Pool is to complement the Park Forest Pool, what will be included in the Park Forest Pool? Mr. Hunsaker reviewed that plan and indicated it was a stretched 25-yard pool; a replacement pool of the same type with additional amenities. He showed a concept drawing of the Park Forest Pool explaining the different areas. He emphasized the fact that it was just a concept drawing and the actual may not look exactly like the concept.

2) Kim Faulds - Is glad that it will be in the same location, but asked if there weren’t challenges with the topography of the site and then with the high school being undecided as to what they are going to go with the surrounding land, can we count on the parking? Was a hydraulic study done and can we expand as far as we want? Mr. Roth explained that one of the provisions of the 25-year lease with the school district provides parking on the same side of Westerly Parkway as the pool. The school district wants to make it work. Mr. Hunsaker indicated that hydrology was part of the work they will be doing.

3) Margaret Higgins - Relayed that she saw a renewed pool that was not done well. The spray features splashed all over her daughter who didn’t want to be splashed. There was nowhere for her daughter to enjoy herself. She would like to see some standing water where children could play that didn’t like the sprinkler and splash features.

4) Paul Gable - Spent his summers at Welch Pool. All he would like to see is a 3-meter diving board. His friends would have contests to see who could make the biggest splash. He asked what was going to happen with the land on the other side of the bike path, you don’t want to be right up against the houses. Mr. Hunsaker replied that children’s experiences are different today and a 3-meter diving board may not hold the same interest as it once did. The bike path may have to be moved, but that will be decided when the master site plan is done. Mr. Hunsaker will be providing site specifics and the specific expenses in September when they present the options.

5) Jim Meyer - Provided a letter that will be attached to these minutes. He briefly went over the information in the letter. He is in favor of a large pool where the public can lap swim, have competitions, and have recreational amenities, including pavilions. He thinks that zero-depth entry is very important.

6) Rebecca Hirsch - Does not want waterpark mayhem! She doesn’t want a waterpark that would cause the pool to lose its community atmosphere. She is in favor of more pool, less waterpark, and more shade. She doesn’t think we should build based on what this generation wants. After seeing the pictures that were shown, she is afraid that what they have will be lost (a community pool). She is not opposed to including something for 15-year-olds, but she doesn’t want the entire pool to be that type. Mr. Hunsaker related that the site could accommodate some amenities without losing the community feel of the pool experience.

7) David Paterno stated that the current issues were that the pool was really crowded on hot days and during competitions, are both pools crowded for the competitions? Mr. Roth indicated that all six swim league pools are packed for competitions. Mr. Paterno thanked everyone for what they are doing. It is hard to have some play areas that fits both 10-year-olds and above as well as those under 10. He thinks zero-depth entry will be helpful for those age 4, 5, and 6. For 10-year-olds and older, he thought basketball would be good; for 16 and older, volleyball would be good.
and could be in the 3 ft. section - these would be good if separated so people are not being hit by balls. These could be put away and just sometimes brought out for use. He is in favor of a large pool area for competition.

8) Kim Faulds goes to adult swim every day. She would like to see lap swim exist at the same time as recreational swim so that everyone could be in the water at the same time. She also would like to see swim team start later than 6:00 am.

9) David Paterno suggested that for two weeks they close off the diving board and have people swim laps in the diving well while the rest of the community could swim in the other part of the pool.

10) Janice Voigt swims laps. They used to have a time when you could swim laps in the high school natatorium, but that was cancelled by the district. She agrees with others about no waterpark. Would like to see more lap lanes and more room in the shallow end.

11) ?? - a park inside the pool area would be fabulous.

12) Carol Nollau suggested that Park Forest be made the waterpark.

13) ?? Would like to see a lot of shade, including umbrellas.

14) ?? Would like shade shelters, waterslide but not a waterpark, small concession stand, zero-depth entry, padding in the kids’ area, and something to meet the needs of the big kids.

15) David Paterno - The pool area can get bigger because there is a lot of real estate to increase the size.

16) Michele Rowland - Take advantage of the school parking lot and use the space for more pool. More space at certain depths (3 ft), more open deck space. She recently visited the newly renovated Tyrone Pool and really liked it. It was a big pool with two slides, lots of shade, zero-depth entry, some water spouts, and was very affordable. That pool did not have the staircase, but she liked that concept.

17) ?? Where is everyone going to park when the marching band uses the South parking lot for practice? Mr. Roth indicated that the swim lessons are finished when the marching band starts their practice in August. There is one week that overlaps, but that can be adjusted through programming.

18) David Paterno would like something for teens, maybe a slide, but thinks the lazy river concept would be a waste. Mr. Hunsaker indicated that pools are becoming more defined and less generalized.

19) Unidentified Resident: There should be some interactive features. Children seem to love the dumping buckets that have been used in the area (at Arts Fest). Thinks it would be good to
incorporate several pieces for each. Mr. Hunsaker indicated that we are looking at a Family Aquatic Center (instead of a “waterpark”) that would have balance (something for everyone).

20) Carol Nollau thought she heard about land that was purchased in Harris Township and that an aquatic center would be built on that site. There is no aquatic center proposed for the Oak Hall parklands (68 acres) in College and Harris Township. The land purchased there is not for aquatics; it is primarily for sport fields.

21) Unidentified Resident: A little bit for everyone to keep sense of community with a place for people to hang out while watching kids.

22) Unidentified Resident: Would like something for everyone, but separate.

23) Al Voigt - We can only use the pool for three months and it is really limited as to when it is crowded. He feels that attendance is down. He also thinks there are tons of things to do for entertainment in the area, so the pool should be more functional. If a waterpark was really in demand here, some commercial enterprise would have already built one here. Does not want the bathhouse knocked down, the building is solid and perfectly okay. He would like the water surface expanded and have lots of places for people to have picnics.

24) Unidentified Resident: Could we see the value of each item so we know whether we could afford or not? Mr. Hunsaker said that there will be several scenarios with the value of each item so the elected officials will be able to decide.

25) David Paterno - If we have the values for those researched for Park Forest maybe we could use those figures.

26) Kim Faulds - Suggested that we take some of the swim team and someone who swims all the time and ask for their suggestions. There were meetings held earlier in the day with pool staff and swim team parents.

27) Unidentified Resident: Depending on the pool size, there could be more programs such as water aerobics and more programs would get more users.

IV. Adjournment

Mr. Hunsaker indicated they would take all the information that they have gathered and work up several options. The consultants will be back in September with these options. Those meetings will be Sept. 24 and Sept. 25.
September 25, 2007 Meeting 7:00 p.m.

I. Present

James Myers, Harris Twp
M.J. Langston, SC Borough
Kathy Kalinosky, SC Borough
Betty Moore, SC Borough
Lindsey Fullmer, SC Borough
George Vlismas, SC Borough
Ginger Suhey, SC Borough
Kathy Suhey, SC Borough
Anne Kerber, SC Borough
Fiona Vashaw, SC Borough
Shawn Vashaw, SC Borough
Vivian Baumer, SC Borough
Michele Rowland, SC Borough
Rebecca Hirsch, SC Borough
Jim Pawelczyk, Ferguson Twp
Kim Ache, SC Borough
Kim Faulds, SC Borough
Sue Rogacs, SC Borough
Joe Rogacs, SC Borough
Lori Paterno, SC Borough
Jean Najjar, SC Borough
Richard Mandel, Ferguson Twp
Alvi Voigt, College Twp
Chris Jones, SC Borough
Shannon Jones, SC Borough
Will Schmitt, Ferguson Twp
David Wasson, College Twp
CRRA:
Donna Conway, SC Borough
Roy Harpster, Harris Twp
Consultants:
Alan Popovich, HPArchitects
Scot Hunsaker, Counsilman-Hunsaker
Todd Smith, ELA
CRPR Staff:
Ronald J. Woodhead, Director
Todd Roth, Aquatics Supervisor

II. Summary of Public Meeting

At 7:00 p.m., Mr. Todd Roth, CRPR Aquatics Supervisor, welcomed everyone to the Public Meeting for Welch Swimming Pool Renewal. He presented a slide show about the pools and the
operations. The Centre Regional Recreation Authority owns and operates the two outdoor pools; the five municipalities (State College Borough, and the Townships of College, Ferguson, Harris, and Patton) provide part of the funding. He then reviewed the history of the pool, the operation figures from 2007, and the goals of this project. He indicated that an Aquatic Advisory Committee had been formed (for both pool renewals) that incorporates CRRA members, a school district representative, Welch Pool Swim Team parents, Park Forest Swim Team parents, and student swimmers. He stated that the Master Site Plan process would be paid by a $33,000 grant from the state and $33,000 from the five municipalities. The consultants hired were: HPArchitects (Boalsburg), the lead on the project; Counsilman-Hunsaker Associates (St. Louis, MO) the aquatic consultants. HPArchitects also retained the ELA Group, Inc. (State College) for landscape architecture services and Reese Engineering (State College) for engineering services.

Mr. Roth then introduced Scot Hunsaker, who presented a slide show with five conceptual options for the renewal of Welch Pool across a wide range of program opportunities. This presentation, which can be viewed at the CRPR website, had details about the options and showed some of the details regarding the basis for many of the figures presented.

III. Public Comments

1) A question about ADA requirements - Mr. Hunsaker explained the requirements and how the pools would meet them, and that all plans include parking and pool accessibility for those patrons with such needs.

2) A question about the site boundary - Mr. Hunsaker showed the leased boundary and showed how it is different than the currently fenced area. He also explained that the next step in the process will involve putting the selected programming elements on the site.

3) A question about the use of the wooded area west of the bike path - Mr. Hunsaker explained that the design is not to a stage where any firm decisions have been made, but explained that the existence of the bike path and utility lines may make moving the path and using more of the wooded area less desirable.

4) A question about the term neighborhood pool vs. community pool - Mr. Hunsaker explained that based on use and volume, some of the concepts may only serve the immediate neighborhood around the pool, while others would serve the larger regional community.

5) A question about water depths in the conceptual plans - Mr. Hunsaker explained that they were all able to be changed and set to meet the needs of the community.

6) A question about the inclusion of a vending area versus a snack bar. Mr. Hunsaker showed that options four and five included a snack bar, while one, two, and three did not. Snack bars become economically viable options only with a certain level of attendance at a facility.

7) A question about the 50-meter pool and use. Mr. Hunsaker showed that having a 50-meter pool would meet a specific need for one group, while the pool would have the ability to be used width-wise for the needs that the pool now serves.
8) A question to clarify how pool capacities were calculated - Mr. Hunsaker showed the calculations for that.

9) A question about whether other area pools were included in the assessment of needs. Mr. Hunsaker showed that while some of the pools were included, many are not open to the public. A detailed look at all of the area pools will be included with the final report.

10) A question about the attendance at Welch versus Park Forest. Mr. Roth explained that Welch serves about 60% of the pool visits and Park Forest about 40% of the pool visits of the region.

11) A question about one big community pool versus several smaller neighborhood pools - Mr. Hunsaker explained that this is a philosophical question for the community, but that his charge was to look at a community facility at this site. Historically the CRRA has pooled resources from all five participating municipalities to serve the entire community with fewer facilities that can serve more people. Mr. Hunsaker also relayed that many children are not allowed the same freedoms to walk or ride their bike as far as they used to in order to get to a pool. Also, depending on which option is selected, there may be a future need (in 10 or 15 years) for a third community pool.

12) A question about the safety of recreational play features and insurance for the facilities - Mr. Hunsaker explained that these features have been on the market for 15+ years and that insurance companies are comfortable with them. Insurance figures are provided in the cost estimates for each option.

13) A question about increased personnel - Mr. Hunsaker showed that all options have figures for personnel charges that are specific to each concept and that use CRRA wage rates and staffing ideals based on work with the parks and recreation staff.

14) A question about the possibility to raise season pass fees - Mr. Hunsaker relayed that it is recommended to raise fees somewhat to meet the fiscal needs of the Authority. Mr. Roth relayed that the fees are consistent with or lower than the state average and that scholarships are available for those with need. Mr. Hunsaker also relayed that pass fees can be adjusted, but that would change the capacity for the pool to pay for its own operating expenses.

15) A question about the size of the proposals - Mr. Roth shared that the leased area is larger than the currently fenced area.

Following Mr. Hunsaker’s presentation of five conceptual options, the following comments/questions/discussions occurred:

1) Shannon Jones believes that ‘less is more’ and that lower cost fun can be had without big plastic elements - a plain basic down-to-earth model. She also believes that the bathhouse needs to be replaced.
2) Betty Moore agrees that there is need for improvement with some up-to-date elements, especially with the baby pool. She would like to see additional lap lanes and would like to see some growth of the pool, but without many of the extra play elements.

3) Jo Bevilacqua likes the pool as it is, but is concerned with the pandemonium that comes when the summer camps visit the pool and what may happen with increased use. She would like 1-2 extra lap lanes, some attention to the baby pool, and would like to make sure that the youth swim team needs are met in terms of having the ends of the competitive pool deep enough for turns.

4) Jim Pawelczyk has been very happy with the success of the Park Forest project and hopes that a ‘Park in the Park’ concept, with swings or other “dry play” equipment, can be used here as well. He also questioned the vending versus snack bar numbers. Mr. Hunsaker explained that some of the concepts included a snack bar because it was asked for in the original meetings in July, but that most snack bars will not break even financially unless the facility brings in 60-70 thousand visits per summer.

5) Richard Mandel shared his observations that Park Forest was warm and Welch was cool. He saw that the shallow area at Welch was always very crowded, but that the 5' area was wasted because there was little or no use during the day. He shared that Park Forest’s pool was better configured for overall use with more shallow water area and a separate diving well, and that other pools around the country that he has seen have had much higher use in the 3'6" to 4' range.

6) Jim Myers sees this project as an opportunity in that what we decide over the next few months will last for the next 50 years. He felt that options 1, 2, and 3 were stagnant or backward-moving designs, and that options 4 and 5, even with a larger price tag, would allow the community to move forward for swim teams, wellness, lessons, and recreational use. He shared that having a 50-meter pool would allow for the most flexibility for programming and use over the next half century.

7) Chris Jones thinks a good solution would be something in between options 1 and 2. Some smart adjustments could keep costs in check, and options 3, 4, and 5 will go too far. He does not want an “amusement park” atmosphere.

8) Sue Rogacs did not like the snack bar that was there in prior years, and would prefer to have people bring their own (healthier) snacks. She is also concerned about the overall costs and thinks that we should set an overall cost first, then work out programming details.

9) Joe Rogacs asked where the attendance numbers came from. Mr. Hunsaker explained the basis for the figures, including available water surface area, recreation amenities, local population, weather, and their firm’s experience from over 500 municipal facilities. Mr. Hunsaker also explained the dilemma of serving the needs of the immediate neighborhood versus those of the overall community and that it is possible to build a facility that nobody will come to, and that the attractiveness of the facility will depend on the programming and features available.

10) Rebecca Hirsch felt that the community had no problem with kids hanging out a Wal Mart or other locations due to a lack of better amenities, and pointed out that the assembled group cared.
enough to come out to this meeting and hoped that their comments would be weighed accordingly. She questioned whether a facility would be built that would draw in new people at the expense of the current users’ preferences. She would like smaller features, the park in a park concept, diving boards, and a pool that maximizes water surface area.

11) Kim Faulds worries about the danger of ‘under-building’ for the needs of the community. She shared the excitement of 8- to 11-year-old children and their friends about the options shown in the newspaper and wants to have a facility that kids can get excited about. She wants a facility that is interactive, has options, and has lap swimming available while kids are in the pool. She hopes that we can build an exciting facility that can engage kids of all ages.

12) Kathy Suhey wonders if we can provide a similar facility to what we have now, with some minor improvements, and save the bigger features for another (3rd) community pool that could be built somewhere with more land.

13) Shawn Vashaw likes the idea of adding more lap lanes, and likes the 50-meter option. His 10-year-old daughter wants more fun stuff, and bigger and better features. He also pointed out the use of the diving well for deep water exploration, not just diving boards, and hopes that this may be a continued option of any new pool. He would trade recreational features for more water surface area.

14) Al Voigt cited the CDT article from July about the last public meeting. He wants more water with no bells and whistles and asked about the option to just renovate. He believes that there are still re-usable structures at the facility and asked ‘why be state-of-the-art?’

15) Vivian Baumer requested more features, bigger and better than what we have now. She wants to keep 12 to 18-year-olds interested in coming to the pool, which we currently lack. She feels that we need a facility that grows and that will serve for the next 50 years.

16) Betty Moore suggested research in our schools to find out why some children do not currently visit the pool.

17) Kathy Kalinosky asked about 25 yard vs. 25 meter for competition. Mr. Hunsaker clarified the standard race courses in the U.S. and explained why 25 yard is suggested. Ms. Kalinosky thinks that 8 lanes is an improvement and hopes for enough depth for flip turns. She wants to keep the diving boards, and wants to keep 2 to 3 lanes for lap swimming all day, if an 8 lane pool allows for that. She is concerned about the volume of concrete decking in terms of keeping cool, about the separation of the pools for those who keep track of multiple children, and likes the zero-depth entry concept. She would rather bring her own food than have a snack bar if she had to choose, but suggested having a snack bar with limited operating hours, such as just over the dinner hours. She wants the toddler pool to be more recreational, without ‘squirty’ things or umbrellas, wants to add water slides, and wants to expand the 3 to 4 foot water depth area. She also hopes that the new showers have better temperature controls and a mechanism for staying on without having to hold the handle. Mr. Hunsaker explained the advantage of having separate pools for both safety and cleanliness reasons.
18) Jean Najjar suggested building a snack bar, then allowing outside or volunteer/charitable groups to come in and sell concessions. She likes the versatility of the 50-meter pool if some of the options can be slimmed down.

19) Jim Pawelczyk stated that the 50-meter pool will give us enormous programming opportunity and flexibility. He also brought up issues surrounding pool depths. Mr. Hunsaker explained current trends in acceptable minimum diving depths for competitive swimming around the country, as well as the options available in comparing deeper water for competition versus shallower water for recreation.

20) Jo Bevilacqua said that after hearing other comments, she was swayed to the 50-meter concept with varied depth such as one end deep for diving boards, a middle area for lap and competition swimming, and a shallow end for recreation and play.

IV. Adjournment

Mr. Hunsaker and Mr. Roth thanked everyone for coming, and reminded the group that they could find renewal updates and information at the CRPR website and could email staff at crpr@crcog.net with further input. The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 PM.

This Meeting Summary was prepared by Todd Roth troth@crcog.net , CRPR Aquatics Supervisor, and is based upon a digital audio recording of the meeting and from the sign-in sheet for attendees. 1 Oct 07

November 20, 2008 Meeting

I. Present

Ad Hoc Regional Park Committee members (5 of 6): Messrs. Klees, Rosenberger, Mascolo, Warner, Luck
CRRA/CRPR Committee (5 of 6): Ms. Mascolo, Mr. Hurley, Mr. Harpster, Ms. Matason, Dr. Ricketts
Others: Mr. Brumbaugh, College Twp. Manager Mr. Kurtz, Assistant Borough Manager Mr. Erickson, Patton Township Manager Mr. Steff, COG Executive Director Mr. Woodhead, CRPR/CRRRA Director Mr. Jeff Hall, CRPR Recreation Supervisor Mr. T. Roth, CRPR Aquatics Supervisor Mr. Alan Popovich, HPArchitects Mr. Todd Smith, ELA Mr. Scott Hunsaker, Councilman Hunsaker

II. Summary of Meeting

Held in the COG Forum Room, Mr. Klees called the November 20, 2008, meeting of the Ad Hoc Regional Park Committee to order. Mr. Woodhead asked for nominations for officers for 2009. Mr. Rosenberger nominated Mr. Klees for Chair; Mr. Mascolo seconded. Mr. Klees was unanimously elected as Chair for 2009. Mr. Mascolo nominated Mr. Rosenberger for Vice Chair, Mr. Luck seconded. Mr. Rosenberger was unanimously elected as Vice Chair for 2009. Mr.
Klees then took over the meeting as Chair. He asked if the meeting schedule presented was good (it listed the third Thursday of each month - same as 2008). The meeting schedule was unanimously approved on a motion by Mr. Mascolo and second by Mr. Luck. Mr. Klees asked everyone to introduce themselves for the consultants. Mr. Roth introduced Mr. Popovich, HP Architects; Mr. Hunsaker, Counsilman Hunsaker; and Mr. Smith, ELA Group, consultants who have been working on the Master Site Plan for the Welch Pool. He reminded everyone that the original studies began in 1997 - 1999 when we had feasibility studies done. In 2007, the Master Site Plan was started and today we are working to finalize this plan so we can advertise and send out information for construction bids. Mr. Hunsaker reminded everyone that they originally presented 5 options and that Option #3 was approved by the General Forum. He reviewed the amenities that were included in Option #3. Mr. Popovich talked about how the amenities would fit on the site. He indicated that there were three things that govern the general development:

1) Availability of parking - cooperation with the State College Area School District allows all the land on the site to be used for features. Utilize a drop off and ADA spaces.
2) Has existing infrastructure, the storm drainage, the bus lane, access road
3) Topography within the site.

Strengthened the entrance so that it would be a corner site and eliminating some entrances to Westerly Parkway. You can see the amenities of the pool from the street. Optimizing the available land, including pushing back the perimeter. Ms. Mascolo asked, do we have a layout of the changing rooms so that we could see because the school district wants to use it? It was not available at the meeting. Mr. Popovich continued to describe the layout of the pool area. Mr. Hunsaker then reviewed some of the amenities, and that when people come into the pool area they will have a sense of Wow! There are three separate areas of leisure opportunities in the pool area. He then presented an updated business analysis projecting the revenue and the level of participation. He recommended that a capital replacement fund be set up and maintained so if things need to be replaced down the road, there will be money available. He spoke for the team and staff to say that in order to meet the schedule, we need to be going to bid by early summer or late spring. Mr. Mascolo asked for copies of the numbers from Mr. Hunsaker. Mr. Woodhead asked the joint meeting members if they would approve the consultants going ahead to get the information ready for bid preparation. He then asked if there was discussion concerning anything on the inside of the pool fence. Mr. Mascolo thought it was premature to have the consultants move ahead when we don’t know what will happen with the school board. Mr. Woodhead indicated that there was a public meeting schedule for tonight (Jan. 15, 2009) to update the community on the Welch Master Site Plan. He referred to the draft agreement for the “Shared Parking” and reviewed the yellow sheet that listed what he thought the school district and the Authority agreed on and what was still up for discussion. He indicated that at the school board meeting, on Monday evening, they assigned a subcommittee to meet with several members of the COG committee to work out the issues. He was hopeful that the agreement was close to being approved. He asked who would represent the COG. Mr. Klees, Mr. Rosenberger, Ms. Mascolo, and Mr. Hurley would meet with the school district representatives. The meeting should be soon so that the school district could discuss the options at their January 26th meeting. In an effort to obtain a clear picture of what the Authority and Ad Hoc Committee members could agree to, Mr. Klees asked some questions. Of Mr. Hunsaker, he asked how problematic for customers is it that
the closest parking is 387 feet away from the pool gate? Mr. Hunsaker doesn’t think it is an overwhelming obstacle especially with the drop off and ADA parking spaces. It would be better to have them closer, but the proposed parking is acceptable. It is good that the parking is bundled and not spread here and there throughout the South side. Mr. Klees asked if the group wanted to focus on #11 that deals with resolving the primary shared spaces for the interim and then for a permanent basis - the radius of the parking from the pool gate. Mr. Luck reflected that the school district wants this to be flexible since they are not finished with their Master Site Plan, they don’t want to commit to anything. A discussion followed, including Mr. Mascolo voiced his concern that with another election we could be dealing with a different board with a different view of the parking for Welch Pool. He related that he thought the pool should be placed in another location. Although others were not happy about the parking situation and would like to have more control over the land where the pool is located, they indicated that it would cost too much and would result in a lot of lost time if the pool was moved to another location. Mr. Luck suggested that a footprint of the pool and parking should be completed instead of the interim parking and permanent parking. This would keep the parking close to the pool and allow the school district to plan around the footprint. Mr. Rosenberger suggested that the document be revised to indicate nothing else could be built between the pool and the parking and it would have to be on the South side of Westerly Parkway. Mr. Klees reviewed that the group wanted to stay with parking within 387 feet and require South side parking with nothing else but grass between pool and parking. Mr. Luck suggested an additional option that when the school district’s Master Site Plan is finished, the school district turn the pool property over to CRRA. There was some discussion as to whether the school could legally do that. A discussion then revolved around whether the consultants should proceed and get the documents ready so they could go to the bid documents. Mr. Luck moved that the committee give the consultants the green light, but he then withdrew his motion based upon the consensus of the committee members. Mr. Woodhead will try to set up a meeting with the school board representatives for Tuesday night, January 20, 2009. Mr. Woodhead asked if the committee was comfortable with what was inside the fence. The consensus was that the design inside the fence was fine. Ms. Mascolo, Mr. Hurley, Mr. Klees, and Mr. Rosenberger will represent COG when they meet with the school board, January 20, 2009. Mr. Mascolo will also be attending, but as a member of the public not as a representative.

Oak Hall Master Site Plan
Since the meeting in December, Pashek Associates has completed an extensive analysis of sports field needs. On January 27, 2009, at 12:15 p.m. at the Ferguson Township building, Pashek Associates will present one draft of a “field layout plan”. They will review the results of their analysis and the proposed layout for Oak Hall and Whitehall parklands.

III. Adjournment
The next Park Planning Committee Meeting will be Tuesday, January 27, 12:15 p.m. at the Ferguson Township Building meeting room. The proposed date for the Oak Hall Parklands Community Meeting is Tuesday, February 10, 7:30 p.m. at the College Township Building. The next regular scheduled meeting of the Ad Hoc Regional Park Committee is Thursday, February 19, 12:15 p.m. in the COG Building Forum Room. Mr. Warner moved to adjourn the meeting; Mr. Mascolo seconded. The motion past unanimously and the meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m. Respectfully submitted by Diane Ishler, Recording Secretary
January 15, 2009 Meeting 7:00 p.m.

I. Welcome & Introductions
Mr. Ronald Woodhead, CRPR Director, provided an introduction and welcome. He then turned the meeting over to Mr. Todd Roth, CRPR Aquatics Supervisor.

II. Summary of Meeting

The Pool Renewal Process
Mr. Roth introduced the consultants: Scot Hunsaker from Counsilman-Hunsaker Associates in St. Louis, MO, and Mr. Alan Popovich from HPArchitects LLP in Boalsburg, PA, and Todd Smith from ELA. Mr. Roth then gave some background and history information - where we started, where the funding comes from, where we are, and where we are going in relation to the Welch Pool Renewal. He stated that the first two community meetings were held in 2007 and the selection of Concept Option #3 was approved by the five municipalities in November 2007 with a not-to-exceed cost of $5.4 million. Funding for the pool is through state grant assistance for Master Site Plan and construction, municipal contribution, and private donations. There has also been public meetings and discussion with the SCASD for shared parking, ADA spaces, drop-off area, and shared use of the bathhouse. The remaining tasks for the Renewal are: Complete the Master Site Plan and seek municipal and state approvals, Prepare detailed plans and bid documents, Seek bids and award contracts, Start construction Aug. 3; new pool opens May 30, 2010

Presentation of Proposed Master Site Plan for Wm. L. Welch Community Pool:
Mr. Hunsaker shared previous information that was considered including the five concepts presented. He then shared the proposed Master Site Plan and updated demographic and budget numbers. He reviewed the features that are in the design showing three separate programming areas. Mr. Popovich stated there are three things that help to determine what could be placed on the site:
1) parking would be shared with the SCASD off the pool site. This allowed the entire pool site to be used for features.
2) storm water, circulation of vehicle traffic, changing to a corner spot that the features of the pool area are visible from the street.
3) topography of the area

He talked about moving the bike path so that the site could be used more effectively. He also indicated that the entry would be off Westerly Parkway with the school district entry to the school. He then pointed out the area that is still under discussion with the State College Area School District. He emphasized the ADA parking, drop off and reviewed each feature on the design. Ms. Bevilaqua was asked if there were bleachers. Mr. Popovich stated that because of the topography there could be natural sitting on the sloping area beside the pool. Mrs. Albert asked what the seating capacity would be. Mr. Popovich indicated that as the pool is developed they will know how much seating will be available. Mr. Hunsaker indicated that it is situated facing Northeast so that the sun would not be in the face of the spectators in late day. Mr. Hunsaker then reviewed the different areas of the pool site. He indicated that the site is very balanced with three areas to meet the needs of recreation aquatics, competitive, and even a place...
Mr. Mascolo asked where the zero entry starts. Mr. Hunsaker indicated where that would be in the pool area and noted that it would be concrete. Ms. Hirsch asked Mr. Hunsaker if he could explain what the structures are in the recreation pool. He reviewed several possibilities include an interactive spray feature, slide, spray pad. He also indicated that the grand staircase would be a great place for teaching. Ms. Hirsch asked if you had a young child who wanted to jump into the parents arms, where would that be able to take place. He suggested the zero entry level area but it would be up to the rules of the pool. Mr. Woodhead asked how deep the current channel would be. Mr. Hunsaker related that he thinks it would be about 3’6”. Ms. Bevilacqua asked Mr. Hunsaker to explain what the snack area would look like. Mr. Hunsaker indicated that it is about 350 square feet. There is no provision for an exhaust hood, etc.; it is more of a distribution point than a kitchen. Mr. Popovich noted that it is a covered area with the distribution towards the back, it could be expanded in the future if needed. Mr. Roth related that 350 sq ft is about three times bigger than the SPRA concession area. Mr. Mascolo asked the difference in the two slides; Mr. Hunsaker indicated that it was speed and explained how the loops worked in the slide. Ms. Hirsch asked what the circular area was. Mr. Hunsaker said it was landscaping, a area for people to “hang out”. Mr. Hunsaker reviewed the updated demographic numbers and the operation numbers including projected visitation, salaries, fee schedules, etc. He also indicated that a capital replacement fund should be set aside to be ready for any replacement needs in the future. Mr. Mascolo asked about the rates. Mr. Hunsaker indicated there is a break for people when they buy a season pass. Ms. Hirsch liked the design calling it thoughtful; she likes the green space. Her concern is how firm is the fact that the pool is staying where it is. Is it a done deal? Mr. Woodhead indicated that no it is not yet a done deal. It will not be a done deal until we have the signed parking agreement (between the school district and the Authority) and approval from the COG/Authority. Mr. Hunsaker asked if another site was being studied? Mr. Woodhead indicated that another site has been mentioned but none have been studied. Ms. Bevilacqua asked if the costs projected for the pool include the costs for moving the bike path. The answer was yes, it does include those costs; however, it does not include the traffic mitigation that is on Westerly Parkway. What needs to happen for this to be a done deal? Is there a timeline? Mr. Woodhead related that the school district has indicated they want to resolve so they can approve the agreement at their January 26, 2009 meeting. He also said that we need to move quickly so that the bid documents can be sent out and approved so everything is ready to start construction on August 4, 2009 so the pool will be ready to open on Memorial Day 2010. Ms. Bevilacqua asked if the school board signs the agreement is it then done. Mr. Woodhead indicated that the agreement must be reached between the school board and the municipalities. Ms. Hirsch asked if the status of the State budget would impact this project. Mr. Woodhead indicated it would not because we have a grant contract for $375,000 and we have three years to complete this project. We also have a loan for this project. She asked what the school board meeting date was. Mr. Woodhead indicated January 26, 2009. Ms. Albert asked if the older adults come into the pool do they have to go through the sprinklers, etc. to get to the pool they want to use. Mr. Albert asked if the shallow is 3’ - Mr. Roth said 3’6”. She asked if they needed more depth for children to dive off the side? Mr Hunsaker indicated this was a grey area -he said that many states have different depth requirements. There is no industry standard but the trend is deeper. They suggest 6’ for people to dive. Mr. Woodhead asked if we would be able to have lap lanes all day and still have recreation swimming? Mr. Hunsaker indicated that you could close off one diving board and have two lap lanes on one side. Ms. Bevilacqua asked if there was an overlay that showed what is different than what is currently. Mr. Roth and Mr. Hunsaker went over the
differences. Mr. Mascolo asked what is the increase in water surface area? Mr. Hunsaker said that the combined area of two pools was 13,500 sq ft; the renewed Park Forest Pool surface area is 6,575, and the Welch will be 11,900. The combined increase be about 8,500. Ms. Albert asked about the exit from diving board area? Those details have not be yet been prepared. Ms. Hirsch asked if the pavilion is totally closed or more open. Mr. Popovich indicated it would be more open, the same as the Park Forest Pool Pavilion. Ms. Hirsch was not familiar with Park Forest and asked if there were tables under the pavilion. The answer was yes. Everyone was thanked for coming.

III. Adjournment

January 20, 2009 Meeting 7:00 p.m.

I. Present

Representing: COG Ad Hoc
Regional Park Committee
Representing: Centre Regional Rec. Authority
Representing: SCASD
Board of School Directors
Dan Klees, Chair
James Rosenberger
Sue Mascolo, Chair
Chris Hurley
Rick Madore, President
Donna Queeney
Jim Pawelczyk
Staff:
Dr. Patricia Best, Supt. of Schools
Ronald J. Woodhead, Director CRPR
Ed Poprik, Phys. Plant Director Jim Steff, Exec. Dir. COG
Todd Roth, CRPR Aquatics Sup.
Diane Ishler, Office Manager / Recording Sec.

II. Summary of Meeting

Ronald J. Woodhead, Director CRPR thanked everyone on the various committees/boards for coming and also thanked those from the community for attending. He asked everyone listed above to introduce themselves. Mr. Woodhead then provided a summary of the remaining items to resolve using a PowerPoint Presentation. He related that he had high hopes that the latest concept would be acceptable and the renewal process could go forward. The latest concept for shared parking and access proposed five ADA parking spaces plus a drop-off area at an estimated cost of $96,000. This new concept was prepared on Jan. 13 and incorporated into the Master Site Plan by the consultants. It was then presented to a Joint Meeting of the Ad Hoc Regional Park and the Authority on Jan. 15, then to a Community Meeting that evening. He then reviewed the shared parking on this proposal. The last slide of the presentation related to walking
distances from the shared parking spaces to the new pool gate, including to the distance
previously discussed by COG as the maximum distance from the new pool gate. As provided in
the agenda, he opened the discussion for comments from the public.

III. Public Comments

1) Jean Najjar, State College, PA, likes the last concept showing only one driveway (there have
been too many driveways right there). It is a real improvement. She hopes the school district and
COG can make it work and the project can go forward now. Wants the pool to stay where it is
because it is a real asset to their neighborhood. They like to walk to that area.

2) Kim Faulds, State College, PA, indicated that we need to close this issue. She has a second
grader who was an infant when this discussion first started. She said that the two groups have
been talking about the Welch Pool project for seven years and it is time to get everyone at the
same table and get something done. We need to get something in writing that the school board
and the COG are committed to this, do what is right, and move forward - with the pool remaining
“downtown”. It has been discussed too long to still have the relocation of the pool on the table.
Because we need this pool, we need to move on and do it.

A summary of the apparent status of each item was distributed with the agenda packet and also
available at the meeting. The summary was developed to serve as an outline for the discussions
here. Mr. Klees reviewed events to bring everyone up-to-date. On Thursday, there was a Joint
Meeting of the Ad Hoc Regional Park Committee and the Centre Regional Recreation Authority
to view the Welch Master Site Plan and review the current parking discussions. Using the
“Welch Pool Renewal, Status of Proposals: Municipal & School District” distributed by the staff,
the joint committees seemed to agree on most points. He reviewed the current conditions and
interim conditions, then moved to the permanent parking. The interim would include the school
district providing five ADA parking spaces and a drop-off to become permanent in June 2012;
the one point to be clarified was the permanent parking. The Committee/Board agreed that the
111 shared parking spaces should be within a radius of 387 feet from the pool gate and on the
South side of Westerly Parkway - with no future buildings between the pool and the shared
parking. Mr. Pawelczyk related that using the radius idea moves beyond “interim parking” and
“permanent parking.” He thinks that would work. He thinks that it comes down to responsibility;
whose responsibility is it to pay for the modified parking of ADA spaces and drop-off? If the
Authority removes the 37 spaces that are now located on the Welch Pool site, whose
responsibility is it to restore those parking spaces? Mr. Pawelczyk related that the person
removing the spaces should be the one to pay for the replacement spaces; not the school district.
Ms. Mascolo thought the school district was going to work with COG since we allow school
district parking on the Park Forest lot and are allowing the Welch Pool bathhouse use, as
requested. Mr. Klees reminded everyone that when the lease was signed in 2007, the school
district was going to have construction on that site and everyone knew that the Welch Pool
parking would not be provided on the renewed Welch Pool site. Since that time, the school
district’s situation has changed and it was an oversight as to what that meant for pool parking.
Ms. Queeney said that the school board never thought of replacing parking, but it was clear that
the entire pool area would be used for the pool. Now, we have the spaces required and they can
be used by the pool patrons. Ms. Queeney noted that the pool land lease says that if the school
district would do any construction, the school district would be responsible for making sure there was parking provided for Welch Pool. Mr. Rosenberger asked if we could stay with the last concept that has 111 spaces in the radius of 387 feet. More discussion followed about the parking and spaces. Mr. Madore said there probably would not be a problem if the present parking would become the permanent. They could agree that no buildings would be built between the shared parking and new pool. He also indicated that pool patrons will use the North parking lot regardless if the school district or the COG wants them to. There was general agreement that the current parking could become the permanent parking. Mr. Madore thinks the only item remaining to discuss is #14:

“14. To finalize the District’s funding commitment for the temporary facilities (drop-off area, ADA parking, driveway construction and pedestrian path), and for the permanent, shared parking spaces. The Authority has offered to provide engineering services for the temporary items.”

...whether the school district is responsible for the payment. He related that an assumption was made that the school district would pay for the ADA parking spaces and drop-off. He related that if the COG was taking the parking spaces out of the leased area, it is the COG responsibility to pay for the replaced spaces. If the COG wants to use their land for construction of these spaces, that would be agreeable with the district. There was discussion on why or why not each entity should or should not pay for this parking. The school district representatives related that they are entering a very difficult budget year with the school district only allowed to increase their spending by 4.1% per PA Act 1. This means that there are no extra funds for recreation-related expenditures; in fact, some educational necessities may not have funding. The representatives of COG did not know the school district would take this stand. They did think that since it was all taxpayer monies, it shouldn’t make a difference. The $5.4 million approved by COG in 2007 was for use within the pool fence. Mr. Steff wanted to clarify what funds were being discussed: the $96,000 for the ADA spaces and drop-off or the permanent spaces vs. the prior proposal for $275,000 (with 48 new spaces)? It was the $96,000 proposed to construct the ADA spaces and drop-off that was at issue. Mr. Rosenberger indicated that he thought the ADA spaces and drop-off would be beneficial to both parties since the school district has games in the fields above. The school district indicated that those facilities would not be needed for their uses. In trying to clarify the issue, Mr. Rosenberger asked if the COG comes up with the $96,000 that we can have the agreement written, sent to the Solicitors, and have agreement by the school board; is this the only issue? Mr. Roth asked about the proposal for the district to provide 111 spaces within a certain radius of the pool gate. Mr. Pawelczyk indicated that he thought that would be a good idea and would eliminate the confusion created by dealing with interim and permanent parking. Mr. Rosenberger asked if it is the same group of taxpayers, why the ADA parking spaces and drop-off ($96,000) couldn’t come out of the pool construction funds? Some of COG representatives agree; other COG representatives related that the $5.4 million dollars was to be spent inside the fence. Mr. Klees is not sure how we legally could get a decision from COG in time for the school board meeting on January 26, 2009. Ms. Queeney asked if they could take the agreement to the school board contingent upon the CRRA/Ad Hoc Regional Park Committee agreeing to fund the ADA parking spaces and drop-off. She would like to see this put on the agenda. A reminder was provided that the attorneys would not have a chance to review the agreements before the meeting. Dr. Best, State College Area School District Superintendent, spoke to the taxes being used for the pool parking. She indicated that school taxes are to be spent
for the school and educational benefit of the students, while municipal taxes are to be used for municipal projects. Mr. Mascolo, an Ad Hoc Regional Parks Committee member, who was participating as a member of the public, indicated that he would be remiss to the residents to place the pool in its current location instead of at one of the regional parks that are being developed. A discussion followed as to why he felt this way and the school district’s reply. Mr. Rosenberger asked if the school district could supply any of the money, even a small amount that would encourage the elected officials to agree to pay for the construction of the ADA spaces and drop-off. Mr. Steff related that he liked Dr. Queeney’s suggestion to take this to the school board meeting on Monday night and asked the board to ratify the agreement with the stipulation that the COG pay for the ADA and drop-off parking construction. This would focus the discussion to one for the General Forum making it easier to get a decision. The COG representatives agreed that it would be a good idea. Mr. Woodhead indicated that the municipalities have financed the pool renewal costs over a 20-year period. Could the COG construct and pay for the ADA parking and drop-off area with the school district then reimbursing the COG later when the economic climate was better? The school district representatives felt they were not legally allowed to take such action. After further discussion by the group, the maximum radius of the most-distant pool parking space was established at 400’ from the new pool gate. Mr. Klees asked if there were any further comments from the public.

1) Lori Paterno, State College, PA, - As a community member who has been involved with this project, it was surprising to her that the COG still moved forward with the project after they knew that the school district had changed their construction plans. She said the COG still moved forward with this location and stated that this location would not change. She would rather have less “bells and whistles” at the new pool than relocate the pool. She says that the public has not been asked if they want this type of pool here or do you want it elsewhere?

2) Rebecca Hirsch, State College, PA, - just to clarify, there is grant money being used for this project that must be used by what date? Mr. Woodhead indicated that the grant is good for three years (from Nov. 2008) and was for $375,000. The Welch Pool is to finish May 2010, which would be within the grant date. She asked if COG stopped this project, would we lose the grant due to the economic conditions? The state may not be as willing to provide the money. She would rather see a slide be dropped temporarily than have the project postponed or dropped. That slide could be added later. She thinks that it would be profitable to move it forward since tax dollars have been used to proceed to this point. Mr. Mascolo indicated that when the pool discussion was in the first stages, an alternative site was not available. COG did not own any suitable land; now they do.

IV. Finalize a Schedule for Action on the necessary cooperative agreements regarding:

- The principles of the agreements
- Creating the agreements by the respective Solicitors
- Official action by the District and the Authority on the final documents

Mr. Klees asked the school board representatives if they wanted either he or Mr. Woodhead to attend their meeting on January 26, 2009. General Forum meets on the same evening. It was decided that a listing of the points that needed consideration would be fine. Mr. Klees stated that the new listing did not have to be as long as the current listing since some of the items relate to
each other. Ms. Queeney asked if it made any sense to give the Authority a copy of what is going to be presented at the school board meeting. Dr. Best asked if it would be different than the listing provided for this meeting. It was decided to go down over the list and make sure the information summarized the situation accurately. The list was reviewed and a copy of the result is attached to this summary

*(Attachment #1 - Principles of Agreement)*.

Mr. Pawelczyk asked if the parking is constructed and funded by the Authority outside the Welch Pool site, who owns the parking. It was relayed that the school district would own the parking and it would have to be covered in a parking lease or agreement between the school district and the Authority. The SCASD waterline relocation (for the Welch fields) movement does not have to be part of the lease but does have to be approved by the school board. A joint meeting of the COG Ad Hoc Regional Park and the CRRA is scheduled for January 27, 2009, at 12:15 p.m. where this can be discussed. Assuming a green light on the Authority side for the parking, the agreement should be ready for action by the school board at their February meeting. Mr. Klees asked Mr. Steff what he thought about putting on the agenda for the General Forum meeting on January 26, 2009. He thinks it would be more important for Mr. Klees and Mr. Woodhead to be present at the General Forum meeting.

V. **Adjournment** 8:30 p.m.

Enc. Attachment #1 (Page 5-6) Principles of Agreement (as a result of this meeting)
*This summary was prepared by Diane Ishler, CRPR Office Manager, and will be provided for school and municipal records.*

Attachment #1: Principles of Agreement - January 22, 2009

The Welch Pool Renewal
Centre Regional Recreation Authority (CRRA)
State College Area School District (SCASD)

*As discussed at a Joint Committee Meeting on Jan. 20, 2009*

The purpose of this overview is to summarize the principles of the proposed agreements to supplement the Pool Land Lease Agreement (2007) between the CRRA and SCASD for the shared uses related to the Welch Pool Renewal:

- Shared Parking and Access Agreement
- Shared Use of Pool Bathhouse Agreement

If acceptable to the district and the Authority, the respective solicitors would be asked to prepare the necessary documents for official action by each party.

1. Both parties wish to provide the Wm. L. Welch Community Swimming Pool, its related facilities and parking in perpetuity, for the benefit of the Centre Region community.
2. SCASD agrees to permit the use of the existing South High School facilities for the primary pool parking area (a minimum of 106 parking spaces) and related access to the pool facilities. The term of this agreement should coincide with the Pool Land Lease Agreement: expiring December 31, 2031, with a renewal provision of 10 years.
3. SCASD will grant the necessary permissions for the CRRA to plan, construct and utilize the facilities as generally outlined on the attached plan (Exhibit A) to include a drop-off area, five ADA parking spaces, a pedestrian access path and other related facilities. These facilities will be funded by CRRA and constructed as part of the Authority’s pool construction project.

4. The planning and construction of the ADA parking spaces, drop-off area and related facilities by CRRA will be finalized with the coordination and approval of SCASD staff, which will include unrestricted access to the South Building facilities for school operations.

5. Maintenance and ownership of the shared parking facilities, shared driveways, ADA spaces, pool drop-off area and sidewalks will remain with SCASD.

6. The CRRA will provide SCASD access to the new pool bathhouse (during Spring & Fall) by separate agreement, at no direct cost to SCASD other than operational reimbursements.

7. As provided in the Pool Land Lease Agreement, “if Lessor (SCASD) engages in a construction project the parking areas will be modified at Lessor’s expense and will include a drop-off area and handicapped parking spaces for the use of pool patrons.”

In addition, it is agreed that:

• The drop-off area and the handicapped parking spaces will be replaced by SCASD only if they are impacted by those modifications.
• All (106) shared spaces for the pool will be located within a 400’ radius of the pool entrance gate and only on the South side of Westerly Parkway.
• There shall be no buildings or structures between that area and the pool facility (the two areas should be contiguous),
• The COG / CRRA will be included in the Master Site Planning process for the South Building as it relates to the future viability of the Welch Pool complex.

8. As long as SCASD retains ownership of the high school properties, it will share parking with Welch Pool. If the sale of the pool lands or shared parking areas becomes necessary, the district agrees to meet with CRRA and discuss that proposal at least six months prior, including providing for a buffer area around the pool facility. The “shared parking & access” responsibilities for the pool will remain the obligation of any new landowner, as is now provided in the Pool Land Lease Agreement, for the life of that agreement.

9. At all times of pool operations, pool patrons will be permitted to access, on a supplemental and optional basis, designated parking spaces in the North Building parking area. The High School Band Camp will retain sole access to the entire South Building Lot on August weekdays from 8 a.m. - noon. However, during the band camp times, pool patron access to the pool drop-off area and the pool ADA spaces will be maintained.

10. SCASD agrees to construct an alternate water service and supply to the sport field area above Welch Pool. The current water service is provided from the existing Welch Pool bathhouse and is scheduled to be demolished upon the start of the Authority’s pool construction project.

EXHIBIT A
PROPOSED MASTER SITE PLAN
WITH DROP-OFF AREA, A.D.A. PARKING, PEDESTRIAN PATH & POOL ENTRANCE PLAZA
End of Attachment #1
Center Regional Recreation Authority

William L. Welch Community Swimming Pool

Zoning Analysis

**Property Location:** 670 Westerly Parkway

**Parcel Number:** 36-17-150A

**Municipality:** State College Borough

**Lot Size:** 5.06 acres

**Zoning District:**
- (PK) Park
- (R3B) Residential
- (CP2) Planned Commercial
  
  Pool use permitted
**Parking Requirements:** 1 space required for each 75 s.f. Of water surface area

Existing water surface area: 7,225 s.f.
Required parking spaces 97
Existing parking spaces 37
Deficiency of spaces 60
(Existing nonconformity to zoning requirements)

Required Parking Based on Increase of Water Surface

Proposed water surface area: 11,985 s.f.
Increase in water surface: 4,760 S.f.
Increase in required parking spaces: 64
Total required parking spaces: 101
Proposed parking spaces: 111
(Parking Provided by Agreement between, CRRA & SCASD)

**Lot Coverage:**

Maximum permitted building coverage:
(Not Specified in the Zoning Ordinance)

Existing building coverage: 4,672 s.f. = 2.12%
Proposed building coverage: 5,258 s.f. = 2.38%
**Impervious Coverage:**

Maximum permitted impervious coverage: 50%

Existing impervious coverage: 46,282 s.f. = 20.97%

Proposed impervious coverage: 47,929 s.f. = 21.73%

**Maximum Permitted Building Height:** 25'

Proposed Buildings are mono-Pitch Roof Design 9’-4” to 12’-9”

**Building Setbacks:**

front:

30’

Sides:

20’ Adjacent to R-2

0’ Adjacent to CP2

Rear:

30’ Adjacent to R3B

**Narrative:**

The William L. Welch Community Swimming Pool is situated along Westerly Parkway adjacent to the State College Area School District’s High School. The access to the pool is from Westerly Parkway - a State College Borough Road.

The pool is situated on property owned by the School District through a long term lease. Directly to the East of the pool facility is a large expansive parking lot that serves the school district buildings during the school year. By agreement, again between the SCASD and CRRA, the parking lot will be utilized for pool patron parking. Shared use of the parking lot benefits both the pool facility and the school facility.

An advantage of shared use of the parking area for both facilities is a reduction of paved area. In addition, the shared use promotes a more efficient use of the parking area.
For as the pool season and the school year do not overlap by more than three weeks, year round use of the parking facility occurs.

Directly South of the pool facility is a storm water detention facility utilized by the SCASD for sports venues. The outfall of the facility runs along the eastern boundary of the pool facility. Design of the new pool facility must maintain the existing storm water system. Through design meetings with the Borough Staff it has been indicated that crossing the swale system will be permitted. However, the continued functioning of the swale must remain intact.

On the Western portion of the pool leased area there is an existing public bike path known as the Orchard Park Bike Path. In order to develop the leased area to its greatest potential the bike path is planned to be relocated further to the West. The new alignment is planned to traverse through an existing wooded area so as to create an informal grassed and treed area for pool patrons to utilize away from the active pool deck area. The wooded area where the path is to be relocated includes a drainage-way and recharge area that are planned to be preserved. There is a natural clear corridor through the trees that is the proposed path alignment that will help in the preservation of the wooded area that will be located to the West of the Pool security fence (outside of the pool facility). Inside the pool fence some of the existing wooded area will be preserved and supplemented to promote a shaded quiet area for pool patrons.
APPENDIX D: EXISTING CONDITIONS
APPENDIX G: CONCEPTUAL SITE RENDERING
APPENDIX I: MUNICIPAL LETTERS

Summary of comments received via mail and email for the William L. Welch Pool Renewal project (as of 1 Aug 07):

From: PERNILLE S BOVING [mailto:psb12@psu.edu]
Sent: July 23, 2007 11:34 AM
To: crpr@crcog.net
Subject: Welch Pool ideas

I would like to give my five cents for some idea on how to upgrade Welch community pool. The highest priority is to keep the pool in the same location - right there in the middle of its community. It functions as a community meeting point. You meet your neighbor, children can bike or walk to the pool (giving them a sense of responsibility and community!). It would make no sense to place the pool outside of its current community and to increase the number of vehicles driving to and from a community pool. Actual ideas for the pool could include:
1. A walk-in beach style entry
2. Slide
3. Coffee stand/vending
5. More umbrellas/canopies
6. Lawn
7. Wavepool - if this idea requires the pool to be re-built in another location, then my suggestion would be to build a new pool somewhere else, but by all means keep Welch where it is. I am sorry that I can not participate in Tuesday nights meeting. Please let me know if there is anything I can do to "gather voices" from the community to make sure that Welch Community pool stays in its current location. We absolutely love Welch pool. It has become a summer tradition over the past seven years for our family and so many other families in State College. Thanks again for letting the public speak and be heard, we appreciate it very much.
Sincerely,
Pernille Boving
930 Robin Road

From: Thomas Daubert [mailto:ted@psu.edu]
Sent: July 24, 2007 8:34 AM
To: crpr@crcog.net
Subject: Welch Pool Renewal

As a State College Council member, member of the ad hoc regional parks committee, and an almost daily user of Welch Pool, I have a brief comment on the planning process. Discussing the pool renewal with the 'Welch Pool Regulars' reinforces my opinion that the basic purpose of the pool is to serve the recreational needs of Centre Region residents including local competition but not other than incidental service to outside organizations and groups. Community Pools should not be destinations for tourists or competition junkies. They are to serve the communities and taxpayers of the region. The older group is well-served by the current pool. Replacement of the piping and other infrastructure is obviously necessary. The retirement of the baby pool and installation of a zero depth entrance in that shallow end of the pool will serve us well. However, total rebuilding of the service facilities - office and changing rooms- doesn't appear to be
necessary at Welch as it obviously is at Park Forest. I'm sure I'll have more comments as the plans proceed. Thanks for listening.

Tom Daubert

From: Susan F. Smith, Consultant
PO Box 1026, Lemont PA 16851
suesmith22@juno.com 814-238-1288

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the Welch Pool project. We were unable to attend the public meeting. My comments are listed below: I have only visited the pool four times, but each time I found the shower/bathrooms very dirty (probably impossible to clean because of the materials used) I think it's important for children and older people, especially, to get the chlorine off of their skin and hair before it dries, there were too many children who had been dropped off, with no supervision, behaving badly, and lifeguards were very young and were more interested in socializing with the other kids than watching the pool. I realize that only one of these comments relates to the current project, but these are also concerns that I have. Since I can take the CATA bus to the University Pool, I prefer taking my grandchildren and neighborhood children there, instead of Welch, for all of the above reasons.

Sue Smith

From: Marjorie Costello
202 Ellen Ave
State College, PA 16801
(814) 231-8415

Dear Mr. Woodhead,
Although I was unable to attend last night's meeting I would like to share my ideas for the future of Welch Pool. Upon discussing improvements with my family, which includes three children, ages 10,12,14, we would like to see the following improvements. At this point, please understand that this is "brainstorming" and I do not know the amount of the budget you're working with.
1) cleaner bathrooms -
2) cleaner and more user friendly showers. more hot water, showers that operate without having to hold the water faucet (perhaps "timed" showers?)
3) Adirondack type chairs, lots! or low-beach type chairs, even if you have to "check " them out at the front desk.
4) vending machines that work
5) more food options - perhaps sell cold drinks, fruit cups, etc at the front desk? or ice cream bars or Popsicles. Have the food booth open and manned, not just during swim meets.
6) outdoor stations for people to rinse off before entering the pool.
That's all for now. Thanks for listening.
Sincerely,
Marjorie Costello

From: Vicki Fong of State College
Please expand the size of the pools and the water park-type features are important to attracting more families and teens.
1. Many people don't have the skills to swim in the deep end of the pool or dive, myself included.
2. Then, non-swimming adults huddle in the shallow end, crowding out small children and other youth. This includes teens who like to play games but can't swim well. My teens and friends avoid Welch pool because of the overcrowding from young children and pre-teens. Plus, there is a perception of germs and lack of sanitation due to aging facility.
3. I have used the waterpark features at DelGrosso park and found them greatly enjoyed by young adults and teens.
4. Waterpark features are not a luxury. They are important recreational activities that help keep our youth out of trouble and into healthy activities.
5. Many municipal pools are giving up diving due to liability insurance from neck injuries plus the declining number of people who dive.
6. Would like longer adult-swim time. Am willing to pay a few extra dollars in taxes to keep a healthy community.

Vicki Fong of State College
longtime resident, taxpayer and parent

From: Mark Jancin
848 Bayberry Drive
State College
My comments on the pending Master Site Plan are simple -- as a local resident who uses the pool and drives by it frequently on Westerly Parkway, I do not want to see a significant increase in the car traffic at this location. MSPs and the related subcontractors always seem to promote "bigger is better" because it serves their financial interests. In the case of Welch pool, I think the current sizes of the pool and parking area are satisfactory. The last thing I want to see is traffic delays and overcrowding at the pool.

From: Kelly A. Delaney-Klinger
Assistant Professor
The Pennsylvania State University
Department of Management and Organization
Smeal College of Business
University Park, PA 16802
Voice: 814-863-4593
Fax: 814-863-7261
E-mail: kdklinger@psu.edu
I am sorry I was unable to attend the recent planning meeting on Tuesday evening for the renovation of Welch pool. Unfortunately, that was the night of a swim meet between Welch and Park Forest. I suspect that if the meeting had been held at the pool that night, you would have received very different comments and suggestions than those reported in the Centre Daily Times. As a mother of two children of very different ages (4 and 11), I have to agree with the consultant quoted in the paper: families are looking for fun, interactive facilities. For my own family, there are a few crucial things:- Areas for swimmers of various proficiencies. My older son can swim laps, play water polo, enjoy a big slide, diving board, etc. My younger son appreciates a nice, shallow area free from the "big kids" and fun things like a sprinkler area or height appropriate slides. As an adult, I would enjoy a variety of activities ranging from lap swimming to simply floating around.

William L. Welch Community Swimming Pool
Master Site Plan Report
- Clean, spacious changing/bathroom facilities with options for showering or simply changing clothes.
- Family seating areas with tables/chairs.
I also agree with the consultant that we should be thinking of future use when renovating the pool. There seems to be an attitude in town that life is and will continue to be as it was 50 years ago. We could certainly debate whether the changes in our children's expectations about recreation are positive or negative. However, these expectations are what they are. If we want to continue to offer recreational opportunities for a wide variety of people in our community, then we need to design facilities that are flexible and cater to as many different use patterns as possible. Meeting the needs of a broader consumer base also makes sense financially. If we as a region are going to spend money on these facilities, we need to do it "right." Let's make sure our investment is one that will bring returns in the form of increased community participation across all demographic areas.
Thank you for allowing me to contribute my input.
Dr. Kelly Delaney-Klinger

From: Carolyn Rohan
301 Rolling Ridge Dr
State College, PA 16801
Phone 1: 234 1003
E-Mail: carrohan@cuisp.com

Comments:
Sorry to have missed the meeting tues night concerning improvements for Welch Pool. I am a senior citizen and I usually take the children about 3 times a week to the pool myself and the rest of the time their parents take them. I would like to add a few suggestions to the planning committee for pool improvements:
1. More chairs to use at the pool.
2. More parking closer to pool.
3. REFRESHMENT STAND TO REPLACE THE DEPLORABLE VENDING MACHINES.
4. Prior notice to when the pool sessions end early due to swim meets, etc., such as a season schedule.

William L. Welch Community Swimming Pool
Master Site Plan - Pool Renewal Options

Letters and Email Submissions
Regarding the Community Meeting held on Tues, Sept. 25, 2007

From: Jere Northridge (no address indicated) internjere@hotmail.com
Date Rcvd.: 9/25/07
I read the article in today’s CDT regarding the Welch Pool renewal project. While I understand that costs of concrete alone have risen sharply since Hurricane Katrina, I can’t help but think that this project is an opportunity to renew the community spirit of State College. This project could be a poster-child for volunteerism and community service in the State College area, and I hope that you could explore these possibilities. “Service” Fraternities in the downtown/State College Borough area have received, deservedly or not, a negative perception in recent media articles. Perhaps some donated labor, at a minimum for the final plantings and painting and sealing of the
pool, would be both cost-efficient and community-responsible. Further time donations by Scouting groups or through the High School’s new requirements for service projects could additionally provide volunteer support. Perhaps the South Hills students or Centre County Vo-tech students could donate surveying, stake-out, and even excavation time to the project. This project, 40 years ago, would have been a rallying point within the community to do something together. Now it’s a question of balancing a checkbook. My fear is that we’ve become a “pass-the-hat” society and that we’re too willing to just kick in $400,000 dollars and see what that gets us. What about time donated by municipal engineers to do contract administration or some project oversight? What about excavation equipment lent rental-free for South Hills or Vo-Tech students to use? What about asking local engineering firms to comment on the plans and costs provided by Mr. Hunsacker? This project is next to the high school, the single most polarizing institution in the last decade of this community. I would like to see a community project, built by volunteers, built as a reminder that this community can work together. Please let me know if there’s anything I can do to help. I will be happy to offer any assistance I can related to both my engineering background and the volunteering of my time to help with any labor in the future.

From: Mark Jancin, Bayberry Drive, SC mark.jancin@veoliawater.com
Date Recvd.: 9/25/07
I am unable to attend the public meeting this evening on the above subject. Please enter this email into the record of public comments. As a user and nearby resident of the Welsh pool, my main concern with the pending renovation is that the design does not result in new, heavier car traffic to this location. The summer is the only time of year when we local residents can more or less freely drive through this part of Westerly Parkway without being impeded by students -- I do not want new traffic congestion to result from the pool renovation. To me, smaller is better. Please keep the design firms in check, they will tend to think larger is better.

From: Mary K. (KK) Marino, S. Sparks Street, SC sualums@bcpl.net
Date Recvd.: 9/25/07
In an editorial opinion, our Sunday newspaper asks, “Who better to decide the pool’s fate than those who regularly swim there?” I would like to answer: all of the people who regularly live in the two neighborhoods that the facility shares! Being one of them I offer this: My name is Mary Marino, and I have a pleasant home on the Holmes-Foster Park side of South Sparks St, just up from the pool. Most people call me KK. I am very happy with the current design of Welch Pool! I think it works well and provides an overall great return on investment. I don’t mean strictly financial. I would like to see us keep our commitment to this generous memorial by maintaining it, and wish that we hadn’t wasted money delaying so long. Please note: I believe our zoning laws are intended to protect, not to dole out privilege. If we truthfully value our neighborhoods, then they must be shown respect, and this is a good place for that. We need to realize that just because a neighbor is an institution and not a residence, doesn’t mean it can overtake or bully the homes in a neighborhood it is only a part of. Before you spend money, you need to tell the neighbors just how many more customers you hope to attract and what changes that will make to the traffic, light, and noise levels. They are at a barely acceptable level now, and I don’t want to see them increased. You must consider these things before you make a decision. Let’s be satisfied with what we have that serves us well. That’s the responsible thing to do – it’s what makes for true happiness. Thank you for taking the time to listen to me.
From: Kathy Kalinosky, SC Borough  kwren@dejazzd.com
Date Rcvd.: 9/25/07
I wanted to thank you and the folks who have been so diligently working on the plans for the Welch Pool. I appreciated the opportunity to attend the meeting this evening to hear about the options from the consultants and share ideas. I thought Mr. Hunsaker did a wonderful job at presenting the info and making people feel comfortable to share their ideas and viewpoints. He was most patient. Three more comments for the record:
1.) In thinking about the 50 meter pool, which I originally thought was ridiculous, it would allow multiple activities to occur at once. One of the activities that I know CRPR offered this summer was diving. I was interested in having a couple of my kids take the class, but with 4 kids, I had to make some decisions about our time and believe it or not, driving over to the PF pool was just beyond our limits, because we live over here by Easterly Parkway Elementary school. The diving might be something that could be offered with the 50 meter pool, correct?
2.) Regarding the discussion about water depth for swim team starts and relays: I definitely would not feel safe having my child dive into 4 feet of water for a swim team start. I think the more shallow end of the lap pool would need to be at least what we have now.
3.) Snack Bar. I liked the suggestion that a charitable group could schedule to run it, especially for a dinner time. The pool facility could provide the equipment...grill or whatever and the group would provide the rest.
Blessings, Kathy Kalinosky (mother of 4)

From: Tom Griffiths, Ferguson Township  tjg4@psu.edu
Date Published: 9/28/07
Letter to the Editor - The Centre Daily Times
I fear local residents will be too closed-minded when evaluating the current proposals for renovating Welch Pool. Boring, rectangular, competitive pools, similar to those existing in the Centre Region, recover only 20 to 40 percent of operating costs through daily fees and seasonal memberships. Family aquatic centers or leisure pools, such as is proposed for the Welch Pool site, often recover 60 to 80 percent of their operating costs at the front gate. A water park is not what is being proposed. Aquatic centers featuring shallow-water, beach-like entries and lazy rivers attract a larger and more diverse population than traditional pools. Not only do leisure pools offer more fun and attract more guests, they are also safer and have more therapeutic options. Lazy rivers used by families riding the current in tubes during the day are often used by senior citizens and disabled people walking against the current in the early mornings and evenings. The region suffers from a lack of good quality aquatic facilities. Now that existing traditional swimming pools are deteriorating rapidly, with most exceeding their life expectancy, we ought to renovate them properly so that more people will use them and fewer tax dollars will be spent maintaining them. A properly designed family aquatic center, similar to Welch Pool options 4 and 5, would significantly improve the quality of life for a larger Centre Region population. Let’s not be short-sighted with this valuable project.

CDT Editor’s note: Tom Griffiths is manager of aquatic facilities at Penn State.
November 5, 2007

James C. Steff, Executive Director
Centre Region Council of Governments
2643 Gateway Drive
State College, PA 16801

RE: Welch Pool Options

Dear Jim:

At their meeting on November 2, 2007, The State College Borough Council discussed the design for the Welch Pool Renewal. Council forwards the following comments:

- Option 3 is the preferred concept for the Welch Pool renewal project with a $5.4 million budget
- grassy areas should be incorporated into the final site plan
- shaded areas should be incorporated into the final site plan
- diving boards should be included in the final program for Welch Pool
- the final program for Welch Pool should include sustainable design elements
- aquatic features that are included in the Welch Pool Program should be carefully evaluated for impact on maintenance and operating costs
- pool design should include both adult swimming and diving options

If you have any questions concerning these comments, I would be more than happy to discuss them with you.

Sincerely,

Thomas J. Fountaine, II
Borough Manager

cc: Ron Woodhead, Director of Centre Region Parks & Recreation
     Todd Roth, CRPR Aquatics Supervisor
     Donna Conway, Borough's representative to CRPR & CRRA
November 7, 2007

Mr. James Steff, Executive Director
Centre Region Council of Governments
2643 Gateway Drive
State College, PA 16801

RE: College Township Comments on Welch Pool

Dear Mr. Steff:

College Township Council reviewed the options for construction of Welch Pool at its November 1 regular meeting and provided the following comments:

- General comfort with pool project resembling Option 3, although not wedded to specific pool features.
  - Discussed the possibility of a dedicated lap lane(s) be incorporated into an Option 3-type scenario.
- Council is in favor of a spending cap for pool construction in an amount not to exceed $5.4 million inclusive of inflation.

Please do not hesitate to contact me for clarification of these comments as required.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Adam Brumbaugh
Manager
October 18, 2007

Mr. Ronald Woodhead, Director
Centre Region Parks and Recreation
2643 Gateway Drive
State College, PA 16801

Re: Welch Pool Renewal Options

Dear Ron:

Please accept my appreciation on behalf of the Board of Supervisors for attending the October 15 Board meeting. Also please convey our appreciation to Todd Roth for his attendance and his presentation on the Welch Pool Renewal options. As you heard there are financial concerns given the magnitude of the estimated costs for two pool renovations, two regional parks and other COG related projects and programs as well as ongoing municipal services and projects.

Generally, the Board members prefer Option 3 as presented by the consultants. This option appears to have the best operational revenue, potential for increased pool users, and provides the greatest water recreational features for the investment.

The Board suggested that the General Forum needs to discuss what the COG's priorities are and what can we all really afford?

As always, if you have questions regarding this matter please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Township of Ferguson

Mark A. Kunke
Township Manager

cc: Welch Pool Renewal - 2007
Board of Supervisors
Correspondence file
October 12, 2007

Jim Steff
Centre Region Council of Governments
2643 Gateway Drive, Suite 3
State College, PA 16801

Re: William Welch Community Pool Renewal Project Comments

Dear Jim:

At their meeting on October 10th, the Harris Township Board of Supervisors discussed the Welch pool renewal project. They offer the following comments:

✓ The Board is supportive of Option 3. They would like to see some elements of Option 4 considered as part of the design.

✓ The Board requested that a capital program be drafted. The program should list all planned major expenses, park developments and purchases for the next 5 to 10 year period. Though some of the cost figures may be estimates, it will be helpful to the municipalities as they plan their own budgets.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions about our comments.

Sincerely,

Amy Farkas
Township Manager

cc: Board of Supervisors
DATE: November 7, 2007

TO: Jim Steff, COG Executive Director

FROM: Kimberly Fragola, Township Secretary

RE: Welch Pool Renewal Comments

At the meeting on October 10, 2007, the Patton Township Board of Supervisors reviewed the options for the renewal of Welch Pool with consensus for favoring Option 3.
APPENDIX J: LAND LEASE (2007)

WILLIAM L. WELCH COMMUNITY SWIMMING POOL LEASE AGREEMENT

THIS LEASE AGREEMENT made this _____ day of ________________, 2007, by and between:

STATE COLLEGE AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT, a school district organized under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, having administrative offices at 131 W. Nittany Avenue, State College, Pennsylvania, party of the first part, hereinafter referred to as “Lessor.”

- A N D -

CENTRE REGIONAL RECREATION AUTHORITY, a municipal authority organized under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, having offices at 2643 Gateway Drive, State College, Pennsylvania, party of the second part, hereinafter referred to as “Lessee.”

RECEITALS:

Lessor is the owner of certain real premises situate along Westerly Parkway in the Borough of State College, upon which has been constructed a swimming pool and related recreational facilities known and operated as the William L. Welch Community Swimming Pool, hereinafter referred to as “Welch Pool.” Welch Pool and related recreational facilities are owned by, and have been and are being operated and maintained by Lessee and it is the purpose of this Agreement to continue that relationship under and subject to the terms contained in this Agreement.

The facilities in question, which are depicted on Exhibit “A” attached hereto and made a part hereof, are operated and maintained by Lessee with the permission of Lessor subject to the terms of
a certain agreement dated April 21, 1987.

Lessee is in the process of developing a master site plan which eventually will involve the complete replacement and expansion of the Welch Pool’s facilities. In order to obtain the assistance of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania through its various departments, a long term lease is required.

It is the anticipation of Lessor and Lessee that Welch Pool will continue its current operations until August 2009 when the expansion and construction of new facilities will take place, contemplating a re-opening in May of 2010.

It is the purpose of the within Agreement to continue the relationship between Lessor and Lessee, provide for the continuing operation of Welch Pool, and to extend the term to enable planning and eventual reconstruction to proceed with the assistance of the Centre Region Council of Governments and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual covenants contained herein and intending to be legally bound hereby, the parties hereto do hereby agree as follows:

1. **Initial Term.** Lessor hereby grants Lessee permission to continue to operate and maintain the facilities outlined on Exhibit “A” attached hereto and made a part hereof, more commonly referred to as Welch Pool, for a term of twenty-five (25) years commencing January 1, 2007 and extending through December 31, 2031.

2. **Renewal.** In addition to the terms specified above, Lessee shall have the right to renew the within Agreement for an additional term of ten (10) years commencing January 1, 2032 through December 31, 2041, by providing Lessor with ninety (90) days’ written notice of its intent to renew.

3. **Rental.** Lessee shall pay to Lessor One ($1.00) Dollar per year to lease the premises described more fully on Exhibit “B” attached hereto and made a part hereof. Said lease payment
may be made, in the discretion of Lessee, in advance by providing Lessor with funds in the amount of Twenty-Five ($25.00) Dollars for the initial term of the within Agreement.

4. Leasehold Premises and Shared Parking.

(A) The leasehold premises consist of two sections of land, one identified as the “Pool Tract” and further identified as Tract One on Exhibit “A” which serves as the site for the operation of Welch Pool and related facilities. At present a portion of the Pool Tract is used by Lessor for parking purposes, said parking area consists of thirty-seven (37) spaces being used during the pool operation months by Welch Pool as parking.

(B) Lessor and Lessee will share parking facilities on the south side of Westerly Parkway adequate for their respective needs. The shared parking area will consist of existing parking. If Lessor engages in a construction project the parking areas will be modified at Lessor’s expense and will include a drop-off area and handicapped parking spaces for the use of pool patrons. Lessor and Lessee will enter into a maintenance agreement further defining the responsibilities and liabilities of Lessor and Lessee for construction, maintenance, operation and repair of the parking facilities.

5. Priority Use for Shared Parking Area. During the months of pool operation the Shared Parking Area will be primarily intended for pool patron parking and Lessor agrees to provide for that use when scheduling events on other property of the Lessor located adjacent to the leasehold premises.

6. Lessee Liability. During the term of this Agreement Lessee agrees as follows:

(A) To secure, maintain and keep in full force and effect a public liability insurance policy protecting against injury or property damage occurring in or about the said premises. Limits
shall be One Million ($1,000,000.00) Dollars each occurrence for personal injury or property damage and Two Million ($2,000,000.00) Dollars for personal injury or property damage in the aggregate, said policy shall list both Lessee and Lessor as insureds.

(B) Lessee shall be solely liable for any injuries, damages or claims thereof which may arise from the use and operation of the facilities depicted on Exhibit “A” except as hereinafter noted.

7. **Lessor Liability.** During the term of this Agreement Lessor shall be solely liable for any injuries, damages or claims thereof which may arise from the use and operation of those items hereinafter listed in paragraph no. 9.

8. **Lessee Operation and Maintenance Responsibility.** Lessee shall be fully responsible for the following:

   (A) Construction, maintenance and operation of the Pool Tract, including any interior walkways or bridge to connect to the Shared Parking Area;
   
   (B) Turf, trees and landscaping within the Pool Tract;
   
   (C) Removal of trash, litter and the provision of trash receptacles;
   
   (D) Parking signage and enforcement in the Pool Tract;
   
   (E) Asphalt paving, curb repairs and line painting; and
   
   (F) Snow and ice removal on sidewalks, walkways leading from the pool entrance to the Shared Parking Area, as well as pool service driveways.

9. **Lessor Operation and Maintenance Responsibility.** Lessor shall be fully responsible for the following:

   (A) Snow and ice removal, and sidewalk repairs on the sidewalk located along Westerly Parkway; and
(B) Construction, maintenance and operation of the Welch Detention Basin, dam structure, flood control structures, piping and drainage ways.

(C) Parking permitting for Lessor’s use of shared parking, towing, security and maintenance of shared parking areas.

10. **Pool Vacation.** In the event Lessee determines that it no longer wishes to use the Pool Tract and Shared Parking Area, Lessee will notify Lessor in writing of its intent to vacate. Within thirty (30) days Lessor and Lessee will meet to discuss appropriate utilization of the facilities constructed on the leasehold premises. Lessor may elect to have Lessee demolish and remove the above ground structures, as well as back fill the pool with suitable soil materials, graded and compacted. At Lessor’s election Lessee shall also install topsoil, providing adequate seeding and mulching. Lessee’s obligations to remove the above ground structures and back fill the pool will be completed within one (1) year of the opening of alternate pool facilities by Lessee or within one (1) year of Lessee’s vacation of the leasehold premises, whichever last occurs.

11. **Construction Coordination.** During construction of the pool facilities construction activities will be performed in such a way as to not impede access to school facilities during the August to June school year of any calendar year in which activities take place. In addition, Lessor, in planning for its construction activities as to its facilities located on adjoining property, will not impede access to the pool facilities from May through September of each year.

12. **Assignability.** Lessee may assign the within Agreement to successor organizations created to oversee regional swimming pool operations. Assignee must accept the same terms and provisions of the within Agreement. Lessor may transfer ownership of the fee to third parties, however, any such transfer shall be subject to the terms and provisions of the within Agreement.
13. **Coordination of Design and Development.** Plans for design and development will be submitted to Lessor for Lessor’s review and comment. Following submission of such design, Lessor will have thirty (30) days in which to comment, offer suggestions or request changes, as the case may be. Final design decisions shall be the responsibility of Lessee in Lessee’s sole discretion. During the planning process Lessor may appoint a representative to participate in the planning process who will be kept fully informed of the design approval process as it proceeds through state and local governmental approvals.

14. **Land Development, Replot Plan and Building Permit.** Lessee will be responsible for the preparation of a replot plan to correctly reflect the boundaries of the revised leasehold area and will also be responsible for the preparation, submission and approval of land development plans and building permits necessary to permit construction. Lessor will assist with this process by providing Lessee written verification acceptable to the appropriate municipal bodies acknowledging Lessee’s right to proceed as outlined herein.

15. **Waiver.** No delay or omission of the exercise of any right by either party hereto shall impair any such right or shall be construed as a waiver of any default or as acquiescence therein. One or more waivers of any provision, covenant or condition of this Agreement by either party shall not be construed by the other party as a waiver of a subsequent breach of any other or the same provision, covenant or condition.

16. **Entire Agreement.** This Agreement contains the entire and only agreement between the parties concerning the leasehold premises. No prior oral or written statements or representation, if any, of any party hereto or any representative of a party hereto, not contained in this Agreement shall have any force or effect. This Agreement shall not be modified in any way except by a writing
executed by both parties.

17. Successors-in-Interest. All provisions herein contained shall bind and inure to the benefit of the respective parties hereto, their successors and assigns, as the case may be.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Lessor and Lessee have executed this Lease Agreement intended to be legally bound hereby, both parties acting pursuant to the authority vested in them by their appropriate governmental bodies.

ATTEST:  

LESSOR:  
STATE COLLEGE AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT

By: _______________________________  
President

______________________________  
Secretary

ATTEST:  

LESSEE:  
CENTRE REGIONAL RECREATION AUTHORITY

By: _______________________________
STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA  
COUNTY OF CENTRE  

On this, the _______ day of ____________, 2007, before me, the undersigned officer, personally appeared ________________________, who acknowledged himself/herself to be the ___________________ of State College Area School District, the foregoing school district, and that he/she being authorized to do so executed the foregoing instrument for the purposes therein contained.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and official seal.

My Commission Expires: __________________________

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA  
COUNTY OF CENTRE  

On this, the _______ day of ____________, 2007, before me, the undersigned officer, personally appeared ________________________, who acknowledged himself/herself to be the ___________________ of Centre Regional Recreation Authority, the foregoing authority, and that he/she being authorized to do so executed the foregoing instrument for the purposes therein contained.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and official seal.

My Commission Expires: __________________________
APPENDIX K:  SHARED PARKING AND ACCESS AGREEMENT (2009)

WILLIAM L. WELCH COMMUNITY SWIMMING POOL
SHARED ACCESS AND RECIPROCAL PARKING AGREEMENT

THIS SHARED ACCESS AND RECIPROCAL PARKING AGREEMENT made this ___
13th day of May ___, 2009, by and between:

STATE COLLEGE AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT, a school district organized under the
laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, having administrative offices at 131 W. Nittany
Avenue, State College, Pennsylvania, party of the first part, hereinafter referred to as "School,"

- A N D -

CENTRE REGIONAL RECREATION AUTHORITY, a municipal authority organized
under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, having offices at 2643 Gateway Drive, State
College, Pennsylvania, party of the second part, hereinafter referred to as "Authority."

R E C I T A L S:

School is the owner of certain real premises situate in State College Borough, Centre County,
Pennsylvania, commonly referred to as State College Area Senior High School. Authority is the
owner of a facility commonly known and operated as William L. Welch Community Swimming
Pool, including an attached pool bathhouse. School and Authority have previously entered into a
Swimming Pool Lease Agreement (for the pool facility lands) dated May 24, 2007, with School as
Lessor and Authority as Lessee, hereinafter "Lease Agreement." The aforementioned Lease
Agreement contemplates a swimming pool renewal project and extends for a term of twenty-five
(25) years commencing January 1, 2007, and expiring December 31, 2031, with renewal provisions
for ten (10) years as more fully set forth therein. The parties hereby extending the term of the lease as
provided herein in Section 9 herein.
Under the provisions of the aforesaid Lease Agreement, specifically Section 4(B), Lessor and Lessee share parking facilities on the south side of Westerly Parkway adequate for their respective needs.

To provide for the effective use of the existing school facilities in concert with the new swimming pool facilities, Authority has prepared a plan for constructing a pool entrance plaza, a pool patron drop-off area, five (5) new handicap parking spaces, and a designated pedestrian path with appropriate landscaping in order to provide shared parking closer to the pool facilities (the "New Parking Facilities"). On the plan, the balance of required spaces for pool parking would be shared spaces existing in the South High School lot. A copy of the proposed plan is marked Exhibit "A" attached hereto and made a part hereof.

The within Agreement provides parking provisions necessary to facilitate pool construction and operation, plus a commitment by School to allow Authority to construct the New Parking Facilities. Costs for planning and construction of the New Parking Facilities shall be borne by Authority with all plans for the same approved by School staff. By this Agreement, Authority and School agree to modify the Lease Agreement to verify that the shared parking and related facilities, either existing or the improvements completed by Authority, are provided throughout the life of the Lease Agreement, as extended by Section 9 herein, and any extensions thereto.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual covenants contained herein and intending to be legally bound hereby, the parties hereto do hereby agree as follows:

1. Pool Construction Phase. The proposed construction phase of the Welch Pool renewal is scheduled from August 3, 2009 through May 29, 2010, although the parties acknowledge
that Authority may require additional time for construction, through July 2, 2010, should delays occur in the construction process. As a result, effective August 3, 2009, the Welch Pool Parking area containing thirty-seven (37) shared spaces will close upon the start of the pool construction project. Following that action, no shared parking will be available on the Welch Pool site. Authority will have responsibility for developing the engineering drawings for the New Parking Facilities. The design of the New Parking Facilities shall be satisfactory to both School staff and the Authority, included in the Land Development Plan for the pool, which plan will include a signature block for School as the land owner and thereby document School’s consent to the plans, and in compliance with municipal land development regulations. School agrees to execute any such plan within ten (10) days of the municipal approval and Authority will coordinate the same with School. As part of the Authority’s pool construction project, Authority will construct the New Parking Facilities while maintaining safe access for School uses. Supervision of the construction of the New Parking Facilities will be provided by Authority, working in cooperation with School Physical Plant Director. Authority will fund the construction of the New Parking Facilities.

2. Shared Parking. The summer pool period shall be defined from 5 p.m. on the Friday before Memorial Day each year through midnight on Labor Day of each year, with the Authority’s use of the School parking areas limited during any days in that period in which school is in session at the High School South Building, such use by Authority to not begin until 3:30 p.m. on any school day. Until such time as School either revises the existing South High School parking area or sells the land, during pool operations in the summer beginning in 2010, School will provide pool patrons with priority access to at least one hundred six (106) spaces in the South High School parking area,
depicted as "Area A" on Exhibit "B" attached hereto and made a part hereof. In addition, School agrees to permit supplemental, overflow parking for pool patrons the North High School lots. Further, the Authority will not use any portion of the South High School parking lot so as to provide for the school band practices ("Band Camp") from 8 AM until noon on scheduled August weekdays each summer, after which time each day the priority parking for pool patrons will resume. The schedule for the Band Camp uses will be provided to Authority in writing by May 1 annually. During all Band Camp periods, Authority patron access to the drop-off areas and the ADA parking spaces will be maintained.

3. **Permanent Shared Parking.** While the Authority may proceed with the Authority-developed plan as noted on Exhibit "A" and attached hereto, School and Authority recognize that any construction plans for School facilities and any related shared parking have not been finalized or authorized by School. As long as School retains ownership of the South High School property (and related parking areas), School will share parking with the Authority as provided in Lease Agreement and this Agreement. If School chooses to sell the South High School property, the procedures described in Paragraph 4 herein will be followed. As provided in the existing Lease Agreement, if School or its successor engages in a construction project and the parking areas, including the New Parking Facilities, must be modified, such modifications will be done at School or its successor's expense and must include facilities equivalent to the New Parking Facilities and one hundred six (106) parking spaces. At all times relevant thereto, School or its successor must maintain access to handicapped parking spaces and safe pedestrian access from the shared parking area to the pool entrance gate for the use of Authority patrons. If School or its successor proceeds with a
construction project, School or its successor agrees to maintain in-season pool patron access to the New Parking Facilities and a minimum of one hundred six (106) shared spaces for pool patrons during the School or its successor's construction project. Depending upon the requirements of the construction project, such parking may be, during the course of construction, on the north side of Westerly Parkway, satisfactory to School and Authority. In addition, School will replace the New Parking Facilities only if they are impacted by School or its successor's modifications to the area. All of the one hundred six (106) parking spaces must be located within a four hundred (400) foot radius of the pool entrance gate, as the same is depicted on Exhibit "C", and only on the south side of Westerly Parkway. Neither the School nor its successor shall place any buildings or structures between that area (as shown on Exhibit "C") and the pool facility, the intention of the parties being to have the two areas remain contiguous. Notwithstanding the foregoing, School may construct an elevated walkway or such other structure or structures, to include a building, so long as pool patrons have reasonably free and uninterrupted access, satisfactory to School and Authority, to pool from the parking area. School will include Authority or its representative in the Master Site Planning process for the South High School building and parking area or the planning by any successor owner as that process relates to the areas which are the subject of this agreement. Simultaneous with the submission to municipal authorities, School will provide Authority with a copy of any land development plan for the South High School building and parking area. Any alterations to the conditions of the within paragraph will only occur as may be necessary for any plan to comply with the State College Borough Zoning Ordinance.

4. **Sale of School Property.** It is the intent of the parties to preserve the William L.
Welch Community Swimming Pool, its related facilities and parking in perpetuity for the benefit of the Centre Region community. In the event School determines that it is in its best interest to sell or otherwise transfer the property on which pool facilities and shared permanent parking are located, School will contact Authority as soon as reasonably possible, but not less than six (6) months prior to any proposed transfer, to meet and discuss the sale or transfer of property on which pool facilities are located including shared parking, any intervening lands between the shared parking and the pool, as well as a potential buffer surrounding the pool area. Notification of intent to sell shall be given in writing to Authority. The responsibilities under the Lease Agreement and this Agreement will remain the obligation of any new owner of the South High School lands and parking areas for the life of the Agreements. In any marketing of the property, School will notify potential purchasers of the existing Agreement with Authority and the obligations contained therein.

5. **Maintenance Responsibility.** School will be responsible for maintenance services as well as pavement repairs, curb or sidewalk repairs, traffic control signals and signs, pavement markers, all snow removal and anti-skid services on all of the shared parking, roadway and pedestrian facilities.

6. **Termination.** The within Agreement shall terminate upon the permanent closure or abandonment of the Welch Pool or upon the termination of the existing or as herein modified Lease Agreement whichever shall first occur.

7. **Insurance and Liability.** During the term of the within Agreement School and Authority will maintain and keep in full force and effect public liability insurance protecting against personal injury or property damage occurring in or about the premises. Limits shall be a minimum of
One Million ($1,000,000) Dollars each occurrence for personal injury or property damage, and Two Million ($2,000,000) Dollars for personal injury or property in the aggregate. The said policy shall list both School and Authority as insured.

The within insurance and liability shall apply to the parking areas, driveway and related walkways only and shall not apply to the other school facilities located onsite or other pool facilities located onsite, except as may be specified by other agreements regarding those facilities.

8. **Section 4(B) Modification.** Section 4(B) of the William L. Welch Community Swimming Pool Lease Agreement previously entered into by the parties is hereby modified. In the event of conflict of language between the within Agreement and paragraph 4 of the Lease Agreement, the within Agreement shall control. All other terms of the Lease Agreement shall remain in full force and effect unless otherwise modified by terms herein.

9. **Lease Extension.** School agrees to extend the existing Lease Agreement to December 31, 2034 with the provision that Authority may seek additional ten (10) year extensions beyond the same as provided in the Lease Agreement.

10. **Alternate Water Service.** The current water service for the sport fields located south of the existing facility is presently provided from the bathhouse at the existing facility which will be demolished upon the start of the Authority’s pool construction project. Upon demolition, the current water service will be terminated.

11. **Waiver.** No delay or omission of the exercise of any right by either party hereto shall impair any such right or shall be construed as a waiver of any default or as acquiescence therein. One or more waivers of any provision, covenant or condition of this Agreement by either party shall not be construed by the other party as a waiver of a subsequent breach of any other or the same
provision, covenant or condition.

12. **Entire Agreement.** This Agreement contains the entire and only agreement between the parties concerning the premises. No prior oral or written statements or representation, if any, of any party hereto or any representative of a party hereto, not contained in this Agreement shall have any force or effect. This Agreement shall not be modified in any way except by a writing executed by both parties.

13. **Successors-in-Interest.** All provisions herein contained shall bind and inure to the benefit of the respective parties hereto, their successors and assigns, as the case may be.

14. **Contact Information.** Correspondence related to this Agreement shall be directed to:

Centre Regional Recreation Authority  
Attn: Director of Parks & Recreation  
2643 Gateway Drive  
State College, PA 16801

State College Area School District  
Attn.: Director of Physical Plant  
131 W. Nittany Avenue  
State College, PA 16801

Attachments:

Exhibit "A" Welch Pool Master Site Plan with Shared Parking / Access  
Exhibit "B" Existing South High School Parking with Shared Parking Areas  
Exhibit "C" Radius of Area in Which Replacement Parking Shall Be Located (which exhibit will be provided by Authority subsequent to execution but prior to recording of this Agreement)
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have hereunto set their hands and seals the day
and year first written above.

ATTEST:                                      SCHOOL:
                                               STATE COLLEGE AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT

Joyce A. Benson                               By:  
Secretary                                      President

ATTEST:                                      AUTHORITY:
                                               CENTRE REGIONAL RECREATION AUTHORITY

Kathleen Matson                               By:  
Secretary                                      Chairperson
STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA  
)  
COUNTY OF CENTRE  
) SS:

On this, the 18th day of May, 2009, before me, the undersigned officer, personally appeared Richard Mazure, who acknowledged himself to be the Board President of State College Area School District, the foregoing school district, and that he/she being authorized to do so executed the foregoing instrument for the purposes therein contained.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and official seal.

My Commission Expires:

Leslie C. Dorema

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
NOTARIAL SEAL
Leslie C. Dorema, Notary Public
State College Borough, Centre County
My commission expires: April 11, 2011

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA  
)  
COUNTY OF CENTRE  
) SS:

On this, the 15th day of May, 2009, before me, the undersigned officer, personally appeared Sue Mascolo, who acknowledged herself to be the Chairperson of Centre Regional Recreation Authority, the foregoing authority, and that he/she being authorized to do so executed the foregoing instrument for the purposes therein contained.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and official seal.

My Commission Expires:

Jacqueline R. Carpenter

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
Notarial Seal
Jacqueline R. Carpenter, Notary Public
College Township, Centre County
My Commission Expires: Jan 23, 2011
Member, Pennsylvania Association of Notaries
William L. Welch Community Swimming Pool
Master Site Plan Report
APPENDIX L SHARED BATHHOUSE AGREEMENT

WELCH POOL BATHHOUSE USE AGREEMENT

THIS WELCH POOL BATHHOUSE USE AGREEMENT ("Agreement") made this ___ day of ____________, 2009, by and between:

CENTRE REGIONAL RECREATION AUTHORITY, a municipal authority organized under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, having offices at 2643 Gateway Drive, State College, Pennsylvania, party of the first part, hereinafter referred to as "Authority;"
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STATE COLLEGE AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT, a school district organized under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, having administrative offices at 131 W. Nittany Avenue, State College, Pennsylvania, party of the second part, hereinafter referred to as "School."

RECITALS:

School is the owner of certain real premises situate along Westerly Parkway in the Borough of State College, Centre County, Pennsylvania, upon which has been constructed swimming pool related recreational facilities known and operated as the William L. Welch Community Swimming Pool, hereinafter referred to as "Welch Pool." Welch Pool and related recreational facilities are owned by and have been and are being operated and maintained by Authority. Authority is in the process of renovating Welch Pool and as a part of that renovation a new bathhouse will be constructed.

School has requested permission to utilize the bathhouse as a changing room and restroom facility for use by School sports teams during the spring and fall sport seasons. In addition, the bathhouse would be available to School for use from April 15th through the Friday
before the Memorial Day weekend and from the day after Labor Day through October 31st as approved by the Authority and as outdoor temperatures permit (since the building is not heated), provided School submits a written request for specific daily uses for the upcoming season to the Authority as specified below.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual covenants contained herein and intending to be legally bound hereby, the parties hereunto do hereby agree as follows:

1. **Facility Utilization.** School will have access to the bathhouse constructed as a part of Authority's pool facilities on a schedule acceptable to the Authority for utilization by School's sports teams as changing rooms and restroom facilities each spring and fall from April 15th through 5:00 p.m. the Friday of Memorial Day weekend, and from the Tuesday after Labor Day through October 31st on such dates and times approved by the Authority and as School requests in writing to Authority by July 1st for each upcoming academic year. Since the building is not heated, the approved schedule may be revised by the Authority staff if temperatures are near or below freezing.

2. **Access.** Bathhouse will be constructed by Authority to include one exterior door into each changing room specifically for School use. Locking access will be provided to School. Construction of the access will be the responsibility of Authority. School will not permit access outside the terms of this Agreement and all access will be supervised by school personnel. Access will not be permitted without school supervision.

3. **Inspections.** It is agreed that Authority staff and School staff will jointly conduct walk-through inspections of the Bathhouse to document pre-season and end-of-season conditions. Both parties will be responsible for signing the inspection form, which will be used
to establish any necessary repairs resulting from School use of the Bathhouse. Four (4)
inspections (two (2) for Spring uses, two (2) for Fall uses) shall be held each year.

4. **Operating Costs.** School will reimburse Authority for customary and usual costs
related to providing access and maintaining the shared facility, utility costs and any repairs
necessitated by School use. Authority will provide to School an itemized invoice on a monthly
basis with terms net 30 days. The fee schedule to establish the basis for those reimbursements
shall be determined by Authority as part of their annual budget process and the fees shall be
based upon utility, labor and repair costs. School will be responsible for securing the buildings
and turning off designated lights at the end of each daily use. School agrees to regularly remove
any trash and litter from exterior grounds during the academic year. For all other time periods,
Authority will be responsible for removing trash and litter from exterior grounds located adjacent
to the Bathhouse.

5. **Conduct Rules.** During School's use of the property, School student conduct rules and
policies will apply to any property utilized under the terms of the within Agreement.
Supervision and security will be provided by School.

6. **Hold Harmless.** School agrees to indemnify and hold Authority harmless from any
and all claims for personal injury or property damage caused or occasioned by School's use of
the property. Authority will not be responsible for any loss of School's or its student's private
equipment or personal items. School and Authority will coordinate insurance coverages for
School's utilization of the bath facility in accordance with the provisions of this Agreement and
School will provide notice of such coverage to Authority on an annual basis. Such insurance
coverage shall be in accordance with the standards in Section 7 of the William L. Welch
Community Swimming Pool Shared Access and Reciprocal Parking Agreement.
7. **Term.** The within Agreement shall have a term of one (1) year commencing on the first day of July, 2010, and terminating on the thirtieth day of June, 2011. Authority and School will then evaluate the shared use and consider subsequent agreements.

8. **Contact Information:** Correspondence related to this agreement shall be directed to:

Centre Regional Recreation Authority
Attn: Director of Parks and Recreation
2643 Gateway Drive, State College, PA 16801

State College Area School District
Attn: Director of Physical Plant
131 W. Nittany Ave., State College, PA 16801

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have hereunto set their hands and seals the day and year first written above.

**ATTEST:**

**AUTHORITY**
CENTRE REGIONAL RECREATION AUTHORITY

By: _____________________________ Chairperson

Secretary

**ATTEST:**

**SCHOOL:**
STATE COLLEGE AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT

By: _____________________________ President

Secretary
STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA } ) SS: 
COUNTY OF CENTRE )

On this, the _____ day of ______________ , 2009, before me, the undersigned officer, personally appeared ____________________ , who acknowledged himself/herself to be the Chairperson of Centre Regional Recreation Authority, the foregoing authority, and that he/she being authorized to do so executed the foregoing instrument for the purposes therein contained.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and official seal.


My Commission Expires:

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA ) ) SS: 
COUNTY OF CENTRE )

On this, the _____ day of ______________ , 2009, before me, the undersigned officer, personally appeared ____________________, who acknowledged himself/herself to be the ____________________ of State College Area School District, the foregoing school district, and that he/she being authorized to do so executed the foregoing instrument for the purposes therein contained.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and official seal.


My Commission Expires: