

Peterborough Recreation Committee (PRC) Meeting
Roland "Beaver" Jutras Recreation Building Minutes
of January 25, 2017, 7:00 PM
Approved

Attendees: Andrew Dunbar, Chair (had to leave at 8pm); Heather McClusky, Vice Chair;
Howard Russell, Chris Kotula; Jeffrey M. King, Recreation Director; Lisa Koziell-Betz,
Program Coordinator and Minute Taker

- I. Meeting called to order: Andy called the meeting to order at 7:00PM.
- II. Approval of Minutes: It was agreed this was a special meeting to address budgetary concerns so the approval of minutes will be moved to a later date.
- III. The board was tasked with reducing the budget by \$35,593, increasing revenue by \$35,593 or a combination of the two. Initially, Jeff gave the board an update that the Town is approaching a budgetary season where – even if all departments came in flat and the overall budget came in flat – there would still be an increase in taxes due to forecasted projects such as the downtown bridge projects. This fact is uncontrollable. Because many of the departments cannot generate revenue, eyes have focused on the recreation department that can generate revenue. The PRD projected revenue to offset expenses is about 10% of the PRD expense budget. As compared to last year, the PRD budget is up \$35,593 (after revenues). The town administrator asked us if we can find revenue sources or cut the budget so the overall PRD budget is flat as compared to last year.
 - A) Jeff reminded the board that revolving fund monies are not counted in these cuts for the request was to maintain a flat general fund balance.
 - B) Tonight's meeting is being held because the PRD goes before the Budget Committee and Selectboard next Tuesday, January 31st. Jeff wanted a proposal on how to accomplish the above to present from the PRC.

- 1) First proposal: By Jeff...provide non-resident passes to Cunningham Pond, in a limited number, for the season and charge for them. Jeff proposed 200 passes be allowed to be issued at \$100 each. This would bring in \$20,000.
 - a. End result: sell 100 passes for nonresidents, at \$100/pass. This would bring in an estimated \$10,000. Motioned by Heather, seconded by Chris, unanimous approval. Board realizes this need to be presented at Town Meeting before being implemented.
 - b. Reasoning: Board felt 200 passes were too much for Cunningham Pond. They wanted to start off with 100 and see what the impact is.
 - i. Stickers issued for Cunningham Pond has fallen since the new pool facility was opened. Last year, Jeff said 782 stickers were issued versus the approximately 1,200 to 1,500 stickers back in the late 2000's.
 - c. Other Pond revenue ideas:
 - i. Rent out the camping area. Preliminary thought that needs to be investigated.
 1. Cannot rent over the winter, bathrooms not heated.
 2. Need to consider the feasibility of running a rentable campground.
 3. Need to look at liability issues.
 - ii. Increasing boat rental rates: Chris preferred to advertise the boat rentals more to increase usage versus increase price.

- iii. A new sign needs to be placed regarding ticketing and the seasonal stickers.
- d. It was asked if we have examples as to other towns charging for non-resident pond passes.
 - i. Four examples were given. One was Margaret Lindley Park in Williamstown, MA back in 1993, where they charged \$50.00/season. Jeff went on to explain that this was many years ago, for a man-made pond, that did not have the amenities Cunningham Pond does.
 - ii. Heather mentioned Dublin Lake and she thinks they charge \$100.
 - iii. MacDowell Lake is free but they run into e-coli issues, has a small swimming area, no lifeguards and is a Federal facility operated by the U.S. Army Corps. of Engineers.
 - iv. Andy asked about Sargent Camp. Their swimming area is not open to the public during the summer months due to their own programming that is going on. The boat ramp is open.
- e. Second Proposal: By Jeff...charge a daily pass rate to Cunningham Pond, \$10 for non-residents as well as residents who did not have their pass. Limit daily pass quantities to 20/day. This would generate \$17,000. This figure is based upon 85 pond days x 20 passes x \$10.00. Currently, residents get 1 free beach sticker per household. Any additional stickers for that household are charged at \$10/sticker. Guests of residents can get a temporary pass and get in free. There is not a charge for this temporary pass.
- f. End result: Estimate receiving \$5,000 in revenue from daily pass selling at the pond. Details still need to be worked out. Motion made by Heather, seconded by Chris, approved unanimously.
- g. Reasoning: 85 days and maxing at 20 passes a day seems unreasonable. Plus, the extra strain due to attendance could increase other expenses: maintenance, repairs, lifeguards.
 - i. Do not want to burden residents with paying a daily rate.
 - ii. It was asked if anyone knew the parking capacity of CP. No one knew for sure because the spots are not delineated and a lot depends on the size of vehicles.
 - iii. If non-residents get a pass, what happens when they bring guests? Does this get rid of the “guests only” verbiage of the current town mandate regarding Cunningham Pond?
 - iv. Thought about charging \$5/car, across the board. This idea was discussed then rejected based upon many residents like getting something free (that first sticker) for their tax dollars.
 - v. Some wondered if we would need to hire more personnel to enforce the new program.
 - vi. Many felt that too many passes would lead to too many additional costs.
 - vii. The facility supervisor position was asked about and that person’s role in facilities.
 - 1. Jeff said that this position is vacant and he wants to revamp the program description to make it more conducive to the needs of the PRD. It is also funded entirely from the recreation revolving fund so has no impact on the tax-supported side of the budget.
- h. Board realizes this needs to be addressed at Town Meeting.
- 2) Third Proposal: By Chris...cut the proposed custodial position addition in half, reducing \$9,952 from the currently proposed expense budget.
 - a. End Result: Motion by Chris, seconded by Heather, approved unanimously.
 - b. Reasoning: Because we desperately need more custodial help, especially with the added burdens of cleaning all the facilities, the board felt the position should not be cut in its entirety, but cut in half and see what impact it has on the upcoming year. Something is better than nothing and for the following year, the department can see if the added custodial staff is adequate or if more is needed.
- 3) Fourth Proposal: While this is too early to vote on, having Bingo nights held at the PCC was discussed. All in attendance (Andy left prior to this discussion) were in favor of Jeff pursuing getting RSA287-E approval, but this probably needs to be done at Town Meeting. If we can move things forward, legally, there is a chance to get this up and running by July/August which would positively affect incoming revenue in the upcoming budget season.

- a. Due to ordinances needing to be approved, the “How” and “When” was not discussed.
- b. Due to some legal issues that need to be addressed, the verbiage as to what this money raised would go to was not addressed.
- c. Heather and Howard thought this would be an excellent way of generating revenue, Although Chris said he knew very little about bingo but was interested in exploring the option further.
- d. There may be a dictate where a municipality cannot run such an event. In this case, a “friends of recreation” group may need to be formed to run something like this. If this does happen, this group could become a 501(c)(3) group which would have more access to grant monies. More access than the municipality’s non-profit status has.
- e. With the kitchen at the PCC, this would lend to selling food at the events.

In Summary:

Additional revenue proposed: \$15,000

Reduction in budget proposal: \$ 9,952

Total overall budget decrease: \$24,952

(from a revenue as well as an expense perspective)

Some other discussions that occurred during the meeting:

- 1) Raid the revolving fund: not a good idea with the revolving fund covering the PCC expenses.
 - a. Need to rehabilitate the gym floor
 - b. May need money to assist the mini-bus purchase
- 2) Increase signage about rentals at CP regarding rental rates to generate revenue.
- 3) Build racks at CP that kayaks and paddleboards can go on. The goal: rent these spaces out to residents to store their equipment on so they do not have to transport their boats to CP every time.
 - a. It was suggested that we get this thought out to the public and see who is interested. When 6 folks express interest and pay, then a rack can be built.
 - b. The racks can be built per need.
- 4) Andy addressed ice skating and with the warming winter weather trend, could ice skating monies be cut out of the budget? Actual dollars were discussed but the amount was not seen as substantial enough to cut and make a decent contribution to the request of creating a flat budget.
 - a. Jeff is very interested to get some feedback regarding other town’s experience with their rinks this winter. If we did have the rink up, he thinks the maintenance expenses would be high due to the ever-changing weather extremes we have experienced.
 - b. Maintaining a rink is very labor intensive to do it correctly.
- 5) Heather asked about the advertising budget. Jeff said we are on our way to learning programs to publish brochures in-house and that money will be needed. The goal is to do brochures several times a year.
- 6) Uniform line item was addressed. Heather did not realize that was uniforms for the staff versus sports uniforms for kids. Her thought was that if our kids’ sports programs were on the decline, so should that budget. Everyone now understands the difference.
 - a. The biggest expense for uniforms is for the lifeguards.
 - b. Needs change due to weather and employee turnover.

- 7) Chris asked if programming fees can be increased for seniors to generate revenue. Talk ensued about how seniors do not like to pay and, at this point, fees are artificially low anyway.
 - a. Senior programs are subsidized through:
 - i. Some monies allocated in the general fund
 - ii. Salaried employees work on projects
 - iii. Printing costs for programs
 - b. Senior program is a conundrum because the need is high but the revenues from these programs are low.
- 8) Heather asked if we HAD to cut \$35,000 or if it was asked if we could. There was not a definitive answer.
- 9) Cut the roof expense? Cost will only increase, never decrease. The roof is 25 years old and needs to be replaced. A delay this year is just that, a delay. It should be addressed.
- 10) Cut painting the pool? This must be done! It should be repainted every 4 to 5 years and we are on the 5th year.
- 11) Increase fees for pool usage? No, due to LWCF rules. There are many areas around the PRD that have been improved/built with Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) monies.
 - a. These are federal monies that were matched 50% by local funds.
 - b. Once an area is built or improved with LWCF monies, the land is deemed to be for recreation, in perpetuity.
 - c. LWCF have requirements regarding usage fees and keeping them relatively low. Because the pool is adjacent to facilities improved or built by LWCF monies, the pool is subject to keeping those fees in-check also.
 - d. We cannot increase user fees for the pool.
- 12) Increase STC program fees? Would only generate minimal revenue and make the programs cost-prohibitive, thus killing the programs. For the fiscal year 2007/08, the leaders (STC and Playground Program) pay was removed from the general fund so the programs had to charge a rate that was unacceptable to participants. It has taken many years to build the programs back up since then.
 - a. 2016, the Playground Program had 60 to 70 participants.
 - b. 2016, STC had about 40 attendees, divided over two sessions.
- 13) A possible "Friends of Recreation" group to get 501(c)(3) status. The PRD had an unpleasant experience with a previous attempt to start one so we should proceed carefully. This would depend upon Bingo outcome.
- 14) Chatted a little bit about the Country Club...plowing and the use of the sledding hill.

IV. Additional discussion: It was asked if the next PRC meeting, scheduled for next Wednesday, should be put off until March. There is only one subject that needs to be addressed but Jeff felt that could wait a month. Chris, Heather and Howard felt that they could wait until the first week in March to meet again but wanted to defer to whatever Andy (the Chair) said. Jeff will talk to Andy and they will decide.

V. Adjournment: 9:02pm, unanimous approval

Respectively submitted by Lisa Koziell-Betz, Program Coordinator