

**Recreation Revenue Opportunities
Revenue Opportunities Subcommittee
Financial Task Force
Approved by the Financial Task Force May 11, 2015**

Objective:

As part of the Financial Task Force, the Revenue Opportunities Subcommittee has been charged with identifying new sources of non-property tax revenue and to make recommendations for changes.

The Subcommittee identified recreation as an area that can generate new revenues to cover existing and future operating, maintenance and capital costs. One other idea was briefly considered: outsourcing the management of the Recreation Department. However, it was determined that this would require significant changes contemplated herein that are not solely under the aegis of recreation, and therefore, outsourcing at this time would not be cost effective. Evaluation of these ideas should be revisited once objectives of the town are agreed upon.

The recreation departments of nine comparable towns, as defined by the Financial Task Force, were reviewed: Arlington, Bedford, Burlington, Lexington, Watertown, Wayland, Wellesley, Westford, and Winchester. None of these towns operate a town or school owned indoor pool; therefore, comparables for the Higginbottom Pool include Acton-Boxborough, Dedham, Milford, Sudbury, and Westwood.

Summary:

As municipalities grapple with the constraints of providing services under the constraints of Prop 2 ½, many towns similar to Belmont have recognized that recreation programming and assets are vital to the quality of life they seek to offer and important community asset. In order to fund operating, maintenance and improvement of recreational facilities, comparable communities are generating new sources of revenues through increased participation and utilization, market rates for facility usage, and expanded non-resident use. Many towns are operating their recreation departments as “self-supporting” entities, through Recreation Enterprise Funds, community use programs, revolving funds and other mandates. While not all are successful covering total all-in costs with fees, it is apparent that peer communities are balancing the desire to provide programming that is affordable and engages a diverse and broad segment of the community with the need to leverage the costs of existing recreational assets.

Belmont’s valuable town-wide recreational assets have the potential to generate significant new revenues by adopting a similar model. Historically, however, oversight of these assets has been fragmented, and revenue generation has not been prioritized. Existing programming, rental fees, and usage have developed ad hoc over several decades without a framework for analysis or an understanding of the all-in costs of delivering services. In spite of market demand for access to facilities and fields, rates charged to non-resident users are often below those charged in surrounding towns.

Generating new sources of revenues will require a detailed understanding of direct and indirect costs, clear policies, a new mindset, and experienced management. The town, school department, athletic leagues and recreation commission will need to reduce the barriers that exist and that prevent the effective and efficient use of town assets. This will require committed leadership and entail tremendous time and effort and--most of all--changes in "the way things have been done." However, these changes will provide real budgetary and quality of life enhancements for the community.

Peer communities such as Arlington, Bedford, Lexington and Winchester generate revenues of \$1.2-1.5 million per annum through self-supporting models, in comparison to Belmont's FY13 revenues of \$792,000. These communities are able to fund all-in operating, maintenance and a portion of capital costs with user fees; for example, Arlington and Lexington's Recreation Enterprise funds each pay \$85-100,000 in debt service per annum on town issuances used to upgrade facilities. This is accomplished at affordable rates, with similar staffing levels, and without the combined recreational assets enjoyed by Belmont.

For FY15, the Recreation Budget projects revenues of \$700,000 and expenses of \$832,000 for a net use of \$132,000, not including capital and maintenance costs borne by the Town, such as the Harris Field turf replacement (approximately \$1 million), Higginbottom Pool repairs and upgrades (\$80,000 budgeted for FY15), debt service for the new Underwood pool and other such costs. The Recreation, Town and School budgets also do not include extensive field upgrades and maintenance of the Grove Street, Winnbrook, Pequosette, Town and High School and JV fields over the last 8 years paid for by the Belmont Soccer Association, Belmont Second Soccer and Belmont Youth Lacrosse, Belmont Youth Baseball and the Brendan Grant Foundation.

Belmont can learn from comparable towns that have migrated wholly or partially to a self-supporting model, offering more and diverse programming, more efficiently, and more widely. There exists high demand for use of recreational assets —pools, fields, indoor space—by residents and non-residents alike, which the town does not manage effectively or efficiently. Expanded programming, coordinated field usage and off peak, non-resident market rate rental rates can offset high operating and capital costs. Our analysis indicates that Belmont can conservatively generate \$165,000-\$330,000 per annum in new net rental and programming revenues within three years to fund existing expenses. With experienced management and the support of town leaders, Belmont has the potential to operate town and school recreational assets as truly self- sustaining over the long term.

Key Findings/Opportunities for Belmont

- Belmont is fortunate to have combined recreational assets not found in peer communities. None of the nine comparable towns has a town owned indoor swimming pool and only one—Lexington—operates an outdoor pool. Only three own hockey rinks, and some towns do not have field houses. (Appendix I) While several communities have additional dedicated space, Belmont does not compete for participants with local recreation facilities such as Arlington Boys and Girls Club and Fidelity House in Arlington, Hayden Recreation Center (a private non-profit) in Lexington, and for-profit gyms and facilities such as Boston Sports.

- Of the nine comparable towns, Arlington, Lexington, Westford and Winchester have adopted Recreation Enterprise Funds (REFs). REFs account for all recreation expenses, including direct and indirect operating costs, maintenance, and capital costs, and program costs are used to set fees. Excess funds remain within the REF and fund program expansion and capital upgrades. Arlington, for example, financed the majority of a \$2 million upgrade to its hockey rink through its enterprise fund. The cost of delivering programs and the benefits derived from fees are clear to the users since excess revenues are not returned to the general fund but used to expand programming and improve facilities. These communities also report that understanding and matching revenues to costs also results in greater efficiencies.

With few exceptions, other peer communities are focused on utilization rates, consumer driven programming and matching revenues to expenses through revolving funds and other mandates. While not all of them cover total operating expenses and maintenance, these towns are ahead of Belmont in efforts to understand costs and leverage assets.

- Dedham, Milford, Sudbury and Westwood have adopted self-supporting models to cover the significant year-round costs of indoor school pools. These pools generate \$100,000-200,000 per annum through market rate rentals to non-resident users, expanded hours and creative programming. Milford, through its self-supporting Community Use Program, recently funded a \$50,000 filtration system for its indoor pool. All of these pools are managed outside the School Department in the respective towns.

Belmont's Higginbottom pool costs the School Department an estimated \$200,000 per annum in operating fees, not including staffing or capital costs¹; the pool currently generates minimal revenues. A pool rental rate study shows that Belmont charges rates significantly below market to a non-resident elite team. (Appendix II) Other revenue opportunities include: additional team and club rentals, expanding hours to allow adult lap swimmers, birthday parties and additional programming.

Outdoor pools can be net cash generators, both directly and indirectly through camps. A two-pool configuration for the new Underwood Pool offers the opportunity to double programs throughout the morning or rent to summer swim teams, offer evening swim lessons, and generate rental revenues for low demand hours with rentals and birthday parties. A new facility also presents the opportunity for the Recreation Department and the Recreation Commission to rethink and review the fee schedule, especially with regard to non-resident usage, and consider expanding the season, as well as the hours it is open to allow this valuable asset to be utilized as much as possible.

- Peer communities recognize that field use is at a premium and that maintaining and

¹ USASwimming .org/facilities development: "The average annual operational cost for a new 15,000 square ft facility that houses 6 or 8 lane 25 yard pool in a seasonal climate in a suburban population would be \$210,000 (not including staffing)."

upgrading fields is an important, yet costly, undertaking that requires the coordination of the recreation department, the school department, the DPW and the user groups. All of Belmont's comparable communities have written policies covering usage requirements and permits, priority of use, and applicable fees for town and school fields. All but one of Belmont's peer communities issue permits for both town and school fields through their recreation departments. (Appendix III and V)

As the number of organized sport teams and participants have dramatically increased in recent years, and the demand for field space has intensified, towns such as Burlington, Winchester, Wellesley, and Wayland have created field management task forces or commissions comprised of representation from town, school, league and public stakeholders. The goal of these groups is to determine usage of the fields, plan maintenance and capital upgrades to the town and school fields and to set fair and consistent policies, fees and priorities for usage.

All of the comparable towns in this analysis charge field fees for town and school fields, ranging between \$20-\$125 per hour to \$7-\$40 per participant per season. Fees are based on the user group and residency percentage and use of turf or lights command additional fees to cover higher expenses; non-resident groups often pay \$150 -\$225 per hour. Youth league field fees do not increase cost to the participants, but are paid to the town for maintenance, upgrades and other amenities out of fees collected by the leagues. To ensure transparency, several towns (e.g., Bedford, Westford, Winchester) have dedicated field fee revolving funds that ensure funds collected from such fees are used exclusively for field expenses.

In Belmont, private, non-profit youth leagues have donated time, effort and significant funds generated by participation fees to upgrade, re-sod, reseed, aerate, irrigate and maintain both town and school grass fields. Many of the upgrades are capital projects that the Town would not be able to fund, and some of the projects have resulted in a net decrease in ongoing maintenance and costs for town fields. From the perspective of the DPW, Recreation, and the youth leagues involved, this arrangement has worked well to date. However, lack of consistent, written policies for town and school fields has contributed to a lack of clarity on priorities for usage.

Belmont has the opportunity to generate significant new revenues from charging market rates to non-resident, camp and clinic users of town and school fields. Harris Field is currently not rented to any groups and both town and school fields get minimal use during the summer. Watertown, which does not charge field fees to youth leagues, generates \$130,000 per annum in turf and light fees from non-resident groups (BC and BU) during off peak hours.

- Revenue generation and make up varies by town, reflecting demographics, location and types facilities. However, an analysis of comparable towns indicates peer communities offer a broader array of programming across all age groups, and create efficiencies by outsourcing programs. An analysis shows that participant fees are, in general, no higher than those charged in Belmont for similar programs. (Appendix

IV) Affordability, access to programs and broad participation are an important mission of all recreation entities surveyed.

Opportunities for Belmont to generate new sources of funds without significant investment and without burdening existing users include:

- Market rate rentals for non-resident usage of town and school fields and facilities, especially for teams, camps, and clinics. Typically, camp and clinic providers are charged a “per participant” or 20-25% percentage overhead fee for use of facilities, rather than a flat fee;
- Outsourcing programming to third party providers which broadens offerings without incremental expenses;
- Expansion of programming to include new or underserved residents such as toddlers and preschoolers (soccer, gymnastics, multi sport and arts); alternative sports for all ages (fencing, badminton, ultimate Frisbee, futsal, dodgeball, flag football); adult outdoor and exercise programs (Crossfit, biking, bootcamp); and additional enrichment programs (chess, legos, science and art);
- Additional town-run camps, pre and after care programs and adult leagues, which are often net cash generators;
- Increased utilization of facilities through:
 - Weekend and off peak programming and usage
 - Expanded hours of operation
 - Non-resident rentals for off peak hours
 - Instructional classes which are shorter in duration (ie, tennis lessons).

Recommendations

The Subcommittee recommends that the Town hire a full time Recreation Director to generate new sources of revenues, expand programming and create additional efficiencies. The revenue ideas contained herein require an investment in a dedicated professional who has the mandate, experience and energy to seek out and understand the needs of the community and leverage the costs of existing assets through new usage and creative programming.

This person should have a degree in Recreation Management and 4-7 years managing recreation facilities (an aquatics background would be a plus). To mitigate risk, the town should consider hiring the director with under a 3-year contract with specific goals. If, at the end of the contract, new funds have not been generated to cover the total annual cost of the director’s position plus an amount to be determined, the contract would end and the town could consider other alternatives for the Recreation Department.

Estimated Costs : \$100,000 per annum (per David Kale)

The Subcommittee recommends that Belmont consolidate the management of town and school recreation assets under experienced recreation management. A professional manager will bring a broader and more consistent discipline to understanding the direct and indirect costs, the town-wide and non-resident demand, and the

opportunities for maximizing the value of these assets. Under the current fragmented system, the town is not realizing market rates or maximizing utilization of its assets. This is especially true of school assets, where it is not the core mission to manage rentals and non-school related scheduling. Merging the management of these assets will increase transparency and flexibility for the benefit of all stakeholders.

Additionally, the Subcommittee recommends combining the operation of the Higginbottom Pool and the new Underwood Pool into an Aquatics Program.

Assign a dedicated aquatics manager to focus solely on these two assets, which operate in complementary seasons and serve similar user bases. The indoor pool is a costly asset that does not serve the core mission of the public schools. Outdoor pools, in spite of a short season, are able to generate net operating cash under experienced management.

The town currently has a seasonal, part-time supervisor for the Underwood Pool. This position could be redefined to capture the year round nature operation of both pools.

The Subcommittee estimates that Belmont's aquatics facilities can generate a total of \$150,000-\$225,000 per annum in new net revenues within a three year time frame.

The Subcommittee recommends that the town create a Field Management Committee of stakeholders to determine usage, prioritization, maintenance, upgrades and revenues and coordinate donations for improvements for both Town and School fields. A Field Management Committee would help balance the requirements of the various (and ever increasing) athletic groups with other needs, including the town's need to generate additional revenues to maintain and improve its assets. Peer communities that have adopted this model--Wayland, Wellesley, Winchester and Burlington--all report improved communication and utilization of fields.

The Committee would include representation of the DPW, the Recreation Department, the School Department, the Recreation Commission, Facilities, citizens and each of the youth leagues using the fields. The purpose would be to replace the ad hoc and disparate process that currently exists with one that is fair, consistent and transparent.

The scope of the Field Management Committee would include:

- Develop consistent written policies that address all of the parties needs;
- Determine the current and projected operating, maintenance and capital costs of the fields, and match expenses and capital costs to sources of funds;
- Set policies, usage time and market rates for non-resident groups and camp/clinic use of fields and evaluate other opportunities to generate revenues without compromising field conditions;
- Compare the existing model with field fee models of other towns in more detail to ensure that Belmont's model best suits the town.

Based on comparable communities, it is conservatively estimated that field revenues from camp and clinics, and increased off peak usage and charges range between \$100,000 - \$150,000 for Harris Field alone.

While we are not recommending resident/youth league field fees at this time, we note here that, based on an estimated 6,000 participants, charging per sport/season, field fees could generate \$60,000- \$240,000 (gross) per annum for the Town. Field fees would be offset by the cost of taking on what private organizations currently provide.

The Subcommittee recommends that the Recreation Department work in conjunction with the Recreation Commission to generate written policies, expand programming, users and utilization, outsource programming and identify efficiencies, and evaluate provider and rental fees. Engaging more citizens in a creative and efficient manner while seeking opportunities to fund expenses is a win-win for Belmont. It is highly recommended that the Recreation Department and Recreation Commission contact the Arlington, Bedford, Lexington and Winchester recreation departments for an understanding of what programs and providers have been successful in those towns.

The bulk of net revenues from programming will come from: outsourcing new programming at a rate that funds overhead expenses; additional camps and clinics or other programs; and new non-resident usage and market rate rentals. The Subcommittee estimates that incremental new revenues from these sources will be \$25,000-65,000 per annum to fund existing expenses within a 3-5 year time frame.

Estimated Impact

By adopting these recommendations, Belmont will recommit to vibrant and diverse recreation programming, generate funds to maintain and upgrade facilities, and create budgetary enhancements without burdening taxpayers. A simple, preliminary and conservative estimate of new revenues that could be generated within three years, net of additional expenses, is between \$165,000 and \$330,000 per annum. This estimate reflects a partial analysis only; opportunities for the hockey rink, field house, and other indoor facilities have yet to be identified. Even small changes can yield meaningful results, as evidenced by a change in schedule at the rink in FY 14 that resulted in \$15,000 in additional revenues without additional expense. Additionally, the analysis does not include what, if any, benefit field fees would generate relative to town field expenses.

Aquatics Facilities	\$150,000-\$ 225,000
Non-Resident Field Fees	\$100,000-\$ 150,000
Programming and Service Delivery	<u>\$ 25,000-\$ 65,000</u>
TOTAL Net Programming Revenues	\$275,000-\$440,000
Recreation Director (incl. benefits)	(\$100,000)
Misc. Start Up Costs	<u>(\$10,000)</u>
Net Incremental Revenues	\$165,000-\$330,000 per annum

Appendix

I Comparable Town Selected Recreation Information

II Suburban Non Resident Pool Rental Rates

III Summary of Field Fees for Comparable Towns

IV Fee Comparison of Selected Programs

V Field Oversight in Comparable Towns

VI Private Donations to Belmont and School Fields and Facilities for Maintenance and Improvements, 2007-2014

Appendix I
Selected Recreation Information for Comparable Towns
As of June 2014

	Belmont	Arlington	Bedford	Burlington	Lexington	Watertown	Wayland	Wellesley	Westford	Winchester
FY13 Rec Revenues (000)	\$792	\$1,500	\$1,500 Rev Fund	\$569 (excl. rink)	\$1,156 (ex.golf course)	\$400 (excl rink)	N/A	\$1,000	\$1,143	\$1,536
FY13 Rec FTE	5.1	3.1	4	4	5.3	3	2	3	3	4
Enterprise Fund?	No	Yes	No Rev. Fund	No Rev. Fund	Yes	No	No	No Rev. Fund	Yes	Yes
Field Fees?	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Non res only	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Indoor Pool	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Outdoor Pool	Yes	No/Pond	No	Wading Pool Only	Yes	No	No/Lake	Pond	No	No/Pond
Hockey Rink	Yes	Yes	No	Yes Run by priv. co.	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
Pre School	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
Pre/Aftercare	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Special Needs	S.P.O.R.T.	S.P.O.R.T.	No	No	No	S.P.O.R.T.	No	No	No	No

Notes:

- FTE equivalents taken from available budget reports, recreation brochures and direct contact and do not include pre-school or pre and after care FTEs.
- Buildings listed include town or school owned facilities only.
- Some of these towns have a recreation building, youth center, or other additional space, which allows for additional programming.

Appendix II
Suburban Non-Resident Pool Rental Rates
April 2014

Public	Pool Size	Non Res Rate/Hour	Add'l Fees	Ttl Non Res Rate/Hour	Comments
BELMONT	6/25 yds	\$10-15	n/a	\$10-15	
Acton Boxborough	6/25 yds	\$100	\$48-58	\$148-58	Through A-B Comm Education
Brookline Pool	6/25 yds	\$135	incl	\$135	Menu based fees
Dedham Comm Pool	6/25 yds	\$50*	incl	\$50	Relooking at fees
Camb War Mem.	6/25 yds	n/a	n/a	n/a	No response
Keefe Tech	6/25 yds	\$120	\$42	\$162	Member town rentals not disclosed
Milford	6/25 yds	\$125	inc	\$125	Community Use Program, self supporting
Minuteman Tech	25 meters	\$100	\$30-58	\$130-158	50% for non profit or memb town youth gp
Sudbury Pool	8/25 yds	\$120**	incl	\$120	Rec Ent, self supporting
Westwood Community	6/25 yds	\$100	incl	\$100	Self Supporting Pool at HS, run by Town
Non Profit					
Arlington Boys and Girls	5/25 yds	\$100^	incl	\$100^	5 lane pool; local swim team @ \$90/hr
Lexington Hayden	6/25 yds	n/a	n/a	n/a	Non profit; no team rentals
Watertown Boys and Girls	5/25 yds	\$100^	incl	\$100^	5 lanes; discount for mult days and months
Wayland Community Pool	10/25 yds	\$120**	incl	\$120	Non profit
Private					
Babson	6/25 yds	\$85-100	incl	\$85-100	Reg team rental@\$85
Bentley	10/ 25 yds	\$90(est)	n/a	\$90 (est)	Only rent to one team; \$7000/mo x 12 mos.
Boston University	16/25 yds	\$130	n/a	\$130^^	5 lane rental, non affiliate
Brandeis	6/25 yds	n/a	n/a	n/a	No response
Dana Hall	6/25 yds	n/a	n/a	n/a	No response
Harvard	multiple	n/a	n/a	n/a	3 pools; no response
MIT	multiple	n/a	n/a	n/a	Do not divulge rates
Regis College Pool	6/25 yds	\$105	incl	\$105-135	More if guards provided by Regis
Wellesley College	8/25 yds	\$150	incl	\$150	Less for town use; more for large meets

Addl fees include custodial, weekend and admin. Non-resident rate/hour assumes no lifeguard fees.

*Flat fee per team; per hour rate is estimated by compiler. Town is reviewing fees.

^ Five lane pool; fee for 6 lanes at this rate would equal \$120 per hour. ^^5 lane pool; 6 lane rental=\$156/hr

Appendix III
Summary of Field Fees for Comparable Towns
As of May 2014

	Field Fees Charged	Supplemental Light Fees	Turf Fees
School and Rec Dept Usage Charged by:	Generally, none; Arlington charges per participant and Wellesley for clinics	\$25-\$50/hr Lexington, Winchester	Generally, none; Lexington charges \$25 fee
Town Youth Organizations (90%+ Town Residents) Charged by:	\$7.25-\$40.00/ participant; All, except: Burlington and Watertown do not charge youth leagues; Westford flat \$27K fee/league	\$20-\$50/hr Lexington, Watertown, Wellesley, Winchester	\$20-\$125/hr Lexington, Wellesley, Winchester
Other Youth Organizations/Groups Based on a percentage of resident participants Charged by:	\$20-\$80/hour OR \$30-\$40/participant plus lights All Comparable Towns	\$20-\$40/hr or \$50-\$100/use Burlington, Lexington, Watertown, Wayland, Wellesley, Winchester	\$20-\$125/hr Lexington, Watertown, Wayland, Wellesley, Winchester
Non Resident Groups Charged by:	\$30-\$120/hr plus lights All Comparable Towns	\$25-\$125/hr All Comparable Towns with lights (ex. Arlington)	\$60-\$125/hr OR \$275/use All Comparable Towns with Turf Fields (ex. Arl/Burl)
Private Camps, Organizations, Clinics Charged by:	Varies from 15% of gross revenue to \$35-50/participant OR up to \$2,500/week All Comparable Towns	Up to \$125/hr All Comparable Towns with lights (ex. Arlington)	\$40-100/hr OR \$50/participant add'l All Comparable Towns with Turf Fields (ex. Arl/Burl)

Notes: Fees are used to fund field maintenance, upgrades, administration fees and other amenities. Chart shows range of fees charged by towns indicated for each category of users. Light fees are supplemental to field and turf fees. Some towns do not have lighted or turf fields.

Appendix IV Fee Comparison of Selected Programs 2013-14

	Belmont	Arlington	Lexington	Winchester
Swimming Lessons	\$58/4 days	\$60/? Days	\$40/10 days	No town pool
Summer	45 min plus membshp	40 min plus membshp	plus membrsp	currently
Beach/Pool Membership				
Family	\$225 2 ad/ 4 ch	\$135 2 ad/2 ch	\$225 2 ad/ all ch	No town pool
Add'l child	\$10	\$20	n/a	currently
Child only	\$100	\$30	n/a	
Adult/Senior	\$140	\$45/\$30	\$75/\$50	
Baseball (8 and up)	\$233/week	\$145/week	\$160/week	
Summer Camp	\$221/week	\$175/week	\$205/week	\$215/week
Grades K-5	8:30am-3:30pm	9am-3pm	9am-3pm	9am-3pm
Extended Day Care	\$85/week	\$50/week	\$50/week	\$60/week
Karate (all Steve Nugent)	\$220/session 9 Sessions	\$215/session 9 Sessions	n/a summer	n/a summer
Volleyball	\$235/5 days 9am-4pm	\$180/5 days 9am-3pm	\$110/4 days 8am-12 noon	n/a summer
Girls BKB Clinic	\$233/5 days 9am-4pm	\$130/5 days 9am-3pm	\$160/4 days 9am-3pm	n/a summer
Ice Skating	\$85/8 plus membshp	\$161/7 wks no membshp fees	At Hayden	No town owned rink
Adult Zumba	\$100/10 weeks	\$80/8 weeks	n/a summer	\$55/6 weeks

Notes: Comparison of Belmont's offerings to comparable programs in towns with Recreation Enterprise Funds. Additional programming is available in all towns.

Appendix V
Field Oversight in Comparable Towns

	Field Permits Issued By Recreation	Field Oversight	User Fees
Arlington	Town and School	Recreation	Yes
Bedford	Town and School	Recreation	Yes
Burlington	Town and School	Semi Annual Field Use Mtg	Non Res only
Lexington	Town and School	Recreation	Yes
Watertown	Town and School	Recreation	Non Res only
Wayland	Town and School	Field Use Master Plan	Yes
Wellesley	Town and School	Playing Fields Task Force	Yes
Westford	Town only	School and Town Separately	Yes
Winchester	Town and School	Field Management Cmte	Yes

Appendix VI
Private Donations to Belmont Town and School Fields and Facilities
For Maintenance and Improvements
2007-2014

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total 2007- 2014
Belmont Boosters	\$6,750	\$11,600	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$18,350
Brendan Grant Found-Direct	\$4,025	\$12,618	\$30,904	\$7,929	\$7,233	\$5,202	\$12,400		\$80,311
BG Found-Other	\$1,750	\$1,750	\$1,750	\$1,750	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$1,000		\$12,000
BG Found-In Kind	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000		\$35,000
Belmont Soccer Assoc.	\$23,400	\$24,837	\$147,000	\$25,000	\$23,125	\$23,694	\$105,321	\$98,824	\$471,201
Belmont Second Soccer		\$120,000	\$7,500	\$10,500	\$8,900	\$8,465	\$9,900	\$261,980	\$427,245
Belmont Lacrosse	\$2,000	\$2,900	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,381	\$5,115	\$11,396
Belmont Baseball Assn	\$14,100	\$35,000		\$12,200		\$8,000	\$25,000		\$94,300
Belmont Youth Hockey					\$10,000	\$2,000			\$12,000
Anonymous	\$0		\$3,600		\$2,400	\$2,500	\$2,500		\$11,000
Total	\$57,025	\$213,705	\$195,754	\$62,379	\$58,658	\$56,861	\$162,502	\$365,919	\$1,172,803
Friends of Joey's Park							\$350,000		\$350,000

Does not include private donations used to upgrade locker facility.

Does not include renovation of Brendan Grant Memorial Field, 2002-2007, by Brendan Grant Foundation. Total cost: \$868, 531.

Per Peter Castanino (2014) and updated by Jim Fitzgerald (March 2015). Includes some non-capital costs.