

SPOKANE PARK BOARD

Regular Monthly Meeting – 1:30 P.M. – January 12, 2012 – City Council Chambers

Minutes

1. Park Board Members Present: Ross Kelley, President; Martha Lou Wheatley-Billeter, Vice President; Jim Quigley; Jim Santorsola; Randy Cameron; Chris Wright; Susan Traver; Ken Van Voorhis; Andy Dunau; Sam Selinger; Councilman Mike Allen

Staff Present: Leroy Eadie, Mike Aho, Taylor Bressler, Rebecca Madany, Tony Madunich, Garrett Jones, Al Vorderbrueggen, Angel Spell, Leesa VanZandt, Carl Strong, Craig Butz, Debby Dodson, Jacki Faught
2. **Motion No. 1:** Martha Lou Wheatley-Billeter motioned to approve the Minutes of the December 8 Regular Park Board meeting and Park Board Study Session.
Sam Selinger seconded.
Motion Carried.
3. **Swearing in of new Park Board Members:** *Jacki Faught*
 - A. Councilman Mike Allen was sworn in as the Council Liaison for the Park Board.
4. Additions or deletions to the agenda: It was noted that Mayor Condon would be joining the Park Board meeting and speaking as soon as his previous meeting ends.
Mayor Condon joined the meeting at 2:30 p.m. and thanked the Board for the chance to speak to them. He highlighted the history and his appreciation of our Parks system. Mayor acknowledged that balancing the service needs with the amount of funding available is difficult and plans on working with the Board in the process. Mayor expressed his sincere interest to be kept apprised with what the Board is doing and working with them and the City staff. Mayor spoke of the issues with the centers and of his concerns with interfund charges.
5. **Monthly Highlights:** *Ross Kelley, President*
 - A. The Holiday Promotion brought in a record \$17,767.65 in revenue for November followed by \$43,533 in December. The total revenue from promotion is up from 2010.
 - B. Social Media efforts in 2011 resulted in over 250% growth in fans, over 4,000,000 impressions from posts and Facebook ads, continued increase in user engagement and contributed to a very successful November and December.
 - C. The Holiday Lights show had over 30,000 lights this year, with over 8,000 visitors, and exceeding \$2,800 in donations benefitting The Friends of Manito to help fund projects at Manito Park.
 - D. Park Operations Staff have designed and installed a new automated irrigation system at Shadle Park that will fully automate approximately 7 acres of park land and significantly decrease water usage and labor costs at the park. .
6. **VISITORS:**
 - A. Bonnie McDade, Executive Director Southside Senior Activity Center and Spokane Youth and Senior Centers Association member provided the Association's update.
 - B. The Association thanked Park Board members who have come out to visit the centers and thanked Chris Wright for relocating some of this year's Recreation Committee meetings to the centers.
 - C. The first Stakeholders meeting was held.

- D. The Centers are working on their budgets.
 - E. SSSAC dues went up \$10 and they have more new members than ever.
 - F. The Centers consider themselves value added partners to Parks and Recreation and are putting together a spreadsheet of all that they do.
7. **Motion No. 2:** Randy Cameron motioned to approve claims for the month of December 2011 in the amount of \$1,182,095.62.
Jim Santorsola seconded.
Motion carried.
8. Financial Report – *Rebecca Madany*
- A. Park Fund revenue is at 82% of budget and expenditures are at 93% of budget.
 - B. Golf Fund revenue is down and at 71% of budget with expenditures at 82% of budget. Designated reserves will be used to make up for the approximately \$590K shortfall.
9. **SPECIAL DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:** None
10. **FOUNDATION REPORT** – *Toni Nersesian, Executive Director*
- A. The Foundation's 60th Anniversary Celebration is this month.
 - B. Grant scholarship applications are online.
 - C. Make a Splash is beginning their 2012 meetings.
11. **COMMITTEE REPORTS** – Park Board Action Items

FINANCE COMMITTEE – January 10, 2012

- A. **Motion No. 3:** Randy Cameron motioned to approve 2012 Golf Fees based on option #2, with the recommended rate increase of 5%.
Martha Lou Wheatley-Billeter seconded.
Randy Cameron amended his motion to include the effective date of March 1, 2012.
Martha Lou Wheatley-Billeter seconded.
Motion carried.
- B. **Motion No. 4:** Randy Cameron motioned approve the "Purchases of Goods and Services under the Public Bid Dollar Thresholds Parks Policy".
Jim Santorsola seconded.
Ken Van Voorhis inquired about other contract policies.
Rebecca Madany that other contract policies that will be brought forward are the Minor Contract Policy, a policy of what we do with contract over the public bid limit, however those are not a part of this policy and are currently only in draft form.
Randy Cameron amended his motion to include the changes mentioned in the Finance Committee minutes.
Jim Santorsola seconded.
Motion carried.
- C. **Motion No. 4:** Randy Cameron motioned to approve the Contract with Northeast Youth Center, 3004 E. Queen, Spokane, WA for the provision of recreational services for youth from January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012.
Jim Quigley seconded.
Significant discussion was had on the details of the contract, the repayment of the debt that the center owes Parks and Recreation, the changes requested at Recreation Committee to all the Center contracts and the differences between the contracts of the

Centers who have Parks and Recreation employees and those that don't.
Randy Cameron withdrew his motion and asked that all contracts be addressed at the Recreation portion of today's meeting. .

Pursuant to Board members' request Mike Aho took the contracts for Legal review during the current meeting.

- D. The 2012 Capital Plan was provided to the Committee and discussed.
- E. The Preliminary December Financial Statement was provided to the Committee and reviewed.
- F. The 4th Quarter Budget Transfers were provided to the Committee but not reviewed.

GOLF COMMITTEE – January 4, 2012 – *Martha Lou Wheatley-Billeter*

- A. The 2012 Golf Budget Plan was reviewed and discussed.
- B. The Board discussed the affect the Golf Pros differing contracts would have on revenue from the greens fees increases.

LAND COMMITTEE – January 4, 2012 – *Jim Santorsola*

- A. Stormwater facilities on Parks property were reviewed by the Committee and located on a provided map. Reimbursement to Parks was also discussed.
- B. The Committee discussed the draft lease agreement with Staneks regarding Parks property at Thornton Murphy Park.
- C. The Committee discussed the Parks rules and policy regarding overnight camping on Parks property. Proposed changes to Parks rules as reflected in the Spokane Municipal Code will be an action Item at the February meeting.
- D. The results of a pending grant application for improvements to the Cannon Hill Park Pond and area are expected in late February.
- E. An upcoming article in the Inlander prompted discussion regarding Palisades Park.

RECREATION COMMITTEE – January 5, 2012 – *Chris Wright*

- A. Scott Niemeier gave an introduction to the Committee on the history of the Sinto Senior Center.
- B. The Athletic Complexes are working on allocations and waiting on the return of the contracts from user groups.
- C. The Committee discussed a letter received from Fuzzy Buckenberger on December 19, 2011 proposing new fees for 2012 -2014. The committee felt strongly about holding to the 2011-2012 fees and requested a responsive letter be sent to Mr. Buckenberger explaining the fee structure has already been adopted and he may comment on the 2013 fees in the fall.
- D. IEYSA still owes \$49K for last year and staff is working with them on payment. Allocations for January were made with an advance payment for those allocations.
- E. Aquatics was at 41% costs recovery last year.
- F. Mike Aho returned to today's meeting with the contracts reviewed and updated by Legal. The Board and Staff reviewed and discussed the changes to the contracts.
Motion No. 5: Sam Selinger motioned to approve all five center contracts as amended. Jim Quigley seconded.
Motion carried.

RIVERFRONT PARK COMMITTEE – January 9, 2012 – *Jim Quigley*

- A. **Motion No. 6:** Jim Quigley motioned to set aside up to the amount of the "one-time"

capital funds of \$387,000 and related interest for use towards design and building of a Rotary Fountain facility to be built between the carousel and the fountain. .

Jim Santorsola seconded.

Speaking to the motion:

Jim Santorsola commented that it is mandated that we have to have a bathroom. The idea grew and grew to adding several other facilities. The bathroom is the only must have. If we draw up plans for the bathroom that leaves room to develop the other items at a later date he would be happy with that. The other items do not have to be built at this time.

Randy Cameron outlined the history of the restroom, the proposed restaurant, and chemical storage facility. Plans for a restroom were developed by a former Board member but the Board could not come to an agreement on what they wanted and the plan was rejected. We had two years to come up with another plan. The Riverfront Master Plan was worked on, Duane Hille came up with a great idea for the Pavilion, however there was not a consensus with the Board on what they wanted to do with the restroom. He feels staff dropped the ball on giving the Board different ideas for the restroom and some budgetary numbers.

Chris Wright is opposed this and has been opposed to this for the last two years. The history of this, Steve McNutt's \$100,000 design that fit in well with the Fountain was rejected by the Board. Folks were unwilling to spend \$100K at that time on the restroom, yet now, ahead of the Master Plan, we are possibly spending \$400K on a facility that may be a restroom, may include a bistro, may be something else and we don't have the Master Plan done yet. He believes it is putting the cart before the horse. We may end up hamstringing our design in the park by spending this amount of money. We all know that the Rotary Fountain is not going to go anywhere and that we will need a restroom, but beyond that he doesn't think that it's a given the Carousel has to stay where it is and can't be incorporated into other areas in the park. The idea has not had a chance to be vetted. Instead we are going to commit to keeping it where it is and commit to spending \$400K. He thinks this is ridiculous and will not support it.

Ken Van Voorhis stated he has been following this for a year and is with both Randy and Chris on it. It was presented a year ago that we were going to go through the Master Plan process and collect all the information. At the same time we were going to get to a critical point and provide a focused in plan on this area. If we allocate these dollars as presented his fear is the consideration of what that space means is not completely being taken into consideration. He believes the fountain is a wonderful features, the carousel is a wonderful feature, however he does not believe that those functions in their relationship to each other are part of what the general population wants. He is in favor of the restroom, we need it and we are required to provide it, but we have not been red tagged on the restroom, he would like to continue with the draft Master Plan being presented before we commit to these dollars. He is not opposed to reviewing what staff's recommendation is but before we allocate these kind of dollars to that specific item he would like to see what it is.

Sam Selinger thinks that if we cannot decide on a Health Department request after two years that it does not show the Board's best stewardship. He normally likes the idea of a comprehensive plan before putting things in and has respect for Ken with his experience and that it is important, however he does not see the Board moving ahead rapidly with a total Master Plan that can be funded. It is a ways away. After looking at the difficulty the Board had with just figuring out a bathroom; then we look at the north bank that's empty; then look at all these other things; we take into consideration that

we might get a bond issue in these hard economic times; we look at what is coming down the line; eventually have a plan that can move forward on and be funded that would be current; he doesn't necessarily think that is in the cards. He would prefer to take this one time money, not let it go somewhere else, and put it towards this and focus on getting the bathroom done. He is not necessarily committed to the location in the original motion. He would prefer to be compliant and not wait for a red tag.

Mike Allen asked when the Master Plan is due for adoption.

Leroy Eadie advised that the schedule presented to the Board, which the Board accepted and we are right on schedule with, would bring the amended Master Plan for Riverfront Park forward for Board adoption mid-year this year in July.

Mike Allen noted it is his understanding that if the restroom project were to go forward that it would not break ground until November.

Leroy Eadie assured him it would be that long and could be a little earlier. We would wait to break ground on the project until the summer season had been closed out. We could break ground as early as after Labor Day provided we didn't have any other events.

Mike Allen clarified that before this project would be green lighted for production the Master Plan would be theoretically be adopted by that time.

Leroy Eadie asserted that to pull off everything, finding a designer, get a contractor under contract, and go through the permitting process, that we would have to get going pretty quickly. We would likely have to start the process in March or April to be in any way prepared to break ground at that time.

Susan Traver is concerned about the generality of the motion and that there is no dollar amount associated with it. She will not support a motion that does not have an exact amount in it. She also thinks the motion should, but does not say, exactly what the building is going to be. A restroom only or a combined facility? The board keeps talking about this but the motion does not address this and is not specific enough. It is too general, it leaves too many things open and has too big of a monetary amount that is just going to get thrown out there. If it is \$100K we need then the motion should be for \$100K. For those reasons she will not support this specific motion.

Jim Santorsola stated that without a contract to look at to give the Board a figure we cannot state it specifically. He advised that whatever it takes to build the restroom and the rest of the facility should be used for that then whatever is leftover should go into whatever else the board chose. He wants to make sure the money is there and the job gets done because if it doesn't and the money gets spent he guarantees that it won't get done for the next 8 years.

Randy Cameron asked to make a couple of points. Steve McNutt gave the Board an idea that can be square footed and identify the amenities with just a few questions then we can come up with a solid budgetary number if the Board would just say what the heck the building is going to be. Second of all, if this money isn't dedicated right now then there may be a fear that the money is going to go somewhere. It's not going anywhere based on the Board vote last year that the money is set aside and the Board will decide where the money goes. It will not be used in the budget, it will not be spent anywhere else, its set aside, and he has not heard anyone say they don't want a restroom. The other part is that we have a temporary facility that if it is good enough to go out and sell used, that will be used seasonally for years to come by somebody else, then we could certainly do the same thing there. We have an asset, granted it is depreciating, its ugly compared to what we are going to have permanently. We have a facility that is useful this year and next year, without saying he wants to see it next

year, but to Mr. Allen's point, we have time. We can finish our plan, find out what it is we are going to build, and get some really good figures. That may change what our final design is based on value engineering.

Martha Lou Wheatley-Billeter called for a vote.

Jim Quigley was asked to reiterate the original motion.

Jim Santorsola advised he wanted to amend his motion.

Susan Traver advised that the original motion she heard was the first sentence in the Committee minutes.

It was noted that Jim Quigley made the original motion.

Ross Kelley clarified that the motion is to set aside up to the amount of the one-time money and related interest to be used strictly for the Rotary Fountain facility to be built between the carousel and the fountain.

Motion failed with only three yes votes.

Motion No. 7: Sam Selinger motioned based on the fact that the \$387,000 is already set aside to start looking at design and cost for a bathroom and chemical facility in an appropriate position as required.

Jim Santorsola seconded.

Speaking to the motion:

Andy Dunau asked if the motion precluded a gift shop and restaurant.

Sam Selinger advised that it was omitted intentionally and the motion was to start a process for some outside design with some concrete numbers for a minimum item.

Andy Dunau indicated he would oppose the motion.

Mike Allen advised that he knows that the Health Department asked that we address the restroom and asked if we are at risk this summer or the following summer for fees or penalties if we do not take action.

Leory Eadie advised we are not at risk. We have had to make minor repairs to the trailer over time and were able to do that. The Health Board has been very flexible about when we have had to take the bathroom out of commission to repair it, giving us the flexibility to be able to do that. The issue is not unlike any permanent facility that would be affected by vandalism. We are good to go with the restroom we have this summer and next summer.

Andy Dunau noted that we have not come up with something in two years. If we are trying to do a Master Plan and show good faith to the citizens and if we are going to build something we ought to build it right. We all know that what we build now is not going to be expanded on later. The reason he is opposing is simply that you can design it any way you want but if you don't have the "full monty", so to speak, you don't know what the full cost is. In his mind we are either designing something for all expectations and scaling back or acknowledging upfront we are not going to have everybody's wish list accounted for. If we are going to design something you go for it in full and then decide how to scale back based on cost or other issues.

Sam Selinger asked if Andy would support a motion for a facility that included a bathroom, chemical, restroom and sales.

Andy Dunau indicated yes.

Chris Wright going back two years what he wanted and supported was Steve McNutt's design for \$100,000 within a 100 foot circle of the fountain. It was unlikely a facility that we would have to move. It didn't meet all the needs and was in recognition that we were not going to get a Master Plan done in time, but the Board was unwilling to spend \$100,000 and went the cheap route. So here we are two years later. He would support a Steve McNutt design for \$100,000 because, he does not think it's likely that

we will get the Master Plan done. When it comes to just a bathroom he would not support anything but the original design based on the original cost estimate.

Martha Lou Wheatley-Billeter stated she agrees with Chris.

Ken Van Voorhis stated that we have gathered more information on what people want and that we have gotten to the critical point in the Master Plan where the stepping stones for decisions can be made and we can look at the functionality, how people circulate and see how the river and its shorelines effect these facilities. We are so close to it that he would support putting in a restroom whether it's \$100,000 or \$150,000 or even \$300,000, as long as we have gone through and looked at those things. He honestly believes we are that close and we just need another six weeks. He is challenging staff to say, give that to us, you told us you would in the schedule, and then the Board have this debate on what it is we want. Otherwise let's just stop the Master Planning process and just start fixing the problems in the park.

Leroy Eadie noted that at the last Riverfront Park Committee staff presented their preferred conceptual alternative consistent with the schedule that was presented.

Jim Santorsola confirmed with Taylor Bressler that approximately 4 Master Plans have been done in the 30 years he has been employed. He also asked if nothing was done with these because there was never any money.

Taylor Bressler advised that was incorrect and that there were problems with the Master Plans where it boiled down to either the money wasn't there for certain projects or the priorities changed before the projects were to be done. There were also Master Plans that resulted in the development of new pools to the parks and that sort of thing. So there has been some success with Master Plans, but there is a point where they become very real when you see the dollar sign that will then affect a priority. If a plan is approved then you start projecting it, plan accordingly and implement over a period of time.

Randy Cameron asked what the dollar authority limit is for an RFP. For example if the Board set a dollar amount and said they wanted a design for different options for the facility giving the Board a rough idea of the cost.

Leroy Eadie advised that the department can negotiate contracts with architects or engineers off the purchasing list for less than \$50,000 according to purchasing rules. He would need an account to draw it from and since there has not been any other source identified he would want to draw it from this one time money which the Board has voted to protect. The Board would need to unprotect a portion of that money and allow Leroy access to it in order to bring back some alternatives. He believes he can meet with an architect within the week and he would do his best to bring alternatives to Riverfront Park Committee in February.

Susan Traver stated that in order to proceed forward and pursue some sort of architectural plan the Board was always going to have to unencumber some of that one time money. She agrees with Leory that is a good way to get things moving so we end up with something at the end.

Chris Wright called for a vote on the motion.

Motion failed.

Motion No. 8: Randy Cameron motioned to dedicate up to \$10,000 for the design of four options to include the following amenities: 1 – Minimum requirement of a restroom facility; 2 – restroom with chemical facility; 3 – restroom, chemical facility and bistro; and 4 – restroom, chemical facility, bistro and gift shop; with those designs to be brought to the next Riverfront Park Committee meeting for discussion.

Sam Selinger seconded.

Ken Van Voorhis stated that this is the process that we started a year ago. Milestones were set and we have not hit this milestone yet. In his professional opinion the Board is going to get to a point where staff is going to say "we need to know what you want" based on the Master Plan process and that is when the Board would ask for a professional that is going to provide the development of that square footage. What he is getting at is, that the Board has allocated staff to do when they said "let's go down this planning process". They allocated this and should not pull the rug out from under it and let it come to fruition and come to the milestones which are on track and coming up soon. He wants to give the department's planning staff an opportunity to present those focused in bullet points and then the Board can go into contract to give square footages. Square footages, price and setting a budget can be done very easily.

Randy Cameron stated that this is kind of a black hole with the Master Plans the Board is looking to adopt. They are clouds, ideas, when here the Board is talking about being specific in square footage, elevations, amenities, and he believes it is a little bit of a different animal.

Sam Selinger does not see the argument. If we are going to get it done in 30 or 45 day he asks why not get it going and somehow come up with the variety of things that we know people are going to ask for. These things have been on the table for years.

Ross Kelley called for a vote.

Motion carried.

- B. Riverfront Park Master Plan preferred alternative diagrams and goals were distributed and reviewed.
- C. The preliminary December Financial report was distributed and reviewed.
- D. An update was given regarding the Spokane Tribal Cultural Center at the Bosch Lot.

URBAN FORESTRY TREE COMMITTEE – January 3, 2012 – *Ken VanVoorhis*

- A. The Urban Forestry Annual Work Plan was reviewed.
- B. The Urban Forestry Monthly Financial Report was reviewed.
- C. The expected agenda items at the January 31, 2012 meeting include consideration of several Heritage Tree Nominations, revisions to the Street Tree List, and Stewardship Goals for Park Conservation Lands.

12. **REPORTS**

- A. Park Board President –
 - 1. Appoint Nominating Committee for Park Board Positions – Jim Quigley, Chairperson; Jim Santorsola; Susan Traver; Ken Van Voorhis
 - 2. Annual Evaluation of Park Board Director Committee – Susan Traver, Chairperson; Randy Cameron, Chris Wright, Ross Kelley
- B. Park Board Members –
 - 1. North Bank Liaison – No report given.
 - 2. Downtown Transit Liaison – No report given.
 - 3. Conservation Futures Liaison – Ken Van Voorhis reported that Conservation Futures Committee has only met one time. Their next meeting will be next month.
 - 4. Parks Foundation Liaison – No report given.
 - 5. Council Liaison – No report given.

- B. Director's Report – *Leroy Eadie*
1. The first Centers Stakeholder meeting will be on January 26th. Fulcrum Institute is under contract as the third party facilitator the meetings. Leroy and Teresa Sanders have been chosen by Mayor to co-lead.
 2. Continuing to work with Kendall Yards on the Centennial Trail MOU and to bring closure to the Habitat Management Plan.
 3. We are working on a letter to the State to ask for permission to use the Bosch property for the Tribal Cultural Center.

13. **Correspondence:**

- A. Letters Received – December 19, ASA Proposal

14. **Public Comments:**

- A. Fuzzy Buckenberger stated the December 19 Proposal to sound like a threat. There were hurt feelings and he apologizes. The organization has concerns about fees. His understanding that the fees are concrete for 2012. They have national tournaments for \$10K - \$80K. If they don't use the facilities then the tournaments will be lost. They hold them every year. He understands and appreciates that there are costs and what they are. He thanked Leroy and Teresa Sanders for a great discussion in their meeting and feels the meeting went well. His biggest concern is that he does not want to see the parks empty. They respect the fields at Merkel and want to play there. They have 8 tournaments secured and must let the regional organization know by January 29 if they can play at Merkel or not. With the rates they are they cannot afford them. At the end of the year last year ASA began working well with the Department. They feel that Adriano Eva is a big asset to the department and want to grow together. They no longer have a desire to run the program.
- B. Steve Fountain noted that with the current fees it would cost him \$4,800 to use Franklin and Merkel for a weekend. The closest that he can find is \$750 per weekend in Yakima, a difference of \$4,050. You could rent Yakima 7 times for the same fee as one weekend here. You could rent Coeur d'Alene for 2 years for that price. He does not understand where the logic is. There are two softball complexes in Spokane and he believes they need to be separated from the regular budget and they need to be run like Moses Lake, Yakima, Wenatchee, Coeur d'Alene, Tri Cities, the money is run from the park itself and it is maintained. The City has never done that before. Franklin Park had a WIAA State Tournament there and they came to the Department asking that we renovate the park so that they could continue having it there. The tournament moved to Pasco costing the City millions of dollars. These parks need to be managed by the money that comes into them and not for the money to go to other entities in the Park Department. We need to keep the park. It's owned and operated by the City and they own it outright. We should be able to maintain it and have all the kids play on it. This is not being done, it is shameful and he is upset. In 1981 he obtained use of Garry, Clark, Underhill and others for the newly formed Spokane Girls Fastpitch Softball League. Most of the fields were unplayable and needed maintenance because the City was not maintaining them. Their league worked on the fields to get them playable. The City now took them away from them and gave them to baseball with \$3M in renovations. The City told him that Merkel and Franklin will be affordable and feasible. He feels they were lied to. In 2010 the City came to them and talked to them about fees and he told them that the fees were too much and never changed a thing going from \$1,200 to \$4,800. The rates are the

highest in the country and he hopes that the Board considers changing them. He can no longer do his tournaments. It's about the young kids and not about paying for other departments in the City.

- C. Pat Fountain stated that as of this year her 15 year old granddaughter will no longer be able to play in Spokane and will have to travel out of town every single tournament this year because there will not be tournaments in Spokane because they will be unable to pay for it. Her two younger granddaughters will probably not be able to play softball in Spokane because once softball is gone it will probably never be revived again. If softball doesn't play then baseball will come in and take over the fields. Rumor has it that baseball is going to take over Franklin Park and Merkel Park once softball vacates it. They are wondering if baseball is going to get the fields for the nice sweet deal that they got the other fields for. She thinks it's a sad deal when softball will no longer be in the City. The City will be breaking families apart. Her 15 year old granddaughter will never get to see her two younger brothers play baseball and they will never get to see her play softball because she will be out of town every weekend. The boys will be able to play baseball in Spokane because the fee structure for baseball is different than that of softball and she wants to know why the structure is different. There is a gender difference in the baseball players, primarily boys, and softball players, primarily girls.
- D. Leroy Eadie explained that there were 9 new youth baseball fields that were built as part of the 2007 Park Bond Funds. We worked closely with the baseball user groups on both the number of fields, the location of the fields and the design of each field. One of the things that was nice about youth baseball was that we were able to essentially create home fields for the different youth baseball organizations so each of the fields are designed a little bit differently. Early on in the conversations with the user groups, and because we were able to design home fields, we were able to have them assist with maintenance. Softball fields were a different situation. We have numerous user groups that use the softball fields. Although a lot of the organization may be associated with Fuzzy's organization but there are tremendous amounts of different leagues within that structure and different organizations that are coming in. If we had that same situation as baseball we could probably create that relationship but the main difference is that you have a home field with youth baseball, you don't necessarily have a home field in softball. The leagues are not our leagues so we cannot talk with absolute accuracy the gender ratios for baseball and softball however would say the baseball players are probably predominately boys and softball players probably predominately girls. Since they are not our leagues we cannot organize them.
- E. Mike Allen inquired if both men's and women's leagues participate on the fields or if it is only the boys and girls. Is the reason for the higher adult fees that adults cause additional maintenance and additional wear and tear on the fields?
- F. Leroy responded that with regards to the softball fields that there are both adult genders playing on the fields. The main facilities we have for softball are Franklin Park Softball Complex and Dwight Merkel Softball Complex and both have tremendous maintenance needs. They are not quite the same as the youth baseball fields. The baseball fields have some maintenance requirements but they are not a facility, they are just individual fields.
- G. Ken Van Voorhis inquired with Mrs. Fountain who they pay for their 15 year old granddaughter to play, the City or someone else?
- H. Pat Fountain responded that her granddaughter is on a team, they pay team fees to the teams, the team then pays the tournament organizers who pay the fees to the City Parks.

- I. Mike Allen asked what a typical fee paid by the team to the organizer is for a team to compete in a tournament, how many teams are in the tournaments.
- J. Pat Fountain responded that it is usually \$375 - \$400 and dependent upon how many games are guaranteed. Two day tournaments usually attract 20-25 or more teams and three day holiday type tournaments attract up to 40 teams.
- K. Leroy noted to the Board that he, Fuzzy Buckenberger, Phil Helean and Teresa Sanders had a very good meeting this week. Based on that meeting he had a conversation with the Park Board President and staff is meeting amongst themselves tomorrow to take a look at the latest proposal provided by Phil and Fuzzy. He believes they brought that proposal forward in good faith. We are challenged with revenue and cannot have empty fields this year. We will take a close look at what they presented. He appreciates that the Board adopted the fees last year and supports those fees but if we can develop something that makes some sense then it may be that we will bring something back to the Recreation Committee in February. It is very preliminary at this point but he wanted to share with the Board that there was a very good conversation with Phil and Fuzzy and thinks that they are willing to help find a place to protect the revenue that we need in order to keep the facilities open in the future.
- L. Andy Dunau stated that he is encouraged by Leroy's comments and appreciates what he is doing. He asked Fuzzy to come up and talk about their deadlines.
- M. Fuzzy Buckenberger advised that the 29th is their annual meeting and that they did receive their allocations as well. They cannot wait until after the 29th to find out if the fees are changed. They need to give the national office dates.
- N. Leroy Eadie noted that he has talked with Fuzzy and short of Park Board calling a special meeting there is not much he can do. He has told Fuzzy he will provide him with the staff recommendation regarding the proposal that he can factor into his decision making process so at least he will know where staff stands although he cannot speak for the Board and what they might adopt. He is working with Fuzzy in an attempt to provide him some predictability as best he can as the Director of the Department.
- O. Andy Dunau indicated he would support a Special Board meeting before January 29th and would ask Ross to consider a special meeting.
- P. Susan Traver appreciates that Fuzzy has come forward with numbers. It is a way to talk factually about things and work things out.
- Q. Sam Selinger noted that we are now splitting in kind of a sports way, baseball, softball and so forth, but he thinks our obligation is to the population. We need to start to get some information on children, girls and boys, men and women, to make sure that we are servicing everybody appropriately by gender, age, etc.
- R. Randy Cameron stated that he is not sure that our fees are the highest in the country, not looking for that debate, but to take a look at Coeur d'Alene, Moses Lake, examples. He is not sure how they run their City budget, how they run the Parks and Recreation budget, how they are funded, how they are supported or subsidized. The maintenance has to be done and we have to be dollar conscious on every dollar that we spend on maintenance. We also have the cost of the administration. Over \$2.3M is coming down in Interfund charges. A lot is warranted and some is certainly questioned but it goes into the pricing as well. It is not just the cost of water and maintaining the fields that goes into cost recovery. We have not even touched on the fact we are already not even close to recovering our costs. That is the harsh reality and it is not any sport's fault. It is the Board's problem and they need to be as fiscally responsible and push for economy everywhere they can.
- S. Phil Helean, Executive Director, SYSA advised that they served almost 9,000 in 2011.

The three main complexes we are talking about are Dwight Merkel, SE Sports Complex and Franklin Park. He appreciates Leroy's and Teresa's time at the meeting this week. He won't say it was a good meeting until there are some results. You can meet all you want until something gets resolved but he is optimistic we can come up with something that will work as some sort of a solution. SYSA is a good steward. They pay their bills. Just like the Board they have budgets they deal with so he does understand that there is a cost of doing business but it needs to be reasonable. They talked in their meetings about making the fee increases more progressive. Most games take about two hours, some a little more and some a little less. He outlined how much the fees have gone up for their organization and feels that they are pretty dramatic increases. He wants the Board to understand that they want to use these facilities. That is their goal. Their goal was not meant to be threatening. They want and need to play on these fields, but the reality is they just can't handle the increase. They want the Board to look at the fees that they have recommended. He believes that the fees should be the same for youth and adult because they use exactly the same maintenance. They want to say that the fees they are recommending are not an all or nothing, they just want to work with the Board.

- T. Randy Hastings, VP Spokane Girls Fastpitch, outlined a spreadsheet of how the increases affect his tournament last year, this year and if they held it in Moses Lake. Based on the number they cannot have it in Spokane this year.

15. Adjourn to Executive Session – None

16. **Adjournment:** 4:07 p.m.

A. Next Committee meeting dates:

Golf Committee: February 15, 2012, 7:00 a.m., Manito Park Meeting Room.

Riverfront Park Committee: January 30, 2012, 8:00 a.m., City Council Briefing Center

Land Committee: February 1, 2012, 3:30 p.m., City Hall Conference Room 5A

Recreation Committee: February 2, 2012, East Central Community Center, 500 S. Stone

Finance Committee: February 7, 2012, 3:00 p.m., City Hall Conference Room 5A

Urban Forestry Tree Committee: January 31, 2012, 2011, 4:15 p.m., Woodland Center, Finch Arboretum

B. Next Park Board meeting date: February 9, 2012, 1:30 p.m., City Council Chambers

Next Park Board Study Session: February 9, 2012, 3:00 p.m. or as soon as possible thereafter directly following the Regular Park Board meeting, City Hall Conference Room 5A