

**Q&As: Task Force Meeting #2
September 19, 2017
Glenview Park District**

General Questions

Q: There were some questions asked at the August 22, 2017 Task Force meeting that were not answered at the time. Are we going to get those answers?

A: Those questions were all answered in the Q&A's that were included in your packet tonight. *Note: We did not include printouts of the Q&A's in Task Force members' packets but the answers were sent in a PDF to all of them in an email.*

Questions Pertaining to the Glenview Community Ice Center

Q: Is a Championship and Recreational Rink the same size or are they different?

A: Yes, they are the both 200' by 85' NHL size sheets of ice. The difference is the spectator seating area is smaller, approximately 300 seats, in the Recreational Rink.

Q: Regarding the track, how would the track work with temperatures and its visual connection to the ice rink?

A: The track is separated from the ice climate. The separation wall will also diffuse light and warmth from going into the ice rink. In the new concept, the track orientation is around the championship rink which has 8 laps per mile.

Q: Total programing area shows 90,500 square feet but the concept shows 74,740 sf.

A: The difference is the footprint is 74,740 sf and the entire facility is 90,500 sf.

Q: What is the parking difference between the two ice center options?

A: The renovated/expansion has approximately 42 less parking spaces as it is situated up against the south edge of the lot, we can only go north or west with parking; the new rink is situated more in the center of the site allows parking around the building.

Q: What are the tradeoffs between the two options Concept A – a new facility and Concept B – a renovated facility, i.e., user ability and value perspective?

A: Architecturally there are no compromises from program or user perspective. Approximately 42 additional parking spaces will be available in the new option. The renovated option has the track around the championship rink which causes potential challenges from people crossing the track to access the bleachers or exit the bleachers. The new option has the track around the recreational rink and pedestrian traffic would not be an issue.

Q: Any disadvantage to leveraging current infrastructure, i.e., shortened life, additional maintenance?

A: The new facility would not lose any integrity with what is being kept. The ice slab is fairly current as is the under ice system. However, refrigeration system would need to be new.

Q: Re: Construction time. Build in same location or new, how much programming and rink time will be lost?

A: Our estimation is that a new facility will take 14 months to build and a renovated facility will take 16 months. Our goal is to keep the current rink up during the majority of construction and the majority of the new facility is open. The current rink would then be demolished and construction completed. For the renovation, we would keep the current rink up until the additional sheet is operational and then renovations will begin; the impact is about 2.5-3 months.

Q: Where did the idea for a track come from? Who do you anticipate will use the track?

A: From the Needs Assessment Study and Comprehensive Master Plan surveys, residents indicated a desire for more indoor walking/jogging space. This facility is the right size for a track or we would need to construct a separate track facility. It is a common practice to include a track in community ice rinks throughout the country. Staff anticipate the track to be used by residents (free of charge). Nonresidents would be required to purchase a track pass in order to use the track.

Q: Economic Impact: When will tournaments be scheduled for additional revenue and will they compete with prime time ice?

A: Tournaments and competitions will be scheduled throughout the ice sport season, September through May. The revenue for overnight stays for tournament visitors is projected to be \$6,900. The overall schedule allows for 2 hockey tournaments and 2 special events (figure skating) per year, possibly around the holidays. A 2.5 sheet facility will allow the Park District to expand programming and be more flexible with scheduling.

Q: How would a 2.5 sheet facility be scheduled for the available prime time ice and how much would be scheduled for Park District programs?

A: Roughly 68 hours of prime time ice will be available for other Park District ice programs. Approximately 65 hours of prime time ice will be available for rental and the remaining 10 hours of prime ice will be for ice maintenance.

Questions Pertaining to Mount Prospect Arena (MPA) Option

Q: Where is the Mount Prospect Arena located?

A: 1501 Feehanville Drive, Mount Prospect

Q: What would happen to the current ice center if we purchased the MPA?

A: The Park District would evaluate operations and determine the best option for the future of the Glenview Ice Center.

Q: What is the difference in the MPA and the proposed Ice Center in Glenview?

A: MPA has minimal dry land area and no child's play area. It does have some multi-use rooms. MPA has a ½ sheet less of ice than the proposed ice center in Glenview. The 15,000 sf second floor of either the new or renovated facility would be a big difference from MPA, which only has a small restaurant on their second floor.

Q: How many hours of ice time does the Glenview Park District rent at the MPA or does just the Stars rent ice time?

A: The Glenview Park District does not rent ice time at MPA. Only The Stars currently rent 25 hours of ice time at the MPA.

Q: Has the MPA option been looked at by the Park District attorneys? What impact would this have on us owning property outside our district and the impact on the River Trail park district residents using the facility?

A: The District has provided this information to our attorneys. We have not actively pursued all possibilities for the purchase of MPA as we are not in negotiations. It is legal for the District to own land outside of our boundaries. If the District purchased MPA, the Park District would negotiate an intergovernmental agreement with River Trails Park District.

Q: How would the Park District fund the purchase of the MPA?

A: The Glenview Park District has the ability to issue a \$10 million bond issue that we could use for this purchase. Also, some other fund balances exist but those have limits for use outside of the district. We would have to ask for a lower purchase price, possibly sell our current facility and work with our partners. This would all have to be discussed if we were to move forward, but at this time, we wanted to know how task force members felt about whether this option should be tested.

Q: What is the square footage difference between the Glenview and MPA Options?

A: The Glenview facility options are 94,500 sf. MPA does not have a second floor creating a difference of approximately 20,000 sf.

Questions Pertaining to The Grove

No Questions

Questions Pertaining to Sleepy Hollow Park

Q: How many parking spots are included in Concept C?

A: 20 spots, which is what is currently there.

Q: What about the baseball field?

A: Only Concept C eliminates the ball field.

Q: Who uses the fieldhouse and how often?

A: Analysis of the past 3 years reflects an average of 73 rentals per year. The fieldhouse is used by Scouts, AA groups and HOAs. Most usage is rentals; the Park District offers very little programming at the fieldhouse. (Provided in the 8/22 Q&A's.)

Q: Is that usage about average say compared to the Roosevelt Fieldhouse?

A: Last year, GPD's average fieldhouse rentals was 35.8 per fieldhouse compared to 69 rentals for Sleepy Hollow Park. Renting of the Sleepy Hollow fieldhouse is almost twice the average.

Q: If we remove the fieldhouse, can we accommodate the usage elsewhere?

A: Yes, the Glenview Park District 13 total fieldhouses with Cole Park fieldhouse and Roosevelt Park fieldhouse being the closest to Sleepy Hollow.

Q: How many days have been lost in the last 10 years due to flooding?

A: The Park has had 3 flood events in the last 10 years. The most severe flood event, in September of 2008, kept the fieldhouse closed for 6 months to allow for cleanup. The other 2 flood events kept the fieldhouse closed for a few weeks.

Q: What are the pros and cons of each concept for Sleepy Hollow Park?

A: The following is a list of Pros and Cons for each Concept:

Concept A

Pros

- least amount of paving providing for more open space and potentially less storm water detention requirements
- lowest redevelopment cost
- maintains use of the existing backstop
- potentially less impact to existing trees

Cons

- least amount of parking
- does not include a new fieldhouse for indoor rentals and programs

Concept B

Pros

- provides close to same quantity of existing parking
- uses existing road and parking locations for less impact to the site
- lower redevelopment cost than Concept C
- provides a new fieldhouse
- maintains use of existing backstop

Cons

- more paving and potentially more storm water detention requirements than Concept A
- potentially more impact to existing trees
- higher redevelopment cost than Concept A
- parking not located in as convenient a location to the fieldhouse and playground as Concept C

Concept C

Pros

- provides the most parking of all concepts
- provides new fieldhouse
- consolidates parking, fieldhouse, and playground in northeast corner of site to have less segregated open space
- provides more convenient location of parking to the fieldhouse and playground
- fieldhouse location and orientation provides for less visual obstruction into the park and playground from the road than Concept B

Cons

- more paving and potentially more storm water detention requirements than Concept A
- potentially more impact to existing trees
- higher redevelopment cost than Concept A and B
- omits use of existing backstop

Questions Pertaining to Open Space

No Questions

Questions Pertaining to Funding, Financing and Tax Impact

Q: The \$50 increase is incremental over today's taxes, what is the true impact when factoring in the closure of the Glen and Waukegan Road TIFs?

A: A taxpayer who owns a \$500,000 home would pay \$49.80 in 2019. When the Glen TIF closes, the taxpayer will see a \$15.85 decrease in their 2023 tax bill and when the Waukegan TIF closes the taxpayer will see a \$8.26 decrease in their 2024 tax according to estimates by the District's financial advisors.

Q: Are we spending the money from the TIF closing? What would the taxpayer save if we did not do these projects once the TIF comes off?

A: The funding for the proposed project is not related to the closure of the TIFs. If these projects were not done, a taxpayer who owns a \$500,000 home would see an \$8.11 decrease in their taxes in 2023 and a \$48.43 decrease in 2024. Over these two years, the taxpayer's taxes would be reduced by \$56.54.

Q: Where would the funds go from the \$10 million bond issue if we didn't use them on these projects?

A: The funds are part of the Capital Development Fund and would be used for other projects, though no new projects have been identified at this time. A significant amount of those funds would be needed to address issues at the Ice Center. The current estimate for fixing the Ice Center is \$13-15 million.

Q: When would the bonds be issued? If the rates were not 75 basis points above the current market, as is currently being used, what would the cost be to the homeowner?

A: The bonds would be issued in December of 2018. If the bonds were sold at today's interest rates, the cost to a \$500,000 homeowner would be closer to \$46.

Q: Given the small size of the other projects compared to the Ice Center, what was the rationale to include them in the bond issue and not pay for them with operating funds?

A: The District is trying to use all available resources to minimize the impact on property taxes. The Ice Center project is a large project which would use most of the available funds. If most available funds were used on the Ice Center, little to no funds would not be available to address the needs at The Grove, Sleepy Hollow Park or to acquire valuable land opportunities for many years. This delay raises future costs and increases the potential for future problems with these facilities.

Questions after Group Discussions

Q: Is there a lower cost option then the New or Renovated Ice Center and the Mount Prospect option?

A: There are lower cost options but they would sacrifice programming in Glenview and additional revenues that would cover costs. The Pro Forma took into account 2 1/2 sheets of ice which is significant when it comes to services and revenues.

Q: Is there a way to make it less fancy to get the costs down?

A: Yes, the District could cut costs but that would be reflected in the facility design and appearance and not fit well with the Village of Glenview standards. If we cut amenities, it will not bring in the additional traffic and revenue, i.e., tournaments and family activities.

Q: Do these projects have to be grouped together or can you ask them individually or just the smaller projects together in the survey?

A: The mail survey and phone poll will test each project, helping provide direction on how to proceed.

Q: The Child's Play area is lacking in details, how would that work?

A: This was rated high in the Needs Assessment Study and would be similar to a Funtopia some indoor play areas like the private facility in The Glen or the America Ninja Warrior concept. It could be used by families that are at the Community Ice Center waiting for other children participating in ice programs and could also be a revenue stream as an amenity for the party room.

Q: If we went with the Mount Prospect Arena option, how would sharing with another town work?

A: The Park District would have to displace the groups currently using the Mount Prospect Arena in order to accommodate our programs.

Q: Is there any major differences between the proposed Renovated and New Ice Center?

A: There is no substantial difference other than the price. There is slightly more parking with the new concept and the layout is more efficient. The renovation takes it down to the super structure which basically makes it a brand new building.

Q: What is the motivation for the sale of the Mount Prospect Arena?

A: In conversation with the owner we were told, the owner's primary business is construction and not running an ice arena.

Q: Can we test both options: New and Renovated?

A: Yes, we can test the new option as primary and the renovated as secondary. We will properly word the question so they are not leading questions. The dollar amount for the Referendum will be tested not the costs of the individual projects.

Q: Can you provide more details on the Open Space option?

A: The fund would be used for future purchases of properties around The Grove or park sites that become available. There are three properties currently on Kennicott Lane that could potentially be purchased. The District has a policy that guides the Board of Park Commissioners on the purchase of open space.

Public Comments

Q: Will philanthropy, naming rights and sponsorships be considered as possible matching funds to taxpayer funding?

A: Yes. 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 the final approval.