



GLENVIEW PARK DISTRICT Citizen Task Force

Public Meeting

Glenview Ice Center
1851 Landwehr Road

Glenview, IL 60025

Meeting Minutes

September 19, 2017, 6:00 p.m.

Attendees

Commissioners: President Robert J. Patton, David M. Dillon, Jen G. Roberts, Angie G. Katsamakidis, William M. Casey and David S. Tosh.

Glenview Park District Staff: Michael D. McCarty, Executive Director; Katie Skibbe, Deputy Executive Director; James Warnstedt, Superintendent of Park & Facility Services; Lori Lovell, Superintendent of Special Facilities; Elsa Fischer, Superintendent of Leisure Services; Lorin Ottlinger, Director of The Grove; Jim Weides, Manager of Glenview Ice Center; Jena Johnson, Manager of Marketing & Communications and Joanne Capaccio, Executive Assistant

Consultants: Paul Hanley and Bill Hofherr, George K. Baum & Company; Tom Poulos and Andy Dogan, Williams Architects; Brandon Dowling, Johnson Consulting; Dave Olson and John Emser, WB Olson, Inc.; Tom Rychlik, Gewalt Hamilton Associates; Robert Ijams, Wight & Company; Paul Bluestone, Bluestone & Associates; Steve Konters, Hitchcock Design Group; John Piemonte, Ehlers & Associates

Citizen Task Force Members: Pete Boland; Patrick Callaghan; Pete Cardis; Carlo Cavallaro; John Gall; John Hedrick; Brad Hill; Craig Hurley; Brandy Isaac; Michael Lapiere; Matt Laurencelle; Alan Lofgren; Patty Marfise-Patt; Pete Masloski; Mark Miller; George Nassos; Mike Nolan; Louis Papamichiel; Pam Paradies; Charlie Pyne; Tracy Reeder; Laura Smith; Scott Southwood; Gregg Strellis; Kirsten Vick; Maggie Wall; Pilar Westfall

Task Force Members Absent: Stephanie Arkus

Michael McCarty, Executive Director, Glenview Park District

Tonight's Objectives

Park District Executive Director Michael McCarty welcomed the Task Force Members and announced the Park Board members that were present. He went over the objectives of tonight's meeting: to review the bond proposal; review the financing plan and tax impact; for the Task Force to decide on what to test and to review the next steps in the process. He asked that everyone hold their questions until the end of each project presentation. He also noted that there would be time at the end of the meeting for any public comments.

Highest Priority Capital Facility Needs

Director McCarty noted the four capital facility needs that the Task Force reviewed at their August 22, 2017 meeting: Replace or renovate the Glenview Community Ice Center (with an alternative option to be presented tonight); Improvements at The Grove, Protecting Sleepy

Hollow Park assets and funding for Open Space. He, along with project consultants, went on to review each of the projects' main issues.

Glenview Community Ice Center (Replace or Renovate/Expand)

The Ice Center is a 44 year old facility and is at maximum capacity which limits growth and revenue potential. There is an increase for youth hockey and figure skating programs that cannot be met. The costs keep going up and much of the equipment has reached its useful life. There are compliance and ADA issues and just adding on a full sheet of ice would not fix all the issues. A comprehensive evaluation was completed to determine the right size facility, how to bring it up to today's standards, enable it to generate revenue to cover costs and to determine the best location to rebuild or build. It was determined that if we renovate or build today, we can leverage today's low interest rates.

Director McCarty introduced Brandon Dowling from Johnson Consulting. Mr. Dowling noted that he and his team were the lead feasibility consultants on this project. Brandon presented a summary of key findings from their study. A market assessment was done to determine demographics, house hold incomes, etc., which showed Glenview to have a growing population and healthy median income. Facility audits were done within a 30 minute drive of Glenview which showed prime time ice is at a premium and near capacity at all facilities. He explained that Glenview is currently outsourcing annually about \$15,000 of ice outside the district to meet its programming needs. The additional sheet of ice will allow expansion of programs and generate additional revenue from regional tournaments. Mr. Dowling explained what the economic impact would be on the district from increased volume at the Ice Center. He also explained the one time construction cost impact.

Tom Poulos and Andy Dogan from Williams Architects talked about the importance of the Feasibility Study. Tom explained that it is the foundation for determining the market needs and financials but also the physical space required to host the desired programs. The study also looked at numerous sites and determined the best one for the building, which was the Landwehr Road site. Many design alternatives were considered and narrowed down to the best preferred option along with an alternative solution. The findings from the Needs Assessment and the Park District's Comprehensive Master Plan were also taken into consideration in determining the needs and wants of the community. A track and child play area were desired and included in the designs.

Tom noted the two design concepts being considered: Concept A: 2.5 sheet new facility on existing site and Concept B: Renovation of existing main rink and addition of 1.5 new sheets of ice and added program activities. The square footage of the total program area would be 90,500. Both design concepts would allow the current ice rink to stay open during construction. The new facility's design would have the entrance facing Landwehr Road which would create a better drop off area and would also accommodate more parking. Tom went on to describe the interior layout of Concept A. The total project cost for this design is \$34,930,578.

Tom explained in Concept B the existing recreational rink super structure/foundation is kept with everything else being renovated. The programming mirrors Concept A. The front entrance is orientated toward Landwehr Road with expanded parking. A big difference from Concept A is the studio rink is placed next to the Recreational Rink which provides for a

parent viewing area. Also the track is over the championship rink instead of the recreational rink. The total project cost for this design is \$32,126,506.

Dave Olson from WB Olson, Inc. as construction manager talked about how the budget was put together. He noted square footage, volume of space, structure, materials etc., are all looked at and quantities and unit prices can then be determined. The main rink would stay open so those costs would also need to be determined. The budget has a 10% construction and design contingency which is a range of the project costs which will accommodate the project as it develops.

Questions and Answers (Questions were taken after each project review)

Tom Poulos and Brandon Dowling took questions and comments from the Task Force Members pertaining to the new or renovated Community Ice Center project. The consultants and staff answered the questions at the meeting and also refined those answers after the meeting with additional information. Please see the attached Appendix A for the complete list of questions and answers on all projects.

Community Ice Center (Alternative Option)

Director McCarty explained another option to the new or renovated ice center. He noted staff wanted to share with the Task Force what they know so far about this option. There is a privately owned ice arena in Mount Prospect which is 3.1 miles from Glenview. The current owners approached the Park District with an offer to sell their arena. The facility sits on 7-8 acres, is one-year old, has 2 NHL sheets of ice and the asking price is \$15,000,000. The arena is located in the River Trails Park District and was built for \$13,000,000 with the owners being in the construction business. There are five core user groups of the facility and the Glenview Stars also rent ice time there.

McCarty went on to list some of the Pros and Cons of this facility. **Pros:** The Park District can legally purchase land outside of the district; the asking price of \$15,000,000 is half of what it would cost for a new or renovated ice center; the infrastructure is new and can be expanded; has two full sheets of ice and no Referendum would be needed. **Cons:** It is located outside of Glenview; travel time increases; is undersized for our needs; would have to generate funds to purchase it and there would be no economic benefit for Glenview.

Questions and Answers

Director McCarty took questions and comments from the Task Force Members pertaining to the alternative option to a new or renovated community ice center. Please see the attached Appendix A for the complete list of questions and answers on this and all projects.

The Grove

Tom Rychlik, from Gewalt Hamilton Associates, spoke about the proposed improvements to the outside of The Grove. Tom noted the current entrance is only about 20 feet wide and is fairly concealed from Milwaukee Avenue. The improvements would be to open up the entrance for mostly safety reasons to a standard 35-40 foot entrance and to create a right turning lane off of northbound Milwaukee Ave. A security gate, paving of the west parking lot and pedestrian walkways would also be added to the exterior improvements.

Robert Ijams, Director of Park & Recreation Wight & Company, summarized the list of proposed improvements and also spoke to the appeal of The Grove, especially to those outside of Glenview. He noted the opportunities available to tell the natural history of the region. The existing structure is wood and is in need of a face lift. New infrastructure being considered: adding a sprinkler system; upgraded alarm system and electrical service; new HVAC system and LED light fixtures. A second floor exit is needed per safety codes. Remodeling of the gift shop and office space would also open up the current exhibit area and allow for a centralized reception area.

Paul Bluestone, Bluestone & Associates spoke about improvements to the Interpretive Center exhibits in order to better tell Robert Kennicott's story. Paul noted any updates will respect the history and personality of the building. Robert Kennicott was a recognized naturalist and explorer; many of his collections are on site at the Grove. He was also on staff at the Smithsonian; was founder of the Chicago Academy of Sciences and died at the age of 30 in Alaska. With new historical and animal exhibits in the Interpretive Center, the plan is to connect the historic buildings at the Grove with Kennicott's story and to provide interactive activities. These improvements will ultimately improve the overall experience for visitors to The Grove with a building consisting of a museum, nature center and science center.

Questions and Answers

There were no questions from the Task Force on the Grove project.

Sleepy Hollow Park

Steve Konters, Hitchcock Design Group and Tom Rychlik from Gewalt Hamilton addressed the existing conditions at Sleepy Hollow Park and also the three proposed improvement concepts. The park runs along the West Fork of the Chicago River. Tom showed where the flood way area extends to and the need to maintain that during any improvements to the park. He noted each of the three proposed concepts would improve the flooding conditions. Steve Konters noted that the fieldhouse and playground currently are located in the flood way. He explained how each concept moves those assets to higher ground and provides for new walkways to access those amenities. Total project costs for each concept were also given.

Concept A: Replaces fieldhouse with indoor restrooms and open area picnic area, parking lot removed and built off existing roadway. Playground is moved to higher area and is same size. Baseball field remains.

Concept B: New Fieldhouse with open area and outside restrooms; larger parking lot (18 spaces) in same area as existing parking lot, and playground is moved to same area in all three concepts. Baseball field remains.

Concept C: Complete redo and consolidates assets to one area. Parking spots remain as current, 20 spaces. No baseball field. Cost is higher than others.

Questions and Answers

Superintendent of Park & Facility Services, Jim Warnstedt, took questions and comments from the Task Force Members pertaining to the Sleepy Hollow Park concepts. Please see the attached Appendix A for the complete list of questions and answers on this and all projects.

Open Space

Director McCarty noted \$1,000,000 for funding Open Space is being proposed. This would allow the District to purchase, develop and expand green infrastructure. It would also provide funds for matching grants when land purchase opportunities arise and would allow the District to protect and/or provide a buffer for our parks and historic areas.

Questions and Answers

There were no questions from the Task Force on Open Space Funding.

Overview of Proposed Funding Sources, Preliminary Financing Plan, Tax Impact

Park District Deputy Executive Director Katie Skibbe and Bill Hofherr, George K. Baum & Company reviewed the funding sources, financing plan and tax impact of these projects. Bill Hofherr discussed how the District planned on paying for these proposals and what the overall cost would be. He restated the cost for each project: The Ice Center: \$35 million; The Grove: \$2.65 million; Sleepy Hollow Park: \$1.73 million; Open Space Funding: \$1 million, for a total of \$40.38 million. Bill went on to explain the proposed funding sources that the Task Force is being asked to consider: a potential \$24 million voter-approved referendum/60% of the total cost; existing revenues (\$10 million bond/25% of the total cost); utilize fund balances and community donations (\$6.25million/15% of the total cost). The best scenario is to keep the referendum bond issue to the smallest amount possible and to structure it to have the least impact to homeowners. The \$24 million bond would be structured to be financed for 20 years and wrapped around the District's existing debt which is the Series 2012C Bond that matures December, 2023. The first five years would be interest payments only based on very conservative estimates. The debt service would begin in 2019. Two TIFs are destined to end in 2023 and 2024 so that debt will go back on the District's EAV (Equalized Assessed Value) essentially lowering taxes. The tax impact of the proposed bond funding would equate to approximately \$50.00 annually per homeowner base on a \$500,000 home.

Questions and Answers

Katie Skibbe, Bill Hofherr, and Mike McCarty took questions and comments from the Task Force Members pertaining to funding and financing of the proposed projects and the tax impact on homeowners. Please see the attached Appendix A for the complete list of questions and answers on this topic and all the projects.

Group Discussions to Decide What to Test

Paul Hanley, George K. Baum & Company, directed the Task Force to meet in small groups for 20 minutes to discuss the proposed projects and to decide what should be shared district wide and tested with the public. Once decided, that information will be tested through a mail survey and phone polls with the public. The groups was given a set of questions, asked to rank the Ice Center options and to decide what projects to consider for testing (*See attached Appendix B*). Paul told the group that they could decide what to test, what to eliminate or what to modify. Paul also asked the group to keep in mind and respect the taxpayers when they are deciding these options even if they themselves might have an affiliation to a certain group.

Group Discussions/Ranking and Testing of Projects

Group 1: Preferences/Feedback

1. *Test New Ice Rink option (more amenities, price difference between renovated option is minimal, walking track will appeal to more people)*
2. *Test Mount Prospect Arena (Some concerns though with legal issues, only has 2 sheets of ice, cost to keep existing ice center open and operating, would lose small spaces, distance an issue)*
3. *Would not test Renovated Ice Center*
4. *Sleepy Hollow, test Concepts A & C*
5. *No eliminations, no modifications to any options*

Group 2: Preferences/Feedback

1. *Modifications to any projects- huge price difference between Mount Prospect arena and new or renovated Ice Center. Wanted to see a lower cost option in Glenview presented*
Director McCarty explained that the Mount Prospect Arena was built by the owners who are in the construction business and they took an existing building on land they owned and reconstructed it at cost. They did not have to abide by Prevailing Wage as the Park District would have to.
2. *Test Renovated Ice Center option (not enough material benefits for new option)*
3. *No consensus on purchase of Mount Prospect Arena*
4. *Saw benefits to the running track(keep) but not for the child's play area(eliminate)*
5. *No benefit to the three options for Sleepy Hollow, didn't have time to decide on this*
6. *Did not discuss projects to eliminate*

Group 3: Preferences/Feedback

1. *Preferred testing the renovated Ice Center option since there was not much difference between renovated and new options*
2. *Include walking track, not sure how the child's play area would work. Need more details, but generally see how it can be beneficial*
3. *Do not test Mount Prospect*
4. *Sleepy Hollow options hard to visualize, but favor Concept B for testing*
5. *Possibly eliminate Open Space funding, not enough details or specific*

Group 4: Preferences/Feedback

1. *Prefer testing new Ice Center option, since cost difference is not significant*
2. *Do not test Mount Prospect purchase, too many unknowns and no studio rink*
3. *Include walking track and child play area since multi-function facility would be good for families*
4. *Sleepy Hollow option test Concept B, C, A in that order, some concerns with putting money in an area that floods*
5. *Include all projects for testing, but unclear on Open Space, need more details and specifics*
6. *No modifications needed to any projects*

Straw Poll

Paul Hanley noted the New and Renovated Ice Center options were preferred equally as the first option to test, so the group would have to decide on which one. Paul then asked for a show of hands of those who would like the Mount Prospect option tested; four members voted to test.

Some members were concerned that if the Mount Prospect option was not tested, residents might ask why it wasn't and the District would not know if the residents would have wanted it or not. Some members thought the question should be "would they support a facility outside of Glenview?" Paul asked if the group would be fine with letting the pollster develop a question about the Mount Prospect option, possibly a pro and con statement; the group agreed to that.

Paul addressed the new versus renovated options to test and asked the members for their thoughts. The group expressed their concerns about finding additional expenses once the super structure was exposed and felt there was a benefit to designing from scratch. Others didn't feel the \$3 million price difference between the renovated and new was warranted since both facilities had pretty much the same amenities and since the building is being taken down to the super structure, there wouldn't be any issues. Someone felt that the savings on the renovated option could be used for the other projects.

Paul took a show of hands for testing new: 16; testing renovated: 12. Since this was not a super majority, as the Task Force had previously approved for passing any measure, the members discussed the options further. Paul then took another show of hands to see if the members would want to test a new facility: 15; renovated: 12. Paul explained the question would be to test a new facility with questions also on the differences of a renovated facility. Paul also noted, the dollar amount of the Referendum would be tested, and not the cost of the projects.

Paul then asked for a show of hands to test Option B for Sleepy Hollow Park, since that option was preferred by two groups. Option B keeps the baseball field and provides enough improvements to address flooding, but keeps the park pretty much as is. This testing passed with the count being over the vote threshold.

Next, Paul took a show of hands to test the Open Space funding option. This testing passed with the count being over the vote threshold. Some potential examples of Open Space would be included in the testing.

Paul asked for a motion to: Test the New Ice Center and the Renovated Center as a backup; test the walking track and children's adventure area; test Concept B for Sleepy Hollow Park and test all four projects that were discussed at the two Task Force Meetings. A Task Force member moved the aforesaid motion and it was seconded. A show of hands was taken, and the motion carried.

Public Comments

Director McCarty noted there were members of the public in attendance who wanted to address the Task Force members.

1. Zoe Borys, a Glenview resident thanked the Task Force members and noted one of the reasons she moved to Glenview was because of the reputation of the Glenview Ice Center. She asked if philanthropy, naming rights, and sponsorship would be part of funding these projects. Director McCarty explained that the Needs Assessment tested support for naming rights for facilities and the District is open to this option. The Board of Park Commissioner would have to give the final approval.
2. Former Park Board Commissioner Judy Beck addressed the members and was concerned with the paving projects that are being proposed at Sleepy Hollow Park and The Grove parking lots. She would like to see pervious pavers used in those paving projects which will prevent flood waters from flowing into the green infrastructure at Sleepy Hollow Park and natural areas at The Grove. Judy, along with members of the Grove Heritage Association who were present at the meeting, were also concerned that the Open Space funding was not duly presented at first to the Task Force, but were happy to see the Task Force members' positive responses once it was vetted further. She reminded everyone that The Grove dates back to 1974 with its first purchase of 80 acres which has now grown to its current 145 acres. The Grove is a Natural Historic Landmark and Illinois Nature Preserve and land opportunities near and around The Grove are very important. The Grove Heritage Association has contributed more than two million dollars to the purchase and funding of open space.

Closing Remarks

Director McCarty thanked everyone for attending and reminded them of the letters, survey and additional information being mailed to residents in the next few weeks. He also noted the upcoming three Community Information meetings being held for public input on October 7, 11 and 23. The next Task Force meeting is scheduled for November 15.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:05 p.m.

ATTEST:

Robert J. Patton, President

Michael D. McCarty, Secretary

Approved this 26th day of October, 2017