

MINUTES
CARBONDALE PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
March 9, 2022

Hollis Sutherland called the in-person/virtual meeting of the Carbondale Parks & Recreation Commission to order at 7:03 p.m. at Carbondale Town Hall on March 9, 2022.

ROLL CALL

The following members were present for roll call:

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| Members: | Hollis Sutherland, Chair
Rose Rossello, Vice Chair
John Williams, Member
Leslie Keery, Member
Susan Rhea, Member
Brian Soby, Alternate
Misha Logan, Youth Member |
| Town Staff Present: | Jessi Rochel, Recreation Center & Recreation Programs Manager
Kae McDonald, Boards & Commission Clerk |
| Guests: | Daisy Girl Scout Troop 1782 and parents (Alma Rossello, Gwen DeRudder, Josie McLain, Georgia Owings, Luna Beattie, Gillian Friazee, Myla Carnoali)
Briston Peterson
Bob Schultz
Richard Camp |

CONSENT AGENDA

Motion Passed: John *moved* to approve the minutes from the February 9, 2022, meeting. Leslie *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.

HENDRICKS PARK PLAYGROUND REPLACEMENT PROJECT REVIEW

Rose introduced the members of Daisy Girl Scout Troop 1782 and explained that with a \$20.00 donation from Hollis, the troop members undertook the requirements to receive the "Take Action" badge. Rose shared the power point presentation that explained the research and conclusions reached by the troop members for the playground equipment selection (please see attached PowerPoint at the end of the meeting minutes).

After congratulatory affirmations for the troop's presentation, Hollis asked if the commission members had utilized the assessment sheets. She noted that Proposal A and F had received the most points in her assessment but pointed out that Proposal F didn't have many climbing elements.

Leslie noted that she also liked Proposal F but there aren't any shade structures.

John commented that he also liked Proposal A because of the variety of swings and the shade structures.

Rose was also in agreement that she preferred Proposal A.

Misha noted that while he liked many of the design elements from Proposal A, he also liked the webbed design feature in Proposal D.

Rose replied that Proposal A has all the options and pointed out that the Montessori School is only a couple blocks

down the street from the Hendricks Playground and it has rope climbing elements that can be used when the school is not in session.

Brian commented that he liked Proposal A as well.

Susan agreed that Proposal A had the best presentation while Proposals B and C were confusing. She commented that there were elements from several proposals that she liked but she was surprised how much more expensive engineered wood fiber is than other materials. She pointed out that the company that submitted Proposal A completed the playground upgrade at Miners Park, but she also preferred Proposal E's use of sustainable wood fiber because it has an appealing design and is really compelling to use and touch.

Hollis noted that Proposal E only had two swings, it is heavily weighted for 5- to 12-year-olds and it has a smaller user capacity. She pointed out that there are already wood playgrounds at Orchard Park and there are wood elements at Ross Montessori as well.

Susan commented that Proposal E was the only one that promoted recycling.

Rose responded that she liked Proposal E's designs but pointed out that two swings just aren't enough.

Susan asked how the multi-generational swing would be incorporated.

Rose responded that based on a conversation with Eric, the proposals outline a general design and once a selection is made, they can request to substitute an ADA and multi-generational swing.

Susan commented that engineered wood fiber has an eight-year lifespan while a poured rubber surface will last twice as long.

Rose responded that the rubber surface can get too hot.

Hollis asked if the engineered wood fiber is the material currently used at the Town parks. She asked if it goes everywhere.

Jessi answered in the affirmative to both questions and commented that it does get compressed.

Susan asked how the \$80,000.00 budget was determined.

Hollis responded that it is part of the Capital Improvement Project budget that was approved last summer/fall. She added that the playground elements need to be replaced because of safety concerns.

Misha commented that there is a rubber surface at the Carbondale Middle School playground -- it is blue, so it doesn't get as hot and portions of it are covered as well.

Hollis added that it also surrounds the climbing rock outside the Rec Center.

Motion Passed: Rose ***moved*** to recommend Proposal A for approval. John ***seconded*** the motion, and it was ***unanimously approved***.

Rose moved to recommend the six swings include two baby swings, two standard swings, one ADA swing and one multi-generational swing if the budget permits. John seconded the motion.

Discussion

Brian asked if the proposal was all or nothing.

Rose thought that the six swings were in the proposal and there should be enough funding to include the ADA swing and the multi-generational swing.

Hollis added that it was just a matter of letting Eric know what the commission members preferred.

Jessi noted that the Request for Proposal stated that the proposal is a not-to-exceed price with the maximum budget set at \$80,000.00 but the actual billing will be based upon time, material, and equipment costs.

John commented that the only difference is that two standard swings are being exchanged for an ADA and a multi-generational swing.

Motion Passed: Rose ***moved*** to recommend six swings including two baby swings, two standard swings, one ADA swing and one multi-generational swing if the budget permits. John ***seconded*** the motion, and it was ***unanimously approved***.

LOT 1 PARK PRESENTATION (BRISTON PETERSON, BOB SCHULTZ AND RICHARD CAMP)

Bob reminded the commission members that they had presented the concept at several previous meetings and the memo included in the packet requires a decision on two questions:

- Will the Commission support the proposed park and maintenance plan?
 - Bob pointed out that they have changed the park plan based on commission member comments at the previous two meetings
 - The maintenance plan is based on previous agreements that have been adjusted based on experience
 - Once the essence of the plan has been approved by the Parks & Recreation Commission, the document will be memorialized by the Town Attorney
- Will the Commission support accepting an easement rather than a fee simple dedication?
 - Because the rules changed after the development was approved, the plan is meant to meet both the Town of Carbondale's and Lot 1 owner's needs
 - The Board of Trustees will make the final decision, but the Trustees prefer to defer to the Parks & Recreation Commission on the park's issues

Bob noted that there are examples of the proposed playground equipment included on the handout and added that Eric is comfortable with them.

John appreciated the addition of the bathrooms and changes to allow public parking.

Hollis asked where the recently completed buildings are in relation to the park.

Richard explained that those buildings are to the north of the proposed park and pointed out that the park and private parking will be at the center of the development.

Rose noted that the playground equipment is different and appreciated the effort put into finding something that was different than the other parks.

Briston acknowledged that there will be three play elements including a rope structure for climbing, and balancing structures designed for ages six to twelve and three to five.

Susan asked for confirmation that the parking inside the building quads will be designated for residents only.

Bob answered in the affirmative and explained that public parking will be available on the outside the building perimeter and additional public parking has been added along Shorty Pabst Way. He pointed out there are easements on the north side, a central walkway and at least one access point from all four sides of the development.

Susan asked if there will be walkways between Buildings L and K.

Bob replied that they will encourage community members to use the walkway on the north side for access and noted that there will be many ways to get into the park and thought they might be able to provide wayfinding to provide direction. He pointed out that access will be similar to that of Miners or Sopris Park.

John asked for confirmation if Parkview Court shown on the south side of the park was actually Main Street?

Bob explained that there was Parkview Court, a row of buildings and then Main Street.

Richard pointed out that there will be a sidewalk along the Shorty Pabst parking area, but there isn't a defined trail.

Susan asked if there would be fencing blocking access.

Richard commented that the only fencing will be around the Futsal court and the Futsal court would be accessed through the gazebo.

Susan asked for confirmation that the purpose for the meeting's presentation was to approve the maintenance agreement and the dedication.

Hollis explained that the Commission's purpose was to ensure that all the high-level elements were contained in the documents and then it would go to the Town Attorney for the final version. She reiterated that Eric was comfortable with the documents as written.

Bob explained that the workplan is very specific and they have adopted all of Eric's recommendations. Bob added that if subsurface repairs need to be made to the stormwater management system located underneath the park, it must be restored to the original condition.

John asked for clarification of an easement versus a dedication.

Bob explained that a dedication wasn't currently on the table and added that the Lot 1 park maintenance plan is more detailed than the RVR plan because Eric didn't want any ambiguity.

John noted that the only difference between an easement and a dedication is who owns the property.

Bob replied that it doesn't make sense for the Town of Carbondale to maintain the park because the homeowner's association will be maintaining the rest of the area in the development.

Hollis commented that the easement is in perpetuity and the Town of Carbondale will essentially be getting a park without having to maintain it.

John responded that he would prefer a park owned by the Town of Carbondale because there will be seven homeowner's associations in charge of maintenance within the development.

Bob explained that for the purposes of the agreement with the Town of Carbondale there will be one agreement representing all the associations, but the financial commitment will be based on the square footage of each association. He pointed out that Eric expressed concern about the ability to take care of another park.

Susan reminded commission members that reviewing the development timeline there is no option for dedication because the financing triggered the easement requirement.

Bob added that the Board of Trustees could refuse to accept the easement and then they would have to figure out how to satisfy the requirement. He pointed out that the rules changed between 2018 – at which point the development was approved with the open space was to be maintained for the residents – and 2019, reiterating the developer's solution is the proposed easement.

Briston added that the stormwater management system is already installed but only supports the private roads. Brian noted that the stormwater management system overlaps the park area and asked if that was part of the public space.

Bob explained that the stormwater management system is a below grade drywell system located beneath the park area.

Brian asked if there were usage restrictions.

Bob replied that there weren't any.

Hollis added that the agreement specifies that if repairs are made, the playground must be replaced as is. She noted that there is some latitude for changing the park elements.

John moved that the Parks & Recreation Commission accept the Park and Maintenance Plan whether it is an easement or a dedication. Rose seconded the motion.

Discussion

Brian asked if the Town of Carbondale had standards of maintenance and whether the obligation under the proposed maintenance plan would be subject to a policy that is fixed in time or tracks with changes to the standards as they are revised.

Hollis replied that Eric and Bob have worked through the maintenance plan and Eric has learned from experience what works.

Bob added that the River Valley Ranch maintenance plan was the starting point, but Eric asked for more specificity in both the maintenance and replacement requirements. Bob noted that he wasn't sure about the standards of maintenance being fixed in time versus changing as standards are updated but thought that topic could be addressed when the agreement goes to the Town Attorney. He pointed out that there have been discussions about being able to alter the facilities if needs change and having the park under the umbrella of the weed management plan.

Hollis asked who would be responsible for insurance.

Briston replied that the Town of Carbondale would be responsible for insurance.

Hollis asked if something is broken will it get replaced?

Bob replied that it could be on the list and noted that any questions can be forwarded so they can incorporate changes into the final document. He noted that if it is something the Town of Carbondale would do for one of their parks, and was a reasonable ask, it is likely to be approved, but if it isn't something the Town of Carbondale normally does it is unlikely that they would agree to it.

Motion Passed. John *moved* that the Parks & Recreation Commission accept the Park and Maintenance Plan whether it is an easement or a dedication; Brian added the amendment "with the contingency that it be maintained to current Town of Carbondale standards at all times." Rose *seconded* the motion, and it was *unanimously approved*.

Briston explained that it was his goal to keep the Lot 1 development financing local, but it outgrew the local bank's capacity to lend. He noted that the smart solution was to take the asset out of collateral and find permanent financing at a larger institution once each building was occupied.

Hollis asked if there was any reason the Town of Carbondale could lose the easement.

Bob replied that the Town of Carbondale could abandon the easement, but the development wouldn't have the right to do so because the easement is incorporated into the property title. He explained that even though each building will be a homeowner's association the parcel of land is held by one title and the easement can't be extinguished by the owners.

Leslie pointed out that the easement would give community members access to the park, while the developers are required to build and maintain it in perpetuity. She was in favor of the easement.

Motion Passed: Susan *moved* that the Parks & Recreation Commission accept the easement rather than fee simple dedication for the Lot 1 park. Leslie *seconded* the motion, and it was *approved* with a single dissenting vote by John Williams (he preferred the fee simple dedication).

AQUATICS FACILITY MASTER PLAN—NEXT STEPS: ELECTION SCHEDULE

Hollis noted that the election schedule was included in the meeting packet and the Tabor notice has been mailed. She thought there were good statements in favor of the proposed financing.

Susan asked if something is planned to be broadcast on KDNK.

Jessi responded that they have been contacted by the Sopris Sun. She noted that they provided them a link to the Aquatics Facility Master Plan and the conceptual drawings and are available to answer questions on specifics.

Susan asked if the commission members knew someone that would be willing to promote the project as a “Friend of the Pool.”

Jessi pointed out that Town staff can't be involved.

Hollis added that anything that is done must be done as a private citizen, not as a commission or representing oneself as a commission member.

Rose wondered if, with the acquisition of property across the street from Town Hall, it was possible to revisit the pool's location.

REPORT & UPDATES: STAFF AND COMMISSION MEMBERS

Jessi Rochel, Recreation Center & Recreation Programs Manager:

- Submitted an FMLD grant for replacement skylights and an upgrade to LED lights over the basketball court
- There were 105 responses to the Senior Program Use Survey that was offered in conjunction with Senior Matters
- The ice rinks are still skateable – this is the longest season they have had
- The Parks and Recreation Department are advertising for summer employment
- Summer programming is approaching – Baseball and softball registration will begin on March 15th and registration for swimming lessons will begin in early May

Hollis Sutherland, Parks & Recreation Commission Chair:

- They are planning staff recognition during the April meeting
- A Work Session is planned for either a Wednesday evening or a Saturday in late April. She asked the commission members to review the updated Chapter 4 (there is a link in the Onboarding packet) in preparation.

ADJOURNMENT

The March 9, 2022, adjourned at 8:55 pm. The next regular meeting is scheduled for April 13, 2022, at 7:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Kae McDonald