

|  |                        |
|--|------------------------|
| <b>Parks &amp; Recreation Policy Review Subcommittee</b> | <b>Meeting Minutes</b> |
|--|------------------------|

**Date: November 15, 2021**

**Place: Zoom Webinar**

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

**Members Absent:** Jessica Zarni White, John Bain

| <b>TOPIC</b>   | <b>KEY POINTS/DISCUSSION</b>   |
|--|--|
| <b>Chairperson's Welcome/Introduction</b>                                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting commenced @ 11:30 AM</li> <li>• N. O'Connor welcomed all and moved to approve the minutes of:<br/>12/17/2019<br/>01/07/2020<br/>01/28/2020<br/>2/25/2020 – as amended<br/>W. Sheridan Ames: Accepted as stated; N. O'Connor 2<sup>nd</sup>.<br/><b>Roll call:</b><br/>Approved: W. Sheridan Ames; N. O'Connor<br/>Abstained: T. Mooney</li> <li>• Approval of 11/8/2021 minutes<br/>N. O'Connor moved to approve, Theresa 2<sup>nd</sup>.<br/><b>Roll call:</b><br/>Approved: W. Sheridan Ames; T. Mooney; N. O'Connor</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Discussion of Policy Language with Additional Tier for Special Events</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• L. Jackson: Presented the draft of the Town Owned Athletic Facilities Allocation Policy – Priorities 3 &amp; 4.<br/>Priority 3: Added language regarding competition coming into town, though they will not likely get a permit if we have the same sport already permitted and group in good standing.<br/>Priority 4: We need to define the term “special events”.<br/>Added language that an applicant will be charged minimum 2-hour block.</li> <li>• W. Sheridan Ames: Regarding weekend clinics – do we want to charge them more than an outside group special event? We need to be thoughtful who is being charged and what is the appropriate fee.</li> <li>• T. Mooney: We need to see how this is going to translate into pricing.</li> <li>• W. Sheridan Ames: We should just have parties and special events listed under #4.</li> <li>• A. Cassie: Do we host tournaments?</li> <li>• W. Sheridan Ames: Brookline high school students host soccer</li> </ul> |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   | <p>event – which could be perceived as a tournament but it is a fundraiser.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• J. Lewitus: Is it good to define each special event such as tournaments, etc.?</li> <li>• W. Sheridan Ames: Suggested these specific definitions exist at the Recreation Department level at their discretion.</li> <li>• J. Lewitus: Priority #4, should we state a minimum number of hours? Set a minimum of two hours.</li> <li>• W. Sheridan Ames: Would these time minimums apply to small one-time nonresident events, such as parties?</li> <li>• N. O’Connor: Do we need the word “party” or just call it special events?</li> <li>• T. Mooney: We would want to differentiate nonprofit versus for-profit events.</li> <li>• A. Cassie: We could use the term community event versus a special event such as a family picnic.</li> <li>• L. Jackson: Would we add for-profit like a for-profit fundraiser?</li> <li>• N. O’Connor: As an example, a for-profit event versus a nonprofit community event.</li> <li>• L. Jackson: Let’s come up with fee structures under the priority section in the policy.</li> <li>• J. Lewitus: Under Priority #3, for a small one-time resident event, how do we want to quantify small? 25 or less? If there are 27 it would be at our discretion to increase or not.</li> </ul> |  |
| <p><b>Discussion of Adding Additional Fee for Lights, Synthetic Field, etc.</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• L. Jackson: I hope to have this discussion, put a fee structure together and then vote at next meeting.<br/>From the market analysis we did, some towns more for lights and double for synthetic field use.</li> <li>• A. Cassie: Other towns light fees range from \$15 – \$50 per hour.</li> <li>• W. Sheridan Ames: How do light fees tie into cost recovery?</li> <li>• A. Cassie: We will be looking at meter readings and the electric bills to see what it costs.</li> <li>• W. Sheridan Ames: Not knowing the cost, it is hard to consider the fee before we make a policy decision,</li> <li>• A. Cassie: We have the electricity costs per park, but we do not have specifics as to the light costs. An educated guess would be 50% for ballfields and multi-use fields or \$16,000.</li> <li>• L. Jackson: Can you pull those figures together for the next meeting?</li> <li>• N. O’Connor: Perhaps we should we take a week off from these meetings and give extra time for gathering this information.</li> <li>• W. Sheridan Ames: The most appropriate use of lights is on synthetic fields versus grass fields. Lighting on the synthetic fields would extend programs and working people tend to use fields in the evenings. With costs being covered by capital</li> </ul>                  |  |

budget, why are we adding cost for lights?

- A. Cassie: As we increase user fees it would cover cost for lights for ballfields and multiuse fields.
- N. O'Connor: We will never get to full cost recovery hence the need to charge for lights.
- W. Sheridan Ames: Isn't the cost recovery already in the Park and Open space budget?
- A. Cassie: In the \$33,600 utility budget, roughly 50% is allocated to ball and multi-use fields.
- G. Kelly: The town pays for Brookline Ave. and Park and Open Space pays for Cypress field.
- W. Sheridan Ames: I am comfortable with a separate charge for lights if the cost recovery rate is higher.
- L. Jackson: Alex will put together the figures and report back.
- T. Mooney: I like the idea of disseminating the cost of light across all fields. Have a lower for unlit fields and a higher rate for lit fields.
- W. Sheridan Ames: I would like to have a sense of the scale of Parks and Open Space budget. If you could break out the line item for lights, then you can compare actual cost against the cost recovery. It would be the cleanest thing to do. How recovery relates to cost?
- N. O'Connor: Just for a historical reference, when we created these fees, 10 – 12 years ago, we had no hard-core facts, we didn't have this information. Now we want to understand what actual cost recovery is.
- A. Cassie: The total expenses of Parks for our role in the multi-use and ball fields is over \$900,000. \$16,000 is not a significant amount.
- L. Jackson: We will come up with some fee ranges and options as well as what it would look like if we separated the \$16,000 into a different line item.
- A. Cassie: I will start with a range of fees and compare to what other towns charge. I think it will put us in the same pocket, but it is worth putting the numbers together
- W. Sheridan Ames: Concerned about the cost of electricity for lights – the difference between \$1000 for Waldstein and \$60,000 for the ice rink.
- T. Radicioni: We did full report of usage at our facilities, and the ice rink is running 24/7 for temp ice.
- L. Jackson: Department heads still need to meet for budget discussions. More details will follow.
- W. Sheridan Ames: For the next meeting I am curious as to of the \$900,000 that Parks and Open Space contributes to the cost, has that been factored into the cost recovery model and what

|                |   |  |
|----------------|---|--|
|                | <p>percentage is that of the overall budget.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• G. Kelly: It doesn't. It just covers the additional administrative expenses.</li> <li>• W. Sheridan Ames: Totally legitimate but I just want a sense of the percentage.</li> <li>• N. O'Connor: Alex will gather this information and present at the next meeting.</li> <li>• W. Sheridan Ames: To start the discussion of synthetic fields, certain sports prefer synthetic. If we had premium grass fields, that would be priority, but our grass fields don't get time to rest. We shouldn't charge just to charge because it is in the Capital Improvement budget. What you do with costs is relevant in the policy.</li> <li>• L. Jackson: We have a cost recovery model for athletic fields, and we are raising our fees to get closer or within our cost recovery goal range. The budget is in the revolving budget. We do send some of our budget funds to Parks for maintenance. It is all in Parks General Fund account.</li> <li>• N. O'Connor: When we instituted fees, they were to support a park ranger and maintenance on fields. The fees were supposed to go up incrementally, but it did not. Putting these funds into a revolving account makes it easier to move funds around.</li> <li>• T. Mooney: We need a brief rationale for the price increase to brought back to the Commission. The why.</li> <li>• L. Jackson: Do we keep charging separate fee for synthetic fields?</li> <li>• W. Sheridan Ames: This makes sense, but we will need to review Alex and Gerry's numbers.</li> <li>• J. Lewitus: Regarding the cost recovery process, where are we compared to other towns?</li> <li>• G. Kelly: There is always flexibility. We are going to use these numbers to see how we going to raise funds for programs, etc.</li> <li>• L. Jackson: To summarize, we need an understandable fee structure table. I will find out the original fee purpose 10 years ago in the Commission votes notes. We will create a special event model as well as articulate a statement to the Commission as to why we are changing fees. Alex will pull together information on the lighting costs.</li> <li>• N. O'Connor: There will be no meeting on November 22nd;</li> </ul> |  |
| <b>Adjourn</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting adjourned @ 1:00 PM</li> </ul>   |  |

**Next Meeting: Nov. 29, 2021 @ 11:30 AM**

**Location: Zoom Webinar**

**A true record**  
**Attest: Laurie Ferrell**

**Date: November 15, 2021**