HONEY LAKE VALLEY RECREATION AUTHORITY

GOVERNING BOARD
BRIAN WILSON, PRESIDENT
JIM CHAPMAN, VICE PRESIDENT
NICK MCBRIDE, BOARD MEMBER
DAVID MESERVE, BOARD MEMBER
TOM HAMMOND, BOARD MEMBER

STAFF
JARED G. HANCOCK, EXECUTIVE OFFICER
HEIDI WHITLOCK, PROJECT MANAGER
NANCY CARDENAS, TREASURER

HONEY LAKE VALLEY RECREATION AUTHORITY
GOVERNING BOARD MEETING

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

March 3, 2015 - 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:** Approval of minutes form the January 20, 2015 meeting.

5 **CORRESPONDENCE:** None.

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. Update on Roosevelt Pool Abatement
B. Update on Financials

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:** None.

- ***The next meeting will be held on March 17, 2015 at 3:00 p.m.***

I, Heidi Whitlock, certify that I caused to be posted notice of the regular meeting scheduled for March 3, 2015, in the areas designated on February 27, 2015.

Heidi Whitlock, Project Manager

AGENDA ITEM NO. 4A

Submitted By: Jared G. Hancock, Executive Officer

Action Date: March 3, 2015

AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: Minutes of the HLVRA January 20, 2015 meeting.

SUMMARY: Attached for the Board's review are the minutes of the HLVRA January 20, 2015, meeting.

FISCAL IMPACT: None.

ACTION REQUESTED: None.

ATTACHMENTS: Minutes: January 20, 2015.

HONEY LAKE VALLEY RECREATION AUTHORITY
GOVERNING BOARD MEETING
Regular Meeting Minutes
January 20, 2015 – 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: Dave Meserve, Tom Hammond, Jim Chapman & Brian Wilson.
Absent: Nick McBride.

Board member McBride was seated at the dias at 3:03 p.m.

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

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

Mr. Hancock states that as the election of officials was not on this agenda, we will hold a special meeting or we can do so at the next meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Motion by Board member Meserve, second by Vice President Chapman to approve minutes from December 16, 2014. Motion carried unanimously.

5 **CORRESPONDANCE:** None.

6 **PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

7 **MATTERS FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION:**

7A Approve and Adopt Resolution No. 15-01 acceptance of Elementary School District property located at 800 South Street

Mr. Hancock opens by stating that this is a fairly simple item. Specifically, the County recorders representative has requested specific language in resolution form for the purpose of recording the deed. Board member Hammond inquires as to the timeline for the acquisition and Mr. Hancock responds, tomorrow.

Motion by Vice President Chapman, second by Board member Meserve to approve Resolution no. 15-01 accepting the Elementary School District property located at 800 South Street. Motion carries unanimously.

7B Review current financial documents

Mr. Hancock states that, in the packet, there were some items missing within the documents. He contacted Nancy Cardenas, Lassen County Treasurer, for updated financials. At this time, there are updated documents to view and she will go over them with us.

Nancy Cardenas states that the balance of the pool account is currently $733,467 as of this morning.

Questions were asked about the report dates and Mr. Hancock clarified that new reports were given to us this morning and were provided by Mrs. Cardenas.

Vice President Chapman inquires about the Pennies for the Pool money. Ms. Cardenas responds that they are still being held in a separate account. Vice President Chapman just wanted to make it clear since people have asked. The amount for Pennies for the Pool is in addition to the $733,467. That balance is approximately $26,000.

Board member Hammond states that he would like to have a meeting with Mr. Hancock to go over a lot of the information, in general, as he is new to the Board. Mr. Hancock agrees.

President Wilson thanks Ms. Cardenas for joining and going over the financials with the Board.

7C Discussion regarding draft OGALS grant application

Mr. Hancock states that he will try to give a quick summary. Staff became aware of a grant that was available to build a public facility. The grant provides matching funds up to 50% of the total project amount. This includes cost for site selection, acquisition, demolition, environmental studies etc... but not to exceed $2 million. We have documents to pass out to you and would like the Board's feedback on the draft grant proposal. Mr. Hancock suggests picking a minimum amount and select features that we could afford with that amount. He states that we are essentially at a $3.3 million dollar project, including preconstruction and demolition. If we get funded for $1.2 million, what are some other options we would like to see, parking, slides, a splash park, a therapy pool? The State has requested a minimum and maximum bid amount to cover as many areas as possible. Is the natatorium the first priority if we get funded? Should it be requested in the minimum bid amount or only as an option if we receive the maximum $2 million as requested it was then opened up for Board discussion.

Board member Hammond again states that he is at a disadvantage not even knowing what the pool looks like. Mr. Hancock states that it is a basic bathhouse and "L" shaped pool which is 25 yards by 25 meters, a gathering space, restrooms and parking for current needs. Vice President Chapman suggests putting a binder together with all documents for review to bring Board member Hammond up to speed. Mr. Hancock agrees.

Mr. Hancock continues that the future features therapy pool, the splash park, slides, additional parking and a cover. If money were no object, what would we build? We know what we are already building with the funding we currently have in place but, this is for additional features.

The grant due dates and priorities were discussed.

Board member McBride suggests including all the other outdoor items and only the natatorium if we get fully funded, minus the splash park. For clarification, Mr. Hancock states, start with the other outdoor features first. Then, if funded, we can take out the splash park and enclose it.

Board member Meserve states that Board member McBride has a good thought on this. Mr. Hancock confirms that the Board wants to request the minimum amount for the other outdoor features and activities and adding the natatorium if the maximum award is granted or to include at a later date?

Jim Hodge (public) states that the Board should cover the pool first since the other items are smaller and easier to get funding for later.

Todd Eid (Public) inquires as to whether or not we have looked at maintenance costs for a covered pool versus an uncovered pool. Mr. Hancock responds that this is a good discussion to have, there are a lot of factors to think about. Certain features take longer to cost recover. We do have a buffer in there for the loss but, adding these smaller features adds revenues. Board member Hammond asks what the annual operating costs would be as of right now. Mr. Hancock responds that we have allowed approximately $115,000 for the deficit. Richard Egan, Lassen County CAO, asks if we can simply use this extra funding to reduce each entity's contributions.

Vice President Chapman states that he agrees that groups would be more easily able to come up with funding for smaller features. Board member Hammond responds that it would be easier to add the cover in the initial phase.

Board member McBride states that the reason he suggested it was because he thought there needed to be a big enough difference in the minimum and maximum grant amounts requested.

Vice President Chapman suggests writing the application with a set of circumstances such as what we would be able to complete with each dollar amount. Mr. Hancock responds that how much we receive is determined by the granting agency and a range for total project cost will not work. We want to have enough variation between the numbers so they can still assist us with some funding while allowing them to still pick other areas to assist so they can show what they've done with their programs. We feel that $1.2 million is a good number but, once you get to $1.5 million, you might as well put $2 million.

Vice President Chapman states that he thinks they are looking for flexibility in the program. If you take $1.2 million for the natatorium then $200,000 for the slides and $600,000 for the splash park we could do it. He states that getting financial support would be harder for these features because they are upper end. The lower end could be the natatorium and slides. He says that they are still going to go back to the public for funding so a therapy pool is probably the most likely to get funded publicly. It gets the larger items paid for by the grant.

Bill Feirabend (public) states that he would like to hear what Tony Jonas has to say about the priority of these items since he has run a pool previously. Tony responds that the Board is correct when they say the pool then the therapy pool. Jim Hodge (public) states that the therapy pool, pool and cover are his choices, not the slides. Covering is good for everyone, young and old. The splash park will bring people as well as a therapy pool.

Board member McBride inquires as to why the parking is considered an amenity. Mr. Hancock responds that as we add more features such as the splash park etc... capacity goes up making additional parking a necessity.

Tony Jonas asked about the natatorium. He inquires as to whether it is pre-engineered or a brick and mortar building. He states that the maintenance costs between the two are very different so, the numbers presented for operating costs are not necessarily accurate until a cover is chosen. Mr. Hancock responds that what was discussed was a poly material cover with roof panels that could open, it was not made of glass.

President Wilson states that he has mixed feelings but thinks he sides with Board member McBride this time. He thinks the natatorium may open other problems such as additional operating costs. He is more along the lines of options which produce cash flow. Board member McBride responds that the recreation areas are what brings in the revenues.

Mr. Hancock inquires if we receive the maximum amount, is the natatorium what they would want? Or, do we write the grant application requesting funds for the other amenities? Do we ask for the slides or the splash park? Board member Hammond asks if we can specify what is to be built. Todd Eid inquires about the age of those using the splash park...assuming younger than those using the slides. Mr. Hancock states that yes, splash parks are for younger children while slides accommodate more age groups. We've seen multiple types such as those emptying into the pool to standing alone. Mr. Eid asks if the slides will have a water supply. Mr. Hancock responds, yes. President Wilson asks if staff could size down the splash park so we could have both the splash park and the slides. Mr. Hancock responds, yes, this is around the 2,500 square foot range. However, the huge fixed cost is attributed to the plumbing not necessarily the square footage. Board member Meserve reminds the Board and public that the splash park also requires an added expense since the filtration system would be different. Mr. Hancock responds, yes, an economical one with basic features could be designed. He then asks the Board if that is the direction he is to follow, to scale down the splash park and slides. Board member McBride states, the splash park, not the slides. Mr. Jonas asks if the slides and splash park will be seasonal or inside. Mr. Hancock responds that they would be seasonal as they are all extra outside amenities.

Bill Feierabend inquires as to where the splash park would be located. President Wilson states that we don't have an answer to that yet.

Vice President Chapman states that the concern he would raise after this discussion is whether or not the most asked question has been answered...is it covered or not. Not whether or not there is a therapy pool or slide. He has said he wanted an open-air pool built in a way to cover later if extra funds or grants became available. This is an opportunity

to use a grant to cover the pool. Once the pool is covered we can then look at other options if any funding is still available. He would love to have all of this but it probably won't happen but, the cover is an expectation.

Board member Meserve states that he thought, originally, Board member McBride said covering everything was the number one priority. But, after hearing Vice President Chapman, he agrees with him. The first thing I hear is whether or not the pool will be covered. Board member McBride then states, no, the first thing I hear from the public is, when are we getting a pool. The Board agrees. He then adds, however, without recreational amenities, we may not be able to sustain it.

Bill Feierabend states that this is a very educational discussion. He states he never viewed it from a revenue generation standpoint. He thinks that the covered pool however, is the public's expectation.

Vice President Chapman states that the financial budget was not why the pool was not open year round previously. The real reason is because people didn't know how to deal with the condensation. No one wanted to swim around in a cloud. It was a safety concern and why mold grew in the building.

Mr. Jonas revisits the funding from the entities. He asks if we have the set funding from the City and County yet. Then, if we budget for a pool with a natatorium at $5.3 million and it ends up at $7.8 million, what happens to the money. Are there strings attached? President Wilson also inquires as to whether or not there are strings attached to this funding. Mr. Hancock responds that the strings attached are that the property must be used for this purpose forever.

Inquiries are made about both the CEQA and NEPA. Mr. Hancock states that we are well underway with both and that the CEQA is almost completed.

Board member McBride states that he would like to see us adding just the natatorium up to $2 million and keep everything as is at $3.3 million. Ask for half of $3.3 million ($1.65 million) as the minimum and up to $2 million for the maximum. This will pay for the natatorium and if we have a savings we can add more features. But, that way, there is no delay. Mr. Hancock states that we may want a bigger difference in the lower amount. McBride responds back with $1.3 million then. Vice President Chapman agrees that this is a smart move and would prevent delays.

Motion by Board member McBride, second by Vice President Chapman to ask for a minimum amount of $1.3 million to the maximum of $2 million from OGALS with the intention of the bathhouse and natatorium being interconnected if all funding is granted. Motion carries unanimously.

Vice President Chapman requests this item be continued to the next meeting or a special meeting to review. Time set for 4:30 p.m., Tuesday January 27, 2015.

8 BOARD MEMBER ISSUES/REPORTS:

Vice President Chapman wants to welcome Board member Hammond to the Board. Board member McBride also welcomes him.

Board member Meserve states he will not be available for the special meeting.

CLOSED SESSION: None.

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 4:12 p.m.

_____

Brian Wilson, President

Respectfully Submitted by

Heidi Whitlock, Project Manager

AGENDA ITEM NO. 7A

Submitted By: Jared G. Hancock, Executive Officer

Action Date: March 3, 2015

AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: Update on Roosevelt Pool Abatement

SUMMARY: The Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority has contracted with Leckey Land Clearing to perform the abatement and demolition of the existing Roosevelt Pool. An update will be given on the status of this project.

FISCAL IMPACT: None.

ACTION REQUESTED: None.

ATTACHMENTS: None.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 7B

Submitted By: Jared G. Hancock, Executive Officer

Action Date: March 3, 2015

AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: Review current Financials

SUMMARY: The Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority will be providing monthly updates when available. Attached are the most current financial statements.

FISCAL IMPACT: None.

ACTION REQUESTED: None.

ATTACHMENTS: Current Financial documents.

Fiscal Year 2015 As of 2/26/2015

Fund 536 HONEY LAKE VALLEY RECREATION

Budget Unit 0950 COMMUNITY POOL CONSTRUCTION

Cost Center NONE

County of Lassen Budget Status

User: ncardenas

Percent of Year Elapsed 66 %

Account	Account Name	Adopted Appropriation	Adjusted Appropriation	Expenditures	Outstanding Encumbrance	Unencumbered Balance	Percent Approp Used
3020	**SERVICES AND SUPPLIES**						
3002200	OFFICE EXPENSE	$8,000.00	$8,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	$8,000.00	0%
3002300	PROFESSIONAL & SPECIALIZED SV	$150,000.00	$150,000.00	$100,654.97	$23,352.39	$25,992.64	83%
3002400	PUBLICATIONS AND LEGAL NOTICES	$2,000.00	$2,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	$2,000.00	0%
3002800	SPECIAL DEPARTMENTAL EXPENSE	$50,000.00	$50,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	$50,000.00	0%
	Major Object Total	**$210,000.00**	**$210,000.00**	**$100,654.97**	**$23,352.39**	**$85,992.64**	**59 %**
3040	**FIXED ASSETS**						
3006000	LAND	$50,000.00	$50,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	$50,000.00	0%
3006100	BUILDING & IMPROVEMENTS	$300,000.00	$300,000.00	$1,553.55	$0.00	$298,446.45	1%
	Major Object Total	**$350,000.00**	**$350,000.00**	**$1,553.55**	**$0.00**	**$348,446.45**	**0 %**
	Cost Center Total	**$560,000.00**	**$560,000.00**	**$102,208.52**	**$23,352.39**	**$434,439.09**	**22 %**
	Budget Unit Total	**$560,000.00**	**$560,000.00**	**$102,208.52**	**$23,352.39**	**$434,439.09**	**22 %**
	Fund Total	**$560,000.00**	**$560,000.00**	**$102,208.52**	**$23,352.39**	**$434,439.09**	**22 %**

Fiscal Year 2015 As of 2/26/2015

User: ncardenas

Fund 536

Budget Unit

Function

Department

County of Lassen
Budget and Revenue Status by Fund and Major Object

Percent of Year Elapsed 66 %

Expenditures by Major Object for Fund 536 (HONEY LAKE VALLEY RECREATION)	Initial Budget	Current Budget	Expended YTD	% Expended
FIXED ASSETS	$350,000.00	$350,000.00	$1,553.55	0 %
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	$210,000.00	$210,000.00	$100,654.97	48 %
Expenditures All Major Objects	**$560,000.00**	**$560,000.00**	**$102,208.52**	**18 %**

Revenue by Major Object for Fund 536 (HONEY LAKE VALLEY RECREATION)	Initial Budget	Current Budget	Collected YTD	% Collected
INTERGOVT REVENUE-OTHER	$400,000.00	$400,000.00	$400,000.00	100 %
MISCELLANEOUS	$150,000.00	$150,000.00	$0.00	0 %
REVENUE FR USE OF MONEY & PROP	$0.00	$0.00	$399.95	0%
Revenue All Major Objects	**$550,000.00**	**$550,000.00**	**$400,399.95**	**73 %**
Expenditures Under(Over) Revenue	**($10,000.00)**	**($10,000.00)**	**$298,191.43**	
Expenditures Under(Over) Revenue - Grand Total	**($10,000.00)**	**($10,000.00)**	**$298,191.43**	

GLD - 851

FD: 306 AUDITOR TRUSTS

County of Lassen
Auditor Controller
General Ledger

From 1/1/2015 to 1/31/2015

Account	Date	Program	Description	Document	Debit	Credit	Balance
76-03379	01/01/2015	**********	PENNIES FOR THE POOL		$0.00	$0.00	($26,530.62)
76-03379	01/01/2015		OCT-DEC INTEREST APPORTIONMENT	JE000879	$0.00	$14.46	($26,545.08)
			Ending Balance:		**$0.00**	**$14.46**	**($26,545.08)**