The regular meeting of the Foothills Park & Recreation District was held at Peak Community and Wellness Center, 6612 South Ward Street, Littleton, Colorado 80127.

I. CALL TO ORDER: Director Bradley called the regular meeting to order at 6:00pm.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Director Bradley led those in attendance in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

III. ROLL CALL: Director Bielkiewicz: Present
Director Bosanko: Present
Director James: Present
Director Sutton: Present
Director Bradley: Present

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Ronald Hopp, Executive Director; Paul Rufien, District Counsel; Patricia Parkin, Director of Administrative Services; Colin Insley, Director of Parks Planning and Construction; Derek Eberhardt, Manager of Recreation Facilities; Barb Butler, Manager of Recreation Programs; Tom Woodard, Director of Golf; Richelle Riley, Recording Secretary; other Foothills staff and members of the public.

Potential conflicts of interest were disclosed pursuant to Colorado Revised Statutes 18-8-308(2), 24-18-109(3)(a), 24-18-110, and 32-1-902(3).

IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

MOTION: Director Bosanko moved that the Foothills Board of Directors approve the November 10, 2015 agenda as submitted. Director Sutton seconded the motion. Poll of the Board: Director Bielkiewicz, aye; Director Bosanko, aye; Director James, aye; Director Sutton, aye; Director Bradley, aye. The motion was approved.

V. APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 27, 2015 MINUTES:

MOTION: Director James moved that the Foothills Board of Directors approve the minutes of the October 27, 2015 board meeting as submitted. Director Bielkiewicz seconded the motion. Poll of the Board: Director Bielkiewicz, aye; Director Bosanko, aye; Director James, aye; Director Sutton, aye; Director Bradley, aye. The motion was approved.

VI. COMMUNITY COMMENTS:

A. Staff Introduction

Kevin Wilks told the Board there was a Regional Parks’ full-time employee that made a lateral move into the Urban Parks department, so a full-time position opened up in Regional Parks. Zack Quintana was awarded that position, who has worked as a seasonal since 2011.

VII. OLD BUSINESS:

A. Prairie Dog Management Policy Update

Referring to information provided in the packet, Colin Insley provided history surrounding the current Prairie Dog Management Plan, and outlined the changes being proposed for the updated policy. He mentioned that staff have worked with volunteer groups for prairie dog relocation and management, and have tried some new things.

Director Bradley discussed that the Board had received a letter from a number of individuals that had two comments specifically, and opened the floor for public comments.

Diane Suchomel, district resident, expressed support of the draft policy; she has seen so many thousands of dollars worth of trees and bushes damaged, and holes in irrigated park land.
Ms. Suchomel recognized the District does need to have control and needs to be able to manage it. She suggested if the District allows an outside group to move prairie dogs, it should be at their expense, not the District’s expense. The District has so many capital things, there needs to be priorities.

Tina Gurdikian, district resident, read a letter that had been sent to the Board by her, Leslie Johnson, Ellen Kessler, Karl Mann, Blythe Ramsdell, Lisa Watkins, and Gina Writz regarding the proposed revised policy. The letter contained a request that the statement that fencing or man-made barriers are not acceptable control methods be removed from page two – it is an option they would still like Foothills to consider. A second request, Ms. Gurdikian proposed that on page three, it is unreasonable to state that relocation activities must be completed at no cost to the District. She observed prairie dog extermination costs the District, so whatever cost would go towards extermination should be redirected to volunteers to cover their expenses for relocation. Ms. Gurdikian questioned why District staff did not consider adding language to the policy that would require a land developer that purchases Foothills’ property to make an effort to relocate prairie dogs.

Matt Spruill, West Gold Meadows resident, said when Mossbrucker Park was developed he was told that tall grass would prevent prairie dogs from coming in to the area, and it has been a failure. He indicated there is a north/south trail and the prairie dogs cross over the walkway into the play areas and picnic areas. He said people walking their dogs in that area go home with fleas and ticks, and elaborated.

David Anderson, district resident, said at Mossbrucker Park they walk their dogs and constantly deal with prairie dogs. Prairie dogs are in the middle of the field where the kids play sports.

Tina Gurdikian indicated she lives in the same neighborhood, the prairie dogs have been there for eight years and it has never been a problem until recently, and offered information about plague.

Gina Writz, district resident, reminded the Board that there is an active Prairie Dog Taskforce team and would like to have that utilized in the Prairie Dog Management Policy as one of the first resources as far as mitigating or controlling the prairie dog populations. Ms. Writz gave handouts from the Prairie Dog Coalition to the Board and talked about preventing plague with flea dust. She suggested collaborating with staff as far as looking at some adjustments to the Prairie Dog Management Policy.

Leslie Johnson said she moved here from Highlands Ranch and was involved in some of the work with prairie dogs in Highlands Ranch, and talked about their prairie dog policies. She asked that staff work with her organization to redo this Prairie Dog Management Policy.

Blythe Ramsdell, district resident, said environmental and compensation for that is considered when they are doing evaluations for land. Developers know they should have to pay some of the impact.

Matt Martin, district resident, said he enjoys seeing prairie dogs, coyotes, red tail fox, burrowing owls; losing that isn’t worth it. We need to look at the joy and respect what we have.

Nicole Zaragoza, district resident, expressed love for the prairie dogs. Having to explain to her son why we are killing nature so we can put up buildings is hard; there has got to be other ways.

In answer to Director Bosanko, Mr. Insley talked about fencing options and costs. Director James recommended amendments to the Prairie Dog Management Policy that include barriers and fencing to be considered and up for discussion, money for controls can be contributed to relocation efforts, with the relocation being completed with no additional cost to the District; Director Bielkiewicz agreed with those changes. Director Bielkiewicz acknowledged the District’s capital needs are phenomenal, this is just one need. Director Bosanko suggested where the money is spent, staff needs to do the research, and is willing to keep options open. Director Sutton observed it is an ongoing maintenance problem, and suggested this policy is an attempt to say how it will be managed.
Director Bradley mentioned he had talked to Fish and Wildlife Service. In Albuquerque and in Nevada, they have had metal fencing and it has worked, and proposed there are some success stories. Director Bradley summarized two particular issues the Board is open to regarding the policy: a change on the openness to a consideration of a fencing option, and Foothills can put the cost of a control towards a relocation effort in place of a control. A third item is staff coming up with a comment and acknowledgment that there are groups that are strongly aligned with prairie dog preservation such as the Prairie Dog Task Force and that the District will try and work with groups wherever possible.

Ronald Hopp responded that to spend between $11,000 and $22,000 to contain prairie dogs with metal fencing in areas that would be potentially available for the public to be part of, the aesthetic nature of it as well as a safety issue, staff feel strongly that fencing is problematic. He proposed if that’s what the Board wants to do in terms of costs and aesthetics, that takes the desire of not being ambiguous with this policy. There is no issue with the provision of the funding, if the problem is mitigated one way or another by relocating to a site outside of the District versus controlling, those dollars are being spent and can be used to mitigate one way or the other. Regarding working with groups, Mr. Hopp explained the District does not cite that in other management plans and policies, and used Adopt-a-Park program for an example. The question about requiring a land developer to relocate prairie dogs, Mr. Hopp explained that adding that to this policy would be more restrictive than the County’s land development policies; it seems those efforts could be lobbied to the County.

There was discussion and it was decided to amend the policy with the suggested changes and bring back to the next board meeting. The Board discussed putting language about a task force in the policy; Mr. Rufien offered advice and caution. He discussed the revisions can be accomplished, making sure to give the ultimate power and ultimate authority to staff.

**MOTION:** Director James moved that the Foothills Board of Directors table the revised Foothills Park & Recreation District Prairie Dog Management Policy until the December 8, 2015 board meeting. Director Bielkiewicz seconded the motion. Poll of the Board: Director Bielkiewicz, aye; Director Bosanko, aye; Director James, aye; Director Sutton, aye; Director Bradley, aye. The motion was approved.

### VIII. NEW BUSINESS:

### IX. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT:

Mr. Hopp reported that he had a meeting with Darrell Windes, general manger of Ken-Caryl Metropolitan District and discussed continuation of the IGA. There was a pricing meeting today with the investment bankers on the refinancing and extraction of additional principle, Mr. Hopp explained. Mr. Hopp pointed out there is an External Stakeholder Master Planning meeting on Thursday, December 3rd. Mr. Hopp mentioned that Tom Woodard received another Hall of Fame designation for University of Colorado Golden Buffaloes.

Director Sutton questioned, regarding Mesa View, if something could be worked out in terms of how residents of Mesa View are recognized by staff. Could some sort of I.D. be issued to them to find out who is using it and build on that. Mr. Hopp said the POS system is in the process of being changed over; staff can talk about that and see what can be done.

In answer to Director James, Mr. Hopp indicated there have been conversations with Bowles Metro District about an IGA, and will follow up with them.

Director Bradley proposed to discuss a refrain from smoking policy potentially at the next board meeting.

### X. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

#### A. 2016 Proposed Budget Presentations

Patricia Parkin discussed overall revenues and expenditures of the 2016 Administration proposed budget as provided in the budget book. Ms. Parkin provided highlights for Executive Director’s Office, Marketing and Public Outreach, Finance, Human Resources, and Information Technology.
Tom Woodard discussed the 2016 Golf budget as shown in the budget book, detailing the overall revenues and expenditures. Mr. Woodard pointed out a 2015 Greenfee Survey that was provided in the Tuesday folders. Mr. Woodard provided highlights for Foothills Golf Course and Meadows Golf Club, and talked about golf carts and items proposed for the Golf Development and Improvement Fund.

Mr. Hopp recalled at the October meeting there was an overview of the budget and over the course of the last couple meetings staff did presentations for Leisure Services, Parks, Golf, and Administration. The final budget will be considered at the December 8th board meeting. Mr. Hopp said there will be some tweaks; final valuations from the County will happen towards the end of November.

Director James proposed if the District is going to be going after a mill levy in the spring of 2016, recalling information from the NRPA conference, to look at getting a public opinion survey and our objective would be what are the funding priorities from the public, and also determine confidence in Foothills as far as a pro vote/no vote –feelings about a yes or no vote on a mill levy if it were at different levels. Director James indicated a budget for it could be one dollar per likely voter; set aside anywhere from $45,000 up to $75,000 to get a public opinion survey. He proposed that staff get bids for a public opinion survey and add that to the budget for next year, possibly using some of the dollars from the increase in tax collection. Board discussion ensued. Paul Rufien clarified that fair campaign practices limitations do not kick in until the Board adopts ballot language.

B. Financial Forecast

According to the financial forecast spreadsheets provided, Mr. Hopp highlighted specific line items, indicating that the increased assessed valuations certainly helped. He pointed out details for the top 20 line items for supplies, purchased services, admission fees, etc. extended through 2031. The last spreadsheet showed variables of how increases were applied. The 2016 budget is balanced; the 2017 budget shows a deficit. Mr. Hopp pointed out that typically the forecast models have shown about $400,000 per year in capital; starting in 2017, it is showing $1 million in capital. If capital is taken out of the equation, the forecast is to the good from the operational perspective, not addressing any capital. If all of the capital were removed, the District could get by for 2017 and 2018; by 2019 it would be a deficit budget again.

Mr. Hopp talked about the assessed valuation forecast estimates, and various mill levy increase scenarios for the District, Sub-District A, and Sub-District B. The estimated impact of mill levy proceeds to estimated net revenues (losses) was outlined according to the spreadsheet. He reminded that in 2020, there is the opportunity to ask the voters to extend the bond issue, and that is all capital. Mr. Hopp concluded that a mill levy is a little more difficult, in agreement with Director Bradley, if there is some sort of a sunset term, as well as a lower mill levy amount, it is going to be much more palatable to the public. He pointed out the spreadsheet shows the estimated cost with the different mill levy increase scenarios for a $400,000 home.

Board discussion ensued. Mr. Hopp proposed if the District did go with a lower mill, it could address capital for a few years but definitely would have to ask for an extension of the bond. He reiterated the lowest amount that is tolerable is probably the best with a sunset provision, but recognized that it doesn’t address capital needs. Director Bosanko expressed support for a survey. Director Bradley expressed support for putting that money toward something that advertises what the District is doing rather than a survey. If this mill levy is an interim thing to get the District by for four or five years, Director Bradley expressed it needs to be done next year.

Mr. Hopp indicated the District did a public opinion poll in 2008 and it showed the mill levy would pass and it did not. He recognized there are consultants that would assist with ballot language and would have expertise related to that. Director James expressed the District needs to get to know its’ audience and get to know its’ voters better. The District has not presented a case that’s convincing enough to have people vote yes.

Director Bielkiewicz expressed disagreement for a survey, and questioned whether the District needs to ask for a mill levy right now, and elaborated. He summarized there is potential for more income in two years when property taxes go up again, the bond
opportunity, and believes the future looks good. There are capital things that need done, things that are broken in the facilities that people don’t see; how does the District sell that?

Mr. Hopp discussed some opportunities, and said good feedback was received from a survey staff conducted after the failed mill levy in 2014. Director Bradley suggested the discussion be continued at the next board meeting.

XI. EXECUTIVE SESSION

A. Contract Negotiations per 24-6-402(4)(e), C.R.S.

MOTION: Director Bielkiewicz moved that the Foothills Board of Directors move into Executive Session to discuss Contract Negotiations pursuant to Colorado Revised Statute 24-6-402(4)(e). Director Bradley seconded the motion. Poll of the Board: Director Bielkiewicz, aye; Director Bosanko, aye; Director James, aye; Director Sutton, aye; Director Bradley, aye. The motion was approved.

The regular meeting adjourned at 8:33pm. Executive Session started at 8:39pm and ended at 8:52pm. The regular meeting reconvened at 8:52pm.

XII. ADJOURNMENT:

The regular meeting was adjourned at 8:53pm. The next regular board meeting will be held at 6pm on Tuesday, December 8, 2015, at Peak Community and Wellness Center, 6612 South Ward Street, Littleton.

Submitted by:

Richelle Riley, Recording Secretary