

Sports Commission Meeting Minutes

Thursday, November 29, 2018

Langston-Brown CC, Room 106

Time: 7:00-9:00 PM

Commission Members Present:

Shirley Brothwell, Chair

Drew Murray

Justin Wilt

Steve Severn

Janet Eichers

Dave Maher (late)

Commission Members Absent:

Sherry Kohan

Jessica Paska

David Tornquist

John Bacon

Corey Simples

County/APS Staff:

Megan Carney, SC Liaison

Deb DeFranco, APS Liaison

Guests

Cynthia Hilton – Aquatics Committee

George Thompson – Potential New SC Member

Matt Gallon – Potential New SC Member

Steve Finn – Parks & Recreation Commission

Please note: Agenda items may not be in chronological order.

Approval of Past Meeting Minutes

[7:00 -7:10pm]

Motion to approve October meeting minutes; cannot vote as quorum not present

New Business

Aquatics Committee (see presentation in packet)

[7:10-7:55]

The Aquatics Committee Chair, Cynthia Hilton, co-presented a methodology and recommendation regarding pool fees with Sports Commission member, Janet Eichers. The committee requests that the Sports Commission pass recommendation through to the County Board with either a letter of support or dissent.

History

- APS took over pool management in 2009
- Since, DPR has provided APS a financial transfer annually that has not changed and does not cover the APS O&M costs
- APS has increased aquatics fees with no justification

Goal: Framework for an aquatics cost recovery model

Model:

- Committee was asked to come up with a better way of charging for pool use
- Proposed methodology uses “splash” fee to charge a person for each entry into the pool
- Based on FY 2018 actual expenses and with existing discounts for certain users groups maintained, the group came up with a \$5.15 per splash fee; if expenses increased, fee could change over time
- The target amount recovered from fees versus taxes could be determined by the Board; the main goal is that all users are treated the same (see slide 8)
- Splash fee covers O&M and not instructor costs which are still covered by DPR’s class fees

Recommendation (slide 10)

- Fee should be on a continuum
- Everyone is assessed an admission charge, but the % changes

Outcome (slide 11)

- Tax support decreases fee revenue increases
- Those receiving discounts would continue to do so
- Not recommending an exact fee, but how O&M is split so revenue increases and tax support declines

Other Considerations

- Dissenting opinion by former Committee chair was discussed; concern is how this would impact DPR teams and classes
- Desire to do something fair as some pay for O&M and not others

Discussion

- Concern that this sets a precedent that is unlike other facilities such as fields or basketball courts
- DPR and APS transfer money to each other for joint use facilities based on different agreements

- General agreement that DPR should pay its fair share to partially to cover costs, but fundamental concern about impact on other types of facility use
- Proposed fee is not similar to field fund which is charged seasonally and not used to cover O&M (and is much lower)
- Concern other DPR users would get charged per use fees

Conclusion

- Sports Commission will discuss further when quorum is met
- Aquatics Committee feels they are equal to the Sports Commission; request that Sports Commission act expeditiously and not hold up process

Post Presentation Discussion:

- Relationship:
 - What is the relationship between SC and AC?
 - Different perspectives on relationship
- Further Concerns:
 - Dissenting opinion came from immediate past chair
- Concerned on ripple effects for user group fees on other facilities
 - Fees for sports may continue to go up; should the SC letter note this possibility
- Fees should attach themselves to costs (PRC liaison)
- APS Background
 - APS and DPR have MOU for field use
 - History of why APS took over the management of the fields
 - APS should run pool but not classes
 - Flat transfer fee interesting, DPR heaviest user
 - Difficult for APS to recover costs from DPR use
 - DPR's share of costs probably should be higher, but need much broader conversation
 - Discussion on pool costs and synthetic field replacement costs
- Questions
 - What did they mean by O&M?
 - What unique costs are users causing?
 - How does it apply to fields and DPR sports programs?
 - Can APS can provide detailed expense reports how they run the pool?

Athletic Field Allocation Draft Project Letter

[8:00 – 8:25 PM]

Discussion & Comments:

- Letter acknowledges where things were before Greenplay study as well as issues the user groups had with regards to field allocation
- Letter is an opportunity to get some things on record with regards to fields; letter demonstrates that the policy is a significant departure from the past

- Use letter as an opportunity to make recommendation and insert some oversight; DPR report to Sports Commission; use this to address concerns and allegations on concerns over transparency (i.e.; SC should serve as oversight or outcomes for allocation policy)
- MOA's likely not going to the board until February/March 2019
- Policy lists all the responsibilities the partners of DPR have (background checks, certain operating rules, fiscal responsibility, maintenance)
- Signage & Fundraising
 - Discussion included appropriateness in policy and content
 - Review if language is finalized
 - Consider if fundraising is a separate policy

DPR Follow-Up & Technical Comments

- To what extent did the pilot period prove or disprove the allocation formula
- Include the National Sports Turf Recommendations and compare to Arlington (and why)
- Explain: Adult "for profit" groups are volunteer run and not there for profit
- If rapid team expansion compared to prior season, how will the policy respond?
- Include periodic evaluation (SC role?)
- Use of synthetic fields, but should say field density: as appropriate
- Closing fields; should natural grass fields stay closed to all users in the winter?
- Eliminate fundraising section under DPR responsibilities
- Clarify summer fee (not intended to apply to occasional, drop-in programs)
- Edit: Sports Standards for Youth Sports to condense and pertain to only field sports

Other Discussion

- Process to "return" field space
- Web-portal for viewing scheduled fields

POPS Framework Update

[8:25 -8:35 PM]

Commissioners commented on their efforts to review individual sections

Justin: ask commission members to send text to him to pull together for December meeting

Commissioner Updates

[8:35 – 9:10 PM]

Fields

- Several field user groups met to discuss the PSMP and how to respond to Parks4Everyone
- POPS resolution introduced to Civic Federation; recommends that Civic Fed stands behind removing "erroneous" data from POPS ; has been sent to four committees for further consideration; Civic Fed – wide vote is scheduled for January; Shirley wrote email on concerns to Parks and Rec Committee
- Efforts from sports groups to encourage more outreach led to Parks4Everyone email to County Board on this outreach and the Sports Commission Chair

- Most effective thing groups can do is ask for meetings with board members
- Meeting with Matt De Feranti; Foti, Balutis, Thompson to discuss field use, difficulty during field times, work done on fields, fees, what happens when fields are misused, rainouts
- Sports groups should communicate to the community at large what they do
 - E.g.; one pager G. Thompson did on ABR's work in the community

New Member Orientation:

- Check on resources for new members
- Can county representative come and talk to Sports Commission as a group
- Reminders: don't talk to press and don't meet more with more than two members at a time (or don't discuss commission business)
- Reception: Commission chairs and noteworthy commission members (put forward Patricia for outreach); check into whether other people can attend

Next Monday: POPS Open House Reschedule; send reminder to commission members

December 20th ; Next Meeting

Public Comment

N/A

Meeting ends 9:50pm

Christian Dorsey, County Board Liaison

Attest:

Megan Carney

Megan Carney, Staff Liaison