

Aquatic Committee Meeting
Wakefield High School Pool
1301 N. Stafford St.
October 24, 2018
Time: 7:00-9:00 PM

Attendance: Don Hesse (Chair), Cynthia Hilton (Vice Chair), Kristi Sawert (Member), Janet Eichers (Member) Ron Kampeas (Member), Dee Romanek (Member), Marilyn Judson (Member), Mackenzie Kearney (Member), Helena Machado (APS Liaison), Jennifer Lainhart (DPR Liaison), Trina Wood (DPR staff), Jeff Humphries (APS staff)

MINUTES

I. Approval of minutes from September - Minutes approved with minor edits.

II. Public Comment(s) - None

III. Cost Recovery Working Group Report Update and discussion – with handout

The CRWG reconvened to consider questions that were raised. History and background.

Addressed questions that came up in writing from the last meeting. Defined operations and maintenance cost (O&M) to include: staffing, utilities, repairs, maintenance (intermittent and long term) costs to keep the pools up and running and operating safely.

Discussed what current aquatics fees by individuals are used for. For APS, they go directly to O&M. For DPR, they go for DPR instructors, supplies and administrative fees, not O&M.

Discussed what the tax support appropriated to APS pools used for. It is used for APS instruction for students, athletics, and other programs. In CRWG report's social value scale, rentals and private lessons are not using the tax support, but community swim and DPR programs are somewhere in the middle of the scale and may have some tax support and some fee support.

The CRWG use "splash" data as a common denominator to determine the O&M cost attributed to each swimmer. The working group felt that it was easier base fees on this data than to attempt to calculate fees based on space and time usage. On the last page of the handout, a chart shows the percentage of O&M fees that would be attributable to each of four user groups based on FY 2018 data. The chart also shows the percent of much tax support (if any) that would be recommended to cover discounts available to individuals in those groups.

100% cost recovery refers the recovery costs through tax support and fees combined. How will the current tax support change under the new plan? Using FY 2018 data, tax support contributed by both DPR and APS would have been reduced using the CRWG recommendations because the O&M fees would have applied to the DPR users. Tax support will decrease from \$1,155,575 to \$536,445.

Which agency has the authority for setting fees for the use of APS facilities? APS has authority for setting fees for the use of its facilities.

The working group recommended several changes to the report the group released in AUG based on a meeting held on OCT 11. The changes to be made are: (1) If there is an over collection of fees, there will be less need for tax support. The recommendation that the AC would be responsible for approving extra funds for specific projects would be dropped. (2) Rather than use prior year data to determine splash ratios, the county and APS would estimate splash contribution each year as part of the budget cycle and reconcile those accounts at the end of the year. APS will project and manage their budget accordingly. The county tax support would not exceed a specific agreed upon amount and could be adjusted if fee revenue exceeded budgeted O&M expenses expected for DPR registrants and community swimmers. (3) Rental fees will be simplified to follow the “splash” model. See 1st page of the handout. Rental fees in the model are based on 6 swimmers in a lane.

Concern about the increase in fees to use for adults and seniors using DPR programs in the pool. Those participants would see at least a 50% increase in current fees. The working group disputed that fees would increase “50%”. DPR registrants would be eligible for the same fee discounts that are available to community swimmers. To know exactly how much an individual registrant’s total fees (DPR class + APS O&M) would increase, the cost of the DPR class/team would have to be known as well as what APS discounts the individual would use. It is unlikely that fees would increase 50% if registrants took advantage of offered discounts.

Discussion of logistics of how this will go forward. A cover letter will be prepared and be vetted with the group along with changes to the recommendations noted above. Following approval, the package will be sent to the School Board, and to the Sports Commission to be transmitted to the County Board, with or without a cover letter from the Sports Commission.

Further discussion, issues with paying DPR and paying APS. Discussion about large increase in fees and the perception of the participant paying for the class. Comments were made that DPR classes are inexpensive and parents would not mind paying more.

A motion was made to approve the amended working group report with a cover letter and to distribute these documents to the School Board and, through the Sports Commission, to the County Board. The motion to approve the action carried by a vote of 5 yes, 2 nos, 1 abstain.

IV. Long Bridge Fees Working Group Update –

Random survey had 824 responses. Public Survey is out for feedback, not statistically valid. Meet again with some recommendations on fees for the facility for general admission. The group will review those fees and finalize recommendations. Question about where it would fall in the cost recovery pyramid. Meeting again in November. No current updates.

V. Sports Commission Update – Janet Eichers

A lot of discussion about fields and discussion about possible joint meeting as the Sports Commission wants to know more about what our committee is doing.

VI. Selection of New Chair and Vice Chair

Pursuant to the AC charter, Don Hesse’s and Cynthia Hilton’s terms as chair and vice chair were ending in NOV and new leadership is to be selected from the membership. For the NOV 2018-NOV-2020 term, chair is supposed to be an APS representative and the vice chair a DPR representative. Cynthia was

nominated for chair and Marilyn was nominated for vice chair. A motion was made to put their names forward and seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

VII. New Business

Discussion about county board's approval of the new zoning for the Macedonia Church and Nauck Civic Association pool centered on concern that public may not get use the facility due to their partnership with the water polo group.

Upcoming meetings:

Yorktown - Poll the dates in November to determine availability 11/20, 11/27, 12/4

Motion to adjourn 8:45pm, Adjourned.