

# LAKE OSWEGO RECREATION AND AQUATICS CENTER PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## MEETING 3 SUMMARY

**Date:** 4/8/21

**Time:** 6:00pm – 8:00pm

**Place:** Zoom Meeting

**Purpose:** Review feedback from community engagement, SW Community Center tour and review updated site plans (for overall site, parking/traffic, and competition and recreation pools).

**Outcomes:** Update PAC; gather feedback on overall site, competition and recreation pools, and traffic and parking.

### Attendees

#### PAC Attendees:

Chris Duncan

Sandy Intraversato

Jahzeel Ormeno

Sarah Ellison

Leasa Lowy

John Wallin

Aukai Ferguson

Cassidy Miller

John Wendland

Natalie Gentry

Cole Olsen

#### Staff Attendees:

Ivan Anderholm, City of Lake  
Oswego

Erica Baggen, Scott Edwards  
Architecture

Billy Griffitts, Councilman  
Hunsaker

Jenny Anderson, City of Lake  
Oswego

Jennifer Marsicek, Scott  
Edwards Architecture

Michael Morehart, Councilman  
Hunsaker

Bruce Powers, City of Lake  
Oswego

Sid Scott, Scott Edwards  
Architecture

Ken Rehms, PBS

Jan Wirtz, City of Lake Oswego

Andra Zerbe, Scott Edwards  
Architecture

Allison Brown, JLA Public  
Involvement

Tony Vandenberg, Lake  
Oswego School District

Mike Gartland, Councilman  
Hunsaker

Ariella Frishberg, JLA Public  
Involvement

### Welcome and Introductions

Allison Brown, JLA Public Involvement, began the meeting. She reviewed Zoom tools and etiquette and reviewed the meeting agenda and purpose.

The group reviewed the PAC Meeting 2 Summary. The summary was approved with no additional edits.

## **SW Community Center Tour: Reflections**

PAC members and project staff shared their highlights from the tour:

- During peak times there can be an hour wait for the warm water pool due to capacity limits. That was concerning as a parent of young kids because waiting is not always an option. The current pool warm water pool design is the same size as the SW Community Center's pool and there is concern they will have the same issue.
- The SW Community Center had to limit capacity because they didn't have enough staff to support the number of lifeguards needed to increase capacity. The LO pool can anticipate this problem by calculating the volume by the number of staff to make sure they can operate the pool at peak capacity.
- They have a large seating area at the entrance. A large seating area is not currently included in the plans, but wondered if that was ever a consideration or conversation in the design process?
- The facility does not have enough storage.
- Weight and cardio room is tight. At 2,400 sq ft, it is busy enough that they often receive complaints about users not sharing equipment.

PAC members who were not on the tour but personally use the SW Community Center shared the following:

- Frequent users know to get to open swim early because it fills up quickly. Typical wait times are 30-60 minutes, but his family typically left if there was a wait time.
- Parking is an issue and almost always full during peak use times.
- Awesome pool slide.
- Great gym space and multifunctional dry recreational activities.
- The basketball court is located near the entrance and has provided a nice activity while waiting for the pool to open. Having something to do can take away the discomfort of waiting.

A PAC member asked about how the service areas compare between the SW Community Center and the proposed LO recreation site. A PAC member noted that the programmatic design is similar between the two.

## **Outreach Updates**

Allison Brown reviewed past outreach effort including a dry recreation survey, a community meeting open to the public and a neighborhood meeting. Summaries for each meeting were shared with the PAC. Jenny Anderson, City of Lake Oswego, shared that 748 people responded to the survey and it was open from February to March 4. Allison shared that the primary concern from both meetings was related to traffic, access and parking. There was no further discussion from the group on outreach updates.

## **Design Overview**

Jennifer Marsicek, Scott Edwards Architecture, shared a preliminary design timeline graphic.

- Currently working on a schematic design set, solidifying the building program as well as building systems.
- Next phase of work will include more PAC meetings in the summer.

She then walked the group through graphics for the site analysis and plan. Updates include the following:

- Stafford includes a new 12' multiuse path and a 5' landscape buffer. This includes 10' property dedication as required by the City's TSP.
- New left turn lane off Stafford into the facility.
- New reconfigured main driveway and the second access point off Overlook is now a formal driveway allowing better circulation through the site for delivery and emergency vehicles.
- Parking area set back 39' to reduce impacts from elevation changes on Stafford.
- Main parking lot has 163 stalls. Ken is currently studying this to make sure it supports the building.
- New pedestrian connections creating three points to enter the site on foot.

#### Discussion

- Does the current plan include buffer space for expanding the facility footprint, specifically adding more gyms, in the future?
  - There is some space for expansion to the west, but there has been no discussion about adding an additional gym or buffer space in the future. The green space to the south of the parking space is reserved for storm water treatment facility or landscaped bioswale.
- Did the design get pushed further back on the property or is this the same layout?
  - It did move back about 10' into the golf course to allow more space for pedestrian pathways and landscaping.

Jennifer walked the group through a graphic showing a detailed building plan.

- Lobby will have some seating for a waiting space.
- Offices will include space for 20 employees.
- Four family changing rooms currently planned.
- The interior hallways create a visual to the pool and the golf course.
- The plan is compact and efficient with good flow.
- The competition pool includes a second entry point for competition, spectator seating for 300 and restrooms.

#### Discussion

- What's the separation between the rec and competition pools?
  - It will be a wall, but details for the separation have not been designed yet, but the team intends to include a transparent or glass element for visibility. Both spaces will be separate because of different water and air temperatures needed for each pool.
- What are the challenges with an outdoor patio space? Many community members have asked for it and it's not included in the current design.
  - An outdoor patio space is important, and they are working with the landscape designer on how they can open the space. While it is not shown on the plans, they are still discussing it and agree it is important.

- Opportunities on both sides to include an outdoor patio space.
- Parents have expressed interest in a splash pad or water feature outside that connects with the pool area.
- Important to coordinate with golf course design because there is a possibility of balls flying into the west side of the building.
- Overall capacity will increase with added outdoor area.
- The Chehalem project includes stubbed plumbing for future outdoor water use.
- If the outdoor patio/area is on the grass side, it would be nicer to have the gym open up to the grass space than the weight and cardio room. Current design feels backwards – the men’s locker room and weight/cardio room should flip with the gym and multipurpose room. Changing the flow could help open up rental options and revenue.
  - There is value in multipurpose room close to the parking lot.
  - Functionally, the locker rooms need to be as close to the competition pool as possible.
  - The golf course view is nice for the cardio/weight room, too.
- The existing club house could serve as a place for an outdoor patio space.
  - The design includes plans to create a room divider for more rentable space and developing corresponding outdoor space to support rental events. Design might include a putting green, too.
- Allison asked when will the project team be able to give the public a solid answer on an outdoor patio space?
  - Functionally, still working out the details. An outdoor space will need fencing and control measures. Outdoor connections will be included in the schematic design. A definitive answer will be “coming soon.”
- Community members have expressed a desire for a walking or running space within the facility or around the golf course.
- Will the PAC get an update from the golf course design team to help understand the layout and make sure it doesn’t impact facility uses?
  - The PAC can get an update from the golf course design team after pre-app next week. The facility also needs to not impact the golf course design and layout.
  - Fairway nine is running parallel with the building. 150’ from center of fairway is not a lot of room in golf terms.
- Can the gym or weight/cardio room be built later to allow for a bigger recreation pool now?
  - Current program requirements in the MOU require a gym and cardio/weight room, so that is the focus of the current design. The current size of the competition pool is locked in per the MOU and they are close with the rec pool size.
  - Space for future growth is something the City is still exploring.
  - Parks did express concern over the warm water pool sizes in the initial design and if it is the right size for the community.
  - Ivan would like insight into how they arrived at the current pool size compared to the community’s expectations.
  - Current pool design has capacity for 450 people, which is very large.
- What is the vision for this space? Community members talk about wanting “A space where every child can learn to swim.” What if the vision is through a racial equity lens? Would that make this project

different? The PAC has focused on nuts and bolts, but what if it addressed the overarching goals for the community?

- There was some informal community visioning work done during the City's first attempt at a recreation center, the Westend Building, and the idea was for a "multi-generational facility for all Lake Oswego citizens." That sentiment still applies. The community is looking for recreational programming at affordable prices. The SW Community Center exemplifies this – there is something for everyone. Everything can't be as big as one constituent group wants it to be. With this project, we're looking for something that has something for every generation that can create enough revenue to operate.
- There was no formal community visioning process for this facility. When the project first began in 2016, the city was looking for a space that the City would own and operate a permanent space to continue providing programming. The project went through a feasibility study with City Council to see if the golf course could be a potential area. When the council was presented with a request for proposal on the golf course site, they paused the process because a bond was recently passed for a swimming pool. The council gave directive to staff to explore the feasibility of a partnership with the city pool and dry recreation center. The process led to the District and the City signing an MOU and the current project. The community was involved through surveys. Needs really drive projects.
- Will the gym be large enough for two concurrent games to meet the "multiuse" function? If it's only big enough for one basketball court, that can limit capacity to about 10 people.
  - Currently set up for two cross courts.
- Support for pickle ball!
- How are we including ADA communities in this process?
  - The Student Services group for The District represents all students with ADA needs and has very active community members. The space will be designed to meet ADA requirements and beyond; accessibility will be included throughout the building. There will be additional conversations about inclusivity.
  - Jan Wirtz, City of Lake Oswego, oversees programming and inclusion program. We have the gold standard in the NW in terms of our inclusion programs and access to facilities and programs.

## Competition Pool Design

Jennifer Marsicek, Scott Edwards Architecture, introduced Mike Gartland, CH, who reviewed changes in the design based the feedback they received from a focus group meeting with members of the competitive swimming community:

- Confirmed current deck width is appropriate to support circulation needed for events.
- Rethinking the ramp and stairwell on east side of the pool. Potentially seeking an exemption from the County to allow for a narrower stairwell and increase deck width. Michael Morehart clarified that the changes in the stairwell would not take away from any ADA accessibility requirements. There will be pool lift and two ADA recognized points of access

Michael Morehart, CH, reviewed the competition pool:

- 25 yard to north/south direction, 75'. 104' in east/west
- 12 lanes in north/south direction, each lane is 8' wide. This will allow for multiple concurrent wet uses.
- 9 lanes in east/west direction, each lane is 8'4" wide. This area is designated as "main field of play."
- Floating goals on east and west side of pools for water polo.
- Competitive swim community confirmed that seating for 300 spectators is appropriate.
- Moveable bulkhead for use as a floating wall to partition pool into two separate tanks and to keep the swim lanes the correct length.
- Confirmed water depths with focus group. Deep water depths also beneficial for lifeguard and fire department trainings and community programming.
- Confirmed water temperature at 78-82 degrees with focus group.
  - A PAC member noted this is a large range in temperature and recommended they have a smaller range in temperature. Competitive swimmers like 78 degrees, lap swimmers like 82 degrees and water polo likes 80 degrees.
  - The mechanical design can handle a range of temperatures depending on use.
  - Chehalem keeps their pool at 80-81 degrees.

### **Discussion:**

- The locker room to the pool is a high traffic area during competitions and that is a key consideration for deck widths and flow.
- Why does the rec pool need to be separate from the competition pool?
  - Water temperature needs are drastically different. From a mechanical standpoint, it would be difficult to achieve that if the pools were connected.
- The Newburg Pool recommended air conditioning to keep the air temperature more comfortable. Is that included in the design?
  - Yes. The design also includes large fans over the spectator bleachers for more localized cooling. This is the primary reason for including a wall separator between the competitive and rec pools.

## **Recreation Pool Design**

Michael Morehart, CH, reviewed four recreational pool designs. The following five elements are included in every design:

- Minimum 3,000 square feet of pool water surface area.
- Spa.
- Water slide.
- Two 25-yard lap lanes for recreational use.
- 4-5' water depth for classes.

### **Option #1 (15):**

- 125 sq ft spa, accommodates 17 people, comfortable at 12 people.
- Stair access directly into lap lanes.
- Protected shallow water zone with water spray areas.

- ADA ramp with landing in 1' zone.
- Multiuse area with a plunge area for water slide with floating partitions.
- Deepest pocket of the pool at 5'.
- Water volleyball net.

#### Option #2 (#19)

- Bench seating around the pool.
- Stair access directly into lap zones.
- 125 sq ft spa, accommodates 12 people, comfortable at 8-10 people.
- Body slide with isolated plunge area.
- Large staircase entry into main portion of the pool.
- Water volleyball net.
- Protected shallow water zone with water spray areas.

#### Option #3 (#20)

- ADA ramp on north side of pool
- Smallest spa out of four options – 8-10 capacity.
- Protected shallow water zone with water spray areas.
- Main pool includes the plunge area for water slide with bench seating.
- Swim lanes range from 3'-5' depth.

#### Option #4 (21)

- Very similar to option #3, but the shallow water zone is larger.
- Main stair entry goes into main pool area.
- Different slide design.

#### **Discussion:**

- A PAC member asked in the chat for an informal poll about increasing the size of the rec pool. The staff reiterated that it might not be feasible to explore at this time.
- A PAC member asked for clarification on point of access from the locker room on Design #2 (#19)?
  - There is only one point of access from the locker room, however there are multiple points of access around the pool design.
- Positive feedback for the larger ramp in Design #1.
  - The ADA ramp access to various areas in the pool feels more inclusive.
  - Feels overall more efficient.
  - Larger spa with the most seating areas.
  - Spa position allows parents to keep an eye on kids while stairs provide a barrier for people who do not want to interact with kids.
  - Desire for benches in spa to face the pool, not locker rooms.
  - Plunge zone does not cut access to pool and lap lanes.
  - Bigger slide!
- What is the size difference in the 1' zone in Design #1 and Design #4? Curious if the spa or shallow play area are higher-use areas?

- Design #4 is larger.
- Lap swim, spa, slide and 4'-5' of deep water were the most important elements from the focus groups.
- Positive feedback for designs in which the splash zone and slide are near each other.
- A bigger spa is better for the community. A bigger slide is better for families.
- How does the slide plunge area alter the usability of the surrounding area?
  - Plunge area should be protected and partitioned off.
  - The plunge area in Design #4 cuts off access from stairs to the rest of the pool.

Allison invited PAC members to take a poll on “After seeing the different options, which recreational pool design do you like the best right now?” All 14 members selected “Pool 1.”

- A PAC member asked what would the cost be to increase the pool area to 4,000 square feet and move the dry recreational side by 10-15 feet to the right?
- Most pools around the country are slightly bigger than this, but not by much. This is about right for the city size. It will probably always be at capacity, based on Ken Ballard’s studies, and very popular in the community. Warm water is always a big draw for community users. Doesn’t have data on exactly how much larger other pools around the country are, but 3,000 square feet will be functional and will get used. Ken Ballard can provide more data on this.
- The recreational pool will be used by multiple groups – is there enough space for all the different users at once or will it need to be scheduled?
  - Some programs can’t happen at the same time, but yes, a little extra space would allow for more flexible programming.

## Traffic and Parking

Bruce Powers noted that the traffic impact analysis and parking study are not official and waiting review by City engineers and suggested a more detailed presentation at a separate meeting for those interested. Ken Rhems provided a brief overview of updates:

- Studies are complete and under review.
- Overall traffic volume increases will be minimal.
- Adding northbound left turn lane.
- Access leaving uses separate right and left turn lanes.
- Studied all intersections and Overlook Drive.
- No new right turn lanes are warranted.
- Traffic Study: Stafford Road is classified as a minor atelior road. Minor atelior roads can hold 10-20K vehicles a day, Stafford Road currently at a volume of 12K. The roundabout dictates capacity and is under Clackamas County jurisdiction.
- Parking Study: No code requirements for golf course parking spaces. Compared to other rec centers around the Portland area and look at shared use between golf course and rec center to find a balance in number of parking spaces needed.
  - Considering adjacent places available for overflow parking for big events.

- No road improvements or widening planned for Stafford Road. Some improvements recommended to the Burgess intersection in the TSP.

**Discussion:**

- Concern about pedestrian access across Stafford/the Burgess intersection from the neighborhood meeting. Community members were excited about an added sidewalk on the west side of Stafford but need a way to get there.
  - Recommending in report to add crosswalk on eastside between existing curb ramps with added signage and flashing lights.
  - Currently no pedestrian sidewalk improvements in the TSP along the east/residential side of Stafford Road and outside of the scope of the rec center.

**Next Steps and Outreach**

Bruce Powers suggested an additional PAC meeting before schematic design is complete. The committee agreed to an additional meeting via Zoom poll. The additional PAC meeting will be in April or May.

Bruce and Allison thanked PAC members for volunteering their time and choosing to be part of this process.

PAC members can contact Bruce Powers or Jenny Anderson with questions for Ken Ballard.