

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE MEETING

APPROVED MINUTES

May 19, 2010

DIRECTORS PRESENT: Ron Treabess and Judy Friedman

STAFF PRESENT: Bob Bolton, Roger Adamson, and Cindy Gustafson

OTHERS PRESENT: Duane Whitelaw from North Tahoe Fire Protection District (NTFPD)
Kevin Murnane from Tahoe Cross Country (TXC)
Justin Broglio from Tahoe City Downtown Association (TCDA)
Doug Pendleton from the America's Best Value Inn
Peter R. Kraatz from Placer County

The May 19, 2010 meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m.

A. DISCUSSION ITEMS WITH POSSIBLE ACTION

1. SNOW STORAGE REPORT FOR WINTER OF 2009-10

Mr. Bolton stated that on December 18, 2009 the Board approved a snow storage agreement to store snow in the PUD yard. Two contractors signed agreements, Tahoe Marine & Excavation (TME) and Gensburg & Sons, paid the fees, provided appropriate insurance, and supplied a storage log at the end of the season. Mr. Bolton was asked at that time to report back to the Board as to how it went and it went extremely well. TME stored about 4,000 yards and Gensburg about 500; all the snow came from downtown. The yard could have probably handled twice that much.

If the District wants to continue with snow storage, staff recommends that the site be permitted and BMP's performed. This would cost anywhere from \$20 to \$50K. Ms. Gustafson added that the County does not believe it is their responsibility. It's unsure as to who should fund the permitting; possibly those people who benefit from it like the business owners.

Mr. Bolton stated the need to get an estimate from a consultant as to the capacity for snow in the yard. This storage can't solve the entire community's snow problem. Mr. Kraatz commented that the County is not turning a 180 and could provide some assistance, especially through Public Works, and Placer Redevelopment would be there to help support this financially. Ms. Friedman went on to state that this is no more or less the PUD's problem than Placer County thinks it's theirs. For the District to be expected to spend \$20 to \$50K to make the site available for businesses in town isn't right. The business community needs to participate in this financially.

If Tahoe has a huge winter, more businesses will need storage and the County should be involved. Ms. Gustafson brought up the issue of the TRPA and that businesses can't just push the snow where they want to anymore. 64 Acres has the best size and scope for snow storage but it is controlled by the Forest Service. If we united with the County we might convince the Forest Service that we could propose a dual project. We need more parking there and then we could use it for snow storage in the winter. Mr. Kraatz inserted that once the transit center is built at 64 Acres, the idea of storing snow there can be entertained. Ms. Gustafson suggested the idea of using the 64 Acres be put off for another year. TCPUD's site worked fine this winter and hopefully it will work next winter. The District has too many projects going on right now to tackle another.

Mr. Broglio said his Board would like to see a clear statement from the District's Board or staff that the site worked and approve it in the interim for one more year up to a certain perimeter of approximately 7,000 yards or whatever is decided upon. Next, have the PUD Board encourage the business owners to form a task force specifically focused on this issue that would lobby the Forest Service or appropriate agency and give clear direction that the PUD is not the solution. Ms. Friedman asked why, if the TCDA represents the business community, they are putting this on the PUD to conduct the outreach. Mr. Broglio corrected her that the TCDA will do the outreach, they just need a clear direction from the PUD. At this point Mr. Bolton stated that staff is recommending that if the District wants to continue the snow storage they will need to get it properly permitted and BMPs completed, and keep the discussion open about who is going to pay for these costs. It was added that next winter's contracts should be signed by a certain date in the fall so the PUD can prepare.

Mr. Wilderotter emphasized that the task force would need commitment from all the businesses in town, not just the more proactive ones. Ms. Friedman asked who would spearhead the task force. Mr. Broglio responded it's not certain yet but they would look to specific spear headers in the community. Mr. Broglio has a list of people already interested and the PUD would not need to lead this. Ms. Gustafson suggested the task force should have a discussion with Placer County Redevelopment concerning costs. Mr. Treabess asked how much the storage cost the PUD this year. There was a security camera installed and some BMPs were done with work release which had to be monitored by staff. The site improvements cost the PUD more than was collected from the two contracts.

Mr. Bolton asked that the Committee recommend to the Board that the PUD provide the same site again this winter until it fills to capacity. There is no backup plan if it reaches capacity and the PUD might have to close the site if this happens. No permanent BMPs will be completed this year. Contractors will be asked in trade to do some snow removal from the bike trails and other projects as seen fit.

Ms. Gustafson encouraged a task force to be formed and secure the funding to get the permits for this site. Mr. Treabess stressed the need to be proactive, especially when it comes to funding. Ms. Gustafson asked for clarification as to whether the PUD would apply for the

grant money or the task force would take the lead on this. Ms. Friedman doubted if the task force would be able to apply for a grant; sometimes these grants are only available to agencies such as the PUD.

Ms. Gustafson then urged that the Board send a message that they will work together but there needs to be strong leadership from the business community and the contractors. Mr. Bolton brought up the issue as to whether this snow storage would be just for downtown Tahoe City or all areas in the District. Mr. Bolton doesn't think there is the capacity for more than downtown but it is bound to come up. No strong recommendation was received on this. Mr. Treabess stated the site would be used until it's full, then it will be closed. When the snow melts the contractors will need to take care of what needs to be done to make it a usable area again.

Mr. Broglio brought up that the Board had stated last fall that if it comes to a head where the business community is at a standstill and someone is needed to do the analysis on the permit, there are specific resources at the PUD that may not be available to the community or the task force for help, like engineering. They would come back to the PUD and ask for that help if directed by the TCDA Board or the task force.

Mr. Broglio, Mr. Wilderotter, Mr. Kraatz, Mr. Pendleton and Mr. Whitelaw left the meeting.

2. PLACER COUNTY PARKS MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT

Mr. Bolton opened up the floor for questions. Ms. Friedman asked what would happen if the PUD said they are going to cut back on Heritage Plaza, cut back on Commons Beach, and are not going to maintain the Squaw Valley bike trails or Lake Forest Beach? Mr. Bolton replied that the PUD wouldn't get any money from Placer County at all. Mr. Adamson met with Placer County Parks about two months ago and was informed there would be no COLA increase for this coming year, but in order to get the \$67K in TOT the PUD would have to get into another contract with the County which would include all four areas. Placer County has asked to see the real costs associated with the maintenance which is included in this packet but has not been provided to Placer County yet. When they are, it's assumed Placer will not pay these costs but will tell the PUD where to cut back in maintenance to lower costs. Ms. Gustafson added that even though TOT has gone up, because of County deficits there will be no COLA. Staff wanted to get these maintenance cost numbers in front of the Committee and the Board so the community would know what deficits the PUD is taking on to maintain these facilities. At some point the PUD, through the TOT process, should have the opportunity to get more tax dollars because TOT has been increasing.

Ms. Gustafson stated that in the past the PUD let the Parks and Recreation facilities deteriorate until there is the necessity to go get more grant money. This is not the way it should be done. There needs to be money put aside now to bank for reserves so funding is there when it is needed. The TOT election is coming up in two years; now is the time to be talking with both the County and the Resort Association with numbers that are realistic for

visitor services. Mr. Bolton added that the PUD needs to put the County on notice that the PUD can't subsidize these costs anymore. It is his recommendation that this report be sent to the County requesting that the County reimburse the PUD for these costs - \$107,904. Ms. Gustafson said that our property owners benefit from these facilities so it's not fair to say money should only come out of TOT for visitors; our tax payers should have a share. The PUD needs to show that money could be banked into a reserve so when there is a failure at a facility there would be the funds necessary in a reserve. Ms. Friedman supported the staff recommendation.

Mr. Bolton's recommendation to the Board will be that these cost figures be submitted to the County for their review during their budget process and the PUD will see what Placer can give back.

Ms. Gustafson left the meeting.

B. INFORMATION ITEMS

5. DOLLAR PROPERTY SKI TRAIL LICENSE RENEWAL WITH CALIFORNIA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

Mr. Bolton reminded the Committee that the PUD has been renewing contracts with all the property owners at the cross country ski hill; State Parks and Tahoe Cross Country (TXC) have both recently signed a 10 year contract with the possibility of a 10 year extension. California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC) owns a big component of the property at the hill and it is time to renew their contract. CTC did not want to commit to a 10 year contract as they normally only enter into five year contracts. Mr. Bolton wants the Board to approve the five year contract with a possible five year extension with CTC. In order to meet the requirements of the CTC, the contract with TXC has to supersede CTC's.

6. TAHOE CROSS COUNTRY REVISED CONCESSION CONTRACT

Mr. Bolton plans on bringing the changed, amended contract with TXC to the Board for approval. The PUD attorney Mike Sexton has reviewed this contract and adjusted the wording to say that this contract must adhere to the contracts with CTC and the State. Mr. Murnane stated the TXC Board has approved these changes.

Mr. Bolton said that there will be funds remaining in the PUD's per capita once the playground at Rideout has been approved. These funds have to be used by March, 2011. Staff is working with TXC on using this grant money to remodel the restrooms at the Highlands. The per capita grant staff said the PUD would be able to apply for money to upgrade the restrooms and make them handicap accessible. The goal is to get the remodel completed this summer.

Mr. Murnane left the meeting.

3. LEASE AGREEMENT FOR RIDEOUT PLAYGROUND PROPERTY

Mr. Bolton explained that a 10 year lease is needed because the per capita funds would not approve the playground with only a five year lease. Staff worked with the School District and TCPUD attorney Mike Sexton to create a contract that would allow the PUD to get the playground put in at Rideout. Mr. Sexton wrote this contract for the 10 year lease of the playground from the School District.

Mr. Treabess referred to Section 7 which states the District and TCPUD may mutually consent to terminate the Agreement. In that event, TCPUD shall take action to remove from the Premises the playground equipment that has been installed using State of California grant funds, or repay the grant funds to the State. Mr. Treabess asked why the PUD would have to pay the State back if the playground was left at Rideout. Mr. Bolton replied that the requirements of maintaining it for 10 years wouldn't have been met which means the PUD is not following through on the contract for the grant. Mr. Treabess went on to ask if this notice of termination occurs, how long can the PUD continue to operate the playground? Normally a certain amount of time will be stated in a contract. It was decided there would be the opportunity to discuss this during the mutual consent discussions if this ever occurred.

After review both Board members supported this amendment.

4. RIDEOUT COMMUNITY CENTER REPAVING PROJECT AGREEMENT WITH TAHOE TRUCKEE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

The District received the bids for repaving the parking lot at Rideout. The lowest bid came in at \$59,730. The PUD is responsible for 50%. \$30,000 was put in this year's budget for this capital expense. There are a couple of other costs involved. One is test pits (~ \$4,500) which will be used to make sure this pavement is a good candidate for grinding and repaving. The other is consultant costs (\$2,000 - \$3,000) to make sure the compaction is appropriate. This brings the PUD's portion of costs up to \$36,600. Mr. Bolton wants to bring this to the Board and ask that the PUD costs not exceed \$37,000 with a chance they might be as low as \$33,000. \$30,000 of this will come from capital and the rest from money saved elsewhere. Mr. Bolton would like to recommend the PUD moves forward with this project and approve the contract written by Mike Sexton between the PUD and the School District on how this project will be carried out. The Committee was in agreement.

Mr. Bolton then told the Committee that Matt Homolka had asked him to inform the Committee that staff is bringing Phase 7 of the Lakeside bike trail to the Board to approve for calling of bids for construction of the trail. The status between State Parks, TRPA and the Tahoe Gal is moving along as expected with a little delay from TRPA concerning some coverage issues.

6. PUBLIC FORUM

No one was present for this item.

7. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:42 p.m.

Amy Norman, Administrative Assistant

Prepared by Amy Norman