

**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


Heidi Whitlock, Project Manager


Brian Wilson, President

Approved on July 17, 2014