I. **Call to Order:** Meeting called to order at: 12:01pm

II. **Roll Call**
**Members Present:** Chair Loren Jones, Rob Steedle (alt), Josh Anderson, Patty Collins, Mike Stanley, Matt Boline, Sigrid Dahlberg (alt)

**Members Absent:** Kim Kiefer, Pam Leary

**Other Staff Present:** Diane Cathcart, Lauren Anderson, Myiia Wahto, Lindsey Brown, Matt Lillard, Jerry Nankervis (Assemblymember), Mayor Sanford

III. **Discussion on the Information Received To Date**
Chair Loren Jones opened with reviewing the goals of the task force and the summary he created that was sent out to the Task Force. The summary looked at Management, Cost Recovery, Innovation, Staffing, Financial, Budget Setting and CIP Budgeting Process as areas that were discussed during the meetings. Has the information gathered to date been sufficient to start making decisions and recommendations or is there still information the task force is lacking? Do we have some idea of a summary that we can use to have available to the public and use to inform the public as to what the task force has done to date. Are there any corrections to the summary?

Myiia Wahto mentioned that under the financial part question #3, she wants to make it clear that we don’t just randomly come up with rates, but the rates that we do have are in our fee schedule. Matt Lillard mentioned that Eaglecrest does a similar thing as Treadwell, we look at rates, usage and demands, also regarding the statement in the summary under Management “Board of Directors was successful only when the Board acted as a policy setting Board…” is a rather strong statement, better addressed as “most successful when acting as a policy Board” is a better statement.

The task force has 3 policy questions they are going to try and answer. The last public hearing will be November 25th which gives the task force the first couple weeks of December to formulate the report given to the Assembly. Loren Jones asked the members if the information we collected, is it helpful to answer the questions we’ve been tasked with, and in what direction should we be looking down road to answer the questions regarding the empowered board or management
structure. Jones then opened up the meeting to members for their thoughts and any unanswered questions they may have.

Matt Boline: comparing Parks and Recreation management, versus empowered board management of Eaglecrest, I haven’t seen a whole lot of disparity in how to reduce costs with the exception of employee wages, but I don’t know that that’s really enough of a cut based on reduction of costs, it’s still rather vague and not enough information for me.

Loren Jones: are there questions that come to your mind that we need to ask or try to answer?

Matt Boline: when it comes to reducing costs, it seems Eaglecrest goes through the same process at Parks and Recreation it’s just a different group of people doing it. Patty Collins: empowered board with Eaglecrest has more flexibility it seems to me, quicker response time, flexibility of employment is a big one; more user responsive because they are a set of users that are doing the management, and the single focus helps their ability to reduce costs. One facility to be concerned with vs. Parks and Recreation has many.

Loren Jones: Are there questions we haven’t looked at?

Patty Collins: following the model of Eaglecrest for Treadwell seems like a good idea, but one of the questions we haven’t looked is, is it wise to roll Treadwell under Eaglecrest and how would that look with finances, user concerns, if Eaglecrest was going to operate both facilities.

Loren Jones: Eaglecrest Board brought forth a list of questions to the Assembly. So some of those questions the task force could look at.

Sigrid Dahlberg: as far as reducing costs, any of these entities could work towards reducing costs but it’s more flexible under an empowered board because you’re not as constrained by the rules of CBJ, but there aren’t really that many costs to cut. For the rink to be a successful endeavor they need to look at what can be done to promote more revenue and a lot of that is tied into marketing. Eaglecrest made a huge jump in how they handled marketing. While I’m not sure it makes sense to put Treadwell under Eaglecrest; they have a great model for changing the way that area is marketed, and bringing people in and the whole set of programs of bringing school kids in as part of the school curriculum there are a lot of things that Eaglecrest has done really well. There aren’t that many costs to cut so we need to think about how to increase revenue and not just by increasing rates for the user groups. The amount of money coming up in from the user groups is pretty stable, if rates go up the number of hours may change, and you can only squeeze so much out of the user groups. Need to look at supplemental things to bring people in during the day. Bring school groups in during the day. Fill those hours and bring in that revenue, and not have it be just on the backs of the existing user groups.
Josh Anderson: I don’t see too many differences between what restrictions the Parks and Recreation has compared to Eaglecrest, there are many similarities. I think if we looked at making a list. A simple check list of all the things you want to do; put Parks and Recreation on one side and Eaglecrest on the other and check yes or no can we do it? If the list on the right for Eaglecrest is heavy saying yes they can do everything and if the list on the left for Parks and Recreation is not, then it shows right there that someone is limited or someone is not, but it seems to me they are pretty comparable. There might be some subtle differences but those are small things. How much work can you get done to implement new policy? I’m looking at it more simplified, can we do it, yes or no.

Sigrid Dahlberg: like the idea but would like to add a column for Treadwell under Treadwell Board.

Josh Anderson: if Treadwell is its own board instead of Eaglecrest you would have to know what that board could do, are we hiring a 3rd party to run that board, otherwise it would follow the same guidelines as all CBJ empowered boards and if you modeled it after the Eaglecrest Board you would have the same limitations that they have.

Sigrid Dahlberg: except that the focus would be different. The focus would be all Treadwell, it would a board made up of all people interested in Treadwell just as Eaglecrest is all Eaglecrest focused. That’s my concern with putting Treadwell under Eaglecrest is it splits the focus. It’s doing a great job running Eaglecrest, if you make it bigger it makes it gets unwieldy if you keep it the same size and split it between Treadwell and Eaglecrest then you have these two factions not always able to work together.

Patty Collins: you create the very thing that Eaglecrest Board said was a difficulty. You want a policy board you don’t want a management board. They had problems when they had board members that were only interested in their individual programs. So if you take the Eaglecrest Board and have some people only interested in skiing and some only interested in skating you’ve now created a board that are interested in their individual programs; that’s where I have a concern.

Mike Stanley: agrees with the last few comments, would have to be a lot of discussion if you were looking at putting Treadwell under Eaglecrest Board, for the very reasons that have been talked about. You would be diluting the focus of the board members that are currently interested in Eaglecrest. I don’t think there’s a big cost reduction to be had just by moving to an empowered board, there may be some savings over time, depending on your manager. It’s not going to be a big piece, where all of a sudden you can save a large amount of money. There are certain costs to running the ice arena that aren’t flexible. Growing your base is important such as implementing school programs. At Eaglecrest, the skiing population was starting to age out so the key was getting the next generation committed and bought in. Parks and Recreation could come up with those same
ideas, and create some type of board that is focused on Treadwell can bring that kind of passion. It is going to be about revenue, if you can increase revenue with a modest reduction in costs in a balance that you want them, which is going to be the key. That doesn’t necessarily mitigate in favor of Eaglecrest managing Treadwell, a separate empowered board or even a different type of structure. In the original Eaglecrest study it was suggested to give the facility to a nonprofit to run. I don’t think you’re going to see a big cost savings just by moving to a structure different then you have now.

Rob Steedle: I agree that we would not accomplish much in the way of cost savings by having this run as an empowered board; operating costs are pretty low as it is. Mr. Anderson has a good suggestion of taking all the factors you would consider and determining if an empowered board could do it more effectively then under existing management; I think that will help clarify the picture. It’s important to divide the two questions, could a board do this more efficiently – which board. SO if you get to the point that you decide a board may make a lot of sense that would be the time take the question of whether Eaglecrest Board is appropriate for this or if the Assembly wants to create yet another empowered board. The key to the sustainability of this is going to be increased marketing to drive those revenues up.

Loren Jones: hearing some unanimous thoughts of how this needs to get laid out and presented to us. Josh has a good suggestion. Take whatever suggestion we have here and send it out to everyone. Are there other specific factors we would want to put in the left column?

Josh Anderson: Depending on how detailed you want to get, all the interest that the skating community has, concessions, ice time, mainly are how to more generate revenue. What are those hurtles: to have alcohol at an event, rentals, food concessions, etc.

Matt Boline: Not just about the skating community either, large events or in the summertime when the ice is not in. Like when Juneau Jazz and Classics used the arena when another venue wasn’t available; why isn’t it used more in the summer? I know we cut summer funding recently, but if there is the possibility to generate a large amount of revenue by holding a large event in a building that’s perfectly designed for it why would we say no to it? Is it because of City policy or is it other factors.

Josh Anderson: that’s a good point, I had forgotten about potential summer usage.

Sigrid Dahlberg: I know the ventilation in the building in the summer is an issue. Is it tied into the plant, I don’t understand why the existing ventilation system can’t be used to create better ventilation in the summertime.

Staff: The compressors and exhaust fans are off in the summer. The fans are loud so they are not very user friendly for events.
Loren Jones: any other factors?

Patty Collins: addressing user concerns, gathering information from users should be on the list.

Josh Anderson: labor/employees and employee structure fulltime vs. part-time. If Parks and Rec wants to have a structure like that could they follow a similar thing to Eaglecrest?

Loren Jones: Eaglecrest still follows CBJ Human Resources Personnel rules and gets approval from HR for Eaglecrest pay plan.

Sigrid Dahlberg: looking at what would be in the left column; some of these issues are a big deal, some are not. For example, at Eaglecrest there are so many employees that small changes can make a big difference but at Treadwell there aren’t that many employees so if you make a small change it’s going to make a very small difference. We need to keep in mind the magnitude of difference it makes to do these things, because if you come out at the end and say – look there’s 25 things that this model does better than this model and you look at all of those 25 things and all of them are tiny and the 3 things that the other model can do better are big, maybe it’s still an imbalance. We need some type of prioritization, they need to be categorized and we need to think of every single thing we can do to make the rink operate better so it can improve. For purposes of discussion, don’t want to get lost in the little things that aren’t going to make a big difference.

Loren Jones: Instead of listing multiple items summarize it as - ease of making management decisions related to revenue, which management structure might increase those better?

Patty Collins: another concern is accountability and transparency. There have been multiple times when there have been questions asked as to why something is a certain way and not another way; and answers can be vague, elusive, or nonexistent at times. An empowered board may be different.

Matt Boline: the arena has more value then just for the user groups, it has a value to the City. When talking about the level of importance and certain differences, what may seem small to the arena end up being really big to the City. $1500 in ice rental may amount to a large amount of money in tax dollars and permitting fees and bringing people into Juneau. When it comes time to discuss values or how an empowered board versus Parks and Recreation Dept. would make decisions, those things should come into play too.

Loren Jones: Similar model to how JCVB looks at the value of conventions at Centennial Hall and how that relates to additional revenue spilling out into restaurants, hotels and sales tax.
Mike Stanley: one of the things you get by having a citizen volunteer board is you get a lot of free labor, people spend a lot of time thinking about stuff, working on plans, trying to think of better ways to do it by having that oversight board. There is some value to that; the people who are on that board are dedicated to that facility. They bring a range of different skill sets; everyone is a skier and committed to seeing Eaglecrest succeed. The same could be said for Treadwell. The Treadwell Board would be a working board, giving guidance to the Manager, or you could still have a Parks and Rec Manager, there’s some merit or consideration of having that kind of energy and time commitment brought by citizen volunteers.

Loren Jones: I think we’re going to have a lot of that discussion now that the City will have to start crafting the ordinance of an empowered board for the pools. Whatever we do here with a recommendation, if the Assembly follows through and it’s an empowered board it’s got to go before the electorate next October, even if it goes under Eaglecrest it has to go back to the municipal election to be voted on. A lot of the questions that might be faced if we were to recommend an empowered board for Treadwell we may have answered quite a few of them as we struggled through to get the aquatics ordinance correct and go through the recruitment process to get people interested in being on the boards. We may get some of those same questions answered as to the effectiveness and business orientation; exactly who we chose or who applies if we have a criteria for who we want and those people don’t apply do we just appoint somebody anyways or do we not appoint someone because they don’t fit what we thought was the best for the boards.

Patty Collins: Along those same lines; with Eaglecrest being run by an empowered board, it has a general vibe to it of belonging to the skiers, although that same vibe, in theory, could exist with an entity run by Parks and Rec I think the fact that it isn’t’ and it’s run by an empowered board does contribute to that existing and I feel that users feel more commitment and loyalty to the facility of Eaglecrest because of that structure.

Josh Anderson: we could have a Treadwell Arena Advisory Committee.

Matt Boline: we already kind of have that with the Parks and Rec Committee.

Several members: but it isn’t because it’s looking at all issues not just Treadwell.

Loren Jones: Will take what we have talked about today, review the minutes and look at not having a meeting next week, but still have the Oct 30 meeting. That should give us some formulation for what we might present at the public hearings, and be ready for the 6, 13, and 25 public hearings to take comments and questions from the public.
IV. Dates for Public Comment Meetings: with no objections from the task force, the below dates were set for the task force to take public comment.

1. November 6, 2014 – Douglas Library 5-7pm  
2. November 13, 2014 – Mendenhall Valley Library 5-7pm  
3. November 25, 2014 – Assembly Chambers 5-7pm

V. For the Good of the Order  
Matt Boline suggested that if the task force is going to make a list and go back and forth on management practices if we could submit ideas for the list and submit to Di, it was agreed that was the best way to keep with the open meetings act requirements.

Discussion was had on how best to layout the list, how detailed it needed to be, think of things that matter that would be handled differently and see how that falls out versus a long list of things that would be done the same under any option.

Loren Jones will take the summary and the list from what was just talked about in terms of the factors. Loren will summarize those down to keep it focused on the major groups; and to the extent that each can be answered yes or no - could this still be done under the current management, or would an empowered board make a difference. Any comments should be added to help expand on the yes’s and no’s as needed. This will help write up a summary for answering questions from the public and structuring on how we might start writing the report that will be given to the Assembly.

VI. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 12:43pm