



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

Appendix A

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 with 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 74,740sf and the entire facility is 90,500sf.

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, i.e., user ability and value perspective?

A: Architecturally there are no compromises from program or user perspective. A bit more parking available in the new option.

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

DRAFT

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 that track?

A: From the Needs Assessment Study and Comprehensive Master Plan surveys, this is what residents asked for/wanted. 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.

Q: Economic Impact: when will tournaments be scheduled for additional revenue of approx. \$6,000 a year and will they compete with prime time ice?

A: 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: What is the estimate of customers and the revenue breakdowns?

A: The current Stars' hours in Glenview and what they rent elsewhere and others renting elsewhere were calculated. Approximately 65 hours of prime time ice will be available for rental. Roughly 68 hours of prime time ice will be available for other Park District ice programs and the remaining 10 hours of prime ice will be for maintenance.

Questions Pertaining to Mount Prospect Arena (MPA) Option

Q: Where is the Mount Prospect Arena located?

A: Wolf Road and Kensington Roads in 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 whether we would sell or keep 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 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?

DRAFT

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 and it would be our property. The Village of Mount Prospect would lose this tax base.

Q: One of the pros is that no referendum is needed, so how would we do the funding to purchase the MPA?

A: We have 10 million dollars in bond funding that we could be used 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 94,500sf. MPA does not have a second floor creating a difference of approximately 20,000sf.

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. (given in the 8/22 Q&A's)

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

A: Roosevelt has higher fieldhouse rentals and program and camp use. (given in the 8/22 Q&A's)

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

A: Yes, we have 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?

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

DRAFT

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 field house 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 field house
- 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 field house and playground as Concept C

Concept C

Pros

- provides the most parking of all concepts
- provides new field house
- consolidates parking, fieldhouse, and playground in northeast corner of site to have less segregated open space
- provides more convenient location of parking to the field house and playground
- field house 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

DRAFT

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 bill.

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: This bond measure does not spend money 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-dollar bond 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 will 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 keep taxes low. The ice center project is a large project which would use most of the available funds. This made it sensible to package a few other high priority projects with the Ice Center project and make it a broader based referendum.

Questions after Group Discussions

Q: Is there a lower cost option than 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 Glenview standards. If we cut amenities, it will not bring in the additional traffic and revenue, i.e., tournaments and family activities.

DRAFT

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 phone survey will test arguments for and against grouping them together and how they could appear on the ballot.

Q: Our group also discussed if District 34 would have needs issues in the future, do we need to talk to them about this?

A: This was more of a comment than a question.

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 or a 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: We 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: Need more details on 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: 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.

Appendix B

Citizen Task Force Meeting – September 19, 2017 Small Group Discussion

- ✓ **Rank the three Ice Center options:**
 - New ice center to replace old center at current site
 - Renovate/expand existing ice center at current site
 - Purchase privately owned ice center

- ✓ **If new or renovated ice center on existing site is pursued:**
 - Include walk/jog track?
 - Include children's adventure play area?

- ✓ **Multiple ice center options can be tested in the mail survey and/or phone poll. Do you wish to test multiple options? If so, how many?**

- ✓ **Rank Sleepy Hollow Park options:**
 - Concept A
 - Concept B
 - Concept C

- ✓ **Any projects that you do not want included in the proposal?**
 - Ice Center
 - The Grove
 - Sleepy Hollow
 - Open Space

- ✓ **Any projects you wish to modify before sharing and testing district-wide?**

