

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

May 5, 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 from the April 21, 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. Discuss and Adopt Revised Proposed Budget
- B. Discuss Design Comments Received
- C. Discuss Preparation of a Design-Build Request for Proposal


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 May 19, 2015 at 3:00 p.m.***

I, Heidi Whitlock, certify that I caused to be posted notice of the regular meeting scheduled for May 5, 2015, in the areas designated on May 1, 2015.


Heidi Whitlock, Project Manager

Submitted By: Jared G. Hancock, Executive Officer

Action Date: May 5, 2015

AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: Minutes of the HLVRA April 21, 2015 meeting.

SUMMARY: Attached for the Board's review are the minutes of the HLVRA April 21, 2015 meeting.

FISCAL IMPACT: None.

**ACTION
REQUESTED:** None.

ATTACHMENTS: Minutes: April 21, 2015 meeting

**HONEY LAKE VALLEY RECREATION AUTHORITY
GOVERNING BOARD MEETING
Regular Meeting Minutes
April 21, 2015 – 3:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers 66 North Lassen Street Susanville CA 96130**

Meeting was called to order at 3:20 p.m. by President Wilson.

Roll Call of Board of Directors present: Dave Meserve, Jim Chapman, Brian Wilson and Tom Hammond.
Absent: Nick McBride.

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

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Motion by Vice President Chapman, second Board member Hammond to approve minutes from February 3, 2015. Motion carried unanimously. Absent: McBride. Abstain: Wilson.

Motion by Board member Meserve, second by Vice President Chapman to approve minutes from March 3, 2015. Motion carried unanimously. Absent: McBride. Abstain: Hammond.

Motion by Board member Meserve, second by Vice President Chapman to approve minutes from March 17, 2015. Motion carried unanimously. Absent: McBride.

Motion by Board member Meserve, second by Board member Hammond to approve minutes from March 31, 2015. Motion carried unanimously. Absent: McBride. Abstain: Wilson.

5 CORRESPONDANCE: None.

6 PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

7 MATTERS FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION:

7A Budget Discussion

Mr. Hancock stated that direction was given at the last meeting to establish a budget to present to the Board for adoption. He then presented the budget created and asked for feedback. Vice President Chapman requested that two additional lines be added to the revenue section. He would like to see the County and City's contributions broken down into construction funding and ongoing support funding. He would like to make it easier for the public to see the differences between the construction costs and ongoing costs.

Eileen Spencer (Public) – inquired as to what “specialized expenses” were. Ms. Cardenas responded that would be staff time for both Mr. Hancock and Ms. Whitlock. Ms. Spencer expressed her dissatisfaction with the timecards. She alleged that the County was not getting the information she obtained through a public records request needed to make the payments. Vice President Chapman stated that, being that they are City employees, the Board has seen the timecards and they should get reimbursed for their time. Ms. Spencer expressed more dissatisfaction with the payment process.

Mr. Hancock added that the amount of \$80,000 was requested in the special department expenses for the next budget because there will be construction expenses that will include more staff time. President Wilson asked for confirmation that Mr. Hancock thought more expenses would be incurred and Mr. Hancock confirmed. Ms. Cardenas added that this is only an estimated budget and it can be altered if needed.

Jim Hodge (Public) inquired as to whether or not staff were looking into solar grants. President Wilson responded that we have not applied for a solar grant but conversations between themselves and the Lassen Municipal Utility District have occurred. Vice President Chapman added that the heating will still be provided through the use of geothermal. Mr. Hodge then stated that the ongoing costs of pumps could be offset by using solar. Vice President Chapman stated that solar was discussed at some point over this timeframe. It's part of the discussion just not a main issue at this point. Mr. Hancock added that standard California rebates may be available but, there are not any that they are currently aware of that will give the JPA funding, only rebates.

Charles "Moose" Mueller (public) inquired about the status of the grant staff applied for and if the JPA were to get funded and cover the pool, could the solar panels be placed on the roof. Multiple people stated that it would not be an option.

Vice President Chapman asked if staff had thought about wind turbines. Mr. Hancock responded, yes. Vice President Chapman stated that there is money out there, we just need to find it to assist with operating costs. Conversation continued about other options and what upfront cost it would require. Discussion also occurred regarding the use of geothermal wells for both filling up the pool and for heating and whether the wells were hot enough to produce electricity. Richard Egan, Lassen County CAO, stated that these are all options but they are alternative energy sources. And in general, if they were cost effective, they would be mainstream. They will always have to be subsidized and may not be a viable option for a pool.

Tony Jonas inquired as to the award date for the OGALS grant. Mr. Hancock responded September.

Vice President Chapman added that he would also like to see the header for the proposed budget to state "Proposed Budget – Community Pool Project" not simply, Community Pool Project.

Mr. Hancock also added that he would like to keep the "trust" account (Pennies-for-the-Pool) separate from the main budget until funds are collected and allocated to a specific need. Those in attendance agreed.

President Wilson stated, because we moved forward with approval of the minutes, we should take public comment. No public comment was made.

7B Discuss Scope of Work and Bidding Requirements

Mr. Hancock stated that this topic requires serious discussion and decisions as there are multiple pathways. He stated that staff will need to generate RFP's to build the pool. There are three pools to discuss: the pool with no additional funding, the pool with the minimum amount awarded by OGALS and the pool with the maximum amount awarded by OGALS. The first and third option are fairly similar as the only difference is the cover. Having the three options makes it difficult to put out an RFP. If money were not a factor, we would hire an engineering and design firm and work with them to develop plans and specifications for the entire project. They would design it as an engineer would design it. We would take that complete set of plans and put it out to bid and we would have one large general contractor to build the entire project. If we keep it as one project, the contractor would subcontract out to subcontractors for specific work. However, when we do this, although it would be easier, the engineer and contractor will require payment as well, increasing costs. It can also limit the amount of say that the Board has as the general contractor would make the decisions on who is subcontracted and it would not be as hands on for the Board. It would also be harder to determine the smaller components in the project that could be separated out that other crews or community groups could perform.

The other option is to define the entire scope of work that is to be completed and break it out into smaller components. We could have 1) the pool itself, 2) the building, plumbing and electrical, 3) the parking lot and flatwork and 4) landscaping or fencing. For instance, we could create a design-build RFP for the pool itself and send to a pool contractor. They may have plans that are similar pools or an engineer that they work with a lot. Pools like this are typically a design build. If we choose the first option, a pool contractor may not be involved in the design which will require modifications. It may be beneficial to break down the project into the smaller components for this reason and because of the cost savings. However, it is more labor intensive.

Vice President Chapman stated that he thought we needed to keep focused on the basic pool. He reminded staff and the Board that we already have the general idea because of the preliminary design. He stated that he would still like to visit the site to visualize as previously discussed. He added that he hopes the design we already have can be adapted to work and that we needed to spend money to build it and add the cover later if necessary. He stated that a commitment was made to get a pool in the ground, not have all the extras that the grant funding may allow for.

Mr. Hancock responded that this conversation ties into what has been stated, looking at the big picture has worked well, up until now. At this point, we need a greater amount of detail when getting RFP's ready. We need to identify the entire scope of work. He then confirmed that Vice President wanted everything in one project. Vice President Chapman responded that he wanted to keep it as simple as possible. The Board asked why we would want to break it up and asked to keep it simple. Mr. Hancock responded that his concern is the design. Discussion on other individual areas is held. Mr. Hancock stated that, for staff, it would be easier to have a general contractor. But, it will be more expensive and the Board will have less say on the project.

Eileen Spencer (public) stated that she appreciated what staff was trying to do but felt that, in her opinion, staff did not have the capital project experience and without the experience building, it would not be preferred. There are procedures one needs to follow and a priority list. She then stated that plans have to be drawn first and that she stated that she is very knowledgeable in the process.

Vice President Chapman stated that he would prefer we focus on the pool itself while using resources sparingly. We can add the rest later. Board member Hammond asked if we are waiting to start construction until we hear about the grant. Mr. Hancock stated that it was an option. President Wilson asked when we will know. Mr. Hancock responded September. It goes to the Federal Level in June if it makes the cut at the State level. We will know if it passes state but we won't know about the federal level until September.

Tony Jonas (Public) stated that we have a site, we now need a design that we can build from. We can go in and tell someone we have \$3 million and this is what we want. Ms. Cardenas stated that we did not include grant funding in the budget, we are not counting on it being there for construction. The Board can only build what they have money for. Vice President Chapman stated that the first option was the option he wants to start with as it was the original idea. Ms. Cardenas added that she felt that Mr. Hancock's only concern with design two was that it had the potential to generate more revenue. Vice President Chapman stated that he is against all other add-ons. They are all components to be added on later.

Board agreed that option one was the chosen option and we can add the extra features when funding is available.

Mr. Hancock expressed concern that this is only one part of the discussion. He wants to give the Board hard numbers. He needs to know if he is going after one bid or multiple bids with an independent engineer. He is concerned with how to get the Board those hard numbers.

Discussion between Board members and Mr. Hancock about the design firm previously used for preliminary design. Mr. Hancock explained that they were designers, not contractors. Mr. Hancock inquired again about the RFP. Should we create an RFP for the design only or a design build? He added that to go with one firm for engineering it could cost as much as 15% of the total project cost just for design and not including the general contractor. He also added that, being a government agency, there are other codes that we must follow which limits our flexibility.

Vice President Chapman suggested the staff put out an RFP to start in May/June for the first option. President Wilson confirmed that he suggested the all-in-one. Vice President Chapman stated, in the short term (30 days). And, staff can also put together packages to go out to bid for individual projects if need be. Mr. Hancock requested confirmation that Vice President Chapman stated we create a basic design build RFP for the entire project for the amount of \$3 million for a general contractor and see what happens. Vice President Chapman agreed then added, while that is going on, start the alternative bid packages for parking lot and other smaller projects. Do not pursue them yet but do not stop until we know what we get. Consider it another dual track option.

Mr. Jonas asked Mr. Hancock if he had any idea on how much it would cost for the design, engineer and specs. Mr. Hancock responded that if we hire an engineer firm for the design and specs, the complete plans, construction estimates and engineer reports it would probably run approximately 15% of the \$3 million. Mr. Jonas stated that this is not a small amount but, it may be the smartest route. He suggested however, that we separate the engineering from the construction. This way, the JPA owns the plans. President Wilson and Vice President Chapman liked this option. Mr. Jonas then added that the parking lot and other smaller projects can still be separate.

Eileen Spencer stated that, in her experience, contractors add in at least 25% for their change orders. There are orders to the activities to be completed and suggested the Board will save money if they hire a general contractor.

Board member Hammond asked if general contractors always charge on a percentage. Mr. Hancock responded no, we can prepare the scope with a not-to-exceed amount.

Mr. Hancock stated that, up until today, it has been presented that we should be getting the most we can out of the money we have. President Wilson stated that it may seem more efficient to separate everything out but, it would be more work for staff. He suggested that the Board now turn it over to a professional with a design that looks similar to the one we had designed. Vice President Chapman added however, that whoever we choose must stay within the \$3 million budget. There can be no pipe dream designs, just a basic pool. Mr. Hancock confirmed that staff should put out an RFP for a contract construction management firm for a pool project. President Wilson inquired if they would do the plans. Mr. Hancock responded that the RFP would include all work. The Board can agree to then go to a general contractor. Both Vice President Chapman and Board member Hammond agreed that we must finalize the design, see how it fits on location and change what we need to. Mr. Hancock stated that he will work with members to schedule a meeting for those who want to, to visit the site. He stated, however, that there is a concern since it is a liability to have people on site walking it. Vice President Chapman suggests designating a point to gather and have it flagged based on the last set of plans so people can see without entering the actual site.

Tony Jonas asked if a new map was available, one with the new dimensions. Mr. Hancock stated that he could give him the dimensions and a map can be provided. Vice President Chapman would also like a new map. Mr. Hancock states that we can provide one with an overlay. An aerial view and we can add a sketch over it.

8 **BOARD MEMBER ISSUES/REPORTS:** None.

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Brian Wilson, President

Respectfully Submitted by

Heidi Whitlock, Project Manager

Submitted By: Jared G. Hancock, Executive Officer

Action Date: May 5, 2015

AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: Discuss and Adopt Revised Proposed Budget

SUMMARY: At the March 31, 2015 meeting, it was requested that the Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority prepare a draft budget for the 15/16 fiscal year. Discussions between the Treasurer and staff had resulted in a proposed budget which was discussed at the April 21, 2015 meeting. Changes have been made at the request of Board members and a revised proposed budget is being presented for discussion and possible adoption.

FISCAL IMPACT: None.

ACTION REQUESTED: Direction to staff and possible adoption of revised proposed budget.

ATTACHMENTS: Revised Proposed Budget to be provided at meeting.

Submitted By: Jared G. Hancock, Executive Officer

Action Date: May 5, 2015

AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: Discuss Design Comments Received

SUMMARY: The Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority, at its April 21, 2015 meeting, discussed construction options for the purpose of building the new community swimming pool. During the discussion, it was requested that members be able to visit the site to see where items would be located to better visualize the preliminary design. It was requested that any comments and/or changes requested be submitted to the Board for consideration prior to drafting the RFP. It is anticipated that additional Board comments will be received and will be provided at the meeting.

FISCAL IMPACT: None.

**ACTION
REQUESTED:** Direction to staff.

ATTACHMENTS: Comments from Board member McBride

Comments requested from April 22nd Meeting

Building should be a shed roof with peak on pool side to attach to pool enclosure.

Building should be configured straight NO L shape.

No foundation for pool enclosure should be built if enclosure is not being built at same time.

Enclosure should be designed and engineered with original design and engineering of facility.

Pool and Pool enclosure must be attached as board has approved.

All parking will be paved to comply with city ordinance.

ATTACHED


My vision of facility combining all statements I have made in HLVRA meetings.

Design rendered from Aquatic Design Group
Presentation 2B

Thank You

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Nicholas McBride', written in a cursive style.

Nicholas McBride



1" = 30'0"
 NORTH →

SOUTH STREET

Submitted By: Jared G. Hancock, Executive Officer

Action Date: May 5, 2015

AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: Discuss Preparation of a Design-Build Request for Proposal

SUMMARY: The Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority, at its April 21, 2015 meeting, began discussing different Request for Proposal (RFP) options. Staff will provide an overview and recommendations on the preparation of a design-build RFP for the pool.

FISCAL IMPACT: None.

**ACTION
REQUESTED:** Direction to staff.

ATTACHMENTS: None.