



Alameda Community,

On August 3rd, the City of Alameda and ELS Architecture and Urban Design facilitated a third community workshop to further develop the design of the Alameda Aquatic Center. Similar attendance to Workshop #1 and #2, nearly 50 people gathered for Workshop #3 at the Albert H. Dewitt Officers' Club (O'Club) as ELS and City Staff shared what they have learned to date. Topics included the site conditions and design implications for the new aquatic center, current status pursuing an all-electric facility, an operations analysis performed on the two-pool and 50m pool schemes, and conversations over which concept, two-pools or the 50m, the community wants.

Site Remediation: As we conveyed during prior public events, the project site has a high water table, meaning that groundwater can be found quite close to the surface, requiring special design, engineering and construction considerations. The site is also in a liquefaction zone, requiring that soils stabilization procedures be undertaken to make the site buildable.

Since our last workshop on June 8, 2024, we have learned more about the site and the budgetary impacts posed by an investigation into the site's challenging soils. The cost for mitigating these conditions could reasonably approach \$1 million, therefore the design has had to change in response to the funds needed to stabilize the soil for the new aquatic center. The adjustments do not impact the overall aquatic program, but we feel that it's important to share this information. You can help us decide how best to prioritize certain programmatic elements once the soil stabilization has been completed.

We have adjusted a few elements to make up the \$1 million deficit needed for soil remediation.

We will provide:

- an outdoor, multipurpose shade pavilion, in lieu of a multipurpose room (\$500k)
- a breezeway and window transaction area, in lieu of an enclosed lobby (\$200k)
- an outdoor storage area for pool deck equipment, in lieu of including the storage area within the support building (\$200k)
- eliminate the dive well area and springboards (\$100k)

By making these adjustments to both design concepts, we keep to the \$30MM budget and retain all other project components.

All-Electric Design: The city shared with the community that it would like to pursue a climate-friendly approach to designing and building the new Alameda Aquatic Center. To confirm whether an all-electric design approach is feasible, a more detailed investigation is required. The cost of constructing an all-electric design is estimated to be \$1.5 million (on top of our \$30MM budget). At ELS, all-electric design strategies are a great way to support our planet and our people while helping meet municipal climate action plans. As stewards of this project's financing, ELS also needs to be absolutely certain that an all-electric approach is the best use of city funding. Over the next few months ELS will explore an all-electric concept in great detail with Alameda Municipal Power and the design team. This will involve a life-cycle cost analysis of the new Alameda Aquatic Center, helping to determine the pay-back period of all-electric operations. By eliminating greenhouse gas emissions that come from using gas to power and heat the pools, the city hopes to create a healthier Alameda environment for pool patrons and park users alike.



If the project budget finds capacity for additional aquatic amenities, we would like to hear from the community your top priorities. To give your input on the prioritization of the above adjustments, please take the online survey.

Operations Analysis: The City has retained Bay Area Economic Associates to compare the hypothetical revenue and expense streams for a Two-Pool Aquatic Center versus a Single 50-meter Pool Aquatic Center. The Two-Pool Aquatic Center will have a net income of \$660K annually on \$2.01 million in annual expenses. The 50-meter Pool Aquatic Center will have a net loss of income of \$80K annually on \$1.13 million in annual expenses. These numbers do not include the Debt Service of \$895k.

Community Engagement: In our previous community engagement efforts, 75% of all collected data has shown that the community prefers the two-pool scheme. Respondents noted that such a facility supports a broad range of aquatics programming while also addressing the needs of a broader user base than that of a 50-meter Pool Aquatic Center. However, deciding between a two-pool scheme or a 50m pool is a big decision. Therefore, with the additional information we have collected on operational expenses, we wanted to ask the community to complete the online survey to vote again on your pool concept preference. The results will not replace the previous responses. It will be added to the data collection.

- a. **Two-Pool Aquatic Center:** a 30-meter x 25-yard competition pool with a minimum depth of 3'6" and temperature range of 78 to 80 degrees; an activity pool (approximately 3,200sf) with zero beach entry, shallow swimming lanes, and water temperature range of 82 to 85 degrees.
- b. **50-meter Pool Aquatic Center:** a 50-meter x 25-yard competition pool with a depth ranging from 4'-6" to 7'-0". This pool will likely have a temperature range of 78 to 80 degrees.

If you missed Alameda Aquatic Center's Workshop #3 or you would like to make additional comments, please take the Workshop #3 online survey. The online survey will be available until 7pm on Sunday August 25th, 2024.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/AlamedaAquaticCenter_Survey3

For this project's next steps, the City and ELS will continue to advance the programming and conceptual design effort. The input collected from the Community Engagement Series: Workshop #1, #2 and #3 will be integrated into design options that will be presented to the Rec and Park Commission on September 12th and to City Council on September 17th. We have appreciated our community's readiness to attend these important workshops. Your thoughts are invaluable to this process.

Thanks,
The City of Alameda and the ELS Team



From the ELS Team Notes:

Comments and Questions from the community audience during Community Workshop #3 held on August 3, 2024.

Community Speaker

- Since the City is committed to promoting alternate modes of transportation other than driving, we should make the parking lot as small as possible and use the savings on other parts of the project.

Community Speaker

- Why are we trying to shoehorn everything we want into this park space? Why can't we find a space in Alameda like out on Alameda Point behind the gym where we can put what we want, two pools, with one being 50 meters? Let's spend money and build what we want.

Community Speaker

- We need to do everything we can to get an all-electric aquatic center. Having a gas load is at odds with our city policy, it will soon be at odds with state law and a good cost benefits analysis will show that. We've got all electric pools in Piedmont, Mountain View. Alameda rates are 45% below both of those communities, so if they can pull it off, we certainly can.
- The master swimming community, the Alameda triathlete's community, a number of other communities, and most importantly our youth, would be well served by a 50-meter pool. Our facilities in Alameda are substandard compared to where our youth competitive swimmers go. They compete in 50-meter pools such as in Walnut Creek and Navato. Why can't we have this as well to train in?

Community Speaker

- I wish that the 50-pool design included a movable bulkhead because that affords multiple usages of the 50 meter pool.
- Like the barriers that are put up for kids at bowling center to keep the ball out of the gutter, you could probably do the same with a movable one foot or two-foot cushion between the wall and the swim lesson platforms so that the kids would be safe while learning to swim.

Community Speaker

- Unlike the 50-meter pool, the two pool approach allows the community broadly to have access to this facility and generates the revenues that pays for the operation of the facilities.
- If we could afford a 50-meter pool, I'd support that fully, but we can't afford it.
- We're faced with a scenario where a minority contingency within the community wants to take yet again the public's money, the tax money, and put it to the benefit of just a small segment of the community. We don't want our tax dollars to be taken again for the use primarily of just a small segment of the community. With 75% of survey responders voting for a two-pool solution it's very clear what the consensus approach is.

Community Speaker

- Could you talk more about the partnership that you've had with AUSD on this project? Your comments led me to believe they haven't been part of this project and that you will negotiate at



some point. Given the relationship of the facilities, it seems important that you work with them, and not be siloed.

Community Speaker

- What is the length of the Encinal pool?

Community Speaker

- I don't understand why the few loud voices will make this not be what the community has spoken for. I would vote for and support a two-pool solution so that the total community, young and old can benefit on this island which is surrounded by water but with no place to swim.

Community Speaker

- I would like the project to be all-electric.
- As much as I would enjoy swimming in a 50-meter pool, I think it would preclude its use by most of the people who are recreation and lapsed swimmers.
- If we could have it all, that would be my vote, but given that we can't I would still prefer the two-pool solution.
- I think that it is important to consider how people with disabilities will use the center when designing it so that the facility will benefit the entire community.

Community Speaker

- Are there opportunities in the future to add back some of the elements that are being removed from the design if additional funds become available in the future?

Community Speaker

- In this whole design process, it seems as though we're lacking a broad view of the aquatic infrastructure in Alameda. We ought to be working more collaboratively as a community between AUSD and ARPD in order to meet all of our aquatics needs. We ought to be able to maximize Emma Hood and Encinal and this new site and meet all of our needs because there will now be so much more water.
- At the Aquatech pools, which only provides lessons, every lesson happens on a platform. I don't understand why there are not workarounds that would allow group lessons to happen in a sizeable area of the 50-meter pool as well.

Community Speaker

- I think your 50-meter pool concept revenue numbers are inaccurate because it is possible to offer lessons in a 50 meter pool. Could you elaborate on how the revenue dollars for the 50-meter pool concept were determined?

Community Speaker

- The best solution I've heard yet is for ARPD and AUSD to have a partnership where the whole community can use all the available pools effectively. Instead of having three pools that are the same size, have two pools that are the same size and one nice long one that we can use for a lot of other purposes.



- I'd like to know what Emma Hood and Encinal are going to be doing with their small pools during high school time? Seems to me that the small pools could serve to increase revenue. Why isn't that factored into the revenue source that you are talking about?
- A 50-meter pool could be shared by the high schools for workouts. With 16 lanes, two or maybe even three programs could be swimming at the same time. The 50-meter pool is going to be heavily used and revenue will be generated from all the programs that use the pool.

Community Speaker

- Has there been any progress on the development of the community gardens?
- Why hasn't there been more progress in opening the two private Alameda pools?
- Use the adjacent parking lot as much as possible. Whatever we can do to minimize the size of the Aquatic Center parking lot will be a good thing.

Community Speaker

- What can young people like me from Boy Scout Troop Two do to help with this whole project?

Community Speaker

- Is the Workshop #3 survey going to mention a 'fun' pool vs. a 'competition' pool?

Community Speaker

- I'm glad the design for the meeting room has become an open space instead of enclosed because this approach will incorporate it more into the park. When people are having meetings there, they'll be able to look out into the park and that'll be much more pleasant than being in a closed off room.
- If we're going to build a pool that has everything, I think that the diving well and diving boards are something that we should try and incorporate back in.
- The activities pool is an absolute must, not only for classes, but also for people to come and just play in those pools.

Community Speaker

- As a resident of the neighborhood directly adjacent to the park, will traffic, noise, and other environmental issues that might have an impact on the neighbors be studied?

Community Speaker

- Could the cost of the wind fencing be eliminated if we switched where the buildings are built so that they buffer the winds coming from the West?
- I think that the idea of having more collaboration between ARPD and AUSD and trying to figure out how to best utilize our aquatic resources would be great. Having three pools that are similar in size will make them redundant, particularly once we train everybody to swim. Having a different size pool could be a great asset.

Community Speaker

- The wind coming from the West is going to be a huge issue because it affects the site all the time, and it would be better to locate the buildings on the western side of the site to create a wind buffer.



Community Speaker

- I would like to see all three pools built. In all honesty, it would be great. It is up to the council to get us more money.

Community Speaker

- Are there Gates Foundation grants, money from Warren Buffet, or other grants that could help fund a larger project? Are we going after such grants?