

community noun
the community: po
lace, people, citizen
public; residents. in
citizens. 2 a mo
brotherhood, fr
order. 3 a comm
ity, liken



How did we get here?

- Club Source Design was hired to analyze current pool condition and ability to handle UPA.
- PARC was asked to review Club Source Design's analysis of pools.
- PARC was asked to recommend a path forward.
- PARC created a subcommittee to speed in analysis and decision-making.
- Subcommittee presented to PARC.

Subcommittee

Mel Burton

Bobby Joyner

Chuck Rayfield

Jack Bettin

Frances Hillman

JB Bailey

Goal:

Based on Club Source Design's analysis, review options for pools, including UPA.

From the beginning. . .

Ignore the past and focus on moving forward.

No assumptions regarding final outcome.



Plan of attack

Pro's and Con's for each option.

- A. Close the pools
- B. Keep the Pools



No Pools

Pro's

- + Avoid Pool Maintenance Expenses
- + Reduce Future Capital expenses
- + Free up Common Space for other uses*
(* Would have to stay as common space)

Con's

- **Gives perception that “Bmill is going backwards”**
- Lose asset that attracts new residents
- Reduces perceived value of homes
- Expense to remove pools/Cost to convert to another use



Keep the Pools

Pro's

- + Increase perceived value of homes
- + Stay competitive w/ other communities.
- + Bring community members together
- + Promote family values
- + **Community pride**
- + **Swim Team**
- + **Encourage healthy lifestyle**
- + **Offer variety of social activities (water aerobics, pool parties, etc)**
- + Jobs for teens

Con's

- Cost to residents
- Not everyone will use them
- Noise at/from pools
- Perception that they will not increase value to homes
- **"My opinion doesn't matter."**
- **"The Board has a hidden agenda"**



First Decision Point

A. Close the pools ❌

B. Keep the Pools ✅

What is the best path forward for the pools?

1. Keep the same membership structure
2. Change to a different fee structure
3. Close 1 of the pools
4. Move to Universal Pool Access



(Keep the Pools)

Keep Current Membership Structure

Pro's

- + Only those residents using the pools have to pay
- + Not overcrowded
- + No assessment increase
- + No controversy
- + No impact to Commercial partners
- + "Ownership" mentality

Con's

- "Expensive" for members
- **Condition of pools remains unchanged or declines**
- **Not enough members to be self-supportive** (assessment increase?)
- **Not competitive with surrounding communities**
- Potential new home buyers may be disenchanted due to no pool access

(Keep the Pools)

Change to New Fee Structure

Examples of what may be in a new fee structure plan:

- Make the pools more accessible to all Bmill residents by increasing the number of Community Days from three to six or eight.
- Explore significant fee reduction for a full season family pass from \$435 to \$? with comparable decreases in all other current and new fee categories.
- Create several new fees in order to offer more flexible access.

AS an example...

• Families (Resident) \$195	• Non-Resident Family \$275
• Couple (Resident) \$145	• Non-Resident Couple \$235
• Single (Resident) \$115	• Non-Resident Single \$200
• 12 Time Family Pass (Res.) \$110	• One Day Family Pass (Res.) \$20
• 12 Time Indiv. Pass (Res.) \$75	• One Day Indiv. Pass (Res.) \$8
• One Day Family. Pass (Non-Res) \$30	• One Day Ind. Pass (Non-Res) \$10
• 5 Consecutive Days (Fam. Res.) \$50	• 5 Consecutive Days (Indiv Res) \$20
• 5 Consec. Days (Fam. Non-Res.) \$75	• 5 Consec Days (Indiv Non Res)

(Keep the Pools)

Change to New Fee Structure

Pro's

- + **Attractive due to flexible pricing options/Less expensive for members**
- + **More families using amenities**
- + Commercial Partners don't have to participate
- + Eases transition to UPA
- + No urgent decision is needed/Allows time to educate community
- + Not everyone has to participate
- + Increased pool usage could equate to more support for UPA
- + Easier to compete with other communities

Con's

- Costs increase. (More people equals higher operational costs)
- **Revised fees may not produce the needed or desired revenue**
- Overcrowding (?)
- Pool experience is diminished
- If revenue comes up short, may need to increase assessment
- **Condition of pools remain unchanged or decline**

*** New fee structure may increase support for UPA **and** also decrease the need for UPA. ***

(Keep the Pools)

Close 1 of the Pools

Pro's

- + Save money on Operating Costs
- + More land for other uses

- + **Specific to Harbor Pointe:**
Affects smaller number of residents

Con's

- Loss of asset
- Unhappy residents ("Don't close MY pool!")
- Crowding at other 2 pools
- No UPA
- Expensive to replace

- **Specific to Harbor Pointe:**
Clubhouse rental is less attractive w/o pool.
Future Community Center
HP residents have to travel further to other pools
Waterfront attraction lost

- **Specific to North Beach:**
Swim Team impact (possible move to STL)

- **Specific to St Ledgers:**
Largest and Newest Pool

(Keep the Pools)

Universal Pool Access

Pro's

- + **Sign of positive change for Bmill**
- + Allows Bmill to become competitive with other communities
- + **Provides funds to significantly upgrade pools**
- + Increase perceived value of homes
- + Utilize assets to fullest potential
- + Everyone has access
- + Lower cost to users
- + Improves the perceived value of the Bmill experience
- + Upgraded pools and still have competitive assessment amount

Con's

- Increased assessments
- Non-pool goers have to pay
- Crowding (?)
- Some unhappy residents
- More "issues" come with more users
- Significant resident opposition
- Impact to commercial partners
- Higher operating costs



Next Decision Point

A. Close the pools ❌

B. Keep the Pools ✅

If B.

1. Keep current membership structure ❌

2. Modify membership structure ✅

3. Close 1 of the pools ❌

4. Universal Pool Access ✅

Conclusions

Brandermill can not stay competitive with surrounding communities and attract new residents without the pools.

The Brandermill pools can not survive under the current fee structure.



WIG's

(Wildly Important Goals)

1. Do not increase assessments before the pools have been upgraded.
2. Use the transition period to increase interest in the pools (and UPA).



Recommendation



1. Board needs to move on prior PARC recommendation regarding safety/ADA/accessibility upgrades to pools.
2. Conduct a Facilities Condition Study as recommended by Club Source Design.
3. Hold community meetings
4. Migrate to UPA:
 - a) From 2014 to 2016 , upgrade pools.
Finance Committee needs to analyze and finalize amounts for revised fee structure, as well as how to pay for upgrades.
 - b) In 2016, implement UPA.