



Advisory Board Meeting Minutes January 14, 2016

Board Members Present: Rudy Sanford, Tricia Clark, Linore Wallace, Phoebe Stoner, Jim Clouse, David Ellerstein

Staff in Attendance: Steve Ashworth, Jill Russell, Hannah Sell, Andy Fleck

Public in Attendance: none

1. Call to Order

Linore called the meeting at 5:06 pm

- a. New Board Introductions: David Ellerstein
- b. Additions/Deletions of the December 9th meeting minutes: none

2. Approval of the December Minutes

3. New Staff Introductions

None

4. Public Correspondence

None

5. Upcoming Volunteer & Participation Opportunities

1/30/16 5:30 PM Daddy Daughter Dance @ Grand View Lodge Snow King

6. Citizen Input to the Board for Items not on the Agenda

None

7. Information/Discussions/Action Items

7a. Program Cost Recovery

The purpose of setting cost recovery goals is to reflect transparency to the community: what costs are involved with programs and what do the fees cover. The goal is not to increase fees, but to look to the board for direction and clarification to create the cost recovery formula moving forward.

Question 1. Should the cost recovery formula cover direct Costs, salaries and direct Costs or ALL costs?

Currently included are direct costs and salaries. We're not as concerned about the % that we recover, but want to accurately communicate what program fees are covering. The goal is not to make more money, but to be consistent across the programs that are offered.

Tricia asked if the rest of the board thought that indirect costs should be left out because they are always present regardless of what is happening in the space. Stated that the numbers may be easier to understand if you are looking at direct and salaries.

Steve gave an example: volleyball program that takes the gym away from the public – that is revenue that cannot be charged to the public and therefore potential fees charged are being lost. We want the facility to make as much as possible and bring the community in, but we want the programs to be as successful as possible too. The more programs that the programmers do in the rec center, the less the rec center can charge admission or allow the public to use the facility. Even if it is interdepartmental transfer of funds, the question was posed of whether or not that program should be paying "rent" to the rec center and should the fee to participate be set accordingly?

Rudy stated the fee should be factored into the recovery because you are taking the space away from other user groups.

If we set cost recovery goals, and you're not covering indirect costs – are you truly subsidizing the program? Is it more transparent? We don't always get the opportunity to explain. Consider whether or not 125% cost recovery is misleading if the indirect costs aren't included? Are we actually making money if the indirect costs are not included in the formula? The percentage may actually drop, but the program would not actually be changing.

Jim asked how most programs stack up in cost recovery.

Steve stated that there are inconsistencies. Some programs reach 100% cost recovery and others do not.

Linore asked if the percentage drops after we factor in the indirect costs - is there is a chance that the department would lose that program (example: senior programs)

Steve and Andy stated that we may need to move to subsidizing with sponsors or donations to make up for these differences. The community survey revealed that the community values Parks & Recreation services and does not see 100% cost recovery as vital.

Phoebe stated that she would prefer to include indirect costs to be more transparent.

Question 2: Should Rec. District Funds be factored in as revenue?

Phoebe asked how these funds are different from the taxes that fund Parks & Rec.

Parks & Rec. is funded by sales tax and property taxes
Rec district is a mil levy on your property tax

In general: 90% of the town funding comes from sales tax and 50% of county funding comes from sales tax.

Phoebe: could the rec district mil be redirected or not assessed in the future?

It may not be assessed on certain years. It is possible that it be eliminated or that Parks & Rec. may not be recipients of the funds. If the rec. district went away, we would still need to come up with the \$135,000 that we currently are granted and use to operate programs.

The Rec. District funds have been awarded to Parks & Rec. since 2007. First year we had it for the after school program 2008. Originally, the policy was that the after school program should be 100% cost recovery. Now, the public has a different take on it.

Phoebe: What's the major disadvantages of not including the Rec District in the revenue?

If you don't include it in revenue, we are meeting the goals that the community thinks we should make: 50%

If we do include it, we are recovering 100% and therefore need to lower the fees. Then, if the mil is not assessed, the fees would have to be doubled from what they are now. Fees are already at what is considered to be attainable, but at the maximum end.

Currently the rec district funds are counted as a revenue for Parks & Recreation. The question is: Is it a revenue or is it a subsidy because it comes from a tax.

Phoebe asked for Jill's opinion: If it goes away, someone else needs to subsidize it. Unless you want to double fees. Thinks it should be included as part of the revenue.

Revenue includes fees, sponsorship, donations that are brought in.

Linore asked why the rec. district is considered the same.

It's a taxation subsidy, it's just coming out of a different taxation line.

The current cost recovery goals should not be considered while the board makes this decision. There will be a set of exercises that the board works through in order to come to the new goals after the decision has been made regarding what costs need to be included.

Linore does not want to include Rec. District funds as a revenue

Phoebe agreed with Linore – makes it easier to cope with if it does go away.

MK: Agreed

Consensus of the board: Do not include the Rec. District money only include program fees. The board asked Andy and Steve to come back with some new goals based on the survey.

7b. Recreation Center Renovation/Expansion Revisions and Schedule

Steve and Jill met with architects to go back to the original priorities list and how to make this more of an achievable project. Their recommendations are bringing fitness area square footage down from 8000 to 7000 square feet and looking at other spaces we may be able to scale down. Currently looking at the highest priorities from our survey to see what projects are highest on the priority list. The “unprogrammed shell” is not completely off the table, but won’t be included in the base to bring the overall cost down. From the community survey we see that our patrons would like to see new locker rooms. The architects will look at the floor plan that we currently have and improve upon it. The architects were able to reduce the overall price to 21 million – and still accomplish the highest priorities. The option to expand will be there in the future.

Earlier in the week, town and county met to discuss community priorities. They voted that their highest priorities are housing, transport, budge hill slide. They passed a motion to bring back a resolution for adoption that would set forth ballot language for community priorities fund general purpose tax that would meet the objectives of the community priorities fund. That tax will be in place for four years. After which it will be voted to be renewed at least once. Current spet will run out Oct. 1st. If community priorities fund is voted in November, collection will begin April 1st. There may be a special purpose question for the mitigation of the budge hill slide for \$6-9 million. (Collected from August to April the hole between spet and general revenue) This plan will not raise taxes, the general revenue just replaces the spet tax april 1st.

Earliest discussion for SPET projects will be 2018 midterm election. If the public is interested in an additional penny for spet at that time. All projects contingent on raising tax to 7 pennies. Soonest that this project would move forward fall of 2018 or 2020.

Currently looking into using the money that was budgeting for planning the pool renovations for pool repairs. Will need to find out if this is an approved expense for those funds. Potentially, renovate the locker rooms potentially with the money we have now.

Phoebe: Can you budget renovation into CIP?

Steve: Over the course of 4 years CIP Parks & Recreation will work to complete the projects beginning with the highest priorities.

Jim Stanford: the idea of the general revenue tax allows the town and county a little freer hand since it is earmarked transport or housing. The money they are currently spending on START may be freed up and be able to fund some of the CIP pressing projects and not just put them off to 2020.

Linore: what happens if the community doesn't support this tax?

Jim responded that the feeling is that this is what the community is asking for and that this gives an option to focus on priorities without raising the taxes. Even if the elected had gone with the SPET path, he didn't see the project being funded for the entire amount requested.

7c. FY16/17 Budget Schedule and Draft Work Plan

Overall, our service levels are where they need to be for most part according to the feedback from the public. Highlighting the sectors where we could do better.

Staffing changes: not proposing replacing park planner position.

Reevaluation of programs: trying to hit what the community is asking for.

Capitol and operational budget: update to registration and management software

There will be a separate meeting in which the board will need to adopt a budget to be turned in and approved by commissioners.

8. Action Items: none

9. Comments/Matters from the Director

9a. Snake River Management Plan Update:

Moose to Wilson: Currently 15 scenic/10 fishing advisory cap. No capacity limit, but we require reporting. The Recommendation is to put a hard cap in place: 25 scenic/20 fishing which is higher than preferred, but the only way to get the data that is necessary to move forward in future seasons.

Capacities between Wilson and South Park: holding to 45/25. Changed the language regarding the pool. 50% of the allotment per day will remain pool (while the other 50% will be used as pre-season allocations). Outfitters will not automatically receive a certain number of boats. Outfitters are eligible until the 50% runs out. Therefore, all those who qualify for one boat, shall receive theirs first before an outfitter that qualifies for two allocations receives their second.

Two companies operating as one: The four rules that had been proposed at the last meeting won't work. We need 8 steps for it to hold up in court. Anticipate we will be moving forward with the recommendations.

9b. Dog Park Update:

Has been received very well in general. What happens when the temporary dog park closes? These discussions are happening.

Linore requested that some options be presented in the next couple meetings?

Phoebe requested that benches be placed at the park

Jim Stanford: Thank you to the board for support and participation. The dog park has been an instant hit. Thank you to the staff for getting this up and running.

9c. Staffing update: Park manager:

Currently, an offer is out to an individual who will be coming to Jackson to check out the area and visit with Steve to see if this will be a good fit. He has 31 years of experience in the field.

10. Comments/Matter from the Board

10a. Annual Meeting with Commission and Council

10b. Board Retreat: January 18th early evening. 5 pm – 7 pm in the Meeting Room at the Rec. Center

10c. Liaison updates

Jim: Age Friendly Jackson Hole met. Good response, but Jim had to educate the time frame for May Park.

Meeting adjourned at 6:55 pm Tricia moved. Phoebe seconded.