



**Hyland Greens Task Force
December 16, 2015
6:30 – 8:30 p.m.
Haeg Conference Room
2nd Floor, Bloomington Civic Plaza
1800 W. Old Shakopee Road, Bloomington, MN**

Call To Order:

Facilitator Irina Fursman called the fourth meeting of the Hyland Greens Task Force to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Haeg Conference Room at Bloomington Civic Plaza.

Task Force Members Present: 14

Rod Axtell
Jack Baloga (as alternate for Andrew Carlson who was absent)
Doug Bruce
Liz Heyman
Diann Kirby
Mike Kolthoff
Laura Perreault
Randy Quale
Cindy Rollins
Jim McCarthy
Virg Senescall
Cary Weatherby
Roger Willette

Task Force Members Absent: 1

Andrew Carlson

Other Staff Present: 1

Alison Warren, Office Support Specialist, Parks and Recreation Division (to take minutes)

Facilitators Present: 2

Irina Fursman, *Huelife*

Members of the Public Present: 12

Welcome and Introductions/Agenda Review - 6:30 p.m.

Irina welcomed the Task Force members and guests to the fourth meeting for the Hyland Greens Task Force. She requested that the members introduce themselves. The introductions were as follows:

- Irina Fursman introduced herself as the co-facilitator of the Hyland Greens Task Force
- Cindy Rollins is serving as a member of City staff (Budget Manager)

- Ron Axtell is serving as a representative of the business community
- Jack Baloga is serving as an alternate representative of the City Council
- Doug Bruce is serving as a representative of the community
- Rick Sitek is serving as a member of City staff (Golf Manager)
- Liz Heyman is serving as a member of City staff (Planner)
- Randy Quale is serving as a member of City staff (Parks and Recreation Manager)
- Laura Perreault is serving as a representative of the neighborhood
- Roger Willette is serving as a representative of the Planning Commission
- Mike Kolthoff is serving as a Hyland Greens user
- Virg Senescall is serving as a representative of BAA Golf
- Cary Weatherby is serving as a representative of the community
- Diann Kirby is serving as a member of the City staff (Community Services Director)

I. Fursman reminded Task Force members of the charge given to the task force by the City Council which is “To study data related to Hyland Greens and its services; review budget forecasts and their implications; identify problems to be solved; study potential alternatives; and provide feedback to the City Council.” I. Fursman also summarized the past three meetings of the Task Force. The first meeting of the group was about getting to know each other and creating the protocols for members to follow, grouped by preparation, participation and purpose. The second meeting was spent reviewing information about Hyland Greens such as the budget. The third meeting was focused on identifying the problems that the Task Force was asked to solve and creating criteria by which the alternatives will be reviewed.

I. Fursman stated that today’s meeting is to review the three major categories of potential alternatives and agree on the criteria for evaluation. The fourth meeting is also tasked with deciding which alternatives to focus on for further research and discussion.

I. Fursman presented to the Task Force the plan for the evening. She stated that there are three different tables that represent the three major categories for potential alternatives: redevelopment, parks and golf. Each table will be hosted by a City staff representative.

D. Kirby reviewed the contents of the meeting materials which included the agenda for December 16, 2015 meeting; the minutes from the November 10, 2015 meeting; an updated chart of monthly rounds played at Hyland Greens through the end of the 2015 season; an updated chart of monthly rounds of golf played at Dwan through the end of the 2015 season; a wage and benefits summary for Hyland Greens and Dwan; a summary of the problems statement workshop; a memo describing the three major categories for the future use of Hyland Greens; a summary charts of the three major categories of future use of Hyland Greens; an updated golf course question and answers; the evaluation summary from the November 10, 2015 meeting; and the evaluation form for the December 16, 2015 meeting. C. Weatherby read the outcomes for the day.

Debrief of Reflections: Confirm Problem Statement and Agree on Evaluation Criteria – 6:40 p.m.

I. Fursman reviewed the three evaluations categories that were formed by the problem statements discussed at the last meeting of the Task Force. The categories included cost to operate, community needs and values and land use. She requested that when the Task Force thinks about cost to operate, ask what it would take to sustain each alternative. When thinking about community needs/values, ask what community needs it serves. Finally, when looking through the

lens of land use ask what is the potential return on investment, financially, environmentally and socially.

I. Fursman asked the Task Force if anything was missing from the categories. C. Weatherby inquired about the City's motive and objective for the Task Force. She asked if the City Council is looking to make more money or increase opportunity for recreation or something else entirely. D. Kirby responded that the City Council is looking for input from the Task Force on which direction is the right one for the community of Bloomington.

I. Fursman split the Task Force into three groups and asked them to use the evaluation criteria to review each of the three major alternatives. She noted that the questions were broad and did not require the Task Force to choose a scenario within each alternative. She noted that this session will be used to determine which alternative should be researched and discussed further.

Review of the Three Major Categories of Potential Alternatives – 7:00 p.m.

The Task Force discussed each alternative category and summarized their discussions using the following statements.

Park:

What will it take to sustain this alternative?

- Periodic investment to maintain facilities - \$'s to maintain
- Attractiveness to community
- People interested in using park space/amenities provided
- Programming beyond organized athletics (youth and family), seniors, all!
- Activities and amenities for everyone
- Increased city resources for maintenance and capital, reducing resources available for other parks in the system

What community needs will it serve?

- Parks and recreation needs for adjoining neighborhoods
- Health and wellness
- Appealing to non-golfers
- Could be a space for other activities

What will the community lose if this alternative is not implemented?

- Community access and usage
- Parkland – once it's gone, it's gone
- Parks and recreation needs for adjoining neighborhoods
- Health and wellness
- Appealing to non-golfers
- Could be a space for other activities
- Option to create more green space on east side

What will the community lose if this alternative is implemented?

- Golf in present configuration
- A place for youth to learn and seniors

- Recreation opportunities for golf for current users (youth and seniors)
- Loss of upfront revenue if developed
- Driving range

What would be the financial return on investment?

- Sell/develop eastern portion of property to fund other park improvements and operations and maintenance
- Varies based on option selected
- Significant capital costs
- Potential for revenues from facility rentals/leagues
- Negative operationally
- Property values in area increase

What would be the social return on investment?

- Neighborhood access to parks and open space
- Community gathering place and recreation
- Health and wellness
- Address changing recreational needs of community
- [Takes away] option to create more green space on east side of town

What would be the environmental return on investment?

- Maintaining green space
- Wildlife preservation
- Water quality – non-impervious surfaces
- Same as golf course usage

I. Fursman inquired about questions the Task Force had about the park alternative. C. Rollins asked, “Would the answers be different if we focused on passive versus active use?” R. Quale responded by saying that there may be different answers depending on the usage. He noted that with parkland, there is a wide spectrum of opportunities. He stated that if this is something that the Task Force wants to recommend, staff could look into it further and develop specific scenarios.

I. Fursman asked the Task Force to consider the information that had been provided so far to determine the greatest benefit to the community if the park alternative was chosen.

C. Weatherby stated that the greatest benefit would be the opportunity to address the changing recreational needs of the community. She noted that there are currently no designated lacrosse fields and that they are becoming a big demand. She stated that the Hyland Greens space could be used to help address up-and-coming needs.

L. Perreault stated that the biggest benefit to the community would be providing an option that is accessible to all demographics whether that is financial or physical. She added that anyone could go to a park and that parks benefit the whole community rather than just one specific group.

D. Bruce noted that the park alternative was attractive due to the growing need for green space for multi-residential facilities in the area. He stated that residential areas like apartments may not have green space and a park could address this need.

I. Fursman asked the Task Force to share what they felt was the biggest challenge with the park alternative. R. Axtell stated that keeping a balance of amenities on the east and west side of the City would be a challenge. He noted that the park alternative may raise questions about the fairness of City amenities and their locations within Bloomington. M. Kohlthoff stated that he was concerned that the loss of golf was not worth the additional 5% increase in parkland when there were already so many acres of land dedicated to parks including options that are within walking distance to the current neighbors of Hyland Greens. I Fursman asked if the Task Force need to know anything additional regarding the park alternative. The Task Force did not have any comments.

Golf:

What does it take to sustain the golf alternative?

- Decrease losses
- Increase rounds
- Improve marketing
- Reduce expenses
- Refine internal service charges
- Community buy-in for subsidy (treat like parks)
- Alternatives for uses and management
- Year-round golf options
- Increase interest in golf/foot golf
- Facility upgrades
- Variety of golf experiences (mini, Frisbee)

What community needs will it serve?

- Provide a place for youth to learn how to play
- Provide a place for seniors to play a shorter course
- Provide a place to practice (driving range)
- Provide a faster and less expensive alternative
- Serves different group than Dwan – par 3 golf course
- Environmental/green space
- Health and wellness

What will the community lose if it is still a golf course?

- Opportunity for multi-use space
- Negative \$ balance
- Lack of total, free community access

What will the community lose if golf is not implemented?

- Provide a place for youth to learn how to play
- Provide a place for seniors to play a shorter course
- Provide a place to practice (driving range)
- Provide a faster and less expensive alternative
- Serves different group than Dwan – par 3 golf course
- An attraction for other people to live here
- Community amenity

- Negative publicity (image of city)

What would be the financial return on investment?

- Current negative ROI in \$
- Potential improvement in \$ ROI
- Hoping for break even
- Long term cost – annual losses > annual park maintenance

What would be the social return on investment?

- Attracts people to city
- Serves different group than Dwan
- Health/wellness

What would be the environmental return on investment?

- Green space
- Lack of pavement

I. Fursman inquired what questions the Task Force had about the golf alternative. The Task Force did not have any additional questions. I. Fursman then asked the Task Force to determine the greatest benefit to the community if the golf alternative was chosen. C. Rollins stated that a citywide amenity would continue to be provided. C. Weatherby shared that the biggest benefit would be continuing to maintain green space. M. Kohlthoff said the greatest benefit is that the alternative serves all ages. R. Axtell said that Hyland Greens serves a different group than Dwan.

I. Fursman asked the Task Force to share what they felt was the biggest challenge with the golf alternative. V. Senescall said that the biggest challenge would be the sustainability of a potential net loss every year. He noted that he wasn't sure if a decrease in the loss would be sufficient. J. Baloga noted that not losing money is different than making a profit. He added that the facility needs to do more than just break even to provide an opportunity for reinvestment. M. Kohlthoff expressed his concern that some City facilities host a smaller amount of visitors than the golf course yet have a significantly higher cost of operations. I Fursman then asked if the Task Force need to know anything additional regarding the golf alternative. The Task Force did not have any comments.

Development:

What will it take to sustain the development alternative?

- Basic City services
- Park maintenance (if included)
- Willing buyers/tenants
- Access - transit (public and private)

What community needs does it serve?

- Increase tax base
- Space for senior housing
- Third places – community space/gathering
- Some preservation of green space
- Model city for future development
- More land for development

What will the community lose if not implemented?

- Opportunity – model/leader in 21st century development
- \$/revenue
- Increase tax base
- Space for senior housing
- Third places – community space/gathering
- Some preservation of green space
- Model city for future development
- More land for development

What will the community lose if implemented?

- Green space
- Golf course
- See golf options list

What would be the financial return on investment?

- Use cash to upgrade facilities or cover deficit
- Large revenue infusion
- If sustainably/efficiently developed = \$

What would be the social return on investment?

- Could be meet needs for senior, affordable housing
- Opportunity to partner with non-profits who meet City needs (art spaces)
- Increase/attraction of new residents/younger families
- “Eco-halo” (same as if sustainably/efficiently developed = \$)

What would be the environmental return on investment?

- Neutral
- Walkable area
- If sustainably/efficiently developed
- Decreases green space
- Negative visual, pavement, urban sprawl, traffic

I. Fursman inquired about questions that the Task Force had about the development alternative.

L. Perreault asked about the impact of the home values in the surrounding area if this alternative was selected. She also wondered what the impact would be based upon what type of development took place. E. Heyman stated she would look into this question and report back

I. Fursman then asked the Task Force to determine the greatest benefit to the community if the development alternative was chosen based on the information provided so far. C. Weatherby stated that the one-time infusion of cash would be the biggest benefit. C. Rollins said that the increase of tax base would be the greatest benefit. R. Axtell inquired if there was an opportunity to combine the golf course with the development option, for example, developing the old driving range space. L. Perreault stated that this option seemed like an opportunity to be diverse and flexible. She noted that it could be residential, park and golf course all at the same time as well as industry-leading from a sustainability point. She said the ability for limitless options was the biggest benefit.

I. Fursman asked the Task Force to share what they felt was the biggest challenge with the development alternative. R. Axtell responded that gaining support for development from the neighbors, golfers and other residents who support the golf course would be the biggest challenge. V. Senescall added that it would be tough to gain support from the parents of youth. M. Kolthoff questioned the reason for singling out the golf course as the only green space area that is open for development. He said that there are 3,635 other acres of green space that could also be repurposed for the same type of development.

Reflection on Categories Review – 8:20 p.m.

I. Fursman asked the Task Force which alternative or alternatives needed further research before drafting a recommendation to the City Council. D. Bruce stated that he would like to learn more about the golf course and development combination and what it could potentially look like. V. Senescall agreed. R. Axtell asked if there was the potential to keep the golf course and use the extra space for something such as park or development. L. Perreault would also like to see the different combination of options between development, park and golf. She noted that she thought this was the most interesting option.

L. Heyman offered to look into the combined options, but added that digging into the exact details of what these would look like would require additional community engagement processes. R. Quale suggested that they could identify the acreage and location of land that could be portioned off for development without impacting the golf operation. He noted that what could then be done with the land could be discussed at a later time.

I. Fursman asked the Task Force to share what other information would be helpful to create their recommendation. V. Senescall answered that he would like to know what steps can be taken to improve the bottom line at the golf course, noting that this would affect his recommendation. C. Weatherby stated that she would like to explore other golf uses, such as a mini course. She also inquired about other things that can be done to upgrade the golf facility to potentially attract more users. L. Perreault stated that she would like to hear more from the community voice to get a true understanding of what is wanted and needed. She stated that she felt as if assumptions were being made about what the community values, whether it was about golf or something else. She said that she is looking for residents to provide unbiased input to learn more about the community at large. Lastly, J. Baloga noted the broad range of opportunities within parks and the cost differential that corresponds with those opportunities. He stated that he felt that the park alternative should be drilled down to better define what the cost would be since this can be a factor in decision-making.

Closing and Evaluation – 8:25 p.m.

The meeting closed at 8:32 p.m. I. Fursman requested that Task Force members complete the meeting evaluation forms found in the Hyland Greens Task Force binders. She stated the next meeting of the Task Force is December 30, 2015.