



GLENVIEW PARK DISTRICT

Citizen Task Force

Public Meeting

Glenview Ice Center

1851 Landwehr Road

Glenview, IL 60025

Meeting Minutes

August 22, 2017, 6:00 p.m.

Note: The meeting convened at 6:10 p.m.

Attendees

Commissioners: President Robert J. Patton, David M. Dillon, Jen G. Roberts, Angie G. Katsamakis, William M. Casey. Commissioners Daniel B. Peterson and David S. Tosh, arrived after the start of the meeting.

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; Brian Montgomery, Manager of Program Services at the Ice Center; Jena Johnson, Manager of Marketing & Communications and Joanne Capaccio, Executive Assistant

Consultants: Paul Hanley, Senior Vice President, George K. Baum & Company and Bill Hofherr, Senior Vice President, George K. Baum & Company

Citizen Task Force Members: Stephanie Arkus; Pete Boland; Patrick Callaghan; Pete Cardis; Carlo Cavallaro; John Gall; John Hedrick; Brad Hill; Craig Hurley; Brandy Isaac; Michael Lapierre; Matt Laurencelle; Patty Marfise-Patt; Mark Miller; George Nassos; Louis Papamichiel; Pam Paradies; Charlie Pyne; Tracy Reeder; Scott Southwood; Kirsten Vick; Maggie Wall; Pilar Westfall

Task Force Members Absent: Debbie Hepburn; Pete Masloski; Mike Nolan; Laura Smith; Gregg Strellis; Alan Lofgren

Michael McCarty, Executive Director, Glenview Park District

Welcome

Director McCarty welcomed the Task Force Members and introduced the Park Board members that were present and the district staff members.

Committee's Purpose

He explained that the process to form a Task Force began with the Park Board putting together a list of involved citizens who understood what the Glenview Park District means to the community. He thanked each of the members for stepping up and participating in this planning effort. He explained how they will be provided essential information on Glenview Park District's capital facility needs and proposed solutions; will be reviewing that information; vetting a bond proposal and deciding on what to test. As a Committee of the

Whole, they will present a recommendation to the Park Board who will make the final decision.

Introductions: Task Force Members:

Mike asked the Task Force Members to introduce themselves; state how long they have lived in Glenview and who they represent or are affiliated with, i.e., community groups.

The members have lived in Glenview anywhere from 2-42 years. They have/had children in hockey; ice skating; 4H Club and many other Glenview Park District sports programs and offerings. Some of the groups they are affiliated with or represent are: Sunrise Rotary, Glenbrook South High School Board, District 34 PTA, Friends of Downtown Glenview, Glenview Stars, Blades and Grizzlies, Special Needs Community, Local Parish Council, Seniors, Glenview Education Foundation and the Sports Community (Baseball, Basketball, Soccer).

Role of Task Force, Board, Staff and Consultants

Director McCarty noted the wealth of experience among the Task Force members after hearing their affiliations. He encouraged them all to participate, ask questions and even challenge the information they receive. He also asked that the members discuss the issues in these meetings as a group and not outside individually. Their main role is to evaluate the information, define their proposal for testing and prepare a recommendation to the Park Board. Staff's role is to provide information and make sure the process runs efficiently. The consultants are here to facilitate the process and provide additional resources, expertise and data and the Park Board are here not to participate but rather to listen, better understand the process and to also support the Task Force.

Schedule of Meetings and Key Agenda Items

Director McCarty referred to the upcoming meeting dates which all members previously received. He noted the following desired outcomes of each meeting: (August 22 meeting) We have already reviewed the Task Force purpose and role. We will discuss the process, planning efforts and introduce our capital needs. Financials will not be discussed tonight but rather at the second meeting; (September 19 meeting) We will review the bond proposal, tax impact and decide on a proposal to test with the community; (November 15 meeting) We will review the mail survey and phone poll results and review/agree on next steps; (November 28 meeting) We will vote on a recommendation and who will be selected to make that recommendation to the Park Board.

Director McCarty pointed out some areas in the room for the comfort of the members during tonight's meeting; restrooms, refreshments, etc. He also announced staff would be available after the meeting to take members on an optional tour of the Ice Center.

Director McCarty went on to introduce Paul Hanley, Senior Vice President, George K. Baum & Company. The company works in public policy engagement services and also underwriting services. George K. Baum has an office in Chicago; Paul is based out of Colorado. However, he is very familiar with this area and has done many projects in Illinois. He recently assisted with School District 30's Referendum which went through a similar process.

Paul Hanley, Senior Vice President, George K. Baum & Company

Pre-Referendum Program Overview

Paul Hanley asked the group why most taxpayers dislike taxes. There were many responses, some being, no control; don't like how their spent; never decreases and no personal benefit. Paul noted statewide surveys tell us the biggest reason is people don't feel they have power over what the money is being used for. Paul wants to involve all of the taxpayers in the process to make it their plan and that is why the task force members are here tonight. So if the Park Board decides to put a proposal on the ballot, it has a good chance of passing.

Paul explained the first phase in the four phase public policy process is for the Park District to do a Needs Assessment. Phase Two is community outreach; sharing the information with the community. Phase Three is to ask the community what they think and what would they be willing to pay for. The Board then decides if it's a go or no go, and if it's a go, what that proposal will look like. And finally, Phase Four is the campaign phase. Paul explained that the first three phases can be paid for by the Park District if there is no advocacy involved and is informational only; no tax dollars can be used for the campaign phase. A Campaign Committee would need to be formed. Paul went on to detail each phase.

Phase One/Needs Assessment

- Facility Needs Assessment: the district has done its homework.
- Voter Analysis: Illinois has good voting records to identify likely voters for the survey and phone poll.
- Develop Key Influencer Database among those in the community: Many are top tier property tax payers who would most likely resist a tax increase. These are who we would want to communicate with and have involved in the process.
- Recruit Citizen Task Force: Out of this database, we chose 35 individuals who would be great influencers and truly vet this proposal. That is why each one of you was selected to be on the task force and is here tonight.
- Two Task Force meetings to do homework: Second meeting will define what information to share and test with the community. Board has agreed to allow the task force to decide this.
- Help put together the core argument: what's the problem, solution, cost, why it's urgent and what value will be added.

Phase Two/Community Outreach

- Ongoing staff communications: staff needs to be engaged in the process.
- Key Influencer letter: Task Force members will also receive this, will have attachment with additional information.
- Letter to registered voter households: Will receive similar letter as key influencers
- Newsletter to registered voter households: we do all of these mailers to keep this matter in front of the public and keep them focused on it.
- Community presentations: To share information with the community.
- Social Media: Another way to share information.

Phase Three/Community Comment

- Public Meetings: Ask the taxpayer what they think.

- Mail Survey: Will include information and questions. Will receive many comments which will help us determine what the voters want. Gives general undertone of the electorate.
- Phone Poll: Need 300 completed calls for good polling data. This is a scientific poll, can better rely on the data. Will give pros and cons and will ask question as it will appear on the ballot.
- Task Force Meeting (Final 2): Will have all survey results to share at the November 15 Task Force meeting. Task Force will ask questions of the Pollster and Consultants. At the November 28 meeting the Task Force will decide what their recommendation will be to the Park Board.
- Follow-up letter to registered voters: Will give an update on the process.
- Park Board decides Go or No Go: Board will look at all survey data, public meeting feedback and consider Task Force recommendation.

Phase Four/Campaign

- Task Force will not run the Campaign.

Discuss and Agree on Decision-Making Method

Paul noted at the second meeting straw polls will be taken on what will be tested and shared district wide. He explained there are four options for deciding on a question: Consensus, Simple majority, Absolute majority and Super majority. Consensus, where all must agree, is hard to achieve, especially with the diverse makeup of this task force. Most committees choose the Super majority as did District 30. This option is decided by a percentage of the task force members, usually 60% (3/5) or 67% (2/3).

Motion: A motion was made and seconded to require a 2/3 vote of the task force members present to approve any decision by the task force. By a show of hands, the motion carried.

Paul also asked the members who should get to vote. Should you get to vote at the second meeting if you missed the first meeting but got caught up before the second meeting? Director McCarty would decide if the person was caught up.

Motion: A motion was made and seconded to allow a person to vote on a task force decision at the second meeting if they missed the first meeting but got caught up before the second meeting. By a show of hands, the motion carried.

Paul's final question to the members was how many task force meetings can a member miss, if any, and still be allowed to vote at the fourth (final) meeting?

Motion: A motion was made and seconded that if you miss two meetings you are not allowed to vote at the fourth meeting. By a show of hands, the motion carried.

Michael McCarty, Executive Director

Introduction to Glenview Park District

Director McCarty gave the members some general information about the Glenview Park District: Who we are, What we do and How we do it. He noted the park district is one of the largest geographically in the state of Illinois with a population of 58,133 which includes Glenview and surrounding communities. It also has a diverse offering of facilities, programs

and services. It is one of the larger employers in the village with 1,226 employees consisting of full, part-time and seasonal staff working in the many facilities with a wide range of responsibilities. Also, with 17,000 hours of volunteer work, this saves the district on additional staff costs. Forty-eight percent of the district's revenue is earned revenue which helps to keep taxes low. And, with a budget of \$34,835,431, we have just been reconfirmed by Moody's with a Aaa bond rating. We also transform, enrich and save lives by creating opportunities through programs and services that give a sense of place in the community; improving health and wellness of the community through our fitness and sports programs; driving the economic vitality of the community by maintaining high-quality facilities which encourage families and businesses to move to Glenview and we are good stewards of the environment, our physical assets and our financial resources. We accomplish much of this through are strategic partnerships with the village, school districts and private entities.

We offer over 1,400 programs and see 1.7 million visitors annually to our facilities and parks. The most visited facility is Park Center and the second most visited is the Ice Center with over 163,000 visitors annually. Director McCarty noted 93% of resident have a favorable view of the park district which is a higher rating than our neighboring districts and state and national ratings. Our capital replacement program is one of the reasons our facilities are so well maintained. The district saves for major repairs and/or replacement on a yearly basis; however, this program does not finance large scale projects. Although 52% of our revenue comes from property taxes, that is modestly low compared to other park districts. A majority of those funds go into salary, wages, capital replacement, maintenance and commodities to make sure facilities operate well.

Unlike the village and schools, the park district is limited to how much they can levy for taxes through the Property Tax Extension Limit Law (PTELL) which is based on the Consumer Price Index (inflation); this has been very low the last few years. We are also limited by the amount of debt we can issue, which is why a potential bond issue is being considered. Over the last 5 years the district's tax rate has remained stable. Of your overall tax bill, only 8.1% goes to the Park District compared to 72.4% going to the Schools. And unlike the village and the county, property taxes are the only source of taxes the district can levy. Director McCarty remarked that with all the facilities, parks, programs and offerings of the Glenview Park District, it has shown to be a good steward of your tax dollars.

Planning Efforts Completed to Date

Director McCarty noted over the last few years, the district has been actively working on three parallel efforts: The Comprehensive Master Plan, Glenview Community Ice Center Feasibility Study and The Grove Management Plan. *(The Task Force will be given these plans to help with their research)*. Much of the information that will be evaluated by you in these meetings has come out of these Plans. Director McCarty gave a brief overview of each plan.

The Comprehensive Master Plan is the first one since 1983 and it will look at evaluating and planning for all District assets and programs over the next 10 years. The Ice Center Feasibility Study will determine the right approach for a Community Ice Center (size, scope, mission, location, etc.) and the Grove Management Plan is a guide for the operations and management of the Grove which has not been updated since the Grove's beginnings; it is in

the initial stages of revisions. All plans are still being worked on and vetted by the Park Board.

Director McCarty summarized the findings of each plan.

Findings of Comprehensive Master Plan: After evaluating every park and facility, holding two public outreach meetings, numerous board workshops, and results from a statistically valid survey that was sent out to 4,000 households with 400 responses (*survey results have already been measured by the choice of projects that are being presented*).

- The Ice Center is in the most need of facility improvements
- Safety and Operational issues identified at the Ice Center as well as The Grove
- Sleepy Hollow's flood issues need to be addressed; flooding threaten our assets
- Residents want more walking/running areas, indoor children play areas, outdoor restrooms, and support more open space

Findings of Glenview Ice Center Feasibility Study: Many of the following concerns can be addressed with the proposed New Community Ice Center.

- Research was done looking at the marketplace/market supports 2 to 2 1/2 sheet ice facility
- Looked at our location and best approach for our business model
- How can we best meet our mission to provide recreational programs
- 44 year old facility is costly and has limited offerings
- Need for more ice and support facilities
- High demand for prime time ice time
- Residents want to play and practice in Glenview

Findings of The Grove Management Plan

- Safety issues with the existing entrance
- Programming improvements needed
- Continued acquisition of open space

Preliminary Review of Capital Facility Needs

Director McCarty noted that all of these findings give us a good picture of what the Glenview Park District's top Capital Facility needs are: The Community Ice Center, The Grove Interpretive Center, Sleepy Hollow Park and Acquisition of Open Space. The top three all focus on improving safety; efficiencies and program offerings and addressing renovations to bring facilities up to today's standards. Open Space acquisition will continue to enhance the Grove and other areas of the district. Director McCarty gave some background and addressed each capital need in more detail.

Glenview Community Ice Center

Director McCarty explained that the Ice Center opened in 1973 after a successful Referendum. It went through major renovations in 1998 and 2008. He described the facility's amenities and noted the many offerings, programs, major events, and tournaments that are held there. With the Ice Center, being the second most visited facility in the Park District; it is a very busy place with 164,000 in attendance and 8,940 unique registrations annually. He also spoke about the Ice Center's operational challenges and deficiencies. He explained that with demand for prime time ice exceeding available ice, we cannot expand our programs and offerings and many Glenview residents are skating outside of Glenview. The lobby is

extremely congested at peak times; there isn't enough space for locker rooms which are poorly located and the restrooms are outdated and inadequate. There are also mobility issues and ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) deficiencies. The Studio Rink leaks and has drafts which are not good for maintaining the ice, the lobby floods and the roof leaks during rain events; all contributing to increased maintenance costs. There is a lack of storage and office space for both staff and coaches and the security system is outdated. There are high operating costs due to low energy efficiency systems and the facility's age. And even though our research has determined the Landwehr Road site to be the best location, the site needs improved visibility and experiences drop-off congestion and parking issues that need to be addressed. Director McCarty noted that these are just some of the issues facing this aging facility. Superintendent of Special Facilities, Lori Lovell, offered the task force members a tour of the Ice Center after the meeting to give them a better look at the issues.

The Grove Entrance and Interpretive Center

Director McCarty gave a brief overview of The Grove. He noted it has 150 acres of natural areas and is a National Historic Landmark and Illinois Nature Preserve. There are many historic buildings on the property including an Interpretive Center and rental facilities. It hosts 100,000 people annually with 900 school group visits each year. However, it only has a narrow singular entrance which causes safety issues with entering and exiting due to poor visibility and high traffic from Milwaukee Avenue. There is no pedestrian walkway from the entrance so pedestrians have to share the road with cars and buses. Also, there is no way to secure the entrance at the end of the day. The Interpretive Center at The Grove was built 27 years ago and houses many small animals and fish, educational exhibits and classrooms. The building is not ADA compliant, the filtration system for the fish tanks is outdated and space for support staff as well as classroom space is very limited.

Sleepy Hollow Park

Director McCarty described the park as being the second oldest park in the district, is 7.5 acres and includes a playground, fieldhouse and ballfield. Only 1% of the park is outside the flood zone; both the playground and fieldhouse are in the floodway. The fieldhouse sees an average of 73 rentals each year and is used for the annual OLPH end of school year picnic and boys and girls scout events. The recommendation is to move the fieldhouse, parking lot and playground to higher ground.

Open Space

Director McCarty explained that there are limited dollars and grants available for acquiring open space. The Grove Heritage Association has been key to helping fund recent land acquisitions; but additional funding would allow us to leverage land grants for matching funds and to acquire properties adjacent to existing parks when they become available. Acquiring more open space will also help enhance recreational opportunities, provide a buffer to our properties and help to preserve the natural environment. According to the latest resident poll, 78% of residents support open space acquisition.

Questions and Answers

Director McCarty opened the meeting up to questions and comments from the Task Force Members. Staff answered the questions at the meeting and subsequently refined those answers with additional information. See the attached Appendix for all questions and answers.

Public Comments

Director McCarty asked if there were any comments or questions from the public that was present. There were no comments.

Robert Patton, Park Board President, Glenview Park District

Closing Remarks

President Robert Patton recognized the enormous time commitment required by all those who serve on this task force and on behalf of the Park Board, thanked all the members for their willingness to serve. He noted how difficult this decision regarding the Ice Center has been in the past and hopes the task force will come up with a practical solution. He is looking forward to the results.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:15 p.m.

ATTEST:

Robert J. Patton, President

Michael D. McCarty, Secretary

Approved this 21st day of September, 2017

August 22, 2017 Task Force Meeting Minutes

Appendix

Q&A: Task Force Meeting #1

Glenview Park District

General Questions

1. Does the proposal involve a permanent tax?

No. Property taxes would be increased to pay the principal and interest on a bond issue. The bond issue would have a maximum final maturity of 20 years, meaning that the tax would go away within 20 years.

2. Will this referendum go on the ballot in March 2018? What major decisions will the task force be making?

The District is considering placing a bond ballot measure on the March 2018 ballot. The task force will be voting on what proposal to share and test district-wide as well as final recommendations to the GPD Board of Commissioners. Specifically, the task force will be making a recommendation on if the District should place a bond measure on the ballot and the composition of that proposal, if pursued.

3. Does the Park District have any debt being retired in the next few years?

Yes, the outdoor pool bonds will be retired in 2023. Additionally, there are some small issuances that will be retired in the next few years.

4. When will financing information be shared with the task force?

Financing information will be shared at the September 19, 2017 task force meeting.

Questions Pertaining to The Grove

5. Is the District considering adding a second entrance at The Grove?

No, the plan is to widen the current entrance to create safer ingress and egress for pedestrians and vehicles.

6. Would the Interpretive Center at The Grove be renovated or replaced?

The proposal calls for the renovation of the Interpretive Center.

Questions Pertaining to the Glenview Community Ice Center

7. What is Glenview Community Ice Center's mission (charter)?

GPD's focus is on recreation opportunities and sustainability of the facility. The Ice Center is to be operated as an integral part of the total system of recreation facilities and activities of the District. At all times feasible, the facility is to be utilized to meet the needs and interests for ice skating activities of all types and that only as a secondary purpose be used for other types of community recreation events or activities.

8. Why is the business plan of the Glenview Ice Center not working?

The current business model does not allow the District to meet its mission of providing recreational programs and maintaining a financially sustainable model. Additionally, the facility is 44 years old and has an aging infrastructure with systems that are costly to operate, inefficient and out of date. Staff anticipates operations and maintenance costs to continue to increase. The current one-and-a-half sheets of ice limits revenue generation, as all available prime time ice is currently being used. Design elements of the facility also restrict programming and rental opportunities, further limiting revenue growth.

9. What was Glenview Community Ice Center's net income for FY-2016?

The net operating income of the Ice Center was \$215,534 in 2016/17. The facility is not currently covering its portion of General & Administration costs as well as their pension, social security and Medicare costs. Once these costs are included the adjusted net operating income is (\$48,510). The pro forma for the new facility includes all of these costs and projects a net operating income of \$339,085 in the first year.

10. What does a typical ice center make on an annual basis?

The business models—and net operating income—vary based on a variety of factors: mission, philosophy, size of facility, location, and focus of facility (programs, hockey, figure skating, leagues, rental, etc.) as well whether the operation contributes to capital, covers the cost of pension, social security or Medicare. Comparable sized facilities in our market, range from net operating income of \$4,889 to \$300,000. The variance in the range is dependent on the previously cited factors.

11. How much prime time ice time is currently available at the Ice Center?

Currently, there is no available prime time ice available for rental at the Ice Center. All prime-time hours are scheduled for District programs or recognized associations. There are 53 prime-time hours on the District's main rink and 40 prime-time hours on the District's studio rink.

12. If an additional full sheet of ice is added, why does that solve the problem?

Adding a full sheet of ice allows the District to improve park district program offerings at prime-time hours, increases utilization from recognized organizations and significantly improves total revenue. The market analysis substantiated demand for more ice sheets in the region.

13. If another full sheet of ice is added to the Glenview Community Ice Center, for a total of 2.5 sheets of ice, how much total prime time ice time would be available? Does the District plan to sell all the prime-time ice time if the extra sheet of ice is added?

Each of the full-size rinks would provide 53 prime-time hours each week and the studio rink would provide 40 prime-time hours each week. This is a total of 146 prime-time hours. The District's plan calls for 100% utilization of prime-time ice in-season and 88% utilization of prime-time ice off-season.

14. How many ice centers did the Park District evaluate in estimating demand for an improved and expanded Glenview Community Ice Center?

Forty-one ice centers were used for a comparison of ice sheets and amenities. The analysis reviewed 15 ice centers within a 25-minute drive time from the center of Glenview and 26 other ice centers between a 26- and a 95-minute drive time from the center of Glenview.

15. Has the Park District done a market analysis of other ice rinks to determine the financial sustainability of the rink?

The District conducted a market analysis to determine the financial sustainability of current and future ice. This information is included in the final report of the Feasibility Study available at [Final Feasibility Report](#)

16. Is capacity data on Ice programs available?

All ice time for existing programs at the Glenview Community Ice Center are filled and scheduled. The District cannot create new programs, as there is not prime time ice available to schedule.

17. If the District had 2-1/2 sheets of ice, could prime-time ice be completely rented out for each of the rinks?

There is a demand for prime-time ice, and the District would be able to rent prime-time ice to both ensure a sustainable operation and expand recreational programs. On 2-1/2 sheets of ice there are 146 prime-time hours of ice, 53 on each large rink and 40 hours on the studio rink. The District's projected schedule shows 65.41 hours of prime-time ice would be rented to recognized associations and outside groups and 68.48 hours of prime-time ice time would be used for Park District programs and house leagues. The remaining hours on the schedule would be utilized by resurface time allotments, 10 minutes for large rink resurfaces and 5 minutes for studio rink resurfaces. The District is looking to balance its mission of providing recreational programs and financial sustainability.

18. How much does the Park District spend annually on ice rental outside the Glenview Ice Center for programs?

To address the District's Youth Hockey League programs, the District rents approximately \$15,000 of ice time at non-Glenview Park District facilities.

19. How much does the Park District spend annually on ice rental outside the Glenview Ice Center for partner programs?

The Glenview Stars rent approximately \$412,000 of ice time outside of Glenview. Glenbrook South Titans Club Hockey rents 1 hour per week at Mt. Prospect, which equates to about \$8,000 annually.

20. Would a new or improved Ice Center bring in more teams and increase revenues?

A new or improved Ice Center would bring in figure skating and hockey teams from the surrounding region for competitions and tournaments, resulting in increased revenues. Our main goal is to meet the needs of district residents. A secondary goal is financial sustainability; which non-resident users of the Ice Center would help to address.

21. How are recognized organizations, like the Glenview Stars, billed for ice time? Is it the same for Park District recreation programs and leagues?

A cumulative invoice (encompassing the entire season) is provided to the Glenview Stars at the onset of the season. At that time, a 15% deposit is paid. Over the course of the season, five additional payments of 15% are paid. The final payment is the balance owed plus/minus any additional or unused ice. The District does not invoice our house leagues or programs; participant fees cover the associated expenses.

22. What is the Glenview Stars' obligation to remain in Glenview?

GPD is currently negotiating with the Glenview Stars for a commitment. They have informed the District that they are a Glenview Club and want to skate in Glenview.

23. The Grove Heritage Association (GHA) currently helps fund and acquire additional land for The Grove. Are there any organizations like GHA that could help fund improvements to the Community Ice Center?

The Glenview Stars' travel hockey association may have an interest in providing funding for the Ice Center improvements. The District is in discussions with this organization.

24. How many residents are involved in ice activities and/or martial arts at the Ice Center?

More than 164,000 people walk through the doors of the 44-year-old Ice Center each year. It is the second most frequented facility in the District, second only to Park Center.

The Ice Center hosts more than 51,000 hockey program visits, 23,400 figure skating visits and 10,400 public skating visits. Martial arts classes, broomball, birthday parties and other events also take place at the Ice Center.

There are 5,109 unique registrations associated with the following programs:

- Glenview Stars Boys
- Glenview Junior Stars (formerly the Generals)
- Glenview Stars Girls
- Public Skate
- Youth Hockey Leagues
- Rec Hockey Program
- Rec Figure Skating
- Martial

Arts

Residents make up 3,814, or 75%, of the registrations. Ice programming registrations alone include 3,458 resident registrations, or 74%. Other activities such as open skate and birthday parties (visitors) are not included in the number of registrations.

25. How many unique resident households are represented at the Glenview Community Ice Center?

There are 929 unique households represented. This does not include daily admissions, recognized organizations or rentals.

26. How does the number of residents compare to the non-residents at the Ice Center?

There are 3,458 unique residents and 1,198 unique non-residents using the Ice Center.

27. What is the breakdown between residents and non-residents using the Ice Center?

Statistics show a favorable record of 74% resident participation (3,458 out of 4,656 program participants). Following are details of the percentage of residents participating in various programs at the Ice Center:

Park District

- 71% of Youth Hockey League
- 72% of Hockey programs
- 85% of Figure Skating programs
- 81% Glenview Blades Synchronized Skating Teams
- 70% of Public Session Season Passes

Recognized Organizations

- 95% of Glenbrook South Titan Hockey Club
- 59% of Glenview Stars Boys
- 54% of Glenview Junior Stars - Mites (formerly Generals)
- 24% of Glenview Stars Girls

28. Who would be impacted by the Ice Center improvements?

A new or improved ice center in our community would directly impact participants in Youth Hockey leagues, Youth Hockey programs, Figure Skating programs, Glenview Blades synchronized skating teams, public skating participants, Glenview Stars, GBS Titan Hockey Club, Glenview Junior Stars (formerly the Generals), and martial arts participants.

The proposed improvements include the addition of an indoor walk/jog track and indoor adventure play area, positively impacting an even larger number of residents.

GPD's amenities and services also have an indirect impact on all residents' quality of life and property values.

29. How many residents skate elsewhere?

GPD does not have the capability to track usage at non-district facilities.

30. How many children visit the Ice Center and The Grove each year?

At the Grove, last year we had approximately 28,813 children visit for school field trips and scout groups. Another 6,351 attended recreation programs for a total of 35,164. We don't keep track of numbers of children vs. adults for events and drop-in visitation.

At the Ice Center in 2015-2016, 1,651 of our 1,671 Figure Skating program registrations were children under 18 years old and 1,702 of our 1,724 Hockey program registrations were children under 18 years old. Combined, the programs were 98.8% children under 18 years old. 460 of our 810 season passes were sold to children under 18 years old. We do not keep track of children vs. adults for spectators, daily admissions, contracted programs and rental use.

31. What is the number of children in each sport at the Glenview Park District?

Ice Programs

Public Skate Passes - 782 (70% Resident)
Youth Hockey League - 394 (71% Resident)
Rec Hockey Program - 1,638 (72% Resident)
Rec Figure Skating - 1,531 (85% Resident)

Non-Ice Programs held at Ice Center

Martial Arts - 453 (82% Resident)

Recreation Leagues

Basketball, Boys/Girls - 735 (97% Resident)
Softball, Girls - 212 (98% Resident)
Co-Ed Flag Football - 371 (98% Resident)
Co-Ed Volleyball - 75 (80% Resident)
Lacrosse, Boys - 23 (91% Resident)
Lacrosse, Girls - 66 (98% Resident)

Recognized Organizations

Glenview Stars Boys - 196 (59% Resident)
Glenview Junior Stars - Mites (formerly Generals) - 41 (54% Resident)
Glenview Stars Girls - 74 (24% Resident)
GYB - *1,504 (59% Resident)
AYSO - 1,067 (Not Available)
GYS - 770 (63% Resident)
*GYB - 552 - Fall Ball included in the 1,504 but not R/NR totals as fall ball does not track residency status.

32. How will ADA issues be addressed?

Any new or substantially renovated public facility (including an Ice Center) is required to be in full compliance with the requirements of the federal Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG) and the Illinois Accessibility Code. Specific examples of components and

areas that will comply with current accessibility codes and regulations, and best practices, include:

- adequate number of accessible parking spaces
- accessible curb ramps at pedestrian areas with detectable warning surfaces
- automatic door operators at main entrances,
- service, rental, and concessions counters at accessible height
- fully-compliant restroom and changing room facilities
- a fully ADA-compliant elevator capable of housing a stretcher and emergency personnel
- areas for wheelchair accessible seating in the ice rinks
- accessible play elements in the proposed Indoor Adventure Play area
- wider walking/running track lanes to accommodate persons in wheelchairs and those with mobility limitations
- at new ice rink(s), the ability to move onto the ice without a change in level

33. Is a banquet-size room proposed for the Ice Center?

No.

34. The plan to add a sheet of ice to the Glenview Community Ice Center was previously shut down? Why did this happen?

A previous plan to add an additional sheet of ice was not approved by the GPD Board of Commissioners in 2014. Unlike the current proposal being considered, the 2014 plan simply involved adding another full-sheet of ice. The current proposal includes the new sheet of ice but also improvements to the existing facility to extend the buildings useful life, improve safety and security, address energy inefficiencies, address space needs and expand non-ice-related recreation opportunities for residents.

Questions Pertaining to Sleepy Hollow Park

35. What is the average number of fieldhouse rentals compared to the fieldhouse rentals at Sleepy Hollow Park?

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.

36. Does GPD have programs and/or camps that operate out of the Sleepy Hollow fieldhouse?

Very few Park District programs are held at any of the District's fieldhouses. One or two camps only, and none at the Sleepy Hollow fieldhouse.

37. How is the fieldhouse at Sleepy Hollow Park used?

The fieldhouse at Sleepy Hollow has been previously permitted to the following groups: AA, NSSRA, OLPH, Scouts, Recognized Organizations and the Village of Glenview. There are also a few private (resident and non-resident) rentals of the facility each year.

38. Can GPD obtain grants from the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District or the Village of Glenview address storm water improvements at Sleepy Hollow Park?

The District is planning to continue to look for grant dollars, especially for the storm water improvements that are needed.

39. Has GPD considered simply removing the fieldhouse at Sleepy Hollow Park?

Yes, it was discussed during our review of the Master Plan draft priorities. Although a final decision has not yet been made by the Board of Commissioners, there appears to be interest in retaining this asset.

40. Are exterior public restrooms part of the proposed improvements at Sleep Hollow Park? At present, the only persons who get to use the restrooms are those who rent the fieldhouse.

The District would like to provide public exterior restrooms. Access to restrooms rated high on community survey we conducted as part of the Comprehensive Master Plan process.

41. When Sleepy Hollow Park floods, is it rain or river water?

Both rain and river water are creating flooding at Sleepy Hollow Park. As water comes down river it collects from many areas and backs up. It rises over the river banks and comes into the park. Sleepy Hollow has had 3 heavy rain events over the past 10 years which have flooded the fieldhouse. Each time the fieldhouse floods, monies are allocated toward cleanup.

42. What is the proposed new location of the Sleepy Hollow fieldhouse?

GPD seeks to move the fieldhouse to higher ground in an area that is less flood prone.

43. How many fieldhouses does the Park District own and operate?

The Park District has a total of 13 fieldhouses.

44. Is flood mitigation part of the Sleepy Hollow Park proposal?

GPD's first priority at Sleep Hollow Park is to move the fieldhouse to higher ground and away from flood-prone areas. The District does plan to evaluate mitigation opportunities at Sleepy Hollow, however, any reclamation projects would require involvement of the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District (MWRD) and the Village of Glenview.

45. Where would the water go if storm water mitigation was pursued at Sleepy Hollow Park?

The District would work closely with MWRD and the Village of Glenview in the development of a proper storm water plan. Details at this time are not available.

46. Does the Park District plan to build anything else at Sleepy Hollow Park?

There are no plans to build any new structures at Sleepy Hollow.

47. Would land that is eminent domain by the Village of Glenview be annexed into the Sleepy Hollow project?

The Village of Glenview owns the Pine Street properties, which is floodway, and it is not part of the Park District's proposal. The District's policy does not allow for acquisition or development of a floodplain/floodway with district dollars. But, we would not be opposed to being part of the solution down the road.

48. Who owns the Flood Way Buy-out properties?

The Village of Glenview owns this land.

49. Would the fieldhouse at Sleepy Hollow Park be moved where the baseball fields are located?

The baseball fields are on higher ground and this is one of the locations being considered for the fieldhouse.

Questions Pertaining to Open Space

50. Is there particular open space that GPD seeks to purchase?

GPD is looking at property at The Grove as well as other park areas. For example, the District is looking to purchase property to improve the access to various parks.

51. What are examples of how open space could be used for recreation-related purposes?

Open space purchases could be used for passive recreation such a walking trails, gardens or sitting areas. It could also be used for active recreation, sports activities or events.

52. Are there policies that would guide GPD's purchase decisions when it comes to open space?

GPD has a policy that guides the Board of Commissioners on the purchase of open space.