

MINUTES
CARBONDALE PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
December 8, 2021

Hollis Sutherland called the in-person/virtual meeting of the Carbondale Parks & Recreation Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. at Carbondale Town Hall on December 8, 2021.

ROLL CALL

The following members were present for roll call:

Members: Hollis Sutherland, Chair
Rose Rossello, Vice Chair
Ashley Hejtmanek, Member
John Williams, Member
Leslie Keery, Member
Susan Rhea, Member
Brian Soby, Alternate
Misha Logan, Youth Member

Town Staff Present: Eric Brendlinger, Parks & Recreation Department Director
Jessi Rochel, Recreation Center & Recreation Programs Manager
Will Tempest, Recreation Coordinator: Youth and Adult Athletics
Luis Yllanes, Board of Trustees Liaison
Kae McDonald, Boards & Commission Clerk

Guests/Attendees: Jacob Baker, Roaring Fork Outdoor Volunteers
Briston Peterson, Carbondale Lofts
Richard Camp, Carbondale Lofts
Bob Schulz, Carbondale Lofts

CONSENT AGENDA

Motion Passed: Susan *moved* to approve the minutes from the November 10, 2021, meeting. Rose *seconded* the motion, and it was *unanimously approved*.

ITEMS FROM CITIZENS PRESENT NOT ON THE AGENDA

There was no one present, not on the agenda, to address the Commission.

CARBONDALE RECREATION AND COMMUNITY CENTER ALTHLETICS COORDINATOR PROGRAM REPORT

Will Tempest updated the commission members on the Carbondale Recreation and Community Center youth and adult athletic programs and the youth outdoor program. He noted that his busiest seasons are the winter months (December through March) and summer months when the kids are out of school (June through August). He listed the programming he is currently facilitating:

- Youth basketball league in conjunction with Aspen, Basalt, and Glenwood. They have eight teams comprised of 3rd and 4th graders and 5th and 6th graders; the coaches volunteer their time. Practices began this week and will run through the holidays with games starting in January.
- Youth climbing classes generally run year-round with beginner through experienced classes.
- Adult volleyball league started in November and will run through January. They may offer a second league to try to include other teams.
- The Recreation Center is offering adult drop-in basketball on Tuesday evenings, drop-in soccer on Friday evenings, and drop-in pickleball on Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday afternoons from 1 to 4 pm.
- The youth hockey program will begin in January—it is more casual than those offered in Aspen or Glenwood Springs. Adult broomball will be offered on Wednesday evenings and, if there is enough interest, Monday evenings.

Questions/Comments:

Susan asked how many people participate in the drop-in programming.

Will replied that drop-in attendance varies, and the Rec Center stopped keeping track of the numbers a few years ago because the metrics didn't seem to be that useful. Will noted that the Rec Center has been doing targeted advertising for specific programming, but drop-in activities are harder to promote so he anticipates it may take some time for those numbers to rebound.

ROARING FORK OUTDOOR VOLUNTEERS END OF SEASON REPORT AND 2022 TOWN TRAIL BUILDING PROJECT ON RED HILL

Jacob Baker updated the commission members on the Roaring Fork Outdoor Volunteer 2021 season using a prepared PowerPoint presentation that was included in the meeting packet. Highlights from the 2021 season include:

- RFOV worked with 18 distinct land management entities; specific to Carbondale projects land managers included the Town of Carbondale, the Bureau of Land Manager, and the Roaring Fork Transit Authority
- The youngest volunteer was less than five years old, and the oldest volunteer was 81.
- RFOV doubled the volunteer hours from 2020 to 2021. Factors that led to the increase in these areas included the natural social distancing built into working with hand tools and new residents using the volunteer opportunity to get to know the area and its residents.
- The 2021 theme was "Renewing Landscape and Community through Collective Action" with three community projects (Sutey Ranch Trail, Artway Gardening and Avalanche Creek) and six group projects (Red Hill Trails Network, North Face Park, Crystal River & RVR Trail, Nuche Park, Lorax Trail and Perham Creek Trail) in the greater Carbondale Area.

Jacob noted that in 2020 RFOV instituted programming to develop more accessible trails. He explained that the Ponderosa Trail in Basalt was the initial project and RFOV worked with several groups such as Ascendigo and Challenge Aspen to design the trail. Jacob pointed out that while RFOV expected more frequent usage because of the trail design, what they found was that local businesses were using the space for outdoor meetings and families with young children were using the space for picnics; the lesson learned is when a space is made more accessible it sees more frequent use by a wide range of the population.

Jacob went on to note that another RFOV goal was to make trail-users into trail participants which will encourage greater stewardship of local outdoor opportunities with RFOV's 2022 theme being "Making our shared outdoors into common ground.". He added that 2022 project planning began in August and the C-Line Trail on Red Hill will be a community project utilizing funds set aside by the Town of Carbondale. He explained that the B-Line trail as designed is an expert trail and adding the C-Line trail will provide a more sustainable trail for a wider range of skill as well as afford the opportunity to designate ascent and descent-only trails.

Hollis asked whether there will be any trail work at the Coffman Ranch.

Jacob replied that the Aspen Valley Land Trust has not yet completed the Master Plan for that property and AVL T will determine what will be done. Jacob noted that RFOV has four work domains and gave examples of each:

- Healthy Landscapes: RFOV is engaging with CMC to map all the trails in and around the Spring Valley campus
- Fire Adaptation: RFOV is working with local entities to help restore the Lake Christine Burn Area
- Sustainable Recreation: RFOV is working with the Town of Basalt to overhaul their signage program
- Community Engagement: RFOV offers community and group service projects to improve local trails

Susan asked if RFOV was the lead group in charge of Red Hill trail maintenance.

Jacob replied that along with RFOV other entities engaged in maintaining the Red Hill trails include the Red Hill Council, Roaring Fork Mountain Bike Association, Town of Carbondale staff, and trail adoption by local business or groups. He added that while RFOV does have a community education component, they currently lack the staff to facilitate adequate programming, but they are discussing how to rectify that shortfall.

Susan asked whether RFOV gets funding from Great Outdoors Colorado.

Jacob answered in the affirmative and directed Susan to the RFOV website where it lists a breakdown of funding sources. He estimated that RFOV receives approximately 20 to 25% of their funding from government agencies with other primary funding sources including corporations and foundations. He added that only a small percentage of their overall funding is from individuals.

LOT 1. CARBONDALE LOFTS PUBLIC PARKLAND DEDICATION & PARK MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT

Eric explained that the revised parkland easement details are included in the packet and Briston Peterson, Richard Camp and Bob Schulz were present to answer any further question commission members might have.

Bob noted that the playground equipment will follow universal design standards as requested at the last meeting. He also noted that they figured out how to get utilities to the park area so restroom facilities will be available, albeit they will be closed in the winter.

Eric noted that in other parks where the bathrooms are closed for the winter, the Town of Carbondale supplements with port-a-potties.

Rose asked whether dogs will be allowed in the park area and, if so, whether dog pots would be provided.

Eric noted that TOC park spaces generally don't allow dogs, but dog owners will be able to utilize the pathways.

Briston noted that tenants will pay a fee to keep a dog.

Hollis asked if there would be a specific space for owners to take their dogs.

Briston replied that a passive park within the development will be available for dogs.

Bob added that the goal is to identify key issues and have the draft agreement available when the preliminary plat is presented to the Planning and Zoning Commission in January or February. He noted that the final step will be to convert the agreement into enforceable language.

Susan asked when the development would be built out.

Bob replied that there was no set schedule, but the next building in Lot C should be completed in late summer 2022 with the next set of buildings along Shorty Pabst and the paralleling the park area to be completed by late 2022. He went on to note that after that the buildings along Hendrick Drive and the 13' townhomes would be constructed based upon demand. He estimated the park would be available for use in October 2022.

Briston added that they are reaching out to local businesses to fill the commercial space.

Hollis asked for clarification on the difference between an easement and a park dedication as well as the advantages and disadvantages.

Eric replied that the request doesn't fit into the Unified Development Code very well and the next step will be to figure out the language with the Planning and Zoning Commission, the attorneys, and the Board of Trustees.

Bob explained that the project was approved in 2018 and the UDC was then updated in 2019, leaving the development between two different standards. He reiterated that the goal is to come to an agreement that works for everyone.

Susan asked about enforcement and noted that there wasn't any specific language in the document addressing that topic. She also asked where the funding would come for enforcement.

Eric responded that specific language addressing that topic would be developed later. He pointed out that the specific task for the commission members was to ensure that the document meets the needs of the community in the same way as other parks in town. He noted that the request to add dog pots (as well as the cost and maintenance) was a good point and necessary to the document, so it matches the River Valley Ranch agreements.

Ashley asked if the three other common spaces included in the previous meeting packet were for private use and not part of the agreement under discussion.

Bob replied in the affirmative.

Hollis asked where the fees for the futsal and gazebo rental would be assigned.

Eric replied that, like the River Valley Ranch agreement, the fees would be paid to the Town of Carbondale.

Hollis followed up by asking what the lifespan of a futsal court was and whether there would be provisions in the agreement if there was a desire to convert that space to something else.

Richard commented that the developers would be able to change the use of that space if needed.

Bob added that the lifespan of a futsal court is approximately 15 years, and it would require a mutual agreement by both parties to change it. He added that they are working on the funding for maintenance.

Eric asked if they noted anything egregious in the requests.

Bob replied that so far there wasn't anything egregious. He suggested comparing the RVR agreements with the current one. Bob added that they have designated all the parking along Shorty Pabst as public access.

John asked for confirmation that the playground is located over the water retention area.

Bob answered in the affirmative and explained that no features of the underground stormwater collection area will be visible on the ground surface. He noted that if the stormwater collection area needs work it is written into the agreement that everything on the ground surface will be put back as it is.

Eric requested that with the addition of the bathrooms an ADA drinking fountain would be a nice amenity.

Ashley requested that the commission members be provided the opportunity to review the draft agreement side-by-side with the RVR agreements for comparison.

COMMERCIAL AND FOR-PROFIT USE OF PUBLIC PARK SPACES: RULES, REGULATIONS AND FEE STRUCTURE PROPOSAL

Eric opened the discussion by noting that during the height of COVID there was an influx of requests to utilize public spaces for a variety of activities (for example, teaching yoga in the park) and he realized that he didn't have a process in place for that. Eric explained that he realized it wasn't necessary to reinvent the wheel and he could adapt the existing commercial/for profit form for that use. Eric added that he benchmarked the fees against Crown Mountain Park, Aspen, Rifle and Glenwood Springs and based on that information the fees presented in the form are accurate; given their accuracy he won't need to go through a Schedule A meeting with the Board of Trustees, but he does need the Parks & Recreation Commission approval.

Brian asked if there was a separate fee structure for nonprofits. He also suggested, in the interest of fairness, defining what "local" was.

Eric replied that local means Carbondale-based and pointed out that there hasn't been a problem to date.

Hollis asked Eric to explain how "local" was defined when the Recreation Center had tiered membership pricing.

Eric replied that it was 1) Town of Carbondale limits, 2) Within the 81623 zip code, and 3) outside the 81623 zip code.

Hollis suggested defining local as the 81623 zip code.

Eric was amenable to that suggestion and noted that to date he has known most of the parties involved.

John suggested clarifying the fee structure as Nonprofit/Local and For Profit/Not Local.

Brian thought that suggestion was reasonable, and it is an easy way to define local. He asked how the commercial category was defined.

Hollis replied that a commercial enterprise is when someone is charging for a service.

Susan asked about the Pickleball Association.

Eric responded that they pay to rent the courts for tournaments.

Ashley suggested adding definitions to the form.

Motion Passed: Brian *moved* to define “local” as having a residential address, organization or business within the 81623 zip code. Ashley *seconded* the motion, and it was *unanimously approved*.

Brian asked if the fees listed on the agreement were proportional to the expense.

Eric replied that they were not and explained that the form applies to many uses—some complain that the fees are too high and some of the fees are too low—but he thought they were appropriate at a staff level. He added that each facility has a different maintenance matrix and reiterated that the fees have been benchmarked against other municipalities in the area.

Brian suggested creating a separate fee structure for costs incurred during specific events.

Eric countered that the TOC facilities are maintained as open and available for use by the public and except for the baseball diamond—which has a unique fee structure for its use—there aren’t any activities that lead to additional maintenance.

Brian suggested adding verbiage for large events such as Mountain Fair that might lead to additional maintenance costs.

Eric responded that the form has worked well to this point.

John pointed out that the form specifically states that the user is responsible for any damage incurred during the rental.

Susan asked if there was a cap on the number of participants.

Eric explained that there is a more detailed process if more than 100 people will be attending, and an event hosting more than 250 people use an entirely different form.

Hollis suggested adding language to the form that states it is for an event hosting 250 people or less.

Motion Passed: Brian *moved* to limit the use of the form as presented to less than 250 guests. Susan *seconded* the motion, and it was *unanimously approved*.

Motion Passed: Susan *moved* to adopt the fee schedule as listed on the presented form. John *seconded* the motion, and it was *unanimously approved*.

AQUATICS FACILITY MASTER PLAN—NEXT STEPS: BONDING PREFERENCE WORKSHEET AND BALLOT PROMOTIONAL RULES

Eric explained that there has been a timing disparity between the Parks & Recreation Commission meetings and hiring the financial advisor and developing the aquatic facility financing options. He noted that the November 23rd Board of Trustees meeting memo was included in the current meeting packet because it mapped out the process to ensure that ballot language was finalized in time for the April municipal election. Eric went on to explain that at the November 23rd meeting, the Trustee’s discussion has focused on not increasing taxes as well as reviewing the

efficacy of utilizing sales tax to pay off the bond which might result in a higher interest rate and higher long-term cost. Eric pointed out that ultimately the Board of Trustees settled on Option 2 (General Fund Bond) which has a better rating and lower interest rate.

Eric informed the commission members that at the December 14th Board of Trustees meeting the discussion will focus on which amenities could be constructed using only proceeds from the bond initiative should it be approved by the electorate and invited everyone to participate if they were interested. Eric explained that the Trustees will also be reviewing other expenditures covered by the general fund and how the aquatic facility financing might affect current and anticipated projects. Other necessary revenue sources recommended by the financial advisor include donations, revenue from the second level of the bathhouse, naming rights for local businesses and grants. Eric noted that the Aquatic Facility Master Plan also reviewed the possibility of phased construction, but realistically the only amenity that could be phased-in is the splash pad.

Brian asked what criteria were used for the bond rating.

Eric explained that the financial advisor had produced the ratings with the Town of Carbondale's best interests in mind and thought they were conservative. He encouraged everyone to review the rating notes listed on the Financing Options Chart included in the meeting packet.

Luis pointed out that the only single "A" rating was Option 1, and all the others are "AA."

Brian asked whether fees from the Gateway RV Park should be earmarked to support construction of the aquatic facility.

Eric replied that the RV Park will become an Enterprise Fund when the current maintenance needs have been addressed. He added that it is preferable to have the cost spread among the greatest number of people, but also recognizing that there isn't much appetite to raise taxes.

Hollis asked whether it was possible to raise the cost of the Recreation Center programming and membership rates for the same purpose.

Brian agreed and suggested maximizing the cost compared to the activity. Brian asked if it was possible to implement tiered pricing.

Eric explained that the pyramid pricing structure developed by the National Recreation Association is used to set pricing at the Recreation Center. He suggested returning to this topic when the Parks Master Plan is reviewed and noted that it isn't something that could be accomplished quickly.

Hollis asked if TOC staff could review this information.

Susan asked whether the BOT would be discussing funding mechanisms and amenities at the December 14th meeting.

Luis pointed out that the aquatic facility will likely cost between seven and eight million dollars but added that the BOT discussion wasn't entirely gloomy because the recreation tax is going up and the tobacco tax funding might also be utilized. He noted that there is support for a new aquatic facility among the Trustees and the December 14th discussion will focus on what can be undertaken.

Susan asked if Great Outdoors Colorado grant funding might be used.

Eric replied that it depends on what cycle GOCO is in.

Susan added that she didn't think that Recreation Center programming costs should be increased to pay for the aquatic facility.

Hollis agreed and suggested reviewing outside funding sources.

Susan noted that she understands that when a River Valley Ranch property is sold a tax is collected for maintenance. She wondered if the TOC could implement something similar. She asked if only one ballot measure would be put forward.

Luis replied that as he understood it, only one measure would be put forward.

Hollis pointed out that the Parks & Recreation Commission is a policymaking body, so the information included in the meeting packet about permitted and prohibited activities under the Colorado Fair Campaign Practices Act applies to the commission members.

Eric clarified that that information only applies to campaigning on the ballot issue.

REPORT & UPDATES: STAFF AND COMMISSION MEMBERS

Hollis noted that Susan requested reviewing the current Master Plan in terms what has not yet been accomplished. Hollis thought it was a good idea and asked when the commission members would like to do so.

Ashley suggested having an annual work session.

Eric pointed out that it would involve a budget discussion and suggested later in the year when the Commission is setting goals.

Ashley suggested the May meeting so the commission members can review any issues on the Parks Tour, and they are prepared when the next budget is reviewed.

Eric Brendlinger, Parks & Recreation Department Director:

- Eric invited the commission members to review the 30/60/90-day spreadsheet noting that 2022 projects have been highlighted in pink.

Jessi Rochel, Recreation Center & Recreation Programs Manager:

- The Recreation Center hosted another successful blood drive that day
- There will be a January Member Appreciation sale—buy three months and get one free
- The Recreation Center hosted a vaccination clinic and 121 people were vaccinated; the follow-up clinic is scheduled for December 29th
- There were over 600 participants at the Turkey Trot
- First Friday was a success
- The Recreation Center will close early on Christmas and New Year's Eve and will be closed on Christmas and New Year's Day

Hollis Sutherland, Parks & Recreation Commission Chair:

- Hollis announced that Kathleen Wanatowicz is resigning from her commission membership.

ADJOURNMENT

The December 8, 2021, regular meeting adjourned at 9:15 pm. The next regularly scheduled meeting is scheduled for January 12, 2021, at 7:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Kae McDonald