



Town of Payson
303 N. Beeline Highway
Payson, Arizona 85541-4306

Town Hall (928) 474-5242
Fax (928) 474-4610

COUNCIL DECISION REQUEST

DATE: May 14, 2025

SUBJECT: Council Decision Request filed by Rod Buchanan to select Aquatic Center location and authorize proceeding with construction documents of selected option.

SUBMITTED BY: Rod Buchanan, Interim PMO Manager

AMOUNT BUDGETED: \$2,480,000

EXPENDITURE REQUIRED: Not to exceed \$1,480,000 for FY25

POSSIBLE MOTION: I move to select Option ____ at the _____ location and authorize the Town Manager to execute necessary contracts/expenditures for construction documents and pre-construction services not to exceed \$1,480,000 for the purpose of advancing the aquatics center project as approved by Council.

SUMMARY OF THE BASIS FOR POSSIBLE MOTION:

Attachment A provides background information related to initial council discussions up to the March 4, 2025, presentation and resulting council consensus.

Site Assessment: On March 4, 2025, the consensus of the Town Council was to perform a three-part site evaluation on the Taylor Pool site in Rumsey Park. The three tasks included:

Task 1: Facility condition assessment of Taylor Pool (Options 1-5)

Task 2: Analyze aquatic center site relative to Rumsey Park Action Plan - Selection 1

Task 3: Rumsey Park / Malibu Site Comparative Analysis

Task 1: Taylor Pool Facility Condition Assessment

The scope of work for the Facility Condition Assessment included such tasks as:

- Document physical conditions of the current aquatic facility and support building
 - Collect and review all available documentation, including plans, studies, reports, aerial photos, maps, and other relevant materials
 - Conduct a non-destructive observation of the aquatic and building elements
 - Identify deficiencies of aquatic and facility components regarding current local health codes, ADA, fire and safety adherence, building codes and industry standards
- Make recommendations for up to 5 aquatic configurations (Options 1 - 5) at the Taylor Pool

location, which are sequential in nature, including Rough Order Magnitude (ROM) of costs for each configuration.

The 5 aquatic configurations included:

- Option 1: Minimum requirements to reopen Taylor Pool as is with 6 lanes (in current configuration) including bringing the facility up to current code and standards. This included an evaluation of anything that can be “grandfathered in”
- Option 2: Apply best practices to Option 1 to make Taylor Pool more usable and better meet community needs.
- Option 3: Add two lanes to current 6 lane pool including Option 1 and 2
- Option 4: Add a therapeutic pool to Option 3
- Option 5: Install the previous “Malibu” community pool concept at the Taylor Pool location

On April 1, 2025, the evaluation team visited Taylor Pool to perform the facility assessment. Then on April 7, 2025, the underground piping was scoped to ascertain condition. Descriptions of the Outcomes and Options can be found in Attachment B and B-Cont.

Highlights include:

- A non-destructive inspection was performed
- The building itself appears to be sound
- In order to be brought up to code the building will have to be expanded by approximately 350 sq. feet, making the building size approximately 2,760 sq. feet
- The new building configuration will be the same configuration for all 5 Options
- The ROM includes anticipated construction costs (at +/-15% to +/-25% accuracy) at today's costs, is very early in the process and has been estimated without complete construction documents
- ROM is also estimated without any phased construction; phasing could raise total cost
- Needed parking improvements are included in ROM and are approximately 750k to 1 Mill. for the 5 options
- Renovations can sometimes yield changes or challenges resulting in increased costs as the project is being built

Outcome Results:

ROM construction cost estimates for each option at Rumsey Park (excluding escalation and phasing, as well as amenities such as pool cover, and slides)

OPTIONS	ROM Construction Costs*	ROM Parking	ROM Other Costs*	ROM Total
1- Original Pool	\$5,661,273	\$750,000	\$1,282,254	\$7,693,527 +/-
2- Original Pool + Best Practices	\$6,380,023	\$750,000	\$1,426,004	\$8,556,027 +/-
3- Option 2 + 2 lanes	\$6,870,988	\$1,000,000	\$1,574,197	\$9,445,185 +/-
4- Option 3 + Therapy Pool	\$7,026,152	\$1,000,000	\$1,605,230	\$9,631,382 +/-
5- Community Pool Concept	\$7,755,106	\$820,000	\$1,715,021	\$10,290,127 +/-

* “Construction Costs” include a 3% owners contingency. “Other Costs” include construction documents,

permits, plan reviews, capacity fees, FF&E's, project and construction management and ROM is estimated at 20% of construction costs.

Task 2: Analyze aquatic center site relative to Rumsey Park Action Plan - Selection 1

The scope of work included the evaluation and impact of adding a pool back in the Selection 1 scenario of the Rumsey Park Action Plan. This Selection was recommended by the Parks Commission due to being the least amount of change and lowest cost option to make needed improvements in Rumsey Park. The results of that analysis can be found in Attachment C.

Highlights include:

- Parking and cost: an additional 75 to 100 parking stalls will need to be constructed as part of the aquatic facility at Rumsey.
- Fields: no fields will have to be eliminated or moved
- The pump track will be moved down to co-exist with the skatepark
- American Gulch: no improvements will be needed to American Gulch as a result of the pool

Task 3: Rumsey Park / Malibu Site Comparative Analysis

The scope of work included a comparative assessment to estimate the ROM and timeline for Option 1 and Option 5 at the both the Rumsey and Malibu sites, along with a list of the pros and cons for each site.

ROM

Option 1: Keeps current configuration for Taylor Pool and builds same size Pool at Malibu

OPTION	ROM Construction Costs	ROM Parking	ROM Other Costs	ROM Total
Rumsey Park	\$5,661,273	\$750,000	\$1,282,254	\$7,693,527 +/-
Malibu	\$7,005,106	\$750,000	\$1,551,021	\$9,306,127 +/-
			Difference	\$1,612,600 +/-

Option 5: This is the Malibu design with 6 lanes and water current channel (therapy piece) for both locations

OPTION 1	ROM Construction Costs	ROM Parking	ROM Other Costs	ROM Total
Rumsey Park	\$7,755,106	\$820,000	\$1,715,021	\$10,290,127 +/-
Malibu	\$9,088,329	\$820,000	\$1,981,665	\$11,889,994 +/-
			Difference	\$1,599,867 +/-

Pros & Cons Pool at Rumsey vs. Pool at Malibu site:

Overarching Considerations for both sites:

- Building for future population vs. current population
- Making the pool an indoor pool, year-round facility, at some point in the future (season historically has been approximately 65 days a year)
- The potential for adding a recreation center in the future for more efficient operations and shared infrastructure
- Aging infrastructure vs. new
- Return on investment

- Recreational opportunities distributed throughout the town

Rumsey Park:

Pro's:

- Community heritage/nostalgia preserved
- Access/proximity to schools
- Rumsey is known as the Town's sports park

Con's

- Conflicts with other programming in terms of parking
- Limited deck and "zoo" space for meet competitors/parents
- Limited space and future expansion opportunities such as a recreation center
- Less recreational pool programming opportunities with Options 1-4

Malibu:

Pro's

- Room for expandability such as adding a recreation center at some future point
- Adequate area for the "zoo" to support swim tournaments
- Shorter timeline for completion
- Adequate space for parking lot
- 30% construction documents already completed on malibu which will save cost and time
- Provides much needed public recreation opportunities east of Hwy 87
- Connectivity to some community schools east of Hwy 87
- Highest likelihood for potential funding such as naming rights

Con's:

- Connectivity to some schools (west of Hwy 87 will be improved after the Rumsey Dr. connection is completed)
- Cost is higher for initial infrastructure

Anticipated Contracts:

There are two anticipated contracts needed for the remainder of FY25 to allow the project to proceed. These are for Construction Drawings and Construction Manager At Risk (CMAR) Pre-Construction Services.

1. Construction Documents: it is anticipated that complete Construction Drawings can be achieved in FY26. This would include:

- Full Construction Documents

2. Pre-Construction Services: Pre-Construction Services by the CMAR may include, but not be limited to the following:

- Leading project planning and scheduling for both the construction documents and construction phases
- Providing for construction phasing and scheduling
- Providing alternative systems evaluation and constructability studies
- Advising Payson of ways to gain efficiencies in project delivery and reduce overall delivery time
- Providing long-lead procurement studies and initiating procurement of long-lead items
- Participating in constructability reviews at various levels of construction document development
- Providing value engineering
- Providing detailed cost estimating and knowledge of marketplace conditions

- Developing and maintaining the project cost model
- Providing subsurface investigations as requested (e.g. geotechnical, potholing, etc.)
- Concurring with plans and specifications prior to construction
- Submitting a Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) for Payson review and negotiation

Estimated Timeline on Rumsey

	Tentative Dates*
Construction Documents Complete	2/26 to 5/26
Construction Start	7/26
Construction Complete	8/27 to 11/27
Project Complete	1/28

Estimated Timeline on Malibu

	Tentative Dates*
	11/25 to 2/26
Construction Start	4/26
Construction Complete	1/27
Project Complete	3/27

*Anticipated completion dates subject to change. Naming rights/sponsorships can be accomplished concurrently in this estimated timeline.

Future Decisions: Council will receive regular updates and opportunities to provide feedback, input and direction. Additionally, each of these contracts will have a termination clause for Payson's use if needed.

Additional funds for full project completion will be requested in the FY 2026/27 and FY 2027/28 budgets for Council direction and decision.

PRO: The Aquatic Center can progress in a timely fashion, thereby allowing the Town to deliver a much-needed community facility and be cost effective. Proceeding now will also allow the Town to seek out potential funding such as naming rights, etc.

CON: Delays in timing listed above could inflate project costs and not deliver a needed community facility.

FUNDING: Up to, and not to exceed, \$1,480,000 would be spent on these two contracts using FY25 approved funds. Funding will come from Fund 401 line item 401-5-3442-01-8022. General Funds may also be reallocated from unspent department capital projects or operating budgets such as personnel vacancies and unspent supplies/services.

ATTACHMENTS:

[Attachment A.pdf](#)

[Attachment B - Taylor Pool Assessment 20250501.pdf](#)

[Attachment B Cont. - Taylor Pool Facility Assessment Final ROM Estimate of Probable Construction Cost \(RLB, 5.2.25\).pdf](#)

[Attachment C - Rumsey - ROM - Parking Study.pdf](#)

[Council Presentation Taylor Pool](#)