

February 10, 2021

Regional Aquatics Center Feasibility Study

As a part of the Feasibility Study for the Aquatics Center, the team has explored the possibilities of locating the amenities at two complimentary facilities versus a single facility. Below is an analysis of the potential strengths and weaknesses of these strategies.

SINGLE FACILITY

<u>POSSIBLE STRENGTHS</u>	<u>POTENTIAL WEAKNESSES</u>
Decreased overall operational costs with a single facility	Would require a larger parcel of land that is centrally located to each community
Significantly less cost in construction (i.e. limit redundant administration, lifeguard offices, parking, etc.)	To attain the requested amenities, it would require a larger initial capital investment
Significantly less development costs (i.e. permit fee, tap fees, etc.)	Would require an initial operational agreement between Olympia & Tumwater
Ease of operational strategy between Olympia & Tumwater with shared costs & returns	Potentially more program compromises & less ability to customize the programs to community desires
A single facility has the potential to meet community's expectations is higher	A single location could potentially lengthen the drive distance/time to an aquatic amenity
A partnership approach disperses the burden among a broader portion of the community	Would require a strategic political alignment
Lower risk for a major amenity to be eliminated	
Greater potential to achieve program synergies	
Higher potential for multigenerational participation	
Higher potential for multi-programming & higher utilization	
A larger facility with more amenities has the potential for higher fees (and therefore increased potential for cost recovery)	
More centralized recreational opportunities, therefore possibly strengthening appeal	
Community building	

DENVER
3457 RINGSBY COURT
UNIT 200
DENVER, CO 80216

DALLAS
129 S. MAIN ST.
UNIT 230
GRAPEVINE, TX 76051

CONTACT
P 303.455.1366
F 303.455.7457
BRSARCH.COM

COMPLIMENTARY FACILITIES

<u>STRENGTHS</u>	<u>WEAKNESSES</u>
Potentially independently operated (i.e. one by Olympia & one by Tumwater)	Significantly more construction costs (i.e. redundant administration, lifeguard offices, parking, etc.), therefore ability to provide less amenities
Smaller facilities would require smaller land parcel per facility	Significant more operational staff & utility usage (increased & redundant operational costs)
Would not require a strategic political alignment	Additional development costs (i.e. permit fee, tap fees, etc.)
Initial capital investments could be pursued by Tumwater & Olympia separately	If complimentary amenities (in lieu of duplicate) are selected, the facility with the Indoor Activity Pool would have a significant advantage in cost recovery
	Availability of two parcels of land centrally located to both communities
	An outdoor aquatics facility has the potential for low utilization during the cooler months of the year
	An indoor lap pool has the potential for low utilization during portions of the day
	Greater potential for entrance fee inconsistency (favors indoor aquatics center)
	Less potential for multigenerational participation