

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 125 N. Hobson Street, Mesa on March 8, 2007.

Members Present:

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

Staff Present:

Darla Armfield
Rhett Evans
Mike Holste
Sue Deck
Kym Otterstedt
Dale Furnas
Dyan Seaburg
Sherry Woodley
Dawn Bies
Kelly Rafferty
J.D. Dockstader
Kevin Christopher

Members Absent:

Reggie Dye, excused
Jeff Kirk, excused

The meeting was called to order at 12:00 p.m. by Bud Page, Chair.

Russ Gillard amended an item from the January 18, 2007 minutes regarding the Big Fat Greek Fundraiser at Daphne's Restaurant, stating that the amount raised was \$328 instead of \$1,700.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Page asked if there was a motion for approval of the minutes from the January 18, 2007 meeting. LeRoy Brady made a motion, Russ Gillard seconded, and it was unanimously carried to approve the minutes from the meeting of January 18, 2007 as amended.

Public Comments

Tom Klobas, President and Board of Director Member of the Arizona Railway Museum addressed the Board stating that the Arizona Railway Museum had recently been communicating with Stephanie Bruning regarding the Pioneer Park locomotive and relocating it to their facility for restoration. The Arizona Railway Museum has previous experience restoring locomotives, such as the one owned by the City of Chandler at Tumbleweed Park. They have the track space to be able to secure the locomotive and have developed a funding source to provide the bulk, if not all, of the cost of moving the locomotive. Restoration being considered is not to make the locomotive operational, but a cosmetic restoration, making it an educational platform, explaining how it functions, and its role in Arizona history. While this locomotive is different than the one currently housed at Tumbleweed Park, the Railway Museum would like to have access to the locomotive at Pioneer Park for the same purposes.

Mr. Klobas was under the understanding that the historical preservation committee was supposed to make a recommendation the Parks Board about how they would like to proceed

with this restoration. He was expecting it to be an agenda item at this meeting and is attending to answer any questions the Board may have.

Mr. Klobas introduced Mr. Russell Lassuy, a fellow Arizona Railway Museum Board member.

Mr. Page asked Mr. Lassuy if he would like to address the Board. Mr. Lassuy is familiar with the original efforts to restore the Pioneer Park locomotive, approximately 14 years previous, when the City was considering donating the locomotive to the Arizona Railway Museum to preserve it. Mr. Lassuy stated that they have been trying for a long time to take possession of the locomotive for restoration; they are interested in gathering any new information and to answer any questions about their proposal that the Board may have.

Mr. Page asked Rhett Evans if he would like to respond to Mr. Klobas and Mr. Lassuy's inquiry. Mr. Evans responded that Mike Holste would be giving an update about the status of the report for the historical preservation committee. He stated that the City had brought in a consultant approximately two weeks ago. The consultant is in the process of completing his report, but did share some preliminary information with Mr. Holste. Mr. Evans explained that the formal report would be completed shortly.

Mr. Page thanked Mr. Klobas and Mr. Lassuy and invited them to stay for Mr. Holste's update on the locomotive.

Action Items

Mr. Page stated there were no action items for this meeting, but did request that future items be submitted to the Board well in advance for review, and that they be donated as such on the agenda.

Mr. Page addressed the Board about the method used for sending meeting packets. He asked each member of the Board to express their preference for receiving their packet. The Park Rangers used to hand deliver the packets, which have most recently been sent electronically with links for the agenda and past meeting minutes included.

Dina Lopez stated that she had no preference in how the information was sent, that she had no problem accessing the information electronically.

Don Goodrum wanted to continue to receive the information electronically.

Mr. Gillard stated that he would like to receive the information electronically, however he didn't care for the links and would prefer the information being sent as an attachment or to receive the information in the mail.

Mr. Brady stated that he likes getting the information electronically since his office is in Phoenix, but stated that he also had problems accessing the links on the most recent agenda.

Connie Gullatt-Whiteman mentioned that she would like to continue to receive the information electronically but requested that the information be sent as Microsoft Word attachments. She had experienced the same problem accessing the links from time to time.

Marilyn Wilson prefers to have a printed copy mailed, however, she expressed concern about the cost of mailing out the packets and is willing to continue to receive them electronically with attachments.

David Martinez also had problems opening the links recently also but likes the electronic format.

Mr. Page mentioned that a discussion had been held with Mr. Evans and Dawn Bies prior to the meeting regarding this issue and that the Board had the option of receiving the packets in the mail or electronically.

Ms. Lopez, Mr. Goodrum, Mr. Gillard, Mr. Brady, Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman, and Mr. Martinez will continue to receive their board information electronically with attachments instead of links. Mr. Page and Ms. Wilson would like to pick up a copy at the Convention Center office monthly.

Mr. Page asked that the Parks and Recreation Board Member listing information be updated again as he had recently changed his mailing address. He would like it included with the agenda for the April 2007 meeting.

Mr. Gillard asked Ms. Bies to check on the phone number for Jeff Kirk, as he believed it was incorrect and needed to be updated.

Staff Introductions

Mr. Page asked Mr. Evans to make the introductions for new City of Mesa staff attending.

Mr. Evans introduced J.D. Dockstader as the Assistant Director over Business Operations, which includes Sales & Marketing, Sponsorships, Budget and Strategic Planning. Mr. Dockstader comes to Mesa from Fresno, California.

Mr. Evans introduced Kelly Rafferty as the Assistant Director over Commercial Operations, which includes the golf courses, Hohokam Stadium and Fitch ball fields, the Amphitheatre and Convention Center, cemetery, and Adults Sports programs.

Mr. Evans requested that the Board contact Mr. Dockstader for issues regarding sponsorships and Mr. Rafferty for issues with Adult Sports.

Reports on Meetings/Events Attended by Board Members

Mr. Page asked Mr. Gillard to report on the March 5th fundraiser at Buffalo Wild Wings.

Mr. Gillard stated that they had a decent turnout with purchases of approximately \$1,500, with 15% percent going to the Foundation for Mesa Parks & Recreation. He informed the Board that the next Foundation meeting will be on April 11, 2007 at the Mesa Convention Center in Building B.

Mr. Gillard informed the Board that one of the topics of discuss was an off leash dog park for the west part of Mesa. Mr. Gillard told the Board the Foundation had received a donation of \$100,000 from Bark Avenue but would need another \$100,000 to build it. The site discussed up to this point is Riverview Park. Mr. Gillard assumed the Foundation will be receiving an update on that point. There is another fundraiser scheduled for May 20, 2007 and a flyer will be put out shortly.

Staff Updates

Pioneer Park Locomotive Project

Mr. Holste reported to the Board that the City had hired a consultant, Scott Lindsay from Birmingham, Alabama. Mr. Lindsay has 30 years experience working with steam locomotives. Mr. Lindsay spent three days in town, visiting Tumbleweed Park and Scottsdale Railroad Park. Based on the current location of the Pioneer Park locomotive he felt it would be completely deteriorated within three to five years, and that something needed to be done immediately. Mr. Holste believes that Mr. Lindsay's recommendation will be to move the locomotive to a museum or to leave it at Pioneer Park after restoration, moving it up to the front of the park off of Main Street. This would give the locomotive more exposure and prevent incidents of vandalism. However, it would be a costly process due to the asbestos abatement. Mr. Lindsay estimates costs at \$15,000-\$20,000.

Mr. Holste stated that Stephanie Bruning would be receiving Mr. Lindsay's report sometime this month and the preservation committee would put together a complete report listing possible alternatives prior to the next Board meeting.

Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman asked who was on the preservation committee and when they would be meeting to discuss the restoration report. Stephanie Bruning is chairing the preservation committee and Mr. Holste thought two of the Parks Board members were on the committee. He said that Reggie Dye was one of the members and he couldn't remember who the other member was.

Ms. Wilson said that she thinks it might have been Jeff Kirk and suggested that previous Board minutes should reflect that information. Mr. Holste told the Board he would find out, as he had taken over this project after Terri Palmberg retired and was not involved in the process at that time.

Mr. Lassuy wanted to ensure that scrapping the locomotive not be considered an option. Mr. Holste agreed that scrapping the locomotive was not an option that the committee would consider.

Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman asked if the preservation committee would be meeting prior to getting information to the Board. Mr. Holste replied that was correct and said there was still a possibility that Council would want the locomotive to remain in Mesa; however, it must be restored to some degree.

Mr. Page asked if the preservation committee meeting was an open or closed meeting. Mr. Holste said that previously it had been a closed meeting and at that time it had been decided to hire an expert in the field; Mr. Lindsay was the person who had been recommended to the preservation committee.

Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman asked if Ron Peters was on the original committee and mentioned that originally it had been discussed as an historical restoration. Mr. Holste responded that he saw Mr. Peters name on Terri Palmberg's forms. Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman reported that Mr. Peters had gone to one of the original meetings and there had been a discussion about raising funds to do something with the locomotive. She suggested that the preservation committee pull all of that original committee's members together. Mr. Holste agreed and said that the funds had been discussed. The initial estimate was \$20,000; it was then increased to \$80,000 and kept

escalating. Final recommendations are forthcoming, pending Mr. Lindsay's report. Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman suggested they contact Mr. Peters. Mr. Holste said Mr. Peters had confirmed that it would be approximately \$1.5 million to make the locomotive operative again. Mr. Lassuy said that it depends on what kind of shape it is in. The Arizona Railway Museum had been told that the engine that is at their location now could be shipped to the Grand Canyon Railroad and for about a \$1 million they could restore it to full operating condition. Mr. Klobas stated that the biggest problem was that the restorer must be a certified licensed boiler manufacturer. He knew they did restore a number of locomotives in the Midwest, but didn't believe there were too many of them in the West. Mr. Lassuy mentioned that the Southern Railroad had restored a lot of locomotives in the past.

Mr. Goodrum clarified that the Board's objective was to give a recommendation to Council and asked when that was expected to happen. Mr. Holste said he hoped to have a report to the Board by the April meeting. Mr. Goodrum asked if there was a sub-team that would compile the information. Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman replied that the original committee she had mentioned earlier should be the group to address the findings submitted by the consultant.

Mr. Evans pointed out that just moving the locomotive was very expensive and well above staff's original estimate. Mr. Holste agreed and said Mr. Lindsay had mentioned putting down some temporary track and trying to move it within the park, which would cost approximately \$100,000-200,000. He said it was not going to be cheap no matter what the City does with it, and that it would be difficult to discuss without concrete numbers from Mr. Lindsay.

Ms. Wilson recalled that Mr. Peters was going to look into getting some grants and that someone else commented that grants for this sort of thing were very limited. She also remembered someone's proposal offering to move the locomotive at no charge. She said it would have to be reviewed on previous meeting minutes to verify. Mr. Gillard stated there was a company in California that was going to use it for commercial purposes. Ms. Wilson said she remembered that if we were not going to keep the locomotive in Mesa, that it was an option mentioned previously. Mr. Evans stated that it would be included in the report. Mr. Page mentioned that Ms. Palmberg had spoken to the Mesa Rotary Club, the original sponsor of the locomotive project. He said two members of the club would like to attend that meeting and give their input on what the Mesa Rotary Club would suggest for the locomotive.

Mr. Page thanked Mr. Holste for his report.

Sponsorships

Sherry Woodley gave the Board information on sponsorships. She introduced Dyan Seaburg, the Sales & Marketing Supervisor and explained that Dyan was also in charge of sponsorships.

Ms. Woodley explained that municipal sponsorships were relatively new throughout the country. She said that some cities had done a lot of them. San Diego had done a huge amount of them and that Mesa was looking to them as a model. Atlanta, Charlotte and the Twin Cities had also been very successful implementing large sponsorship programs. Ms. Woodley provided the Board with the following information regarding the development of the sponsorship program:

- In 2004 the City began exploring sponsorship options as a united effort rather than having individual departments do them.
- In 2005 Council approved Management Policy 121 on municipal sponsorships.
- In 2006 the Commercial Facilities Division began sponsorship sales for the golf courses and Convention Center and had good success.

- In 2007 the Parks, Recreation and Commercial Facilities Department (PRCF) hired two staff members dedicated exclusively to sponsorship development.

Sponsorship goals and objectives:

- Raise funds to bolster existing parks and facilities (equipment, improvements).
- Raise funds to help subsidize youth and special populations programming.
- Partner with local organizations to increase development opportunities.
- Create partnerships with local business to benefit both organizations.
- Allow business partners to demonstrate a commitment to their community.
- Generate revenue to help protect current assets and potentially develop new facilities and programs.

PRCF Sponsorship Plans:

- Hired two dedicated staff members, Darla Paulson for Commercial Facilities and Melanie Dykstra for Parks, to generate interest and develop opportunities.
- Create an action plan to implement ideas.
- Pursue additional grant opportunities for the department.
- Sell, sell, sell!

Current PRCF Activities:

- Sales of tee signs at Riverview and Dobson Ranch Golf Courses.
- Sales of tent seating at Hohokam Park.
- Signage sales in the Amphitheatre.
- Development of parks' inventory for potential sales opportunities.
- Seeking additional cell tower placement.
- Sales of advertising space in TimeOut brochure to help subsidize costs.
- Seeking sponsor to help stock two urban fishing lakes.
- Developing sponsorships for after-school and summer programs.
- Working with local youth organization to develop additional soccer fields on existing parkland at Red Mountain Park.

Ms. Woodley mentioned that Commercial Facilities had set up restricted accounts that the money goes into instead of the general fund and is then able to be used for facility improvements and equipment purchases not funded by the budget. She showed pictures of tee signs and signage already in place and mentioned that staff is well on track to meet their goals for the year.

Mr. Page asked if the City was still receiving requests for cell tower placements. Ms. Woodley stated that staff has received a couple of additional requests and staff is also going to be aggressively soliciting requests. They would be contacting cellular companies to let them know the City would be willing to entertain these requests, as long as they blended in with surrounding scenery.

Mr. Page asked about the prospects for Chaparral Park. He mentioned that the City had previously had two prospects and that one had backed out. He asked if staff was going to be reconstructing that deal to see if they would be interested in coming back in. Ms. Woodley said they may not be interested in that particular location but staff could approach them with another location, now that this would be going citywide.

Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman inquired about a comment made about the City losing that \$40,000 and asked if the City was going to be able to keep the money from the next one. Ms. Woodley said she didn't think the City had lost the money, that money was actually set aside in a restricted fund. She asked Sue Deck to verify that information for the Board. Ms. Deck said it was in a restricted fund. Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman wanted to ensure that the money wasn't going to be used elsewhere. Ms. Woodley said staff was keeping an eye on that money and that there was actually about \$60,000 in that fund. Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman then asked why it was reported on paper the way it was shown. Ms. Woodley said it had to be reported that way for the budget because it was an existing activity. It could not be reported as new activity.

Mr. Goodrum asked Ms. Woodley to clarify what was meant about the development of soccer fields and how that would work. Ms. Woodley said that the City would own the land, the soccer groups would get grants or raise funds to do the development and they would get preferred use for a specific number of years. She clarified that preferred use does not mean the fields would be theirs all the time, but that they would get preferred scheduling on the fields. It would be for a specific number of years, after which all scheduling would revert back to the City.

Mr. Gillard asked about other publications, such as the Splash Calendar that Josh Adams puts out. He asked if advertising is sold for that publication. Darla Armfield confirmed that advertising on the Splash Calendar covers the entire cost. Ms. Woodley mentioned that the TimeOut was a large venture and that it would be twice as large if they depended on advertising to pay for it. Staff is hoping to sell advertising to underwrite a portion of it.

Mr. Page asked for an update on the girl's softball summer league that Chester Smith has run in previous years. Ms. Woodley said she had spoken with the media the previous week about that league, which was not going to continue this year. She said the City had been receiving calls from citizens wanting to establish a league. Ms. Woodley said they can establish a girl's softball league at any time and the City would work with them to establish their field allocations. She said they offered to work with Mr. Smith if it was a financial issue, which he assured them it was not an issue on the City's part. His decision to cancel the league was not predicated on a City requirement that he could not meet.

Mr. Page thanked Ms. Woodley for her report and asked Sue Deck to come forward for her report.

Budget Update

Ms. Deck handed out charts to the Board. She stated that in February staff submitted a budget of \$30,564,353. She gave a breakdown of the budget to the Board. She explained that the PRCF department has several requests for funding since we haven't had any new funding in recent years. She reported that PRCF receives \$3,500/month for cell towers and those monies are dedicated to capital equipment replacement for Parks and Recreation. It is a restricted fund and cannot be used or taken away for other purposes. She stated that we also have that type of funds for the Convention Center, cemetery or other areas that generate enterprise funding.

Mr. Page asked if Gene Autry Tennis Center fell under recreation. Ms. Deck informed the Board that the City receives \$600/month for rental of the facility. The City has maintenance expenses associated with the facility that are minimal and fall under the Parks Maintenance area. She stated that maintenance support was all the involvement the City had at Gene Autry Tennis; there is no recreation programming at that site.

Mr. Goodrum asked about FTE changes for FY 07-08 & 08-09. Ms. Deck stated that Parks & Recreation had sustained significant cuts in the previous year and the plan going forward was to maintain what we do have.

Mr. Martinez asked about expenses and revenue at Hohokam Stadium. Ms. Deck said that she did not include anything generated from Spring Training in the figures, only operations and maintenance. Any activities at the stadium were included, such as concert revenue or revenue generated for suite/field usage, was included. Mr. Martinez inquired where the spring training figures were shown. Ms. Deck stated that those figures were shown under the Finance Department; revenues and expenses for Spring Training fall within that area. Mr. Martinez asked if the gross expense was only the gross expense for Parks & Recreation. Ms. Deck stated that that was correct. She went on to explain that the City received approximately \$1.6 million for Spring Training, which was split in commissions between the various organizations associated with Spring Training (Cubs, HoHoKams, etc.).

Mr. Goodrum asked how many people are working in the PRCF department. Ms. Deck said that while she didn't have the number of actual people, but estimated 400-500. She explained that in the summer time, one FTE could equal 20 people working in a program like Aquatics. Mr. Evans mentioned that the full-time FTE was included on the charts, but the figures did not include temporary or seasonal staff.

Ms. Deck gave upcoming budget dates to the Board: April 26th – fees and charges would be reviewed by the Finance Committee; May 14th – Council will hold budget hearings to review individual department budgets; June 25th – final adoption of the budget.

Mr. Page asked Ms. Bies to send out memos to the Board with those dates so the Board could attend.

Mr. Martinez asked if this was only a requested budget that still had to be approved. Ms. Deck said yes and mentioned that staff was requesting additional funding for facilities maintenance and capital equipment also.

Performance Measures

Dale Furnas introduced herself and told the Board she is stepping in for Andrea Moore today and giving a report on Performance Measures.

Mr. Page asked Dale to pass on the Board's condolences to Andrea regarding her grandfather.

Ms. Furnas informed the Board that performance measures were started a couple of years ago and are mainly used mainly as a decision making tool to gauge where we're at, where we'd like to be, where we need to step it up, and where we need to cut back.

Ms. Furnas passed out a chart of the existing performance measures and told the Board that decisions that are made as a department are gauged on these measures. She told the Board that the department is limited in what they can measure. She said the City must compare to the same data other cities are counting already in order to back up the measures the City is using. The PRCF is also in constant change, which would lead the department to change what performance measures they are tracking. These performance measures are used as an adaptable communication tool that changes as the goals and objectives of the department and the City change.

Ms. Furnas gave information on the following performance measures:

- Commercial Operations Operating Cost Recovery
- Fee-Based Participation
- Recreation Hours of Volunteer Service
- Percentage of Developed Park Acreage
- Developed Park Acres Per Thousand Population
- Golf Rounds vs. Revenue Trends
- Sponsorships/Ticket Rebates

Ms. Furnas told the Board that the City is currently working to link performance measures to budget eventually. She told the Board that the data is received from a benchmark organization called ICMA, for which some City departments report early performance data from monthly performance reports to be used as a comparison with other cities.

Ms. Furnas told the Board that the participation figures from Red Mountain Multigenerational Center are not included in these measures at this time, but would be added in the future. She talked about cost recovery targets for this fiscal year.

Mr. Martinez asked for clarification on reading the charts and asked what 100% cost recovery means. Ms. Furnas replied that it means recovering 100% of the facility's costs and that anything less means the City is footing the bill.

Mr. Martinez asked why the target for golf was going down. Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman indicated she would be interested in knowing about that as well. Mr. Evans and Mr. Page stated that City staff would be talking about that information as another item during the meeting.

Ms. Furnas spoke about volunteer hours and pointed out the drop in volunteer hours from last fiscal year (116,008) to the target for the current fiscal year (70,000). She stated that was due in part to the reduction in staff and resources needed to support that program.

Ms. Furnas noted that for developed park acres were a little lower than the median due to large numbers of people moving into the area, which makes the percentage of park acres go down.

Mr. Page asked why Long Beach was used as a measurement. Ms. Furnas replied that it is about the same size in population and the City was limited to comparing cities of similar size that reported this same information. Ms. Wilson asked why Tucson's park acres were reported so high. Ms. Furnas stated it was due to a lot of open range area (preserves, river paths) that qualify as park acreage.

Ms. Furnas gave the Board the 07-08 target for sponsorships, mentioning that staff is hoping to get to \$400,000 this year.

Mr. Gillard asked if these were all the performance measures. Ms. Furnas replied that there are additional performance measures staff uses, but these were the core measures the City Manager has asked PRCF to report as they are the ones being used as a gauge currently. She told the Board they would probably see those change.

Director's Report

Mr. Evans addressed the Board and mentioned that the information he is going to present should possibly be placed on a future agenda for further discussion as time is running short today. He passed out charts and told the Board he would like them to have time to digest the information given and come back at a later meeting to discuss the information.

Mr. Evans gave information regarding golf course expenses vs. revenues. He explained the operation/maintenance expense was the baseline budget given to the Golf Supervisor to manage, and also the A & G, the administrative and general overhead, which is allocated to the department by the City and is used to pay for all of the City's overhead (including such broad services as Human Resources, City Attorney, Information Services, etc.). He mentioned capital outlay costs and explained two kinds of cost recovery: operational cost recovery, which can be controlled by the department, and program cost recovery, which includes the administrative overhead and debt service (this lowers the cost recovery substantially). Any remaining monies are placed into a golf enterprise fund, which is projected through 2012.

Mr. Evans brought up a question asked earlier about the golf performance measures. He explained that the golf business was saturated two to three years ago with an onslaught of courses developed in the valley. The industry is currently in the downturn portion of this cycle. The City relies heavily on the enterprise fund balance to get through the lean years of this cycle when rounds and revenue are down.

Mr. Evans shared that the City is in discussions with the developers of the Waveyard project. He explained that the status of the Riverview Golf Course is in question due to the project. Waveyard is moving ahead and will go to a vote in November; if it passes, development could possibly be completed by early 2009. The Riverview property is a part of the development parcel.

Mr. Goodrum asked about the difference in revenues forecast on the charts. Mr. Evans explained that the budget number given by Ms. Deck is a stationary number and those on the pro-forma change as the market changes. Ms. Deck stated that the forms are constantly being fine-tuned and updated, based on rounds and expenses.

Mr. Goodrum asked if the budget information given to Council is what we are requesting. Mr. Evans confirmed this was correct.

Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman asked that if the City loses the golf course, would any replacement be given for redevelopment. Mr. Evans told the Board that discussions as of late have only included replacing the ball fields and soccer fields located at Riverview Park, but no commitment has been given regarding replacing the golf course. Ms. Wilson asked if the playground area at Riverview Park would also be lost. Mr. Evans stated that the lake area would stay, but the areas north of the parking lot would have to be replaced in west Mesa as part of the agreement with Waveyard, Inc.

Mr. Gillard mentioned that he sat on the original Golf Course Board when it was decided there would be a City golf course at Red Mountain Park. He asked if the City still had the land to build that course. Mr. Evans stated that there was enough land there, slated in the Master Plan for the development of an 18-hole golf course but as shown on the pro-forma the ending fund balance of the two existing courses would not support that development.

Mr. Page asked why, if the golf course made money, the ending balance shows zero on the chart. Mr. Evans said the City formerly had a surplus of approximately \$821,000 in the fund balance but in July 2006 the City decided to use the money in the enterprise fund elsewhere during the lean years to fund other projects. Recently City management replaced \$200,000 of the fund in FY 05-06, which means the golf enterprise lost approximately \$500,000. Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman asked if these funds that were given back would be available to the City for use elsewhere or would it be earmarked for use at the golf courses only. Mr. Evans said staff would have to keep an eye on the fund balance. He stated that in lean years the golf courses needs that fund to complete needed capital projects. Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman stated that staff and the Board need to keep the Council educated on the importance of keeping the money in the golf fund so as not to hurt the golf courses and the City in the long run.

Mr. Evans handed out pro-formas on the Cemetery and Hohokam Stadium for review and suggested a discussion be held at a later meeting on those facilities. Ms. Gullatt-Whiteman suggested these pro-formas be put on the agenda for the April meeting. Mr. Page asked Ms. Bies to make these the first items on the agenda for April.

Chair Comments

Mr. Page asked if there were any other items for discussion.

Mr. Page asked if there was a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Goodrum made a motion, Mr. Gillard seconded and the motion was carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 1:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Rhett Evans
Parks, Recreation and Commercial Facilities Director