

**HONEY LAKE VALLEY RECREATION AUTHORITY
GOVERNING BOARD MEETING
Special Meeting Minutes
February 14, 2017 – 3:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers 66 North Lassen Street Susanville CA 96130**

Meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m. by President Wilson.

Roll Call of Board of Directors present: Dave Meserve, Tom Hammond, David Teeter, Kathie Garnier and Brian Wilson.

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

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

2 APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None.

3 PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

4 MATTERS FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION:

4A Review Monument Sign Designs

Mr. Hancock stated that this item was related to the proposed monument sign and continued that they have received a very generous offer from Eileen Spencer and her husband to donate the sign. He stated that staff has been working with Yesco to provide both mockups and cost estimates, which are included. Also included are the original renderings of three possible design options. He continued that, on the original renderings, the first drawing is one which is a heavy timber look with landscaping, the second has a more substantial base with a sign panel and the third option is a more standard pillar design. He added that the Board has not discussed or designed a seal to date but Yesco provided an option that can be added now and changed out at such time that one is designed. He continued to show that the mockups provided by Yesco were the first two renderings. He stated that Ms. Spencer had reached out to another sign company and provided a very generous budget. Mr. Hancock continued to discuss some of the landscaping to be placed around the signs and the exact location of the sign. He then requested comments from the Board.

Eileen Spencer (public) offered a photo of the site to the Board to show the proposed location of the sign.

President Wilson asked Ms. Spencer if there was anything she would like to add prior to the Board commenting.

Ms. Spencer responded yes, that she had the other sign company create a mockup as well for the Board's consideration which is a traditional monument sign, aluminum with sprayed stucco. She added that another option would be a sign like that of the old Roosevelt Pool sign however, a mockup of that sign was not fabricated as they wanted to wait to hear about the outcome of this meeting.

Vice President Garnier asked why the third rendering was not offered by Yesco.

Mr. Hancock responded that that type of sign is a fairly traditional design so, it had not been requested yet.

Vice President Garnier offered her thoughts on the longevity that rod iron would provide versus some other options. She added that she preferred option two and three of the original renderings but preferred three if it was still an option.

Ms. Spencer asked for her thoughts on the additional signs adding that her opinion would not hurt her feelings as she did not design them.

Vice President Garnier responded that she wanted to be diplomatic but then offered her opinion of the traditional monument sign design provided by Ms. Spencer's sign design company.

Ms. Spencer agreed that she was not very fond of the design either.

Board member Teeter stated that he preferred option two. Vice President Garnier agreed.

Board member Hammond offered thanks to Ms. Spencer and added that her willingness to donate such a huge item puts him in an uncomfortable situation where he feels awkward choosing something that she will be paying for. Other Board members agreed. Ms. Spencer stated that he should not worry about such things, that she has given them a budget. Board member Hammond then stated his preference for the third design.

Mr. Hancock gave an explanation on why the original renderings had not been shown until this meeting and discussed the specifics of the second design, how it appears versus how it should have been presented in the rendering.

Board member Hammond inquired as to how many sign companies had been contacted.

Mr. Hancock responded that Yesco and one other, with the exception of the company Ms. Spencer had contacted.

Conversation occurred on how long sign companies usually take because of how busy they always appear to be. Ms. Spencer added that she is familiar with the process and if you pay 50% up front, they typically place you at the top of the list.

Mr. Hancock requested from Ms. Spencer the amount that was quoted to her for the additional design. She responded \$8,500.00.

Vice President Garnier stated her concern about the lifespan of the sign chosen. She wants to ensure that whatever Ms. Spencer is paying for will last.

Ms. Spencer responded that, if the Board is looking at the renderings as the options, her company does not do masonry work but Yesco can. Her only additional comment was that option two reminded her of a national park sign.

President Wilson added that he agreed, but also that whatever materials are to be used should be those which can be fixed easily when damaged.

Ms. Spencer reiterated that the company she worked with designed an aluminum sign with stucco and the letters could be easily removed if the entire sign required repainting or other repairs.

Mr. Hancock stated that the width of the sign could be an issue as denting could occur with an aluminum sign.

President Wilson stated that he preferred something simple. He added that he liked the second sign but it may be going overboard as it would be the best looking sign in town. He then requested that Ms. Spencer share which design she preferred as he would support whatever she wanted since she was donating it.

Ms. Spencer responded that she preferred option one. However, she thought it would be logs and not planks.

Vice President Garnier asked why logs were not an option. She suggested contacting the person in Westwood who could do so.

Ms. Spencer stated that she thought of that in the beginning and that was what she originally wanted. She also stated her preference for certain sign designs as she was very opinionated in that area.

Board member Hammond responded that it sounded as though she was the right person to design it then.

Ms. Spencer asked for confirmation that the Board was requesting her to choose the design. The Board confirmed.

4B Update on Pool Director Recruitment

Mr. Hancock stated that staff has now received two letters of interest. However, the job description which includes both the executive officer and pool related functions, may be difficult to find in a single applicant at this salary. He continued that the Board has had a lot of discussion about the salary but it is getting down to the wire trying to find someone with all of the required skillsets. One applicant may be a really good fit however, staff is still awaiting additional information to be provided prior to scheduling the item to be discussed during closed session.

Mr. Hancock continued that staff is still continuing with the advertisements for other positions including swim instructors and lifeguards to be placed in the newspaper and also circulating to the college and the high school. He stated that most training can be performed here but, for some of the aquatic components, they will have to go elsewhere. Mr. Hancock requested direction from the Board due to the lack of interest in the position thus far.

Board member Hammond stated his concern with the money situation and revenue predictions. He requested a budget history for Roosevelt Pool, a three to four year average if available. Mr. Hancock responded that the information was available.

President Wilson stated that **Mr. Jonas** (public) had come to visit him a few times and asked Mr. Jonas what the last years' revenues were for Roosevelt.

Mr. Jonas responded it was approximately \$94,000 in gross revenues but added that that was a time when the pool contracted with multiple schools for recreational activities and that they used the pool heavily.

Mr. Hancock added that he believed the pool operated at a \$60,000 deficit in its last year. He added that there may have also been issues with how the pool was operated and currently, staff would need to do it differently.

Vice President Garnier added that it must also be taken into consideration that it was \$94,000 and \$60,000 13-14 years ago.

Board member Hammond asked if the college utilized the pool.

Mr. Jonas responded yes, but it was for water aerobics and lap swimming.

Ms. Spencer stated her concern that the Board has still not set pricing for seasonal and daily passes etc... She added that she has a few people that are willing to "donate" to the pool by buying passes, even if they will never use them. But, they are wondering what the costs would be.

President Wilson responded that they have not set them yet, they have been discussed but not set.

Board member Hammond voiced his concern with having someone come in from out of the area. He added that maybe it should be an interim position initially.

Mr. Jonas responded to Board member Hammond's earlier request stating that using Roosevelt's numbers will not work for this Board.

Board member Hammond responded that it would at least offer a template to work from.

Mr. Jonas offered his opinion that Mr. Hancock's looking into the cost of the Quincy Pool and others similar would be a better option than reviewing the numbers from Roosevelt Pool.

Ms. Spencer again stated her concern with getting the pass amounts established. She offered her memory of paying \$3 for a daily pass in Santa Clara, but stated that was approximately 40 years ago.

President Wilson stated that it goes back to the question of what the Pool Director will be doing. We are anticipating having his or her assistance in preparing the fees, the programming etc... He continued that we have flown the position for 6 months now and have only received two applications. He asked, if the Board decided to hire someone for just the pool manage duties, who would take on the administrative tasks?

Mr. Hancock stated that staff could reach out to the County.

Jim Hodge (public) recommended the Board consider seasonal passes and also that the person who they hire to do the job is innovative and has already brought programs in and not just show up to punch the clock.

Mr. Hancock responded that they would want the person to be innovative.

Mr. Hodge added that the kids in the areas need to learn how to swim. He suggested that the Board look into contracting with the local schools and maybe the Rancheria to get an idea of what fixed income could be generated.

Mr. Hancock responded that a lot of that base information has already been collected. Such as, the area has 10 years of children who have not had swim lessons. Once those kids go through the program, it will start to taper off. He added that information is available but we are not wanting to simply hand it over to the person hired, they want someone to assist in preparing all of the items such as what would be expected, swim programs, fee schedule etc...

Board member Hammond asked if Mr. Jonas has submitted an application.

Mr. Hancock responded that he had not.

Board member Hammond asked Mr. Jonas if he was interested in doing so.

Mr. Jonas responded that he is not looking for a lifetime job. He would be interested in getting the programming going but, not a full time job.

President Wilson asked the Board if direction should be given to stay on course or if the direction should be changed.

Board Hammond responded that he would like to see Mr. Jonas submit a proposal and he can do the job until we get someone else in, he can be an interim pool director.

President Wilson stated that the position seems to be a part time position as opposed to full time, even in the off season, there will only be pool checks to be completed.

Mr. Hancock stated that, in the beginning, there was a lot of hope that there was someone in the community who we were not aware of, someone who recently relocated due to a spouse's employment at the prison etc. We have placed the ad out there, out enough to get responses from both Arizona and San Jose. He then suggested that maybe the Board should revisit the item next week at the regularly scheduled meeting to discuss the individuals who submitted letters.

Mr. Hancock then asked Mr. Jonas if it was feasible for him to put a proposal together prior to that time.

Discussion occurred on the next meeting date and time.

President Wilson asked Mr. Hancock what other items would be on the agenda. Mr. Hancock responded that possibly the midyear budget and the audit.

It was decided to have the regularly scheduled meeting on the 21st but to hold closed session prior to open session, at 2pm.

5 **BOARD MEMBER ISSUES/REPORTS:**

Board member Meserve offered thanks to Ms. Spencer for her generous donation. Other Board members offered thanks.

President Wilson added that a donation item should also be brought back at some point soon.

Mr. Jonas and Ms. Spencer discussed an option where they may be interested in starting a nonprofit for the pool.

Mr. Hancock brought up the option of a GoFundMe page based on current options.

President Wilson responded that there is typically a charge for GoFundMe but, if he can use it as a tax write off, he would donate.

Vice President Garnier stated that anyone who donated should receive a plaque at the building or some sort of recognition.

ADJOURNMENT:

Meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.


Brian R. Wilson, President

Respectfully Submitted by


Heidi Whitlock, Project Manager/Secretary

Approved on March 21, 2017