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Tonight’s Discussion

- Review of Goals & Objectives
- Review of Meeting One
  - Update on grant application
  - Recap of comments
  - Survey results
- Part 1 - Pool Amenities
  - Options for Pool Amenities
  - Pool Amenities Public Comments
- Part 2 - Indoor Pool
  - Indoor Pool Considerations
  - Indoor Pool Public Comments
- Next Steps
Meeting No. 1
Review
Goals & Objectives

- Establish aquatics strategy for the next twenty years
- Address safety, accessibility and maintenance
- Optimize use of the pools with public input
- Improve amenities to better serve all ages
- Pool capacities remain unchanged
- Stay within limitations of existing properties
Meeting One Comments

- Process felt hurried
  - Grant application deadline required rapid response to qualify for a significant funding opportunity
  - Overall process includes three meetings plus multiple surveys

- Lap swimming concerns
  - Park District will not reduce lap swimming access

- No space taken from Rehm Park
  - Grant application revised – equipment within pool area

- Interest in an indoor pool
  - Researched the options and will discuss Part 2 later tonight
On-line Survey Results

- 491 Respondents (93% Oak Park residents)
- 8% Attended Meeting No. 1
- 84% Had pool passes in last 3 years
- 84% Have children in the household
- 32% kids 0-4; 66% 6-12; 42% teens
- Typical respondent uses pools 1-5 times a week
- 63% use Rehm and 37% use Ridgeland Common
- 63% want additional shade structures
Optional Pool Amenities

- Interactive Spray Pad: 45.9%
- Water Flume Slide: 49.3%
- Inner tube slide: 31.2%
- Run-Out Slide: 39.5%
- Lazy River: 41%
- Crossing Activities: 38.7%
- Pool Volleyball: 13.5%
- Bowl Slide: 28.6%
- Climbing Wall: 30.1%
Part 1
Pool Amenities
Existing Rehm Pool Layout

A. Diving well:
   1, 3, 7 & 10 meter diving
   Drop slides

B. Main Pool:
   50 meter lanes
   Observation deck

C. Kids area:
   Zero-depth w/play features
   Wading pool
   Sand box
Kids Area Amenities (Grant Submittal)

A  Existing zero-depth
B  Splash Pad
C  Shading & Seating
D  Lawn Area
Existing Rehm Pool Layout

A  Diving well:
   1, 3, 7 & 10 meter diving
   Drop slides

B  Main Pool:
   50 meter lanes
   Observation deck

C  Kids area:
   Zero-depth w/play features
   Wading pool
   Sand box
Main Pool Amenity Options

- Observation Deck Unchanged
- 25 yard & 50 Meter Lanes

Current Channel

- A
Main Pool Amenity Options

A Cross Activity

25 yard & 50 Meter Lanes

Observation Deck Unchanged

B Pool Basketball
Main Pool Amenity Options

- 50 Meter Lanes
- Expanded Deck
- Lazy River
Main Pool Amenity Options

- Water Flume Slides
- Expanded Deck
- 50 Meter Lanes
Existing Rehm Pool Layout

A Diving well: 1, 3, 7 & 10 meter diving Drop slides

B Main Pool: 50 meter lanes Observation deck

C Kids area: Zero-depth w/play features Wading pool Sand box
Diving Well Amenity Options

A  Water Flume Slides
B  1m Diving Board
C  Climbing Wall
D  Drop Slides
Diving Well Amenities (shallow water)

A Crossing Activities

B Current Channel
Existing Rehm Pool Layout

A  Diving well:
   1, 3, 7 & 10 meter diving
   Drop slides

B  Main Pool:
   50 meter lanes
   Observation deck

C  Kids area:
   Zero-depth w/play features
   Wading pool
   Sand box
Rehm Pool Options Layout #1

A  Diving well:
   Water flume slides
   Climbing wall
   1m diving board
   Drop slides

B  Main Pool:
   25 yard & 50 meter lanes
   Current channel
   Observation deck

C  Kids area:
   Zero-depth w/play features
   Splash Pad
   Enhanced shade & seating
   Expanded lawn area
A  Diving well:
Water flume slides
Climbing wall
1m diving board
Drop slides

B  Main Pool:
25 yard & 50 meter lanes
Crossing activity
Water basketball

C  Kids area:
Zero-depth w/play features
Splash Pad
Enhanced shade & seating
Expanded lawn area
Rehm Pool Options Layout #3

A  Diving well:
   Water flume slides
   Climbing wall
   1m diving board
   Drop slides

B  Main Pool:
   50 meter lanes
   Lazy river
   Expanded deck

C  Kids area:
   Zero-depth w/play features
   Splash Pad
   Enhanced shade & seating
   Expanded lawn area
Rehm Pool Options Layout #4

**A** Diving well:
- Shallow water
- Crossing activities
- Current channel

**B** Main Pool:
- 50 meter lanes
- Water flume slides
- Expanded deck

**C** Kids area:
- Zero-depth w/play features
- Splash Pad
- Enhanced shade & seating
- Expanded lawn area
Ridgeland Common Amenities

A  50 meter lanes

B  Zero-depth pool

C  Shades and seating

D  1 meter diving boards
Ridgeland Common Amenity Options

A  Lessons

B  Games & activities

C  Inflatable
Part 1
Pool Amenities
Public Comments

Online Survey at:
Funding Considerations

- Currently PDOP outdoor pools generate funds to be used toward capital projects throughout the Park District.
- Based on research indoor pools typically do not cover all operating costs.
- Indoor pool could potentially reduce funds PDOP has to allocate towards its capital improvement plan.
Operational Considerations

- Indoor pools with best use mix for financial success include:
  - Activity pool for kids play
  - Lap swim pool
  - Therapy and lessons pool

- Indoor pools are typically more successful when housed within a community recreation center or fitness facility
Indoor Pool – Fabric Enclosure

- Reviewed with IDPH and building code officials
- Considered a permanent structure – must comply with all codes including fire protection and energy
- IDPH has never approved a fabric enclosure system
- Building code officials consider fabric enclosures high risk installations that performs poorly in emergency situations. Even partial failure can compromise life/safety and exiting
- Minimally engineered and lacks structural redundancy
- Not suited to varying climate – insulation and energy efficiency affected by humidity levels
- Savings limited to enclosure system and offset by shorter life span
- Short term savings offset by extensive risk and liability when installed over pools

Conclusion: Permanent structure recommended
### Indoor Pool-Permanent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ridgeland Common</th>
<th>Rehm Pool</th>
<th>New Facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014 Renovation</td>
<td>1996 Renovation</td>
<td>Purchase land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 year duration</td>
<td>5-10 year duration</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning variance</td>
<td>Zoning variance</td>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constricted site</td>
<td>Larger site area</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of structure</td>
<td>Size of structure</td>
<td>Limited properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support facilities in place</td>
<td>New support facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand equipment room</td>
<td>Larger facility possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional parking needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Ridgeland Common:**
  - 2014 Renovation
  - 20 year duration
  - Zoning variance
  - Constricted site
  - Size of structure
  - Support facilities in place
  - Expand equipment room
  - Additional parking needs

- **Rehm Pool:**
  - 1996 Renovation
  - 5-10 year duration
  - Zoning variance
  - Larger site area
  - Size of structure
  - New support facility
  - Larger facility possible

- **New Facility:**
  - Purchase land
  - Zoning
  - Parking
  - Traffic
  - Limited properties

- **Costs:**
  - **Ridgeland Common:**
    - $13m - $16m
    - + operating costs
  - **Rehm Pool:**
    - $16m - $19m
    - + operating costs
  - **New Facility:**
    - $35m - $40m
    - + operating cost
Indoor Pool
Public Comments

Online Survey at: