

Peterborough Recreation Committee, (PRC), Meeting
Roland "Beaver" Jutras Recreation Building
Minutes of April 7, 2010, 7:00 PM
(Approved)

Attendees: Tina Kriebel, Chair; Todd Weeks, Secretary, Andrew Dunbar; Jeffrey M. King, Recreation Director; Robert Lambert, PRD/Budget Committee Liaison, Barbara Miller, Select person; and Lisa A. Betz, Program Coordinator/Minute Taker. Representing the Peterborough Wave Swim Team (PWSC); Dick Cuddihee, Beverly Patten, Kirsten Barwood, Robert Dellavalle, Joe Rogers, Lori Cawthern, and Lisa Rogers.

- I) Meeting called to order: at 6:34 PM by Tina for the tour of the Armory. The second part of the meeting was held in the PRD Meeting Room which began at 7:00pm.
- II) Approval of Minutes: Due to the lack of a quorum, the Minutes of March 3rd were tabled until next month.
- III) Tour of Armory: Attending members of the PRC meeting this month, along with Bob Lambert, toured the Armory facility with Jeff. Jeff gave everyone a synopsis of what his plans were for the various rooms, the ADA issues and code issues that needed to be addressed and well as sharing the facility with other organizations.
 - A) Jeff first addressed the rec offices upon entering the building, stating that a wall may have to be blown out to accommodate a kitchen pantry.
 - B) In the Kitchen, the sink needs to be replaced to meet code. The sink in the concession stand does indeed meet code so the PRD might be able to move the sink over. The new appliances for the kitchen are in the drill hall of the armory.
 - C) The vault needs to be addressed because it is a safety hazard.
 - D) There are ongoing discussions as to how big a space the Food Pantry needs to be. There is a side door that folks can utilize to access the Food Pantry.
 - E) The paneling in many of the rooms is not to code so they would have to be torn down.
 - F) There were several discussions regarding the placement of bathrooms. No resolutions were made. The number of bathrooms are dependent upon occupancy rates and what the certificate states.
 - G) Storage concerns were expressed as to how, where and for whom.

- H) After touring the inside, everyone went out to see the boiler room.
- 1) The question of asbestos was raised. There are several mitigating factors regarding the exposure of asbestos and how to address it. That would have to be determined by a professional.
 - 2) The issue of asbestos will have to be appropriately addressed before the building is utilized.
 - 3) Jeff made mention that the boiler was relatively new.
 - 4) The oil lines going into the building will be replaced.

IV) Director's Report: The Board addressed the PWSC issues first due to the presence of PWSC representatives/parents.

- A) The purpose of the PWSC parents being at the meeting was to represent the organization during the discussion of a probable fee increase when they utilize PRD property. The PRC wants to have equitable situation, across all organizations, which use PRD property without being under the auspices of the Recreation Department.
- 1) This discussion has already occurred with Cal Ripken baseball. Agreed upon resolution? To charge Cal Ripken \$10/baseball player head with a maximum cost not exceeding \$1,000.00 for the first year.
 - 2) Again, equitability was stressed as the purpose of this meeting with PWSC.
 - 3) The PRC is not trying to drive out the PWSC from using the pool this summer....it is the job of the Board – representing the Peterborough Taxpayers – to have parity amongst organizations. Right now, those organizations include Cal Ripken and PWSC.
 - 4) Todd spoke out that he would like to see a breakdown on all maintenance and operational costs for the pool....by the hour.
 - 5) Jeff offered that this drive for balance is driven by the PRC and not him. The PRC backed up this statement.
 - 6) When costs were compared to Crotched Mtn Rehabilitation Center's (CMRC) fees for the PWSC's use of their pool, Dick Cuddihee spoke up.
 - 7) He felt that CMRC's fees have nothing to do with the PRD.
 - a) Different community atmosphere
 - b) 25 weeks of use versus 6 weeks
 - c) Warm water versus cold water
 - d) Hence, he would not disclose what the PWSC pays CMRC.
 - 8) Dick felt the PWSC paid \$450 to the PRD in 2009, from non-resident fees that averages over the whole club.
 - 9) The PWSC parents felt a lot of this fee discussion was "bothersome" because they utilize the pool when the general public does not, so there should be no new issues. Even the 4:30 to 5:30pm time slot – the pool was closed and they asked to use it.
 - 10) Todd stated that because the PWSC uses the time during the late afternoon, even if we were dealing with an extremely hot summer, we would not be able to open the pool to taxpayers because of the Wave's use of the pool during

- that time.
- 11) Andy spoke, addressing two points:
 - a) Jeff is carrying out the wishes of the PRC and
 - b) the PRC's responsibility is to the tax payers of Peterborough.
 - c) Yes, we are in a bad economic time with severe budget issues and the PRC needs to make any alterations they see fit to protect the Peterborough taxpayers during these times.
 - 12) He continued that if the costs of the pool are strictly covered by the taxpayers, then the taxpayers should not be restricted from its use. An equitable balance needs to be defined and carried out.
 - 13) Tina interjected that recreation will never be a revenue center and the PRC has an obligation to the current budget crisis.
 - 14) Talk continued about the age of the pool and maintenance costs. Many PWSC parents felt they should not be held liable for maintenance issues when they use the pool when the pool was originally closed and the age of the pool has nothing to do with them.
 - 15) Andy countered that the "big picture" needs to be looked at.
 - 16) It was decided that if any pool dollars should be broken out, it should be operational costs on an hourly basis.
 - 17) Kirsten Barwood wanted a cost comparison, apples to apples.
 - 18) Jeff presented costs from the Dover pools that were much higher than what the PRC was proposing.
 - 19) Conversation ensued about how much the Peterborough Tax payers pay – for recreational services – as compared to any of the other adjacent Towns. Again, why should Peterborough tax payers pay for recreational services for surrounding towns?
 - 20) Barbara Miller continued on this thought saying the Peterborough taxpayers had to absorb a \$300,000 downshift this past year and it looks like that may very well happen again this coming year. That is \$600,000, in two years, representing 13% of the Peterborough budget. The BOS gave a directive to the departments to try to maintain their standards while operating on a flat budget as compared to last year.
 - 21) Jeff continued that the PRD budget is actually down 14% for the upcoming year which makes matters more difficult.
 - 22) The conversation deviated to the PRD/PRC trying to get a bond for the pool to fix it now and pay for it later, but that was voted off the ballot due to the difficult economic times. They will try again next year.
 - 23) On May's agenda, the PRC wants to put the PWSC fee on the floor to be discussed. This would be a lump sum would represent equitability and will not be presented in the form of "resident versus non-resident". Tina volunteered to take the operational costs...compare then to the increase in Non-resident pool fees in 2010 and strike up a balance.
 - 24) The PWSC will be at the meeting at 7:00pm, in May, to find out the

resolution.

25) Jeff will be in touch with Dick Cuddihee in the meantime.

- B) A heated discussion amongst those present after the PWSC representatives left in the meeting room caused a 2 minute recess to be taken. The meeting then resumed with attention on additional items on the Director's Report.
- C) The fence on Union Street was discussed, while there may be a standard of care issue in reducing the height of the fence, the folks from the Local Government Center did not think it would cause a problem to go a lower fence. Many felt that the fence should remain high on the hill...not closer to the softball fields.
- D) Paula and Jeff met prior to this meeting and drew up another set of scholarship criteria. In looking at it as well as what was written down before, it was determined that the two sets of criteria are very similar and the big piece that needs to happen is adherence to the policies. It is going to be hard this year because of the economy and the reduction of State Funds, but adherence is going to be the key factor in the issuing of scholarships this year.
- E) Non-resident pool pass fees as well as swimming lesson fees were addressed. The PRC supported Jeff's proposed changes.
- F) Jeff also said the general pricing of programming is changing a bit. Instead of holding prices firm for several years then increasing fees substantially...the PRD is raising fees slightly over much shorter spans of time.
- G) Staffing was addressed. Seven playground program staff members are returning. Jeff feels that this is all he will hire. The ratios will not be as good as he wants them but they will be sufficient. The budget constraints are driving this decision.
- H) We need to hire a tennis instructor.
- I) Lacrosse is coming along.

V) Action Items List:

- A) Andy brought in an article regarding ice skating on shallow ponds.
- B) No other items were discussed.

VI) New Business:

- A) Andy expressed his concern over casino trips for it is his feeling these types of trips could support an addictive habit. He made a motion to suggest to Jeff that he does not run these types of recreational trips. No one seconded. Motion denied.
- B) Conversation went back to a topic brought up last month that the PRC needs to be supportive of the PRD in reducing the number of program offerings due to staffing and budget cuts. Jeff stated that the office work is overwhelming right now, especially being down a person.
- C) Andy made a motion for the PRC to have another meeting in 2 weeks (without Jeff's presence) to address the issues surrounding the PWSC fee issue so a concrete, defining answer can be given to the PWSC when they come in May. Tina seconded. Unanimous approval.
 - 1) Tina said that she would orchestrate the collecting of pertinent information so the

PWSC's financial responsibility is sound.

- 2) She wanted copies of the bills related in the operational aspect of the pool and then she would correlate them.
- 3) No date was determined but it would be set to occur around mid month.
- D) Jeff told the Board about a Pool/Pond safety meeting that he and Lisa went to – presented by the Local Government Center (LGC). The new trend in pool/pond safety seems to include life jackets for little children, 7 years of age and younger, and for those who do not swim. This is determined by giving swim tests to all and if they cannot swim they get a yellow bracelet and lifejacket to use in the water.
 - 1) Signs were also a big component of making the water area safer.
 - 2) The dangers of “holding your breath under water” was also discussed and illustrated.
 - 3) This program seems to be a program the LGC seems to support.
 - 4) Jeff asked the board if the PRD should participate in their pilot program.
 - 5) The PRC was supportive of this approach in trying to keep our waterfronts safe.

VII) Before the PRC went into a non public session, Andy wanted Jeff and Lisa to know that he felt we were doing a good job especially with the staff reduction and budgetary issues. Other Board members agreed. Andy made a motion, at 8:55pm, to enter a non-public session to discuss personnel. 2nd by Tina, unanimous approval. No action was taken. Andy moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:07pm. Todd seconded. Unanimous approval.

VIII) Adjournment: Andy moved to adjourn at 9:07pm, Todd seconded it. Unanimous approval.

Respectfully submitted by Lisa Betz, PRC Minute Taker 04-12-10.