



TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Office of the Town Clerk

MINUTES OF THE SEAVIEW PARK COMMISSION MEETING HELD

MAY 29, 1991

I. CALL TO ORDER: A meeting of the Seaview Park Commission relating to the FY91-92 budget was held on May 29, 1991 in the Seaview Park Recreation Center. In the absence of Chairman Broberg, Vice Chairman Myers called the meeting to order. Commission members in attendance were; Mr. Myers, Mrs. Newman, Mrs. McIntyre and Mr. Ochstein. Mr. Broberg, Mrs. Clark-Royal and Mrs. Coniglio joined the meeting later. Staff members in attendance were; Mr. Bitzer, Miss Rockwell and Ms. Reedy.

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA: Motion was made by Mrs. McIntyre to approve the agenda. Seconded by Mr. Ochstein, motion carried.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Mr. Bitzer said the minutes of the May 22, 1991 meeting had not been completed yet, but as soon as they were finished they would be passed on to the members of the Commission.

IV. OLD BUSINESS: None.

V. NEW BUSINESS:

A. FY-92 Proposed Budget.

1. EXPENDITURES.

FACILITY MAINTENANCE: Mr. Bitzer said that despite a 40%, or \$25,000.00 increase in the departments insurance related accounts, the FY-92 proposed expenditure budget is only \$8000.00, or 1% above FY-91 estimated expenditures, and the FY-92 proposed revenue is 3% above FY-91 estimated revenue.

Mr. Bitzer said there was a 7% decrease in the Facility Maintenance Expenditure in the proposed FY-92 budget and that was due to the reduction in new equipment purchases. He said they had to replace a lot of expensive equipment last year. Mr. Bitzer said the proposed facility maintenance expenditures for FY92 are \$174,173.

TENNIS PROGRAM: Mr. Bitzer said the reason for the 85% recovery in FY90 in the Tennis Program was due to the late opening of the Tennis Pro Shop. He said they estimate that they would have had approximately a 73% recovery if the Pro Shop had opened on time. Mr. Bitzer said that in FY91 they had the full time clerk, tennis court drainage work and tennis court maintenance which is routinely done about every 3 years and all those things brought down the percentage of recovery. Mr. Bitzer said the proposed Tennis Program for FY92 is \$236,252 or approximately a 2-1/2% increase with a revenue recovery rate of 69%.

Mr. Bitzer said there were significant increases in the insurance costs, but the Recreation Department itself had a very good year in 1991 but the insurance rates are not calculated for each department but for the Town as a whole.

Mrs. McIntyre asked if someone injured themselves at the Recreation Center and decided to sue for damages, would they sue the Recreation Center or the Town? Mr. Bitzer said this was employee health insurance and had nothing to do with participant insurance. Mrs. McIntyre asked if the Town carried Liability Insurance? Mr. Bitzer said they did but he added that the Town doesn't carry any health insurance except for employees. He said there were firms which offered Recreational Insurance, and they had surveyed participant interest in the past, but there wasn't enough interest because most of the kids had school insurance which covered them 24 hours a day.

ADULT PROGRAM: Mr. Bitzer said this was a very small program and they anticipated a \$927.00 increase in the Adult Program which is largely due to an increase in the insurance fees. Mr. Bitzer said the expenditures in the adult program is primarily staff time.

YOUTH PROGRAM: Mr. Bitzer said they expect an expenditure of \$227,443 in FY-91 in the Youth Program and the proposed for FY-92 is \$241,932 or a 6% increase. Mr. Bitzer said that 82% of the FY-92 anticipated increase is due to the higher cost of insurance. He said they anticipated a 6% increase in revenue based on the proposed FY-92 fees.

Mr. Bitzer said the combined estimated total of programs 311 thru 314 for FY-91 is \$658,724 and the proposed for FY-92 is \$666,607 and the total insurance increase in those combined programs is \$25,000. He said the estimated percentage of recovery for FY-91 is 52% and the proposed for FY-92 is 53% to 54% recovery.

Mrs. Coniglio said she wished to call attention to the difference in the percentage of recovery between the Recreation Center and the Golf Course. She said the estimated percentage of recovery

for Golf is 102% while the estimated percentage of recovery for the Recreation Program is 52%. Mrs. Coniglio said she wanted to call to the attention of the Town Council the differences between the two programs, and that there was a huge difference between an adult playing golf at \$50.00 a pop and a child playing T-Ball, and she asked that the Town Council take in to consideration those differences.

Mr. Myers said he agreed with Mrs. Coniglio and he felt it was important to keep in mind that the Golf Program has a very expensive piece of property for which they charge a fee which enables them to achieve a high rate of recovery percentage. He said it was very easy to operate a golf course and realize a large profit. Mr. Myers said he felt it was more difficult to realize a 52% recovery rate in a program such as the Recreation Program than it is to recover 102% in the Golf Program.

Mr. Bitzer said that was a good point, and this has been discussed before the Town Council previously. He said he felt there was not as much comparison between the two programs as there had been in the past.

Mrs. Coniglio asked why was the insurance costs so high? Mr. Bitzer said he had explained to the Commission before Mrs. Coniglio arrived at the meeting, that the Town had experienced a large number of claims during the past year and this has resulted in a large across the board increase in insurance costs.

RECREATION DEPARTMENT FULL TIME EQUIVALENT PERSONNEL: Mr. Bitzer said the increase in facility maintenance costs was due to the increase in maintenance which is performed at Seaview Park by the Public Works Department.

TENNIS PROGRAMS: The increase is a proposed registration clerk to cover the extended daylight hours for the tennis courts.

ADULT PROGRAMS: The proposal is .15 of a full time person based on 40 hours per week.

YOUTH PROGRAMS: Proposed is a 15% increase which is a percentage of one person which will be moved from the Tennis to the Youth Program.

Mr. Bitzer said the total proposed increase in the 311 thru 314 programs is .69% of one position. He said they anticipated recovering the entire cost of the tennis clerk by fees collected during the extended operating hours of the tennis courts, and the clerk will be provided only if it is self supporting.

2. REVENUES:

Mr. Bitzer referred to Exhibit 1 from the information package provided to the Commission. He said there were some recommended fee increases in the Tennis Division. Mr. Bitzer said they had made large increases in some of the previous years in the tennis fees and they had received several complaints about the large increases, so the Town Council recommended that they have smaller fee increases each year instead of larger increases periodically. He said they are recommending a 5% increase across the board in the annual fees.

Mr. Bitzer said he realized that in the past the Seaview Park Commission had voted against any fee increases because they were fearful that an increase in fees would mean a reduction in memberships. Mr. Bitzer said there had been discussion regarding the fees for the Ladies Teams. He said he had spoken with one of the Ladies Team captains and she had indicated that the members of her team would be taking out annual memberships next year. Mr. Bitzer said that if the other teams followed suit, they could realize a significant increase in revenue.

Mr. Ochstein asked why the revenue was so much lower in 1991/92 than in 1990? Mr. Bitzer said he felt the decrease was the result of fewer clinics and a reduction in private lessons. He said the Tennis Pro position was not filled until March that year, so there was a loss of commissions in the Tennis Program.

Mr. Myers said there was a significant drop in membership last year and even though the cause could not be pinpointed, he felt that if fees are raised high enough you will lose a number of members. Mr. Myers felt that if it was necessary to raise fees it would be better to leave the annual fees the same and raise the daily fees. He said he felt that if they raised the daily fees it might be an incentive for some people to purchase annual memberships.

Mrs. Coniglio said she felt the daily fees were way out of line as compared to the other fees being charged at the Recreation Department.

Mr. Myers said that was correct. He said that actually the daily fee at Seaview Park was lower than the ones at Boynton Beach and the annual fees are substantially higher than other municipalities in the area. Mr. Myers said the annual family memberships were particularly out of line.

Mr. Bitzer said that had been one of the questions when they were contemplating raising the fees. He said that personally he had not had complaints about the fees, but he had received complaints

about not being able to get on the tennis courts, and as for the number of annual adult memberships, Mr. Bitzer said that last year they had 164 members and this year they have 166 annual adult members.

Mr. Myers asked what the numbers were three years ago before the fees rose so drastically? Mr. Bitzer said that in 1989 there were 240 adult memberships and that's all the classifications grouped together, in 1990 there were 224 and in 1991 the memberships were back up to 242. Mr. Bitzer said that generally the daily fees charged at Seaview Park are pretty expensive compared to other municipalities.

Mr. Myers said the annual memberships were substantially higher than other municipalities and the daily fees about average and he felt that if there is a need to generate more revenue it should be through the daily fees. Mr. Bitzer said that if a daily fee of \$5.00 was charged and you had a membership of \$160, based on that you could play 32 times before the cost would equal an annual membership.

Mr. Bitzer said the only category which has experienced a reduction in membership is the annual resident family membership. He said the number was down from 17 members in 1990 to 11 members in 1991. Mr. Myers said that was the category which was most out of line price wise.

Mrs. Coniglio asked if the Commission needed to vote on whether or not to raise fees? Mr. Bitzer said he would convey the Commissions recommendations to the Town Council.

Mrs. McIntyre said it might be better to address some of the other problems such as not being able to get court time rather than focus on raising the fees.

Mrs. McIntyre made a motion that there should be no increase in the annual resident family fee, and if any fee increases are necessary, they should be in the daily fees. Seconded by Mrs. Coniglio. Mrs. Clark-Royal asked what about raising the nonresident fees. Mr. Bitzer said that in 1990 there were 7 annual nonresident adult memberships and in 1991 there are 6. Mr. Myers said the motion had been made and seconded and called for a vote. Motion carried.

Mr. Ochstein said he would like to discuss another point and that is that some of the ladies reserve three hours of court time and only pay for one. Mr. Bitzer said it was his understanding that the ladies have six courts and they all finish at different times. Mr. Ochstein said the point was that they blocked off the courts and he felt the ladies should be charged for the amount of time they have the

courts blocked off. He said that may encourage the ladies to purchase annual memberships which he felt they should have to do anyway.

Mr. Myers said he agreed that they should become members. He said it was his understanding that only Seaview Park members had the right to reserve courts according to the rules. Also, he said guests are being invited to play tennis at Seaview Park but no one is paying any fee for their playing time.

Mrs. Wells, A-1 team captain, said she thought it was a good idea that all team members be members of Seaview Park Tennis Courts. She said she thought that in the past that annual memberships were a requirement for the ladies teams, and she felt that memberships should be a requirement beginning with the 1992 season. Mrs. Wells said that all the private clubs where they play require them to be members.

Mr. Bitzer said he had advised the ladies team captains that he did not anticipate recommending a raise in ladies team fees, however, he does not set policy and, like the Seaview Park Commission, he can only make recommendations to the Town Council. Mr. Bitzer told the ladies team captains that the annual permit issue was discussed briefly at the March Seaview Park Commission meeting and he felt sure that the issue of everyone having to obtain an annual membership or be required to pay for the actual units of time they use the courts would be brought up again.

Mrs. Coniglio asked if it would be agreeable to the other members of the Commission to require the nonresident participants to buy a resident membership? Mr. Ochstein said that a nonresident would have to pay whatever the fee is for a nonresident. Mrs. Coniglio asked if it would be possible to charge a team fee at the same price as the annual resident fee through this year.

Mr. Bitzer said he would question the legality of such an arrangement, and he said he didn't feel the Town Council would make fee exceptions for nonresidents. Mr. Bitzer said he felt that if they were nonresidents and wanted to participate in the Seaview Park Recreation programs, then they would have to pay nonresident fees. Mr. Bitzer said he would worry about charging some nonresidents one fee and other nonresidents a different fee.

Mrs. Wells said something would need to be done about the fees, because a woman who plays on a team at Seaview Park 12 times and has to pay \$300.00 she felt was too much. Mrs. McIntyre said that possibly would encourage them to buy an annual membership. It was noted that they would not be allowed to purchase an annual membership because they are not a resident of the Town.

Mr. Bitzer said that a nonresident can purchase an annual permit, however, he said there was another alternative. He said that ideally the participant joins the facility where they play, or they could pay the daily fee times the hourly units of time they use the courts, and in this instance the fee would be \$10.00 per match for residents and \$20.00 per match for nonresident.

Mr. Ochstein said he would like to make a motion that members of the ladies tennis teams should pay for whatever units of time that they have the courts tied up for, or be an annual permit holder.

Mr. Bitzer said that the fee could be calculated into a team fee. He said the fee would be \$120.00 per match if they were all residents. He said if the team had members who are not Town residents, then the fee would be based on the nonresident fee. Mr. Bitzer said if the resident team members wished to subsidize the nonresident members, pay the difference and have one team fee, he had no problem with that. He said they wanted to be flexible but at the same time they needed to be consistent and in compliance with Town approved fees.

Mrs. Wells suggested that for the 1991-92 season they leave the fees as they are now, which is that the residents pay \$5.00 daily fees and nonresidents pay \$10.00. She said approximately half of the members of the women's teams seemed positive about buying an annual membership, and for the 1992-93 season they could go into the regulation regarding the higher fees.

Mr. Bitzer said it was very early in the budget process and any increase in fees would not take effect until October and he did not feel the Town would defer fee increases until the 1992-93 season.

Mrs. Wells proposed that the nonresident fees be raised in the 1991/92 season and encourage all team members to purchase annual memberships. She said that in 1992/93 there will be a lot of changes in the regulations for the ladies tennis teams and then they should be required to pay for either triple or double units, or be annual permit holders.

Mr. Myers said he felt that Mr. Ochstein's suggestion was very good in that the team members have the option of the court time they use which would typically be 2 units, or purchasing an annual permit.

Mr. Ochstein's earlier motion that the members of the ladies teams be required to pay for all units of time which they have reserved or purchase an annual membership in FY91-92 was seconded by Mrs. Clark-Royal and the motion carried.

An earlier motion was made that if there should be any fee increases, that it should be in the daily fees. Seconded by Mrs. Clark-Royal, motion carried.

Mr. Myers said he would just like to state that they very much want the ladies teams at Seaview Park. He said there had been a problem with the Tennis Pro and members of the ladies teams a few years ago and he hoped the relationship would improve. Mr. Bitzer said they did get several complaints from annual permit holders that the teams take up prime time and they feel that as annual permit holders, they should have preference of court time. Mr. Bitzer said if the members of the ladies teams purchased annual permits, that feeling would be eliminated.

EXHIBIT 3: Mr. Bitzer said they were recommending that the after school program be expanded to include a new classification which is the 6 through 9th grade after school program.

Motion was made by Mrs. McIntyre to establish an after school program with the recommended fees for the 6 through 9th grade children. Seconded by Mr. Ochstein, motion carried.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT:

Mrs. Clark-Royal asked why the Council only approved lighting two tennis courts? Mr. Bitzer said the the Town Council wanted to light two courts and wait and see how that works out. Mr. Ochstein asked if the Town Council was aware that the Seaview Park Commission had recommended that four courts should be lighted? Mr. Bitzer said the Council was aware of the Seaview Park Commission recommendation.

Mr. Broberg asked Mr. Bitzer if he knew what time the proposed Recreation Budget would be heard by the Finance & Tax Committee? Mr. Bitzer said he could not be sure. Mr. Broberg asked if it would be helpful if he appealed to the Finance & Taxation Committee on behalf of lighting the other two tennis courts? Mr. Bitzer said he would have to find out if it was possible to recommend adding the two other courts since the contract had already been awarded. Mr. Broberg asked if the low bidder would still honor his bid to light four courts? Mr. Bitzer said he thought the bid was originally good for 90 days, however, the contractor may no longer be obligated to honor this 90 day bid extension. Mr. Broberg asked if they were still within the 90 day period? Mr. Bitzer said he believed that was correct. Mr. Broberg asked if it was possible to approach the Finance & Taxation Committee and possibly get all four courts lighted at once.

Mr. Ochstein asked if it was possible for them to go before the Town Council with this matter? Mr. Broberg said he couldn't

understand the Council's reasoning in lighting two courts instead of all four, because if they light courts #3 and #4 now the cost will be \$7,200 but if they light these courts next year the cost would be \$30,000.

Mrs. Clark-Royal said it seemed that the Town Council was being "penny wise and pound foolish" because there is such a difference in the cost of the lighting if four courts are lighted instead of only two.

TENNIS & BASKETBALL COURT RESURFACING: Mr. Bitzer said this project included resurfacing of the basketball court at \$3,000, the hard tennis courts #7 and #8 at \$6,000, and the clay tennis courts #1 thru #6 at \$6,600. He said that the hard tennis courts and basketball court require a protective sealer coat resurfacing approximately every five years and that FY-92 will be the 5th year since these courts were resurfaced. The clay courts require reconditioning every two or three years and that FY-92 will be three years since these courts were reconditioned.

TENNIS COURT LIGHTING: Mr. Bitzer said it was proposed that they light courts #3 and #4 in FY-92 at a cost of \$30,000 which includes a 10% contingency fee.

SEAVIEW PARK MAINTENANCE BUILDING: Mr. Bitzer said the maintenance building proposed for FY-92 has been in the Capital Improvement budget for approximately four years and is intended to provide additional storage for Recreation program and maintenance equipment. Mr. Bitzer said he would recommend that the maintenance building be proposed for FY-93 and the regrading of courts #1 thru #4 be proposed for FY-92.

TENNIS COURT RENOVATION - COURTS #1 - #4: Mr. Bitzer said the regrading of courts #1 - #4 is scheduled for FY-93 at a cost of \$45,000 and basically affects the older clay courts. Mr. Bitzer said with the poor existing grade and drainage, he would recommend that this project be proposed for FY-92.

LANDSCAPE IMPROVEMENT: Mr. Bitzer said the landscaping is scheduled for FY-94 at a cost of \$35,000 and is intended to add shade trees to the entry way and some of the seating areas at Seaview Park.

Mr. Bitzer said the Commission might want to consider moving the regrading of courts #1 thru #4 from FY-93 to FY-92 because the reconditioning of the tennis courts is good for 2 years and if they come back the next year and do the tennis court regrading they will basically lose 1 year of the reconditioning because they will have to tear up the tennis courts to complete the regrading project. Mr.

Bitzer said that if the regrading project was moved from FY-93 to FY-92, the reconditioning of courts #1 thru #4 at a cost of \$4,400 could be eliminated from the FY-92 proposed capital improvement program.

Mr. Broberg made a motion that the tennis court regrading project should be done in FY-92 and the maintenance building be postponed until FY-93. Seconded by Mrs. McIntyre, motion carried.

VI. ANY OTHER MATTERS: None.

VII. ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business, meeting was adjourned.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Jacquelyn Reedy", written over a horizontal line.