

Harada, Patricia

From: Weaver, Tracy (City Clerk)
Sent: Friday, January 13, 2023 5:56 PM
To: ALL ELECTED OFFICIALS
Cc: *ALL CITY CLERKS
Subject: Fwd: Plunge

Hi all,

please see email and attachment. Public Communication for Tuesday's meeting.

~Tracy

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Kelly Watson <kellyami@yahoo.com>
Date: January 13, 2023 at 5:51:38 PM PST
To: Drew Boyles | Surf Lakes <drew@surflakesusa.com>, "Weaver, Tracy (City Clerk)" <tweaver@elsegundo.org>
Cc: "George, Darrell" <dgeorge@elsegundo.org>
Subject: Re: Plunge

I did not. Thank you so much!

Kind regards,

Kelly

On Friday, January 13, 2023 at 05:49:02 PM PST, Weaver, Tracy (City Clerk) <tweaver@elsegundo.org> wrote:

Yes. We will post to our website under the Jan 17th agenda. This will be done Tuesday morning once we are back in the office. Monday is a holiday.

Did you send the communication to all Elected officials? If not, I can forward to them. Let me know, more than happy to forward.

Thank you,

~Tracy

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 13, 2023, at 5:32 PM, Drew Boyles | Surf Lakes <drew@surflakesusa.com> wrote:

Madam Clerk,

Please advise.

Drew Boyles | CEO

Surf Lakes SoCal

www.surflakessocal.com

Mayor | City of El Segundo

Begin forwarded message:

From: Kelly Watson <kellyami@yahoo.com>

Date: January 13, 2023 at 17:27:47 PST

To: Darrell George <dgeorge@elsegundo.org>, Drew Boyles | Surf Lakes <drew@surflakesusa.com>

Subject: Re: Plunge

Hi - Yes, see attached. Will this letter be part of public communications? I would request that it is.

Thanks!

Kind regards,

Kelly

On Friday, January 13, 2023 at 05:17:32 PM PST, Drew Boyles | Surf Lakes <drew@surflakesusa.com> wrote:

Hi Kelly. Would you please send us your thoughts on the plunge? I'm referring to our conversation several weeks back and what you shared you were in favor of and not favor of, in terms of changes.

Drew Boyles | CEO

Surf Lakes SoCal

www.surflakessocal.com

Mayor | City of El Segundo

<City Council Plunge Letter 12 2022.pdf>

Dec 17, 2022

Dear council members:

I understand you are meeting today to review and approve potential cuts to the proposed plunge renovation plans, including removal of the proposed upper deck, refurbished entryway, and small pool bleachers in order to “sharpen the pencil” on the project costs.

You should know these plan revisions were proposed by the new contractor that was engaged to provide environmental assessment on the original plan. This contractor has not attended ANY user group, staff, or community feedback meetings, nor have they met with the Recreation and Parks Commission Aquatics Committee who were involved from the inception of this project and have extensive knowledge of both the user group input and the original designs. Thus, it is not surprising that when asked to “sharpen their pencil,” they have done so NOT by removing additions they have made to the plans but rather skuttling important features designed by the previous contractor that were inclusive of user needs.

Let’s consider each of the proposed cuts in this context:

1. They would like to eliminate the renovation of the bleachers into an upper deck. They obviously did not know that the upper deck feature would allow user group programming to be staged more tightly for maximum usage and revenue. Instead of using pool time to stretch on the deck before practice, which requires the previous group to exit the pool area first, having an upper deck would allow groups to stage and stretch, only entering the pool when they are ready to swim. Further, this space would also be bookable for parties, team meetings, and other revenue /cost recovery opportunities.
Further, the opaque glass railing on the upper deck had an important function which was to dissipate the light from the windows which staff told us otherwise reflects poorly off of the pool and distorts the lifeguards’ view of the surface. Moreover, our plan was to offer this opportunity for artwork to be etched into the glass, opening up arts fundraising opportunities.
By the way, the conference room was NOT in the original plan and was not a request of the user groups, but rather something the second contractor added. I understand this was seen as a questionable non-essential by the council, and we agree, but let’s please not get distracted and throw out the upper deck which is critical to the cost recovery plan.
2. They would like to eliminate the dazzling new entranceway. Look, I get it. When the first contractor (who were experts in renovating buildings from this era, btw) designed this, I spoke up and questioned it as unnecessary. But their response was that when you do a project as big as this that is mostly about fixing behind the scenes stuff nobody sees, you need to have something exciting for donors and the community to grab onto as being worth the money. The proposed entryway is meant to be just that. Further, it had art features, like the big glass wall, that could attract arts fundraising as well. It was

designed to be the focal point of the renovation; the place where the big donor plaques will be on the wall, where the community will see where their money was spent, and where the champagne bottles get uncorked at the ribbon cutting.

3. They would like to eliminate the small pool bleachers at the back. These bleachers were designed so that parents watching small children in the child pool were closer to their children. They can help them run to the restroom mid-lesson or help them enter and exit during free swim time, providing towels, etc. Otherwise, they have to watch them from the upper balcony and go all the way around when they need to get to them. Or they cluster around the side of the deck in the way of staff. It's such a no brainer ask and the space is there, why not provide this amenity.

By the way, we understand that there was pushback on the computer room. The only reason that was created was because the mechanical equipment previously in that space was removed and the staff thought then it could be used for storage and possibly computer equipment because the pool environment is so wet. It is not a deal killer and was never a big item. But again, this should not distract from the bleachers, which are the really important item.

This second contractor has added millions of dollars in ADA recommendations including two lift elevators that the original contractor didn't see need for without considering other options. So, to cut back on these essential elements, which will only give a savings of \$750k anyway, seems like the wrong approach to me. Perhaps before agreeing to a final project we should have a third party vendor review the entire package to reconcile the competing bids - and of course include the Aquatics Committee in the conversation. And perhaps, the entire project could use a project manager to oversee it so that the interests of all are preserved. At the very least, I hope council will consider finding other ways of managing costs without stripping out the very elements that users, staff, and the community inspired.

Sincerely,

Kelly Watson
Recreation and Parks Commissioner
& Aquatics Committee Member