

**HONEY LAKE VALLEY RECREATION AUTHORITY  
GOVERNING BOARD MEETING  
Regular Meeting Minutes  
March 18, 2014 – 3:00 p.m.**  
City Council Chambers 66 North Lassen Street Susanville CA 96130

Meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m. by Brian 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 McBride to approve the agenda as posted; motion carried.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Motion by Board member Meserve, second by Board member McBride to approve February 18, 2014 minutes with the change of 7C to change Vice President Wilson to President Wilson; motion carried.

**CORRESPONDANCE:** No correspondence was presented.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

**Tony Jonas** (Public member) – Requested to know whether or not any reportable action occurred during the last closed session, from March 4, 2014. The Executive office will review the minutes and will update Mr. Jonas at the next meeting.

**7        MATTERS FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION:**

**7A       Updated Timeline**

Jared Hancock starts by stating in January, staff created a timeline with the goal of having measurable benchmarks that we are trying to reach. It was requested that we move forward and extend that timeline as it is good to see that we are able to accomplish those goals. We extended the timeline out until September. Keep in mind that there will be other things added, but these are just main topics. Staff are requesting feedback on added dates, changing dates or even removing items. There are many items moving simultaneously. Board member Wosick requests that we go through the items and Mr. Hancock explains each of the items from the current date forward.

As title acquisition was mentioned, President Wilson inquires as to whether or not the title will be acquired before escrow. Mr. Hancock responds, with Vice President Chapman agreeing, that the title process can take time so it's best to move forward. He then inquired about the old site deliverables and Mr. Hancock responded that we would like to think we should have the information back on the old site by May 20, 2014 so we will add that to the timeline.

Motion by Vice President Chapman, second by Board member Wosick to adopt the updated timeline. Carried unanimously.

**7B       Discuss and adopt County Purchasing Policy – designate signing rights**

Mr. Hancock states that in our quest to find a Treasurer, it was decided to utilize the Lassen County Treasurer / Tax Collector. He continues that the Lassen County Board of Supervisors meeting, to be held on March 24, 2014, there will be two components discussed 1) the transferring of funds over to the JPA with different funds for "other contributions" and the "Pennies for the Pool" and 2) financial disbursements. He continues that the County has agreed to waive the indirect costs but they would like to use the County's Purchasing Policy. The policy has basic items broken down into 5 categories: less than \$20.00, \$20.01-\$750.00, \$750.01-\$2,000.00, \$20001.01-\$10,000.00 and over \$10,000.00. Mr. Hancock then states that the changes we will want to make in this policy would most likely be the authorizations although the Board may desire to change those limits. However, the County Auditor would prefer it if no changes were made. Vice President Chapman states that the only changes that he can see are the mention of the "Board of Supervisors" being changed to "JPA Board". Mr. Hancock then states that we are still trying to clarify what their level of involvement will be and that we are already requesting forms so we can take some of the burden off of County staff. Vice President Chapman states that the County already adapts to other agencies but Mr. Hancock states that we just want to make it as simple as possible. Mr. Hancock then states that we are not looking for approval at this time, simply to give information to the Board on where we were today. Changes that we should discuss would be, for instance, changing "Board of Supervisors" to "JPA Board", "County CEO" to "Executive Officer", and "Department Head" to "Project Manager". Mr. Hancock then states that we will bring this back with changes attached.

#### **7C Update on allocating funds for Roosevelt Pool Analysis**

Mr. Hancock states that at a previous meeting it was asked "does the JPA have the legal authority to investigate the feasibility of rehabilitating the old Roosevelt Pool". We were asked to have a legal opinion prepared and we are anticipating it getting to us. Tony Jonas (Public member) then stated that what he had asked was whether or not funds were legally allowed to be used to complete the analysis. President Wilson responded that he believed that the JPA covered both of those topics. Mr. Jonas then points out that the JPA does not own the Roosevelt Pool. President Wilson responds that they do not own the Credence School site yet either. Vice President Chapman states that Mr. Jonas brings up a good point and maybe both the City and the Elementary School District should have an agreement, in writing, (including permission to access the site) prior to any money being spent. He continues that it may only be a matter of formality but it should be in writing in the file. Other agreements have not been carried out previously and we do not want to see a "failure to execute" issue like other agencies have had. Mr. Jonas then asks again whether or not the JPA has the right to spend public funds to rehabilitate another agencies site. Vice President Chapman states that if we obtain the rights to the property first, then we can use the public funds. However, we need to have this in writing first and the memo needs to address all of these points.

#### **7D Discuss quotes for Old Roosevelt Pool Analysis RFP**

Mr. Hancock starts by stating that we have received two responses for the RFP we sent out last month and both companies cover the deliverables required. The agencies are Siegfried, out of Sacramento, and Garavaglia, out of San Francisco. Garavaglia came in with a bid of \$59,550 and Siegfried was able to come in at \$21,000. Siegfried, as you can see, came in at 1/3 of the cost. Staff is requesting that we continue with Siegfried as they are the less expensive option and they also have more experience with pool design and rehabilitation, with the written consent from the City and Elementary School District of course. It was then further explained that there were three scenarios given that the agencies would have to place a price on. Mr. Hancock then stated that at the end of this process we will have a complete document based on all these factors. Then we will know that these particular options will cost "x" dollars to complete. Vice President Chapman adds that in doing it this way we are able to compare apples to apples. He continues that Siegfried seems to have an advantage that they know what they are doing if you look at the other pools included in their quote. Mr. Jonas then asks, do we know if they will be including the cost of the infrastructure, parking lot etc... Mr. Hancock states that it will not because that will be covered in the building design phase and we do not want to pay for it twice. Vice President Chapman continues that Siegfried is much more reasonable with its bids on the other projects they have worked on, particularly the one like ours. Board member McBride states that he also prefers Siegfried because the pools are more similar being shut down for the same issues Roosevelt Pool was closed for. He adds that we already have an idea of what we are looking at. He thinks they would give the best direction and he likes their numbers.

Motion by Board member McBride, second by Vice President Chapman to use Siegfried for the Roosevelt Pool Analysis; motion carried unanimously (with the written consent of both parties and both the City and Elementary School District to access the site).

## **7E Preliminary Pool Design options / Firms**

Mr. Hancock starts that at the last meeting we discussed design options and going out to local firms. The three we heard back from were Greg Melton Design, Aquatic Design Group and NST Engineering. However, we have yet to receive a bid from NST Engineering and it may be because they are trying to contract with the same pool design company as Greg Melton Design. He continues that he hopes to hear from NST within a week or two. But, we currently have one from both Melton and Aquatic design. When speaking with NST, they stated that they are willing to partner with someone locally for possible fee reductions etc... NST may be willing to offer a reduction but we must wait to see what they come back with. My question to the Board is, should we move forward or wait for NST. President Wilson inquires as to why we didn't receive anything from NST. Were they not notified at the same time? Mr. Hancock responds they have been following the meetings etc... but it may be a conflict with Holiday pools who are already working with the Greg Melton Group.

Board member McBride states that he is still opposed to moving onto the design phase before seeing the results to the Roosevelt Analysis. But, he is liking what he is seeing with Siegfried for possibly rehabilitating Roosevelt. Board member Wosick states that he respects Board member McBride's point of view but to revamp the old pool that's a strange size? We need to get a community pool. If we spend money on the old pool, it will still be an old pool. He believes Roosevelt has run its course. Vice President Chapman also states that he appreciates what Board member McBride stated but they committed to go on a dual track and not to wait. If we go with a design group, I'm more interested in finding expertise. If we had reason not to go with Melton, it would be because Aquatic Design group has a vast amount of work they have done. They are everywhere including Texas and Disney parks. We just need to give the tighter parameters to work within. Our local person does not have experience with building pools. We just need to make sure we tell Aquatic Design Group what that "this is what we want" instead of them selling us on items. Vice President Chapman likes Aquatic Design Group. Board member Wosick states that he agrees, that cheaper isn't always the way to go.

Mr. Hancock continues that both Melton Design and Aquatic Design Group inquired as to whether or not they would be excluded from the building phase if they do the design. He agrees with both Vice President Chapman and Board member Wosick that you don't have to pay someone to learn the job. Melton may have better cost estimates but Aquatic Design Group is a very reputable firm but there are some cost estimate concerns. He then states that spending \$7,500 is a good and well spent if we want to stay on a dual track.

An unidentified male (public) inquired about whether or not they would be constructing the building as well because there is concern on being able to obtain items placed in a new community pool that may not be readily available here. There will be situations that arise that we will have to research where to get some of the items for maintenance. President Wilson then inquires if the Aquatic Design Group performed soil testing and building analyses. Mr. Hancock responds that we can wait to approve this until the next meeting but the Board wanted to move ahead. They will not perform these studies. They will look at the site, current buildings etc... President Wilson asks if someone else will be contracted to test the soil and to see if the building is in a condition that can be altered for bathrooms etc... board member Wosick inquires as to why we couldn't move ahead anyway. President Wilson responds that he doesn't want to spend money on a design that could never be used. He continues that he knows we want to move forward but we need to know how all these parts will fit together. Mr. Hancock states that we have the approval for this set for the next meeting. We have two choices and he feels it's best to contract with someone that does this every day. We don't have to make a decision today. The Board could choose to direct staff to contract with the Aquatic Design and we can pick a date at that time, April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2014.

Motion by Board member Wosick, second by Board member Meserve to contract with Aquatic Design Group start date to be decided at next meeting; motion carried, Board member McBride voted no.

**7F Approve Purchase of Preliminary Title**

Mr. Hancock states that this is a basic item, we will want to perform a preliminary title and we suggest using Chicago Title since they have done this site in the past.

Motion by Board member Wosick, second by Board member Meserve to use Chicago Title for the preliminary title; motion carried.

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

**PUBLIC COMMENT TO CLOSED SESSION ITEMS:**

**CLOSED SESSION:** At 4:55 p.m. the Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority recessed to closed session to discuss the following:

A. PROPERTY NEGOTIATIONS

**RETURN TO OPEN SESSION:** At 5:59 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 6:13 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Brian Wilson, President

Respectfully Submitted by

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Heidi Whitlock, City of Susanville, Project Manager

*Approved on May 6, 2014*