

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, NORMA SCHEETZ

HONEY LAKE VALLEY RECREATION AUTHORITY GOVERNING BOARD MEETING

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

July 15, 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 May 20, 2014, June 3, 2014 and June 17, 2014 meetings.

5 **CORRESPONDENCE**

A. Update on Distribution of Roosevelt Pool Site Analysis

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 agendaize the matter at a future meeting.)

7 **MATTERS FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION:**

A. Site Selection

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 item under consideration during Closed Session.

10 **CLOSED SESSION:**

A. Conference with Real Property Negotiator:

1a) Location – Roosevelt School, APN # 107-260-29 & 107-160-03, 800 South Street, Susanville, CA; b) Negotiator – Jared Hancock; c) Subject – provide direction to Property Negotiator regarding price and terms of potential site; d) Negotiate with – Lassen County.

2a) Location – Mesa Street, APN # 105-130-01 & 105-180-23, Mesa Street, Susanville, CA; b) Negotiator – Jared Hancock; c) Subject – provide direction to Property Negotiator regarding price

and terms of potential site; d) Negotiate with – Lassen County.

- **The next meeting will be held on August 5, 2014 at 3:00 p.m.**

I, Heidi Whitlock, certify that I caused to be posted notice of the regular meeting scheduled for July 15, 2014 in the areas designated on July 11, 2014.


Heidi Whitlock, Project Manager

Submitted By: Jared G. Hancock, Executive Officer

Action Date: July 1, 2014

AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: Minutes of the HLVRA May 20, 2014, June 3, 2014 and June 17, 2014 meetings.

SUMMARY: Attached for the Board's review are the minutes of the HLVRA May 20, 2014, June 3, 2014 and June 17, 2014 meetings.

FISCAL IMPACT: None.

ACTION REQUESTED: Motion to waive oral reading and approve minutes of HLVRA May 20, 2014, June 3, 2014 and June 17, 2014 meetings.

ATTACHMENTS: Minutes:
May 20, 2014.
June 3, 2014.
June 17, 2014.

**HONEY LAKE VALLEY RECREATION AUTHORITY
GOVERNING BOARD MEETING
Regular Meeting Minutes
May 20, 2014 – 3:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers 66 North Lassen Street Susanville CA 96130**

Meeting was called to order at 3:07 p.m. by President Brian Wilson.

Roll Call of Board of Directors present: Nicholas McBride, David Meserve and President Brian Wilson. Absent: Larry Wosick and Vice President Jim Chapman.

Staff Present: Jared Hancock, Executive Officer, Heidi Whitlock, Project Manager.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Motion by Board member Meserve, second by Board member McBride to approve the minutes from the March 25, 2014 meeting; motion carried unanimously.

CORRESPONDANCE: No correspondence was presented.

PUBLIC COMMENT: No public comment.

7 MATTERS FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION:

7A Review Website

Mr. Hancock opens that currently, we have basic information available through the City of Susanville's own web page. Once the Board agrees on a site design, do we want to market this, keeping the community involved and keep going with the fundraising efforts? Some basic items are missing such as images, a timeline with basic check points so people can follow the progress and possibly a newsreel for updates. He then asks for direction from the Board, are there additional priorities you see, should it be more creative should we hire an independent person to put it all together? Staff would like direction on where the Board feels they should take the web page and what the Board would like to see on it.

Board member McBride suggests not changing anything yet. Maybe once fundraising begins and we have a design. President Wilson agrees with Board member McBride's response. Board member Meserve suggests the timeline but states that he can also wait until that time.

Mr. Hancock states that a picture would be easy enough but the timeline may be above the expertise of staff. However, we may be able to link it to the existing "documents" tab and update when necessary.

7B Updated Timeline

Mr. Hancock states that the timeline the Board adopted has items on it that we need to wait on for instance, the CEQA analysis and site design, until we have acquired the property or have the site analysis completed and returned. We are expecting the final analysis to be presented at the next meeting. These items will be continued after acquisition.

No comments from the Board.

7C Treasurer for the HLVRA

Mr. Hancock states that the language on the staff report came straight form the JPA Agreement. However, additional feedback has been obtained since the staff report was written. It is recommended that Norma Scheetz be the Treasurer for the JPA.

President Wilson inquires as to whether they appoint a name or a position. Mr. Egan responds that the code deals with the JPA’s officers. They can choose one of three options: County Treasurer or Auditor, someone from the City or County or the JPA appoint their own. The agreement does not specify a name, just treasury management services. With the County you would get both the Treasurer and Auditor, with the City I believe you would get the Finance Manager.

Mr. Hancock responds that using the County would be a good option because of the Treasurer and Auditor being available. Can the Board of Supervisors tell or appoint someone who doesn’t wish to fill that roll? If that person doesn’t want to participate, can they opt out and have someone else do it? I think we need to name them to be an “official” contact for the JPA. Mr. Egan believes it becomes the duty of the person taking office. President Wilson states he still believes it to be a good idea to ask the person. Mr. Hancock states that we can send the person a letter and see what is said, it wouldn’t hurt.

Motion by Board member Meserve, second by Board member McBride to send a letter to the Norma Scheetz requesting she be the Treasurer for the JPA.

BOARD MEMBER ISSUES/REPORTS: None.

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

At 3:22 p.m. President Wilson called for a three minute break prior to the recessing to closed session.

CLOSED SESSION: At 3:25 p.m. the Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority recessed to closed session to discuss the following:

- A. PROPERTY NEGOTIATIONS – Credence School APN #103-324-02. Negotiator – Jared Hancock. Negotiation with Lassen High School.

RETURN TO OPEN SESSION: At 4:21 p.m. the Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority reconvened in open session.

Motion by Board member Meserve, second by Board member McBride to direct staff to draft letter to the Lassen Union High School regarding negotiations.

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Brian Wilson, President

Respectfully Submitted by

Heidi Whitlock, Project Manager

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

Meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by President Brian Wilson.

Roll Call of Board of Directors present: Nicholas McBride, David Meserve, Vice President Chapman and President Brian Wilson. Absent: Larry Wosick.

Staff Present: Jared Hancock, Executive Officer, Heidi Whitlock, Project Manager.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Motion by Board member Meserve, second by Vice President Chapman to approve the minutes from the April 15, 2014 meeting; motion carried unanimously. Absent: Wosick

CORRESPONDANCE: No correspondence was presented.

PUBLIC COMMENT: No public comment.

Mr. Hancock suggests that the Board flip item 7B and 7C. Board accepts the change.

7 MATTERS FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION:

7A Adopt Resolution No. 14-01

Mr. Hancock states that at the meeting before last, we adopted the approved purchasing/signers form to be given to the County. However, they require us to approve by resolution, not just minute order, so this will be our first one, Resolution No. 14-01. We also received confirmation that the accounts have been set up and we will verify that both the City and County contributions are received.

Motion by Vice President Chapman, second by board member Meserve to approve Resolution No. 14-01; motion carried unanimously. Absent: Wosick

7C Final report for Roosevelt Pool – Siegfried Engineering

Mr. Hancock states that we have been working with Siegfried Engineering out of Sacramento over the last 6 weeks. They were the least expensive and the most experienced in these types of projects. The objective was to have a document that the Board can rely on with cost estimates. We are pleased with the product and their willingness to provide detailed cost estimates. We asked for estimates for three scenarios. Keeping all elements the same was the first scenario, option two was to remove the roof structure and provide an open air pool and rehabilitate the remaining space, and the third option was to remove all structural elements but rehabilitating the swimming pool. They also added an option four, a from-scratch pool after abating the building.

They looked at all areas, the geothermal well, lighting, lockers, common areas etc... we also requested a breakdown on the government permitting requirements. The cost estimates we received states scenario one would cost approximately \$7.5 million, scenario two would be approximately \$5.6 million, three approximately \$4.5 million and option four at approximately \$4.9 million. The bathhouses are only showing 6,500 square feet in this estimate (currently 8,000 sq ft) with the intention of scenario two and three having only 6,500 based on feasible space for pool size. Scenario one also

includes the 6,500 for a equal comparison with scenario two and three, although it would cost more to complete as currently designed with 8,000 square feet of bathhouse space. The other estimates were based on prevailing wage. Also included was a 12% increase for building cost increases and another 5% for our Susanville location.

Mr. Hancock suggests we let the community review and consider this document. Once accepted by the Board, we can send it to the City and County. However, if any modifications are requested, let's discuss those items before we send it off. Board member McBride asks where the \$350 sq ft comes from and if it is an accurate estimate. Mr. Hancock responds that costs change based on what is being done. For instance, kitchen space costs more than garage space. Also, the use of commercial grade materials in a bathhouse will make it more expensive. We may need to work with that number but the quality would not be as high. It is an estimate on the high side, but not unreasonable as it was based on a recent project.

Charles "Moose" Mueller (Public) – inquires about the cost of putting a roof on the building at a later date. Mr. Hancock responds that it could be \$250 sq ft based on the current natatorium estimates bringing it to approximately \$2.5 million and open air at approximately \$500,000 for a cover. Even without the cover, the estimates do not fit within the given budget. Moose asks if it will ever be covered and Mr. Hancock responds that the Board will have to decide. If the pool was only being used for recreation use it would be a seasonal pool at 4-5 months out of the year. Operating costs would need to be looked at to see what could happen with a covered, year round pool. Moose states he would like to see it covered. Mr. Hancock states that either now or later, it will be designed to have a cover eventually.

Bill Feierabend inquires as to what it would cost to build a pool at a new location. Mr. Hancock states that we will be looking into that on the next item and states that comparisons have been made with the East Quincy pool. It has very modest amenities but fits their needs. It is an "L" shaped pool with a diving board and a small wading pool. So, based on that type of design, that's about \$2.5 to \$3 million. So, what we will be showing you in the next item will be a breakdown of those individual cost estimates.

Recess called at 3:25 for additional analysis copies to be made.

Reconvened at 3:38.

Marlon Hall asks why the pool costs are different on the analysis. President Wilson responds that it depends on what is needed to be completed for each pool. Moose then inquires if the Roosevelt Pool is not rehabilitated, who pays for the abatement of the site. Vice President Chapman states that it is not tied to the site. The owner of the site and the leasee would be the parties responsible for the abatement.

Vice President Chapman states that the Board has been following a dual track up to this point. In his opinion, it is obvious that the cost in this analysis is way beyond the means of the Board. He does not believe it's feasible to continue with Roosevelt and wants to put the effort into an alternate solution.

Board member McBride states it is unfortunate that they had to spend money on something they already knew but president Wilson stated it needed to be done. President Wilson then states that there should be a note that the actual square footage of the bathhouses is 8,000 square feet and there would be a higher cost if we left it "as is" to rehabilitate.

Mr. Hancock asks if the Board is happy with this document. President Wilson suggests that we get an explanation on how some of these numbers were calculated for future reference. Vice President Chapman states that we should give it to the community before declaring the Roosevelt Pool as "dead". Mr. Hancock suggests the Board adopt the document as a preliminary report and provide time for the public to review. In doing so, we can get information before the next meeting with adjustments such as the 8,000 square foot bathhouses, and bring back for final approval at the next meeting. It was requested that Siegfried include an asterisk along the bottom of the document stating the 8,000 versus 6,500 square foot difference.

Mr. Hancock states that it is important to note that the cost of the community swimming pool is not necessarily in the cost of the pool itself but the other necessities such as the bathhouses and parking lots.

President Wilson asks if the Board wants to adopt this as the preliminary document. Vice President Chapman responds yes, with public comment at the next meeting. Mr. Hancock states that we will place an advertisement in the paper inviting people to review and comment on the analysis and that the Board is looking for input prior to making their decision.

Motion by Vice President Chapman, second by Board member Meserve to accept the preliminary report and set up a public comment period at the next meeting to be held on June 17, 2014; motion carried. Absent: Wosick

7B Basic Site Design

Mr. Hancock starts by stating that the Board has already agreed to use the Aquatic Design Group but not until they were in escrow on a preferred site as it will be necessary to know the details on the site to create a design. The Board wanted to know what the "basic" components were and based on the Credence site, we provided in the packet, both an "L" shape and "straight-8" configuration. We printed these to scale along with cutout shapes. If they are printed out correctly, the Board can "play" with the layout. Our concern was that people would think that this was *the* design. It's not, just a preliminary idea of how components fit on the site. Once we are in escrow, we will start with an actual design.

Vice President Chapman states his appreciation for the efforts made but expresses concern with the property negotiations. He states that the property belongs to the Lassen High School and he doesn't believe the outlook is promising. He suggests looking into other locations.

Bill Feierabend and Moose agree that Credence is looking less attractive and Mesa and Riverside are looking better. Vice President Chapman adds that the Roosevelt site should not be forgotten. He then inquires as to whether or not other maps are available. Mr. Hancock states that Mesa and Roosevelt are also available. He then adds that he is also concerned with Credence but he is hesitant to change anything until the LHS next meeting so see where they stand on the property. Vice President Chapman wants to look at the top 3-5 sites. He doesn't believe the LHS will give the JPA the property. Board member McBride agrees with the top 3 sites.

President Wilson states his concern with using the cutouts and maps. Vice President Chapman likes the idea of having the shapes to look at options. Mr. Hancock states that even the cutouts can change, for instance, the parking lot can be set up multiple ways. Vice President Chapman would like the other maps available if desired. President Wilson states that as long as we are clear that this is not the design and the site.

President Wilson and Board member Meserve believe this is premature. Board member McBride adds that this was meant for us to push around prior to a design group coming in, so we have an idea of what we want.

Direction was given to staff to not take this any further but to provide the information if requested. Board member McBride requested staff to supply the other two maps for Board members.

BOARD MEMBER ISSUES/REPORTS:

Board member Meserve states that he will be here for the next meeting but will be gone for the July 1, 2014 meeting. President Wilson states we may cancel the July 1, 2014 meeting if others are not present.

PUBLIC COMMENT TO CLOSED SESSION ITEMS: (if any): Any person may address the Board at this time upon any item under consideration discussion during Closed Session.

No comment.

CLOSED SESSION: At 4:15 p.m. the Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority recessed to closed session to discuss the following:

- A. PROPERTY NEGOTIATIONS - Credence School APN #103-324-02. Negotiator – Jared Hancock. Negotiation with Lassen High School.

RETURN TO OPEN SESSION: At 4:38 p.m. the Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority reconvened in open session.

No reportable action taken.

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by

Brian Wilson, President

Heidi Whitlock, Project Manager

**HONEY LAKE VALLEY RECREATION AUTHORITY
GOVERNING BOARD MEETING
Regular Meeting Minutes
June 17, 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 Brian Wilson.

Roll Call of Board of Directors present: Nicholas McBride, Larry Wosick, Vice President Chapman and President Brian Wilson. Absent: David Meserve.

Staff Present: Jared Hancock, Executive Officer, Heidi Whitlock, Project Manager.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Motion by Vice President Chapman, second by Board member Wosick to approve the minutes from the May 6, 2014 meeting; motion carried unanimously. Absent: Meserve.

CORRESPONDANCE: No correspondence was presented.

PUBLIC COMMENT: No public comment.

7 MATTERS FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION:

7A Budget Amendment

Mr. Hancock starts by stating that the JPA has been successful in working with the County to setup the line items in the budget. While doing so, the County consolidated the 10-12 items that we originally had down to 5-6 items. Today we are requesting a budget modification to have our line items match the County's for consistency. However, we have also found some areas where the estimated amounts should be modified to reflect the actual cost/experience.

President Wilson requests that Mr. Hancock go over the changes. Mr. Hancock explains that each entity has now placed their contributions of \$200,000 into the JPA's account. Vice President Chapman asked for clarification on why the additional Trust account only showed \$10,000 since he knows there is approximately \$27,000 in the account. After much conversation in regard to this item, it was brought to the attention of the Board that the Trust (Pennies-for-the-Pool) monies have been transferred but are located in a restricted account. It can be moved over to an operating account when requested. President Wilson asked if both a balance sheet and income statement will be provided from now on so we can see those other areas. Mr. Hancock stated that staff will provide both once everything is set up.

Motion by Vice President Chapman, second by Board member Wosick to approve the modified budget with the County format; motion carried unanimously. Absent: Meserve.

7B Reimbursement Request – Staff time, Roosevelt Pool Analysis and Attorney Fees

Mr. Hancock presented to the Board the amounts paid by the City in staff time (\$13,940.28), Seigfried Engineering, Inc. Services (\$10,011.79) and Attorney fees (\$528.50) and a request was made for reimbursement.

Motion by Vice President Chapman, second by Board member Wosick to approve the reimbursement amount of \$24,480.57 to the City of Susanville; motion carried unanimously. Absent: Meserve.

President Wilson inquired as to the amount that they will have to approve versus being sent to the County for direct payment. Mr. Hancock responded that he believes anything \$10,000 or more would need approval.

7C Review Findings/Comments from Public – Roosevelt Analysis

Mr. Hancock stated that the Board received the Roosevelt Pool Analysis at the last meeting and the Board wanted to allow time for review and feedback from the community. We have received two (2) emails and we are hoping to hear comments or to identify any errors in the analysis so we can move forward to finalize the document and choose to rebuild the Roosevelt Pool or build a new one. Once finalized, we will send a copy to both the City and the County to let them know it is complete.

Bill Feierabend (public) – States that none of the options given in the analysis are viable, they all cost more than what we have available.

Helen _____ (public) – agrees with Bill. The Roosevelt Pool was part of the '80's. It's time to put the old pool to rest. It's just not feasible.

Charles "Moose" Mueller (public) - Also agrees, but wonders what other sites are high achievers. Asks if the Board will go back to all 19 sites or what was still in the running. President Wilson states that he is not sure we have a concrete answer to that question at this time.

Clarification was made by Vice President Chapman that the Roosevelt Pool may be off the table, but not the Roosevelt School site, two separate solutions.

Mr. Feierabend suggests taking a closer look at Riverside, SPI land.

Mr. Hancock requests that we complete the one item before moving onto the next site selection. Let's get feedback on the Analysis before jumping into other sites. Was the analysis accurate and thorough enough?

Motion by Board member Wosick, second by Vice President Chapman to accept the analysis and supply both the City and County; motion carried unanimously. Absent: Meserve.

7D Report LHS Board Meeting/Property Negotiations

Mr. Hancock reported that he had attended the Lassen High School's Board meeting on June 10, 2014 and during that time, they acknowledged receipt of our letter. However, they did not give any direction to respond.

Vice President Chapman motioned to cease negotiations with the LHS and Board member McBride seconded but then board member Wosick asked if they would be ceasing the closed session item. Mr. Hancock responded that there are still items to go over. Vice President Chapman states that if the motion passes, there will be no need to wait for them. Mr. Hancock responds that not much time was given to them prior to their meeting. President Wilson states that he believes no one from the High School would comment until the title issue was squared away.

Board member Wosick agrees with ceasing the negotiations but requests that, at the next meeting, we should go to the #2 site and draft a letter to the County in the agenda packet accepting that location.

President Wilson states that we gave the Lassen High School until June 30th to respond. He does not believe in pulling the plug until then. We can look at the #2 site, but still know that Credence may not work.

Members of the public commented on the lack of parking around the Credence site and suggests looking at Mesa due to its capability to supply ample parking. Moose suggests writing letters to the owners of the Riverside, Mesa and Roosevelt School locations simply to see if they would be interested.

Motion to communicate with the Lassen High School that the JPA is no longer interested in the Credence site for the location of the future Community Swimming Pool; Wosick: Aye, McBride: Aye, Chapman: Aye, Wilson: Noe, Meserve: Absent.

BOARD MEMBER ISSUES/REPORTS:

Board member Wosick requested that the Roosevelt School site be on the next agenda along with a copy of the letter to go to the County. Board member McBride requests that we add Mesa Street to that list. Vice President Chapman requested that letters be sent to the owners of both sites to see which ones were available. Mr. Hancock stated that these suggestions sound like closed session items but the letters are ready to go. Vice President Chapman responded that he just didn't want the old pool site messing up the outcome of the new site. Tony Jonas states that, while attending the last Board of Supervisors meeting, the Board voted to offer both Mesa and Roosevelt School to the JPA. Mr. Hancock stated that staff will work to have a response by the next meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT TO CLOSED SESSION ITEMS: (if any): Any person may address the Board at this time upon any discussion item under consideration during Closed Session.

No comment.

CLOSED SESSION: At 4:15 p.m. the Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority recessed to closed session to discuss the following:

- A. PROPERTY NEGOTIATIONS - Credence School APN #103-324-02. Negotiator – Jared Hancock. Negotiation with Lassen High School.

RETURN TO OPEN SESSION: At 4:31 p.m. the Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority reconvened in open session.

No reportable action taken.

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 4:34 p.m.

Brian Wilson, President

Respectfully Submitted by

Heidi Whitlock, Project Manager

Submitted By: Jared G. Hancock, Executive Officer

Action Date: July 15, 2014

AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: Update on Distribution of Roosevelt Pool Site Analysis

SUMMARY: The Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority chose Siegfried Engineering, Inc. to conduct the Roosevelt Pool Analysis. On June 3, 2014, the Board approved the document and a couple of minor suggestions were made. Since that time, Siegfried has been working on making the recommended changes to ensure consistency within the document and further notations where needed. At this time, staff is awaiting the final document for review and will have it forwarded to the City and County once received.

FISCAL IMPACT: None.

**ACTION
REQUESTED:** None.

ATTACHMENTS: None.

Submitted By: Jared G. Hancock, Executive Officer

Action Date: July 15, 2014

AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: Site Selection

SUMMARY: The Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority started the first phase of the site selection process by analyzing nineteen (19) potential sites. The results of the first phase resulted in the Board continuing onto the second phase with the top three sites; the Credence School site, 800 South Street and Mesa Street. The Credence School site proved to be the best option at the end of the completed site analysis. However, this site is not currently available.

Staff and the Board are now choosing between the 800 South Street site and Mesa Street. While we believe that both of these sites are feasible, none of the sites analyzed are perfect and these sites are no exception. Both sites have attributes that can potentially lengthen the construction timeline.

800 South Street – This site may require the demolition of the old Roosevelt Pool. Staff has requested a cost estimate for hazardous material abatement and the cost of demolition. These estimates were due by July 9, 2014, but at the time of the agenda preparation, the estimates were not yet received. Staff will continue to follow up and anticipate having them available at the meeting.

Mesa Street – Staff have looked into opportunities to accelerate the environmental review and land use designation changes. After further review, it was determined that the description included in the site analysis is still the appropriate approach to meet the current land use requirements.

Excerpt from Phase 2 Analysis

“Permitting / CEQA: Additional environmental site information has not been collected since the first phase of analysis so specific environmental data is not available for the site. This site is currently zoned for single family residential development with a corresponding General Plan Land use designation. The proposed pool facility is not compatible with the current land use designation and a Rezone and General Plan Amendment will be necessary and the project would need to comply with CEQA guidelines. The site was used historically by a logging/lumber company and a question of soil contamination has been raised and soil testing should be completed prior to site acquisition. Potential environmental issues that should be examined for the site include wetlands, biological resources, soil contamination, drainage, traffic, noise and land use compatibility. It is anticipated that a Negative Declaration with mitigation measures

would be the environmental document for the project at a cost of approximately \$45,000 and 6 months.”

Staff reevaluated the possibility of using a Categorical Exemption. The Class 32 exemption related to infill development projects and has the following criteria:

- The project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations.
- The proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than five acres substantially surrounded by urban uses.
- The project site has no value as habitat for endangered, rare or threatened species.
- Approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality or water quality.
- The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services

After review, it appears that the Class 32 exemption cannot be used. Staff is requesting the discussion of both sites and a site selection be made.

FISCAL IMPACT: None.

ACTION

REQUESTED: Discuss sites and direct staff to proceed with site selection.

ATTACHMENTS: Demolition and Abatement Estimates to be provided at meeting.