

Parks & Recreation Policy Review Subcommittee	Meeting Minutes
----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------

Date: November 8, 2021

Place: Zoom Webinar

Subcommittee Members Attending: Leigh Jackson, Alex Cassie, Gerry Kelly, Jon Lewitus, Theresa Mooney, Nancy O'Connor, Wendy Sheridan Ames, Tyler Radicioni, Laurie Ferrell

Members Absent: Alexandra Vecchio,

Staff:

TOPIC	KEY POINTS/DISCUSSION
Chairperson's Welcome/Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting commenced @ 11:30 • N. O'Connor asked for the approval of the 11/1/21 minutes. • W. Sheridan Ames moved to approve, Nancy 2nd. • Roll call: T. Mooney, N. O'Connor, W. Sheridan Ames all approved. • It was decided that the approval of the prior meeting minutes be moved to the 11/15/21 meeting.
Adding Additional Fee Structure for Sports Camps, Clinics, Special Events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L. Jackson: Under Priority 3: These events are normally run by private, for-profit organizations making consider having them fall under new Priority 4. Then I propose to charge a separate fee for Special Events and add language under standard policy. • Discussion: • W. Sheridan Ames: Concerned that sports camps may have to adjust their contracts. When people fill out the Special Events form it should trigger a Priority 4 fee. • G. Kelly: Groups completing this form include a wide spectrum such as religious organizations, vigils, etc. Also, Boston University and Red Sox camps. We may add social sports clubs, HUB sports, private for-profit adult leagues. Brookline soccer club is an example of a sports clinic, though they are in Priority 2. • J. Lewitus: There are definition and licensing issues; different parameters for camps vs programs. Camps get licensed and inspected versus town programs do not. They cannot advertise as a camp unless they are licensed • W. Sheridan Ames: Proposed a new category - short-term events – with a new form and fee. We do not have excess space for priority groups so price should be higher for these events We don't want to be

	<p>dependent on this revenue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L. Jackson: Do we agree then to move nonresident for-profit, one-time special events from Priority 3 to Priority 4 and be clear they will have a different fee. In Priority 3 We can define clinic, camps, and programs for clarity. • W. Sheridan Ames: I think it is less about the language. We need to be very clear what priority they fall under. But you also have the exception if there is a major event happening. • N. O'Connor: Let's write it up and see what the ramifications may be. • L. Jackson: We are not in this to make money on the nonresident groups. School groups would get priority • G. Kelly: Suggests writing language for Priority 1, 2, and 3. • J. Lewitus: What were the qualifications for tournaments, etc. in our survey of similar towns? • A. Cassie: Camps, clinics, and events cause more damage to a facility, so higher fee. • W. Sheridan Ames: The staff should present a draft of an easy plan to guide callers to the correct Priority price • L. Jackson: Will define Priority 3 and create language for Priority 4 to present at next meeting • 	
<p>Good Standing Definition</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L. Jackson: To be in Good Standing an organization has completed all obligations in their submission to the Recreation Department. They are subject to sanctions if not in good standing, we'd utilize a step warning process or move to further restricting access, until the group is again good standing. • G. Kelly: Under the new policy, men's softball went from Priority 2 to 3 (not 100% resident rate). Do we invite them to the field user annual meeting? Do we invite Babe Ruth and Pop Warner to the field user annual meeting? • N. O'Connor: There is no problem charging the nonresident rate. Invite them but charge them appropriately. Example: Baseball and Soccer teams have 2 nonresidents. Would it be at the discretion of Dept head which Priority rate? • L. Jackson: Bullet points on application include need to submit rosters, game/practice schedule, code of conduct policy. When we can revoke a permit is also 	

	<p>in Policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • W. Sheridan Ames: It is also important for our partner programs to submit these rules as well. • N. O’Connor: All these points need to be followed through and submitted on time. People need to know we are serious. • J. Lewitus: Is there a line “at the discretion of dept head”? to give us some wiggle room? • N. O’Connor: What about conflicting programs? • L. Jackson: We will provide language about this issue. • W. Sheridan Ames: Think about having 1 group per sport for recreational play; For example, Brookline Recreation events have priority, then more competitive groups come next. • L. Jackson: Approved organizations in good standing have priority- already in policy. • N. O’Connor: Language is vague. Can we come up more sound language? • W. Sheridan Ames: We don’t have space for new groups at the expense of a well-established groups in good standing. • L. Jackson: We could add “New organizations are encouraged to coordinate with existing organizations in good standing.” • W. Sheridan Ames: It would be helpful to have an on-boarding video about our rules & regulations of our fields. • L. Jackson: Suggest that people go online to read our policies or during the initial call mention our existing teams, etc., • G. Kelly: The Annual Field Use Meeting is a chance to get together with Priority 1 & 2 groups to discuss new policies, trash rules, etc. • N. O’Connor: It is an opportunity to field questions from the groups to related town depts. • W. Sheridan Ames: This would be a good purpose of the on-boarding video. • L. Jackson: We can do that 	
<p>How to Equitably Charge Our Sports Leagues (Baseball)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L. Jackson: The question is do we charge per hour or per person understanding that most sports last 1 or 2 hours. • Our goal is to propose equitable fee structure. • W. Sheridan Ames: Supports time block model. Baseball’s cost recovery rate is 30% where others are at 80%? 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • G. Kelly: He learned from BYB in the past that baseball rates at \$15/hour is not affordable. At what point does baseball have to run their organization better? • A. Cassie: The 50-60% increase assumes an across-the-board increase. We could balance the increases – more for baseball, less for others. \$15/game = 65% increase which equals the across-the-board increase rate. • W. Sheridan Ames leaves meeting @ 12:50 • N. O’Connor: Brookline Youth Baseball initially fought fees, so we have slowly been bringing them on with phased-in fees. It has been \$27.50/head for 4 or 5 years. It is time for them to catch up. Suggested a meeting with Holden Hodges to see what other programs are charging. • T. Mooney: Could it be perceived we are giving preferential charges to baseball? Another approach would be a rate based on type of field. • L. Jackson: How could we make this equitable? Liked idea of separating out baseball fields. • G. Kelly: Cypress/Larz Anderson are multi-use fields. Would we charge for 2 fields? • L. Jackson: What’s wrong with charging the same rate for a time block – baseball and soccer – or an hourly rate? • L. Jackson: Proposed going from a per person to a time block rate. • N. O’Connor: If there are fields that they are not using, they do not pay. Example: Fields are released, and teams save team money. • A. Cassie: A 70% increase is in line with across-the-board increase. • L. Jackson: I will set up meeting with Holden Hodges, including Nancy and Wendy. 	
Adjourn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting adjourned @ 1:13 PM 	

Next Meeting: Nov. 15, 2021 @ 11:30 AM

Location: Zoom Webinar

**A true record
Attest: Laurie Ferrell**

Date: November 8, 2021