



AGENDA ITEM 6A

MUNICIPAL POOL SPECIAL USE PERMIT AMENDMENTS

Prepared by:
Mike Brungardt, P.E., City Engineer

Prepared For:
City Planning Commission
City of De Soto, Kansas
April 21, 2005

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

- A. Agenda Item:** Consider amendment(s) to the Special Use Permit for the De Soto Municipal Pool, 32905 W. 84th St.
- B. City Staff Involved:** Mike Brungardt, City Engineer
Greg Johnson, City Administrator
- C. Applicant:** City of De Soto
32905 West 84th Street
De Soto, KS 66018
- D. Consultant:** Treadwell Jones, Aquatics Manager
Larkin Aquatics
9200 Ward Parkway
Kansas City, MO 64114
- E. Packet Materials:** **Exhibit A:** Ordinance 2072 granting a Special Use Permit for the Municipal Pool.
Exhibit B: Schedule of Value Engineering Items

Plan sheets C2, B1A and B1B, dated 4/20/05.

II. BACKGROUND

On December 28th, 2004, the Planning Commission gave approval of a Special Use Permit for the municipal pool that is to be constructed behind City Hall. The special use permit request was accompanied by a detailed site plan of the proposed facilities, which was made part of the application and factored heavily in the Planning Commission's decision on the matter. The City Council passed Ordinance 2072 (attached as **Exhibit A**) on January 20th, 2005, accepting the Planning Commission's recommendation and granting the use permit for the pool.



Competitive bids for the pool construction were received on March 10th, 2005. Unfortunately, none of the bids were within the City's ability to fund the project. The City therefore elected to enter into a value engineering process with the lowest bidder, Vanum Construction, in hopes of avoiding a redesign and re-bid of the entire project.

In order to fund the cost of design, survey, construction, and administration of the project, (and retain a conservative construction contingency fund), we have identified a targeted construction cost for the project that can not be exceeded. Our negotiations with Vanum are aimed at lowering the contracted price to meet this targeted figure. The contractor's base bid for the construction was \$2,689,000. The targeted construction cost is \$2,400,000. This targeted amount includes a contingency. We therefore set out to identify savings through the value engineering process that would leave the City with the ability to preserve a conservative construction contingency fund which may be needed to pay for rock excavation, the removal of unsuitable soil, or other unanticipated project costs that may occur during the construction.

Whatever portion of the contingency fund is not utilized during the initial phases of the construction can be used to add back in some of the elements that have been removed by the value engineering process.

During this process the City's Pool Committee, the City's design consultant, and the contractor set out to identify aspects of the design or elements of the construction that could be modified to reduce costs without compromising the integrity of the final product. After several weeks of negotiations, the group has arrived at a list of changes that will reduce the overall construction costs enough to proceed with the project. Some of these items have an impact on the elements of the site that were approved by the Planning Commission and Council as part of the Special Use Permit consideration. Staff therefore feels that it is appropriate to have the modifications presented to the Planning Commission in the form of a revision to the approved Special Use Permit.

III. MODIFICATIONS TO THE PREVIOUS APPLICATION

Exhibit B is a listing of the results of the value engineering process. Many of these items have little or no impact on the aspects of the site plan that would be relevant to the Planning Commission's decision. The items with no "Deduct Value" amounts are those that will not be removed from the project. All the site layout changes relating to the arrangement of the facility, architectural elements, and pool amenities are reflected on the revised site plan documents included in your packets. These changes are summarized below.

A Architectural Modifications to Bath and Filter Buildings

- i. The covered shelter area at the east end of the filter building has been removed.
- ii. The gabled ends of the filter building roof have been changed to a hip roof.
- iii. The split face concrete masonry units for the building facades have been replaced by colored blocks
- iv. The interior ceiling of the bath and concessions building will have straight trusses instead of a scissor truss/vaulted ceiling arrangement



B Pool Feature Modifications

- i. The diving boards and diving well have been relocated to the north
- ii. The large slide and tower location has been shifted to the north end east
- iii. The arrangement of the vortex area has been simplified
- iv. The family slide and tot slide elements have been removed. Plumbing and structural support for these elements will be constructed so these can be added back in to the project if funding allows.

C Site Layout Modifications

- i. The western parking lot will receive a chip seal paving surface instead of asphalt. The proposed pavement section will include 9 inches of fly-ash stabilized sub-base, 6 inches of compacted AB-3 gravel, and a double chip seal application. All the concrete curbs and landscaping islands will remain. The pavement markings will be paint instead of thermoplastic.
- ii. The sidewalk from 84th Street to the eastern parking lot has been removed.
- iii. The sidewalk directly adjacent to the community center building on the west side has been removed.
- iv. The sidewalk encircling the play equipment has been removed.
- v. The eastern, southern and western portions of the exterior chain link fence will be galvanized, rather than the PVC coated galvanized finish. The northern portions will remain with a PVC coated finish.
- vi. The retaining wall around the southeastern portions of the pool deck area is no longer needed because of changes to the diving well and aquatic slide positions.

With the cost reduction amounts indicated on Exhibit B for the above-listed items, the project obligations can be met with the available funding, leaving a contingency fund of roughly \$71,000.

IV. CONTINGENCY ALLOCATION

As previously stated, the construction contingency fund is needed in the event that unforeseen project costs arise during the course of the project. Within the base bid for the construction the contractor has included unit costs for rock excavation and the removal of unsuitable soils from the project site. There is a geotechnical report for the site that includes boring samples taken to identify the presence of rock or other subsurface conditions that might impact the methods for construction. Although the report does not indicate that significant rock excavation will be necessary, or that unsuitable soils exist on the site, it is prudent to plan for that possibility.

The highest potential for the use contingency funds will occur in the initial phases of the construction, when site grading and excavation takes place. Once the sub-surface conditions



are verified, and if the contingency fund is not needed for rock excavation or the removal of unsuitable materials, the City can begin considering how best to utilize the contingency dollars. Because of the timing of the contingency fund allocation decision, it will not be feasible to re-incorporate some of the items listed in Exhibit B. For example, it will not be possible to relocate the diving boards to their original location because the excavation and foundation work will have already been completed by the time we will be able to re-allocate the contingency. With reference to the "Item Numbers" shown on Exhibit B, the items that can not be added in during construction include numbers 2, 10 and 17.

The remaining items listed in Exhibit B can be added back into the project during the course of the construction. Under the best case scenario, if none of the contingency is used elsewhere, we will have approximately \$71,000 to add back into the project.

Staff and the Pool Committee would like to have the Planning Commission's direction on the priority for the ad-in items. In general terms, we have discussed the desire to add the family and tot slides back into the project. The Planning Commission may place a higher priority on the split face CMU units or the sidewalk elements.

V. CONCLUSION

The requested revisions to the site plan are necessary to make the project financially viable for the City. In the view of the Pool Committee, the changes are of a nature that does not materially impact the form or function of the facility. They are, however, significant enough to warrant consideration by the Planning Commission and City Council under the requirements of the special use permit.

Staff is asking for the Planning Commission's approval of the project scope changes as identified in Section III of this report, and direction on the prioritization of the items that may be added back into the project if the contingency funds are available.

End of Report
Exhibits to Follow