

Parks & Recreation Board Meeting Minutes

The Parks and Recreation Board of the City of Mesa met in a regular session at the Parks and Recreation office at 200 S. Center Street, Building 1, Mesa, on January 10, 2008.

Members Present:

Russ Gillard
Don Goodrum
Connie Gullatt-Whiteman
Dina Lopez
David Martinez
Walter "Bud" Page, Jr.
Michelle Udall
Marilyn Wilson

Staff Present:

Sue Deck
J.D. Dockstader
Rhett Evans
Mike Holste
Bob Huhn

Andrea Moore
Kelly Rafferty
Rochelle Rotert
Sherry Woodley

Members Absent:

Frank Alger, excused
Reggie Dye, excused
Jeff Kirk, unexcused

The meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m., by Connie Gullatt-Whiteman, Chair.

Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman announced that a site tour would take place immediately. She cautioned each Board member to not discuss or make any comments to one another during the tour regarding the two potential softball relocation sites so as not to risk any violation of Arizona Open Meeting Law. Upon reconvening the meeting, agenda item #4 would allow an open public discussion among Board members about all aspects of the site tour.

Parks Board Site Tour

City staff members accompanied Board members Russ Gillard, Don Goodrum, Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman, David Martinez, Walter "Bud" Page, Jr., Michelle Udall, and Marilyn Wilson on a site tour to examine two of the possible relocation sites to replace the Riverview Softball Complex. Specifically, these sites included a 25-acre retention basin owned by the City of Mesa, located south of the US 60, at the northwest corner of South Lewis and East Coury Avenue, and a 16-acre parcel owned by the City of Mesa, located at the northwest corner of Center Street and Lehi Road (north of the Red Mountain 202 Freeway). They also visited the Washington Activity Center, Riverview Park, and the Carson Jr. High pool to complete the drive-by tour.

The Board members returned to the Parks and Recreation office to continue the meeting at 5:25 p.m. Board member, Dina Lopez, who was unable to attend the tour, joined the other Board members for the meeting.

Approval of Minutes

Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman asked if there was a motion for approval of the minutes from the December 13, 2007 meeting. Mr. Gillard made a motion, Mr. Page seconded, and it was unanimously carried to approve the minutes as written.

Public Comments

None.

Discuss and Take Action on Relocation Sites for Riverview Softball Complex Ball Fields

Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman asked Andrea Moore to display aerial view slides of the two possible ball field relocation sites so that Board members could view them during the discussion.

The 25-acre retention basin at Lewis and Coury was the first location discussed by the Board. Ms. Moore pointed out that the lowest portion of the land is nearest the US 60 and would hold the water for most storm events. The land graduates up and engineers have placed the two ball fields in the middle area of the property. When more significant rains occur, Ms. Moore explained that the ball fields might become flooded. The parking lot and restroom building would be on the high ground at grade with the street. These designated areas are about 16 feet from the current bottom of the basin. She also said that the design includes a series of ADA ramps that would go down from the parking lot to the ball fields. The cost estimate for this option is \$7.8 million.

Mr. Page asked Ms. Moore if engineers have studied/tested for percolation at this property and came up with something that would absorb some of the rainwater. Ms. Moore said that no studies have been done because this land is functioning now as retention only. Mr. Gillard said that engineers would know the percolation rate on the current soil in the retention basin because it is part of the flood control. Ms. Moore agreed.

Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman asked Ms. Moore to show the second aerial slide, this site being the location at Center Street, north of the 202 Freeway.

Ms. Moore said that this site houses Solid Waste's recycle bins. The northern boundary is the Police Department's impound lot and shooting range, and Lehi Road is the southern border of this property. The land to the west is not City-owned property and belongs to the Salt River-Pima Indian Community; this land would have to be leased in order to make the four-field layout work. The cost estimate for this option is \$7.6 million.

Mr. Goodrum said that he would like to see if there was a way the engineers could fan the ball fields somewhat to put them in a circular format in the middle of the park, realizing this would encroach upon the police property to some degree. He did not know if the engineers had done that already or if there were some issues with the Police Department, but in his opinion, this would make a better layout. Mr. Goodrum added that the Indian-leased land should be avoided at all possible costs.

Mr. Gillard asked Ms. Moore about the warm-up area between the two double complexes. Ms. Moore said that there could be space between the fields; also, there is space south of the fields and possibly around the restroom building.

Rhett Evans commented on Mr. Goodrum's remark about the Indian-leased land west of the Center Street property. He asked the Board to take into consideration during their discussion that it could take a long time to acquire that lease, therefore, to look at the layout as though the City may not get the land, which would allow this property to only have three fields, not the four-plex that is the current design. Mr. Evans posed a question for thought to the Board to consider

having two ball fields at the Center Street site and another two fields at a different location or consider if three fields at this site would be acceptable.

Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman stated that the Board should keep in mind that it is possible to say “no” to both of these sites.

Ms. Udall asked Ms. Moore if it would be viable to relocate some of the police areas to the west of the Center Street property, as Mr. Goodrum mentioned earlier, to allow for the cloverleaf design as it is currently laid out at Riverview. Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman added that the Board could make a request to have drawings made up to reflect different configurations and provide the Board the costs associated to relocate existing areas currently north of the proposed ball fields.

Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman informed the rest of the Board that Ms. Moore was going to show them a third aerial slide of a piece of private property at an undisclosed location in west Mesa. She said that this property, designed with four ball fields, would be a third option for the Board’s consideration.

Mr. Gillard asked Ms. Moore if there were an equivalent number of parking spaces at all three sites since all options essentially have the same configuration. Ms. Moore said that each site has been given approximately 270 spaces. Mr. Gillard then asked Ms. Moore how many parking spaces were currently at Riverview. Ms. Moore said that Riverview has about 300 spaces; this includes parking for the soccer field.

Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman said that the location on private property had only one restroom to serve all four ball fields, and the northwest ball field was a considerable distance from the only restroom on the property.

Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman asked Ms. Moore if there were warm-up areas available. Ms. Moore stated that some retention areas in the corners of the property were built into the site for warm-up, plus warm-up areas between all of the fields and the parking lot.

Mr. Martinez asked Ms. Moore if the restroom building could be moved to the corner of the parking lot so that it could be more centrally located to all four fields, and then make the parking lot longer to be in the shape of an “L”. Mr. Martinez also asked Ms. Moore what the preliminary cost was for developing the piece of private property. Ms. Moore replied that it would cost \$7.9 million.

Mr. Martinez asked Ms. Moore if the higher cost at this undisclosed location was due to the extra work it would require filling a ditch that runs along the southern perimeter of the property. Ms. Moore stated that it is the cost to bury the ditch and pipes underground.

Mr. Evans added that the \$7.9 million did not include the cost of the land, given that this is private property; this figure reflected the cost of construction only.

Mr. Goodrum asked Mr. Evans if the Board was presently discussing specific recommendations to take to City Council. Mr. Evans said yes.

Mr. Goodrum stated that it was difficult to make a recommendation on a piece of property when you don’t know where it is located; there is not enough information to make any kind of recommendation. Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman added that there was not enough information and a lot of unanswered questions with the other two sites as well.

Mr. Goodrum expressed his opinion by stating that the retention basin at Lewis and Coury was not a good site, not even for softball fields, due to poor access. He also said that the property is designed for only two fields, which is not replacing Riverview's four fields. Mr. Goodrum remarked that we are doing a disservice to our community if we do not replace all four fields at one location, so the City needs to find a site that is viable for four fields.

Mr. Goodrum continued by saying that the property at the undisclosed location could have promise, but is a potential cost issue because of the unknown amount to acquire the land. He went on to say that the Center Street location has the most opportunity. However, the lease issue with the Indian land is not a desirable quality; it would be nothing but problems from a timing standpoint, and may possibly never happen. Mr. Goodrum recommended that the City engineers take a look at the Center Street site to see if there was any way to reconfigure it to include the land north of the potential ball fields. He said he did not know if that was an option, but with the Board's current information, it seemed that the Center Street site was the most viable of the three sites. Mr. Goodrum added that he really was not comfortable in giving City Council a recommendation without more information and more study.

Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman asked Mr. Gillard if he would share his thoughts with the rest of the Board regarding the ball field site options. Mr. Gillard answered by saying that he had not yet seen a proposal that was an equivalent replacement for Riverview or one that he would recommend. Having played softball for 40 years, Mr. Gillard stated that anytime you play a tournament you have to have a cloverleaf. None of the options at this time are designed as a cloverleaf. He said that Gilbert's Field of Dreams would be opening on January 12th, and if patrons wanted to schedule a tournament, they will be heading to Gilbert. Mesa will be sending away all of its tournaments if the Board recommends any of these options, whether they are two fields or four fields.

Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman asked that each remaining Board member express their thoughts on the potential ball field sites.

Ms. Udall stated that rather than see a configuration that is not in a cloverleaf design, she would want to see a location that could accommodate a cloverleaf, even if that meant on the east side of Mesa. She expressed her desire to see the Center Street/202 Freeway option be redesigned in a cloverleaf configuration. Ms. Udall thought that the Lewis and Coury option would mean spending too much money to get only two fields.

Ms. Wilson said that the priority should be to find a location to incorporate four fields. The options she has seen do not compare to the Riverview complex, and she would not feel good about saying to the City Council that any of these options would really work for the City.

Ms. Lopez said that she respected the opinions of each Board member; she had not been shown any configuration in the slide presentation that was comparable to Riverview.

Mr. Page agreed with Mr. Goodrum's comments regarding the Center Street site to see if the ball field configuration could be changed, and possibly relocate some of the gun ranges. If these changes could be done, then Mr. Page said the Center Street location would be his choice. Mr. Page also agreed with Mr. Gillard that the lack of a cloverleaf design was going to lose tournaments for the City; and he thought that Ms. Wilson was correct when she said that no options thus far have equaled the Riverview complex. Mr. Page said we should see what additional options are available.

Mr. Martinez reminded the Board that there is a commitment, but no legal requirement to relocate the four softball fields. By saying the Board does not want any of these sites, the Council may come back with a reply that they will not build *any* softball fields because there are no agreeable sites. Mr. Martinez thought that the Board should be careful when saying that none of these sites work; the Board may end up with nothing at all since there is no legal requirement on the Council's behalf to follow through.

Mr. Martinez continued by saying that he agreed the cloverleaf design was important, but was not sure if the Board's intent to replace the softball fields was to provide opportunities to compete with other cities for large out-of-town team tournaments or the intent to provide Mesa residents with quality fields.

Mr. Gillard stated that City staff has the numbers on the demand for softball field usage. He thought that if four fields were lost, there would not be available fields to keep up with the demand that already exists. He further stated that ball players do not mind driving to sports complexes across town as long as they are the best places to play.

Mr. Martinez did not think that any of the sites were viable; he said that the Center Street option had possibilities, but there is an additional cost connected to the leasing of the Indian land. Mr. Martinez commented that if there is no legal requirement, then the Board should not be restricted to west Mesa. Rather than settle on one of the three sites discussed today, he thought that the Board should be knowledgeable of other sites, whether in west Mesa or not, because none of the options on the table right now are for primary use by west Mesa anyway. Mr. Martinez expressed that he would like to see the ball fields relocated in west Mesa, but since patrons may go to Gilbert's Field of Dreams, the Board needs to look at other sites and not be limited to any part of the City.

In reference to Mr. Martinez's comment, Ms. Wilson was under the impression that there was a commitment on the part of the City Council to find replacement fields on the west side. Ms. Wilson stated that there was a certain trust element that would be violated if the City did not find land on the west side. The burden to find a good replacement location needs to fall on the City Council.

Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman stated that she agreed with most of the comments from the Board. She said that she always claimed the fields would be best relocated at Red Mountain. Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman agreed that it was worth another look at the Center Street/202 Freeway site, that it might be a viable location, however, no one had spoken yet about the street improvements cost. She pointed out that a lot of street improvements would need to be made if the complex is built there. She also agreed that none of the sites were really viable as presented, and there was not enough information available on the Center Street site to make a recommendation.

Ms. Wilson asked if a cloverleaf design would fit at the Red Mountain Park.

Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman said that it was originally planned for four more ball fields to be built at Red Mountain, however, the east side location was the issue. She reminded the Board of staff's presentation that survey results indicated ball players did not care where they drove to play. If the Board can get that point across, the east side may be an option.

Ms. Udall stated that if we move the ball fields to east Mesa, there needs to be something done so that west Mesa will not lose parkland. They may lose the ball fields, but they would gain good quality parks.

Mr. Goodrum stated that all of the options that have been considered today are less than a good fit. The Board is being asked to spend good money to recommend a new facility be built on a less than desirable site in a certain part of town. He said that it is difficult to make that kind of recommendation when, as Mr. Gillard stated, the quality of the fields is the most important issue, not the location. Mr. Goodrum continued by saying that a cloverleaf design is the best with a large space for warm-up areas. People will drive from all parts of the Valley to use a good quality facility. He said that he has played for quite a number of years, and it does not matter where the fields are located. Mr. Goodrum felt that Mesa will not be able to compete with the Field of Dreams, but the current usage rate of Mesa's ball fields needs to dictate a location that will provide our future softball program with good quality fields. He said that the Board needs to look for a site, whether it is the Center Street/202 Freeway site in a cloverleaf design, Red Mountain, or another viable quality complex on the west side. The Board needs to make sure it does not stick these fields wherever they seem to sort of fit.

Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman commented that she did not want to have to look someone in the face someday and reply that the City spent \$10 million for a softball complex that isn't being used. She wants to ensure that the money will go towards a good location that all the citizens can be proud to have.

Mr. Martinez said he thought it was the Board's job to examine the sites to find one that makes sense. There is not a place that the Board has discussed today that is desirable when driving into the site. A player will see less than desirable scenery as they drive to the Center Street location, for example. You are still by a landfill. Mr. Martinez stated that he would like to have some information about improving Kleinman or other parks.

Ms. Udall asked if there were any future parks planned but not yet developed, such as Beverly Park.

Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman said that there were many things that the City could do for the west side if a new four-plex is not built there.

Mr. Gillard said that this Board should send City Council a recommendation stating that the ball fields the City is losing at Riverview be replaced, if not on the west side, then on the east side in a cloverleaf design that lends itself to tournaments, with the highest quality fields the City can provide. In addition, some of these land options that are currently under consideration be pursued as parkland so that the west side does not lose parkland if the ball fields are located on the east side.

Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman summarized Mr. Gillard's by saying that the ball fields should be replaced with a priority on building the best quality fields in the best location, allowing for a cloverleaf design, and if all good options are exhausted on the west side, consider the east side and look at the land options discussed today as possible additional parkland for the west side.

Mr. Gillard made an additional comment regarding the Center Street/202 Freeway option saying that maybe the Police Department could relocate south of their current setup, and then it may be possible to fit a cloverleaf design on the property.

Ms. Wilson said that, if she understood it correctly, part of the recommendation was to possibly make the Lewis/Coury and Center Street/202 Freeway land options eventual parks. She said that she would like the wording changed so that it did not say that those pieces of property could potentially be made into parkland.

Mr. Gillard said that he did say those two options could possibly be considered as parkland.

Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman said that the Board should clarify by saying that the City should use other smaller City land that would not accommodate a cloverleaf design, but could be developed as good quality parkland.

Ms. Moore told the Board that the only undeveloped west side parkland available is the 2.8 acres for the future Beverly Park. She said that Parks and Recreation has talked about adding a dog park somewhere on the west side in one of the City's existing parks and also considered renovating Kleinman Park.

Mr. Evans stated that in order to get the acreage that is lost at Riverview, and in order to keep the ball fields on the west side, either the Lewis/Coury location or the Center Street/202 Freeway location would have to become an open space, if keeping the same square footage of parkland in west Mesa is a priority; the City does not own any other undeveloped parkland other than the future 2.8-acre Beverly Park.

Mr. Goodrum did not agree with Mr. Evans' comment and said that the goal is to replace ball fields; parkland is not lost at Riverview, only ball fields. The Board should be looking for options to replace Riverview's quality ball fields with another quality four-plex somewhere in Mesa, preferably on the west side. He continued by stating he did not think the Board has seen any viable sites to date. Beverly Park should be developed and put some improvements into existing parks, spending an equivalent amount of money on improving the west side parks in Mesa.

Both Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman and Mr. Gillard agreed with Mr. Goodrum's statement.

Mr. Martinez said that all the Board is adding to Mr. Gillard's recommendation is a request that additional improvements are made to existing parks. In Mr. Martinez's opinion, the Lewis/Coury and Center Street/202 Freeway options are not desirable as parks, and he would not support either one because of their locations not being in close proximity to any neighborhoods.

Mr. Gillard rephrased his recommendation to City Council and made a motion that the ball fields from Riverview be replaced in a configuration of at least equal quality to Riverview, preferably at a west side location, and if not there, at an east side location within Mesa, and that it is important to continue to look for opportunities for improvements to west side parks if the new ball fields are built on the east side.

Ms. Wilson seconded the motion and it was unanimously carried to approve the recommendation to City Council.

Discuss and Take Action on Fees & Charges for FY 08/09

Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman introduced staff member Sue Deck and asked Fees & Charges Subcommittee members Ms. Udall and Mr. Gillard to discuss the proposed changes to the fees and charges for FY 08/09.

Ms. Deck pointed out to the Board that the Parks and Recreation Board Report regarding fees and charges adjustments had revisions on pages 6 through 9, referring to the Red Mountain Multigenerational Center.

After reviewing the changes with the Board, the following short discussion took place:

Mr. Page asked Ms. Deck to explain the decrease in Multipurpose Room deposits (current fee/range \$300-\$700; proposed \$300-\$500). Ms. Deck replied that staff wanted to reduce the current wide gap in the range and not make it as expensive.

Mr. Page then asked Ms. Deck to explain the difference in room rental cost, one that cost \$300 vs. a room cost of \$700. Ms. Deck said staff established the range so they would not have to come back to the Parks Board or to City Council every year and request an increase in fees.

Mr. Evans added that a citizen would be charged the same consistent rate throughout the year; staff would not vary it from individual to individual, but it would allow the City to fluctuate as the market changed.

Mr. Gillard said that the Fees & Charges Subcommittee tried to ensure they covered areas that were either not already covered in fees and charges or were lacking in charges altogether.

Ms. Wilson asked if the swimming pool rental charges included the cost to staff lifeguards. Ms. Deck said yes, the charges are based on the number of people attending, including the number of lifeguards required.

Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman asked for a motion to approve the fees and charges for FY 08/09. Mr. Page made a motion, Mr. Goodrum seconded the motion, and it was unanimously carried to approve the fees and charges for FY 08/09.

Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman complimented Ms. Deck and her staff on the improved quality and presentation of the Report and thanked Subcommittee members, Ms. Udall, Mr. Gillard and Frank Alger for their participation.

Hear Update on Pioneer Park Locomotive

Mike Holste informed the Board that both he and Scott Bouchie, Environmental Programs Administrator, would be taking the Board's recommendation to the City Council on January 31, 2008, regarding the future of the locomotive at Pioneer Park.

Mr. Holste told the Board that Mr. Bouchie has scheduled the train's stabilization process to begin on January 14, 2008, at a cost of \$11,000; this process was approved by the City Council in October 2007. Mr. Holste said that the recent rains had delayed the process, but it should be completed in mid-January and will keep the locomotive intact for another two years. He said there still has been some discussion whether or not the locomotive could actually be moved in its current condition, but that decision has not been finalized.

Mr. Martinez asked Mr. Holste to clarify the train stabilization process. Mr. Holste said they would be covering the areas of exposed asbestos with a substance comparable to a spray-on bed lining of a pickup truck.

Mr. Page told Mr. Holste that Wickenburg, AZ, has similar aging problems with its town train, and he has requested information as to how the town is handling the issue.

Hear Update on Urban Fishing Program

Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman was introduced to the urban fishing program at last fall's Arizona Parks & Recreation Association's annual conference, and subsequently requested staff member J.D. Dockstader to provide the Board with some general information about the stocking of fish at Mesa's two urban fishing lakes at Riverview and Red Mountain Parks.

Mr. Dockstader provided the Board with a copy of the City Council Report, dated January 7, 2008, that requests approval of the City Manager to sign an Intergovernmental Agreement between the City of Mesa and the Arizona Game and Fish Commission to continue stocking the lakes.

Mr. Dockstader said that the urban fishing program has been in existence for more than 20 years, but in budget year 2005/06, this program was cut by City Council. Council did, however, request from staff to investigate alternative funding options from private sources to sponsor the urban fishing program. In FY 06/07, staff negotiated a one-year funding agreement with Bass Pro Shop to commit to \$8,000 to fund stocking Mesa's two urban fishing lakes.

The Arizona Game and Fish Commission agreed at that time to a one-year contract, but now have asked the City to put in place a multi-year contract to achieve parity with other participating cities.

Bass Pro Shop has agreed to sponsor the program again, but is not willing to make the full commitment. Therefore, staff looked for other funding resources, and including Bass Pro Shop's \$4,000 donation, secured a donation of \$4,000 from the Mesa HoHoKams and \$3,000 from Sahara Construction Company in exchange for water storage in Riverview's lake. Mr. Dockstader said that these donations would fund the fishing program for one year.

Mr. Dockstader concluded his update to the Board stating that the Agreement has the City entering a three-year contract with the Arizona Game and Fish Commission, with the stipulation that if the City is unable to gain sponsorship for the next two years, the City will share the financial impact of \$21,244 (\$10,622 per year). There is also an escape clause in place that allows the City to get out of the contract if staff cannot find the funding, but because of the popularity of urban fishing, staff hopes to continue the program through sponsorship dollars.

Mr. Gillard asked Mr. Dockstader who receives the money for each fishing license issued. Mr. Dockstader replied that it goes to the Arizona Game and Fish Commission.

Mr. Gillard stated that some of the Board subcommittees have talked about involving sponsorships to help with funding. The urban fishing program is one example of how difficult it may be to find sponsors willing to help our parks, facilities, and programs.

Hear and Discuss Subcommittee Updates

Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman asked Mr. Evans and Ms. Moore to give the Board a progress report on the subcommittee activities; the subcommittee chairs would also provide an update.

Mr. Evans wanted to redefine the purpose of the subcommittees and the end goal, and by doing so, has provided the Board with a "Master Plan Update" chart to outline steps as to how the information gathered by each of the subcommittees and their conclusions would come together.

Mr. Evans discovered that in past years that the Parks & Recreation Department had spent considerable time developing a "Standards Report Card;" staff is suggesting resurrecting those

standards by bringing them up-to-date, establishing a list of current parks, facilities, and programs, and rating each one.

Ms. Moore explained that the Parks & Facilities Subcommittee would rate Mesa's current parks, ball fields, soccer fields, basins and undeveloped land by a set of maintenance standards; and the aquatics facilities, gyms/activity centers, Gene Autry Sports Complex, professional baseball, golf courses and cemetery would be measured by another set of standards. Each park or facility would be reviewed and given an overall grade, then identify any underserved areas and areas that are in need of growth. Through these exercises, the Subcommittee would recommend the areas of focus they feel are the best uses of resources for the City's parks and facilities based upon the grades given.

Ms. Moore said that a similar process will be taking place in the Programs Subcommittee by using a "Tool for Ranking Core Services," accompanied by "Programs for Core Services Ranking;" both tools were developed over a two-year time frame by staff and a consultant. All the programs that are on the list of Programs for Core Services Ranking, which includes programs that have been cut in recent years, special events and key programs, such as Fit City, will be evaluated by using the Tool for Ranking Core Services. This tool looks at customer-driven and financial-driven criteria to help in deciding which programs rank highest on the core scale, and also assign point values to questions, such as:

- Is the program filled to capacity?
- Is it meeting the cost recovery goal?
- What is the primary population served?
- Are we serving both the east and west areas?

Financial criteria are also assigned point values with respect to operating partnerships and program competition.

Mr. Evans said that the Programs Subcommittee will come back to the Board with a point value given to each program within Parks and Recreation; likewise, Parks & Facilities Subcommittee will return to the Board with a grade given to each piece of parkland and each facility.

Mr. Evans explained that the Finance Subcommittee also has a major role because they will be helping to support the data through cost recovery and exploring new revenue streams to report back to the Board as well. He concluded by saying that when all three subcommittees merge together, the Board should have the data to make informed decisions as to what needs to be cut out of the Parks and Recreation budget and be able to prioritize the money that is currently allocated to the Department. Together, staff and the Board will be able to make the hard decisions for FY 08/09, FY 09/10, and FY 10/11. Staff is recommending that the Master Plan be updated along with the operational budget and adjustments be made accordingly.

Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman asked Mr. Gillard to update the Board on the December 13, 2007 meeting of the Parks & Facilities Subcommittee. Mr. Gillard said that staff member Darla Armfield gave them a report on the current status of the aquatics facilities and what is contained in the existing Master Plan. At the January 16, 2008 meeting, the Subcommittee's focus will be the aquatics facilities.

Mr. Goodrum, Chair of the Programs Subcommittee, said that at their last meeting on December 13, 2007, they discussed what the expectations were of the Subcommittee and how they were going to receive the data to make logical and informed decisions.

Ms. Udall, Chair of the Finance Subcommittee, said at their last meeting of January 3, 2008, they discussed what information was currently available and what would have to wait until more data came from the other two subcommittees.

Chair Comments

Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman encouraged the Board to register and attend the Fit City kick-off on January 19, 2008. She said if any Board member would like to volunteer at the event to speak to staff member Cindy Hunt or to Mr. Gillard, as they will be needing help that morning at 8:30 a.m., at the Foundation for Mesa Parks and Recreation information table; T-shirts will be handed out at the table.

Director's Comments

Mr. Evans said that every agenda would now include staff requesting input from the Board regarding possible future agenda items so the Board discusses items that are of interest to its members. He said to email either himself or Dawn Bies regarding any suggestions for agenda items to be included during February's meeting. Some possible future agenda items may be:

- Negotiations with clubhouse tenant at Gene Autry Sports Complex
- PRCF area informational presentations
- Park Ranger presentation

Calendar of Events – At the meeting, Board members were given a calendar that included the months of January through May 2008; Mr. Evans said that the calendar marked key PRCF events, but did not include a lot of detail. He encouraged Board members to contact staff for more information on any of the events listed or to consult the City's website. Mr. Evans said to contact staff if passes were needed for any event.

Mr. Evans concluded by saying that the Chicago Cubs Spring Training schedule was handed out as well, and the season begins February 28, 2008.

Reports on Meetings and/or Events Attended by Board Members

Ms. Lopez attended a fundraising meeting for the Foundation for Mesa Parks and Recreation; she said a signature event is being planned for 2009.

Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman asked if there were any other items for discussion; the Board had no additional comments. Ms. Udall made a motion, Mr. Martinez seconded, and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Rhett Evans
Parks, Recreation and Commercial Facilities Department Director