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Memo
To: Steve Grimes, Director of Parks & Recreation
From: Lindsey Peckinpaugh
Date: April 3, 2018  Rev. 4/17/18
Subject: City of Bettendorf Study Kick-off and Stakeholders

Steve,
We would like to propose April 19 and 20th for a two-day workshop in Bettendorf to kick-off the Recreation Facilities Needs Assessment and Feasibility Study. Below are draft schedules, agendas, and prospective attendees for your review and comment.

PROPOSED SCHEDULE

Thursday, April 19th
Location: TBD
9:11am   Steering Committee Kickoff
11am-1pm  Site Tours/Lunch (Goettsch, Life Fitness, Splash Landing)
1:15-2:15pm Stakeholder Mtg #1 (TBD)
2:30-3:30pm    Stakeholder Mtg #2 (TBD)
3:45-4:45pm Stakeholder Mtg #3 (TBD)
5:00-6:00pm Stakeholder Mtg #4 (TBD)

Friday, April 20th
Location: TBD
8-9:00am Stakeholder Mtg #5 (TBD)
9:15-10:15am Stakeholder Mtg #6 (TBD)
10:30-11:30am Bettplex Tour
Noon-2:30pm Regional Rec Summit
Noon-1:00pm Tour Bettendorf Family YMCA
3pm–4:00pm Stakeholder Mtg #7 (Parks & Rec Staff)

Via Memo   Steering Committee Recap (via email)

4.0 Communications Plan Discussion

DRAFT AGENDAS

Steering Committee Kickoff Meeting Agenda:
1.0 Introductions and Roles
2.0 Confirmation of Study Goals
3.0 Review of Study Work plan
4.0 Communications Plan Discussion
5.0 Review of Stakeholder Input Topic Examples
6.0 Site Overview

Steering Committee Recap Meeting Agenda:
1.0 Provide initial site analysis challenges/opportunities
2.0 Provide overview of Stakeholder Input
3.0 Identify additional Stakeholders for outreach
4.0 Discuss operational data sharing needs with Hunden
5.0 Identify Next Steps

POTENTIAL STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

The following is a list of prospective stakeholder groups. We would like to meet with meet with groups for one hour. They can be combined with other groups, but we would like to keep each stakeholder meeting to 7-10 participants each. We do not need to engage all stakeholders on the first trip. We need the City’s help in identifying and inviting these individuals to meet with us.

Primary Competitors: YMCA, TBK Bank Sports Complex (Bettplex)

Strategic partners: School corporations

Youth sports clubs: Aquatics, basketball, volleyball, soccer, other emerging or strong local sport

Active citizens: Neighborhood groups, Middle Park proponents, Active aging seniors (Life Fitness users)

Goettsch users, engaged parents, special needs groups, early childhood education leader, teens

Parks Leaders/Staff: Board and staff
Stakeholder Input Example Questions:

The intent of the stakeholder workshops is to engage in open and facilitated discussion, not scripted question and answer sessions. Below are some example topics:

1. Do you believe your organization has common goals and interests for a community recreation project as the Park’s Department? If so, what are they?

2. What are the non-negotiable program elements or facility needs that must be included in the project plans for your organization to be interested in participating?

3. Are there additional non-essential program elements or facility needs that could benefit your organization if they were part of the project plans?

4. Do you foresee your organization having shared or complimentary needs with other prospective partners?

5. What type of access and control would you desire over the non-negotiable program elements (scheduling/operating hours/management)?

6. Are there specific design or planning considerations that must be considered for your facility needs (i.e. designing for competition vs. practice athletics space, construction and/or materials standards)?

7. Would you be willing to financially contribute to the capital construction costs, and in what range? What about an annual contribution to offset operating costs, and what in range?

8. What do you believe to be the ideal location for a Community Recreation Facility and why?

9. What do you foresee as being potential deal breakers or pitfalls to partnering on a community recreation facility with the Park Department?

10. Do you believe the Community and your service area will support a project of this nature? Why or why not?

Example Stakeholder Invitation:

Dear ________,

The City of Bettendorf Park and Recreation Department recently completed a comprehensive master plan. One of the top priorities resulting from this plan was for the City to conduct a needs assessment and feasibility study for an Indoor Recreation Center in Middle Park. The scope of this study will include determining the project’s recommended activity mix, size, and budget, as well as, a market and operational analysis for the facility. This study will not result in a project design and this will not be the final opportunity for stakeholder engagement.

As a valued member of our community, we would like to invite you to participate in this study through stakeholder engagement workshops. The purpose of these workshops will be to gather insights from diverse community members, special interest groups, and potential project partners to help inform the project’s planning process. We have hired a team of consultants led by Perkins + Will who will facilitate these workshops. The format will be a facilitated open discussion and will not require any preparatory work on your behalf. We simply request your attendance and willingness to provide candid feedback to our team.
MEMO – STAKEHOLDER RECAP
To: Decker Ploehn, Liz Solis-Willis, Steve Grimes, Kim Radcliffe
From: Brent Ross, Lindsey Peckinpaugh
Date: May 2, 2018
Subject: Initial Stakeholder Outreach

During our initial trip on April 19th – April 20th, we enjoyed getting to know you, your community, and your facilities.

We left the meeting with a wealth of information and are following up via this memo with a recap of the stakeholder meetings, requests for additional information, and a schedule for next steps in order to move forward. Please feel free to share this with the broader steering committee.

Summary of Stakeholder Input:
The following is a summary of key takeaways from the stakeholder groups. More detailed meeting minutes will be formalized and submitted for your record. Items are groups by stakeholders, though they may have been expressed in separate meetings:

Life Fitness Center (via Life Fitness Advisory Committee):
- Older community is sensitive to price for memberships and use of the facility
- Newer families may not be as sensitive to price
- LFC is not heavily utilized in the summer due to the lack of air conditioning
- Currently a large social component at LFC among senior community
- Seniors need the track and like the longer track at LFC vs the Y’s track
- Concern about putting money into an aging facility
- Facility was originally designed for Tennis and works well for this use

Bettendorf Ecumenical Food Pantry:
- Private entrance is important to protect the dignity of patrons
- A source of water within the space
- Adequate power for cold storage equipment and access to hand sink
- A space to give class of have adjacent service offerings would be welcome
- Facility needs to be located along public transit routes
- St. James Lutheran also provides food for those in need

Pleasant Valley School District:
- Current 25m "T" configured pool is a challenge to host high school meets
- Pleasant Valley School District’s is interested in the potential for a pool.
- PVSD will not close current pool if a new one is built, but it would relieve pressure on pool

Quad City Pickleball Club:
- Added outdoor pickleball courts through partnerships has been great and is important
- Still a need for more indoor space
- Time for pickleball is very limited at the Bettendorf YMCA
- Life Fitness Center is tight on space behind the end line

Scott County YMCA:
- Recent renovation to Bettendorf YMCA was very successful. Membership grew by 50%
- Utica Ridge has doubled in membership since changing from a Gold’s Gym
- New 70,000 sf YMCA is coming to downtown Davenport
- In favor of a regional outdoor water park/feature (no others in the Quad Cities)
- In favor of an indoor 50m pool
- Smaller fitness clubs (Anytime, Snap, etc.) are starting to pop up and may impact business
- YMCA's market analysis indicates that their target market is saturated

Friend of Bettendorf Parks Foundation:
- Foundation has difficulty reaching those in need or those that would benefit from services

Bridge Club and Senior Card:
- Quiet, well-lit space
- Carpet is preferred to cut down on noise
- Space to run games for around 40 people
- A small kitchenette for snacks and warming items
- Sensitive to pricing
- Space needs to be available consistently
- Current center does is not a full or broad community center

Bettendorf Youth Baseball Association:
- Need a couple more fields or would like more lights at existing four-plex fields
- If field in Middle Park is lost, lighting of the four-plex would overcome field loss
- The YBA wants to offer options and help the community
- Affordability is critical for this group
- Indoor space is currently not needed. Indoor practice / training is done outside of the program.
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Bettendorf Youth Basketball Association / Bettendorf Girls Basketball Association:
• Currently they play at the middle school, but the program is growing ("busting at the seam")
• Affordability is critical for group
• Our team should reach out to others (Gary Thrash)

Piranhas Swim Club:
• Currently uses Pleasant Valley High School’s pool as home base
• Would support a new 50m pool built operated by the City for regional meets and long course programs
• Currently needing to travel 3 hours to get to a 50 meter pool for meets and training
• Team has to move locations based on programming conflicts / low-priority access

Piranhas Swim Club:
• Currently uses Pleasant Valley High School’s pool as home base
• Would support a new 50m pool built operated by the City for regional meets and long course programs
• Currently needing to travel 3 hours to get to a 50 meter pool for meets and training
• Team has to move locations based on programming conflicts / low-priority access

 FC America:
• Needs indoor open space for drills, futsal games
• Wants to be affordable and serve the broader community
• Currently believes that the Bettplex will be too expensive and will not be the right place for them
• Does not support the co-mingling of alcohol and youth sports

Lane 4 Aquatics:
• Currently uses Bettendorf High School’s pool as a home base
• Does not support a 50 meter pool
• Lap (competition) and recreation facilities need to be separate wells
• Ideally would be separated acoustically
• Supports warm water lesson / rec pool that would serve lessons and other flexible programming
• Parents would benefit from something to do (business center, fitness center) during lessons
• Water safety as a like skill is something that the community should support

The Bettendorf Group:
• Existing space works well for their purposes in size and location
• Hosts (6) 1-hour meetings a day
• Group is a community asset and tangentially contributes to quality of life in Bettendorf
• Location should be accessible by public transit as many attendees may have suspended licenses
• Private anonymous access to the space is needed
• Group is price sensitive and is self-supported through donations

TBK Sports Complex:
• Facility is geared towards regional tournaments, training and sports performance.
• Aimed at capturing a larger market traveling for sports academies and higher end programs
• Currently exploring options to capture senior revenue or other alternative revenue during weekdays
• A fitness center will be located on mezzanine
• Looking to open up a portion of the area around the fitness center to provide a walking route

Quad Cities Sled Hockey Association:
• Currently need more ice time for programming
• Adaptive sports programming could/should grow (Lacking in comparison to Chicago)
• Local fitness facilities do not have adaptive equipment or are planned to tightly

Bettendorf Community School District:
• Pleasant Valley and Bettendorf schools are rivals and may have issues sharing pools space at the same time
• Interested in a community pool.
• Currently pool facility will need to be heavily renovated or replaced in the next 5-6 years
• Runs life guarding training and PE units
• Middle Park location would be a good location
• Past off-campus programs (Fish Iowa) have been cancele due to expense of shuttling students

Tennis:
• Indoor tennis facilities have been dwindling; other than the (3) courts at LFC, (9) court Quad City Tennis
• Good local tennis programs (PVHS Girls were state champs)
• Patrons tend to age out of LFC and continue their advancement and Quad City Tennis Club
• Chances of a new tennis facility are remote, so tennis at the Life Fitness Center should try to be preserved

Other items mentioned:
• An indoor track facility could be a community asset or something similar to what was built in Sterling, IL
• More Deck Hockey space is desired for indoor winter activities
• More indoor activities in the winter in general is needed

Staff Concerns:
• New visibility / updated buildings are needed
• A consolidated office space would be a benefit
• There is a desire to keep Centennial Field along 23rd street
• Parking and elevators are an issue at facilities
• In need of ample, centralized storage
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Requests for Information:

We will be following up with the group to track down the following information:

1. Market & Operational Data for Analysis
   - Historical revenues and expenses for existing Parks facilities (five years)
   - Participation numbers for existing programs and leagues
   - Utilization data / schedules for existing facilities
   - List of events / programs that cannot be accommodated currently, but could with new facility
   - List of existing competitive public and private recreation facilities in the market
   - Hunden will also reach out to understand what distribution lists

2. Existing Facility Drawings
   - Life Fitness Center
   - Splash Landing
   - Goettsch Community Center

3. Contact Information for Social Media / Public Relations Contacts

4. Photos for the website

5. Other stakeholder contacts that were not able to attend our initial visit.

The following is a list contacts that were mentioned to reach out to. Please provide any additional contacts you would like us to reach out to and provide contact info for the following if available:

- Sue Johnson – Life Fitness Center Advisory Group
- Gary Thrapp – Beyond the Baseline
- Raul Cervantes
- Bob Juarez – QC Adaptive Sports Association
- Jim Russell

Next Steps:

I will be reaching out to schedule our next meeting dates. In a slight revision from our 2-month look ahead, we would like to schedule a trip to meeting with Bettendorf High School and Pleasant Valley High School leadership groups, meet with a focus groups of students, and tour their fitness and pool facilities. We would propose the following agenda over a one or two day period, either on the 5/16-5/17 or 5/23-5/24.

Example Agenda:

9:30am – 10:00am : Tour of Fitness & Pool Facility – School #1
10:00am – 11:00am : Partnership Meeting – School #1
11:25am – 12:25pm : Student Focus Group – School #1
12:30pm – 1:00pm : Tour of Fitness & Pool Facility – School #2
1:00pm – 2:00pm : Partnership Meeting – School #2
3:30pm – 4:30pm : Student Focus Group – School #2
5:00pm – 6:00pm : Steering Committee Meeting #02

* Perkins+Will will provide pizza and drinks
MEETING MINUTES - PLEASANT VALLEY PARTNERSHIP MEETING

By: Brent Ross  Date: June 21, 2018
Meeting Date: 5/16/2018  Project Name: Bettendorf Rec Feasibility Study
Meeting Time: 11:00am  Project Number: 021423.000
Meeting Location: Skype Call  Attendees: Jim Spelaug, D'Anne Kroemer, Mike Zimmer, Brian Strusz, Lindsey Peckinpaugh, Brent Ross
Next Meeting Date: TBD  CC: Decker Ploehn, Liz Solis-Willis, Kim Radcliff, Michael Montgomery, Rob Hunden

DISCUSSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Dr. Spelhaug provided some history related to Pleasant Valley High School and aquatics in the community noting that originally in 1987 the PVHS pool was designed for school use and the use of multiple competitive swim clubs. Conflicts over peak hours usage arose. St. Augustana College handled community swim program and provided learn to swim and water aerobics courses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>PV Community Schools is receptive to a partnership but is concerned about the specifics of a partnership model.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Bettendorf Swim Club Lane 4 is coach owned, PV Piranhas is directed by a Board. At one time clubs looked to merge, but this arrangement fell apart. Lane 4 Club only serves Bettendorf school students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>PVHS and Piranhas would have no issues sharing a pool at peak use times with Bettendorf HS or Lane 4. D'Anne has verified with the state governing athletic associations that this is permissible as long as the facility is “separate but equal”. A 50M pool would require a moveable bulkhead to accommodate this. A diving well will also be required with 1M springboard for girls. Simultaneous dive practice would not be feasible without separate wells. PVSC could keep dive practice at high school or rotate days with BCSD.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

05  Dr. Spelhaug noted that for a partnership to work for PVCS, the partnership would have to be fair and equal for the PVCS, the City, and Bettendorf Community School District. Noting the following optimal partnership criteria:
- Equal capital contribution from all partners
- Appropriate project timing
- Unbiased and qualified operator to market, schedule, and maximize utilization
- Operational costs leveraged based on actual utilization
- Priority scheduling for practice & home meets

06  He discussed a model where all three partners contributed equally to the capital construction cost of the facility, and noted that the partnership would be contingent on the State's passing of the “SAVE” (Secure an Advanced Vision for Education) $0.01 sales and services tax initiative for school infrastructure funding. He also stressed the importance of a qualified and unbiased facility operator that can oversee maintenance, scheduling, and marketing the facility to maximize its utilization and provide fair access to the founding partners.

07  Dr. Spelhaug noted that PVHS is not interested in subsidizing the pool operations and that the operational fees would need to be levied based on the school district’s actual usage. The district would look to use the facility for swim team practices, home meets, and Piranhas swim clubs practices/meets and support in the hosting of regional meets. Physical education classes and use by other sports teams would remain in the existing school pool.

08  D'Anne and Dr. Spelhaug also noted the physical attributes of the facility they would be interested in partnering in noting the following characteristics:
- 50M pool with diving well
- Moveable bulkhead for use by concurrent teams or clubs
- 500 spectator seats for dual meets with capacity to grow to 1000 seats for regional meets
- Flexible, daily use locker rooms (not dedicated) with showers
- Team flex/meeting room
- Deck space for dry land training and wall hooks for kit back storage
- Neutral facility that is not branded to one team or club
- Parking, restrooms, concessions to support peak spectator load
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>PVCSD noted that they believe the community is in need of a long course pool. Residents currently have to travel to Iowa City (approx. 60 miles) to compete long course. Scott County Park (approx. 12 miles north) has a 50M outdoor pool and have rejected past studies to enclose the pool. The swim lesson overflow is handled at that facility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dr. Spelhaug indicated that partnering with the TBK Bank Sports Complex as an extension of the City’s partnership may be worth exploring. He noted that locating the aquatic facility near TBK would provide adequate parking, convenient access for regional meets, and an equitable location for all potential partners. He also noted that TBK Bank’s operators likely have the wherewithal and connections to market the facility for rentals and events to offset some operational costs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>PVCSD noted that a history of healthy collaboration exists between PVCSD and BCSD leadership and that PVCSD feels that teams can coexist in a practice environment with the leadership of the coaching staffs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>D’Anne noted a partnership between Iowa City High School and the City of Coralville for a pool that the team can look into for agreement details.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>D’Anne noted that she is the Conference Scheduler and the schedule is set 2-years in advance. She noted that conflicts between home dual meets can be managed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The Girl’s swimming season runs from early August-early November. Boy’s season runs from early November-mid February. Junior High programs runs from early January-end in mid-March at Spring Break. The Piranhas swim club is in the pool year round.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Dr. Spelhaug noted that a referendum will be required for PVCSD to fund the capital for their contribution to a pool project if the “SAVE” program does not pass at the State level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>In terms of broader community needs, Dr. Spelhaug and the group noted that they believe most indoor recreation needs in the community are served by the Bettendorf YMCA, but that there is a need for additional indoor tennis courts. They noted that Life Fitness could be successful if converted back to a six-court indoor facility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MEETING MINUTES - BETTENDORF PARTNERSHIP MEETING

By: Brent Ross  
Date: June 21, 2018  
Meeting Date: 5/22/2018  
Project Name: Bettendorf Rec Feasibility Study  
Meeting Time: 11:00am  
Project Number: 021423.000  
Meeting Location: Skype Call  
Attendees: Dallon Christensen, Chris Andrus, Colin Wikan, Brent Ross, Lindsey Peckinpaugh  
Next Meeting Date: TBD  
CC: Decker Ploehn, Liz Solis-Willis, Kim Radcliff

### DISCUSSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 01 | Brent and Lindsey had some brief time with Mike Raso on 5.16.18 he noted the following:  
• BCSD interested in capital contribution and not ongoing operational cost participation  
• TKB site works best for PVHS but not BHS. Middle Park is good for BHS  
• BHS owns land behind Life Fitness that could work |  |
| 02 | Colin noted that he has heard of some pool partnerships that have not ultimately worked out due to scheduling conflicts and competition for peak hours. He noted that (2) Davenport schools have partnered with Y’s and that in reality the partnerships have failed. |  |
| 03 | BHS peak hours 5:45-7:45am and 3:30-5:30pm. He noted that the school cannot forego access to the pool during these hours. |  |
| 04 | When asked about shared use of a pool with the community or PVHS at the same time during peak peak hours, Colin said that he’s not sure how the Coaches will receive that. They likened it to the Cubs/White Sox practicing together. Chris noted that the District must give too much credence to Coaches’ preference as those and that “we should be designing for the coach 10 years from now”. |  |

05 The team noted that the Coaches and Athletic Directors from both schools would need to have a detailed conversation about the feasibility of practicing in the same pool at the same time.  
06 It was noted the PVHS expressed that they believe this is feasible with a moveable bulkhead in a 50M pool. BHS noted that some visual privacy, perhaps via a divider curtain, would probably help their coaches feel more comfortable. They noted that both schools are highly competitive and privacy during training may be important.  
07 It was also noted that D’Anne Kroemer has verified with both state high school sport governing bodies that concurrent practice in a single body of water is permissible if the facility is “separate but equal” to both programs.  
08 Dallon noted that the District is in the middle of significant facility upgrades, and are looking how to adapt the existing pool space in lieu of expanding.  
09 It was noted that BHS offers swimming for fitness courses, lifeguarding certificate courses, and swim is a PE requirement. They also host elementary school kids for swimming. The cost associated with transporting BHS kids for PE courses would have to be part of the partnership considerations.  
10 The existing PHS pool is utilized year round. AM and PM before and school hours are used by the swim teams during the school year. Lane 4 Aquatics uses the pool daily, and year round.  
11 The BHS pool is in poor condition due to its age. The District will need to make a significant investment to repair or replace the pool in the coming years. The pool was built in 1973 and has had a structural assessment completed which determined that the pool was not constructed on deep foundations and has experienced some settling. The shell is in fair structural condition but a hairline crack along the pool length was observed. The pool has had significant leaking losing up to 4,000 gallons every 3 days. The structural assessment noted the most of the leaking is around the joint between the pool shell and metal gutter trough. The joint has been caulked and water maintained below the joint line which has minimized leaking. Leaking is also noted around the perimeter of through wall valves and fittings. It was noted that the caulk is a short term solution and subject to vandalism reducing its effectiveness.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>BHS believes that Middle Park is a fair and equitable location for a pool partnership. It should be noted that Middle Park is 1.2 miles away from BHS and 1.8 miles from PVHS. BCSD noted that the believe Middle Park to be the best location to serve the community needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>If a 50M pool is pursued, the group indicated that spectator seating for 200 is probably sufficient, but that regional meets will require up to 1,000 spectators.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A single shared diving area would be agreeable to BHS. Schedules for use would need to be worked out between the schools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The group discussed operations and noted that a third-party operator may be feasible but mixing for profit and not-for-profit interests may be delicate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Perkins+Will noted that the team is aware of other pool partnerships and will explore the details of those partnerships and how the utilization is working out.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>BCSD noted that they believe they would be willing to contribute some capital upfront towards construction and that amount would have to be framed around what it would cost the high school to construct a new facility on their own.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Operationally, the starting point for financial contribution would be to estimate what the current and ongoing operational costs are for the high school’s existing pool functioning in a steady state.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The group discussed the spectator seating, parking/traffic and hotel demand if regional tournaments are targeted for a new 50M pool. The idea of locating it near TBK Bank Sports Complex was discussed. BCSD noted that they are unsure about this location and that it would seem more beneficial to PVHS. However, this is not necessarily a deal-breaker. BHS is 4.1 miles from TBK, while PVHS is 3.2 miles away.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting minutes - YMCA phone call

By: Brent Ross  
Date: June 21, 2018

Meeting Date: 6/20/2018  
Project Name: Bettendorf Rec Feasibility Study

Meeting Time: 1:00pm CT  
Project Number: 021423.000

Meeting Location: Phone Call  
Attendees: Brad Martell, Brent Ross, Lindsey Peckinpaugh

Next Meeting Date: TBD  
CC: Decker Ploehn, Liz Solis-Willis, Kim Radcliff, Michael Montgomery, Rob Hunden

Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>The YMCA is open to being part of partnering discussions. Brad expressed that the YMCA is not looking to subsidize an aquatic facility. However, they could be an operator for the facility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Rough estimates from the YMCA believes that a well run 50m pool facility will lose 250k a year and a well run 8 lane 25 yard pool will lose 125k a year in operations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>The Scott County Y has partnered with the West Davenport School. That pool is underutilized. Outside of school hours, the water sits empty outside of some water aerobics programming.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>The Bettendorf Family Y pool is well utilized. A new facility will likely not alleviate their peak pressures. Their pool is packed from 3pm – 7pm and this conflicts with HS swimming schedules.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>The Scotty County Y is also pursuing a new Y in downtown Davenport that would contain a pool. Brad noted that this currently being funded by a $20M campaign. Donors had expressed interest in a long course pool, but it is not part of their plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Brad believes that another short course pool in the area is not an attractive proposition. However, a 50m long course pool would be attractive and fill a market need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Brad believes that Bettendorf would be able to attract regional meets, especially with the added development being spurred on by the TBK Sports Complex.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Brad spoke of examples in Indiana (Munster, Fishers HS, and IUPUI) of 50m pools that had 10 lanes and used 2 lanes on the side for cool-down and warm-up. This would save on the cost of building a separate pool well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Brad mentioned other examples of 50m pool partnerships in Topeka and Lawrence, Kansas. The facility in Lawrence has an 8 lane 50m, 6 lane 25y, and an indoor water park. It serves the local community and support 4 high schools in the area. The facility in Topeka is a 50m pool that supports local high schools and was also supported by some generous donations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Brad also noted that the Y has a competitive swim team of about 50 kids that swim in the &quot;Y&quot; league for free. They pay $5 to participate in the statewide meet and he believes this program is a cost effective option for families that cannot afford to participate in USA Swimming.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Meeting Minutes - Pool Partnership Summit**

By: Brent Ross  
Date: July 5, 2018

Meeting Date: 6/28/2018  
Project Name: Bettendorf Rec Feasibility Study

Meeting Time: 11:00am  
Project Number: 021423.000

Meeting Location: Bettendorf City Hall - Conference Room  
Attendees: See Below

Next Meeting Date: TBD  
CC: Attendees

**Attendees:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ini.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Decker Ploehn</td>
<td>City of Bettendorf</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dploehn@bettendorf.org">dploehn@bettendorf.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Liz Solis-Willis</td>
<td>City of Bettendorf</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lsoles@bettendorf.org">lsoles@bettendorf.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kim Radcliff</td>
<td>City of Bettendorf</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kradcliff@bettendorf.org">kradcliff@bettendorf.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Steve Grimes</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stevegrimes@yahoo.com">stevegrimes@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Mike Raso</td>
<td>Bettendorf Community School District</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mraso@bettendorf.k12.iu.us">mraso@bettendorf.k12.iu.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Colin Wikan</td>
<td>Bettendorf Community School District</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cwikan@bettendorf.k12.iu.us">cwikan@bettendorf.k12.iu.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Dallon Christensen</td>
<td>Bettendorf Community School District</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dalchristensen@bettendorf.k12.iu.us">dalchristensen@bettendorf.k12.iu.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Jim Spelhaug</td>
<td>Pleasant Valley Community School District</td>
<td>speilhaug <a href="mailto:jim@pleasval.k12.iu.us">jim@pleasval.k12.iu.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D’Anne Kroemer</td>
<td>Pleasant Valley Community School District</td>
<td>kroemer <a href="mailto:danne@pleasval.k12.iu.us">danne@pleasval.k12.iu.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Mike Zimmer</td>
<td>Pleasant Valley Community School District</td>
<td>zimmer <a href="mailto:mike@pleasval.k12.iu.us">mike@pleasval.k12.iu.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>Brad Martell</td>
<td>Scott County YMCA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bmartell@scottcountyfamily.org">bmartell@scottcountyfamily.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Lindsey Peckinpaugh</td>
<td>Perkins+Will</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Lindsey.Peckinpaugh@perkinswill.com">Lindsey.Peckinpaugh@perkinswill.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Brent Ross</td>
<td>Perkins+Will</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Brent.Ross@perkinswill.com">Brent.Ross@perkinswill.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rob Hunden</td>
<td>Hudson Strategic Partners</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rhunden@hundenpartners.com">rhunden@hundenpartners.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>Michael Montgomery</td>
<td>Hudson Strategic Partners</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mmontgomery@hundenpartners.com">mmontgomery@hundenpartners.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>P+W stated they have had trouble reaching Mike Sampson at TBK to understand if they have any interest in being involved in operation a 50m pool. Decker stated he could try to reach Doug with TBK.</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Decker stated that when TBK looked at water they could not make a case for it. Can TBK make enough money to cover operational costs? It would likely need to be subsidized.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>There is synergy with TBK with shared marketing staff and parking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Steve Grimes noted that the TBK group does not have expertise in the area of aquatics. Like their other programs, they would need to recruit someone to bring the expertise in-house.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>The group would like to understand what the broader economic impact of sports tourism would be around a 50m pool. (Hotel rooms, Dollars spent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Dubuque is currently pursuing the construction of a 50m pool and that may compete for the market. Group is looking to understand where the site of the pool will be. P+W to research.</td>
<td>P+W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>P+W presented case studies of pools with similar partnerships.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>The question was asked on the Edmond, OK pool case study whether or not the high schools have pools. P+W to research.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>The group would like to what kind of operational loss would be seen at a 50m pool. HSP presented some informal numbers breaking down into categories. HSP to research further for Bettendorf example. The group would like to understand expenses associated with maintenance, repairs, salary, salaries (full-time, part-time, benefits, etc.)</td>
<td>HSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>In an ideal world, Bettendorf and Pleasant Valley High Schools would maintain their existing facilities. However, due to the differing condition and concerns of the pools, this may not be possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>TBK location would also make sense for recreation pool as hotel guests could receive vouchers for pool access. (Vouchers could also be used for the existing pool facilities at YMCA's)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pleasant Valley is open to exploring operational cost ratios based on the different use between the schools. However, the space must be neutral ground in appearance and theme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Splash Landing subsidy may be approximately $145-160K, Life Fitness Center may be subsidized between $285-350K. The subsidies for these facilities are something of consequence and applying these dollars to a more efficiently run and better utilized facility would be better benefit to the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Combining both school district’s needs and the City’s needs in a referendum will increase the chances of passing referendum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>An example of an indoor/outdoor pool in Marshalltown, IA was mentioned. This facility hosts state swim meets. P+W to research as a Case Study.</td>
<td>P+W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Iowa City facilities typically host state meets as well. A facility in Bettendorf will likely not draw state swim meets due to its geographic location.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>P+W asked parties to fill out questionnaire related to expectation for pool partnership. Form attached to the minutes. Parties to fill out by July 20th. Groups should assume a hypothetical $20 million capital construction cost and $250k/year in operational loss. Please note budgets are hypothetical.</td>
<td>BCSD, PVCSD, City, YMCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>City could approach Gaming Authority for financial assistance. There are no regulations for final use. However, the group is interested in projects with multiple districts. The Waterfront Convention Center received $3 million from the Gaming Authority.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>City currently owns 10 acres near TBK north of I-80. City believes that TBK will buy this land in the near future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The site near TBK could also be explored for an indoor/outdoor regional water park. Something similar to Wacky Waters that was shut down.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2 partnerships may be possible with YMCA and TBK building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Devils Glen &amp; Tanglefoot Drive at the YMCA was discussed. Outdoor water and Community Center could be placed on site of existing Genesis Building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>A competition natatorium or rec &amp; competition pool could be considered at a site near the TBK Bank Sports Complex and a partnership would be explored with the TBK group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The site near TBK could also be explored for an indoor/outdoor regional water park. Something similar to Wacky Waters that was shut down.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>There is some doubt that a 50m facility would fit on land adjacent to TBK in order to share parking. P+W to test fit all sites for 50m facility to understand if that eliminates any. Middle Park, Devil’s Glen &amp; Tanglefoot, and TBK.</td>
<td>P+W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>A “PERL” (Public Education and Recreation Levy) bond could be pursued for funding. This could contribute to operational expenses. A simple majority vote would be needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Brad Martell called in after school districts had left and discussed the following.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>A site behind the Utica Ridge YMCA could house an 8 lane 25 yard pool. There is probably not enough room for a 50m facility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Bettendorf YMCA does not have daycare on site, just child watch and camps.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>In general, there is need for more preschool space. Pleasant Valley in particular is growing and needs more preschools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Meeting Minutes - TBK/Bettplex Group Call

**By:** Brent Ross  
**Date:** August 16, 2018

**Meeting Date:** 8/18/2018  
**Project Name:** Bettendorf Rec Feasibility Study

**Meeting Time:** 1:00pm CT  
**Project Number:** 021423.000

**Meeting Location:** Skype Call  
**Attendees:** Brent Ross (P+W), Michael Montgomery (HSP), Doug Kratz (TBK), Mike Sampson (TBK)

**Next Meeting Date:** TBD  
**CC:** Lindsey Peckinpaugh, Decker Ploehn, Liz Solis-Willis

### Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 01 | Location:  
- The site south of the baseball fields that Kevin Koellner had outlined and sent over is available. Currently TBK has the option to buy this piece of property back from the City.  
- The land to the east of the highlighted property is owned by Kevin Koellner of Build to Suit. Doug stated that its use as a commercial development is likely a higher and better use than the aquatic facility we’ve discussed. It is doubtful that Kevin would change his plans for this lot that is currently being developed.  
- When asked about how much acreage cost, Doug said it could range widely depending on where the land was located. He thought that the City may end up paying around 30k/acre on the outskirts of town that could be used to satisfy the conservatorship requirements imposed on Middle Park. | |
| 02 | Pool Size & Configuration:  
- Doug thought that the school partners interested in water should determine what they would need for a facility.  
- Doug stated that either the outdoor aquatic facility or the indoor aquatic component would be welcome on that site. They would love to have both. | |
| 03 | Capital Contributions:  
- Doug stated that he wouldn’t necessarily say no to participating from a capital contribution standpoint. However, in this instance as an operational partner, it may not make sense for the Bettplex group to contribute to the capital. | |
| 04 | Operational Contributions:  
- Doug’s initial thought was that Bettplex Group would be transparent and open to a negotiated base fee with a financial incentive structure based on performance.  
- When presented with the notion that the school partners were interested in an outside operator having financial incentive to operate the facility in an efficient and well utilized manner, Doug said his group would embrace a financial incentive arrangement.  
- A firm understanding of the cost of operation would need to happen to discuss how this would work.  
- Doug advocated for us to look at and benchmark the 50 meter Iowa City facility along with other similar-type facilities throughout the nation. | |
| 05 | Utilization:  
- The Bettplex Group would need to understand other pool operations before they can truly weigh in on utilization.  
- Doug discussed partner memberships or deals that would allow fitness users at the TBK Sports Complex fitness facility to have access to the pools.  
- Mike sees the potential for swimming camps and other training programs to be setup at the facility. | |
| 06 | Other:  
- Doug and Mike continued to express interest in the partnership and discussed many synergies between an aquatics facility and the TBK Sports Complex. (Shared parking, recreational pool use by traveling families coming to TBK, commercial development surrounding TBK to support sports tourism for regional aquatic tournaments, close fitness facility for pool users)  
- The Bettplex Group would need to go out and find the right person/people to operate and market the facility. | |
**AP-01.2 Steering Committee Meetings**

**MEETING MINUTES - STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING**

By: Brent Ross  
Date: July 5, 2018

Meeting Date: 6/28/2018  
Project Name: Bettendorf Rec Feasibility Study

Meeting Time: 5:00pm  
Project Number: 021423.000

Meeting Location: Bettendorf City Hall - Council Chambers  
Attendees: See Below

Next Meeting Date: TBD  
CC: Steering Committee, John Holbert, Patrick Eikenberry, Jason Holdorf, George Deines, Michael Montgomery, Rob Hunden

**ATTENDEES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ini.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Decker Ploehn</td>
<td>City of Bettendorf</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dploehn@bettendorf.org">dploehn@bettendorf.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Liz Solis-Willis</td>
<td>City of Bettendorf - Parks &amp; Rec</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lsolis@bettendorf.org">lsolis@bettendorf.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kim Radcliff</td>
<td>City of Bettendorf</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kradcliff@bettendorf.org">kradcliff@bettendorf.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Frank Baden</td>
<td>City of Bettendorf</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fbaden@bettendorf.org">fbaden@bettendorf.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scott Naumann</td>
<td>City of Bettendorf</td>
<td><a href="mailto:snaumann@bettendorf.org">snaumann@bettendorf.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Steve Wilger</td>
<td>Park Board Commissioner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wilgersp@gmail.com">wilgersp@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Tim Carroll</td>
<td>Park Board Commissioner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tcarroll@bettendorf.org">tcarroll@bettendorf.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Steve Grimes</td>
<td>Community Member</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stevegrimes@yahoo.com">stevegrimes@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Brent Scogland</td>
<td>Community Member</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brentscogland@ruhlhomes.com">brentscogland@ruhlhomes.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Julie Martin</td>
<td>Community Member</td>
<td><a href="mailto:juliefick@gmail.com">juliefick@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Lindsey Peckinpaugh</td>
<td>Perkins+Will</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Lindsey.Peckinpaugh@perkinswill.com">Lindsey.Peckinpaugh@perkinswill.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Brent Ross</td>
<td>Perkins+Will</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Brent.Ross@perkinswill.com">Brent.Ross@perkinswill.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rob Hunden</td>
<td>Hunden Strategic Partners</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rhunden@hundenpartners.com">rhunden@hundenpartners.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Montgomery</td>
<td>Hunden Strategic Partners</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mmontgomery@hundenpartners.com">mmontgomery@hundenpartners.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Derek Bratrud</td>
<td>Hunden Strategic Partners</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Dbratrud@hundenpartners.com">Dbratrud@hundenpartners.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Derek Bratrud</td>
<td>Hunden Strategic Partners</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Dbratrud@hundenpartners.com">Dbratrud@hundenpartners.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>HSP presented updates to Market &amp; Performance Analysis with new performance information on Life Fitness Center and Splash Landing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>HSP to remove depreciation from operational figures as it is not something that is funded in the City’s budget. Expense for maintenance and improvements come out of capital budgets.</td>
<td>HSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Note about volleyball in presentation is misleading. Only the summer volleyball program is no longer being hosted by the Parks and Recreation Department.</td>
<td>HSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Life Fitness Center membership/revenues were discussed. Even though memberships increased in 2018, revenue dropped. This may be due to 125 city employees receiving free membership. There is also a jump in senior membership at reduced membership fees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Case studies within presentation were not presented. Case studies are included in the attached presentation for review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Survey questions were reviewed. Comments have been translated to the attached PDF of survey. Survey to be revised and distributed for comment.</td>
<td>P+W / HSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>P+W presented summary of what was discussed in partnership meetings. Overall, talks are positive and will continue to progress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>With Dr. Spelhaug retiring soon, it will be critical to advance the partnership conversation quickly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>A partnership with both schools and the City will be powerful and presents the City of Bettendorf with a unique opportunity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>P+W presented a preview of what was to be presented to the City at the Town Hall meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AP-02.1 Pool Considerations

**POOL - THINGS TO CONSIDER**

**Location**
- Site footprint will be influenced by pool size/spectator load
- Middle Park (1.2m from BHS, 1.8m to PVHS)
- TBK Bank Sports Complex (4.1m to BHS, 3.2m to PVHS)

**Scheduling**
- Schools will want priority use before and after school practice times
- Schools will want to host dual meets after hours during seasons
- Regional Meet / 3rd Party Operators will want to host competitions over the entire week
- Fitness users will want regular/consistent access to the pool

**Water Temperature**
- Recreation, Learn to Swim Classes, Fitness Classes, etc. will want a warmer temperature
- Competitive swimmers will want cooler water temperatures

**Configuration**
- Younger recreation users may want amenities like zero-depth entry, shallow entry
- Competitive and high school swimmers will have set depths

**Concurrent uses**
- Single body of water with concurrent competitive use will require “separate but equal” accommodations
- Diving wells would have to be duplicated or rotating peak use between programs
- Seniors will want to be separated from younger children (Acoustics, Splashing, etc.)
KEY PARTNERING BENEFITS

• Potential to serve shared or complementary program needs and customer bases
• Potential to pool resources (money, expertise, land, staff, etc...)
• Potential to accelerate facility development
• Potential to minimize risk to a single entity or company
• Potential to minimize duplication of facilities within a community
• Potential to serve a broader population segment

KEY PARTNERING CHALLENGES

• Requires operational agreement and substantial pre-planning and cooperation
• Can reduce partners’ ability to react to changing market conditions
• Requires provisions to cover maintenance, repairs, and operational deficits
• Partnerships reduce revenue
• Requires provisions to address a partners’ inability to meet their commitment
• Partnerships may impact other ancillary relationships or partnerships

PARTNERSHIP SPECTRUM

- Full Partner: Capital for construction & operational acumen
- Rental Partner 1: Specific facility wants, capital to fund, long term leaser of space
- Operational Partner: No capital but potential for operations partner
- Funding Partner: Capital for construction no operational expertise
- Program Provider 1: Facility requests, programmer (contract)
- Program Provider 2: Facility requests, programmer (employee)
- Daily User: Individual or group
- Rental Partner 2: Specific facility wants, long term leaser of space
- Future Member: Individual or group
- Facility Advocate: Non-user
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AP-02.2 Partnership Considerations

**City of Bettendorf**
- Interested in partnership opportunities for indoor and outdoor aquatics
- Competitive swim not the City's main interest in a facility, but interested in
- Open to an outside pool operator that would manage the facility in order for it to run efficiently and market effectively
- Looking to understand the demand for access to indoor leisure water

**Bettendorf High School**
- Would be open to 50 meter if others thought it was useful
- Looking to replace their existing pool 25yd (44 years old) or use the space for other program needs
- Programs are very competitive and don't want to have others see how they train
- Don't design just for the current coaches
- May look to pay more upfront and have reduced operational costs
- Physical education / Lifeguarding classes would be dropped depending on location
- A location other than Middle Park is not a deal breaker

**Pleasant Valley High School**
- Believes Bettendorf community would be a good location for a 50 meter pool
- Swims clubs have proven difficult to manage, relationships are constantly changing
- Relationship between schools is healthy
- PV would keep their existing 25M pool operational, use a new facility for practice and meets
- PV currently expects Bettendorf to keep their pool operational to keep things equitable
- Prefers capital and operational costs split equitably
- If the deal is inequitable between school districts, community support may be a challenge
- Funding hinges on sales tax hike renewal ("SAVE")
- PV would be open to / encourage a third party operator (TBK) to market and host events to keep the facility as profitable as possible

**YMCA**
- Believes Bettendorf community would be a good location for a 50 meter pool
- Believes funding for 25 yard facility would be unattractive as a project to community and donors as it does not add anything new.
- YMCA runs a competitive swim team in the Y's own league, approx. 50 kids
- A new facility would not alleviate pressures on their current pool at Bettendorf YMCA
- Pool is underutilized at West Davenport School (Existing YMCA Partnership)
- Would be willing to be an operator for the facility.
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AP-02.3 Partnership Comments

LOCATION

BETTENDORF PARKS & REC
- Anywhere in Bettendorf!

PLEASANT VALLEY COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
- Within 3 miles of the respective school district
- Legally drivable with a school permit

BETTENDORF COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
- Desired location - current Life Fitness Center/Splash Landing location at intersections of Spruce Hills Drive and Middle Road
- Secondary location - Forest Grove/TKB Sports Complex location

POOL SIZES & CONFIGURATION

BETTENDORF PARKS & REC
- Comparable to Splash Landing, but open for more options (i.e. Lazy River)
- Open to a competitive pool configuration, but only with the interest and participation of other stakeholders

PLEASANT VALLEY COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
- 50m with a movable bulkhead and diving well
- Diving well could be located in the middle or at one end

BETTENDORF COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
- Necessary – IAHSAA configuration of 25 yards
- Secondary – 50 meters with ability to use a bulkhead to create a 25-yard configuration
**Capital Contributions**

**Bettendorf Parks & Rec**
- Pending a Bond Referendum – Support a rough estimate of $20 million

**Pleasant Valley Community School District**
- Capital contributions all assume the passage of an extension of the one cent sales tax and access to borrowing capacity
- PV would contribute $6-7 million or (1/3 of cost)

**Bettendorf Community School District**
- Our current facilities plan shows a budget of $4.2M for upgrades to the pool at Bettendorf High School. This would be the starting point for our discussions.

**Operational Contributions**

**Bettendorf Parks & Rec**
- Based on the current budget that includes the operations subsidy
- Most interested in a Splash Landing type solution

**Pleasant Valley Community School District**
- Operational subsidy of $75k per year
- Teams do not pay access fees

**Bettendorf Community School District**
- We would need to more accurately identify the estimated operational costs for the current pool at BHS to provide an appropriate answer...
  Should an acceptable agreement be reached, the district would assume a fair amount of operating costs reflective of what we are currently using today.
Utilization Requirements

Bettendorf Parks & Rec
- Pending the configuration, city’s priority is still a recreational environment
- No specific interest in competitive water
- Rates depend on the marked and pending referendum

Pleasant Valley Community School District
- Schools would need to have equitable access for both practice and competition
- Schools would have the highest scheduling priority

Bettendorf Community School District
- Competitions would be placed as the highest priority for the district. Competitions related to the high school governing bodies (i.e. district meets, state meets) would need to also take priority.
- Schedule that allows curriculum-related activities during the day.

Other

Bettendorf Parks & Rec
- Interested in the data Perkins+Will finds, provides, and recommends
- Interested in results of the survey

Pleasant Valley Community School District
- Minimum seating capacity of 500
- Neutral Facility (no school affiliation)
- Provisions for equipment use and storage
- Parking for a minimum of 350 cars

Bettendorf Community School District
- Practices would need to be arranged so our swimming teams would not be visible to other programs practicing in the facility.
- Timeline is a concern
AP-03.1 Community Survey Overview

- Online surveys were distributed to Bettendorf residents on July 19, 2018
- Surveys also distributed at Goettsch Community Center and library
- Results updated as of September 20, 2018
- 2,426 total responses (+ 61 responses)

Survey Summary

- **Current Challenges**: Respondents indicated that the physical quality of the space (age, outdated equipment) is the biggest challenge facing existing Bettendorf facilities
- **Area Facilities**: Nearly 50 percent of respondents are utilizing the Bettendorf Family YMCA for their fitness and recreational needs
- **Facility Components**: A running/walking track, outdoor pool, cardio equipment, and indoor leisure pool would be the most utilized components of a new recreation facility, according to respondents
- **Facility Utilization**: More than half of all respondents indicated that they would utilize a new Bettendorf recreation/aquatic complex a few times per week or more
- **Support**: 68 percent of respondents indicated that they were either “supportive” or “extremely supportive” of a new community recreation center development in Bettendorf
- Respondents believe that Bettendorf deserves a facility that is up to the standards of the rest of the City
- Citizens of all ages should feel welcome in a new community facility, from teenagers to seniors
- It is important that the new facility provide spaces for non-sports/recreation - music and art must be considered
- Bettendorf currently lacks quality meeting rooms and community spaces - this facility could fill that gap
- A central location would be preferred. Citizens are happy with the accessibility of existing facilities
- While there is excitement about the prospect of a new facility, there is concern from citizens that membership and program costs will increase
Life fitness center

- 60 percent of respondents never utilize the Life Fitness Center

- Those that are familiar with the Life Fitness Center generally view its physical condition as adequate
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**Goettsch community center**

- The majority of respondents (70 percent) never utilize the Goettsch Community Center.

- Those respondents that are familiar with the Community Center view its physical condition as low-quality.
Splash Landing Family Aquatic Center

- 61 percent of respondents utilize Splash Landing Family Aquatic Center a few times per year or more

- Respondents indicated a more favorable view of the physical condition of Splash Landing compared to Life Fitness Center and Goetsch Community Center
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Utilization (Space & Program)

- Other than Splash Landing Aquatic Center, the top spaces utilized at existing Parks and Recreation facilities include the running/walking track and gymnasium.

- More than 20 percent of respondents participate in community special events and youth sports leagues offered by the City of Bettendorf Parks and Recreation Department.
Challenges

- Respondents indicated that the physical quality of the space (age, outdated equipment) is the biggest challenge facing existing Bettendorf facilities.

- Respondents indicated that the primary deficiencies within the entire Bettendorf market are price and lack of aquatic facilities.
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Facilities

- Nearly 50 percent of respondents are utilizing the Bettendorf Family YMCA for their fitness and recreational needs.

- Bettendorf Family YMCA and Splash Landing are the two primary aquatic facilities in the market.
Membership

- The majority of respondents utilize family memberships at existing fitness facilities, followed by adult memberships.

- 56 percent of respondents who utilize family memberships pay between $41 and $70 per month.
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Membership

- 58 percent of respondents who utilize adult memberships pay between $21 and $50 per month.

- Nearly 30 percent of respondents who utilize senior memberships pay less than $10 per month.
Utilization factors

- Respondents indicated that price point and location are the two most important factors when selecting fitness and recreation facilities

- A running/walking track, outdoor pool, cardio equipment, and indoor leisure pool would be the most-utilized components of a new recreation facility, according to respondents
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PROGRAM COMPONENTS

- Respondents' primary interest in community spaces would be for parties

- Respondents indicated that they would primarily utilize a new recreation facility for fitness memberships, classes, and lessons
MEMBERSHIP

• More than half of all respondents indicated that they would pay for a family membership at a new community recreation center

• 50 percent of respondents indicated that they would spend between $41 and $70 for a monthly family membership at a new facility
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Membership

- Nearly 70 percent of respondents indicated that they would spend between $21 and $50 for a monthly adult membership.

- 62 percent of respondents indicated that they would be willing to spend between $21 and $50 for a monthly senior membership at a new facility.
Outdoor aquatic center

• Respondents indicated the highest interest in a lazy river and wave pool at a new outdoor aquatics facility

• More than half of all respondents indicated that they would utilize a new Bettendorf recreation/aquatic complex a few times per week or more
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Outdoor aquatic center

- Less than 10 percent of respondents indicated that they would travel more than 15 minutes from the current location at Middle Park to a new aquatic facility.

- 48 percent of respondents indicated interest in a season pass membership at a new outdoor aquatic facility.
OUTDOOR AQUATIC CENTER

- Majority of respondents indicated an willingness to spend between $51 and $100 for a family season-long pass.

- 58 percent of respondents indicated a willingness to spend between $26 and $75 for a single season pass.
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Outdoor aquatic center

- 68 percent of respondents indicated that they were either “supportive” or “extremely supportive” of a new community recreation center development in Bettendorf.
**Survey questions**

**Question:** In your opinion, what should a community center provide to the City of Bettendorf that is not currently available?

- Respondents believe that Bettendorf deserves a facility that is up to the standards of the rest of the City
- There is community interest in a competitive 50m swimming pool
- Citizens of all ages should feel welcome in a new community facility, from teenagers to seniors
- It is important that the new facility provide spaces for non-sports/recreation – music and art must be considered
- Bettendorf currently lacks quality meeting rooms and community spaces – this facility could fill that gap

**Question:** Thank you for your time in responding to this survey. Are there any other comments you can provide regarding the future of Bettendorf recreation facilities?

- A central location would be preferred. Citizens are happy with the accessibility of existing facilities
- Existing parks and recreation facilities, while utilized and appreciated, are aging and do not offer the amenities that Bettendorf citizens should expect
- While there is excitement about the prospect of a new facility, there is concern from citizens that membership and program costs will increase
- Respondents also indicated that there should be higher priorities in the community and city funds should not be allocated towards a new recreation facility