



**Recreation and Park Commission
Veterans Memorial Center, Multipurpose Room
203 E. 14th Street
Monday February 1, 2016
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES**

Commission Members Present: Ira Bray (Chair), Cecilia Escamilla-Greenwald (Vice Chair),
Travie Westlund, Will Arnold and Emily Griswold

Commission Members Absent: None

Council Liaison Present: None

Staff Present: Kelly Fletcher, Christine Helweg, Dale Sumersille and Jack Dilles,
Municipal Resource Group (MRG) Consultant

Chair I. Bray called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

1. Approval of the Agenda

A motion was made by W. Arnold, seconded by T. Westlund, to approve the agenda. The motion was approved unanimously.

2. Cost of Services Analysis and Fee Recommendations

MRG Consultant Jack Dilles presented an overview of the methodology and purpose for the Study, the types of fees that were analyzed, those fees which were not included in the Study, and the specific types of costs that were included (i.e., fulltime staff, temporary, part-time staff, services/supplies, internal service charges).

Superintendent Helweg provided supplemental information on various program activity budget worksheets as the initial baseline for development of the proposed fees, and also provided information as to how the recommended fee percentages had been determined.

Commissioner Inquiries/Clarifications

E.Griswold – Would like to know what % of the total PCS budget is recovered by fees? She finds it difficult to determine or assess new fees without knowing what the existing fees are and how the proposed fees will financially impact the public users.

C. Greenwald – She would also like to know what we anticipate the new fees to be? And if the Facility Replacement Cost is a typical cost that other agencies factor into their fees? Consultant J. Dilles responded that in his past experience, the Facility Replacement cost is not typically factored into most agency fee calculations.

W. Arnold – Interested in reviewing the existing program fees as compared to the proposed increases to fully see the financial ramifications. He was also referred to the Master Fee Schedule as a source for current City fees.

T. Westlund – He is concerned that some program revenues are not captured as a part of a facility's income generating use, and that it does not accurately reflect the true use of the facility.

I. Bray – He was curious as to what percentage of cost recovery do the other comparative cities have for their services. Consultant J. Dilles stated that they did not have that information available as part of the scope for this study. If the information was readily available from their web site then they noted that information.

Public Comments

Betsy Raymond - ACME Theatre Company expressed her concern for rising theatre rental costs and that significant facility rental increases could prohibit their continued use of the facility in future years. She recalls that the last significant rental fee increases resulted in lower theatre rental use, thus causing significant revenue loss for the City which defeated the purpose of the fee increases.

Emily Henderson - Elasticity is critical to any proposed fee increases. Higher theater rental costs would require local groups to charge unusually high ticket prices that would otherwise not be charged by smaller, more localized theatre performance groups. The higher rental fees would also detract away from the purpose of having a local theatre for community groups, or non-paid professional performing groups.

Billy Doughty – Davis Aquadarts, would like to see more public/private partnerships be developed and explored with City, have more time to explore other options than just raising fees. Over the last several years, the Community Pool partnership has reduced the amount of ongoing loss for City from \$158,000 initially, to \$110,000 during the second year, and now only \$78,000 this last year.

Stu Khan – Davis Aquatic Masters, is concerned that the capital outlay costs and facility replacement costs are duplicated in the methodology of developing the proposed fees.

Greg Stoner – Davis Aquatic Masters, information was not made available to the groups well in advance of the meeting in order for them to have adequate time to review and provide meaningful comments, Davis aquatic users have national recognition and the caliber of the aquatic facilities that the groups utilize should reflect this high level of performance

Michael Karoly – did not see any Field Use fees in the study, fees need to be formatted or presented in a manner that is more practical for the public to understand and comprehend the financial ramifications.

Carson Wilcox - Davis Softball, is concerned that the City does not compare to other comparable agencies regarding the types and conditions of facilities of sports facilities, groups are willing to pay a little more but the City must bring the cost to something more comparable to the condition of the facility.

Denise Johnson – Davis Aquastarz, would like to know when the Fee Analysis and Recommendations will be presented to the City Council? K. Fletcher responded that it is tentatively scheduled to be brought to them in March, but a firm date has not been confirmed yet pending community input from the various City commissions.

Ryan Pistochini, Treasurer - Davis Aquastarz, on Worksheet G-13 he would like to know how the 74% percent of pool use time was determined by the City – this calculation detail should also be provided.

Adam Andrews - Davis Travel Softball, increasing need to expand teams, there needs to be a better solution that provides the ability for the City to build new sport facilities and then turn them over to the user groups to more efficiently operate them.

Carolee – Davis Aquadarts, is concerned with the timeline for implementation of the proposed fees. Many of the groups are already planning for summer and fall and will not have the capability to recover these costs if implemented as currently proposed.

Commission Comments:

T. Westlund – No decisions can be made tonight, defer for more discussion at the next regular meeting in mid-February.

W. Arnold – Agree with Travie, inclination to have fee increases not take effect until January 2017 (or 2 calendar year) from approval

- duplication of replacement costs
- develop a MFS with anticipated fees based upon
- don't want calendar to dictate decision making

C. Greenwald – Concerned that kids can't afford future programs

- recommend individual meetings with user groups
- conditions of facilities
- not reasonable to implement costs this fiscal year
- explore more public/private partnerships
- what costs are missing?

E. Griswold - need more information and how it would affect the overall City's budget

- what is the anticipated bottom line?
- need to know how the fees are going to affect user groups

I. Bray - Very complex report with very small print

- would like to review other Cities (i.e. City of Corvallis Pyramid Pricing Structure)
- Concerned that the City is inadvertently establishing a class system of users – those that can pay and those who cannot, how and where does the philosophical discussion come into consideration relevant to the public good vs. private gain
- Concerned that there are missing fees
- Need clarification of discount rates to user groups
- Fee Subsidy program - simpler and more visibility of program benefits
- Fee examples

- Need more time to digest material, defer to Jan 2017, phasing of fee increases

T. Westlund - suggest 2-3 fee examples and not all the fees, not good use of staff time

A motion was made by T. Westlund, seconded by W. Arnold to adjourn the meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m. by consensus

Respectfully submitted:

Christine Helweg-Parks & Community Services Superintendent