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2014 PDOP Ten Year Comprehensive Master Plan

Short Term (1 to 3 Year) Goals

• Enhance District Signage
• Improve Adult Fitness Programming
• Improve Environmental Education Programming
• Implement Recommendations from Branding Study
• Collect, Analyze, and Use Maintenance Data
• Identify Opportunities to Engage Parks Foundations
• Conduct a Feasibility Study for an Indoor Recreation Center
2014 PDOP Ten Year Comprehensive Master Plan

Primary Themes

• Space constraints & limitations
• Collaboration is first step
• Expand programming for Seniors & Active Adults
• Expand programming for Teens
• Provide centralized multi-generational facility

Study Background & Process
Opportunity Analysis
Proposed Facility Program
Site Analysis Summary
Planning Strategies & Financial Analysis
Conclusions & Recommendations
## Space Constraints & Limitations

### New Facility Priority Rankings

The following table (Figure 3.47) shows that indoor swimming pools, indoor running/walking tracks, indoor fitness/exercise facilities, arts facilities, and indoor gymnasiums are the top five potential facility/amenity priorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Swimming Pools</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Running/Walking Tracks</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Fitness/Exercise Facilities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Facilities</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Gymnasiums</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Fitness Equipment Areas</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities for Teens</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities for Seniors</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Synthetic Turf Sports Field</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frisbee Golf Courses</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton Courts</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Roller Hockey Rinks</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform Tennis Courts</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball Courts</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 3.47 - New Facility Priority Rankings*

*Graphic by Lakota Group 2014*
Collaboration is the First Step

Joint Task Force

- Park District of Oak Park
- Village of Oak Park
- School District 200
- School District 97
- Oak Park Library
- Oak Park Township
Expanded Programming

Active Seniors & Adults

- Indoor Swimming-Lap/Leisure/Therapy Pools
- Indoor Walking/Jogging
- Fitness Programming
### Expanded Programming

#### Teens

- Informal “drop-in” recreational opportunities lacking
- Team sports opportunities for kids that get cut from school programs, or need less structured program
- Safe gathering space for afterschool/weekends
Centralized Multi-generational Facility

- Consolidated services
- Centralized community hub
- Multi-generational programming
- Recreation and community programming
- Supplement uses at existing community centers
Feasibility Study Goals

- Assist the Community and Park District Board in determining need, amenities, location, and cost
- Evaluate the financial realities for construction and operations of a new Community Recreation Center
- Assist PDOP in exploring a program model that is financially self-sustaining
- Evaluate potential sites that can serve as a community destination and landmark
- Create a Joint Task Force to explore opportunities for collaboration & partnership
Feasibility Study Process

February Workshops
- Site Tours
- Strategic Partnership Meetings
- Task Force Meeting #1

March Workshops
- Focus Group Meetings
- Community Outreach Meetings
- Task Force Meeting #2

April Workshops
- Proposed Planning Strategies
- Community Outreach Meeting
- Task Force Meeting #3
Missions & Goals

- Inclusiveness
- Multi-cultural
- Partnerships
- Wellness
- Destination
- Seniors
- Centralized
- Community
- Financial sustainability
- Accessible
- Affordability
- Teens
- Recreation
- Arts
- Collaboration
- Landmark
- Environment
- Stewardship
- Multi-generational
- Adults
Opportunity Analysis

• Market Analysis Summary
• Strategic Partnership Summary
• Community Outreach Summary
Market Analysis

- Population Growth of 0.5% projected over next 5 yrs
- Approx. 52,151 residents by end of 2020
- Age demographic indicates higher concentration of 5-17, 45-54, 55-64 year olds than national average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Nat. Population</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>3,053</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-17</td>
<td>8,901</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>+0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>4,425</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>13,441</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>7,858</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>+1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>7,307</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>+1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>4,468</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>+0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>2,478</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Population: 2015 census estimates in the different age groups in the Primary Service Area.

% of Total: Percentage of the Primary Service Area population in the age group.

National Population: Percentage of the national population in the age group.

Difference: Percentage difference between the Primary Service Area population and the national population.
Market Analysis

- Nearly 1/3 households have children
- Median household income significantly higher than state and national levels
- Over 65% of households have income greater than $50,000
- Cost of housing in Oak Park higher than state and national levels

Age and household income are determining factors that drive participation in community recreation activities
Market Analysis

- Primary service area Oak Park proper
- Secondary service area 5 mile radius
- Private sector has narrow business focus mostly on adult fitness
- Young people, families, and seniors are underserved
Market Analysis

Sport Participation Stats

- National Sporting Goods Association (NGSA) overlay
- Sports participation in primary service area
- Highest participation rates walking/jogging, fitness, swimming, group fitness, gym sports
Market Analysis

Non-Sport Participation Stats

- National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) Participation Survey
- % Of U.S. Adults performing or creating
- Maker trends rely on local community culture

| Table AF – Percentage of U.S. Adult Population Performing or Creating Art: 1992-2008 |
|---------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Performing:                      |     |     |     |        |        |
| Jazz                            | 1.7%| 1.3%| 1.3%| +0.0%  | -0.4% |
| Classical Music                 | 4.2%| 1.8%| 3.0%| +1.2%  | -1.2% |
| Opera                           | 1.1%| 0.7%| 0.4%| -0.3%  | 0.7%  |
| Choir/Chorus                    | 6.3%| 4.8%| 5.2%| +0.4%  | +1.1% |
| Musical Plays                   | 3.8%| 2.4%| 0.9%| -1.5%  | -2.9% |
| Non-Musical Plays               | 1.6%| 1.4%| 0.8%| -0.6%  | -0.8% |
| Dance                           | 8.1%| 4.3%| 2.1%| -2.2%  | -6.0% |
| Making:                         |     |     |     |        |        |
| Painting/Drawing                | 9.6%| 8.6%| 9.0%| +0.4%  | -0.6% |
| Pottery/Ceramics                | 8.4%| 6.9%| 6.0%| -0.9%  | -2.4% |
| Weaving/Sewing                  | 12.6%| 16.0%| 13.1%| -2.9%  | -11.7%|
| Photography                     | 11.6%| 11.5%| 14.7%| +3.2%  | +3.1% |
| Creative Writing                | 7.4%| 7.0%| 6.9%| -0.1%  | -0.5% |
Market Analysis

Programming Conclusions

Oak Park is underserved for

- Recreation swimming
- Fitness/Group Fitness
- Gymnasium programs
- Indoor Walking/Jogging
Strategic Partnerships

Keys to Successful Partnerships

• Shared and complementary program needs
• Resources that benefit each other
• Complementary customer and tax bases
• Customers use facility at complementary times
• Enhance revenue opportunities in facility
Full Partner: Capital for construction & operational acumen.

Funding Partner: Capital for construction no operational expertise

Operational Partner: No capital but potential for operations partner

Rental Partner 1: Specific facility wants, capital to fund, long term leaser of space

Rental Partner 2: Specific facility wants, long term leaser of space

Program Provider 1: Facility requests, programmer (contract)

Program Provider 2: Facility requests, programmer (employee)

Future Member: Individual or group

Daily User: Individual or group

Facility Advocate: Non-user
Strategic Partnerships

Oak Park Library

- Library serves as teen gathering spot after school
- Cannot meet demands for meeting room space, could use rooms for 60-150 occupants
- Need access to flexible multi-purpose space w/ Wi-Fi
- Believe there is a need for “maker spaces”
- Would support programming or service options in Community Center (i.e. children’s story time, book drop, etc.)
- Prefer central location, walkable from...
Strategic Partnerships

School District 200

- Facilities cannot meet demand of OPRFHS curriculum, athletics, and community needs
- Safe and enriched gathering area for teens is needed
- Additional gymnasium space and pool space relieves community pressure from OPRFHS facility
- OPRFHS pool needs are for P.E. and competition may not be complementary with senior and community use
- Prefer central location, walkable from
Strategic Partnerships

School District 97

- Growing enrollment is putting strain on enrichment programs
- Need access to additional gym space, meeting rooms, event space, and indoor turf
- Multicultural Center could have potential role in Community Center
- Believes that community aquatics for lap swim, senior programming, and swim lessons is underserved
- Centralized location and affordability is important
Strategic Partnerships

Oak Park Township

- Support enhanced programming for teens & seniors
- Must be a neutral facility; inclusive & multi-generational
- Gym, walking track, warm water pool, fitness center and multi-purpose space will benefit community
- Center should be outreach location for wellness services, could house admin offices for partner
- Location needs to be centralized & support outreach
Strategic Partnerships

Park District of Oak Park

- Want to extend services to Seniors and Teens
- Can better serve community if operations are consolidated and centralized
- Want to create a central community hub to supplement existing facilities
- Walking paths have always been ranked of high importance in community surveys
- Relies on D200 and D97 for all gymnasium needs thus no weekday day time access
- Has heard community express desire for indoor pool
Strategic Partnerships

Village of Oak Park

- Keeping properties on the tax roll is important
- Diversity and inclusion in facility is important
- Suggested considering indoor turf
- Having a police presence in facility is good community outreach, partnering opportunity
- 24/7 Access for shift workers would be beneficial
Strategic Partnerships

West Suburban Special Recreation Assoc.

• Provide opportunities for persons with disabilities

• Has (11) different community partners

• Admin offices are currently in Franklin Park, would prefer Oak Park for new office location

• Location within facility would be ideal, but anywhere in Village is beneficial

• Affordable access to multi-purpose spaces—gyms, meeting rooms, party rooms, etc.

• PDOP has been best and most collaborative with space
### Strategic Partnership

#### Partnership Conclusions

**Potential Funding Partners**
- Mental Health/Wellness Partner
- Special Rec Partner

**Potential Operations Partners**
- Village Police Security/Outreach

**Potential Program Partners**
- Oak Park Library, SD 97, SD 200, WSSRA
Community Outreach

Outreach Goals

• To listen
• To gather information
• To understand the communities wants/needs
• To understand the ideal location
• To share input from other groups
Community Outreach

Outreach Efforts

- (5) Focus Group Workshops
- (2) Teen Forums
- (3) Community Outreach Meetings
- Digital Community Questionnaire
- Input from over 200 meeting attendees, and over 250 questionnaire respondents
Community Outreach

Focus Groups

• Wonderworks, OPRF Chamber, Early Childhood Collaboration
• WSSRA, County Mental Health, Parenthesis, Rush Oak Park & West Suburban Hospitals
• Community leaders, Success of All Youth, OPRF Community Foundation
• Community sports leaders, EVP Volleyball, Wolf Pack basketball, Oak Park Youth Baseball/Softball, AYSO Soccer, IMPACT Basketball
• Library Manager of Community Resources
Community Outreach

Focus Groups

- Community is lacking quality infant and toddler childcare options that are affordable and accessible.
- Location must be near public transit for facility to be truly inclusionary.
- Diversity and inclusion should socioeconomic factors. Resources exist in the community to help offset costs for low income residents.
- Sensitivity towards duplicating services, competing with private sector.
- Provide enrichment opportunities, job & skill training.
Community Outreach

Teen Forums

- Teen Forum, OPRFHS Lunch Period
- Teen Forum, OPRFHS Afterschool
- +/- 50 student participants
  - Student Government
  - Student/Athletes
  - Student Clubs & Organizations (Robotics, Hip Hop, A Place for All, Students for Peace & Justice)
Community Outreach

Teen Forums

- Central location, able to walk from OPRFHS and access to public transit is important
- Recreation space for unstructured play, informal activities
- Peak use afterschool 3-6pm with extended hours of operation (Fri & Sat late night)
- Space for creative art and expression
- Access to food, Wi-Fi, lounge/comfortable furniture, music, projection screen, group viewing room
Community Outreach

Teen Forums

• Access to tutors on weekend, business mentoring, job training and employment opportunities
• Safe, welcoming, inclusive space that is affordable
• Gender neutral locker rooms/restrooms
• Community resource center for counseling services
• Computer center, access to printers, charging stations
• Free parking and bike racks
Community Outreach

Community Meetings

- Community Presentation, Cheney Mansion AM
- Community Presentation, Cheney Mansion PM
- Community Open House, Cheney Mansion PM
- +/- 150 people combined in attendance
Community Outreach

Community Meetings

• Central location is preferred
• Affordability is important
• Expressed concerns over tax burden
• Emphasized the important of green space
• Expressed desire for cultural space, maker spaces
• Suggested converting an outdoor pool for indoor use
• Desire to accommodate alternative activities (pickle ball, golf simulation, batting cages, etc)
Community Outreach

Community Meetings

- Identifying core needs versus wants is important to the community
- Addressing parking is important
- Addressing how existing facilities will be programmed is important
- Residents prefer a two-story solution with primary activity spaces on the main level
- Proportion of recreation space to community space was questioned
- Separate lap pool and leisure pool was preferred
Community Outreach

Community Questionnaire

• Average residency for respondents was 10.6 years
• Top five ranked facility features:
  • Indoor lap pool
  • Fitness center
  • Walking/jogging track
  • Indoor play pool
  • Gymnasium
Community Outreach

Community Questionnaire

6. Out of the following choices, please rank your top 5 preferred facility amenities you want in a community recreation center.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Lap Pool</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Center</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Track</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Play Pool</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Studio - Classes</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Area</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Room</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Turf Field</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Rooms</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Rooms</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Therapy Pool</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - Walk In</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Rooms</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lounge/Activity Room</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snack Bar</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Score is a weighted calculation. Items ranked first are valued higher than the following ranks, the score is the sum of all weighted rank counts.
Community Outreach

Community Questionnaire

- Central location preferred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Central</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central East</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central West</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location doesn't matter</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score is a weighted calculation. Items ranked first are valued higher than the following ranks, the score is the sum of all weighted rank counts.
Community Outreach

Community Questionnaire

• Facility features & cost are most important factors
Community Outreach

Community Questionnaire

- 35% would support tax increase for project, 45% maybe, 20% no
Proposed Facility Program

Primary Components

- Community Spaces: 11,200 +/- NSF
- Fitness Spaces: 17,600
- Multi-Purpose Gymnasiums/Track: 36,800
- Aquatics: 23,175
- Locker Rooms: 4,625
- Preschool Program: 5,325
- Child Watch & Multi-Purpose Rooms: 2,588
- Administration and Support Spaces: 3,775
- Prospective Partner Space: 5,150
Proposed Facility Program

Community Spaces

- Lobby 11,200
- Casual Activities Lounge
- Access Control/Security
- Public Restrooms
- (3) Meeting Rooms (@ 50 occupants each)
- Art Studios
- Vending

 +/- NSF
Proposed Facility Program

Fitness Spaces

- Circuit Training Machines
- Cardio Equipment
- Plyometric/Stretching
- Access Control
- (4) Group Fitness Rooms (@ 30 occupants each)

+/- NSF

17,625
Proposed Facility Program

Multi-purpose Gyms/Track +/- NSF

- 3-Court Multi-Purpose Gym 36,800
- Multi-purpose Activity Court
- Elevated Running Track (1/10 mile)
- Gym Storage
Proposed Facility Program

Aquatics +/- NSF

- Lap Pool (4 Lane)*
- Leisure Pool
- Warm Water Therapy Pool
- Pool Deck
- Lifeguard & Coordinator Offices
- Pool Equipment & Storage

*Alternates provided for additional lap lanes

23,175
Proposed Facility Program

Lockers +/- NSF

- Men’s Locker Room 4,625
- Women’s Locker Room
- (2) Gender Neutral Changing Rooms
Proposed Facility Program

Preschool

- Dedicated, secure entry 5,325
- (4) Classrooms
- Staff Workroom
- Prep Kitchen
- Youth Restrooms
- Director’s Office

+/- NSF
Proposed Facility Program

Child Watch & Multi-Purpose Rooms +/- NSF

- Child Watch Room (@ 12 occupants) 2,588
- Staff Office
- Gender Neutral Restroom
- (2) Multi-purpose Rooms (@ 49 occupants)
- Prep Kitchen
Proposed Facility Program

PDOP Admin & Partner Spaces +/- NSF

- PDOP Staff Offices (6 staff) 8,925
- Mental Health Offices (4 staff)
- Special Rec Partner (7 staff)
- Shared Conference Room
- Shared Breakrooms
- Storage/Building Receiving/Maintenance
Program Conclusions

- Represents approx. 106,000-118,000 GSF
- Multi-level approach required
- Governing space for site test fit is Gymnasium with approx. 120-feet width needed
- Consultant team developed 3 planning strategies to test fit proposed program on alternate sites
Site Analysis Summary

Site Selection Process

• Reviewed (14) potential sites

• Researched parcel boundaries, sizes, existing structures and features, and ownership records for prospective sites

• Developed priority rankings based on site selection criteria
Site Analysis Summary

Site Selection Criteria

• Size
• Proximate to other key facilities
• Safe/Walkable/Bikeable
• Onsite and shared parking opportunities
• Environmental concerns
• Economic development opportunities
• Ownership and complexity of acquisition
• Visibility of location for community landmark
• Adaptive reuse opportunities
Parking Calculations

- Maximizing onsite parking is important. Drop off area and onsite parking is critical for accessibility & preschool program.
- Majority of parking will be required to be offsite shared parking.
- Facility parking requirements vary based on building size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>BUILDING SQ. FT.</th>
<th>PARKING RATE STALL/BUILDING SQ. FT.</th>
<th>TYPICAL STALLS</th>
<th>ACCESSIBLE STALLS</th>
<th>TOTAL STALLS</th>
<th>ON-SITE PARKING</th>
<th>REQUIRED OFF-SITE PARKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>1/500</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>117,175</td>
<td>1/500</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>52*</td>
<td>183*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>112,300</td>
<td>1/500</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: On-site parking for Site B is provided as an add/alternate.
Stormwater Calculations

- Studied Volume Control (VC) and Detention requirements
- Green roof proposed for all planning strategies. Combination of green roofing and permeable pavers are proposed to meet VC requirements
- Detention requirements are governed by site size and only required on Site C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>VOLUME CONTROL REQUIRED</th>
<th>AMOUNT OF VOLUME CONTROL NEEDED</th>
<th>DETENTION REQUIRED</th>
<th>AMOUNT OF DETENTION NEEDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.19 (±) ac-ft.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.04 (±) ac-ft.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.20 (±) ac-ft.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.82 (±) ac-ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Proposed Facility Program**

**Site Conclusions**

- All proposed sites require demolition and/or remediation to varying extents
- All proposed sites require shared offsite parking to varying extents
- All proposed sites require stormwater volume control to be addressed via green roof and/or permeable pavers
- Only site C requires stormwater detention
Planning Strategies & Financial Analysis

Planning and Pricing Overview

• Developed test fit adjacency diagrams
• Maximized recommended program based on available sites, should be confirmed via revenue analysis
• Rough-order-of magnitude pricing was developed for construction costs and project costs
• Cost are based on a Fall 2017-Fall 2019 construction schedule
• Additional escalation rates will apply if the project timeline is protracted
Planning Strategy A

Estimated Cost $44-46M

Building Area 100,850 SF
Building Height 2-stories
Site Area Required 86,000 SF

Advantages
- Primary activity spaces on main level
- Simple building organization

Challenges
- Site development challenges
Planning Strategy A
Planning Strategy A
Planning Strategy B

Estimated Cost $44-45M

Building Area 112,025 SF
Building Height 5-stories
Site Area Required 50,000 SF

Advantages

- Can fit on numerous site locations
- Most urban strategy

Challenges

- Activity spaces are stacked vertically
- Less efficient layout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Construction Costs Summary</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Cost/SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby Spaces</td>
<td>$1,555,697</td>
<td>$316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-purpose Meeting Rooms</td>
<td>$728,940</td>
<td>$270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maker Spaces</td>
<td>$348,207</td>
<td>$249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vending/Food Prep</td>
<td>$114,324</td>
<td>$381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Center</td>
<td>$1,475,663</td>
<td>$233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Fitness Rooms</td>
<td>$2,105,924</td>
<td>$271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasiums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-court Gymnasium</td>
<td>$4,582,075</td>
<td>$218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-purpose Activity Court</td>
<td>$1,096,586</td>
<td>$219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevated Running Track</td>
<td>$1,290,842</td>
<td>$231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-lane Lap Pool</td>
<td>$957,807</td>
<td>$399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Pool</td>
<td>$957,807</td>
<td>$399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapy Pool</td>
<td>$478,904</td>
<td>$399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Support Spaces</td>
<td>$1,824,090</td>
<td>$217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locker Rooms</td>
<td>$917,232</td>
<td>$316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Program</td>
<td>$1,113,514</td>
<td>$257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Watch &amp; Multi-Purpose Rooms</td>
<td>$520,059</td>
<td>$251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDIF Administration Suite</td>
<td>$689,197</td>
<td>$228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mech/Circulation/Structure</td>
<td>$6,416,244</td>
<td>$223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Building Costs</td>
<td>$27,173,112</td>
<td>$243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Development Costs</td>
<td>$3,399,730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conditions/Overhead Profit</td>
<td>$2,847,284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Contingency (10%)</td>
<td>$3,132,013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalation to Fall 2017 Start (0%)</td>
<td>$1,722,606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Construction Costs</td>
<td>$38,274,745</td>
<td>$323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Soft Costs</td>
<td>$6,915,958</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Total Project Cost</td>
<td>$45,190,693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADDITIVE ALTERNATES:

- Aquatics Alternate: 6-lane Lap Pool $1,016,048 $131
- Aquatics Alternate: 8-lane Lap Pool $2,043,086 $198
- Parking Alternate: Underground $6,568,390 $263
- Prospective Mental Health Partner (560 SF) $193,571 $346
- Prospective Strategic Rec Partner (950 SF) $1,137,132 $288
- Added Circulation for Partner Spaces (640 SF) $1,711,568 $268
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Planning Strategy C

Estimated Cost $41-43M

Building Area 107,150 SF

Building Height 2-stories

Site Area Required 89,000 SF

Advantages

• Primary Activity Spaces on main level

• Simple building organization

Challenges

• Less central location
Planning Strategy C
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Conclusion & Recommendations

Executive Summary:

A new Community Recreation Center is feasible for the Oak Park community.

Unmet space and programing demands, growing youth, active adult and senior populations, as well as financial demographics all indicate favorable conditions for a new facility.
Preferred Planning Strategy is C due to cost, feasibility of land acquisition, efficiency of planning strategy, and achievable adjacencies.
Conclusion & Recommendations

Expressed Concerns to Date

• Will this lead to additional tax burden for residents?
• How will parking be addressed?
• How will environmental stewardship be approached?
• How much will a facility like this cost?
• What’s the timeline for this project?
• What will happen to existing PDOP facilities?
• Why can’t PDOP and SD200 build one pool?
• How will the size and configuration of pools be determined?
Conclusion & Recommendations

Recommended Next Steps

- Operational & Revenue Analysis/Financing options
- Establish a target project timeline
- Formalize Strategic Partnerships
- Establish sustainability goals for the project
- Solicit Conceptual Design & Campaign Services
  - Shared Parking Study
  - Existing Facilities Master plan
  - Site Surveys/Geotechnical Reports
  - Conceptual Design & Renderings
  - Continued Community Outreach
Next Steps

- Final Report due June 7, 2016