

ORANGEVALE RECREATION & PARK DISTRICT

Minutes of Meeting of Board of Directors November 10, 2016

A Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors of the Orangevale Recreation and Park District was held on Thursday, November 10, 2016 at the District Office. Director Stickney called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.

Directors present: Stickney, Anderson, Meraz, Montes, Brunberg (Director Brunberg arrived at 6:34 p.m.)

Staff present: Greg Foell, District Administrator
Scott Russell, Park Superintendent
Jennifer Von Aesch, Finance/HR Manager
Melyssa Woodford, Administrative Services Coordinator

3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** The Pledge of Allegiance was conducted.
4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA** On a motion by Director Montes, seconded by Director Meraz, the agenda was approved 4-0-0 with Directors Anderson, Meraz, Montes, and Stickney voting Aye. There were no Abstentions or Nays. Director Brunberg was absent.
MOTION #1
5. **PUBLIC DISCUSSION** All public discussions were conducted within the relevant agenda item.
6. **MINUTES** a) Approval of Minutes of October 13, 2016 Meeting (pg 1-5): On a motion by Director Montes, seconded by Director Anderson, the minutes were approved 4-0-0 with Directors Anderson, Stickney, Meraz, and Montes voting Aye. There were no Abstentions or Nays. Director Brunberg was absent.
MOTION #2
7. **CORRESPONDENCE** a) Confidential Envelope – Attorney Billing September 2016: On a motion by Director Meraz, seconded by Director Montes, the motion passed 4-0-0 with Directors Anderson, Stickney, Meraz, and Montes voting Aye. There were no Abstentions or Nays. Director Brunberg was absent.
MOTION #3
b) Letters from Terry Benedict and the District Administrator’s Letter of Response (pg 6-12): Admin. Foell believed Mr. Benedict’s letters were due to a misunderstanding of what he thought had been approved by the Board. Admin. Foell responded to his letter and clarified the situation.
8. **CONSENT CALENDAR** No consent matters were reported. The items for October will be discussed at the December meeting.

- 8.1 CONSENT MATTERS GENERAL FUND No report.
- 8.2. OLLAD CONSENT MATTERS No report.
- 8.3. KENNETH GROVE CONSENT MATTERS No report.
9. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS
- a) Administration and Finance: No report.
 - b) Maintenance and Operation: No report.
 - c) Recreation Committee: No report.
 - d) Personnel & Policy: No report.
 - e) Government: No report.
 - f) Planning Committee: No report.
 - g) Trails Committee: No report.
10. ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT
- a) Monthly Activity Report – October 2016 (pg 13-15): The District had been busy working on the two pending projects and getting the bids submitted to the County. Supervisor II Kunakey and Specialist Fridrich attended a meeting at Sierra College to be part of a panel for students to ask questions about working in parks and recreation. The District received a letter stating that this panel was the best they ever had, and they were invited back for next year's meeting. The combined rental and facilities revenue was \$30,499, which was \$2,499 over the projected amount. Family Fright Night had almost 700 people in attendance. Director Stickney attended and commented that it was pretty crowded. The middle basketball program started with 134 players. Supervisor Bain had been assisting in transferring the telephones and computers for the relocation move and coordinating the entire effort. Superintendent Russell said the soccer fields were holding up nicely for the fall season. Director Stickney noted that the tree lighting was being held on December 2.
11. UNFINISHED BUSINESS None discussed.
12. NEW BUSINESS
- a) Consider Approving the Qualified Low Bid for the Pecan Dog Park and Trail Project or Reject all bids and rebid the Project (pg 16-18): The District had sent out for bids on two occasions but have ran into issues. The Board could approve the second low bid

MOTION #6

at \$248,950, or they could reject all the bids and rebid the project. The motion was made to reject the bids for the Pecan Park Dog Park and Trail Project and direct the District Administrator to rebid the project. On a motion by Director Brunberg, seconded by Director Meraz, the motion passed 5-0-0 with Directors Anderson, Meraz, Brunberg, Montes, and Stickney voting Aye. There were no Abstentions or Nays.

MOTION #7

b) Approve the Bid for the Community Center Remodel Project with the Qualified Low Bidder Peterson Developments in the Amount of \$114,000 (pg 19-34): The low bid contractor's bid bond was not for the required amount and due to this inconsistency they withdrew their bid. The District Administrator noted that programs and rentals had already been canceled and the office was starting to become packed up. The motion was made to approve the agreement for the Community Center Office Remodel Project with the qualified low bidder Peterson Developments in the amount of \$114,000 and authorize the District Administrator to execute the contract documents. On a motion by Director Brunberg, seconded by Director Montes, the motion passed 5-0-0 with Directors Anderson, Meraz, Brunberg, Montes, and Stickney voting Aye. There were no Abstentions or Nays.

c) Discussion and Possible Approval of the Almond Park Off-Leash Dog Area (pg 35-39): The District Administrator summarized the project. The proposal began in February 2016 based on community input. A committee was assembled to discuss the details of the plan, and the committee recommended it become part of the Master Plan discussion at the April 2016 meeting in order to reach more members of the community. The Board received opinions on both sides of the issue at this meeting. The District currently follows the Sacramento County Park Regulations which includes a dogs must be on-leash regulation. The District initially gave out warnings to residents having dogs off the leash. Two incidents had occurred at District parks where dogs were attacked and lost their lives due to dogs being off-leash, among other minor incidents. A number of residents that utilize Almond Park to walk their dogs asked for an off-leash, unfenced area and submitted ideas, such as having a specific area that allowed dogs to be off-leash at certain days and times. Admin. Foell didn't find any areas locally that had unfenced off-leash areas but found a few sites under power corridors in other communities or near the coast and no major incidents had been reported. The time proposed for the off-leash area was Sunday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. and it would be limited to a specific area within Almond Park. Further, each dog would require a permit that they must wear while walking off-leash. Admin. Foell also discussed further considerations and questions regarding this issue such as various public safety concerns and a possible trial period to test the proposed idea. He also spoke about the fenced dog parks in the area.

Jeremy and Jodi Morrissey at 8560 Mandorla Circle stated that their family regularly visited Almond Park with his children and dogs. They opposed the off-leash proposal. Two years ago while Jodi was walking their dogs on a leash, a dog without a leash approached and attacked their small dog. Also, their children often play at the playground and they are afraid a dog off-leash will stray from the proposed area and go near the playground. Jeremy felt that those attending the park will not be aware of the off-leash time schedule. Further, he felt the licensing process will not analyze the dog's behavior and the enforcement would be difficult to follow through with.

Carlie Fish wrote a letter and also opposed the idea. She attended the park with her toddler. She also noted that her dog was aggressive and felt it was safer for all of the dogs to be on a leash.

Sharon Bollum indicated that she attended Almond Park daily and she had not seen any issues with dogs being off-leash. She also noted that there would be issues even with fenced-in dog parks.

Damon Herr resides in Fair Oaks but his property bordered Almond Park. He hopes to approve this proposal in order to preserve a well-established culture that already exists. The dog owners all walk their dogs together off-leash and he felt they were all responsible dog owners and will be held accountable. He noted that there was a large off-leash, unfenced dog park in San Francisco that had been successful for several years.

Tom Sunzeri was an Orangevale resident. He was opposed to the off-leash dog park. He felt that it was not worth the risk of even one child being bit by a dog.

Wayne Holt resided on Mandorla Circle in Orangevale. He felt that the residents walking their dogs off leash decided that they were going to act illegally and then force a discussion in order to allow this behavior. Wayne had an extensive insurance background and he felt the District should be required to have inclusion coverage for this off-leash dog park. He believed several people no longer frequent the park because dogs are being walked off-leash. He stated that he and his neighbors had been attacked by dogs in the park and he can no longer walk his dog in the park. He also felt that this proposal conflicted with the family friendly attitude the District was trying to convey. He would also not like Sunday to be included in the times because that was normally a popular day for families to enjoy the park.

Pat Junker had walked his dog at Almond Park for the past two years. He knew every dog that walked in the park, and he believed the residents communicated effectively in order to self-police and prevent any issues. He favored the idea of licensing every dog to

ensure that the dogs are all vaccinated and had responsible owners.

Tim Paul resided on Mandorla Circle. While visiting the park with his daughter, she had to crash her bike because a dog was running toward her aggressively. He disagreed that there were no issues with dogs being off leash at Almond Park, and as a result they have limited their time at the park. He was concerned because the off-leash area would be near the area where children play.

Gina Goveas also resided on Mandorla Circle. She had children and a dog. She does not believe approving the off-leash area was worth the risk due to there being two play areas at the park for children.

The public hearing portion was closed and the Board discussed the proposal. Director Stickney opposed the proposal due to the risk of any children being in danger. Director Brunberg added that 8:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. would be when the young preschool children would visit the park. She felt that most of the dog owners would be responsible but was concerned about the owners that would be irresponsible. Director Montes was initially against this proposal because it was against the law. She attended the community meeting and now understood where the group for this proposal was coming from. She visited the off-leash park in San Francisco and Southern California. As a grandmother, she felt they needed to be good stewards for a park that should be available to everyone in the community. However, she still felt that they should stand up for what was the law. Director Anderson was very familiar with Almond Park and had visited it with his three children. He felt it was difficult for the Board to be an advocate for everyone in the community and believed they should find a balance and possibly bring more compromise into the discussion. Director Meraz wanted the dogs to be able to run free but he understood the fear that others felt. He was concerned about the ability to enforce the rules. Director Stickney added that it would add costs for the District. Director Anderson felt that the residents for the proposal would be willing to pay for some of these costs. Director Montes did not want to take this issue personally and stood by the fact that it was against the law. Admin. Foell clarified that he contacted the liability insurance carrier and that having an unfenced off-leash area was not an exclusion of the policy.

MOTION #4

Director Anderson motioned to approve the unfenced off-leash dog area for Almond Park for a three month trial period beginning approximately March 1, 2017 and/or after the applicable policies, procedures, signage, and dog permit procedures are completed, approved by the Board of Directors, and ready for public distribution. On a motion by Director Anderson, seconded by Director Meraz, the motion was denied 2-3-0 with Directors Anderson and Brunberg voting Aye and Directors Meraz, Montes, and Stickney voting Nay. There were no Abstentions.

- d) Discussion and Possible Approval of the Almond Park Master Plan (pg 40-41): The Master Plan included a new surface coat and restriping on the tennis courts to allow for both tennis and pickleball games. A four foot fence was proposed at the north end of the small children's playground near the driveway. Exercise equipment, a drinking fountain, and two unisex restrooms were also proposed. A half-court basketball court was discussed at the north end of the parking lot. Renovating the volleyball court was discussed but the synthetic surface was a low priority. One large shade structure and two smaller structures were proposed. The plan would also include a tree planting. A motion was made to approve the Almond Park Master Plan with the addition of a fence to deter basketballs from rolling down the parking lot to the street. On a motion by Director Brunberg, seconded by Director Montes, the motion passed 5-0-0 with Directors Anderson, Meraz, Brunberg, Montes, and Stickney voting Aye. There were no Abstentions or Nays.

MOTION #5

13. DIRECTOR AND STAFF COMMENTS

Supervisor Kunakey, Coordinator Woodford, and Sarah Fridrich had been working on the Christmas Tree Lighting event.

Ms. Von Aesch said everything was great in the Finance Department.

Superintendent Russell stated the lift for the tree decorating was arriving the following week.

Admin. Foell felt the discussion at the meeting went well. He congratulated Directors Stickney, Montes, and Anderson on their re-election after a very close vote. The oath of office and election of officers will be conducted at the December meeting and committee assignments will be made in January.

Director Montes, Anderson and Stickney wished the staff happy holidays and thanked them for their hard work.

Director Stickney also noted that Fright Night was a great event and the he was looking forward to the Tree Lighting. Admin. Foell noted that he was planning on approaching the nearby church to request to use their parking spaces for the event. Superintendent Russell was going to perform a "test run" on the lower field to use as parking.

14. ITEMS FOR NEXT AGENDA

None

15. CLOSED SESSION

- a) Closed Session pursuant to Government Code Section 54957
Public Employee Performance Evaluation: District Administrator

**16. RESUME PUBLIC
SESSION &
ANNOUNCE
ACTIONS FROM
CLOSED SESSION**

Director Stickney resumed the open session and reported that no action was taken.

**17. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION #8**

With no further business to discuss, the general meeting of the Board of Directors was adjourned at 9:13 p.m. On a motion by Director Brunberg seconded by Director Stickney this motion passed 5-0-0 with Directors Anderson, Meraz, Brunberg, Montes and Stickney voting Aye. There were no Abstentions or Nays.

Mike Stickney, Chairperson