HONEY LAKE VALLEY RECREATION AUTHORITY

GOVERNING BOARD
BRIAN WILSON, PRESIDENT
JIM CHAPMAN, VICE PRESIDENT
LARRY WOSICK, BOARD MEMBER
NICK MCBRIDE, BOARD MEMBER
DAVID MESERVE, BOARD MEMBER

STAFF
JARED HANCOCK, EXECUTIVE OFFICER
HEIDI WHITLOCK, PROJECT MANAGER
TREASURER, RICHARD EGAN

HONEY LAKE VALLEY RECREATION AUTHORITY
GOVERNING BOARD MEETING

City Council Chambers
66 North Lassen Street, Susanville, CA 96130

March 4, 2014 - 3:00 p.m.

Addressing the Board
- Any person desiring to address the Board shall first secure permission of the presiding officer.
- Matters under the jurisdiction of the Board, and not on the Agenda, may be addressed by the public at a time provided in the Agenda under Public Comment
- The Board of Directors will not take action on any subject that is not on the Agenda

---

1 **CALL TO ORDER**

2 **ROLL CALL BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

3 **AGENDA APPROVAL**

4 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**: January 28, 2014 and February 4, 2014

5 **CORRESPONDENCE**

6 **PUBLIC COMMENT**
(any person may address the Board at this time to comment on any subject not on the agenda. However, the Board may not take action other than to direct staff to agendize the matter at a future meeting.)

7 **MATTERS FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION:**
A. Acceptance of Final Pool Heating Cost Analysis
B. Acceptance of Final Site Analysis
C. Update on RFP posting
D. Update regarding Press Release from February 22, 2014
E. Update on County Treasurer and Pool Account
F. Reimbursement request for staff services
G. Update on pool construction firms
H. Preliminary Design Services – Contract with Greg Melton Design Services

8 **BOARD MEMBER ISSUES/REPORTS:**

9 **PUBLIC COMMENT ON CLOSED SESSION ITEMS** (if any): Any person may address the Board at this time upon any discussion during Closed Session.

10 **CLOSED SESSION:**

A. Conference with Real Property Negotiator:
1a) Location – Credence School, APN # 103-324-02, 814 Cottage Street, Susanville, CA; b)

Negotiator – Jared Hancock; c) Subject – Provide direction to Property Negotiator regarding price and terms of potential site; d) Negotiate with – Susanville Elementary School District.

ADJOURN

- ***The next meeting will be held on March 18, 2014 at 3:00 p.m.***

I, Heidi Whitlock, certify that I caused to be posted notice of the regular meeting scheduled for March 4, 2014 in the areas designated on February 28, 2014.

Heidi Whitlock, Project Manager

HONEY LAKE VALLEY RECREATION AUTHORITY
GOVERNING BOARD MEETING
Special Meeting Minutes
January 28, 2014 – 3:00 p.m.
Roosevelt Pool Site 800 South Street Susanville CA 96130

Meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. by Brian Wilson.

Roll Call of Board of Directors present: Nick McBride, David Meserve and President Brian Wilson. Board member Wosick and Vice President Chapman absent.

Staff Present: Jared Hancock, Executive Officer

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Motion by Board member McBride, second by Board member Meserve approved unanimously.

MATTERS FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION:

1 SITE VISIT FOR ROOSEVELT POOL

A site visit and tour of the pool facility was conducted.

2 SITE VISITS FOR POSSIBLE POOL LOCATIONS

Site visits and discussions were held for each of the following sites:

2A 800 South Street
2B Credence High School
2C Mesa Street
2D Other Locations – Sierra Pacific Riverside

BOARD MEMBER ISSUES/REPORTS: None.

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 5:34 p.m.

Brian Wilson, President

Respectfully Submitted by

Heidi Whitlock, City of Susanville, Project Manager

HONEY LAKE VALLEY RECREATION AUTHORITY
GOVERNING BOARD MEETING
Regular Meeting Minutes
February 4, 2014 – 3:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers 66 North Lassen Street Susanville CA 96130

Meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m. by Brian Wilson.

Roll Call of Board of Directors present: Nick McBride, David Meserve, Vice President Jim Chapman and President Brian Wilson. Board member Wosick absent.

Staff Present: Jared Hancock, Executive Officer, Heidi Whitlock, City of Susanville, Project Manager

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: Motion by Board member Meserve, second by Board member McBride to approve the agenda as posted; motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT REGARDING CLOSED SESSION ITEMS:

Bruce Davie (Public) - addressed the Board stating that he is sure that everyone read his letter that he forwarded to Mr. Hancock and he would like to discuss the benefits of his site (Deal & Davie). He believes that an Uptown area would be a better choice because the area is so blighted. The Pool would help reduce that. If the Pool is not visible, being away from Main Street, the out-of-area population may pass it by because they won't know that it is there costing the Board the non-resident monetary gain. He continues that the City has always wanted "a window" into Memorial Park and this site would give them that window. A community center at this location would have unique attributes and the added parking and access would be beneficial to other buildings such as the Veterans Hall. Vice President Chapman thanks Mr. Davie for being her and states that there have been many conversations between the two of them about what could help the Veterans Hall. He then asks how long it would take to purchase the property, and that he assumes it would be relatively easy since he is coming to us. Mr. Davie responds that he believes it would take no more than three months with a "clean transaction" of $399,000. He then stated that he is not here to negotiate, simply here to state that it's a better option. Mr. Hancock then requests the names of who the contact would be for this property and Mr. Davie states himself since he is the local part of the 50/50 Trust between the families.

Bill Feirabend (Public) – states that the entire first year's funds would be used to purchase this property versus the gifting from a City or County parcel. Mr. Davie responds that the more people who see the pool will use it which means more money to pay the ongoing operating costs, which is his main concern.

RETURN TO OPEN SESSION: at 4:01 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF: Motion by Board member Meserve, second by Board member McBride to approve January 7, 2014 minutes; motion carried.

CORRESPONDANCE: No correspondence was presented.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Dr. Marlon Hall (Public) – states that he is glad he can finally attend a meeting and that he would like to strongly recommend the Lassen Community College site. He states that, by using that site, they would be able to provide instruction, employment through work study and pool management. He just feels that the Lassen Community College should be where the pool is located.

Charles "Moose" Mueller - states that he just loves the idea of Mesa Street. It's flat and easy to work on, there is an available stoplight for crossing the road instead of just a crosswalk and that it has never been worked on so there is no digging up pipes etc...

10 MATTERS FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION:

10A Possible appointment of City Finance Manager as HLVRA Treasurer.

Mr. Hancock states that he has been discussing this item with Richard Egan and that they both agreed on the need for one and it looked it was going to be a County or City employee. It was asked whether or not the City has the capability to fill this role and he responded that the best position at the City would be the Finance Manager and currently, that position is being contracted out with Kevin Harper but he would be very capable. The City of currently looking into filling this role permanently but offers that the City or County would make the most sense.

Vice President Chapman states that, for the County, it would mean a "team" between the Treasurer and the Auditor and that he has been talking with Mr. Egan and found that there are more options. He goes on to explain that Mr. Egan said there was a way to have the County perform this function free of charge if a waiver was granted. He then asks Mr. Egan to elaborate. **Mr. Egan** starts by stating the Board can choose the City, the County or hire someone outside. However, if the County is chosen, the Auditor calculates fees across the board. However, the Board of Supervisors can be asked if those fees can be waived. Vice President Chapman responds that if we do this, we would like the code sited to prevent the Auditor from objecting to the request. Vice President Chapman then stated that, at this point, the amount collected etc... would be relatively small at least for the first few years. Then we may need to look into something else at that point. Mr. Hancock responded that he believes that either the City or County would be most appropriate. He then states that if they were handled by the City there would be no overhead fees charged, simply staff time, and he feels that the County would probably do the same. He thinks that either could carry it out. He ends by stating that he will research with Mr. Egan for the code.

Vice President motions to appoint the County as the interim Treasurer and to request that overhead costs be waived at this time. Board member Meserve seconds.

10B 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 Budget Discussion

Mr. Hancock starts by referring to the presented budget spreadsheet stating that this will be an evolving budget. Staff had originally presented a basic layout with only the 13/14 year but, because it only represented 5-6 months, we were directed to look at both the 13/14 and 14/15 year. We entered in some estimated line items to budget for today and requests direction from the Board on additional items, deletions or other changes. With no interjections he continues to discuss the spreadsheet listing the budgeted items, amounts and reasoning for those amounts. Vice President Chapman responds to Mr. Hancock by stating that all of the numbers are as good of a guess as any. If we overestimate anything, we can place that left over amount in a contingency fund. We have to maintain a lot of fluidity in this process and create a baseline. Mr. Hancock states that it is prudent to add a contingency fund. Vice President Chapman then stated that even staff time could fluctuate. Mr. Hancock then states that we need a best guess for what the start-up costs should be so any input today would assist us in this whether it be today or if the Board would like to email him so we can make those changes. Vice President Chapman stated that this is a good starting point but we need to add the contingency fund line. Mr. Hancock states that he appreciates looking over a couple of years while doing this budget. Board member Meserve thinks this is a good start, a good roadmap. President Wilson asks whether or not Mr. Hancock and staff were looking for direction. Mr. Hancock responded, no, that he will continue to receive feedback and will bring back a final budget for adoption.

10C Pool Heating Energy Analysis

Mr. Hancock opens by stating that at the direction of the Board, staff prepared the attached summary. He continued that there are many cost calculations so we boiled it all down to this single spreadsheet with the goal of seeing what the main source is, then what would make the most sense. He explained the fixed rate for natural gas, how much LMUD charges for electricity etc... When he discussed geothermal he mentioned that, right now, the City turns off the geothermal during the summer months and that they would have to keep it going year round if the pool was using it. The cost for the geothermal would be a fixed cost at approximately $2,500 a month, but that amount can be discussed with the City as the open air pool would not be an enclosed structure, which is what their rates are based on. He discussed the solar option and then the standard pool construction being approximately 5,500 sq. ft. with 8 competition lanes at 25 yards and 5 lanes at 25 meters with an average depth of 7ft. he then goes into temperature details on 82 degrees with pool covers during the night.

With the analysis completed, the results came in for a year round pool having geothermal having the lowest cost followed by natural gas with solar, natural gas alone then electric. The 6 month seasonal pool results showed natural gas with solar having the best cost savings followed by natural gas, geothermal and electric. Mr. Hancock then stated that other options were viewed but were not feasible. He then states that there was a fixed cost of installation for the solar option which is spread over the first year. President Wilson then opened the floor to the Public. Mr. Egan inquired about using geothermal and solar together as an option. Mr. Hancock stated that he would look into this option. He would also see if any other facilities would benefit by having the geothermal on year round so that the pool would not be the only customer paying in those additional months. Vice President Chapman inquires as to why the set $2,500 monthly? Mr. Hancock responds that the system costs approximately $80,000 annually to maintain/run. The amount is average out to those using it by square footage of their buildings.

Bill Feirabend (public) states that he would also like to see the geothermal and solar combination looked into because natural gas could increase at any time yet, the sun will keep on shining.

Charles "Moose" Mueller inquires as to whether or not we have discussed making the pool enclosed since the heating could possibly be cheaper if we have it covered. Has it been discussed? President Wilson responded that the budget, as it is, does not allow for a covered pool at this time. Mr. Mueller then requests that whatever we end up doing, we make sure not to cut corners so that we can't add it on at a later date if we wanted/planned to. Mr. Hancock responded that no, we wouldn't be doing any corner cutting.

Board member McBride then inquires what issues we could see if we had the geothermal running year round. With schools closing for the summer, what would happen if there was a leak, who would know? Mr. Hancock responds that the system actually has more problems with the constant turning off and on of the system, keeping is going year round would help prevent some of those issues (typically). He then stated that if a primary well goes down, it would affect everything, but natural gas would work the same way. He then stated he would look into whether or not shutting it down had a benefit at all to the system versus keeping it running. He then gave an estimate of approximately $15,000 a year using the geothermal and solar option.

Vice President Chapman stated that he is actually surprised by how close all the calculations were. He then proposed that we look into heating nit only the pool but the ambient air around it. Even in the summer months, the temperatures drop in the evenings and having heated air around the facility would be a benefit. Mr. Hancock responds that that is a great point, but this analysis is only for the basic design the Board had originally brought on. However, if they add on more areas, the cost will not increase with geothermal as it would for any other heating source. Vice President Chapman stated that it wouldn't be as inviting if all other areas are not heated. He believes that we would see more of a difference in the heating costs if we choose to include the ambient area, decking for instance, in the calculations for the 6 and 12 month periods.

10D Review methodology for the second phase site analysis for the top three sites.

Mr. Hancock opens by stating that staff are still waiting on numbers for some of the criteria so we are only presenting those criteria and not the finished product at this time. The first phase went to the Board first for approval and we wanted to do the same this time. He then goes into describing all the following criteria in more detail: site configuration, access & parking, property acquisition, site preparation costs, utility extension costs, permitting /CEQA, adjacent property constraints, additional funding potential, activity hub potential, heating analysis, revenue analysis and expense analysis. He then requests comments or concerns be mentioned at this time.

Vice President Chapman suggests that staff change #11 in the methodology to include the Lassen Community College funding. Mr. Hancock stated we will make that change. He then requests that CAL FIRE be mentioned somewhere but Mr. Hancock offered that CALFIRE would offer overall assistance, not site specific. Vice President Chapman stated that some sites site preparation costs could be a negative for a site but if inmate crews did all the work it may even out the criteria to make it more even.

President Wilson opens the floor to the Public.

Charles "Moose" Mueller – states that he used to go to the college and got to swim for free at the pool because he was registered in a class and disabled. Dr. Marlon Hall responded that those who are disabled do qualify for certain perks, but he would still have to pay for the class at the college.

Motion by Vice President Chapman, second by Board member McBride to move forward with the Phase 2 criteria with the given changes.

10E Review proposed scope of work for Roosevelt Pool engineer's analysis.

Mr. Hancock starts by stating that we are currently going down two paths at the same time, selecting a new pool site and refurbishing the Roosevelt Pool. We reached out to WLC Architects but they have been non-responsive. We decided to move forward and create a draft RFP. Mr. Hancock reads the scope of work and the project deliverables to the Board and asks for input on dates and the timeline from the Board.

Project Deliverables – President Wilson expresses his concern with paying for information that we already know. Mr. Hancock states that we have information available for anyone who would like to submit a proposal and that we are only looking for general costs, not down to the penny. He then stated that we can dial it down more, if necessary. President Wilson then states that he feels stuck. We already know about the glazing on the windows, that all the wood is rotted and needs replaced but, I want to do this as cheaply as possible. Do we need to do an RFP? Mr. Hancock responds that we will send out the RFP and he states that we will receive bids from $15,000 to $150,000. He just doesn't want anyone to say that if we went out to bid they could have come in cheaper.

Scope of Work – Board member McBride states that we should make all the photos available as well so no one is blindsided by the amount of work that is involved. Vice President Chapman agrees and states that we should include the newspaper articles as well. Board member McBride expresses his concern for someone placing a bid, coming up here, and then changing their minds and walking away. President Wilson repeats his concern with paying for something they already know.

Three scenarios – President Wilson does not feel that it is cost effective to fix everything in the Roosevelt Pool at this time. He believes that all they will find is what can be salvaged, like the cement, but the wood is all rotted. Mr. Hancock stated that at least we will have a list of qualified respondents and we can include a "cannot go over" bid amount listed but, that will lead to missed opportunities for lower bids. Board member Meserve states that with ten years of deterioration, he believes the Roosevelt Pool is beyond redemption. Mr. Hancock that a lot of people

share Board member Meserve's view and some even believe that we already have a pool, we just need to put water in it. Vice President Chapman adds that some parts of the building may be salvageable, like the concrete from the 30's. It's practically bulletproof and it would interesting to see what it looks like. He wonders if we can use the existing concrete and take out the rest.

Bill Feirabend states that, in his opinion, the Roosevelt Pool would not be cost effective to bring back. Vice President Chapman agrees with this assessment.

Tony Jonas (public) – inquires if the Board can even do this. Can they spend the funds of the JPA to do this analysis? Vice President Chapman responds that between now and the next meeting, we will verify that they have the legal authority to do the analysis and expend the funds to do so. He also expresses his concerns that there are so many people attempting to put restrictions on the JPA that there will be no pool. Then adding that those same people would also be upset to learn that the JPA built a new facility for $5 million instead of paying $1.5 million to refurbish the existing one.

Mr. Hancock states that he will ensure that the RFP spells out that the objective is to see which is more feasible to build new or to refurbish the existing enclosed structure.

President Wilson directs staff to proceed with what they are doing and we will see what comes back.

Mr. Hancock then adds that, at the next meeting, we will have a report on the website and fundraising committee.

BOARD MEMBER ISSUES/REPORTS:

Board member McBride inquired about where we were at on the non-profit organization. He also stated that he used to swim in the Roosevelt Pool and we should not dwell on how bad it has gotten, people may have an emotional memory of it. Vice President Chapman shared that he recently read a story written by someone in the area about the drought we have been in. He then wondered if now was the time to fix this mistake.

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 6:08 p.m.

_____
Brian Wilson, President

Respectfully Submitted by

_____
Heidi Whitlock, City of Susanville, Project Manager

AGENDA ITEM NO. 7A

Submitted By: Jared G. Hancock, Executive Officer

Action Date: March 4, 2014

AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: Acceptance of Final Pool Heating Cost Analysis

SUMMARY: At the January 21, 2014 meeting, the Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority requested a comparison of natural gas and geothermal to calculate cost savings and decide the best heating source for the community pool. The analysis given compared electric, natural gas, geothermal and a combination of natural gas supplemented with solar heated water. At the February 4, 2014 meeting, is was requested that staff also include the cost of geothermal supplemented with solar heated water. At that time, the analysis was presented but questions remained on what specifics were covered in the analysis as it was not clarified on the document itself. It was requested that they be listed on the document in the event the document was viewed independently.

FISCAL IMPACT: None.

ACTION REQUESTED: Review the specifics on the document and accept the final cost analysis.

ATTACHMENTS: Final Pool Heating Cost Analysis.

Swimming Pool Energy Cost Comparison

	Year Round Operation					6 Months Operation (April through September)				
	Natural Gas	Electricity	Geothermal	Natural Gas + Solar Hot Water	Geothermal + Solar Hot Water	Natural Gas	Electricity	Geothermal	Natural Gas + Solar Hot Water	Geothermal + Solar Hot Water
Cost	$1.85/therm	$0.115 KWH	$2500/mo.	$1.85/therm + $75,000 fixed cost ($7,800/year)	$75,000 fixed cost ($7,800/year)	$1.85/therm	$0.115/KWH	$2500/mo.	$1.85/therm + $75,000 fixed cost ($7,800/year)	$75,000 fixed cost ($7,800/year)
January	$9,998	$16,393	$2,500	$8,678	$2,500	$0	$0		$0	$0
February	$9,005	$14,764	$2,500	$7,245	$2,500	$0	$0		$0	$0
March	$8,144	$13,353	$2,500	$5,798	$2,500	$0	$0		$0	$0
April	$6,121	$10,037	$2,500	$3,092	$2,500	$6,121	$10,037	$2,500	$3,092	$2,500
May	$3,593	$5,890	$2,500	$123	$250	$3,593	$5,890	$2,500	$123	$250
June	$1,102	$1,806	$2,500	$0	$0	$1,102	$1,806	$2,500	$0	$0
July	$0	$0	$2,500	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,500	$0	$0
August	$559	$917	$2,500	$0	$0	$559	$917	$2,500	$0	$0
September	$2,835	$4,649	$2,500	$0	$0	$2,835	$4,649	$2,500	$0	$0
October	$5,584	$9,155	$2,500	$3,434	$2,500	$0	$0		$0	$0
November	$8,542	$14,006	$2,500	$7,076	$2,500	$0	$0		$0	$0
December	$10,083	$16,352	$2,500	$8,910	$2,500	$0	$0		$0	$0
Total	**$65,566**	**$107,322**	**$30,000**	**$52,156**	**$25,550**	**$14,210**	**$23,299**	**$15,000**	**$11,015**	**$10,550**

*Utility cost estimates are based on the following conditions: Pool to be 5,500 square feet at an average depth of 7 feet heated to 82°. Pool to utilize a cover in the evening hours.
Reference: Pool Energy Cost Calculator - Neil O. Anderson using Tonopah, NV (as its weather closely reseambles Susanville, CA).

AGENDA ITEM NO. 7B

Submitted By: Jared G. Hancock, Executive Officer

Action Date: March 4, 2014

AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: Acceptance of Final Site Analysis

SUMMARY: At the February 18, 2014 HLVRA meeting, staff presented phase 2 of the site analysis. Discussion between Board members resulted in the selection of the Credence site for the future pool, pending the results of the Roosevelt Pool Renovation Analysis. Since that time, staff have completed the executive summary and acknowledgments for the phase 2 analysis.

FISCAL IMPACT: None at this time.

ACTION REQUESTED: Review and accept the Final Site Analysis including the completed phase 2 site analysis.

ATTACHMENTS: Final Site Analysis.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 7C

Submitted By: Jared G. Hancock, Executive Officer

Action Date: March 4, 2014

AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: Update on RFP Posting

SUMMARY: The Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority is following dual paths in an effort to bring a community swimming pool back to Susanville. Along with the site selection for a new pool, the JPA has requested the analysis of the pre-existing Roosevelt Pool to determine whether or not the rehabilitation of this existing pool is feasible. Staff has created a request for proposal which was posted on February 18, 2014.

FISCAL IMPACT: None at this time.

ACTION REQUESTED: Review updated information received.

ATTACHMENTS: None.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 7D

Submitted By: Jared G. Hancock, Executive Officer

Action Date: March 4, 2014

AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: Update regarding press release dated Feb 22, 2014.

SUMMARY: As a result of misinformation being circulated regarding current college programs, staff met on Friday February 21, 2014 with Lassen College administrators and a joint press release was drafted in an effort to subdue unfounded rumors.

"Saturday, Feb. 22, 2014 - Lassen Community College and the Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority "Pool JPA" would like to jointly release a statement to advise the community that the location of Credence School site on Cottage Street has been selected as the preferred swimming pool site by the Pool JPA.

Lassen Community College has many important programs held at this site including Fire Science, POST, and Allied Health. Lassen Community College and the Pool JPA are currently working together to ensure that the College programs located at the Credence site continue unimpeded and wish to assure the public these programs will continue to be a focus and of high importance to all concerned. The Pool JPA and Lassen Community College are working together to partner in an aquatic facility and other partnerships to benefit the entire community."

FISCAL IMPACT: None.

ACTION REQUESTED: None.

ATTACHMENTS: None.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 7E

Submitted By: Jared G. Hancock, Executive Officer

Action Date: March 4, 2014

AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: Update of County Treasurer and pool account

SUMMARY: At the February 18, 2014 meeting it was stated that, at the County Board of Supervisors meeting, it was requested that the Auditor fees be waived if the County took on the Treasurer position for the JPA. The Board of Supervisors voted unanimously to waive those fees for two years, and approved the use of the Auditor/Tax Collector as the Treasurer for the JPA with a proposed two year term. As the Treasurer position is now assigned, we have sent a request to the respective agencies that the annual contribution be paid and the funds from the City, County and other contributions consolidated into the HLVRA account and the Treasurer's office.

FISCAL IMPACT: None.

ACTION REQUESTED: Direct staff to consolidate funds with the JPA Treasurer.

ATTACHMENTS: None.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 7F

Submitted By: Jared G. Hancock, Executive Officer

Action Date: March 4, 2014

AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: Reimbursement request for staff services.

SUMMARY: Since December 2013, City staff have been working for the JPA taking on the roles of Executive Officer and Project Manager and also performing site analyses. At this time, the City is requesting the reimbursement of funds for hours worked.

FISCAL IMPACT:

$6,752.03	Site analysis
$3,286.15	Agenda preparation and public meetings
$4,895.70	General services
$14,933.88	Total

ACTION REQUESTED: Motion to approve reimbursement.

ATTACHMENTS: None.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 7G

Submitted By: Jared G. Hancock, Executive Officer

Action Date: March 4, 2014

AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: Update on pool Construction firms.

SUMMARY: We have been contacted by two pool construction firms, Alan Jackson Pools and Jim Daughtery, who have expressed an interest in the project and we are continuing to communicate with them on construction options and site acquisition analysis criteria to ensure site suitability.

FISCAL IMPACT: None.

ACTION REQUESTED: None.

ATTACHMENTS: None.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 7H

Submitted By: Jared G. Hancock, Executive Officer

Action Date: March 4, 2014

AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: Preliminary Design Services – Contract with Greg Melton Design Services.

SUMMARY: Staff is recommending that we solicit the services of Greg Melton Design Services for the conceptual design and site configuration. The City has used his services in the past with very good results. With a budget of up to $7,500, we will bring back the preliminary design options. Once the design is finalized, it will be modeled and ultimately used for the preparation of a detailed construction document including plans and specifications. Greg Melton Design partners with a pool construction firm to ensure that design features take into account pool construction concepts and principles so that the facility can ultimately be built cost effectively.

FISCAL IMPACT: None.

ACTION REQUESTED: Direct staff to contract with Greg Melton Design Services and bring contract back for approval at the March 18, 2014 meeting.

ATTACHMENTS: None.