

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

April 1, 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:** Approve minutes for March 4, 2014 and revised February 4, 2014 minutes.

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. Consider Purchasing Policy and Draft MOU
- B. Update on Siegfried Contract

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 April 15, 2014 at 3:00 p.m.**

I, Heidi Whitlock, certify that I caused to be posted notice of the regular meeting scheduled for April 1, 2014 in the areas designated on March 28, 2014.


Heidi Whitlock, Project Manager

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

Meeting was called to order at 3:02 p.m. by President Wilson.

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

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 Wosick to approve the agenda as posted; motion carried.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF:

Motion by Board member Meserve, second by Board member McBride to approve January 28, 2014 minutes, Abstentions by Board member Wosick and Vice President Chapman; motion carried.

Motion by Vice President Chapman, second by Board member Meserve to approve February 4, 2014 minutes, abstention by Board member Wosick; motion carried.

CORRESPONDANCE: No correspondence was presented.

7 MATTERS FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION:

7A Acceptance of Final Pool Heating Cost Analysis

Mr. Hancock states that at the last meeting staff were asked to include specifics on the pool heating cost analysis so in the event that someone viewed it as a stand-alone document, they would be aware of the conditions given for the analysis.

Motion by Vice President Chapman, second by Board member McBride to accept the final pool heating cost analysis; motion carried.

7B Acceptance of Final Site Analysis

Mr. Hancock discusses the completed analysis and asks the Board for approval.

Tony Jonas (Public) inquires as to whether or not the Board actually read the document entirely. Vice President Chapman responds that, yes, he has read everything with the exception of the acknowledgement page as that was just added. He then asks Mr. Hancock if that was the only change. Mr. Hancock then responds that only the acknowledgement page and executive summary were added, everything else remained the same. Vice President Chapman then states that yes, he has now read everything.

Motion by Board member Wosick, second by Vice President Chapman to accept the final site analysis; motion carried.

7C Update of RFP posting

Mr. Hancock starts by stating that we have been taking on dual tracks. First, the site analysis for a new community swimming pool. Second, receiving cost estimates for the rehabilitation of the Roosevelt Pool. At the last meeting we brought an RFP to the Board which was posted on February 18, 2014. At that time it was requested that we add photos. We are letting the Board know that up to sixty (60) photos were included in the RFP posting. He then stated that he has spoken with at least four firms who were inquiring about the project. We have a deadline of March 11, 2014 and we will continue to review what comes in and we will give you an update with bids at the March 18, 2014 meeting. We are not expecting them to turn them in until the very end of the given timeframe.

Board member McBride then inquires as to whether or not Tony Jonas's question from the last meeting had been answered yet, can the Board use the funds for the Roosevelt Pool analysis. Mr. Hancock responds that he yet to receive a written legal response to this question, but he will bring back the answer by the next meeting.

7D Update regarding Press Release form February 22, 2014

Mr. Hancock states that there have been discussions between the Lassen Community College, Lassen High School and programs. Due to both accurate and inaccurate information I met with Dr. Hall, Mr. Trussell, Mr. Walton and Mr. Claussen and we agreed to put out a press release to resolve the negative rumors and we believed that providing a press release would be good for documentation.

7E Update on County Treasurer and Pool Account

Mr. Hancock states that he met with the County yesterday and wants to give a brief background. In forming the JPA, certain staff were going to be needed on an interim basis. Myself as the Executive Officer, Miss Whitlock for the Project Manager and a Treasurer. It was stated that the JPA would like the County to take on that roll if only direct costs would be charged, not indirect costs. That action was taken before the Board of Supervisors and it was approved to waive all indirect costs. Again, I had a meeting with the County yesterday, with Richard Egan, the County CEO, Karen Fouch, the County Auditor, and Nancy Cardenes, the Assistant County Treasurer. They are looking at their accounting summaries and comparing to the line items. They are preparing an agreement to state the fees for holding the funds and to memorialize that the fees are waived for two (2) years. We should have this agreement available for the next meeting. It was also asked that we adopt the County's purchasing policy because we have yet to discuss this. We will also need to discuss who will have signing authority for the warrants etc...It is our understanding that once Mr. Egan is in the CEO position and no longer Treasurer, whoever will take over that position will be replacing him in the JPA Treasurer position.

President Wilson inquires as to whether or not we will be requesting the County and City for their annual contributions. Mr. Hancock states, yes, letters have been drafted and will be sent out. President Wilson then inquires about whether or not the Pennies for the Pool will be in a separate account or lumped with the other funds. We need to keep them separate. Mr. Hancock responded that we ask for three (3) accounts: public contributions, City/County funds and then a Pennies for the Pool fund. President Wilson states that would be preferred because we don't want to use Pennies for the Pool funds for admin or other fees, only actual pool costs. Vice President Chapman states that the County will be able to do this so we know where all the money came from and the breakdown.

Vice President Chapman then requests that we change the wording on the staff report from "Auditor/Tax Collector and Treasurer" to Auditor/Controller and Treasurer/Tax Collector.

7F Reimbursement request for staff services

Mr. Hancock starts by reading the fiscal impact from utilizing City staff and then requests that once the funds are consolidated into a Treasurer account, the fees be reimbursed to the City. Vice President Chapman agrees that we should get the contributions from both the County and City first, then process the reimbursement. President

Wilson then inquires if this amount was coming out of the \$20,000 in the budget for staff cost reimbursements. Mr. Hancock stated that it could come from that area, as well as start-up costs and site selection. President Wilson then states that it looks like we would still stay on track with the budget.

Motion by board member Wosick, second by Board member Meserve to approve the reimbursement of City staff time; motion carried.

7G Update on pool construction firms

Mr. Hancock starts by stating that even though we have yet to put out an RFP for the facility, word is getting out there that we soon will. Vice President Chapman requests that we cease calling it a facility or aquatic facility as it's a community swimming pool. He then states that he has received correspondence commenting on the use of "aquatic facility" and it creates confusion on what we are actually building. Mr. Hancock states that we have been using those terms interchangeably but we can cease using that term and strictly call it the community swimming pool. Vice President Chapman then states, maybe once we have a pool we can expand into an aquatic facility. Board member Wosick responds that this is a good point and Mr. Hancock responds that we will change the wording and send a consistent message.

Mr. Hancock then continues that the word has gotten out that the Board is committed to building a swimming pool and Jackson Pools and Jim Daughtry have been two firms who have requested details on the project. While in discussions with them we were able to see what things they need, environmental studies, etc...He continues that it is good that the word is getting out and we will continue as more firms call. Vice President Chapman inquires as to where there firms are located. Mr. Hancock responds that Jackson Pools is out of southern California and Daughtry is out of Chico.

7H Preliminary Design Services – Contract with Greg Melton Design Services

Mr. Hancock starts by stating that from the beginning we have discussed that site acquisition, design services, etc... have to overlap so that everything keeps moving forward. The purpose is to have a qualified individual to see what our needs are, give us a detailed cost estimate and a design concept that is within our budget while working with someone who has worked with pool construction to ensure the elements will fit. It has also been discussed that additional features could be added later if so desired. We would like to create a single design to then bring to an engineering firm. Typically, engineering firms like to do both, but keeping it separate could be more cost effective versus paying someone a fixed cost to do both.

Mr. Hancock then states that he likes the Greg Melton Design Group. He states that he has recently been informed on one (1) issue with a report but everything else has been very good. At this time we are looking for direction from the Board to whether or not we should go out to RFP or continue on this path.

Board member Wosick asks if Mr. Hancock had worked with this firm before and if so, what this one negative item was. Mr. Hancock responds that the one item was a report. There was a council member who did not like/appreciate how it was written. Board member Wosick then asked if they could have more information. Board member McBride then asks how we cannot conform and not go to RFP prior to choosing a design company. Mr. Hancock then explains that there are two types of contracts, public contracts and professional services contracts. Public agencies have a purchasing policy in place. This is a professional service since they can be considered an extension of staff we are already utilizing. Vice President Chapman states that this will be crucial in keeping our creditability. It would be good to know what the City did with them in the past. He states that Aquatic Design has been used at some point. He then asks where Melton Design Service are located. Mr. Hancock responds, Chico, and as for the Aquatic Design Group, their pricing seem to be 2-3 times higher than Melton Groups in the past. Vice President Chapman then inquires what Melton Design Services have been used for in the past. Mr. Hancock states the Eagle Lake Boat launch, the Sierra Park Project as well as others that he cannot recall at this time. He then stated that he has also worked with them while he was in Oroville and listed a few other projects including one or two pools while working with a pool company. Vice President Chapman then asks if we would be receiving

the cost for these services at the next meeting or if we were going out to RFP? Mr. Hancock responds that it would be up to the Board.

President Wilson then inquires about the County's purchasing policy. Mr. Hancock asks if we are adopting the County's policy. Vice President Chapman stated that we would need to see what we are adopting as a purchasing policy before accepting anything. He then inquires about where the Aquatic Design is located. **Tony Jonas** (public) states that they are located in Carlsbad, CA. Mr. Jonas also adds that they had completed a workup of the Credence School site back in 2005-2007 but he didn't know if that information was available. Mr. Hancock responded to Mr. Jonas that there is nothing available at this time, not that there wasn't something at one time, but those searching have come up with nothing. Mr. Hancock continues that is all comes down to what the Board wants to do. We will stay transparent, no one wants to cut corners. Being that the City has had a previous contract with Greg Melton, I believe we should enter into another contract with the JPA, or do the RFP, time and money are the factors and it's up to the Board.

Board member Wosick agrees that time and money are the factors. He states that we want to move forward with the process and that there is no time for unnecessary delays. If Mr. Hancock has the preexisting contract, why, with our timetable, would we allow delays if they are coming highly recommended, why not keep moving forward?

Board member McBride states that he is the person who has an issue with Greg Melton Design Services. He continues that he would rather have other options, even locally. He continues that he does not want to spend money twice. He would like to sit down and figure out what the Board expects and wants while waiting for the Roosevelt analysis to come back.

Vice President Chapman concurs with Board member McBride. He states that today is the first time he has heard of the Greg Melton. He would like to stick with the timeline but does not want a false start with one company at this time. He believes it all depends on the RFP, could the Roosevelt pool be rehabilitated. He then states he would be surprised if it can be but we need to wait until we get the results. He then suggests that we float an RFP and see what firms are out there because we have a little window that we need to use wisely – by June. We need an idea, possibly scoping out the public like Board member McBride stated.

Mr. Hancock then states that our timeline only goes out to March 18, 2014, but then asks if he misunderstood but thought we were following two paths. We are now having a lot of questions and speculating what will be happening. He then states maybe he misunderstood that role but Greg Melton's job would be to come in and talk with the Board and draft something to understand the Board and community's desires and be able to add or subtract features. He then states that this is only a conceptual design, not a construction design. It's a feature for the public and Board to see. The visuals created by the Melton Group with assist with this and the cost will have to be based on the money that we have budgeted.

Bill Fierabend (public) - feels that the Roosevelt Pool needs to be put to rest prior to continuing.

Board member Wosick asks how long it will be before we have an RFP estimate. The question is do we spend a bit of money, although not recklessly, since we believe the pool results will not favor the rehabilitation. Do we have a public workshop with Greg Melton Design here or do we stop everything until the pool analysis is completed? Vice President Chapman suggests the Board put out an RFP and at the first meeting in April (no later than April 15th) and see what they can do in that price range. We don't want to stop everything and wait, it would be concept only. Board member Wosick then states that it sounds like a relatively small contract just to have them come here. He then states that the County has some money set aside for this purpose.

Board member McBride inquires as to whether or not we have contacted other pools to see who built them. Maybe we can, as a Board, decide seasonal or year-round and then maybe local people can give us estimates on what is already there, such as the cost to add locker rooms in the Credence School building etc. Vice President Chapman responds that Burney had received plans to build there pool and he would suggest again that maybe we can purchase those plans since that pool is 25 yards by 25 meters. There are still facilities we can visit and we can

inquire as to what type of environmental items needed to be addressed etc... We could even contact Redding which build a pool 5-7 years ago.

Board member Meserve requests to go back to the RFP. He states he was sitting here thinking about how we purchase items and he thinks we need to decide, as a Board, what policy we are using. He believes this needs to be decided prior to the Board moving forward. President Wilson responds that he hopes the Board can find a common ground and keep moving forward. He firmly believes that the Board is in need of professional help. He then adds that he would like to view the County's purchasing policy at the March 18, 2014 meeting and that it is his opinion to not contract with anyone until this policy is set. He continues that he doesn't like the RFP option, he believes it is a reason for stalling. He would rather move forward. He then states that the \$7,500 amount requested for Greg Melton Design is worth 2 months of waiting on RFP results, as shown with the process of the Roosevelt Pool. Vice President Chapman then asks if we can get quotes from other firms for the next meeting. He would also like to see the momentum continued and is not opposed to the Melton Group if the cost was good. President Wilson then stated that other item needing to be discussed is how much money they have to work with.

Vice President Chapman states that he has been hearing from the public that they want a covered pool. Before the Board starts looking at other features, this needs to be included. President Wilson states that the limiting factor will still be the money. Mr. Jonas then asks the Board what they mean by a covered pool. Would it be a roof or a fully enclosed structure? Vice President Chapman responds a structure like Roosevelt Pool, or like the pool at UNR, just their main pool area.

Charles "Moose" Mueller (public) – Inquired as to how much the Roosevelt Pool analysis would cost, just a few thousand or \$30,000? Do we want to spend that amount or not. Yes, the public is saying a covered pool. He just wants to know if we are setting a limit on how much we will spend on the old pool. President Wilson states that he isn't sure he wants to answer that question right now but he agrees that he does not want to waste money. **Bill Fierabend** (public) – states that he thinks that maybe we should start with an uncovered pool with the intention of enclosing it later. President Wilson responds that yes, we would design something that would allow us to add onto at a later date if we wish to do so.

Tony Jonas (public) states that Greg Melton Design Services and Aquatic Design are both "dreamer" and that, very soon, we will need to confirm the site. There are a lot of items to take care of prior to starting the design phase and we can't do it until the site is chosen. He then adds that the Credence School will probably not support an "L"-shaped pool. Board member McBride responds that there are people in town who we can ask now to better our chances of getting their support when he start building. We have contractors and engineers that may be able to draft the items we need. Mr. Jonas then states that we, the Board, needs to remember that we are in this for fifteen (15) years, not just right now.

Mr. Hancock states that he appreciates where everyone is coming from. However, we cannot decide how much operation fees will be without the design or what the design will be without knowing how much we can afford in operating costs. What we the Board like for the next meeting? The process is moving along quickly which is generating questions in the public. The longer we proceed without specifics the more rumors will start spending. Maybe we should send out a press release stating where we are going.

Vice President Chapman brings up that we will have to finance because \$800,000 will only get us a concrete structure with a tire swing. This year will be the defining time for what gets completed with the swimming pool. This is the most serious effort we have made in ten years. Let's get this dialed in with the money we have. Board member Wosick states that, if we go with a year-round pool, it does not have to be covered. However, we first need to decide if it will be covered or not and how quickly are we going to know this? If money is a factor, how long do we have to wait until we know? President Wilson responds that this is where he feels we need professional help. Professionals will help the Board build their dream. Mr. Jonas states that he agrees with this. But, we will also need to decide how much per person per day because he feel that the pool will not have enough people going through it daily to cover the operating costs.

President Wilson recommends that the County's purchasing policy be brought to the next meeting along with any recommended changes. Also, any other options for pool creations. Board member McBride again suggests contacting local engineers etc... and engage the community by asking who would like to be involved. President Wilson then suggests that staff update the timeline to include the next three (3) months. And that it is his opinion that we need to stay on track. Board member Wosick inquires as to how we would get the public to attend the public meetings and they don't currently attend. Board member McBride suggests calling them out of the phone book and inviting them. Vice President Chapman suggests picking a date and having an evening meeting with the public. That way we can get opinions and ideas from the public to help in the planning.

BOARD MEMBER ISSUES/REPORTS: None.

PUBLIC COMMENT TO CLOSED SESSION ITEMS:

Dave Trussell (public) (LCC member) – just wanted to state that we want the pool. But, do we know if the property is available? If so, who has the first right to it? Mr. Hancock responds that the Susanville Elementary School District is the owner. They can transfer the property to the JPA if they so choose. President Wilson then states that the JPA has no desire to kick the Lassen Community College out of the building if they acquire it. Vice President Chapman then states that LCC is very important to the community. Board member McBride then states that he would not like to take it away from the college if they desire it. The Board has other sites that they could choose from if the College wanted to purchase it.

CLOSED SESSION: At 5:05 p.m. the Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority recessed to closed session to discuss the following:

A. PROPERTY NEGOTIATIONS

RETURN TO OPEN SESSION: At 5:47 p.m. the Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority reconvened in open session.

Direction given to staff; not reportable action was taken.

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 5.49 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 President 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 here 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.

CLOSED SESSION: At 3:17 p.m. the Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority recessed to closed session to discuss the following:

A. PROPERTY NEGOTIATIONS

RETURN TO OPEN SESSION: At 4:01 p.m. the Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority reconvened in open session.

Board directed staff to begin negotiations with the owner, Susanville Elementary School District, for the Credence Site.

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 a treasurer 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 not 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

Submitted By: Jared G. Hancock, Executive Officer

Action Date: April 1, 2014

AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: Adopt Revised Purchasing Policy

SUMMARY: The Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority has chosen to use the County Tax Collector / Treasurer as the Treasurer for the JPA. The County has requested that the Board agree to use the County's Purchasing Policy. At the March 18, 2014 meeting, the County's Purchasing Policy was provided and it was decided that minimal changes regarding terminology had to be made. Staff was directed to bring back a revised purchasing policy for adoption.

FISCAL IMPACT: None.

ACTION REQUESTED: Board to adopt Revised Purchasing Policy.

ATTACHMENTS: Revised Purchasing Policy.

POLICY NAME:	Purchasing
POLICY NUMBER:	03-P12
BOARD APPROVAL DATE:	January 26, 2004
REVISION NUMBER & DATE:	Replaces Personnel Rules & Regs 1301 to 1315

PURCHASING POLICY

1. ITEMS COSTING LESS THAN \$20:

Departments are encouraged to establish petty cash funds for immediate reimbursement of small purchases. The auditor can assist the department in establishing a petty cash fund.

2. ITEMS COSTING BETWEEN \$21 AND \$750:

Inexpensive materials, supplies, and equipment can be purchased directly by department, no purchase order is required. Claim forms should not be submitted to the Auditor's Office for reimbursements which are less than \$20. Either receipts should be held until the total expenditures add up to more than \$20 or the department should establish a petty cash fund for small purchases. Departments are encouraged to purchase their office supplies from the State contract, CMAS contract, CSAC contract, and Office Depot bulk purchasing contracts.

3. ITEMS COSTING BETWEEN \$751 AND \$2,000:

These items require a purchase order and a requisition form. The requisition must be approved by the Department head. The related purchase order must be submitted to Administrative Services and to the Auditor-Controller's Office for review and approval. Purchase orders for computer hardware and software, printers, and photocopiers must be sent to the county purchasing agent before making a purchase, so the purchasing agent can acquire the items from the vendors offering the best prices and to insure that the equipment being purchased is compatible with the county wide computer standards.

4. ITEMS COSTING BETWEEN \$2,001 AND \$10,000:

Purchase of these items requires a purchase order and informal quotes from at least three vendors. The names of the vendors, their business address and telephone numbers, and their price quotes must be written on the requisition form. If the type of equipment being purchased is so specialized that less than three vendors are available, please document this on your requisition. If you are purchasing through the CMAS contract or one of the other mass purchasing contracts, you are not obligated to obtain quotes from three vendors because these prices have already been negotiated. Again, purchase orders for computer hardware and software, printers, and photocopiers must be sent to the county purchasing agent before making a purchase, so the purchasing agent can acquire the items from the vendors offering the best prices and to insure that the equipment being purchased is compatible with the county wide computer standards.

5. ITEMS COSTING OVER \$10,000:

Purchases of more than \$10,000 must be pre-approved by the JPA Board (either through the annual budget process or through a separate Board Agenda Item) and must be acquired through a formal advertised bidding process with written responses from potential vendors. The purchasing agent will

COUNTY OF LASSEN

assist the department in setting up the bidding process. This paragraph refers to the acquisition of both equipment and contractual services.

5.1 LOCAL PREFERENCE

Where bids are for items totaling \$10,000 (ten thousand) or more, local businesses will receive a 5% (5 percent) preference. Local preference will not apply to bids which combine professional services with hardware purchases. (Amended per Resolution 99-032)

5.1.1 LOCAL BUSINESS DEFINED

A local business will have a physical presence in Lassen County where business is conducted during defined hours. Businesses wishing to receive a local preference must include a telephone number and address within Lassen County in their bid documents. These will be the only points of contact with businesses claiming local preferences. (Amended per Resolution 99-032)

5.2 BID EXCEPTION

Purchases of items and equipment from another governmental agency shall not be subject to the formal bid requirements contained in Section 1305. All such purchases shall have prior approval in writing by the Project Manager requesting the purchase, by the Executive Officer, and the President of the JPA Board. (Amended per Resolution 00-019)

6. PUBLIC WORKS CONTRACTS OVER \$50,000:

Requires pre-approval by the JPA Board; a formal bidding process; and acceptance of the winning bid by the JPA Board. The purchasing agent will assist the department in setting up the bidding process. The purchasing agent and legal counsel will both assist the department in determining whether the project being envisioned requires prevailing wages or not.

7. CONTRACTUAL SERVICES:

All contractual services contracts in excess of \$1,000 per year must be approved by legal counsel and the Executive Officer. Standard state contracts need not be submitted to legal counsel. The purchasing agent and county counsel have standard contracts for personal services, leases, public works projects, and for a variety of other purposes. The department must use the standard county contract forms whenever possible. The Executive Officer is authorized to execute contracts and invoices in the amount not to exceed Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000) per year. (Amended per Resolution 07-031)

8. CONSULTANT SERVICES:

On some occasions, a Request for Proposal (RFP) is more appropriate than a "lowest responsible bid" process. The Executive Officer must authorize the department to issue an RFP, and the JPA Board must then approve the final contract. The purchasing agent can assist the department in preparing the RFP.

9. FIXED ASSETS:

Equipment which costs more than \$5000 and which has a useful life of one year or more shall be defined as "fixed assets" and shall be listed on the department's fixed assets inventory. The fixed assets inventory shall be updated annually by the department; copies of each year's inventory should be submitted to the auditor and to the purchasing agent/budget analyst.

ALL POLICIES ARE SUBJECT TO REVISION AT ANY TIME

COUNTY OF LASSEN**10. OFFICE SPACE LEASES:**

Building leases for periods in excess of two years and having a rental rate of over \$1,000 per month must be approved by the Executive Officer and by the JPA Board. The county's standard lease form should be used unless extraordinary circumstances apply. The purchasing agent may assist the department in negotiating the lease. Shorter leases require approval of the Executive Officer.

11. EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE CONTRACTS:

Regardless of amount, equipment maintenance contracts should be approved by the Purchasing Agent. The County may already have a maintenance contract in place to which another department can be added for a nominal price.

12. VEHICLES:

Departments which have their own vehicles should submit an annual vehicle request to the Sheriff. Funds for vehicle purchases will be budgeted in the Fleet Management division of the Sheriff's office. County intent is to replace vehicles prior to accumulating 100,000 miles on the odometer.

13. EMERGENCY PURCHASES:

In the event that a department needs to make an immediate purchase (exceeding \$750) at a time other than during normal business hours, the equipment or materials may be purchased without prior approval. However, the purchase must later be ratified by the JPA Board before payment will be made. Emergency purchases should be confined to situations where health or safety is affected, or when critical departmental functions would be totally halted (e.g., snowplow repairs, medical equipment, or boat patrol) if the emergency purchase is not made.

14. SURPLUS PROPERTY:

Fixed assets which are no longer needed should be turned over to the Purchasing Agent to be sold at the next surplus property auction. The Department's Fixed Assets inventory should be immediately amended. The Department should also notify the auditor and the purchasing agent of the items which are being removed from the department's fixed assets inventory. Non-General Fund departments will be credited with the revenue generated by the sale of its surplus property, less an administrative fee for auction expenses.

15. CREDIT CARD POLICY:

Currently, the county issues American Express cards to some employees for travel expenses only. The purchasing agent will attempt to set up a Procurement Card program or county VISA charge card account with one of the local banks to be used for small purchases of materials and supplies. Personal expenses MAY NOT be charged to county credit cards; doing so may be grounds for disciplinary action, up to and including dismissal.

AGREEMENT

between the
HONEY LAKE VALLEY RECREATION AUTHORITY (HLVRA)
and
THE COUNTY OF LASSEN (COUNTY)
concerning
**ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL
AND OPERATIONAL SERVICES PROVIDED BY COUNTY**

RECITALS

1. HLVRA desires to contract with County for treasury management and auditor/controller services;
2. HLVRA desires to have County act as agent for the disbursement of funds to provide purchasing, warrant preparation and general accounting services;
3. The County has agreed to waive indirect expenses normally charged for these services for a period of 2 years; and
4. County is willing to provide purchasing, warrant preparation and general accounting services under the terms set forth herein.

In consideration of the Recitals above and the terms and conditions set forth herein, the parties agree as follows:

A. Disbursement by County

At the request of HLVRA, County shall pay from funds placed on deposit with County by HLVRA expenses incurred by HLVRA. Payment shall be in a manner prescribed by County and will be only made under the procedures established by County. Such payments may only be made at the request of HLVRA authorized representative (as identified in Section D below) from funds budgeted for the expenditure.

B. Accounting by County

County shall provide HLVRA an accounting of all money deposited with County and all disbursements made by County on behalf of HLVRA. County shall not be responsible for completing annual audits for HLVRA.

C. Delegation by HLVRA

The HLVRA shall appoint by resolution, individual(s) authorized to request disbursements from the County.

D. Complete Agreement

The parties agreed that this understanding is a complete agreement and supersedes all previous understandings, whether written or oral, of the parties.

E. Notices

Any notices required by this Agreement shall be sent as follows:

1. To HLVRA:
Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority
Executive Director
c/o City of Susanville
66 N. Lassen Street
Susanville, CA 96130

2. To County:
Lassen County Administrative Services
Chief Executive Officer
221 S. Roop St., Ste. 4
Susanville, CA 96130

F. Term

This Agreement shall commence when executed by last of the parties listed below and shall continue until terminated by mutual agreement of the parties or upon sixty (60) days written notice by one party to the other party.

On the dates listed below, the parties agreed to the terms, conditions and covenants set forth above.

HONEY LAKE VALLEY RECREATION AUTHORITY

By: _____

Dated: _____

COUNTY OF LASSEN

By: _____

Dated: _____

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Andrew Haut for County Counsel

Submitted By: Jared G. Hancock, Executive Officer

Action Date: April 1, 2014

AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: Update on Siegfried Contract

SUMMARY: At the March 18, 2014 meeting, the Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority decided to contract with Siegfried Engineering for the purpose of retrieving a cost estimate analysis for three rehabilitation options for the old Roosevelt Pool.

FISCAL IMPACT: None.

ACTION REQUESTED: None.

ATTACHMENTS: None.