

December 12, 2006

Eau Claire Youth Hockey  
Board of Directors Meeting:

Present: Chuck A., Dan D., Brian K., Joe W., Paul A., Joe S., Al D., Tim C., Jeff M.,  
Dan G., Wendy H., Tim B.,

Visitors: Mike Huggins., Mark Stile., John Rucker, Marty Hickey

No meeting last time so no minutes to approve:

**New Rink Discussion:**

Mike: Wanted to address all the reports that have been circulating. Issue the city has is two things: Upgrade Hobbs, or decide to get out of the hockey business. Proposal to the council was to look at a feasibility study to bring Hobbs up to date; i.e. locker, heating showers, etc. They are going ahead looking at upgrade Hobbs, and make it functional with office, UWEC's needs, and locker rooms. The council also added to look at feasibility of a not for profit entity owning and operating the rink. See if a group could own and manage the rink, users/stakeholders. All of this is going on over the next 6 to 7 months. Looking at 'several million dollars.' And get a handle on what the 'not for profit entity would be.' Could costs be spread out so that City is not picking up entire cost? RFP out in January, and out to approval by February, and done in the next 7 months. They will look at UWEC, Schools, Figure Skating and ECYH. ECYH is the first group mike has addressed. They do not have construction costs at this point and would have by summer for fall budgets, and approved in 08 or 09. He can not tell us what the council will approve, and will be back to us for our input.

Jeff: \$ via referendum?

Mike: Bond, and see if the UWEC would look at a third of this, via City bonding capacity and therefore resting on the tax payers.

Chuck: \$ earmarked already to look at this feasibility?

Mike: No, it's an intention as well and the scope is a bit different than prior discussions. Need design costs and feasibility studies. Mike is unsure how involved this will be for that vendor and how time consuming, etc. It may require all he users to comment. Also, are there any other users or stake holders that would be interested in utilizing...?

Jeff: 3 rinks?

Mike: NO, upgrade facility by no third rink. It may come in a later phase. It would address some of the parking issues. Maybe parking on other side of street from Hobbs. May essentially end up with a net loss of 20 spaces. They are looking at more seats, maybe more than 2000.

Jeff: Fye's Property?

Mike: NO discussions at this time.

John: Would it be wiser to put money in new rink?

Mike: I don't know. Our issue is whether this is feasible to update and continue to operate. Recommendation is to operate right, or let it go.

John: 3.5M for third rink?

Mike: we still have outdated facility.

John: what about just cosmetics?

Mike: we are not looking at that.

Jeff: What does that mean, close?

Mike: Yes, then the question is whether to for EC to own and operate the rink?

Mike: Would then look to own and operate rink, and most likely not pay taxes (Jeff)  
If ECYH had an alternate, it may be considered next fall, but that does not address Hobbs condition. At this time, there is no RFP for feasibility. Phil F.: 90 days to complete that feasibility phase. Mike: Trying to also assess if the City could not own the rink – may be some legal issues:

Chuck: Any issues with initial Kaiser Donation?

Phil F: No not by that one or the Hobbs foundation.

Chuck: Speaking for Rink committee and the board has not taken position on rink at this time. The Rink committee is not for the covering of the outside rink if the cost is equal or more than a new rink. This doesn't address ECYH needs. What is impact on ECYH in terms of price costs of ice, and what then is the benefit?

Phil: More locker rooms are the benefit. Also 40 minutes of delay typical between games as teams change. In conjunction with UWEC there would be dry land training available. May be this is better than dry land at banbury? As far as costs going up, we don't really know that. The building may get more energy efficient, etc. We don't know this until we get an engineer to determine this. At 3.5M, this includes High school coach's offices, figure skating storage, etc. If they don't want this, then those items would be eliminated. Therefore, this may be high. We think this is on the high side. We didn't include much for ECYH because we don't see needs for offices and storage.

Jeff: We need ice time, this is biggest need, how does this help? ECYH kids don't have locker room issues:

Phil: Look at schedule, there is a lot of wasted time. It's tough to look at this and say we need a third sheet. Its just not there.

The first thing we talked about was covering the outside rink. Does ECYH want that portion and do you want a full sheet or a studio rink. Can't mites use this?

Dan G: Do high school kids get use of new locker rooms?

Phil: NO, they get use of the other locker rooms.

Dan G; they are near where? Phil: at the church end.

Jeff: we miss tournament opportunities.

Mike: The reasons are the same as 18 years ago. Is there a possibility of doing something together, or does it all go away? I have to go to the city council and ask for 2M bond, and this is not a slam dunk. We may not get this done. We don't know this. But at least we are being proactive. Phil thinks the numbers are high, but we think there is a good chance to work together. Parking is a real issue. Most times works, but not for events like Memorial/north.

Dan G:

Westburn property for parking?

Phil: Yes, busing to those sites is a possibility, if we can get 3500 seats, now we can afford a shuttle that makes it work. There are adjacent property owners that may create options that work for all, like the church.

Mike: ECYH should be part of the not for profit entity.

Phil: We need some answers by the end of March. And see what works. We don't know how this works with ECYH's timeline. We have budget approvals in 2007 for 2008/09 budget.

Chuck: Question for council members so far with no real answer. Subsidy for Hobbs, when in reality, they subsidize other venues that kids use for sports. They don't seem to recognize this utilization and high user contribution vs. soccer and basketball courts.

Mike: Hobbs is an enterprise fund that pays everything. Set up many years ago, and that is the way it's been. Pool is similar or same way. So dollars are provided, and subsidies are largely a function of how items are set up.

Dan G: Did Hobbs build this and pay?

Mike/Phil: Were donations of labor, etc. Hobbs was not going to own and operate, so this has been an enterprise fund. It is separate from budget. If making money, they work great, if they are not making money, they don't work real well.

Jeff: if remodeled would it be in enterprise or taken out like soccer?

Mike: it would be a policy decision, and may be restrictions if it affects tax level. Likely to stay as an enterprise fund.

Phil: I see things going as enterprise funds. Expenses and revenues are singled out and used there.

Mike, not sure if the study would determine what kind of fund.

Mike, thank you so much for meeting with us, and appreciate the opportunity to involve as a user in feasibility study, and to let us know that the actual goal of the feasibility will be determined too, hasn't been yet.

Chuck: let me fill you in on our project:

Objectives of our project: Hit practice/game hour ratios, increase ice times. We are talking about prime time and school time that is just not available. There is a decline in certain social economic pockets; we want ice time cost down so more kids involved. We would like a fund that would allow us to keep ice costs low. We also want to be able to have tournaments, so we can further subsidize costs.

We have been looking for land, there isn't much? We went to several sites, and there just aren't much available. We have a spot on 93/94 where there will be facilities for kids and looking to spend 3 to 4 million for a sheet of ice. On the committee, we have people that wanted a sheet up a year ago like akervik, and there were others that thought that was near sighted and that we should look for facility that enhances the committee. 2400 at Zorn is largest... expand footprint and lengthen out so we get size and seating. Along came an individual that could make 1M contribution and 5 year lease utilizing rink in low use time slots. As this progressed, we both realized our 2500 seat facility would not work, and the 1M contribution would cost 2 to 3 times. So we let him know we are not interested.

We also talked to the YMCA to purchase land and help improve their land, to help their fund raising, and have some shared facilities like parking and bathrooms... still on table but not our prime alternative.

At this point looking at rink plans and concepts with Mark, owner of Lorch avenue property, and will be looking at organizations/individuals that have built rinks economically. We are not going to break ground until we have essentially all the money and are trying a silent campaign to get to 50% of money required.

Received training via university foundation and these are some of their recommendations. We are concerned and are convinced we need Hobbs plus one full sheet of ice. We don't want to end up with one sheet of ice.

Mike: as we go forward, I hope you will participate in feasibility. Do you have your plans set? Can we rule out that you have not interest in a third sheet at Hobbs?

Chuck: timing and size and cost are all concerns. Where does it go? We do not want cities study muddy the waters with ECYH efforts. WE don't want to confuse the issues. This discussion has been around. If it is something that you are interested in, depending on numbers, then we need to know that too. If you know this is not a possibility right now, then we want to know that too. I don't want to spend money in something your not going to support, and want to make sure we don't hinder your efforts.

Chuck: Guy from Chippewa was taking about a 6.9M?

Phil: 2.9 for studio rink Full sheet were 6.1M (

Mike: Planning to look at what is cost of 2 rinks, or 2 rinks and studio, or 2 rinks and new 3<sup>rd</sup> sheet, then or could the full sheet be a phase later, or 20 years from now, a 4<sup>th</sup> sheet of ice. Three basic directions. Don't need answers, tonight, but don't want cities issues or feasibilities on third sheet confuse or interfere. I want direction from ECYH as to where to go.

Phil: It hurts us to have people say we have 3.5, why not build new? That doesn't address Hobbs. They want to go to UWEC to get there's. Then they want to combine

positions and operations and use savings to get this going at Hobbs. These savings of buildings (current 1<sup>st</sup> street) then leave a bond of 2M with 180k annual, and we think the savings make it workable. We do not want to fight, we want to show work to gather so that council will support. With UWEC, ECYH and city, we think we can get this done.

Mike: We will start Jan, or first of FEB that is our time frame:

Chuck: Should we get back together in FEB?

Mike: We need to think of scope and structure of studies, and feasibility, answer what is being studied as feasible, then order the work. It deals with legal entities, and do the entities like ECYH want to.

Jeff: We will bring a smaller team.

Mark S.: Can we work together? And the hockey association could build???

Phil: yes, we can, but we have to move ahead. You are 13% of our ice hours here. If you cut in half, we have to make up 400 hours. We will be looking at alternatives that increase summer ice. It would force us to come up with other revenue plans.

Chuck: we need Hobbs ice.

Mike: Other user groups may be willing to cover capital costs. We want those costs down too. We do not want to hinder your views.

Jeff: our priority is ice time costs and ice times.

Mike: yes, I understand, been through those issues.

Mike and Phil left.

Chuck: Personal opinion is that they update facility, and we do our project. And offer a better third facility for all users including new girls program.

Al D: Look at politics of city council.

Mark Stile Leaves.

Joe Munger Enters.

Chuck: We should use John Ruttger to be our guy to assess feasibility. Mark S. we have ice engineers, and architects in town that are willing to complete this.

Chuck will write a letter regarding the ECYH's position in the next 30 days. We will base this on further discovery with the committee and get the boards endorsement.

Tournaments: Joe Susa - All tournaments are full except for bantam C and this won't be an issue. Tim says close these on the WEB.

Facilities: Dan and Al: Jerseys are passed out. Everything working.

Finance: Jeff M: Coaching Parents, what are we paying them? Same as outside coaches? They did set precedence in past by paying. This is a travel reimbursement, so there anyway with kids. Parent coaches are second choice by board. Some board members recommend saving the money, and not paying parent coaches due to fact they are there

any way. We need to save money. Other board members say we have earmarked money for this anyway. Still others say implement something for next year that sets policy due to precedence and expectation for the effort this year. Jeff suggests waiting until January to assess the situation.

New Rink: Jeff Munger. Need sheets from Paul with donor levels.

AI D: Ideal for mixer for rec and travel kids in tournaments as well as clinic time. AI believes this would be good for overall program. 6 on 6 with 4 on 4, 2 kids rotating, on two ends, 2A, 2B, and 2C, with mini clinic in the middle, then rotate. All levels. Still working on structure. Would be in summer, maybe September, and then get better communication too.

Dry Land: Not being used. We are wasting money. Some teams question value. Guy Brown has volunteered time. Need to talk to teams and get utilization up! It is paid for for this year, so let's use it.

REC – League – Wendy: Are we going to ever reimburse rec coaches for expenses? This is not figured into fees this year to keep costs down. This is not in fees for REC and keeps those leagues fees down. This is budgeted for Travel and paid by players. We will include this for next year and charge up front for coach's expense... We should ask the parents to anti up given that the Travel teams. We have college kids with no money. We may not get these guys next year.