



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts  
Office of the Attorney General  
One Ashburton Place  
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

## OPEN MEETING LAW COMPLAINT FORM

### Instructions for completing the Open Meeting Law Complaint Form

The Attorney General's Division of Open Government interprets and enforces the Open Meeting Law, Chapter 30A of the Massachusetts General Laws, Sections 18-25. Below is the procedure for filing and responding to an Open Meeting Law complaint.

#### Instructions for filing a complaint:

- o Fill out the attached two-page form completely. Sign and date the second page. File the complaint with the public body within 30 days of the alleged violation. If the violation was not reasonably discoverable at the time it occurred, you must file the complaint within 30 days of the date the violation was reasonably discoverable. A violation that occurs during an open session of a meeting is reasonably discoverable on the date of the meeting.
- o To file the complaint:
  - o For a local or municipal public body, you must submit a copy of the complaint to the chair of the public body AND to the municipal clerk.
  - o For all other public bodies, you must submit a copy of the complaint to the chair of the public body.
  - o Complaints may be filed by mail, by email, or by hand. Please retain a copy for your records.
- o If the public body does not respond within 14 business days and does not request an extension to respond, contact the Division for further assistance.

#### Instructions for a public body that receives a complaint:

- o The chair must disseminate the complaint to the members of the public body.
- o The public body must meet to review the complaint within 14 business days (usually 20-22 calendar days).
- o After review, but within 14 business days, the public body must respond to the complaint in writing and must send the complainant a response and a description of any action the public body has taken to address the allegations in the complaint. At the same time, the body must send the Attorney General a copy of the complaint and a copy of the response. The public body may delegate this responsibility to an individual member of the public body, its counsel, or a staff member, but only after the public body has met to review the complaint.
- o If a public body requires more time to review the complaint and respond, it may request an extension of time for good cause by contacting the Division of Open Government.

#### Once the public body has responded to the complaint:

- o If you are not satisfied with the public body's response to your complaint, you may file a copy of the complaint with the Division by mail, by email, or by hand, but only once you have waited for 30 days after filing the complaint with the public body. Mail may be sent to: The Division of Open Government, Office of the Attorney General, One Ashburton Place - 20<sup>th</sup> Floor, Boston, MA 02108. Emails may be sent to: [openmeeting@state.ma.us](mailto:openmeeting@state.ma.us).
- o When you file your complaint with the Division, please include the complaint form and all documentation relevant to the alleged violation. You may wish to attach a cover letter explaining why the public body's response does not adequately address your complaint.
- o The Division will not review complaints filed with us more than 90 days after the violation, unless we granted an extension to the public body or you can demonstrate good cause for the delay.

If you have questions concerning the Open Meeting Law complaint process, we encourage you to contact the Division of Open Government by phone at (617) 963-2540 or by email at [openmeeting@state.ma.us](mailto:openmeeting@state.ma.us).



## OPEN MEETING LAW COMPLAINT FORM

Office of the Attorney General  
One Ashburton Place  
Boston, MA 02108

### Your Contact Information:

First Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Last Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Ext. \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Organization or Media Affiliation (if any): \_\_\_\_\_

Are you filing the complaint in your capacity as an individual, representative of an organization, or media?

(For statistical purposes only)

Individual       Organization       Media

### Public Body that is the subject of this complaint:

City/Town       County       Regional/District       State

Name of Public Body (including city/  
town, county or region, if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_

Specific person(s), if any, you allege  
committed the violation: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of alleged violation: \_\_\_\_\_

## Description of alleged violation:

Describe the alleged violation that this complaint is about. If you believe the alleged violation was intentional, please say so and include the reasons supporting your belief.

Note: This text field has a maximum of 3000 characters.

What action do you want the public body to take in response to your complaint?

Note: This text field has a maximum of 500 characters.

## Review, sign, and submit your complaint

### **I. Disclosure of Your Complaint.**

**Public Record.** Under most circumstances, your complaint, and any documents submitted with your complaint, is considered a public record and will be available to any member of the public upon request.

**Publication to Website.** As part of the Open Data Initiative, the AGO will publish to its website certain information regarding your complaint, including your name and the name of the public body. The AGO will not publish your contact information.

### **II. Consulting With a Private Attorney.**

The AGO cannot give you legal advice and is not able to be your private attorney, but represents the public interest. If you have any questions concerning your individual legal rights or responsibilities you should contact a private attorney.

### **III. Submit Your Complaint to the Public Body.**

The complaint must be filed first with the public body. If you have any questions, please contact the Division of Open Government by calling (617) 963-2540 or by email to [openmeeting@state.ma.us](mailto:openmeeting@state.ma.us).

By signing below, I acknowledge that I have read and understood the provisions above and certify that the information I have provided is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

**Signed:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

*For Use By Public Body  
Date Received by Public Body:*

*For Use By AGO  
Date Received by AGO:*

## Description of violation

### Background

In Q4 '24, the Concord Rec Commission began a project to repave Emerson & Rideout courts, later expanding scope (without a recorded vote) to include options for converting tennis/pickleball courts at Rideout into dedicated pickleball courts. No town-wide assessment of sites, site criteria, potential impacts, sound studies, or representation from pickleball/tennis players, neighbors or the broader community was included.

### Violation

Although planning had been under way for 9+ months, the 10/21/25 meeting was the **FIRST and ONLY public forum where the community was informed of the project and asked to provide input.**

1. **Limited Public Access:** Zoom access, posted as a participant option, was unavailable town-wide during the meeting. While other boards, e.g., Planning, rescheduled to ensure equitable participation, the Rec Commission proceeded, excluding remote participation.
2. **Questionable Abutter Notification:** Many residents on streets abutting Rideout (Conant, Maple) did not receive notice of the meeting. When asked for the abutter notification list, the Rec Director stated she could not provide it, as the Rec Chair personally handled notifications.

Incredibly, at the 10/28 CPC meeting the Rec Chair indicated few neighbors attended the 10/21 meeting but that he had personally delivered notices to “all mailboxes within 200 yards of Rideout.” Not true. Not only were some direct abutters excluded, but a 200 yard radius would include Commonwealth and Highland Ave: no residents on those streets report receiving the flyer. Where is the list?

3. **No Follow-Up Opportunity:** This meeting was the **ONLY opportunity for public conversation** on a proposed \$900K+ project. Afterward, the Rec Chair:
  - o Barred public comment on Rideout at all remaining Commission/Subcommittee meetings. Unfathomable.
  - o Stopped distribution of public letters on Rideout to Rec Commission/Subcommittee members until a later date, reducing their time to understand the issues.
  - o Set a cutoff date of 11/21/25 after which no further comments on Rideout will be accepted, prematurely closing public comment.

On 11/5, 40+ abutting neighbors submitted a petition to the Rec Commission/Subcommittee. On 11/13, we learned the petition and all Rideout correspondence had not been distributed to Commission/Subcommittee members at the Chair's directive.

4. **Insufficient Committee Composition:** The Rideout Subcommittee has only two voting members; the member list is not posted. No tennis/pickleball players or neighbors are on the subcommittee.

5. **Lack of resident identification:** Part 1 of the 10/21 meeting, public commenters were not asked to state their name and address. A directional vote on options was conducted, with no validation that all who voted were Concord residents.

These actions demonstrate a pattern of controlling and limiting public input, procedural deficiencies, lack of transparency and preventing meaningful community and committee participation. Faith in the people/process is shattered.

### **Action Requested**

The lack of process, public input, and transparency has irreparably harmed this project's credibility. We respectfully ask the Town to proceed with repaving Rideout with existing mixed-use courts **but** to establish a new subcommittee to step back and conduct a comprehensive, data-driven, town-wide courts assessment to determine the optimal distribution of tennis and pickleball courts across Concord.

# ANDERSON KREIGER

**MINA S. MAKARIOUS**  
[mmakarios@andersonkreiger.com](mailto:mmakarios@andersonkreiger.com)  
T: 617.621.6525  
F: 617.621.6625

December 11, 2025

**Via Email:**

Ms. Jean Easterday  
48 Maple Street  
Concord, MA 01742

***Re: Open Meeting Law Complaint***

Dear Ms. Easterday:

I write on behalf of the Town of Concord Recreation Commission (“Commission”) in response to your Open Meeting Law (“OML”) complaint dated November 16, 2025. On December 11, 2025 the Commission voted to delegate its response to your complaint to me.

We understand the basis of your Complaint to be a concern about the project involving repair and replacement of the existing tennis and pickleball courts at the Rideout Park (“Project”). Your Complaint alleges that although the Project has been in development for over nine months, the October 21, 2025, Rideout Project Subcommittee meeting (“Meeting”) was the first and the only public forum where the community was informed of the Project and asked to provide input. Your Complaint further alleges that: (1) during the Meeting remote access to the Meeting was unavailable for a period of time; (2) many of the residents of the streets abutting the Rideout Park, including residents of Conant and Maple Streets, did not receive separate, specific notice of the Meeting; (3) members of the community were barred from submitting comments at the subsequent Commission and Subcommittee meetings; (4) The Rideout Project Subcommittee has insufficient composition with only two voting members; and (5) during the Meeting, public commenters were not asked to identify themselves or state their address, resulting in no validation that all participants who voted were Concord residents.

For the reasons explained below, the interruption of remote access did not result in a violation of the OML. All of the remaining grounds for your Complaint are outside the purview of the OML and are not proper subjects of an OML complaint.

**1. Remote Access**

Your Complaint alleges that although Zoom access was advertised as a participant option, it was unavailable townwide during the Meeting. Your Complaint further alleges that, in similar

circumstances, other municipal bodies choose to reschedule public meetings to ensure remote participation.

Under 940 CMR 29.10, the “[t]he chair or, in the chair’s absence, the person chairing the meeting, *may* decide how to address technical difficulties that arise as a result of utilizing remote participation, but is *encouraged wherever possible* to suspend discussion while reasonable efforts are made to correct any problem that interferes with a remote participant’s ability to hear or be heard clearly by all persons present at the meeting location” (emphasis added). Thus, while the regulation encourages chairs to suspend discussion while reasonable efforts are made to correct problems, it does not require meeting termination when remote participation fails.

On October 21, 2025, the Concord Broadband network experienced an interruption in service from 6:45 PM to approximately 7:55 PM due to an external party or parties intentionally sending large amounts of traffic to the network, resulting in more bandwidth than the network could support. Thus, no reasonable effort from the Town staff could have restored the network during the Meeting. It was unfortunate that the technology could not support remote participation on October 21, 2025. The decision to continue the Meeting was made because of a sizable turnout of the community members already present at the physical location, who wished to ask questions of the consultant and to make comments. Nevertheless, the Town has taken appropriate steps to enhance its network security and prevent future attacks to provide a more reliable access for future remote participants.

## **2. Abutter Notification**

Your Complaint also alleges that many residents of the streets abutting the Rideout Park did not receive notice of the Meeting. The OML establishes a framework focused exclusively on general public *notice* rather than individual notification and does not require public bodies to provide additional notice of meetings to abutters. *See* G.L. c. 30A, § 20(b) (public bodies must “post notice of every meeting at least 48 hours prior to the meeting”); 940 CMR 29.03(1)(a) (“public bodies shall file meeting notices sufficiently in advance of a public meeting to permit posting of the notice at least 48 hours in advance of the public meeting”). *See also Matter of Caroline M. Bukard*, 2024 Mass. Op. Att’y Gen. No. 222 (Nov. 22, 2024) (“the Open Meeting Law does not require public bodies to provide additional notice of meetings to specific individuals or groups of individuals for topics discussed during a meeting”).

Although there is no requirement of the abutter notification, the Commission’s Chair elected to notify the closest abutters in an effort to encourage participation at the Meeting, including those residing on Conant Street, Laws Brook Road, and Maple Street. The notices were hand delivered to every residence. This was above and beyond what is required under the OML.

## **3. Opportunity to Submit Follow-Up Comments**

Your Complaint alleges that the Chair barred public comment at all remaining Commission and Rideout Project Subcommittee meetings and set a cutoff date of November 21, 2025, after which no further comments related to the Project would be accepted. Your Complaint further alleges that the Chair chose to distribute the correspondence related to the Project to the Commission and Rideout Project Subcommittee members at a later date and that, the Chair failed to deliver the petition from the abutters and all Project related correspondence during the November 13, 2025, meeting to the Commission.

As a preliminary matter, the November 13, 2025, meeting was a regular, not project specific, meeting of the Commission, and there was no public notice that comments would be taken regarding this Project. *See* Concord Recreation Commission November 13, 2025, Meeting Agenda, available at <https://www.concordma.gov/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Agenda/11132025-13430>. Despite this, the Chair allowed members of the community, who were in attendance, to comment during the November 13, 2025, meeting, and reiterated that public comment had been open until November 21, 2025.

More importantly, the OML does not contain specific requirements for the manner in which follow-up public comments are accepted, processed, and distributed. Rather, the OML focuses exclusively on procedures that must be followed during the meetings and imposes no post-meeting obligations on the municipal bodies (other than with respect to minutes). Public bodies have a considerable amount of discretion in establishing their internal policies for handling public comments received after meetings conclude.

#### **4. Committee Composition**

Your Complaint alleges that there are only two voting members of the Rideout Project Subcommittee, and that the member list is not publicly available. This allegation is factually and legally incorrect—the Rideout Project Subcommittee has seven voting members. More importantly, it, as with other issues above, not an area within the purview of the OML.

The OML defines “public body” as any “multiple-member board, commission, committee or subcommittee within the executive or legislative branch or within any county, district, city, region or town, however created, elected, appointed or otherwise constituted, established to serve a public purpose.” G.L. c. 30A, § 18. The OML further defines a “subcommittee” as “any multiple-member body created to advise or make recommendations to a public body.” *Id.* As such, a public body forms a subcommittee when the body formally authorizes multiple members of the public body to advise or make recommendations to the public body.

In this case, the Rideout Project Subcommittee was formed when the Recreation Commission voted to authorize Phil Griffiths, Chair of the Recreation Commission, and Daniel Rodriguez, member of the Recreation Commission, to advise and make recommendations to the Recreation Commission regarding the Project. Nothing in the OML requires a subcommittee to be

Ms. Jean Easterday  
December 8, 2025  
Page 4

composed exclusively of the members of a parent body. Various subcommittees can, and often do, include Town staff and representatives of other departments. In this case, the additional five voting members of the Rideout Project Subcommittee are: Leigh Jackson, Director of Recreation, DJ Fimiani, Assistant Recreation Director, Mardi Hutchinson, Recreation Supervisor-Special Events, Bob Beatty, Recreation Operations Manager, and Erik Shaw, Assistant Highway & Grounds Superintendent. These individuals were intentionally appointed to include members of the Recreation Department and Department of Public Works to work with the consultants and develop various alternatives for the public to review.

While the OML requires that the information about the voting members of a subcommittee is publicly available, it does not require that such information is disclosed in a form of a pre-published roster. The primary mechanism for public access to this information is G.L. c. 30A, § 22, which mandates that “a public body shall create and maintain accurate minutes of all meetings, including executive sessions, setting forth the date, time and place, the members present or absent, a summary of the discussions on each subject, a list of documents and other exhibits used at the meeting, the decisions made and the actions taken at each meeting, including the record of all votes.” Critically, these minutes must be publicly accessible. This requirement that minutes identify members present or absent effectively creates a public record of who participates in subcommittee deliberations and voting.

##### **5. Resident Identification**

Lastly, your Complaint alleges that during the first half of the Meeting, public commenters were not required to state their names and addresses, resulting in lack of verification that all people who voted were Concord residents. The Meeting was intentionally divided into two halves: the first half (informal half) included a technical presentation from the consultant and provided an opportunity for attendees to ask technical questions, not to provide public comment; during the second half (formal half), those who chose to comment were asked to provide their names and addresses. Moreover, the OML does not mandate recording individual public participants’ identities or votes. *See* G.L. c. 30A, §22(a) (the Open Meeting Law requires that a public body “create and maintain accurate minutes of all meetings, including . . . *the decisions made and the actions taken* [by the public body] at each meeting, including the record of all votes”).

Going forward, the Rideout Project Subcommittee will make every reasonable attempt to restore remote access to its meetings, if technical issues occur. We appreciate your calling this to our attention, and trust that this matter is now resolved.

Sincerely,

/s/ Mina S. Makarious

Mina S. Makarious, Town Counsel, Town of Concord

Ms. Jean Easterday  
December 8, 2025  
Page 5

cc: Office of the Attorney General, One Ashburton Place, Boston, MA 02108  
Kerry A. Lafleur, Town Manager, Town of Concord (by email)  
Phil Griffiths, Chair, Concord Recreation Commission (by email)

DRAFT

# CONCORD RECREATION: RECREATION PROGRAMS AND VENDORS

DECEMBER 11, 2025

RECREATION COMMISSION MEETING

# REVENUE HISTORY AND PROJECTIONS

## Budget Projections vs Actuals: Rec Programs 340

Year	Projected	Actual	Difference
FY24	\$215,000	\$267,058.68	+ \$52,057.32
FY25	\$290,000	\$336,356.61	+ \$46,356.61
FY26	\$352,819.13	\$293,622.12	As of 12.10.25
FY27	\$489,819.30		

# WHY THE BIG JUMP FY26 TO FY27

- NEW PO SYSTEM USED BY TOWN FINANCE – WE MUST PREDICT FULL YEAR REVENUE FROM PROGRAMS
- RUNNING MORE PROGRAMMING THAN EVER BEFORE IN SCHOOLS
- NEW RFP MUSICAL THEATER – PRICE INCREASE FORECASTING
- KIDS TEST KITCHEN – CURRENT SOLE SOURCE, LOOKING AT RFP DUE TO DEMAND
- ADDING CAROUSEL FEBRUARY AND APRIL VACATION PROGRAMMING
- ADDING EXTRA WEEKS TO KALEIDOSCOPE – MORE VENDOR USAGE

# WHY DO WE USE VENDORS?

- VENDORS OFFER US SPECIALTY PROGRAMS IN WHICH THEY ARE THE EXPERTS
- THESE ARE PROGRAMS WE DO NOT HAVE STAFF OR KNOWLEDGE TO TEACH
- HELP US MANAGE COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH RUNNING A PROGRAM; HIRING, TRAINING, SCHEDULING, ETC.
- VENDORS HAVE A VARIETY OF PROGRAM OFFERINGS IN THEIR FIELD.
- WHERE DO WE USE VENDORS?
  - BEFORE-SCHOOL AND AFTER-SCHOOL ENRICHMENT PROGRAMMING IN SCHOOLS
  - YOUTH SPORTS PROGRAMMING
  - SUMMER CAMP

# WHO ARE OUR CURRENT VENDORS?

- BEFORE-SCHOOL AND AFTER-SCHOOL:
  - CHESS WIZARDS – LONG STANDING PARTNER, VERY POPULAR, HAVE ADDED MORE CLASSES AND ADDED TO HUNT
  - KIDS TEST KITCHEN – LONG STANDING PARTNER, VERY POPULAR, HAVE ADDED MORE CLASSES AND ADDED TO HUNT
  - MUSICAL THEATER – LONG STANDING PARTNER, ONE OF THE MOST POPULAR PROGRAMS. RUN MULTIPLE CASTS PER PRODUCTION. ON RFP
  - BUILDWAVE – LONG STANDING PARTNER, VARIETY OF STEM PROGRAMMING
  - RIGHT BRAIN CURRICULUM – USE FOR SOME PROGRAMS, MAINLY LEGO BUILDING
  - UMBRELLA ARTS – LONG STANDING PARTNER, MULTIPLE OPTIONS FOR PROGRAMS
  - SNAPOLOGY – NEW VENDOR, STEM PROGRAMMING
  - BRICKS 4 KIDZ – NEW VENDOR, STEM PROGRAMMING – ENGINEERING MAINLY
  - CODEX – NEW VENDOR, CODING AND STEM PROGRAMMING

# WHO ARE OUR CURRENT VENDORS? CONT'D

- SPORTS VENDORS
  - SKYHAWKS – VOLLEYBALL AND GOLF INTRODUCTION
  - F.A.S.T ATHLETICS – LOOKING FOR SUMMER PROGRAMMING; MINI-SPORTS, AND MULTI-SPORT OPTIONS FOR AGES 3-9
  - SUPER SOCCER STARS – RFP LONG STANDING PARTNER, SOCCER INSTRUCTION AGES 2-7
  - PROVE THEM WRONG – NEWER PARTNER, HELP WITH YOUTH BASKETBALL LEAGUE WITH REFFING, COACHING, AND SKILLS
  - X-GOLF ACTON – NEWER PARTNER, INDOOR GOLF INSTRUCTION, ADDED IN 2024 FOR WINTER PROGRAMMING. POPULAR AND HAD TO ADD 2-3 CLASSES
  - DAVID BELL TRACK – YOUTH TRACK PROGRAM, ALMOST 20 YEARS, OVER 70 KIDS GRADES 3-6. 6 WEEK PROGRAM IN SPRING
  - ON THE MARK ARCHERY – ARCHERY INSTRUCTION CLASSES FOR KIDS AND ADULTS. COLLAB WITH BEDFORD AND CARLISLE ROTATING HOSTING

# BUDGET LINE ITEMS; INCLUDING VENDORS

- BEFORE-SCHOOL SPORTS AT ALCOTT SCHOOL – GRADES 1-5
- BEFORE-SCHOOL CHESS AT WILLARD AND THOREAU – EXTREMELY POPULAR
- CONCORD RECREATION ALSO RUNS VACATION AND PROFESSIONAL DAY PROGRAMS FOR FAMILIES IN NEED.
  - WE HAVE INCREASED DAILY PRICE \$15 FOR STAFFING NEEDS, FIELD TRIPS, SUPPLIES, AND SNACKS. AVERAGE 125 KIDS PER WEEK.

Fill Rate - KPI																
		FY23-Regs	FY23-Open	# Change 23- >24	% Change 23- 24	FY24-Regs	FY24-Open	# Change 24- >25	% Change 24- 25	FY25-Regs	FY25-Open	# Change 25- >26	% Change 25- 26	FY26- Regs	FY26- Open	
Alcott School Programs		5 sessions			5 sessions			4 sessions			2 sessions					
Before-School Sports Grades 1-2		132	8	-23	-17%	109	31	-53	-49%	56	56	-28	-50%	28	22	
Before-School Sports Grade 3		93	47	-28	-30%	65	75	-3	-5%	62	50	-36	-58%	26	24	
Before-School Sports Grade 4		132	8	-14	-11%	118	22	-68	-58%	50	62	-19	-38%	31	19	
Before-School Sports Grade 5		97	43	28	29%	125	15	-45	-36%	80	32	-51	-64%	29	21	
Kids Test Kitchen		46	2	2	4%	48	0	-10	-21%	38	19	11	29%	49	-12	6 classes
Orchestra		16	24	-5	-31%	11	1	8	73%	19	21	-18	-95%	1	7	Winter
MetroCrafft		12	0	-12	-100%	did not run	did not run	0	0%	did not run	did not run			did not run		Buildwave
Business Sharks		0	12	0	0%	did not run	did not run	0	0%	did not run	did not run			did not run		
Legos		27	1	27	100%	54	2	-25	-46%	29	-8			did not run		Right Brain
Languages		2	28	-2	-100%	did not run	did not run	0	0%	did not run	did not run			did not run		
Umbrella Arts		did not run	did not run	22	73%	22	8	-2	-9%	20	7	14	70%	34	-12	
Buildwave		did not run	did not run	0	0%	did not run	did not run	66	83%	66	1	2	3%	68	0	
Expert Architects		did not run	did not run	0	0%	did not run	did not run	13	93%	13	1			did not run		Right Brain
Minecrafft Innovators						did not run	did not run			9	5			did not run		Buildwave
Chess Wizards												49	100%	49	-15	



Willard School Programs															
Chess Club	55	5	1	2%	56	44	3	5%	59	41	-12	-20%	47	0	reg. still open for winter
Kids Test Kitchen	48	0	0	0%	48	0	44	92%	92	-60	3	3%	95	-29	added 2 extra days - sold out
MetroCraft	6	6	0	0%	did not run	did not run	0	0%	did not run	did not run	#VALUE!				not running
Business Sharks	0	10	0	0%	did not run	did not run	0	0%	did not run	did not run	#VALUE!				not running
Languages	10	40	0	0%	did not run	did not run	0	0%	did not run	did not run	#VALUE!				not running
Legos	28	0	-6	-21%	22	34	6	27%	28	-8	-16	-57%	12	2	
Buildwawe	did not run	did not run	32	40%	32	48	50	156%	82	18	-34	-41%	48	12	
Chess Wizards	did not run	did not run	0	0%	did not run	did not run	9	64%	8	20	#VALUE!				not running
Umbrella									10	-5	#VALUE!				not running
Orchestra									5	0	#VALUE!				not running
Expert Architects - Right Brain Curriculum											13	100%	13	-2	
Bricks 4 Kidz											12	100%	12	12	Jr. Engineers, Advanced Builders, Boss Builder (Spring)
Musical Theater Program															
Cinderella (3 shows)			0	0%			63	81%	63	17	-63	-100%			
Beauty and the Beast (3 shows)	104	16	-104	-100%			0	0%			0				
The Little Mermaid (3 shows)	116	4	-116	-100%			0	0%			0				
Snow White (3 shows)	125	-5	-125	-100%			0	0%			0				
Charlotte's Web (3 shows)			131	109%	131	-11	-131	-100%			0				
Rumpelstiltskin (3 shows)			118	98%	118	2	-118	-100%			0				
Sleeping Beauty (3 shows)			111	93%	111	9	-111	-100%			0				
Little Shop of Horrors (Middle School)			18	45%	18	22	-18	-100%			0				
Oliver (3 shows)			0	0%			106	88%	106	14	-106	-100%			
My Fair Lady (Middle School)			0	0%			0	60%			0				
The Lion King (3 shows)			0	0%			132	84%	132	-22	-132	-100%			
You're a Good Man, Charlie Brown (Middle)			0	0%			21	0%	21	14	-7	-33%	14	21	
Aladdin (Friday 1 day program)									34	1	80	235%	114	3	3 shows in FY26
Alice in Wonderland												100%	123	-17	5 and 6 over in 2 shows, 23 in one show
Annie												100%	109	-30	extra show added, lot of room available

Fill Rate - KPI															
		FY23- FY23-Regs	FY23- Open	# Change 23->24	% Change 23-24	FY24- FY24-Regs	FY24- Open	# Change 24- >25	% Change 24- 25	FY25- FY25-Regs	FY25- Open	# Change 25- >26	% Change 25- 26	FY26- Regs	FY26-Open
Super Soccer Stars															
Parent and child 2-3 yrs old		55	17	-19	-35%	36	0	58	161%	94	19			35	22
Ages 3-4		76	17	-7	-9%	69	1	51	74%	120	0			45	
Ages 4-5		45	25	-3	-7%	42	0	17	40%	59	32			16	32
Ages 5-7		13	57	-1	-8%	12	30	-9	-75%	3	10	cancelled		did not run	
Skyhawks															
Beginner Golf		24	4	6	25%	30	40	-7	-23%	23	13				
Golf Progression		N/A	N/A	0	0%	0	12	0	0%	N/A	N/A				
Floor Hockey		9	21	-6	-67%	3	37	-3	-100%	N/A	N/A			cancelled	
Mini-Hawks		11	69	1	9%	12	62	-12	-100%	0	12	cancelled		cancelled	
Multi-Sport		0	30	11	14%	11	69	-11	-100%	0	12	cancelled		cancelled	
Flag Football										7	13			spring	
Volleyball ages 7-11		37	9	-13	-35%	24	24	-16	-67%	8	8				24
Volleyball ages 11-15		13	11	13	100%	26	22	55	212%	81	-12			31	1
Ultimate Sports		0	10	0	0%	N/A	N/A	0	0%	N/A	N/A	cancelled			
Mini-Golf		N/A	N/A	8	67%	8	4	0	0%	N/A	N/A				
Baseball		0	10	0	0%	N/A	N/A	0	0%	N/A	N/A	cancelled			
Ski and Snowboard 2nd-5th Grade															
										92	-7			100	-26
Ski and Snowboard 6th-8th Grade															
										114	-37			104	-15
On the Mark Archery		41	17	7	17%	48	33	7	15%	55	19			32	20

# COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS?