MINUTES OF REGULAR BOARD MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
OF
ESTES VALLEY RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT

Tuesday, August 16, 2016 – 7 p.m.
Estes Park Golf Course
Clubhouse
1480 Golf Course Road, Estes Park, CO 80517

Present:  Ken Czarnowski, Ron Duell, Stan Gengler, Dave Kiser, Marie Richardson

Absent:  None

Staff:  Tom Carosello, Mary Davis, Heather Drees, Kim Slininger, Matt Enrietta, Cheryl Sarnwick

Others:  A.J. Saucier (Estes Park), Steve Johnson (Estes Park), Jenna MacGregor (Estes Park), Angela Eckert (Estes Park), Josh Cramer (Estes Park), Randy Biddle (Estes Park), John McGrath (Estes Park), Janet Bielmaier (Estes Park), Greg Muhonen (Town of Estes Park), Sharyn Gartner (Estes Park), Denali Lawson (Estes Park), Lisa and Tyler Berglund (Estes Park), James Cozzie (Estes Park), Megan Thorburn (Estes Park), Kris and Craig Axtell (Estes Park), Todd Plummer (Estes Park).

Prior notice of this meeting was given by posting a notice at the Town of Estes Park’s Municipal Building, the Estes Park Public Library, Estes Valley Recreation and Park District’s Administration Office, the Larimer County Clerk’s Office in Estes Park, and the Boulder County Clerk’s Office in Boulder.

The meeting was called to order at 7:02 p.m.

Board President Czarnowski began the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance and a moment of reflection. Mr. Czarnowski asked if any Board members had conflict of interests related to the agenda. No conflicts of interest were disclosed.

CONSENT AGENDA

The consent agenda for the meeting included:

A. Board Minutes:
   1. July 19, 2016, Regular Board Meeting
   2. August 3, 2016, Board Work Session
   3. Trails Committee Minutes
   4. June 7, 2016 Trails Committee Meeting (Approval)
   5. August 2, 2016 Trails Committee Meeting (Review)

B. Staff Reports:
   1. Golf Operations
   2. Recreation Operations
   3. Aquatic Operations
   4. Marina Operations
   5. Golf Maintenance
   6. Parks/Trails Maintenance
   7. Campground Operations
   8. Human Resources
   9. Financial Reports
   10. Paid Bills

Moved by Marie Richardson, seconded by Ron Duell, to approve the consent agenda as presented.

No discussion. Ayes – 5 Motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF REGULAR (ACTION) AGENDA

Moved by Ron Duell, seconded by Dave Kiser, to approve the regular (action) agenda, as presented.

No discussion. Ayes – 5 Motion carried unanimously.

CITIZEN & BOARD COMMENTS

Board Comments:
Board member Duell commented that he likes the pictures that departments include in their monthly Board Reports. It helps him really see what is going on, and he would encourage more managers to include them.
Executive Director Report

Tom Carosello, Executive Director, supplied a written report prior to the meeting.

Mr. Carosello referred to his written report, and added with the completion of the Trails Master Plan GOCO has reimbursed the eligible amount to the District. The formal adoption of the plan will be added to the September agenda as a resolution. The Town of Estes Park will also be addressing this at their Board Meeting next week. We are looking for all the partners to adopt the Trails Master Plan. Mr. Carosello also provided an update on the Common Point Gun Range Contract. A revised draft with incorporated changes suggested by the Gun Club was received earlier this morning. Mr. Carosello believes that we are really close, and hopes to have a draft ready for the Board soon. A special meeting will be scheduled to have the contract agreed upon, and operation signed over to the Gun Club.

Dynamic Sign Installation – Cherokee Draw

Mr. Carosello reported that he had sent the Board a proposal from the Town of Estes Park in regards to the Dynamic Sign Installation at Cherokee Draw. He also forwarded the proposal to Pat McCusker at the BOR, but he has been out of the office so he has not received any feedback from them. The proposed sign would be 4x8 or 4x10 placed on the south side of Cherokee Draw visible to traffic coming into Estes Park from US Hwy 36. Mr. Carosello asked the Board for their preliminary thoughts.

Discussion:
Board member Duell asked for more details on the proposal. Greg Muhonen (Town of Estes Park) replied the proposed sign would be an electronic sign with variable messaging that could be programed. As of now there are two concepts for content. The first screen would have 3 lines of text: the 1st line would be “Rocky Mountain National Park parking full or open”. The 2nd line would be “Downtown Parking Full or Open”. The 3rd line would be, “Parking Garage Parking Full or Open”. This would give arriving guests real time parking information. The screen would then switch over to the second screen which would show a left arrow with the 1st line of text being “Free Shuttle”, 2nd line “Free Parking”, 3rd line “Oversized Vehicles” (RV’s, busses, trailers). This would increase awareness of the available parking at the Events Complex and encourage people to utilize the free parking and shuttle service. Board member Czarnowski asked if this would be a permanent sign. Mr. Muhonen answered yes, this would be a permanent sign on a steel post in the CDOT right of way. Tom Carosello asked if this sign would also be utilized by the EVRPD department for special events. Mr. Muhonen answered that he would not be adverse to that but the Town is going to have to obtain Special Use Permits from CDOT. CDOT will most likely put limitations on what can be placed on the sign, and this sign will be used for transportation purposes. But the Town has a vision for event messaging in a future project. Board member Czarnowski then asked, how does this fit in to the Town of Estes Parks sign code. Mr. Muhonen responded that he has not yet approached Community Development Division at the Town of Estes Park.

Project Manager Report

Kim Slininger, Project Manager, supplied a written report prior to the meeting.

Mr. Slininger referred to his written report, which included active projects and the status of the project. Active Projects included; Noels Draw / Common Point, Trails Master Plan, Marina Irrigation System, East Portal CG Waterline, Mary’s Lake Campground Sewer Line Rehab / Construction, and Fish Creek Trail.

The Board did not have any questions for Mr. Slininger.

Board member Duell commented “It looks good – Thank you!”

Finance Director Report

Mary Davis, Finance Director, supplied a written report prior to the meeting.

Mrs. Davis briefly reviewed the status of year-to-date actual vs. budgeted revenues and expenses, cash flow, large capital expenditures and property tax collections for bond debt service. Mrs. Davis added that July was a great revenue month, with golf revenues making an upswing. She is really focused on the 2017 Budget, she has had a preliminary meeting with the managers on the capital budget. At this meeting she handed out worksheets that are due back to her by August 26th. With this information they will be able to put together a 5 year plan. The plan will be presented to the Board at the next regular Board meeting in September.

Discussion:
Board member Czarnowski stated that it is good to see golf rebounding, Board member Gengler added that the campgrounds and marina are also doing very well.

Old Business

Community Center Project - Owner’s Rep Update
Chuck Jordan (RLH Engineering, Inc.), Owner’s Representatives for the Estes Valley Community Center project, supplied a written progress report prior to the meeting covering the period from July 19, 2016 to August 16, 2016.
Mr. Carosello, in Chuck Jordan's absence, referred to the written progress report supplied by Mr. Jordan and added that there is a public meeting for the site and design plans scheduled for Thursday August 18th, 6:00pm at the Estes Park High School Commons. Mr. Carosello also reported that they are putting together the Bid Package for the site work and grading. If the Town is willing to grant a phased approach to the construction, we hope to get that permit and be ready to mobilize and break ground on September 19th or 20th. We are past the 50% design development documents, and hope to have the 75% construction document package ready in October. Plans have been submitted to the Town of Estes Park for review. There is a separate review taking place for the site work, as long as it takes the Town to review the building plan it should not affect the site grading package this can be done while plans are being approved or altered according to code.

Discussion: Board member Czarnowski asked if we were still looking at $400 per square foot. Mr. Carosello answered that he has a meeting scheduled with A&P on August 18th at 2:00pm, he will get an updated price per square foot.

**Update on Development of Community Center IGA with Town of Estes Park (Discussion/Action)**
Tom Carosello, Executive Director, led the discussion.

Since the Town of Estes Park's announcement of its intent to discontinue its "in-house" meal program and shift certain senior programs to the District, staff and legal counsel from both entities have been developing an intergovernmental agreement to facilitate the transition, including specifics regarding the transfer of Ballot Measure 1A funds to the District for use in the construction of the community center. Executive Director Tom Carosello began the discussion by stating that a draft IGA incorporating the Board's comments was forwarded to the town on August 8, 2016. A revised version of the IGA reflecting the edits/additions was received from The Town of Estes Park earlier that afternoon. The Board members were given a copy of the IGA for review.

Discussion:
Board member Richardson asked how EVRPD was going to pay for all the senior services that are being transferred from the Town of Estes to EVRPD. Tom Carosello answered the bulk of the expense in their budget was for food and transportation /VIA which the Town of Estes will still try to continue to fund. Some expense is staffing, which we believe we can absorb. In regards to staffing, Mary Davis replied that the District had already planned on having recreation coordinators that focused on adult programming. Board member Gengler had questions about Section 4.2 in regards to the 501 (c) (3) entity. Mr. Carosello responded that he believes the funds they have could be used for the Community Center, if that is what they choose to do. Board member Gengler also voiced his concern about the verbiage in Section 3.1A in regards to the kitchen specifically "being capable of providing hot meals". Mr. Carosello responded, that the way it was written now does not specify items as it did before. He also added that our genuine hope is that somebody will figure out a way to provide meals. Board member Duell asked if the seniors will continue to meet at the current Senior Center until the EVCC is open. Mr. Carosello believes so. Board member Richardson asked for clarity on Section 3.1B, she asked if the multi-purpose rooms could only be used by seniors. Mr. Carosello answered no, the seniors would have access to all multi-purpose rooms but not exclusive access. Board member Czarnowski asked about Section 4.4, would this include the walking track. Mr. Carosello answered this document does not specify the track, but it has been discussed.

Moved by Stanley Gengler, seconded by Ron Duell to approve the intergovernmental agreement specifying the scope of senior programming and transfer of Ballot Measure 1A funding for the Estes Valley Community Center.

No further discussion. Ayes - 5. Motion carried unanimously.

**Update on Stanley Park Bike Park Design (Discussion/Action)**
Todd Plummer, Estes Park Cycling Coalition, provided an update on the design for the Stanley Park Bike Park.

Mr. Plummer reported that he has been working with FlowRide Concepts, and presented the Stanley Park Bike Park conceptual design to the Board. This is a 3 part Bike Park which includes an aerobic single track, a pump track, and a mountain bike skills course.

Discussion: Tom Carosello noted that the Staff has no objection to the Board approving the conceptual design, but believes there are several elements (construction/maintenance costs, agreements with town, school, etc.) of the project that need to be addressed before authorization is given to proceed with construction. Board member Gengler asked if special equipment would be required to maintain this trail. Mr. Plummer responded that no special equipment would be needed. The pump track is a clay sand mix it would need minimal maintenance, but needs irrigation water available to keep from completely drying out. The aerobic track is only a dirt trail which would only require minimal maintenance with no special equipment needed. Board member Gengler then stated if this trail runs along Community Drive and the Ballfields, he is concerned with safety with all the parking along there. Cheryl Sarnwick replied that they have already eliminated parking along that area because if safety concerns. COMMENT -if this has this been brought to the Trails Committee yet. Mr. Carosello answered that the Trails Committee was aware of the Boards decision to go ahead with obtaining the design, but has not seen the conceptual design or made a decision to spend Trails funds yet. Board member Czarnowski asked if this trail is on BOR land. Mr. Plummer responded no, they have avoided all BOR land. The trail does go on school property but this has been Ok’d with an understanding / memorandum that the Park School District is not responsible for construction, maintenance, or liability for trail use. Board member Czarnowski also asked if they had an assessment on safety concerns in the congested areas like the playground, tennis courts, and parking lots. Mr. Plummer responded that the pump track and skills courses are not near the other existing facilities. There is always potential for injury, but he is willing to make changes to the design plan to satisfy the Board of safety concerns. Board Member Gengler asked about signage. Mr. Plummer responded yes there
would be signage. Signage would include: Helmets required, yield signs, ride responsibly, and skill level signs. Board member Gengler stated he would like them to look at alternatives to large signs, painting rocks, something that looks more natural then a sign. Board member Richardson asked if this trail could be used for cross country skiing in the winter months. Mr. Plummer responded that it could be done with special equipment, but suggested that the golf courses are a still a better option because grass holds snow better than a dirt trail. Board member Duell commented that he liked the design.

The board opened the floor to public comment.

Citizen Comments:
Sharyn Gartner (Estes Park), she is concerned about the bike trail interfering with the drainage along Community Drive. Board member Duell stated that those issues would be reviewed and or addressed with the Grading Permit.

Josh Cramer (Head coach – High School Mountain Bike Team), he is in favor of the Stanley Park Bike Park. He believes this trail would benefit his team and other young riders. Trails like this teach bike handling skills, cornering trails, and it would be a safe and fun place to ride and practice skills year round. In the winter months this trail could be used for “fat biking” (bikes designed to ride on sand and snow) which is becoming very popular. The High School Mountain Bike Team and supports could help with building and maintain the track. Mr. Cramer also mentioned that one of their team supporters is a certified trail builder. He urges the Board to approve the design.

Staff Comment:
Matt Enrietta, EVRPD Parks and Recreation Director, wanted to reiterate what Tom Carosello stated earlier in regards to questions about costs, construction, and maintenance. Mr. Enrietta is also concerned about the trail being close to the shelter, playground, and other structures. He is urging some caution before approving the design and construction at this time.

Moved by Marie Richardson, seconded by Ron Duell, to approve the design for the Stanley Park Bike Park.

Discussion: Board member Gengler also shares concerns and cautions over safety issues with the trail being so close to other facilities and would like to see this addressed in the plans. Todd Plummer asked if it would be possible to work with staff at EVRPD to pin flag an alternate routing in the areas with safety concerns, so this plan can move ahead. Tom Carosello responded that he and Matt could go out and help reroute the areas with safety concerns. Matt Enrietta agrees with Mr. Carosello, and believes we should all work together. He stated that we should visit other agencies that operate bike parks in Northern Colorado and see what if any issues they might have, what their maintenance issues are, and see what their cost projections are like. Board member Duell agrees that we should visit other bike parks and we need to address safety issues.

Moved by Marie Richardson, seconded by Ron Duell, Amended motion to approve the design for the Stanley Park Bike Park with EVRPD staff addressing potential safety issues.

No further discussion. Ayes – 5. Motion carried unanimously

Youth Center Staffing/Programming (Discussion).
Tom Carosello, Executive Director, led the discussion.

Mr. Carosello stated that last summer he made the decision to close the youth center indefinitely in order to focus staff’s attention on improving core recreation programming. Hearing very little public concern regarding the facility’s closure through the fall, he decided to keep the center closed. Receiving feedback on the apparent need to reopen the youth center from Recreation Supervisor Cheryl Sarnwick, during last year’s budget work sessions, the Board decided to fund the pursuit of a part-time youth center coordinator for 2016. This spring, that job was offered to two candidates on separate occasions; both candidates declined the offer. It is his intent to keep the center closed, especially since we were unsuccessful in our attempts to staff it, the building now serves as the recreation office. The community center will be open late next year or in early 2018 and available to the patrons who used to frequent the youth center. He is offering this topic for discussion at the Board level since we have two new Board members.

Cheryl Sarnwick followed with a presentation. The presentation included the history of the Youth Center, the definition of recreation, examples of recreation, How the Youth Center meets EVRPD’s Mission, programming, and also options for operating.

The board opened the floor to public comment.

A.J. Saucier (Estes Park), spoke on behalf of reopening the Youth Center. He stated that he has gone to the Youth center for 5-6 years. The Youth Center has gone through many changes in the past years but has always remained a safe place for kids to go. He always looked forward to going, he knew he would have fun, and could meet new friends. With the center being so close to schools, it has been a place for kids to wait for rides, work on their homework, participate in an activity, or just hang out with friends.

Tyler Berglund (Estes Park), also spoke on behalf of reopening the Youth Center. He shared his personal stories and experiences at the center. He stated that while going to the Youth Center, Cheryl helped him to make friends. Making friends helped his grades, and also other relationships. Tyler was a part of many charity events and programs. He was a part of TobaccoNO, and was the Easter Bunny for the annual community Easter egg hunt for the past few years.
Kyrn MacGregor (Estes Park), she also spoke on behalf of reopening the Youth Center. She agreed with all the comments previously stated and added her own personal stories. She moved to Estes Park in the 6th grade and had troubles making friends. The Youth Center was a safe place for her to go, and she was able to make friends there. She felt like the Youth Center was her 2nd home.

Jenna MacGregor (Estes Park) reiterated the previous comments/statements. She believes that the Youth Center helped to keep her daughter out of the “wrong crowd”. She also stated that drug use is a bigger problem than people think in this town. Many families have to work 2-3 jobs to survive up here. The Youth Center was a safe place for her children to go. Jenna also mentioned that not all kids are “sporty”. Many kids are more involved in the arts, skateboarding, Ping-Pong, computers, and gaming, and they need a place to go to. She really appreciated having the Youth Center.

Angela Eckhart (Estes Park) represented herself and her son Dustin, who had to work. She started by reading a letter written by her son. The letter stated that Dustin was in the 4th grade when he moved to Estes Park and did not fit in with the other kids. He met Cheryl at the 6th grade welcome, and his mom really pushed him to go to the Youth Center. It was either go to the center, or ride the bus home and read alone. He made friends at the Youth Center. The center is not just a building to him, it is a 100+ memories, the place where no one excluded him, the place he learned life lessons, and later he was that older kid teaching life lessons. The Youth Center at worse, is a place for friends to meet after school, at best it is a place for lonely kids to find a friend. Angela continued with her own comments. She has 3 children, they moved to Estes Park after her children’s father passed away – for a new start. Her middle son Dustin, whom she read the letter for, was diagnosed with Asperger’s. His diagnoses entailed delayed motor development that kept him from playing at recess when he was younger, and a lack of social skills. He had tried many clubs and hobbies, mostly to please her, but he never really enjoyed them. Almost immediately after he started going to the Youth Center he said “it was FUN”. Angela started volunteering at the Youth Center and she was able to bond more with him. He was able to develop more social skills. The center became a place where he felt comfortable and respected – nowhere else in the outside world has he felt this, besides his home. She said the Youth Center is not for the majority or for the all, which lead her to stories of her older daughter. Her older daughter was a talented young lady that excelled academically and made friends easily up until high school. Unfortunately she started changing, she got into drugs, started sneaking out of her house. Angela stated that she needed help. Without hesitation Cheryl agreed to try to help, even though her daughter was not a kid that attended the Youth Center. She didn’t attend or interact with people at the center, in fact she avoided the Youth Center because of her drug use and friend choices. However just because of the location of the Youth Center, those kids started avoiding the surrounding area, with Cheryl keeping an eye on them, calling the high school SRO. They were no longer able to do drugs in the pavilions. She is not proud to share this story but wanted to let people know that there was an impact on a daughter that didn’t go to the Youth Center that kept those drugs away from that area. Angela’s youngest daughter is like most of the other kids at the center. She is happy and loves the Youth Center. Angela then asked the Board a why they closed the Youth Center. Tom Carosello responded, it was his decision to close the center, without being able to staff the location after two failed attempts to fill the position. Angela responded, so it is a staffing issue. Tom Carosello responded, it was – and now it is at the Board level. Angela stated, the reason she was asking was because she was a volunteer at the Youth Center, and would like to step forward and become a permanent volunteer with a structured schedule. She is not interested in a paid position, but could be there 5 days a week to help keep the program going because it means that much.

Steve Johnson (Estes Park) stated that he is a 6th grade teacher at the Estes Park Middle School. He believes that the Youth Center is a good place for kids that have a gap in their life. When he talks to the kids in his class, he hears how much they enjoy the center. He knows they are with good people, good influences. This is a very valuable place for our young people to have in our community.

Denali Lawson (Estes Park) he agreed with all the positive comments and the need for the Youth Center. He stated that he grew up in the Youth Center. He has worked with many of the kids at the center. He believes it’s a great place for kids growing up.

Discussion: Cheryl thanked the Board for taking the time to listen, and asked the Board members to consider reopening the Youth Center. The Board thanked everybody that spoke in favor for the Youth Center. Board member Czarnowski stated that even though no Board action is needed, he believes the Executive Director would like some sense of what the Board is feeling. Tom Carosello agreed, and added that he is not against organized curriculum or youth programing, but the lack of staffing and an actual plan, leads him to his recommendation of keeping the Youth Center closed but is asking for direction from the Board. Matt Enrietta added his thanks to everyone that shared their stories and agrees with Mr. Carosello. He feels that youth programing needs to be organized, and with the new community center this can happen. Board member Kiser asked when the job was offered to the two individuals if they initially accepted the position. Mr. Carosello responded no, they both declined the position.

Board member Richardson commented that she loved the stories, she loves the kids and believes that the Youth Center did do good for these, and other kids. As a Board member though, she needs to look at the suggestions made by EVRPD staff, and in the end she supports the Executive Director’s decision. We need to wait for a more structured program.

Board member Gengler stated that the now that the youth center is being used as an office it would not be sensible to run programs out of the building. This would also take a lot of staff time to organize and oversee programs without being able to hire someone.

Board member Duell also appreciated all comments, and feels for them but needs to follow the direction of the EVRPD staff.

Board member Kiser stated that it is unfortunate to have a gap that will be so long, but the staffing issue is more complicated then it seems. He also will follow the direction of the EVRPD staff.
NEW BUSINESS

Update on 2016 Longs Peak Scottish-Irish Highland Festival (Discussion)
Tom Carosello, Executive Director, led the discussion.

Mr. Carosello reported that this spring he contacted Peggy Young of Longs Peak Scottish-Irish Highlands Festival Inc. to discuss possible amendments to the contract governing the festival, specifically the amount of money EVRDP receives from the event. Ms. Young was adamant that she was not interested in renegotiating the contract, and indicated she would have to consider “moving the event” if her corporation had to pay more in exchange for the use of Stanley Park. Since we are apparently at an impasse with regard to nominally increasing the “lease fee” paid to EVRDP, he is recommending we increase the parking fee from $5 to $10 at Cherokee Draw during the festival to increase our revenue to offset impacts the event has on our Facilities.

Discussion: The Board all agreed to increase the fee from $5 to $10 at Cherokee Draw.

BOARD ACTION: None (Discussion Only)

Point of Sale Software (POS) Implementation (Discussion)
Tom Carosello, Executive Director, led the discussion.

Mr. Carosello reported that throughout the summer he, Mary Davis, and Matt Enrietta have been evaluating and “test driving” numerous point-of-sale (POS) software utilities. While their focus has been on evaluating systems that can be utilized in the community center, we naturally desire a system that can also be integrated throughout District facilities. There is a total of $80,000 available in this year’s budget for a POS system, and they have narrowed their choices to RecTrac and eTrak-Plus; eTrak-Plus is the more economical option, and have been quoted a price of $55,300 which would cover implementation and technical support over a five-year duration. We hope to make a selection in the next couple of weeks. His recommendation is to purchase and begin utilizing and integrating a POS system before the end of September.

Discussion: Board member Duell asked which system was better. Tom said for our needs he now believes eTrak is. Board member Duell also asked if everything would be on this system. Tom answered yes, except golf at this time, but eTrak is willing to test drive a new module on our system to integrate golf into the system. Board member Duell asked if Tom has used eTrak, Tom responded no, but Matt Enrietta has. Matt added that he has also used other POS systems in the past and recommends eTrak.

BOARD ACTION: None (Discussion Only)

FURTHER BUSINESS

Meetings to Schedule

- **Next regular Board meeting:**
  Regular Date changed due to SDA Conference
  Monday September 19 – 7:00 p.m. – 18-hole Golf Course Clubhouse

- **Trails Committee Meeting:**
  Tuesday, September 6 – 6:00 p.m. – 18-hole Golf Course Clubhouse

- **Special Board meeting:**
  If grading permit is received, a Special Board Meeting will be scheduled to take action signing a contract before A&P mobilizes.
  TBD. – 18-hole Golf Course Clubhouse

In closing, Mr. Carosello asked Sharyn Gartner (Estes Park Gun & Archery Club) if she has had a chance to review the new Closure Agreement draft. Mrs. Gartner replied yes, but has found typing errors. She is also concerned that the NRP contract has been removed, and requests that it be added back in. Mr. Carosello stated that the NPS contract could be added as an Addendum, as the draft is complete. Before this agreement it is put before either Boards, Sharyn and Mr. Carosello will correspond via email after she has time to proof the draft for other typing errors or, other areas of concern.

Meeting adjourned at 9:37 p.m.

Kenneth Czarnowski, Board President
Stanley C. Gengler, Board Secretary

Recorded by Heather Drees, EVRDP Senior Administrative Assistant