HONEY LAKE VALLEY RECREATION AUTHORITY
GOVERNING BOARD MEETING
Regular Meeting Minutes
December 16, 2014 – 3:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers 66 North Lassen Street Susanville CA 96130

Meeting was called to order at 3:34 p.m. by President Wilson.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Motion by Board member McBride, second by Board member Meserve to approve the minutes from the November 4, 2014, meeting; motion carried unanimously. Absent: Wosick
Motion by Board member McBride, second by Board member Meserve to approve the minutes from the November 18, 2014, meeting; motion carried unanimously. Abstention: Chapman. Absent: Wosick

5 **CORRESPONDANCE:** None.

6 **PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

7 **MATTERS FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION:**

7A **Update of Financing Options**

Mr. Hancock states that this item is being discussed right now at the Board of Supervisor's meeting and that he and the County CAO, Richard Egan, have been working on the financing plan for both the City and the County looking at taking the first three years of contributions, through 2015. In July 2015 both the City and the County would have contributed $600,000 each giving the total funding collected by that time to be $1.2 million. Some costs have already been incurred such as design, site preparation etc... and if both the City and the County would come up with $1.1 million each, it would leave approximately $3 million for construction costs. In return, each entity would reduce their annual contribution to $80,000-$90,000 a year depending on the 3% or 4% interest over twelve (12) years. We may meet somewhere in the middle as well. We are confident that there will be sufficient funds to cover the anticipated operation. We feel that this is the most prudent way to move forward. They are discussing this right now and tomorrow the City Council has it on their agenda. While each agency agreed to $200,000 a year, it looks positive to the community if some of the funding is put in up front. It would be up to each entity to find other options fi this option did not work.

Vice President Chapman states that the BOS just gave the okay to use tobacco settlement money to fund the pool. Two thirds of the money will go towards it. Mr. Egan was very supportive and the Board voted 5/0 for it.

President Wilson asked Mr. Hancock if $3.4 million will be the total to cover everything. Meaning, the first year's operation costs, construction and demolition costs and site acquisition. Mr. Hancock responds yes.

Bill Feierabend (public) asks if the ideal situation would be both entities self-funding. Mr. Hancock responds that it is a combination of both self-funding and with monies already collected. Because of how the budget cycles have occurred, we have been able to collect three year's worth on contributions over 18 months.

7B Approval of LWCF Application and Resolution 14-02

Mr. Hancock opens by stating that this is an informational item but we would like direction from the Board. We know the Board wants a basic design with funding from the City and County while looking for additional funding sources. We have been looking into other options and there is a grant available through OGALS. It could be up to $3 million with a 50% match for already planned projects where one can send in reimbursement requests. We do not need it to build the pool as currently designed and we don't' want to rely on it but the additional funds would be very beneficial. We have Resolution 14-02 attached and staff is requesting permission to submit the application. The reality is, we can go ahead and apply without a resolution but, quite often, funding sources require a resolution so we would like to get it approved now.

Tony Jonas (public) inquires as to when the award date would be. In response he is told the application deadline is February 3, 2015 with an award date of sometime in July, 2015. Vice President Chapman states that some of the language in the Resolution may be incorrect and we may want to review. Mr. Hancock responded that it was language taken directly from the OGALS application but, we would review to ensure all wording is correct.

Motion by Board member Meserve, second by Board member McBride to approve Resolution 14-02 allowing staff to submit an application to OGALS for additional funding. Motion carried unanimously. Meserve: Aye, McBride: Aye, Wilson: Aye, Chapman: Aye. Absent: Wosick.

7C Update on Phase I & II

Mr. Hancock states that we were hoping to have a report for the Board but, there is a single item holding up the report. The person who took the sampling stated, after the tanks were again covered, that he wanted to have them dug out and probed to double check that they are in fact filled as they sounded hollow when he checked them. We are awaiting a dry moment since the weather has not been cooperative, to dig them up again and again verify. It would've been nice to know at the time prior to filling them in but, this is what we know now.

7D Review Preliminary Site Design Option

It was requested that we move this to the end of discussion by Mr. Hancock, the Board agreed.

7E Property Acquisition Update

Mr. Hancock gave a brief update on the property acquisition stating that everything is good to go once the H&K report comes back clean.

7F Demolition Update

Mr. Hancock gave an update on the demolition of the existing old Roosevelt Pool. He stated that bids are due by 2 p.m. December 18, 2014. A walk through was done on Thursday with nine (9) firms and, based on their comments, some changes were made to the bid packets. We are anticipating a good number of bid packets coming in as we submitted to trade journals, local demolition firms etc.... We've received many comments and we know of a few local firms that are bidding, even if they won't make much of a profit simply because they want to be a part of the process. We are assisting them with prevailing wage and scheduling questions etc...

Vice President Chapman inquires as to where firms are from. Mr. Hancock states that they are local firms or from Chico, Redding. No one from Reno at this time.

Mr. Hancock added that he has also been in communications with Tom Valentino, Solid Waste, about waiving or reducing dumping fees for the demolition. Not everyone was planning on using the landfill but we may be able to get lower dumping fees.

7G Letter to New Treasurer

Mr. Hancock addresses the fact that we have been going through multiple Treasurers. First, Richard Egan followed by Norma Scheetz, and now it will be Nancy Cardenas. At this time, we wanted to let the Board know that we have sent a letter to Ms. Cardenas to invite her to fill the role for the JPA as the others before her have.

7D Review Preliminary Site Design Option (continued)

Mr. Hancock begins by stating that we have been using the services of the Aquatic Design Group for the purpose of coming up with a preliminary design. They have been helping us by combining what the public expressed interest in. We had four designs, down to two, then back to four. We have now brought back a final drawing to provide a good layout with parking designed for immediate needs. We repositioned the building for better solar access and flow for patrons. Emergency and services access points, prevailing wind issues and simply having a more pleasant pool environment have been considered. We have also rearranged the pool, considered the mentioned pool depths and also allowing room for growth. I would like to go through this is detail east to west.

He continues, starting on east side we have additional parking. The grey area will be unimproved at this point and the remaining portion will be paved including the entrance, exit and loading zone. The aisle widths will allow for buses and emergency vehicles. The area in the middle will be paved for easier sheriff's access. Moving to the front, the loading area will be for parents dropping off children and buses. Also included are 4 ADA spaces in the front. The cross-hatched section is the service entrance to the building. The building's front section is 35' x 35' providing the main entrance and a small gathering area and some office space. The area south of the main entrance goes towards the future feature and will hold both the men's and women's restrooms and a small mechanical room for the future splash park, if needed. If we look at the pool itself, the white outline shown around it, would have footings located for a future enclosure. The pool, again, would be 25 yards by 25 meters. The location of the pool shown, once covered, will provide coverage for the gathering area, slides etc... and could be located on the north end if needed. Activities which are louder would be located at the north side or southern end of the property. The "L" shape provides room for both lap swimming and free swimming at the same time. Anything on the south side of the property would be quieter activities. We have left sufficient space behind the building for access in case of emergencies etc... and the well could be plugged into the small mechanical room to assist in topping off the pool or to tie into the City's system to help maintain temperature. The design itself we tried to get a geometrical as possible to enable us to dig footings for the future building etc... all at one time. It would also allow for a smoother addition of radiant heating. We feel it's a good combination of both 2A and 2B of last meeting and concerns from the Board members. But, in wrapping up, it looks like a very detailed design but it is still just a "conceptual site plan", it's not chiseled in stone. It's to look at the basic features, not individual lines and details.

Vice President Chapman states that a lot of his concerns still did not come through on this design. He wanted it more centered on the property with parking on both sides. He states he doesn't want to keep fighting over it. He likes the enclosed area to provide shelter from the winds and as far as views, no one will really be looking at them while swimming. He thinks it's an improvement but there is a lot of space between the pool and the building. He sees the gathering area and thinks it may be large but, with radiant heating, it may not be so bad.

Board member Wosick arrives at 4:20 p.m.

Board member McBride states that he feels that the parking area is still too big and that it needs to be scaled down. The "L" shape building will cut off some of the views and the pool is too far away from the building. He appreciates the work but thinks staff has gotten too far away from the "basic" design.

Board member Wosick responds that he thought we were only going to tweak the design decided on at the last meeting. He inquires how we got to a new design.

Board member Meserve and President Wilson also express their concern with the distance between the pool and the building.

Mr. Hancock responds that the center portion of the building is 35'x35', that it's smaller than the council chambers. He states that if it was moved the deck space may not be adequate. Vice President Chapman suggests going to the site to stake it out and walking it off to get a better idea of how much the distance really is. Mr. Hancock responds that another site may be better as there would be no obstacles to block views. This would be his recommendation if the Board wanted to do so. He suggests going to Riverside Park and layout the design on the field so one can see it with markings on the ground.

President Wilson states that, with the pools they visited, he didn't feel that the space would be needed. Board member McBride agrees and uses the Quincy pool as an example.

Vice President Chapman inquires as to how many parking spaces are needed. He didn't want the extra spaces if they were not needed. Board member McBride suggests we simply look at the Quincy pool, simple pool with a simple building. Vice President Chapman inquires as to how many spaces we legally need. I see a lot of parking spaces. I don't want to pay for it if it's not needed.

Tony Jonas (public) – responds that this parking works really well with busy swim seasons. Very well. Then inquires about how far is the alley from the foundation? Mr. Hancock responds that it is approximately 12 feet from the existing fence and 12 feet from the property line. Mr. Jonas then asks how far the footing line is from the end of the paper. Mr. Hancock responds that it is about 110 feet. Mr. Jonas states that it's a good distance and discusses other areas including if the JPA is attempting to secure the triangular portion of the City's property. Mr. Hancock responds, yes.

Bill Feierabend (public) inquires if the north and south sides would be grass areas. Mr. Hancock responds, yes. Mr. Feierabend responds that it is a lot of space for people to sun themselves but he doesn't think people need that much deck area. He suggests moving the long leg of the building to the other side to have covered access to it later. Mr. Hancock states that the mechanical room is located on that side with a family restroom. Also, if we have them try to connect to the existing later, a larger cost will be incurred. Also, if you place anything against the leg, people would have to go through the natatorium to get to the splash areas, horseshoes or whatever else we decided to put on that side of the building later. There is an advantage to deck space because of dirt on children's feet etc...

Charles "Moose" Mueller (public) asks is the bus will be dropping people off in that area. Discussion occurs on the topic and it is stated that once it is necessary, the bus may have to based on demand. The loading zone is designed to accommodate buses. It would be their choice not to go through it. Mr. Hancock states that it would be logical to park right outside but, the most efficient way is through the lot. President Wilson states that when people want to be dropped off there, it will become an issue and will probably be addressed at that time.

Tony Jonas (public) – wonders if the JPA is stuck on an all glass structure. He would be willing to come up items against the glass structure. He thinks the distance would be an issue once it's enclosed. Children needing to use the restrooms may become an issue. You will want the building to be closer. It's an awful long distance. He likes that the Board chose the "L" shaped pool. He thinks it's a good move but there still needs to be some work done on it. The distance with the mechanical rooms also need some more thought.

Board member Wosick asks what they are looking to do. He thought they were looking to approve this design today. He thinks it's good to go flag it out to take a look. President Wilson states that he thought the locker rooms and natatorium would be the same building. He also wants to know what they have to do today to take the next step. Mr. Hancock responds that he thinks we have gotten into the situation where we are looking at design details where everything is interlocked and intertwined. He thinks some decisions need to be made and wonders what the majority of the Board wants to do. Everyone can do it ten different ways and he needs clear direction. Every comment being made has one going against it. He inquires as to what we need. He feels he got the closest to making every person happy, there are many features. Let's hammer it out now and get it completed. If we have an engineer do it, it will cost $5,000-$6,000. Right now, Public works can perform the flatwork on paving. There is not that much to do but, with the Board not agreeing, it's hard to figure out what will help us move forward.

Board member McBride states that no one ever mentioned an "L" shaped building and the parking is not the same as before. I wanted to have the Board discuss this prior to spending $8,000 for a firm to design something and now we are fixing it. What happened to the west/east or north/south differences? The parking lot is a lot bigger. We are complicating this too much. We just want a rectangular building, paved parking and a pool, that's it. We have minutes stating what we wanted, how did it get misconstrued?

Vice President Chapman states that he sees Board member McBride's point and he appreciates Mr. Hancock's passion for this but, my frustration comes from wanting simplicity. The funding side is slowly working out. I'm going to be flipping some things around. I do think it's an improvement from 2A & 2B but we need to compact it. But, we need to stop thinking about additional items, just the basic design. I think staff has brought a lot to the table but, we all do and we need to use it all. The people coming to the meetings will also assist in how this will be designed.

Mr. Feierabend states that he appreciates all of Jared's work and he is of the opinion that the parking lot is good, let's move on.

President Wilson states to Mr. Hancock that they owe him an apology. He believes he is in a situation where he cannot win. There are too many people with opinions and he was simply trying to take everyone into consideration. We need to stop being so stubborn and stop picking parking spaces and buildings. If we don't, we will have all the cash we need to build it because it will be ten years before it happens. As a group, he requests everyone to come together. He states it's not ideal but that's just his opinion. Next July, what do we want? Board member McBride agrees to answering that question and asks do we want to split the parking lot or same lot, same lot was agreed upon, "L" shape, response was yes.

Vice President Chapman states that he would be okay with the proposed design but, he would just like to see a pool. He likes this layout but if there are ways to make it better he is for it. He just doesn't want someone saying, I wish we did this or that. He suggests we stop beating each other up and move forward.

Board member Wosick states we have an open air pool and later cover it. But, he doesn't think it will ever be covered. He thinks it adds so much to the atmosphere to see the steam etc... But to try to cover it and attach it to the existing building later, he didn't think they had discussed it.

Motion by Board member Wosick, second by Board member Meserve to go with the given design but to consider moving the pool closer to the building. Wosick, aye. Meserve, aye. McBride, no. Wilson, aye. Chapman, aye.

Tony Jonas would like it noted that we missed an important fact that the Aquatic Design Group did not supply site plans and items to scale for "playing' around with on the site. We skipped that entire process.

Vice President Chapman states that he is fine with this design and that he is done discussing the parking lot.

Mr. Hancock verified that staff should move the pool approximately 10 feet to the south and 40 feet to the east of its current location but the assertion was not confirmed. Board member McBride states that a rectangular building still makes more sense to him. It can always be added onto later. Right now, the plan blocks off the north side of the lot. The other design would've been simpler.

8 BOARD MEMBER ISSUES/REPORTS:

Vice President Chapman would like to thank Board member Wosick for his service as this is his last meeting. Board member Meserve also thanks Board member Wosick then adds that he has been on this board for a year and there are always politics on boards. However, he thinks they have come a long way and the concept is good. Engineering can change a lot of things so we will need to continue to be focused on the end result. He is confident that there will be a pool for our community. Board member Wosick expresses his appreciation for being able to serve on this Board and helping with this project. President Wilson also expresses his appreciation to Board member Wosick.

CLOSED SESSION: None.

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 5:34 p.m.

Brian Wilson, President

Respectfully Submitted by

Heidi Whitlock, Project Manager

Approved on January 20, 2015