

**Park Advisory Board
Meeting Minutes
April 7, 2022
Meeting called to order 5:31 PM**



I. ATTENDANCE:

A. Park Board Members Present:

Board Member, Don Mitchell
Board Member, Lori Wood
Board Member, Michelle Musgrave
Board Member, Jacob Powers
Board Member, Gregory Webb

B. Staff Present: J.C. Kennedy, Parks & Recreation Director

II. Agenda Approval: Mr. Powers suggested adding an introductions item to the agenda as this is the first meeting for the entire board to be present. A Motion to approve the Agenda with the addition was made by Mrs. Musgrave. Second by Mrs. Wood. Agenda Approved.

III. March 10, 2022 Minutes: Motion to approve the minutes was made by Mr. Mitchell. Second by Mrs. Woods. Minutes approved.

IV. Introductions: Everyone provided a brief overview of themselves and how they became involved in wanting to serve on the board.

V. Highland Village Park Update: Mr. Kennedy provided an overview of correspondence regarding the project status since the last Park Advisory Board meeting:

From Mr. Kennedy Wednesday, March 30, 2022

Albert/Heather

It's been 4 weeks now since we reached out to Stanley for guidance on the Highland Village Park issues. I haven't heard anything and just wanted to check in to see if I was just out of the loop, have we received any direction?

From Mr. Tripp Wednesday March 30, 2022

JC:

I took a look at the issues noted below. Even though the property has been granted to the city, I think we are in good standing to enter into a mitigation agreement with the developer to mitigate park impact fees using the property. I am basing this upon the facts of how the city came to obtain the property initially which is for park impact mitigation. Secondly, I think there is a mechanism available for the developer to build out the improvements without the city needing to perform a public bidding process.

I think the cleanest path for assisting the developer in obtaining COs without paying park impact fees is to finalize the park mitigation agreement wherein a

land and improvement mitigation amount will be established and deducted from their total impact from their mitigation. If this process creates a need for additional mitigation that amount should be applicable for future COs at the time of development.

Does this help address the concerns?

From Mr. Kennedy Wednesday, March 30, 2022 (legal was cc'd on this message as well).

Albert,

The reason we were reaching out to legal for guidance is tied to language in the State Bidding Book published by MRSC (attached). Page 20 states:

Generally, if the project is done completely by the developer and then donated to the city, the bid laws do not have to be followed because the city has not contributed any city money and the developer is not acting as an agent of the city. But, if the cost of a project involves any city money, then typically the entire project is subject to the bid laws.¹⁹

Cities should consider the following when reviewing whether bidding laws and prevailing wages may be required: 1) who owns the land, 2) who pays for the project, and 3) who owns the project when it is completed.

- Clearly at this point the City owns the property.
- Who pays for the project, the developer will pay, but the question now is; we have charged park impact fees on the properties that they have received CO's on (now city funds) that would be returned to support the development of the project.

Will the Auditor determine that: When the City receipts in park impact fees they become "City Money". Would returning the impact fees paid by the developer back to the developer to support the development in question constitute "City Money" being involved in the project?

When I discussed this with Heather we both thought that since the property being developed was now city property it would initiate the need to follow all state bidding guidelines. If I misinterpreted that conversation I will defer to Heather to clarify her opinion. I still believe that input from legal is the safest path forward to avoid an audit finding.

The other point that I wanted to mention was our discussion about them not having enough funding to develop the park property according to the plan that they presented and the Park Advisory Board approved. We discussed them not having the funding to keep the second age appropriate playground and wanted to eliminate it. If you recall I emphasized the importance of this and suggested adding funds from our Park Reserve Fund to keep this in play. That would also constitute "City Funds" being involved in the project.

If we had them put a place holder and added the second playground later that may constitute bid splitting in the eyes of the auditor?

Altering the plan that was presented and approved by the Park Advisory Board would bring us back to square one again.

Just want to move this forward as it has been dragging on for a long time.

VI. Department Update: Mr. Kennedy provided an update to a few of the items regarding the department.

Revenue: Mr. Kennedy informed the board that the department is on track for projected revenue goals with the month of March being the best month since the onset of the Pandemic.

Landreth Park Site Furnishings: Checked in with Northwest Playground Equipment regarding the status of the order when we didn't receive any shipping notifications and found out that the shipment has been delayed at least another few weeks.

Corporate Membership Model: Mr. Kennedy presented a draft for a Corporate Membership.

One of the goals of establishing a corporate member structure would be to create a valid partnership with the West Plains Chamber of Commerce where the chamber could improve outreach on what the Center offers and promote the program to existing WPCC members and new members as more businesses move to the area.

OVERVIEW:

Airway Heights Parks & Recreation partners with businesses and organizations throughout the West Plains. AHRP provides employee wellness through membership and a variety of programs to support a healthier workforce. Corporate membership is an important step in improving the health and productivity of employees and potentially improving the overall cost of employer-provided health care.

The Corporate membership program can benefit employers by:

- Improving Employee Recruitment and Increasing Retention of Quality Employees
- Lowering Health Care Costs
- Reducing Absenteeism
- Achieving Higher Employee Productivity
- Reducing Workers' Compensation and Disability-Related Costs
- Reducing Injuries & Improving Employee Morale and Loyalty

Because of the ever-increasing costs of health insurance and the importance of employee health, employers should consider implementing a well-thought-out wellness program that benefits both the employee's health and the employer's bottom line.

CORPORATE MEMBERSHIP

Companies with 5 or more employees that are interested in joining the AHRC receive a 10% discount on the purchase of Annual Adult Membership Dues. Businesses or individual employees can increase memberships to include family for an additional fee. Memberships will be pro-rated from starting month through December of initial year. Renewal will be based on calendar year January through December.

- VII. Draft Request for Proposals Grounds Maintenance:** Mr. Kennedy presented the “DRAFT” of the RFP for Grounds Maintenance that was discussed at the March meeting. Mr. Kennedy informed the board that this “DRAFT” was based on the RFP that the City of Spokane Valley has in place. This version of the RFP includes everything that is in the Spokane Valley RFP with the exception of requiring the contractor to maintain a yard within the City limits. Mr. Kennedy informed the board that he deliberately left in sections that will be removed so that the board could see the contract in its entirety. The sections that staff feels can be legitimately removed from the RFP were highlighted in a mark-up version.
- VIII. Adjourn:** A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mr. Powers. Second by Mrs. Musgrave. **Meeting adjourned at 6:19 pm.**