

Peterborough Recreation Committee (PRC) Meeting
Roland "Beaver" Jutras Recreation Building
Minutes of December 6, 2017
Approved

Attendees: Andrew Dunbar, Chair; Heather McClusky, Vice Chair; Chris Kotula, Secretary; Kate Coon; Ryan Griffiths; Jeffrey M. King, Recreation Director; Lisa Koziell-Betz, Program Coordinator and Minute Taker

- I. Call to Order: Andy called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.
- II. Approval of Minutes:
 - A. Ryan made the motion to approve the Minutes of October 4th with Kate seconding the motion. It was unanimously approved.
 - B. Note: There was not a meeting in November.
- III. The Director's, Program, Senior Program, Revolving Fund and Outstanding Balance reports were accepted as submitted. Below are a few notes regarding them:
 - A. Ryan asked if a brochure will be out soon. Yes – was the answer – in early February.
 - B. Kate asked what DCA stood for on the facility outstanding balance report, Lisa said it was for Dublin Christian Academy and their standing with us is good. They will pay.
 - C. Andy asked about the program outstanding balance report for programs. It was not submitted this month due to the Holiday of Trees event coming up.
- IV. Overall FY 2019 Budget Discussion:
 - A. The nuts and bolts of the proposed budget? The proposed 2019 budget shows a 2.2% increase which is in line with the Consumer Price Index (up 2.5% between 1/2016 and 1/2017). The rate of inflation is averaging 2 %. With the additional estimated revenue that the PRD is looking to take in, the overall 2019 proposed budget increase is .36%.
 - i. Ryan moved to accept the budget as presented. Heather seconded.
 - ii. Unanimous approval.
 - B. Jeff went over the basic format of the budget presentation.
 - C. Jeff also said that he does not have all the reports he usually has due to a hold up in Finance. He did present a couple of reports that were confusing (due to the layout of the report) or handwritten. This was what we had to work with given the lack of regular financials.
 - D. An explanation of the revolving fund versus the general fund was given. The general fund is money that involves tax payer monies that deal with operational expenses while the revolving fund is centered more around programs. The PCC – per the Board of Selectmen – was accepted by the Town with the understanding that it would not be a burden to tax payers for recreational services. As such, the PRD revolving fund is used for PCC operational expenses except for 27% of the PCC operational expenses used by the food pantry. This portion is paid by Buildings and Grounds.
 - i. Expenditure tax supported operating budget = general fund.

- ii. General fund monies are allocated on a yearly basis. After the fiscal year, what is not spent is reabsorbed. One cannot go over budget. The revolving fund is not constrained by any timeline...money goes in, money goes out.
 - E. A further explanation was given – using the pool as an example. The general funds take care of the operations of the pool as well as the lifeguard’s wages when they are “lifeguarding” during regular hours of operation. When these same lifeguards teach swimming lessons, their wages come out of the revolving fund – paid by monies taken in for swimming lessons.
 - F. Some confusion arose as to why, if we had monies for operational needs, are the programs so expensive. Jeff explained that different programs have different requirements and sometimes the programs are more affordable due to the additional general fund moneys for operational expenses. Sometimes though, there are big ticket items that are paid through collected programming fees (revolving fund) that would not be paid for otherwise. An example of this was the \$5,000 light repair job done on the field lights. The adult softball line item paid for this because they are the main users of the outdoor lights. If we did not have the monies in that particular line item, the lights – in all likelihood - would not be fixed. Especially considering the future demands on the Town’s budget over all with the library, fire department and DPW proposals. Many agreed that this was true.
 - G. Encumbrances. This is money allocated through a purchase order. That does not mean the monies are necessarily spent at the time of the report – they are encumbered to be applied towards an expense so on the report it looks like an actual expense.
 - H. Revenue Status Report: After explaining how to read it, Jeff made note that we were up in three revenue categories, down in one – most likely down due to the cold summer. The rental of paddleboards was up \$3,495, beach sticker revenue was up \$5,056 and the rental of facilities (not the PCC) was up \$742.50. The only category that was down was pool registrations, down \$3,423.53. Overall, revenue was up 123% at \$6,396.11!!
 - I. Ryan asked if the PRD is recognized for being under budget ever year and producing this sort of revenue. Jeff said that no, not directly.
 - i. One can breakout this information in the Annual Town Report, but that can be a difficult task when the Rec budget is put under “Culture and Recreation”. “Culture” includes the library. Because the Department of Revenue clumps these two together, the Town does also - despite numerous requests to separate them.
 - J. This hides what Recreation actually does, expense and revenue wise.
- V. Specific Categories within the Proposed Budget:
- A. Projected revenue budget for 2019 is:
 - i. \$6,000 for rentals of paddleboards
 - ii. \$7,200 for beach stickers
 - iii. \$22,500 for pool registrations
 - iv. \$1,000 for rental of facilities

- v. \$66,500 from the Isabelle Miller Fund for the gym floor and windows at the PCC. The gym floor renovation has already been approved. The window repair/replacement is a new proposal that needs to be approved by the PCC.
 - a. Usually, the PRD receives about \$20,000/year (interest only) to be used for new recreational opportunities.
 - b. These monies, historically, are accumulated over the years to pay for big ticket items like the one being proposed for Spring 2018.
 - c. The balance of the Isabelle Miller Fund is believed to be over \$100,000 but that could not be verified before the meeting.
 - vi. The overall anticipated revenue increase is \$9,950, totaling \$36,700.
- B. Salaries: The figures of the salary budget within the dark yellow highlights are last year's numbers. Jeff did not have the report needed from Finance to fill in the actual projected numbers for things like the cafeteria plan, life insurance, workman's comp etc. These highlighted items – when adjusted – will affect the overall budget proposal but he had no idea as to the extent. Should be minimal.
- i. While the numbers given in the summary sheet is correct for wages, there is an error due to the lack of specific reports from finance.
 - ii. Another confusion was caused by the fact that only three (out of 8) program staff members are paid by the general fund. This includes the 2 STC staff and 1 Playground Program staff leader.
 - iii. Jeff also explained that some of our staff – like Lauren and Gloria – are paid through both funds which makes calculations by hand a bit trickier.
 - iv. Why pay the three program staff members through the general fund? Because if we did not, the program would not be affordable to many participants.
 - a. In 2007/08, the monies were taken out causing us to dramatically increase the price of the programs to cover the cost of the program. We experienced very low registration numbers that year.
 - b. Another example given was Lacrosse. We will probably charge \$150/player in Spring 2018. While the general fund covers the field maintenance expenses, the fees collected from participants covers uniforms, LAX equipment, referees, dues to national organization, background checks, some monies allocated in case we need to mark field at the Dublin School for PRD use, coach training etc.
 - c. Jeff reminded the board that he has been tasked with trying to fund programs directly, trying to reduce the use of the general fund for programs.
 - d. He has also been tasked with generating revenue.
 - v. Maintenance salaries: With the retirement of one of our maintenance guys a couple weeks ago, Jeff has restructured the maintenance payroll to better address our custodial needs at the PCC.

- a. The 14 hours/week for 22 weeks, that was approved for this year, will be added to the hours used by the retired maintenance worker so one of the current maintenance workers can work 28 hours/per week, year round. His job would now be maintenance and custodial.
 - b. The workers from Monadnock Work Source are no longer cleaning the PCC 2x/week. Monies saved here will be applied towards the 28 hours.
 - c. Summer staff will be impacted a little. Instead of having three, 28 hour/week for 30 weeks workers, we will only have two dedicated strictly for maintenance and the one listed above will do both.
 - d. These changes result in an overall projected wage decrease of \$1,235.
 - e. Aquatic Staff Salaries are down \$1,851 to better match what was spent in fiscal 2018. These wages are so dependent upon Mother Nature that it is always risky estimating.
- C. Administrative Expense Budget: Several categories are down despite the fact the overall proposal is up 7.9%. This is because the pool painting and roof replacement were removed from last year's budget proposal and we cannot keep holding off on these items.
- i. The \$3,578 reduction in "other professional services" is due to the fact that the monies appropriated for a study on the drainage issue at Cunningham Pond is no longer relevant. The study was done in-house instead of contracting out professionally.
 - ii. "Outside Services" is a new line item representing the expenses for the security cameras. Albeit being a lot of money, and some saying we probably will not experience \$6,828 worth of vandalism, it was agreed upon this expense is probably necessary for the safety of our staff as well as our facilities.
 - iii. One paragraph – in the maintenance portion of the budget (page 37) needs to be removed. While the budget proposal numbers are correct, the camera expense paragraph does not apply. By removing this paragraph, it will not appear as though the cameras are double budgeted.
 - iv. Kate asked if the repair of the crack at the pool was in the proposed 2019 budget. Jeff said "no" because it will have to be done in this fiscal year.
- D. Programs Expense Budget: This portion of the budget produced little discussion.
- i. Andy asked about the purchase of additional tables for programming, whether it will come out of the revolving fund or the general fund. That will be determined at a later time.
 - ii. A question was asked about the credit card fees.
 - a. For every credit card payment through MyRec, we need to allocate monies set aside to pay for those fees.

- b. Regarding credit card purchases made with the Town Card, Jeff said we have detailed receipts if anyone wants to see them.
- E. Maintenance Expense Budget: Proposed budget is flat except for the contacted services for the pool painting and the office roof repair.
 - i. The PRC said that they would like to see the all the bids for these two jobs before the work is done. Jeff agreed.
 - ii. The bids should be numerous for the replacement of the roof but seeing how the painting of the pool is specialized, he expects few bids on that job.
 - iii. The bids will be advertised locally and through Construction Services wires.
 - iv. Ryan asked about the financial breakouts of things like fertilizer. Jeff said he did not break everything down, but from what he could recall, the last time the properties were fertilized, it took (35) 50 pounds bags.
- F. Vehicle Budget: Not discussed.
- G. Miscellaneous Sidebars:
 - i. Revolving fund expenditures in 2016/17 was \$152,362. This number came out as a demonstration of what extra expenses the PRD incurs outside of the general fund and our ability to offer a variety of programs because of the revolving fund.
 - ii. Andy reminded everyone about the perception out there that many, many towns feel they are entitled to the PRD facilities and programs despite not paying taxes. A discussion ensued about this.
 - a. Sharon pays \$0 towards recreation, Bennington budgets \$35,000 and Antrim's rec budget was \$70,000
 - b. The average for CV towns is \$35,000/town
 - c. Peterborough has a half million-dollar budget.
 - iii. Andy told the board that back when (during Beaver's time) and agreement was made with the school that if we use their properties, we need to let the rest of the CV towns use ours. This was a very poor agreement that has led to some of the towns believing that is still true. It is not.
 - a. Based upon a 20+ year old study that the Town conducted, about half the users of the PRD properties are not Peterborough residents. Andy believes there is still a lot of use of Peterborough recreation by non-residents.
 - b. Many years ago, a group representing the Town of Peterborough management went to the Sharon Board of Selectmen saying if they pay into the PRD like residents do, then they would receive the benefits Peterborough residents do. They said "no".
 - c. This is an ongoing struggle.
 - iv. Jeff talked about the huge, \$8,500, custodial fee the PRD incurred for the use of CV school facilities when he was hired. This was just for basketball. Much of that \$8,500 paid for times the janitors were on duty anyway. A meeting was held to rectify the situation resulting in not paying when school janitors

were on duty anyway and training our own folks to do the janitorial duties when the school staff was not there.

- v. Jeff also told the PRC he just has a meeting with Kimberly Saunders (CV school district superintendent) and she is putting \$6,000 into the school budget to cover the use of our tennis courts and fields. This has never happened before. We'll see if this makes it through the voting process.

- VI. Adjournment: Andy motioned to adjourn the meeting and Kate seconded. With unanimous approval, the meeting adjourned at 7:27pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Lisa Koziell-Betz,
Minute Taker
December 7, 2017