



MEETING MINUTES

Como Regional Park Pool Replacement

St. Paul, MN

MEETING: Task Force Design Workshop #6

DATE: March 26, 2009

LOCATION: Como Streetcar Station (Horton & Lexington)

TIME: 4:00-6:45 p.m.

1. Call to Order – *Chairperson – Therese Kelly*
 - a. Review of Task Force Mission Statement
 - b. Review and approve meeting minutes for TFDW #5
 - i. Discussion of meeting minutes and comments on minutes
 - ii. Decision made to strike the word “majority” from minutes in 4a.
 - iii. No other changes, minutes approved.

2. Design charrette summary – *USAquatics / AKA*
 - a. Summary of charrette comments & design progression
 - i. Discussion on bather load and the design being program driven by programming (as discussed at beginning of workshop meetings)
 1. Design dependent on programming determined through task force
 2. Task force drive for a non-typical natural themed pool challenged staff and consultants to pursue new opportunities in the pool layouts and design
 - ii. Review of programming
 1. Provided existing and proposed programming handouts
 - iii. Review of proposed bather load
 1. Provided handout demonstrating existing and proposed bather loads
 2. Recommended staff/consultant bather loads vs state bather loads
 - a. Significantly reduced
 - b. Eliminates overcrowding and helps provide “country club” atmosphere
 - c. Reduced bather loads allow for increased safety
 - iv. 2 major questions posed by task force members
 1. How does the increase of the pool relate to other exhibits and features of the Como Park that have recently been improved or expanded?
 2. What if everything in the park were to increase by the same percentage as the planned pool increase (68%), then what would the result be?
 - v. Continued discussion on the charrette process
 1. Continued discussion on bather load and the overall impact to the community
 - vi. Discussion of children’s input vs adult’s at the design charrette. Children were given equal voting opportunity at the charrette. Some committee members saw this as positive, others as negative.
 - vii. Staff and consultants indicated that the majority of the area and bather load increase was a result of attempting to provide something for teenagers through the lazy river and expanded diving well.
 - viii. Discussion on pool increase as a relation to the adjacent athletic fields. The adjacent athletic fields will not be increasing, in fact they will be going from 6

softball fields to 3 and there is a possibility that the broomball will be relocated elsewhere during the winter.

- ix. Task force member comment
 - 1. Needs to be a comprehensive review of Como Park as a whole and the relation of the pool project with all other park projects and exhibits before any decisions on the pool can be made.
- b. Presentation of draft schematic design (based on final charrette selections)
 - i. Provided example of existing facility overlay, demonstrating that the overall areas of the existing and proposed facility are very similar in size and scale.
 - ii. Presentation of preliminary schematic design and individual pool elements.
 - iii. Como Woodland has 3 major concerns
 - 1. Buffer between the pool and the woodland
 - 2. Road work phasing
 - 3. Hydrology of the roadwork relating to the planned constructed wetland
 - iv. Staff commented that the proposed grades for the realigned Como Avenue need to be reviewed to determine how to make the stormwater work for the constructed wetland.
 - v. Phasing was discussed and staff indicated that the pool will not open without construction of the associated parking.
 - vi. The parking will need to be constructed together with the pool. There may be the possibility of staging the Como Avenue construction.
- c. Comments & approval for further detailing
 - i. General task force approval needed to proceed with review of budget, phasing, and refining of schematic design
 - 1. Changes can still occur
 - 2. Comments can still be provided
 - ii. Concern from some task force members that sufficient time to review the schematic design and other information was not provided
 - 1. Public review and input would be possible through the next meeting and continually possible through the public approval process as the plan proceeds to the Parks Commission and eventually to City Council.
 - 2. Changes to the schematic design can and will likely still be made.
 - 3. Comment that changes are hard to make once a commitment on a plan or layout has been made.
 - 4. Another comment that public comments would be disregarded once the plan was voted on for pursuit. Once things move on, inclusion of public comments is difficult.
 - iii. Additional concern that a decision cannot be made without a full review of Como Park and its relation to the pool project as a whole.
 - iv. Some task force members felt that it was time to move on and provide direction for staff and consultants to continue their analysis.
 - v. Staff and consultants indicated that they would post the information, handouts, and schematic design diagrams provided at the meeting for public review on the City website.
 - vi. Final vote taken on whether to approve the preliminary schematic design for continued refining, preparation of budget, operations, and expense numbers.
 - 1. Vote passed, 7 in favor, 2 against.

3. Review work goals and agenda for Task Force Design Workshop #7 – *USAquatics*
 - a. Work goals
 - i. Prepare final schematic design
 - ~~ii. Prepare draft final report~~
 - iii. Work goals revised to continue refinement of schematic design, preparation of budget, operations, and expense numbers for presentation to the task force. Preparation of final report to follow.
 - b. Task Force Design Workshop #7
 - i. Present refined schematic design, budget, operations, and expense numbers for review, comment, and recommendation to the Parks Commission.
4. Adjournment