## To: Select Board, Town of Camden
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## Executive Summary

As the FY17 Budget Team for the Camden Snow Bowl, we did have some success in achieving our goals in the short time we had to work, and did have an impact on the amount of revenue we can reasonably expect to earn by recommending a ticket price increase. We also recommended to maintain current hours of operation and to operate the double chairlift during the week, as we felt cutting service offerings would have a negative impact on revenue without providing tremendous cost savings. We had no direct impact on controlling expenses. The dynamics of committee work prevented us from achieving all of our duties. There is a lot of risk involved with operating a ski mountain on the coast of Maine and understanding the risk factors, although crucially important to the operation of the Snow Bowl, are beyond the scope of this committee. This report contains a synopsis of the topics we discussed and documents some of the strategies we used, both collectively and individually. As of the writing of this report, we do not have a final budget from Management that illustrates the budget that was approved in a 4 to 1 vote on Thursday July 7. To achieve the financial results in the proposed FY17 budget, Management must be very active in the day to day operations, must strive to increase revenue and strive to understand in detail the factors that drive expenses at the redeveloped facility. At the end of this report we've included recommendations that we have for Management, and the recommendations that we have for the Select Board.

## Risk Factors

There is a lot of risk involved with operating a ski mountain on the coast of Maine. Weather is a risk to successful operations that Management cannot control. There are many other risk factors that Management can have a substantial influence over by making changes in staffing, snowmaking, grooming, ticket \& lesson prices, hours of operation, safety programs, vendor management, etc. Many of these factors have an influence on the financial results and must be considered in the development of a budget and the operation of the Snow Bowl. The Budget Team discussed some of these risks throughout our budget process.

## Assumptions in Budget

The assumptions used in the development of the FY17 Budget have a lot to do with why the Budget is different than historical results. Management has projected increases in revenue beyond historical levels. With a shortened FY15 season due to the delay in redevelopment and a paltry FY16 due to very warm poorly timed weather events, Management believes that FY17 can be very different and will result in higher revenue. The specifics of these assumptions must be reviewed in detail to understand how the revenue levels will be obtained.

## Duties \& Summary of Process

The following are the duties assigned to the FY17 Snow Bowl Budget Team:

Work with the Snow Bowl staff, Finance Director and Town Manager to

1) Review the FY17 Snow Bowl budget
2) Analyze actual and projected costs and revenues
3) Identify essential expenses (the minimum necessary to operate a community ski area safely and efficiently)
4) Consider opportunities for cost containment and revenue growth
5) Develop a balanced budget based on an average winter that breaks even
6) Identify and consider various scenarios such as how to respond to a difficult season if revenues and expenditures are not expected to meet projections.
7) Recommend the FY17 Snow Bowl budget to the Select Board
8) Bring forward any other recommendations the Budget Team thinks the Select Board should consider.

## Methods Employed, Observations, \& Findings

After creation of the Budget Team on May 10, we first met on May $25^{\text {th }}$ for the first of what turned out to be six meetings. A tremendous amount of time and effort was devoted by committee members both in and outside of the meetings due to our support of the Snow Bowl. We spent the first two meetings primarily involved in subjective discussions, which was important to share ideas and knowledge, but didn't afford us the opportunity to complete all of our duties. We were not presented an FY17 budget to review until one day prior to our third meeting on June $8^{\text {th }}$. At that meeting we learned that the budget was based on a reducing services in weekday hours of operation from 10 hours per day to 8 and eliminating double chairlift service operations during the week. In our subsequent meetings we discussed revenue projections and what levels of ticket sales would be necessary at various price points to achieve the budgeted revenues. We also discussed how much revenue might be lost and how customer satisfaction would be impacted. We felt the reduction of services could have an adverse effect on net income. On the expense side, we did not get to the line-by-line analysis that was suggested by some on the committee. That effort will be necessary and tough decisions will need to be made before the Snow Bowl will operate with balanced actual results, unless Management is able to find ways to deliver on the revenue projections.

We employed professional skepticism when reviewing the budget and the assumptions that it is based upon. Professional skepticism is defined in accounting and auditing standards an attitude that includes a questioning mind being alert to conditions which may indicate possible misstatement due to error, and a critical assessment of audit evidence. This involves taking a position of neutrality - don't accept statements without testing and understanding the relevant facts.

We reviewed the Snow Bowl Statistics from 2008-2016 that was provided by Management. This document was essential in that it provided several units of measure that helped with analysis of historical results and the FY17 Budget.

We reviewed the FY17 budget in comparison to actual results from eight prior years. A long view provides a better perspective of expected results. We agreed that FY15, the year of redevelopment, resulted in a late opening. We agreed that FY16 weather had an impact on days of operation, daily ticket sales, lesson income and rental income. We determined that an average of FY14 and FY15 provided a reasonable view of what a statistically normal season would look like.

We "normalized" FY15 and FY16 results by calculating and estimating dollar values attributed to changes from a typical year due to the late opening in FY15 due to redevelopment delays and the abnormally warm and rainy winter of FY16.

We challenged the assumptions in the revenue and expense FY17 budget. Due to time constraints, the dynamics of committee work, and the lack of meaningful answers provided to our questions we were unable to have much success analyzing the expenses as presented.

We challenged the statements made in the April 26, 2016 Select Board Workshop packet and found several to be unsupported by actual financial results or facts that we could substantiate. We also found that many of the comparisons were FY16 Actual verses FY16 Budget as opposed to historical actual results - although these calculations may have been accurate, they did not fully explain the actual underlying reasons for the operating loss that was suffered in FY16.

The FY17 Budget prepared by Management includes a significant increase for Daily Ticket sales and lessons. With the initial budget, Management indicated that there would be no need to change ticket prices. We determined that the $\$ 305,000$ of daily ticket sales was attained by selling 15,250 day tickets at the current average revenue per ticket of $\$ 20$. We found that level of activity a far stretch from normal levels of less than 12,000 . We also found this inconsistent with the statement in the Select Board workshop memo that states that 10,000 tickets would be necessary for a successful season. This spread of over 3,250 day tickets represents a $\$ 65,000$ difference in day ticket revenue. We recommended a lower amount or revenue or a higher average ticket price.

FY16 included sponsorship and grant revenue in the amount of $\$ 56,646$ which came from supporting organizations. Without this item, the loss from FY16 would have been in excess of $\$ 250,000$. The FY17 Budget includes $\$ 50,000$ of donations and grants.

We questioned the impact that complimentary passes, both daily and season passes have to revenue. We determined that in FY16 325 Season Passes were issued, which far exceeds historical levels and also exceeds the number of people that have been identified as employees, Ski Patrol, Mountain Stewards and Coaches. We also determined that in FY16, there were 533 complimentary daily passes provided. We concluded that these practices need to be reviewed, at the very least clouded analysis of revenue and expenses, and likely have a large impact on net income.

We identified that there are 4 key revenue producing events during the season.
December school vacation (Christmas break)
Martin Luther King Weekend
Toboggan Nationals
February school vacation
Year-to-date financial performance and statistic reports generated during and after these benchmark dates should be reviewed by Management and the Select Board to keep a pulse on the activities. Metrics should be developed to compare these benchmarks to overall budget expectations.

We believe December school vacation week can make a significant contribution to revenue and have asked Management to gain an understanding of the costs involved in making snow
early with the goal of opening for Christmas. A cost/benefit analysis will need to be performed to determine if it's worth the extra efforts to open primarily with man-made snow.

The Snow Bowl has never been allocated or reported its share of Worker's Compensation insurance.

Some of the unresolved questions and issues that remain on the expense side include the following:

1. FY15 Alpine Salaries are substantially understated. Full time salaries show income of $\$ 19,000$. Part-time employee line may be slightly inflated due to full-time error. This needs to need to be examined and explained.
2. FY16 Alpine Salaries need to be examined and explained -We know that physically there was a shift from Fitzy to others that were part time. We should have experienced savings in benefits by making this shift, but this doesn't appear to have occurred. Also, we would have incurred additional labor costs for all of the seasonal employees if 20 more days of operations occurred. Groomer wages were lower in FY16 than FY15 - this is inconsistent with the workshop memo.
3. FY15 and FY16 Electricity and Snowmaking Electricity lines need be examined and explained and compared to FY17 budget.
a. Electricity - There will be additional costs that should be added to FY15 actual to allow for operation of the double chair. There are additional costs that would be added to FY16 to account for the 20 additional days of operations; however it already appears overstated in comparison to history and FY17 budget. Perhaps FY17 budget is too low.
b. Snowmaking Electricity was actually less in FY16 than FY15-this is inconsistent with the workshop memo.

We believe that with additional efforts, information and analysis we could learn much more about the fixed and variable costs associated with operations. We could also determine which costs were essential to operations and which costs were not as critical, and which costs should be eliminated.

## Exhibits

These two exhibits were created by TC Bland and were provided to the committee for review. These exhibits seek to illustrate what an "average" winter looks like based on historical performance.

## Exhibit A - Budget Analysis Worksheet (attached)

This spreadsheet shows a clear illustration on just two pages of the actual results from four years in a format comparable to the preliminary FY17 budget. The alternative FY17 revenue budget based on calculations that I believe are representative of historical actual results while factoring in changes based on the discussions we had in our meetings. I did not provide an alternative expense budget due to time constraints and unanswered
questions. This illustrates a revenue budget of just over $\$ 800,000$, net of donations. Again, the expense budget comes from Management, but I believe understates expenses related to electricity and other categories. More analysis is needed in my opinion.

## Exhibit B - Financial Results Analysis - Normalized Results (attached)

This spreadsheet illustrates calculations of "normalized" revenue and expense based on FY15 and FY16. These dollar amounts are estimates, but were derived from using the actual results as detailed in the FY17 budget document and adjusting them based on the statistics document that we were provided. On the revenue side, I again came up with totals of about $\$ 800,000$. On the expense side, I have some questions that I have asked above and noted on the spreadsheet, but I'm reasonably confident that "normal" expenses will be in the $\$ 920,000$ to $\$ 950,000$ range based on Management's representations.

## Recommendations for Management

Get very involved in the management of the finances of the Snow Bowl operations, both on the revenue and expense side. To achieve the financial results in the proposed FY17 budget, Management must be very active in the day to day operations, must strive to increase revenue and strive to understand in detail the factors that drive expenses at the redeveloped facility.

Continue to actively manage to all 4 key benchmark dates.
Get open for Christmas week!
Maximize snowmaking by using additive.
We recommend substantially reducing the overall costs and/or finding alternative sources of revenue to reduce the risk of another loss from operations.

We recommend developing a thorough understanding of the electricity costs associated with all segments of operation, including each lift, the snowmaking water pumps, snowmaking compressors, and alpine lighting. There is a need to understand how much is really would cost to make snow in November and understand seasonal arrangements and peak demand charges, etc. This information would help you and others perform a cost/benefit analysis of various components of the alpine operation.

We recommend reducing the number of Complimentary Season Passes that are granted. In FY16 the number was 325, which far exceeds historical levels and also exceeds the number of people that have been identified as employees, Ski Patrol, Mountain Stewards and Coaches. We also recommend reducing or eliminating the practice of complimentary daily passes.

We recognize the importance of the fourth grade ski program with area schools and see this as a historically strong program that builds future customers and strengthens the ties with the school and community. We recommend looking for alternative funding sources for this program to offset costs of offering the program.

The Ambassador program seems to provide an essential service to the overall operations at a fair cost. We determined that the forgone revenue - Complimentary Season Passes - was worth about $\$ 10,000$. Other costs for appear to be minimal. Many of the services that the Ambassadors provide might otherwise go undone, need to be staffed, or outsourced - likely at a higher cost.

During discussions we felt an increase in day ticket prices might be well advised. One point of caution - increasing prices and cutting back weekday operations could result in adverse effects to revenue by driving customers away.

Management has communicated that the current arrangement with the rental shop operator may not be sustainable and may need to be renegotiated which would likely result in increased costs and/or reduced revenues to the Snow Bowl in order to maintain essential function to the alpine operation, which overall is a revenue source. Negotiate for a win/win with this long term Alpine partner.

## Recommendations for Select Board

Employ professional skepticism when reviewing the budget and the assumptions that it is based upon. Professional skepticism is defined in accounting and auditing standards an attitude that includes a questioning mind being alert to conditions which may indicate possible misstatement due to error, and a critical assessment of audit evidence. This involves taking a position of neutrality - don't accept statements without testing and understanding the relevant facts. As an example: Management included $\$ 305,000$ day ticket revenue in the first draft of the FY17 budget. We determined from using the historical revenue and statistics that daily ticket revenue averages about $\$ 20$ per ticket. We calculated that 15,250 day tickets would need to be sold to achieve this total revenue. The historical statistics show that day ticket sales have never reached 12,000. We didn't believe the $\$ 305,000$ was a reasonable budget for day tickets and recommended a lower projection.

We recommend substantially reducing the overall costs and/or finding alternative sources of revenue to reduce the risk of another loss from operations.

We identified that there are 4 key revenue producing events during the season.
December school vacation (Christmas break)
Martin Luther King Weekend
Toboggan Nationals
February school vacation
You should receive and review year-to-date financial performance and statistic reports generated at these benchmark dates to keep a pulse on the activities. Metrics should be developed to compare these benchmarks to overall budget expectations.

We believe that the recent increase in costs needs more attention. We did not deeply analyze the costs due to the time constraints of the budget process. We believe that with additional efforts, information and analysis we could learn much more about the fixed and variable costs associated with operations. We could also determine which costs were essential to operations, which costs were not as critical, and which costs should be eliminated.

The labor allocation between the Parks and Recreation in the General Fund Budget and the Snow Bowl Enterprise Fund should be revisited next year. There is a $50 / 50$ split in the FY17 budget and recent prior year actuals - 6 months of labor costs (salaries, payroll taxes, and benefits) for all full and part time employees are allocated to the Snow Bowl. Several years ago 7 months was allocated to the General Fund, with 5 months to the Snow Bowl. For the years included in our analysis, it appears to be consistently a $50 / 50$ split and therefore no increases in the labor costs can be attributed to this change.

The Snow Bowl has never been allocated or reported its share of Worker's Compensation insurance. We recommend reviewing this situation with Management.

A new lodge will bring with it new costs for staffing, maintenance, electricity costs and heating and ventilation costs. The new costs will be in addition to the same types of costs already paid for the existing lodge since the existing lodge will remain. We recommend exploring new sources of revenue to support these new lodge costs as it does not appear that current sources of revenue are sufficient to bear any additional costs.
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## Camden Snow Bowl

Budget Analysis Worksheet

| Expenses |  |
| :--- | ---: |
|  |  |
| Administration | $70-01$ |
| Lodge | $70-05$ |
| Maintenance Shop | $70-05$ |
| Alpine | $70-15$ |
| Rental Shop | $70-30$ |
| Toboggan Chute | $70-15$ |
| Capital | $70-35$ |
| Toboggan Nationals | $70-30$ |


|  |  |  |  | 2015/2016 2013/2014 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012/2013 | 2013/2014 | 2014/2015 | 2015/2016 |  |  |  |
| Actual | Actual | Actual | Actual YTD | Budget | Average |  |
| 132,397 | 179,037 | 252,031 | 219,961 | 218,120 | 215,534 | 70-01 |
| 29,792 | 38,031 | 42,880 | 45,180 | 53,552 | 40,456 | 70-05 |
| 5,236 | 7,505 | 9,314 | 5,100 | 8,200 | 8,410 | 70-05 |
| 437,350 | 456,729 | 488,303 | 575,723 | 583,441 | 472,516 | 70-15 |
| 37,685 | 24,677 | 31,362 | 30,295 | 33,000 | 28,020 | 70-20 |
| 18,786 | 16,437 | 11,652 | 6,186 | 5,003 | 14,045 | 70-25 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18,076 | 39,077 | 42,495 | 30,788 | 46,148 | 40,786 | 70-30 |

Total Expenses
Profit/Loss
Less Town Matching 70-01 19 Less Sponsorship 70-01 20

| $\$$ | 679,322 | $\$$ | 761,493 | $\$$ | 878,037 | $\$$ | 913,233 | $\$$ | 947,464 | $\$$ | 819,765 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |


| \$9,874 | \$12,880 | (\$85,422) | (\$197,332) | \$20,016 | (\$42,782) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $(15,000)$ | - | - | - | - | - |
| $(1,050)$ | $(1,000)$ | - | - | $(5,000)$ | (500) |
| - | - | - | $(56,646)$ | $(35,000)$ | - |
| - | - | - | - | - | - |
| - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (\$6,176) | \$11,880 | (\$85,422) | (\$253,978) | (\$19,984) | $(\$ 43,282)$ |

Less Grants
Less Donations 70-15 26 Less Capital Donatior 70-35 Addback Capital Outlay

## Profit/Loss From

$(\$ 6,176)$
\$11,880 $(\$ 85,422)$ (\$253,978) (\$19,984) $(\$ 43,282)$

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Management } \\ & \text { 2016/2017 } \\ & \text { Budget } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Management } \\ \text { 2016/2017 } \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 214,410 | 214,410 | combined w/ Lodge in F\&17 <br> combined with Alpine in FY17 combined with Alpine in FY17 |
| 54,500 | 54,500 |  |
| - | - |  |
| 600,690 | 600,690 |  |
| - | - |  |
| - | - |  |
| 15,725 | 15,725 |  |
| 27,240 | 27,240 |  |

Management Management
2016/2017 2016/2017

| $\$ \quad 912,565$ | $\$ \quad 912,565$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| $\mathbf{\$ 9 , 4 3 5}$ | $(\mathbf{\$ 8 9 , 5 6 5 )}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| - | - |
| $(10,000)$ | - |
| $(15,000)$ | - |
| $(10,000)$ | - |
| $(15,000)$ | $(15,000)$ |
| 15,725 | 15,725 |

$(\$ 24,840) \quad(\$ 88,840)$

## Operations

## 5 Year Average of Revenue**

2011/2012 to 2015/2016 2010/2011 to 2014/2015 2009/2010 to 2013/2014 2008/2009 to 2012/2013

## 5 Year Average From Operations

2011/2012 to 2015/2016 2010/2011 to 2014/2015 2009/2010 to 2013/2014 2008/2009 to 2012/2013

| Revenue | Expenses | Profit/Loss |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\$ 707,684$ | $\$ 769,023$ | $(\$ 61,339)$ |
| $\$ 709,582$ | $\$ 716,974$ | $(\$ 7,393)$ |
| $\$ 677,097$ | $\$$ | 649,124 |
| $\$ 642,165$ | $\$$ | 596,399 |
|  |  | $\$ 27,973$ |
|  |  |  |
| Revenue | Expenses | Profit/Loss |
| $\$ 692,755$ | $\$ 769,023$ | $(\$ 76,268)$ |
| $\$ 705,782$ | $\$ 716,974$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 1 , 1 9 3})$ |
| $\$ 669,147$ | $\$ 649,124$ | $\$ 20,023$ |
| $\$ 629,215$ | $\$ 596,399$ | $\$ 32,815$ |


| Per day ticket \& season pass average revenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Day tickets Sold |  | 8,679 |  | 11,895 |  | 11,738 |  | 8,497 |  | 11,817 |  | 5,250 |  | 12,000 |
| Average revenue per day ticket | \$ | 21.37 | \$ | 18.73 | \$ | 22.12 | \$ | 20.10 | \$ | 20.42 | \$ | 20.00 | \$ | 22.00 |
| Season Passes Sold |  | 1,039 |  | 932 |  | 1,060 |  | 1,267 |  | 996 |  |  |  |  |
| Average revenue per season pass | \$ | 173.45 | \$ | 208.37 | \$ | 186.09 | \$ | 178.48 | \$ | 196.51 |  |  |  |  |

Actual Revenue
Day Ticket Sales Day Ticket Sale growth

Season Ticket Sales
Other Ticket Sales

Lesson Income
Equipment Rental
Lodge rentals
Toboggan Rentals
Toboggan Nationals
Non-recurring grant
"Normal" Revenue

## Actual Expenses

Full Time Alpine Salaries
Part Time Salaries
Ski School Wages
Ski Patrol Wages
Groomer Wages
Lift Operator Wages
Snowmaking Labor
Vehicle Repair \& Maint
Lift Electricity
Snowmaking Electricity
"Normal" Expenses
"Normal" Profit/(Loss)

| FY15 | FY15 comments |
| :---: | :--- |
| 792,615 | pretty typical year <br> reasonable growth could be added and defined here |
| 3,000 | pretty typical year - extra sales due to redevelopment <br> excitement offset by some refunds <br> impact to revenue for fewer complimentary tickets - 30 <br> additional season passes at average revenue of $\$ 200-$ <br> these might be day tickets too |
| 3,000 | more lessons if not delayed by late opening |
| 5,000 | more rentals if not delayed by late opening |
| 5,000 | lodge was closed due to redevelopment |
| (7,000) |  |

$$
807,615
$$

## 878,037

120,000 FY15 shows labor income of 19,000
$(25,000)$ appears inflated need to investigate
3,000 more lessons if not delayed by late opening
2,000 more patrol days if not delayed by late opening
double not operated, some extra on triple?
$(20,000)$ remove groomer hydraulic failure costs Double not operated
$(5,000)$ appears inflated over normal years

## 953,037

(145,422)

| FY16 | FY16 comments |
| :---: | :---: |
| 715,901 | YTD |
| 65,000 | Sell 3,250 additional tickets at \$20 average each |
| $(20,000)$ | Sell fewer tickets FY16 was a year after a huge snow year - so we saw increased actual sales |
| 15,000 | impact to revenue for fewer complimentary tickets - 75 additional season passes at average revenue of $\$ 200$ these might be day tickets too |
| 30,000 | due to 20 more days of operation |
| 30,000 | due to 20 more days of operation |
| - |  |
| 5,000 | due to ice on the pond |
| 15,000 | normalize to historical average |
| $(56,646)$ | one time event? |
| 799,255 |  |
| 913,233 | YTD |
|  | need to illustrate change from Fitzy to part time shift |
|  | need to illustrate change from Fitzy to part time shift |
| 10,000 | due to 20 more days of operation |
| 5,000 | due to 20 more days of operation |
| 6,000 | due to 20 more days of operation |
| 20,000 | due to 20 more days of operation |
| $(7,000)$ |  |
|  | due to 20 more days of operation |
| 5,000 | appears less than normal years. |
| 952,233 |  |
| $(152,978)$ |  |

799,255

913,233 YTD
need to illustrate change from Fitzy to part time shift
need to illustrate change from Fitzy to part time shift
more days of operation
6,000 due to 20 more days of operation
20,000 due to 20 more days of operation
$(7,000)$
due to 20 more days of operation
5,000 appears less than normal years.

