



**GLENVIEW PARK DISTRICT
Strategic Plan Advisory Committee
Public Meeting**

Park Center-Room: Lakeview C
2400 Chestnut Avenue
Glenview, IL 60025
Meeting Minutes
March 16, 2010, 7:00 p.m.

Attendees

Commissioners: President Judy Beck, William Casey, Mary Jean Coulson, Angie Katsamakidis, Bob Patton, Ted Przybylo

Glenview Park District: Director Charles Balling, Superintendents: Barb Cremin, Cheryl Deom, Fred Gullen, Robert Quill, staff members: Laila Bashia, Joanne Capaccio, Nicole Hopkins, Kathleen McInnis, and Interns: Chelsea Wagner, Kevin Lawler

Facilitator: Hank Gmitro

The Strategic Plan Advisory Committee: Al Kearney, Ann Yoshida, Anne Vavloukis, Bill Dempsey, Gretchen Flowers, Judy Hynes, Laura Selby, Mark Walther, Marty Fogarty, Richard Day, Steve Bucklin, Sven Dahlquist

Public in Attendance: None

Greeting/Introductions

Park Board President Judy Beck welcomed the Strategic Plan Advisory Committee (SPAC) and expressed her appreciation to the members for sharing their talents. She commented on our changing world and how now more than ever we need to come together. She said the last (SPAC) in 2006 helped make a huge difference in the Park District's Strategic Plans. She pointed to the very popular Dog Park at Community Park West and innovations in technology and how our e-presence at the Park District is blooming. She also commented on an Initiative to become an "Employer of Choice" and said it is evident with the talented staff that we are so fortunate to have working here. She thanked the Committee again for their commitment and then introduced the facilitator for these SPAC meetings, Hank Gmitro. Hank is a Glenview resident and CEO for a local business in town. He pointed to the background information that staff prepared for the SPAC in their binders and how their input as community members is so important to the Park Board. The SPAC Committee members and Park District staff who were in attendance introduced themselves (see above).

Glenview Park District Background

Facilitator Gmitro briefly outlined what would be covered in this and the next two meetings. First, a video will be shown followed by Director Chuck Balling giving some background information on the Park District and the Strategic Planning process (copy of slide presentation filed herewith). Tonight, staff will then share information on two of the nine Strategic Planning Initiatives that have been identified by a Community Attitude and Interest Survey as well as feedback from the Park Board, staff and community members

over the past three years. The SPAC will then be asked to make comments, ask questions, and validate the recommendations.

Director Balling gave a status update of the last Strategic Plan and announced 95% of tasks have been completed along with three major capitol projects. Chuck pointed out that this Strategic Planning will have criteria for the initiatives, be transparent and have the SPAC review the recommendations, prioritize ideas, and give their feedback. The Park Board will have the final authority of approving the Strategic Plan for the Park District.

Strategic Initiatives

The staff proceeded to walk the Committee through two of the Identified Strategic Plan Initiatives (copy of slide presentations filed herewith). The following staff members presented:

- Barb Cremin: Conservative Financial Planning for Long-Term Sustainability
- Kathleen McInnis/Robert Quill: Enhancing Experiences at Facilities & Parks

Issues and goals were identified and recommendations were given to achieve those goals. Questions and comments were taken from the SPAC. (see Appendix). Written feedback on the issues and recommendations was requested from the SPAC members and they were asked to turn in their feedback sheets at the end of the meeting.

In closing, Hank asked if the material provided in the SPAC binders provided enough information for the members to start thinking about priorities on each Initiative and come back with questions at the next meeting. The members agreed. A list of potential projects was handed out and the committee was asked to rate them High, Medium, or Low in importance to the community in the next three years. These ratings will be tallied and shared with the committee at the next meeting on March 18. Judy Beck asked who the SPAC should consider when rating these projects and if finances should be considered. Hank said the SPAC members are representing the community and what they think the community would want. Director Balling commented that the SPAC should look at the proposed recommendations and not necessarily at the cost or money available. Hank noted that four more initiatives will be presented at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:20 p.m.

ATTEST:

Judy Beck, President

Charles T. Balling, Secretary

Approved this 27th day of May 2010

Appendix

Discussion Points

Q= Question, A= Answer

Financial Planning for Long-Term Sustainability

Q: *As indicated in the Interest and Attitude survey, why do twice as many Glenview Park District respondents cite "fees are too high" as a reason preventing the use of parks, programs and facilities as compared to other those on other Northern Illinois suburbs?*

A: This is an area of concern that we will continue to monitor. When setting our rates each year, we gather information about local competitor's fees to assess the market. Even with this perception about Glenview Park District fees, our revenue generating facilities continue to see high usage.

Q: *Give some background on our Bonding Authority?*

A: Bonding Authority is the amount of indebtedness the District can incur without going to referendum. In determining the amount of available Bonding Authority, certain types of bonds, i.e. Alternate Revenue Source bonds and some other forms of indebtedness are exempt for the calculation. The available authority was essentially used to issue bonds related to the construction of Park Center. Currently, the District does not have any non-referendum debt authority until 2015 when the bonds for constructing Park Center are paid off...

Q: *Does the Park District benchmark fund balances with other comparable districts?*

A: We will report on this at next meeting. (Hank reminded the SPAC that they can fill out a question sheet that will be addressed at the next meeting). Our fund balances do play an important role in obtaining our high Moody bond rating.

Q: *Does the Park District see any expenses accelerating at a higher rate than the Consumer Price Index (CPI)?*

A: Yes. While the CPI is based on composite of many consumer goods, some of the goods included in the CPI are not relevant to the Glenview Park District while others are major expenses for the District. Certain items such as insurance and energy costs are rising faster than the overall CPI.

Q: *Incoming liabilities with Tyner Center and the Prairie moving on the Park District budget?*

A: Until the Tax Increment Financing District (TIF) ends, the District will receive funds from the Village to offset the capital and operating expenses for the Tyner Center and Air Station Prairie. Once the TIF ends, the park district will take on those liabilities. We have planned for this in our long term financial plan.

Q: *What happens in 2013? Looks like there are high expenses for the major facilities and parks?*

A: Funds are being put aside today to cover that. We put away 1/10 of the funds needed for those replacement/repairs each year.

Q: *Explain why Glenview Youth Baseball donated \$350,000 in 2007/2008 and \$70,000 in 2008/2009?*

A: Glenview Youth Baseball's overall donation to help fund the construction of the ball fields at Community Park West was over \$700,000. The \$350,000 was a down payment with an additional \$70,000 to be paid annually until the full donation has been paid. This agreement with Glenview Youth Baseball is another example of the benefits of working together for the good of the community.

Q: *Are Naming Rights being considered for alternate funding sources?*

A: There is nothing in place now, but this topic has been included as one of our strategic plan initiatives for 2010-2013.

Q: *Has there been any progress on developing a policy that will look at cost benefits of Environmental Initiatives, e.g., Solar Panels for the pools?*

A: We have not yet developed a long range policy yet; however this topic has been included as one of our strategic plan initiatives for 2010-2013.

Q: *In the financial plan, there is a big drop in uncommitted funds in 2015, should we save these funds now?*

A: Yes, we have anticipated this and developed a financial plan to build up fund reserves for anticipated future needs and allow for the continuity of programs, services and maintenance of our parks and facilities that the community has come to enjoy.

Q: *Do all part-time seasonal employees receive unemployment compensation?*

A: In general, we don't get many unemployment claims. In those areas where we do receive claims, we will be analyzing whether it is more cost effective to keep these workers employed longer rather than pay for unemployment claims.

Q: *Schools are expecting a decrease in enrollments. Will user fees be affected by this?*

A: We continue to analyze these trends. Generally, we can be flexible with our programming and staffing levels and shift our programs to accommodate enrollments for various ages. As participation rates go down, we can adjust staff levels, materials used, etc., to keep expenses down.

Enhancing Experiences at Facilities & Parks

Q: *Are we addressing the same issue with the two recommendations: Fitness Center expansion and Satellite Fitness Centers?*

A: The two issues are related but are not the same issue. The proposed Fitness Center expansion at Park Center is based on the need to expand the services currently being offered at Park Center Health and Fitness to meet the customers' needs. Considerable research has been done by staff on this proposal and it is being recommended as part of the 2010-2013 strategic plan. The Satellite Fitness Centers is a new concept to accommodate patrons using a facility like Glenview Tennis or Ice and may be interested in sports enhancement and/or who live in different areas of Glenview. This concept has yet to be fully researched. A study into the feasibility of this concept is being proposed in the 2010-2013 strategic plan.

Q: *If Fitness is expanding can we refigure the Fitness Center at Park Center to accommodate more options?*

A: We have already reconfigured the Fitness Center and we have also expanded classes by moving some into the gym and into other areas of the facility. Still, we are running out of space and don't want to further infringe on space for the recreational programs.

Q: *Is Fitness and Park Center an Enterprise facility?*

A: The fitness center is operated similar to an enterprise fund; however, it is part of the Park Center operation. While Park Center operations in total receive some tax funding, it is not generally used for the fitness center operations. User fees are expected to cover the operating costs plus overhead of the fitness center.

Q: *If we overbuild at Park Center, do we have alternative uses?*

A: We have life cycles of all programs which help us decide our space needs. We will always have programs that we could move into these new areas.

Q: *Is it possible to alleviate some of the space issues at the Fitness Center with the proposed Satellite Fitness Centers?*

A: Not enough research has been done yet; on the Satellite Fitness Center concept, Park Center already has the staff, amenities and equipment inventory in place. A centralized fitness center brings many operating efficiencies. We would need to look at what that will cost to replicate at a satellite site.

Q: *What about the areas available at the outdoor pools for satellite fitness?*

A: Those areas are already being used for other programs.

Q: *What about parking issues with the increase in fitness programs?*

A: Parking is an area of concern at Park Center. This issue is included in the 2010-2013 strategic plan. Part of the analysis will be to look at the traffic flow and determine the feasibility of other options such as staggering classes, putting in another drop-in area, using a valet service and other concepts to address the parking issue. We look at the parking problem at the Park Center as a positive.

We work hard to keep the lots full with customers. Between the Park Center, Attea and the street, there are lots of options for people willing to walk a little further. It still is a concern that needs attention.

Q: *Would it be fair to say traffic is a priority issue?*

A: Yes, for the entire Park Center not just fitness. We need to work on traffic flow as well.