



Committee Members: Wright, Chris - Chairperson
Quigley, Jim
Santorsola, Jim
Traver, Susan
Wheatley-Billeter, Martha Lou
Alternate - Cameron, Randy

Also Present: Park Board – Ross Kelley; Staff – Mike Aho, Craig Butz, Callie Byrne, Leroy Eadie, Rebecca Madany, Cheryl Miller, Carl Strong; and Citizens – Mary Anderson, Dave Ayres, Lillie Bruciclo, Mary Kay Bryan, Lynn Burkett, Luella Cantalini, Richard Casey, Curtis Connolly, Elmo Dinehart, Velma Dinehart, Darline Divine, Pat Divine, Mary Dunphy, Donna Fagan, Kate Green, Charlene Hanks, Marguerite Haverfield, Joe Holland, Dorothy Jilbert, Warren Lamson, Josephine Lee, Ray Love, Bonnie McDade, Hal McGlathery, Kay McKay, Jim McLaughlin, Peggy McLaughlin, Kaylin McMillen, Kris Miller, Mark Reilly, Anna Marie Robbins, Katie Roley, Laura Schlangen, Mary Sullivan, Dave Sweet, Sandra White, Marlene Whitney

**Recreation Committee of the Spokane Park Board
September 1, 2011 – 3:30 p.m.
City Hall, City Conference Room 2B
Craig Butz – Recreation/Entertainment Division Manager**

Summary

- Contract Amendment with Senske Lawn and Care for Dwight Merkel grounds maintenance was recommended to go forward to Park Board.
- Value Blanket increase with Oxarc for pool chemicals for the Aquatics Centers was recommended to go forward to Park Board.
- Athletic Field Allocation Priorities were discussed and recommended to go forward to Park Board.
- Athletic Field Use Fees were discussed and recommended to go forward to Park Board.
- The decision to extend operations at two aquatics centers was reviewed.
- A ten year comparison of Community/Senior/Youth Center Funding was reviewed. A new preliminary funding proposal was discussed.
- Fall Activity Guides were distributed and will be mailed on Friday.

Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 3:34 p.m. by Chairperson, Chris Wright.

Action Items:

1. Recommend to approve contract amendment with Senske Lawn and Care for Dwight Merkel grounds maintenance

In 2010, when Merkel opened, Parks did not have staffing for grounds maintenance. So, Parks contracted with Senske to provide this service for a two year period. Last year we contracted them to perform additional services such as ball field preparation and providing fertilizer and other supplies that Parks was not in a position to provide at that time. This resulted in exhausting the contract amount before the term expires. Now an amendment is necessary to increase the encumbrance to cover all the services Senske is being required to perform through 2011. The new maximum totals \$180,550. The amendment also informs Senske that the contract will end December 31, 2011, not exercising the second and third year extensions.

It was recommended to move the item forward to the Board. There were no objections.

2. Recommend increase to Oxarc Chemical Value Blanket for Aquatic Centers

The value blanket amount would increase to \$41,600, to cover chemicals needed through the end of this season. There were issues last year that resulted in more chemicals being needed than should have been. Action was taken to address the issues. Assumptions were made regarding the situation when the estimates for chemicals were made for the 2011 season. It is now apparent that some assumptions and estimates were incorrect resulting in the need for an increase to the value blanket now. Pool maintenance, chemical tracking, pool use statistics, aquatics budget, and comparison of this year to last year were discussed.

It was recommended to move the item forward to the Board. There were no objections.

3. Recommend to Approve Athletic Field Allocation Priorities

Staff met with the associated Advisory Committee in August. In this draft of priorities, item 'k', primary use of facility, in section one was removed because it didn't seem to aid in resolution of disputes; item 'd', regarding dispute resolution, in section one was added; and grouping of information was changed to be more easily interpreted. Following discussion it was decided that 'd' should be in parenthesis following the colon after '1. Field Allocation Priorities'.

With the change of moving '1.d' it was recommended to move the item forward to the Board. There were no objections.

4. Recommend to Approve Athletic Field Use Fees

A printed report was provided and discussed. Proposed changes at specific locations include charging by the hour and not by the game; withdrawing the field use volume discount; withdrawing the early-morning discounts (the early morning discount was not utilized); adding an administrative reservation fee to most non-sports complex athletic fields where there is no field maintenance included. After hearing concerns from the athletic field allocation advisory committee, the field use volume discount was re-instated and the administrative reservation fee of \$10 per scheduled hour was reduced to a fee of \$10 (adults); \$8 (youth) per scheduled field. This fee is a starting point to help cover associated administrative costs for field scheduling. Changes should simplify interpretation of the information and do not alter conflict resolution procedures. Dave Ayers, of the Catholic Diocese League, expressed support of the proposed change for the non-sports complex fields. Joe Holland, of IEYSA, expressed concern that the proposed fee increase at the Southeast Complex would have a detrimental effect on IEYSA. He also expressed support of the proposed change for the non-sports complex fields as being fair and reasonable.

It was recommended to move the item forward to the Board. There were no objections.

A request was made that documentation provided for the Park Board meeting include an informational version as well as one clearly identifying what is proposed for approval. It was further requested that some means other than color be used to identify proposed changes on the informational document.

A question was asked regarding how delinquent user accounts are handled. Gary Lawton, a former Park Board Member, has developed an accounts receivable policy to be presented at Park Board Finance Committee for discussion.

Discussion Items:

1. Aquatic Center closure/re-opening decision

Leroy explained the decision to extend the season at two aquatic centers. Calls were received from the Press for an article. The Mayor asked the Parks Director for information regarding extending the pool season. Three options were provided by Aquatics Supervisory Staff. When Parks Director presented the options to the Mayor, budgetary implications were mentioned and including the Park Board President in the discussion was requested. Consideration of budgetary impact, staffing limitations, and prior commitments were made and the decision was made to proceed.

2. Community/Senior/Youth Center Funding 10 yr Comparison

Ten year reports recapping the Centers' operating budgets and the Parks budget for the Centers were distributed and reviewed. The Centers' operating budgets include funds they raise as a non-profit organization as well as Parks provided funds. The Parks budget for the Centers includes only Parks provided funds. A

2012 Budget for the Recreation Division was also provided and reviewed. Staff indicated there is another proposal to be considered though it has not yet been formulated enough to actually present. The concept is to provide funding for a full time person on each of the north and south areas of the city to provide senior recreational programs. Existing similar programs and assets, such as vans, would be shared. Services would be provided at current center locations. The recreational part of the Centers' programs could be combined into one collective effort. This should save money and should allow for some revenue to be returned to Parks from each of the north and south recreational programs. There is no Parks youth component involved in this plan. The proposed youth component would be to provide the current funding for youth services to the Centers as a lump sum and ask the Centers to come up collectively with a city wide program with those funds, and to include a revenue component back to Parks. A draft of this proposal may be available and the feasibility of this plan may be more apparent by the Park Board study session next week. The definition of 'recreation' as pertains to Parks programs was discussed. An agreement was not reached. Staff indicated that information is available outside of committee meetings to assist in establishing what recreation is for Parks purposes. The opinion was expressed that using sports as the only source of youth funding is a bad idea as youth benefit so much more from a wider scope of activity. An unidentified citizen pointed out that Parks funds support the recreation aspect of Center programs and Center non-profit funds support the social aspects. Mary Sullivan, of the Hillyard Senior Center, expressed concern there is not enough time to implement drastic reorganization of the Centers in conjunction with the 2012 budget. Centers have long term commitments to be considered that will require more time to address than is being allowed for. Hal McGlathery, of the North East Youth Center, expressed comments regarding the conceptual proposal discussed earlier in this meeting that indicate he believes it is a bad idea. A better idea would be to give what was cut from last year to this year to the Centers and let them figure out ways to make it up with fundraising. Regarding the 10 year report Hal mentions that subsidies over the 10 year period for all of the Centers are 21.15%, and their cost recovery far exceeds the Roadmap to the Future stated goal of 40%. This should not be overlooked. Defining 'recreation' is imperative to the budgeting process. A Committee Member confirmed with Hal that the subsidy figure he cited is an average, and this should be kept in mind when managing budgets. Staff pointed out that cross the board cuts were not considered this year, but focus for consideration were assigned to Recreation and Riverfront Park programs. Hal commented that Park Maintenance (Operations) should also be subject to cuts. Ray Love, of the Hillyard Senior Center, pointed out that they took a 5% voluntary cut in 2010 in an effort to help the Park Board in budget considerations.

Standing Report items:

1. The Revenue/Expense Monthly Report was distributed.
2. Roadmap to the Future Action Items - No presentation was made, but discussions have touched on the item.

3. Promotion Ideas – Copies of the Fall Activity Guide were distributed and they will be mailed on Friday. It is also available on line. A new section for Group and Facility Rental has been included.
4. Community/Senior Centers Update - Was covered in Discussion Item 2.
5. Athletic Field Operations - Was included in Action Items 3 and 4.

Meeting adjourned at 5:50p.m.

The next regularly scheduled meeting is October 6, 2011, at 3:30 p.m. in the City Hall Conference Room 2B.