

3.6 STAFFING ANALYSIS

Each of the four aquatic facilities has staff that conduct the daily operations. The largest number of aquatic staff is made up of Lifeguards, followed by Swim Instructors. Table 3.5 shows the staffing by position for each pool.

Pools with more features require more Lifeguards than the smaller neighborhood pools, as can be seen in Table 3.5. The higher requirement for Lifeguards results from the increased number of available amenities as well as additional bodies of water. Each pool has two Manager 1 positions and one Manager 2 position who determine the shifts and chair assignments. Additional staff are required for the operation of Garland's aquatic facilities, including Swim Supervisors, Swim Instructors, Guest Service Managers, Guest Service Associates, Concessions Managers, and Concessions Guest Service.

Unlike many communities, Garland does not currently have difficulty finding an adequate number of lifeguards to staff their facilities despite paying less than many of the other departments in the area. If facilities are expanded to include more features, more bodies of water, or additional concessions, additional staff will be needed. Depending on the number of guards needed, it could become more of a challenge to fill all of the shifts. The proposed pay increase for this year (delayed by the COVID-19 pandemic) would likely help, and Garland is known for accommodating the schedules of their staff.

Table 3.5: Aquatic Facility Staffing

Aquatic Facility	Aquatics Managers	Lifeguards	Swim Supervisors	Swim Instructors	Guest Service Managers	Guest Service Associates	Concessions Managers	Concessions Guest Service	Total
Surf & Swim	3	35	0	0	3	30	3	15	89
Wynne Pool	3	15	2	12	0	2	0	0	34
Holford Pool	3	15	2	12	0	2	0	0	34
Bradfield Pool	3	35	2	25	0	2	0	0	67
Total	12	100	6	49	3	36	3	15	224

3.7 AQUATIC TRENDS

3.7.1 Outdoor Family Oriented Aquatics

In recent years, older rectangle and L-shaped swimming pools have experienced a declining level of appeal to aquatics patrons. The desire to have 3½ foot depths of water for flip turns, or competition swimming, dictated a deeper water depth of the pool, leading to a lack of shallow water. As a result, younger children were relegated to a “baby” pool, which generally only appeals to babies and toddlers. Inadequate amenities for four to 10-year-olds limit the draw of these older pools.

The newer family aquatic centers are geared toward the entire family with zero depth access, shallow water, interactive water spray activities, along with the traditional competition lanes and diving boards. Newer aquatic facilities are often incorporating lazy rivers, which are popular with people of all ages. The newer facilities also provide large waterslides. These elements, along with a generous amount of shade structures, larger grass beach areas, and quality concessions, have resulted in a complete turnaround in the net operating costs for the aquatic facilities of many municipalities.



Whereas the older pools were a drain on the budget, newer facilities are more likely to generate funds to cover the operations cost, and many even show a surplus, which can be used to pay off some of the debt service for the capital construction. When older pools have been renovated to include the newer features, some communities have seen as much as a 200% increase in attendance. This demand provides an opportunity for charging higher fees, potentially yielding a greater profit margin. Garland's aquatic facilities operate at a deficit, generating less revenue than they cost to operate (as outlined in Chapter 2). The facilities that perform better are those that have incorporated many of these amenities, although some of these features are currently lacking at Garland pools.

3.7.2 Splash Pads

Another new concept that is sweeping the country is the development of splash pads or spraygrounds. These facilities have replaced wading pools at many aquatic facilities but can also be developed as standalone wet playgrounds in other park areas. Splash pads have the benefit of offering aquatic recreational features at a reduced cost compared to a pool or even a wading pool. For instance, in most cases, they recirculate water, but lifeguards are not needed because there is no standing water. Therefore, the operation costs are considerably lower than for a swimming facility. Garland currently has only one small splash pad at Bradfield Pool and no independent facilities.



3.8 BENCHMARKING ANALYSIS

One method of evaluating the aquatic services offered in the community is to use benchmarking comparisons to other communities. For the comparisons to the City of Garland, other nearby jurisdictions in the Dallas area are used for this analysis.

Eleven nearby aquatic facilities are used for comparison of available features. Communities for fee comparisons are limited to nine municipalities located in the area with aquatic facilities for which data was available. A national comparison to the top 100 cities, by population, is used for an analysis of the number of municipal pools in Garland to the number offered in other jurisdictions.

3.8.1 Available Features

The availability of features varies among the comparison aquatic facilities. Figure 3.6 shows the features available at seven aquatic facilities located near Garland. Most of these facilities include zero depth and family activity pool. Additionally, all but one facility have one or more tall waterslides. Most facilities have lap lanes, but only two have more than five. Few facilities offer diving boards, and three have climbing walls. Six facilities have lazy rivers, and most of the facilities without this feature were developed more than 10 years ago.

Compared to these facilities in neighboring communities, the aquatic facilities in Garland have few of these features. None of the facilities in Garland offer a lazy river, a family activity area, or a vortex, only Bradfield Pool has a waterslide and a small climbing wall. Residents who want to use these features currently must visit aquatic facilities offered by neighboring jurisdictions.

Table 3.6: Feature Comparison

Facility Name	Location	Year Opened	Lap Lanes	Family Activity Pool/Area	Zero Depth Entry	Tall Waterslides	Lazy River/Current Channel	Vortex	Sprayground	Wading Pool/Tot Area	Diving Boards	Climbing Wall	Surf Simulator	Rental Space
Cimarron Family Aquatic Center	Irving	2008	5	X	X	2				X				X
City Lake Aquatic Center	Mesquite	1	3	X	X	1								
Ford Pool	Allen	2017	6	X	X	1								
Frisco Water Park	Frisco	2015		X	X	6	X			X				X
Frog Pond Water Park	Farmers Branch	2014		X	X	2	X			X				X
Heights Family Aquatic Center	Richardson	2013	4	X	X	X	X	X						
Jack Carter Outdoor Pool	Plano	2016	3	X	X	2	X	X		X	X	X	1	X
The Colony Aquatic Park	The Colony	2							X	X				
The Cove Aquatic Center at Fretz	Dallas	2018	8	X	X	1	X			X	X	X		
Vanston Swimming Pool	Mesquite	2006	3	X	X	1								
West Irving Aquatic Center	Irving	2010	4	X	X	2	X			X		X		X
Total			8	10	10	9	6	2	1	7	2	3	1	5

1. Between 1995 and 2001

2. Pre 1995

3.8.2 Fee Comparison

The charges for the use of aquatic facilities vary substantially from one municipality to another. Table 3.7 shows the fees for usage of facilities at various facilities near Garland, including annual and daily use fees. The fees to use Bradfield, Holford, and Wynne pools in Garland are well below the average and median of these communities, while the fees at Surf and Swim are a bit higher than the comparisons. Many communities charge non-residents higher fees, but Garland does not. Garland does not offer an annual pass, but the median is about \$50 per individual or \$150 for a family.

Table 3.7: Pool Price Comparison

Community	Daily Fees - Resident			Daily Fees - Non-Resident			Annual Fees - Resident			
	Adult Individual	Youth	Senior	Adult Individual	Youth	Senior	Adult/Individual	Youth	Senior	Family "4"
Allen	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$65.00	\$65.00	\$65.00	\$200.00
Dallas (The Cove)	\$8.00	\$6.00	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$6.00	\$8.00	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Farmers Branch	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$130.00
Frisco	\$13.00	\$9.00	\$13.00	\$13.00	\$9.00	\$7.00	\$450.00	\$350.00	\$350.00	\$700.00
Mesquite (Aquatic Centers)	\$4.00	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$7.00	\$5.00	\$4.00	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Plano (Jack Carter)	\$9.00	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$9.00	\$5.00	\$5.00	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Richardson (Aquatic Center)	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$45.00	\$45.00	\$45.00	\$150.00
Rowlett	\$10.00	\$9.00	\$8.00	\$12.00	\$11.00	\$10.00	\$40.00	\$40.00	\$40.00	\$160.00
The Colony	\$4.00	\$3.00	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$3.00	\$4.00	\$45.00	\$45.00	\$45.00	\$90.00
Garland - Surf and Swim	\$8.00	\$6.00	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$6.00	\$8.00	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Garland - Bradfield	\$3.00	\$2.00	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$2.00	\$3.00	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Average¹	\$7.00	\$5.38	\$6.00	\$8.75	\$7.13	\$6.88	\$130.00	\$110.00	\$110.00	\$268.00
Median¹	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$8.00	\$6.00	\$7.00	\$47.50	\$47.50	\$47.50	\$155.00

1. Average and median do not include Garland

2. Height requirements in Garland and Rowlett converted to youth/adult

3.8.3 Number of Pools

The Trust for Public Land (TPL) prepares an annual report that includes a variety of information about parks throughout the USA. The 2019 *City Park Facts* includes data for the number of pools for the top 100 US cities, in terms of population. Table 3.8 presents these 100 cities¹ with the count of pools, number of pools per 100,000

¹ Numbers were available for only 95 of the 100 communities.

population, and the ranking for number of pools per 100,000 population. The top ranked cities tend to be older cities with many small neighborhood pools. In general, the ranking does not vary much by region or local climate as many high-ranking cities have cooler climates and many lower ranked cities have warmer climates.

Based on these numbers, Garland currently ranks 43rd with five pools (Hawaiian Falls included in the numbers), resulting in a value of 2.0 pools per 100,000 population. This number is slightly above the median number of pools per 100,000 population for the 100 cities of 1.8. If Garland had one fewer pool, the resulting pools per 100,000 population would be 1.7, ranking 51st.

Table 3.8: TPL Pool Benchmarking Comparison

Place Name	City Population	Pools	Pools per 100,000 Residents	Rank
Cleveland, OH	381,226	42	11.0	1
Cincinnati, OH	308,969	23	7.4	2
Pittsburgh, PA	310,884	19	6.1	3
Tucson, AZ	541,841	28	5.2	4
Philadelphia, PA	1,591,765	72	4.5	5
Washington, DC	688,642	30	4.4	6
Henderson, NV	298,927	13	4.3	7
Denver, CO	714,708	31	4.3	8
Atlanta, GA	477,371	20	4.2	9
Omaha, NE	450,466	18	4.0	10
Jacksonville, FL	907,722	35	3.9	11
Hialeah, FL	233,504	9	3.9	12
Orlando, FL	286,678	11	3.8	13
New Orleans, LA	392,887	15	3.8	14
Milwaukee, WI	587,575	22	3.7	15
Winston-Salem, NC	246,224	9	3.7	16
Austin, TX	969,733	35	3.6	17
Baltimore, MD	613,084	22	3.6	18
St. Petersburg, FL	260,094	9	3.5	19
Buffalo, NY	260,157	9	3.5	20
Tampa, FL	379,551	12	3.2	21
Lincoln, NE	287,896	9	3.1	22
Boise, ID	227,531	7	3.1	23
Plano, TX	295,013	9	3.1	24
Laredo, TX	268,976	8	3.0	25
Boston, MA	674,913	20	3.0	26
Irvine, CA	270,731	8	3.0	27
St. Louis, MO	315,273	9	2.9	28
Chicago, IL	2,768,416	78	2.8	29
Memphis, TN	662,038	18	2.7	30
Irving, TX	243,678	6	2.5	31
El Paso, TX	698,533	17	2.4	32
Aurora, CO	370,647	9	2.4	33
Sacramento, CA	500,667	12	2.4	34
Wichita, KS	400,599	9	2.2	35
Des Moines, IA	227,308	5	2.2	36
Chandler, AZ	275,654	6	2.2	37
Riverside, CA	321,943	7	2.2	38
Honolulu, HI	1,014,168	22	2.2	39
Lexington/Fayette, KY	323,298	7	2.2	40
Toledo, OH	278,978	6	2.2	41
Albuquerque, NM	571,471	12	2.1	42
Garland, TX	244,303	5	2.0	43
San Antonio, TX	1,457,400	28	1.9	44
Las Vegas, NV	639,625	12	1.9	45
Durham, NC	271,001	5	1.8	46
Portland, OR	652,565	12	1.8	47
Bakersfield, CA	383,573	7	1.8	48
Kansas City, MO	497,311	9	1.8	49
Mesa, AZ	501,137	9	1.8	50
Phoenix, AZ	1,616,300	29	1.8	51
Houston, TX	2,358,708	42	1.8	52
Greensboro, NC	288,594	5	1.7	53
Baton Rouge, LA	233,114	4	1.7	54
Raleigh, NC	469,363	8	1.7	55
Fresno, CA	528,920	9	1.7	56
Anchorage, AK	303,421	5	1.6	57
North Las Vegas, NV	243,535	4	1.6	58
Los Angeles, CA	4,002,721	65	1.6	59
Scottsdale, AZ	249,005	4	1.6	60
Reno, NV	255,055	4	1.6	61
Lubbock, TX	260,624	4	1.5	62
Gilbert, AZ	261,287	4	1.5	63
Virginia Beach, VA	461,588	7	1.5	64
Dallas, TX	1,356,896	20	1.5	65
Santa Ana, CA	342,217	5	1.5	66
Nashville/Davidson, TN	684,946	10	1.5	67
Jersey City, NJ	278,539	4	1.4	68
Oakland, CA	420,486	6	1.4	69
Seattle, WA	710,295	10	1.4	70
St. Paul, MN	305,840	4	1.3	71
Arlington, TX	389,547	5	1.3	72
Stockton, CA	313,009	4	1.3	73
San Francisco, CA	878,294	11	1.3	74
Detroit, MI	656,573	8	1.2	75
Tulsa, OK	415,675	5	1.2	76
Colorado Springs, CO	471,059	5	1.1	77
Columbus, OH	876,962	9	1.0	78
Minneapolis, MN	419,897	4	1.0	79
San Diego, CA	1,405,422	13	0.9	80
New York, NY	8,679,888	72	0.8	81
Glendale, AZ	247,804	2	0.8	82
Oklahoma City, OK	673,590	5	0.7	83
Chula Vista, CA	272,387	2	0.7	84
Long Beach, CA	480,903	3	0.6	85
San Jose, CA	1,040,606	6	0.6	86
Charlotte/Mecklenburg	1,092,533	5	0.5	87
Arlington, VA	227,454	1	0.4	88
Fremont, CA	230,734	1	0.4	89
Madison, WI	258,275	1	0.4	90
Fort Worth, TX	882,972	3	0.3	91
Anaheim, CA	359,477	1	0.3	92
Louisville, KY	632,268	1	0.2	93
Corpus Christi, TX	337,094	0	0.0	94
Newark, NJ	284,054	0	0.0	95
Median			1.8	