HONEY LAKE VALLEY RECREATION AUTHORITY
GOVERNING BOARD MEETING
Regular Meeting Minutes
December 2, 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 Wilson.

Roll Call of Board of Directors present: Dave Meserve, Larry Wosick, Nick McBride, Jim Chapman & Brian Wilson.

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

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Motion by Vice President Chapman, second by Board member Meserve to approve the minutes from the September 16, 2014, meeting; motion carried unanimously. Abstentions: Wosick and McBride. Motion by Board member Wosick, second by Board member McBride to approve the minutes from the October 21, 2014, meeting; motion carried unanimously. Abstention: Meserve.

5 CORRESPONDANCE: None.

6 PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

7 MATTERS FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION:

7A Financing Options

Mr. Hancock states that, based on the discussion from the last meeting, staff has reached out to both the City and the County for up front construction costs but it was not looking promising. We also looked into funding opportunities from the USDA and CDBG programs. Since that time, staff have had discussions with both the City and County and found that there is still some interest for them to provide the upfront financing of construction costs. We will continue to work with them and try to bring back an update for the next meeting.

Vice President Chapman responds that he is more in favor of trying to get City and County funding before looking at outside sources as he would rather not owe as much interest. He suggests taking it to those Boards to try to secure the funding. He feels he's in the minority but would like to stress his view.

7B Review Results – Phase I & II Analysis

Mr. Hancock states, in regards to the Phase I & II analysis, we were supposed to get the results today but they have been delayed. H&K is stating they will have the report by the end of next week. I will contact them as I know both myself and the County CAO would like to see the results come back as clean. We do know that there were traces of diesel at the end of one of the tanks and below both of the product lines but at concentrations well below the Environmental screening levels. We plan to have the results on the next agenda.

7C Review Preliminary Site Design Options

Mr. Hancock states that, again, this is only the preliminary concept for the design. We have included four design options. Two are the 2B option from the last meeting with adjustments along with two "L" shaped pools. We have included designs showing the building both parallel and perpendicular to South Street. I think we've said it but I think it's worth

stating again, this is simply to see if the proposed items would fit in the space and at what cost. I know for each of these construction cost line items, we may know someone who could do it cheaper etc... but, these are estimates and are on the high end for construction. Before construction, we can look at other options for filter systems etc... Also, costs are lower in these designs because we have taken out half of the paved parking, as requested at the last meeting. It's now partially decomposed granite. The site prep and grading is also included in those costs so there are some items aggregated in other line items. Mr. Hancock also asked if the Board like any other information/clarification?

President Wilson opens it to everyone as he feels the breakdowns are clear.

Vice President Chapman states that he is not sure whether or not it was discussed but, the issue was raised and he likes the idea of the "L" shaped pool. He knows that ADG are the experts and that they thought these items were the best but, he is worried about the prevailing wind issues etc... which he felt were significant. He states that he likes the designs but they are fully exposed to the winds. He wanted to see the pool on the east side instead of the west side. Only one design shows some sort of protection from the wind and he would like to know why they never considered this and why they have never been looked into. He asked why his suggestions had been ignored.

Mr. Hancock responds that both 1A and 2A were supposed to reflect the comments that Vice President Chapman had made. On the far-east side of the property, there are constraints such as the sheriff's shed, and access to it. We also thought the requested shift was only 90 degrees not 180 degrees. Vice President Chapman stated that no follow up or questions were ever asked to clarify. Mr. Hancock stated that he thought we understood but, apparently, not.

Vice President Chapman describes were he would like to see the pool be built and shows the map to the Board while doing so. Place the building on the west side then the pool then the school. The building will help hide the public works' yards which Board member McBride had previously stated that he didn't like seeing anyway. Mr. Hancock described some of the changes that Vice President Chapman wanted to see on the next set of options. He thinks we now have enough information from the Board and the design firm to finalize this prior to creating the construction plans. Vice President Chapman added that we are also discussing the acquisition of the jog of land by the sheriff's shed and that, since we don't know what the future holds, we need to leave room for future generations for growth options. Mr. Hancock added that some of the issues presented could be alleviated with the addition of landscaping, windbreaks etc... and we will want to supply all sorts of options. Vice President Chapman states that if this is the only option, then fine. But, I'd like to see others. Board member Wosick agrees that he would also like to see these mentioned options in drawing form. Preferably at the next meeting as there would be quite a dramatic change. Vice President Chapman states that cost should be about the same. President Wilson asks is we can at least narrow it done some, such as we know we want the "L" shape?

Board member McBride discussed his concern with only paving a portion of the parking area. The needed parking can be decreased but it should all be paved. If the majority of the Board prefers 2B than I would work with that but, I'd want the pool pushed back and have the entire lot paved. I don't want the building and pool landlocked and lose the ability to expand it at a later date.

Vice President Chapman asks Mr. Hancock if the current parking lot design is geared to immediate needs or for future needs as well. Mr. Hancock responds that there are two answers to that question. The City improvement standards state that it should all be paved. However, there are no standards for a 7,000 square foot pool requiring a particular number of spaces. It's still a case-by-case basis. The designer stated this phase would be accommodated by this design but more parking would be needed in the future. Vice President Chapman states that he cannot agree to pave for the future needs. I hear what everyone is saying but I don't really agree. We have the space, we can have it for overflow and we can pave it later if needed. Overbuilding now, I'm not in favor of. The future Boards can pave it if needed.

Mr. Hancock inquires, for clarification purposes, are we just paving the needed parking or are we also adding decomposed granite also? Vice President Chapman states we should pave what we need today. If we need more at a later date we can add it then. We are already struggling and over budget. We went from 1 million to 2.5 million to now 3.3 million. I'm worried with the escalation of the budget as it keeps going up. We will lose more of the community and I'm struggling to accept this.

Board member McBride suggests removing the 16 parking spaces to the east and 9 spaces to the south.

Tony Jonas (public) inquires as to whether or not the "L:" shaped pool was at a 12' depth. Is it an option? Has it been included? President Wilson states that he believes it is strictly because of the price difference but he's not sure either. Mr. Jonas then suggests moving the maintenance building to the other side of the building because of ease of access for chemical delivery purposes. It would be easier to maneuver in the parking lot and with a chemical truck, we may not want that. The handicapped parking should also be closer to the front of the building, it's currently too far away.

Board member Wosick agreed with these points and states that we need to narrow all this information down and tweak it for the best option. President Wilson suggests narrowing it down to either option 1 or 2. Board member McBride states the "L" shaped is better. It's important to have a deep end for a 'fun factor". He then adds that he likes option 2B but move the chemical house to the west and the handicapped parking in front with grass for a more pleasing appearance.

Vice President Chapman also prefers the "L" shaped option. He adds that we can always have a warm water pool added later by other funding clubs such as Rotary. It's easier to raise $200,000 than $3 million. I feel comfortable with Option 2A. Board member Wosick states that he also likes the "L" shape option but either 2A or 2B are good. Vice President Chapman makes some good points but I'm happy to support either. Board member McBride adds that there is not adequate fire access to most of the building for option 2A if a fire breaks out. Board member Meserve states that he also likes the "L" shaped option although, he likes 2A a little better. His reasoning is in the orientation of the pool. He likes seeing the front of the building in the way it is currently orientated. President Wilson states that he also prefers the "L" shaped option best.

Motion by Board member Wosick to move forward with option 2A, Vice President Chapman seconds. President Wilson states that it looks as though it will be easier to put a roof over 2B. Vice President Chapman suggests again to change the orientation of the building and suggests changing the fire access. The northern exposure in the worst side to have it. There are pro's and con's on both sides. President Wilson asks if the Board can just state whether they can simply state "L" shape pool and have someone design another option focusing on the wind, sun etc... Board member Wosick agrees. Board member McBride states that 3 sides will have sun if Option 2B is chosen. Discussion occurs on amending the previously suggested motion. Mr. Hancock responds that reading the notes would be beneficial as that way we will know what we are adjusting for the next meeting. 1) "L" shaped pool 2) deep end with 12'6" 3) smaller, all paved parking lot 4) design 2A & 2B qualities with better accessibility to storage areas, fire access and handicapped parking 5) designed to leave significant space for expansion 6) designed taking into consideration shed, wind, views etc... 7) moving slightly to the west to provide more room for the entrance.

Motion by Board member Wosick, second by Vice President Chapman to have staff bring back a single site plan taking the above-mentioned items into account for one plan. Motion carried unanimously.

8 **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.

Open session recessed at 4:09 p.m. closed session to commence in 5 minutes.

CLOSED SESSION: At 4:16 p.m. the Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority recessed to closed session to discuss the following:

A. PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT: pursuant to Government Code §54957. – Legal Services

B. Conference with Real Property Negotiator: pursuant to Government Code §54956.8.

10 **RETURN TO OPEN SESSION:** At 4:35 p.m. the Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority reconvened in open session.

A. Direction to staff, no reportable action.

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 4:37 p.m.

Brian Wilson, President

Respectfully Submitted by

Heidi Whitlock, Project Manager

Approved on January 6, 2015