



**Capital Improvement Program  
Joint CIP CAC and PRG Committee Meeting  
Commerce City Civic Center  
7887 E. 60<sup>th</sup> Ave., Room 3109  
March 8, 2017 – 6 p.m.-7:30 p.m.**



**AGENDA**

1. Welcome (Co-Chairs)
2. Approval of Last Meeting's Minutes (Co-Chairs)
  - a. Unanimous approval
3. Art Update (Susan)
  - a. See attached handout
4. Recreation Centers Naming Update (Carolyn)
  - a. Over 300 submissions
  - b. Contest ends in April
  - c. PRG committee will narrow down top entries at April 18 meeting
  - d. Present to council in May
  - e. Final names not needed until fall
5. Recreation Center Admission Fees (Carolyn)
  - a. Should fees be comparable to neighboring communities with similar facilities/amenities (Brighton, Thornton, Denver)?
    - i. Yes
  - b. If so, would you support a modest fee increase based on these findings?
    - i. Commerce City may have more businesses than typical areas. If many of the facilities come from business taxes, and if the ratio is higher, than the taxes may bring in more money. We should keep this in mind when evaluating pricing.
    - ii. I'd like an analysis done to make sure cost is fair. We don't want to get inundated with non-resident usage due to low fees, which is a high probability with the new facility. We also don't want to push residents out with expensive fees.
  - c. Should fees be the same for the new & existing centers or based on center amenities?
    - i. Fees should be differential based on amenities. I can't picture using the same rates for the new rec center with the new amenities.

- ii. I feel like I need more information to objectively respond to this question. I have issues with paying more for the new rec center than the existing rec center.
    - iii. Charging more for the new center may feel discriminatory and breed separation. The south may feel like they're getting less. The north may feel upset that they have to pay more. Overall pricing should be the same for both centers.
    - iv. It makes sense to pay according to amenities available at each location; although, more information about whether or not folks would use both locations depending on the amenity or still stick with the location most convenient for them would be helpful, which I'm sure parks and rec is looking into.
  - d. Should we provide annual membership packages?
    - i. Yes
    - ii. Yes, but not to non-residents
    - iii. Consider a rec center pass that is good for both locations
  - e. Should we differentiate between resident and non-resident?
    - i. Yes, non-residents should pay more. This will keep people from inundating our centers and taking away from residents.
    - ii. I agree that nonresidents should pay more than residents.
  - f. Do you believe existing fees are affordable and representative of the value of service?
    - i. Do a small increase to keep up with nearby centers while keeping premium quality services available to all residents
    - ii. Balance 2K funds, taxes and user fees
  - g. Review at March 21 PRG committee meeting
  - h. Present to city council April/May (TBD)
  - i. City council to decide July/August (TBD)
  - j. Fees published in 2017-18 winter/spring program guide
- 6. Existing Recreation Center Update (Courtney)
  - a. Parking

- i. I have safety concerns. Many people already use the McDonald's lot. You'll have increased pedestrians walking through the lot.
  - ii. The drop-off will get congested with deliveries and users.
  - iii. It will help to get rid of the garage. Existing handicapped spaces are important to keep and you'll need to add some more in the front if possible. This will cause people to have to walk too far.
  - iv. Bottleneck will occur in northern area
  - v. Look into additional parking surrounding area when evaluating master plan
  - vi. I appreciate your creativity with the parking situation.
  - vii. Consider utilizing 2K funds for resurfacing/parking
  - viii. Consideration to resurfacing the parking lot after all new construction has been completed as part of 2K project should be given
- b. Entry
  - i. Like the security aspect of one entry; it will keep controlled access
- c. Seniors don't want the steam room since we're getting a therapy pool.
- d. I like the steam room but I understand it can be non-hygienic and expensive to maintain. The therapy pool is a great substitute.
- e. Steam rooms have health benefits and I wish we could keep it.
- f. Family changing rooms, lockers and therapy pool are critical.
- g. Like the idea of having three entrances to the pool (men's lockers, women's lockers, family lockers)
- h. Maintain safety rails in showers
- i. Punching bags and boxing-inspired fitness equipment are popular
- j. Fix the hard water situation
- k. Improve Wi-Fi
- l. Like the idea of having different areas in fitness section
- m. I had real concerns but this design presentation has showed me that the existing rec center can be brought up to speed with improved amenities and better flow.
- n. Existing preschool is more symbolic than impactful; small space and few people are served by it; don't want to minimize education for our area but

council could seek partnerships with school districts/agencies/government to fund it; it shouldn't be a parks & rec item; could convert it to a child care/watch (for additional fees, like 24 Hour Fitness)

o. Looking forward to next step in design process; this looks great

7. Executive Summary

a. Can we get an update next meeting about the budget regarding the new rec center and infrastructure/access?

8. Next Steps and Calendar

a. 2017 CIP CAC Regular Meeting Schedule

i. Fourth Thursdays from 6-7:30 p.m.

1. May 25, July 27, Sept. 28, Nov. 16 (one week early due to Thanksgiving holiday on Nov. 23)

ii. Additional meetings as needed

9. Public Comments and Questions

10. Adjourn

