

YOUTH AND RECREATION

Tuesday, June 9, 2026 – 6:30 p.m.

Council Chambers – Olean Municipal Building

Present: Members: Chairman Forney, Vice Chairman McCall, Alderman Crawford, Alderman Robinson, and Alderman Anastasia. Others: Alderman Bennion; Alderman Keary; Mayor Amy Sherburne; Allison Barnish, City Auditor; James Sprague, Director of Public Works; Kris Shewairy, Youth and Recreation Coordinator; Tiffany Taylor, Managerial Confidential Administrative Secretary, and Branden Riggs, Clark Patterson Lee.

1. Roll Call

Alderman Forney called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and asked that the record show that all committee members were present.

2. Approval of Minutes of the Previous Committee Meeting (Tuesday, May 19, 2026)

A motion to approve the minutes of the May 19, 2026 committee meeting was made by Alderman Forney, seconded by Alderman Anastasia. Voice vote, ayes all. Motion carried.

3. Unfinished Business

a. War Vets Pool

Alderman Crawford explained Branden Riggs has been the Lead Project Manager on the Splash Park and will be on the War Vets Pool as well. He asked if Mr. Riggs took the Council's requests back to the contractor and he explained he did. Mr. Riggs explained the low bid came in around \$1.1 million, and after the bids were received there was discussion about the need for an additional scope. He explained the understanding is if the pool is going to get done we want it to be done right and have it be long-lasting. He explained it seems there are voids behind the pool walls and that is something we wanted to get a quote for to investigate. He explained the only way to do this is to remove the marcasite walls, and the original quote was to pressure wash and have the existing tile and place new marcasite on top of the existing. He explained if we are going to investigate to see how many voids there are, we would need to remove all of the marcasite, perform the inspection and replace it. He explained the new quote includes costs for this as well as for a new winter cover. He explained with a credit for some of the original bid work that will not need to be done due to the investigation and replacement of the marcasite, he explained the total change order is in the amount of \$375,000 in addition to the original \$1.1 million bid. He advised this does not include costs for fixing the voids themselves and explained he would recommend having around \$100,000 continuously ready to spend on these repairs. He explained

it is also his understanding that the City has a grant in the amount of \$750,000 and this will put the City on the hook for around \$800,000 or more.

Alderman Crawford explained the Council is trying to take in all of that information, and explained they wanted to confirm that the quote was to indeed remove the walls, do an inspection for the structure to look for voids, and once the voids are corrected, place new marcasite walls in. Mr. Riggs explained this is correct, but the cost does not include fixing the voids that may be found. He explained he hopes that \$100,000 covers the cost for the voids but worst case scenario they may find that the wall is degraded so much that it has to be replaced entirely, and it may get to the point that it would not be beneficial for the City to move forward with the repair. He explained if we do move forward he would suggest working in phases, starting with the investigation of the walls. Alderman Crawford asked if we can remove the walls ourselves and Mr. Riggs explained if the City forces have the ability to remove the marcasite and tiles he would think that is the cheapest way to go.

Alderman Crawford explained the Council is faced with a big-ticket item and has tough decisions to make. He explained a question that has come up again and again is given the dollar value associated with the project if it would be possible to reduce the size or scope of the project and pool into something that would be more efficient like a zero-entry pool. He explained we are talking about a major renovation and question what this would do to the cost, as well as if the City would need to go out to bid again. Mr. Riggs explained he feels this would increase the cost, as there is additional fill and a new concrete wall needed. He explained there would only be a reduction in the amount of marcasite being installed. Alderman Crawford explained he questions the cost reductions in chemicals and lifeguards reducing the pool footprint. Mr. Riggs explained that is not something he could give the City a concrete answer on, but it would probably save money in about a 20 year lifecycle.

Alderman McCall explained there is a cost to everything and there would be a cost to get rid of the pool too. He asked if there is any idea what the cost would be to the City if we did not do this project and decided to fill the pool in. Mr. Riggs explained it would depend on what getting rid of the pool would look like and explained if it was filled with stone it would probably only cost around \$200,000. He explained if we are getting rid of the pool and reusing the area for any other purpose he would assume we are filling the pool and covering it was a new concrete pad, and he can get this cost for the City. Alderman McCall explained she would like to know this amount because there will be a cost associated with this whether we move forward or not. She explained we can't just leave a big hole there. Alderman Crawford explained he thought the highest part of the bid was for concrete for the pool deck. Mr. Riggs explained he thinks about \$400,000 was concrete for the pool deck.

Alderman Crawford explained he would like more information on the covenant that Ms. Kerper pulled up on the pool, and if the pool is allowed to be decommissioned. He explained reducing the scope of the pool is probably not in the realm or feasible, and Mr. Riggs explained he does not think this would result in significant cost savings.

Alderman Anastasia asked when the work can be started and when opening day would occur if we choose to move forward. Mr. Riggs explained if we were to award the project with additional scope changes we would need to allow for eight additional weeks for the scope changes, as well as request an extension with the delay we have had. He explained there was initially a completion date of Memorial Day 2027 and he feels we are probably looking now around August or September of 2027. He explained from the conversations he has had with the contractor, if they are able to get something done sooner, they will. Alderman Crawford asked if marcasite is still the best finish and Mr. Riggs explained we can consider alternatives, but this is definitely the most cost-effective option used commonly for municipal pools. He explained we can explore other options if the Council wishes to. Alderman Forney explained we will wait for the additional information so we have all of the options in front of us before making decisions about costs and where the money will be coming from. Mr. Riggs explained he will have cost information for filling in the pool and laying concrete in two weeks.

Alderman Robinson explained he found emails on this topics and complaints about the City's pace. He explained a topic is introduced with project costs, and when the Council asks questions they are told they will be getting the information. He explained weeks or even months later, the topic is still on the agenda and the redundancy begins. He explained the Council literally repeats what they are requesting for a second or third time. He explained responses are received the day before or day of the meeting with no time to analyze and digest the information, and the responses only lead to more questions, delays, and postponing. He explained the project is now delayed from the lack of response, but the Council is pressured for action and is blamed for inaction. He explained the City doesn't like the response of the Council and delays more, and is slow mobbing to bid, does not respond to questions, and makes excuses for delays in Council requests. He explained if you look at the committee agendas, they are littered with unfinished business and even constituents are questioning how long a topic can still be in the discussion phase. He explained in regards to the recent Olean Star article, he questions how the newspaper is more aware of the pool issues than the Council. He asked why we aren't addressing that the City admitted to neglecting to protect the pool despite the Department Head's mention of "years of experience" and why the responses are written in the paper with a "doom and gloom" response. He asked where the potential solutions were provided, and explained we now have quotes for the upgrade, but since we are so "doomed," where the quotes are for removal. He asked why we haven't mentioned advertising, or gotten a quote for downsizing the pool. He explained Olean has determined that people want the pool, and the Council has already decided

to move forward with the pool. He explained if we need to bond, he thinks that option is on the table, and there is also funding coming from the State that can be used. He explained options are available without the negative narrative. He explained we need to move forward in getting this done and try to be a little more efficient considering this has been dragging from one administration and now is dragging in this one.

Mayor Sherburne explained she did not share information ahead of this meeting, and anything that was in that article was already public knowledge. She explained she has given the Council more than enough information, and the capital project books are in front of them full of information. She explained she is trying to finish a project that was started way before her administration and as far as she is concerned, if the Council wants the pool then that is their decision. She explained she has moved this forward in less than six months after the last administration let this sit there. She explained this administration has had to develop a budget, negotiate three contracts, and work on multiple unfinished projects. She explained she does not appreciate that she is being accused of stalling this project or not communicating, as she feels she is doing good communicating everything especially about this pool.

Alderman Anastasia explained he agrees with Alderman Robinson, and explained we had talked about this several times with the past administration and no one spoke out against the pool. He explained the more we wait, the more costs will go up. He explained we will be getting Temporary Municipal Assistance funding late this summer and that would be a perfect funding source to use towards the pool. Alderman Crawford explained to do the reconstruction we are looking at \$1.5 to \$1.6 million and there is a grant for \$750,000. He explained the Mayor is doing her best being just handed these projects, and if the Council wants the pool it is the Council's decision. He explained the Council needs to decide if they want to use that \$500,000 towards the pool from the TMA funding. He explained it would complement the splash park. Alderman Forney explained she does feel this is an appropriate use of those funds for a one-time investment. She explained the Council did make the decision that they want the pool, but the Council can only take that so far. She explained once the Council approves something it is out of their hands as they are not doing construction or controlling operations. She explained these decisions are made by the Council and action is the responsibility of the administration.

Alderman Bennion explained one question that is going to be asked is what is the most economical way to do the pool, and explained he is still open to the idea of shrinking the footprint. He explained the Council is being told the pool requires three lifeguards, an attendant and a cleaner, and questioned if these people are already on staff. Mr. Shewairy explained a CPO is on staff but the lifeguards are not, and we did not fill the recreation attendant position because the pool was not open. Alderman Bennion asked if we don't have the same number of attendants at the recreation center and Mr. Shewairy explained he does not have any attendants at the

recreation center now, and the only part-time help that will be hired are for the splash pad. He explained there have been no seasonal part time people at the recreation center since the ice rink closed in March, and advised he has provided for the Council the costs of operating the pool. Alderman Bennion and Mr. Shewairy disagreed about staffing, and Mr. Shewairy left the meeting. Alderman Bennion explained there are also issues with the concrete deck at the pool due to a vehicle parking on this 4-inch concrete pad, and this needs to be addressed. He explained he is in favor of the pool and would gladly spend the \$500,000 TMA to that end but he would still like to look at the footprint and reducing it for the future.

Alderman McCall explained getting information the day before or day of a meeting means the Council does not have time to send questions out beforehand. She explained it has been a long-standing issue that we need to work on correcting. Alderman Robinson explained he is curious about the positions as well, and explained if they are not in the budget, then there should have been a drop in the budget when the pool was closed. He explained the Council has been told the operational cost of the pool in 2022 was \$50,000 to \$60,000 and although the number they are being given now is a small increase, it does not coincide with the increases we have seen in costs for other things. He explained he knows an issue that Olean has had is obtaining lifeguards, and one of the big issues is you can make more money and work more hours going elsewhere rather than being a lifeguard for the City. He explained the school district does offer free public swim twice a week but that is not a substitute and should be in addition to the City pool.

Alderman Crawford explained the ultimate goal is to try and problem solve and try to come to an agreement with what would best serve our citizens without a financial burden associated with renovations. He explained options have been discussed tonight. He explained Cattaraugus County has always expressed interest in helping Olean, and this is a project that will serve many people in the County, not just those in Olean. He explained he doesn't know how many municipal pools are in the county but it seems they are limited, and we should try to put the effort into coming up with a solution with the County or business sponsors to help pay for this. Alderman Keary explained we should be looking proactively for Ralph Wilson grants.

Alderman McCall explained she was one that was originally not in favor of the pool. She explained if someone has a family, having a complex with the pool along with the splash park would be family-friendly not just for residents, but for those outside our community as well. She explained we still need to make sure we are fiscally responsible and good stewards with the dollars that we have, so she would like to know all of the costs before moving forward in order to make good decisions.

- b. PL #47-26: (Crawford) To designate the admission fee for the Splash Park to be \$5 for two hours.

Alderman McCall explained she discussed with Mr. Shewairy doing \$5 per session instead of for 2 hours, as session times could change over time. She explained we do projects for our City residents that benefit not just our City residents, but also bring people into the community that will spend money in our stores and restaurants. She explained we want to ensure we make this feasible while also balancing out the cost. She explained she suggests we do \$5 per session with the caveat that we look at different things in the future such as corporate sponsors and working with agencies who serve the underserved in the community. She explained she would also like to look into inviting City residents to be the first to be able to come and participate in the splash park. She explained we have heard concerns about everyone being able to enjoy this, and explained she herself will go out and see what we can do with corporate sponsors and agencies to make sure everyone can enjoy the splash park.

Alderman Crawford explained the idea of doing per session will give the Mayor and Mr. Shewairy some flexibility when scheduling. He explained sessions could be an hour and a half or up to three hours. He explained they also had a pretty lengthy conversation about finding out when the low occupancy hours are to be able to offer discounts for these days and times to incentivize the usage of the facility as well as give families with multiple children the opportunity to attend if \$5 is too much. He explained we have to find a balance and a happy medium when it comes to cost. He explained we can then see how it goes and roll out other things moving forward.

A motion to amend PL #47-26 to state the cost of \$5 per person, per session and 2 and under free was made by Alderman Crawford, seconded by Alderman McCall. Voice vote, ayes all. Motion carried.

Alderman Forney explained she feels there can be a really good balance, but we don't know where the market will be yet and we don't have data yet. She explained she thinks this provides a really good starting point and explained this price can evolve as the next season comes about. Alderman Robinson explained he is in favor of making the charge per session rather than dictating a time limit, but he feels \$5 is still too high and will be voting no. Alderman McCall explained we really do not know how this is going to work until we get some type of structure in place.

A motion to approve PL #47-26 was made by Alderman Crawford, seconded by Alderman McCall. Voice vote, ayes all except Alderman Robinson, who voted no. Motion carried.

Alderman Bennion asked who will be responsible for the damages to the sidewalks in War Vets Park after the splash park is completed, and Director Sprague explained he will be putting this on the punch list for the contractor to fix.

4. New Referrals for Consideration

None

5. Committee Reports

A motion to approve committee reports was made by Alderman Forney, seconded by Alderman McCall. Voice vote, ayes all. Motion carried.

6. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made by Alderman Forney, seconded by Alderman McCall. Voice vote, ayes all. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:25 p.m.