

# POST Meeting Minutes

## July 1, 2020

### **CALL TO ORDER**

The POST Committee was called to order at 4:05 pm by Chair Cindy Bruce. Members present included Cindy Bruce, Jason Groves, Carol Hawk, and Paul Hilts. The meeting was held electronically via Zoom Conferencing. Julie Kolar joined after the meeting was started.

Staff present included Susan Philp, Planning Director; Watkins Fulk-Gray, Staff Planner; and Brian Passenti, Basalt Recreation Director.

Guests included Gyles Thornely and Elyse Hottel, from Connect One Design, Diana Elliot, tennis coach, and Jacob Baker, Roaring Fork Outdoor Volunteers (RFOV).

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

M/S Paul and Carol to approve the minutes of June 19, 2020. Motion carried by a vote of 4 to 0.

### **AGENDA ITEMS**

#### **USTA Tennis Court Proposal for Stott's Mill**

Susan said that the proposal for the tennis courts comes from Diana Elliot, who is also on the Zoom call. The park at Stott's Mill was approved for two tennis courts and a multi-purpose court. Ms. Elliot is proposing four courts. The goal of the discussion is to determine if POST supports the four-court proposal, and if so, to choose one of the options.

Ms. Elliot said that she has been running a tennis program for the Town of Basalt for six or seven years. She wants to have four courts so that there can be tennis tournaments hosted there. She advised that her understanding is that the Developer will pay for three of the courts, and the fourth could be paid for by grants without any cost to Basalt. It would also allow more programming for PE classes.

Susan displayed a site plan of the existing approval for Stott's Mill with two tennis courts and a multi-purpose court. Stotts Mill is in the final stages of recording documents for the project. The park would have to be completed once half the units are built. Susan displayed potential layouts of four courts, which are constructed by the triangular shape of the parcel outside of the gas easement which runs alongside of the Rio Grande Trail. The first option shows the courts running north south. A second potential option has the courts running diagonally. A third layout tries to separate the courts from the adjacent residential lot and includes a multi-purpose court. The fourth option is the same but with more tennis amenities instead of the multi-purpose court. POST does not need to

decide today, but Ms. Elliot is eager to get the project moving, and it would be helpful to decide on whether there should be four courts or not.

In response to a question from Paul, it was clarified that Diana Elliot works for the Basalt Recreation Department as an independent contractor and as a tennis coach for the high school. Paul asked if the basketball or multi-purpose court shown in the original proposal would be retained in the newer options. Susan responded that it would be, or part of one would be, in some of the options.

Paul advised that he would not be in favor of a proposal that did not include a basketball court, and he is in favor of four tennis courts. Jason supports four tennis courts and asked where they play and practice now. Ms. Elliot said they practice at the middle school and play tournaments at Crown Mountain. Jason said it would be a great asset to be able to have competitive tournaments at the high school. He said he would rule out the option with diagonal court layouts and agrees with Paul that the more amenities in the site plan the better. Carol also agreed with having four courts and not diagonal courts.

Julie Kolar joined the meeting at 4:29 pm.

Julie said she agrees with what has been said and thinks having four courts would be good. She would like to see a multi-purpose court rather than just a basketball court. Regarding having restrooms and water, she is in favor of this rather than haphazard portapotties, especially when the park has numerous amenities.

Cindy said she supports what has been said, including having them oriented north south. She supports Option 3, with the additional multi-purpose court. She asked if it would be possible to partner with Pitkin County OST to build a restroom. Susan said the Developer will be responsible for the restroom. If the Town wants to enlarge them more than the approved plan, the money will have to come from a grant or somewhere else. Cindy recommended there be restrooms to accommodate at least two people.

Susan summarized the feedback: four tennis courts, a multi-purpose court.

Ms. Elliot said she would not want a tennis court right next to a residential lot. She recommended option #4 with a multi-purpose court, but not a locker room and storage. Susan said that the Town would prefer not to add to maintenance requirements or franchise out the area. POST said it would be good to see the proposal again before a land use application.

Paul clarified that he is happy to see a multi-purpose court and not just a basketball court.

## **Ratification of Recommendations to Town Council on Arbaney Park Pool Project and Refinements to Proposal**

*Carol had to leave the meeting sometime during the discussion on Arbaney Pool.*

Susan said that at the last POST meeting, POST made recommendations to Town Council based on the survey that was done. Susan highlighted findings from the survey.

Elyse Hottel noted that in the survey the hot tub concept was both a favorite and an unsupported proposed amenity. Elyse said that they have realized since the survey that people may not have the same definition of hot tub, from a “warming pool” to a true “hot tub”. She noted that Toni Kronberg believes the hot tub is absolutely necessary.

Susan displayed the four-year phasing plan for improvements. They were recommending going out to bids for the projects identified for 2020 and 2021. The robot pool would be built in 2021 along with the pool plaster project. Susan summarized the Council action at the last meeting. She asked if POST wants to ratify what was previously discussed, or pause and authorize some initial work, while determining certain other work in the next couple months. On Monday, the Consultant Team and Staff met and are now recommending that we hold back on a month to answer two pieces of information through another survey. One issue is the family friendly restrooms and find out more about the community’s thoughts on concessions. The family friendly restrooms could have been confused with the locker room upgrades in the survey. The other main issue is the depth of the robot pool and the shallow area of the main pool.

Gyles discussed the depth and use of the robot pool. It is designed for small children, at a depth of two feet at the deepest. An ADA ramp is proposed. The current kid pool is two feet deep. It is designed as a pool for toddlers to get familiar with water and not for teenagers to hang around in.

Brian noted that there will be nothing between two feet and four feet of water, and it would be useful to have a middle ground.

Gyles explained that the required ADA grade for accessing pool is 1:12, which takes up a lot of space. He explained how to get a 3-foot depth in the main pool. He suggested focusing on a good aquatic facility foremost. Gyles said that creating a new area of a 3-foot depth in the main pool would incur an additional \$220,000 cost, including the ADA ramp.

Julie asked for a comparison between the amount of shallow water area proposed here compared to other pool facilities. Brian said Snowmass has a large ramp area but does not know the floor area comparison numbers without doing some research. Julie said she asked the question to know if the Town is offering enough shallow water and how much is enough. Gyles said he believes

they have offered at least the minimum amount, based on talking to Andy, the Consultant Team's pool expert.

Susan said she is looking for direction on whether we should wait to act to the July 28<sup>th</sup> Council meeting to allow discussion on the depth of the pool.

Jason said he is not in favor of deepening the robot pool or breaking into the shell of the main pool. Jason noted that the budget of the project is constraining, and that making the main pool's shallow area deeper could cause structural problems. He is very much in favor of the current plan and moving forward and believes we have a great compromise.

Cindy agreed, and said that it may not be worth blowing up the main pool to have a 3-foot depth. She supports the robot pool as currently planned. Cindy favors moving forward with what is currently planned. She also noted that we are trying to do this in the current budget. She would vote to move forward with what we currently have.

Paul likes the idea of having a 3-foot depth portion but does not think the cost would be worth it.

Julie agreed. She appreciates all the input and thought that has gone into this and recommends moving forward.

Susan summarized the feedback as maintaining the robot pool at a 2-foot depth and not changing the depth of the existing shallow portion of the main pool to make a 3-foot area.

Cindy called for public comment, but no public was present on the conference.

Elyse said that the website has been updated with the May survey results. She noted that a draft "refining" survey has been prepared and is ready to be sent out. She said that there is a challenge with maintaining the concession stand with family-friendly restrooms. The draft survey asks if respondents would tolerate vending machines temporarily before a permanent concession stand. The questions in general relate to tolerance for some changes and about phasing. There is a lot of information about a potential hot tub, and attempts to communicate the energy, capital, and maintenance costs. A question has been included to differentiate what people have in mind when they say they want a hot tub and then ask them what they want. Right now, we are proposing in draft Question 5 to ask folks what they feel about the hot tub or warming tub.

Brian said that community-sized hot tubs usually accommodate 10-15 people, which is larger than what was budgeted previously. He noted that hot tubs need to be dumped once a month to be cleaned, which is about 3,000 gallons being refilled. Elyse noted another question about the hot tub is whether it would be an adults-only area or not.

Julie said she has heard the perception that the water at the pool is too cold and wondered if the hot tub is people's way of offsetting this. She wondered if warming the water would negate the perceived need for a hot tub. Brian said they are trying to accommodate this. Elyse noted one individual comment was that a hot tub is unnecessary because the pool is warm. She also noted that heating the pool would require a lot more energy.

Cindy asked if there is consensus for POST members about the hot tub. She also asked about making the concession stand and restroom/changing room smaller to have both. Gyles responded that this was not considered. Cindy said that the concession stand is larger than it needs to be. Gyles suggested POST make a statement about the hot tub.

Paul asked if Brian is in favor of a hot tub. Brian said he is not taking a stance, but only wants to provide information about potential costs. Gyles said he believes it is not important to decide about the hot tub to move forward. However, Elyse pointed out that the hot tub would affect the mechanical system unless there would be two mechanical systems eventually.

Jason said he wants to move forward without the hot tub. He does not think the hot tub falls within our policy objectives. It does not preclude the ability to do one down the line. He also said that when it is hot, hot tubs do not sound good.

Julie agreed and said the question of the hot tub could be punted. However, it should be made open that if there is an opportunity in the future to include it, that it could be considered.

Susan said that she was not going to authorize the architect to design the family friendly restrooms without a location for them. She clarified that what she was hearing was that we would provide information about the hot tub on the Let's Talk website and explain to folks what we heard but why we were not including the hot tub at this time.

Cindy asked that in the next survey, the question be worded appropriately so that the issue regarding the concessions and family-friendly changing rooms is resolved. Gyles said the \$147,000 was budgeted toward the family-friendly restroom including the roof and the concession garage doors.

Jason said the concessions could be kept in the same place they are or moved to the pavilion side.

Julie said that that keeping the concession area is very important. Parents send kids to the pool assuming they can get food there.

Gyles asked if there is any way to help the concession area be less work. Brian said that the concessions do make money.

Elyse asked for clarification on whether one or two-family friendly restrooms should be addressed in the survey. Brian expressed Staffs' concern that people might linger in a single changing room and prevent other people from using it. He said that there is a need for them to be also ADA compliant and gender neutral. Brian reported that despite Covid-19, people are using the locker rooms.

Susan stated that it is their take away that POST wants to move forward asking on July 14<sup>th</sup> to go forward with bid documents with what POST had before while doing the follow-up survey, and if the result of the survey necessitate it, do an add-service to the bid documents to address the family friendly changing rooms. POST agreed.

M/S Jason and Paul to move forward with bid documents as summarized by Susan, with the possibility for doing an add-service. Motion carried by a vote of 4 to 0.

### **Roaring Fork Outdoor Volunteer Proposal**

Susan said that RFOV finished the improvement to the Swinging Bridge Trail. Staff is working on putting lighting on the Swinging Bridge path from downtown to the middle school parking lot. Jacob Baker said the project originated with Basalt Gives. The project will refurbish the trail with a hard pack surface that should be maintenance free for 7-10 years. He said RFOV wants the trail to be well used once it is improved and is interested in putting wayfinding signage in. Susan suggested circling back on the issue. She noted that the parking lots at the middle school will not be able to be used after school restarts. She asked who from POST would be interested in participating in the discussion. Cindy asked if Susan would send all the information.

### **Adjournment**

M/S Jason and Paul to adjourn. Motion passed by a vote of 4 to 0 at 6:17 pm.