



**Community Center Task Force  
April 4, 2016  
5:00 – 6:30 p.m.  
Haeg Conference Room  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Bloomington Civic Plaza  
1800 W. Old Shakopee Road, Bloomington, MN**

**Call To Order:**

City Manager Jamie Verbrugge called the first meeting of the Community Center Task Force to order at 5:00 p.m. in the Haeg Conference Room at Bloomington Civic Plaza.

**Task Force Members Present: 15**

Maureen Bartolotta  
Dan Cripe  
Tammy Galvin  
Olivia Haaland  
MaryAnne Josephson  
Dennis Kane  
Diann Kirby  
MaryAnne London  
Jake Martin  
Jon Oleson  
Maureen Scallen-Failor  
John Schatzlein  
Lenny Schmitz  
John Stanley  
Jim Urie (alternate for Randy Quale)

**Task Force Members Absent: 3**

Joshua Korthouse  
Lorinda Pearson  
Randy Quale

**Other Staff Present: 1**

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

**Facilitators Present: 4**

Irina Fursman, *Huelife*  
Eric Schoon, Senior Utility Service Specialist, City of Bloomington  
Brent Massmann, Senior Utility Operator, City of Bloomington  
Barb Wolff, Office Supervisor, City of Bloomington

**Members of the Public Present: 6**

## **Welcome and Introductions/Agenda Review – 5:00 p.m.**

City Manager Verbrugge thanked those serving on the Task Force. He noted that there has been significant conversation about the future of a potential Community Center and many people are excited about it. Verbrugge referenced a recent Star Tribune that talked about the Bloomington housing market, stating that the article raises good questions about what makes a community attractive including a central location for all to gather. Verbrugge stated that this is an important time in our community and that he and the City Council are looking forward to the task force process.

City Manager Verbrugge then introduced Irina Fursman, Certified ToP (Technology of Participation) Facilitator with *Huelife*. He stated that a professional facilitator was brought in to lead the discussion in order to best develop feedback. I. Fursman's role is to guide the Task Force through discussion while going through the process of exploring the potential Community Center. I. Fursman stated that staff and facilitators have worked to make the environment conducive to coming to a consensus regarding feedback to bring forward to the City Council.

City Manager Verbrugge reiterated the importance of understanding that the City Council has the final say in regards to the Community Center. He also noted that the Task Force is only the first portion of the public engagement process. Verbrugge again expressed his gratitude for their future work on the issue.

I. Fursman stated that the first meeting will set the stage for the remaining meetings. This includes getting to know each other, coming up with ideas on the norms and expectations for the Task Force, as well as learning what might be helpful to each member including diving into learning styles and personality approaches.

The Task Force made introductions:

- Eric Schoon is serving as a facilitator for the Community Center Task Force.
- Brent Massmann is serving as a facilitator for the Community Center Task Force.
- Barb Wolff is serving as a facilitator for the Community Center Task Force.
- Alison Warren is serving as the secretary for the Community Center Task Force.
- Diann Kirby is serving as a member of City staff (Community Services Director).
- Maureen Bartolotta is serving as a representative of the School District.
- Olivia Haaland is serving as a youth representative.
- Jon Oleson is serving as a City Council representative.
- John Schatzlein is serving as a representative of Bloomington's diverse community.
- Dan Cripe is serving as a representative of the Creekside Senior Program.
- Maureen Scallen-Failor is serving as a business community representative.
- Lenny Schmitz is serving as representative of the Parks, Arts and Recreation Commission.
- MaryAnne London is serving as a community representative.
- John Stanley is serving as a community representative
- Jake Martin is serving as a youth representative.
- Michelle La Beau and Mary Anne Josephson are serving as representatives of the Creekside Senior Program.
- Tammy Galvin is serving as a youth athletic organization representative.

- Dennis Kane is serving as a representative of the Human Rights Commission.
- Jim Urie is serving as an alternate staff member in place of Randy Quale who was absent.

I. Fursman asked Task Force members to think about one thing they would like the Task Force to accomplish by the end of the process and write it down on a piece of paper. The following responses were received:

- Tweak and improve the needs assessment to improve it and broaden its scope
- Cohesive center(s) which can serve the community now and next 20 years
- Quality recommendation which meets needs of all Bloomington residents today and into the future
- A transparent process which will bring a recommendation to the City Council on the viability of a community center in the city of Bloomington
- Consensus on need for and elements necessary to create a viable community gathering place
- That the community center meets the needs of a diverse citizenship and exposes all to multiple experiences
- Outline a plan to build Bloomington's sense of community
- Produce community center plan that residents and business will be proud to use and support
- Present fully flushed out plan of City Council that serves all constituents
- Good discussions = good decisions
- Determine potential future of new community center
- The positives/negatives and what would be best for Bloomington
- Create a community center that is interesting to all ages
- Identify a community center concept that reflects the needs of the Bloomington community
- All-inclusive maintaining current human services programs

D. Kirby went over the logistics of the Task Force's meetings: Minutes of all Task Force meetings will be posted on the City of Bloomington website on the Community Center Task Force webpage; notice that per the signage upon entering the conference room, photos may be taken of attendees; free Wi-Fi is available throughout Civic Plaza; and that since this is an open meeting, media may be present at any time.

D. Kirby described the contents of the binders provided to each Task Force member. Each binder has dividers for all planned meetings. The first tab for the April 6, 2016 meeting contains an agenda for the April 6, 2016 meeting, the list of Community Center Task Force representatives and alternates, Task Force contact information, a community center needs assessment PowerPoint presentation, the Community Center Task Force charge, the community center needs assessment report issued by HGA in April 2015 and a meeting evaluation form.

Bartolotta read the purpose of the meeting and Kane read the outcomes for the April 6 meeting.

### **Project Background Review – 5:30 p.m.**

D. Kirby provided a presentation regarding community center needs assessment that was prepared by HGA Architects and Engineers. Phase 1 of the needs assessment reviewed the current Creekside building. The analysis of Creekside included current programming and estimated construction costs to make updates to the building. Creekside was built as an elementary school in the early 1960s. When the school was closed due to declining enrollments, the building was leased to the City in 1975 and purchased the following year. Little in the way of major improvements have been made to the building over the years. Creekside is heavily used with nearly 180,000 people visiting annually. It provides a thriving senior program run by volunteers. HGA determined that construction costs to make needed upgrades to Creekside would total \$4.3 million. This would include a new HVAC system, energy-efficient windows and doors, additional restrooms, a new electrical distribution panel and a new parking lot and curbs.

When analyzing the market area, HGA found that there are alternate service providers in the area including a number of fitness facilities and other recreation centers.

After reviewing the data and input from stakeholders, HGA determined that Bloomington could benefit from gathering place that was comfortable and welcoming as well as multi-economical, multi-generational and multi-cultural. They recommended a community center that maintained social and recreation opportunities and expanded fitness components. This would include a large multipurpose room, gymnasiums, a running/walking track, and multi-use classrooms for programming. The building recommended by HGA totaled approximately 94,000 square feet. Other potential that were discussed but ultimately not included in the final recommendation were an indoor aquatic facility, motor vehicle offices, public health facilities and a domed athletic field. HGA estimated the cost to construct a 94,000 square foot facility at \$41.5 million. This estimate did not include potential site acquisition costs.

HGA presented their needs assessment report to the City Council in April 2015. The City Council decided in summer 2015 to follow up by creating a Community Center Task Force. Appointments to the Task Force were completed in January 2016. The Task Force is scheduled to make a recommendation to the City Council at the September study meeting.

### **Task Force Project Charge Review (Charter Intro) – 5:45 p.m.**

The Task Force reviewed the Task Force charge and the topic that they will be providing feedback on including:

- Community needs and wants for a community/recreation center
- Space considerations for a new community center
- Potential partnerships, both public and private
- Satellite community centers or a stand-alone approach
- Potential site alternatives
- Fiscal implications of a new community center

The Task Force broke into small groups to respond to two questions: What is our shared understanding about the purpose of our work? What are some suggestions for the norms or protocols for the meetings of the Task Force? The small group responses were:

- Purpose: meeting the needs of the community now and in the future, being fiscally responsible (strong rationale of why?), revenue generation, community attractor for visitors and new residents, businesses
- Norms/Protocols: agree to disagree, patience, respect ideas, be flexible, be professional, build trust, everyone has an opportunity to speak and to be heard, work collectively toward a new, best representation as part of a whole  
*(J. Urie, D. Kane, T. Galvin)*
- Purpose: overall view of needs of the community, diverse views, provide outcomes, determine what we are deciding, task force work – 6 items
- Norms/Protocols: provide lots of ideas, pick a topic of discussion and focus on one thing at a time, equal time for all areas, accept a certain amount of HGA’s assessment even if you don’t agree with it, “heavy lifting”, get into the work and be passionate  
*(M. Josephson, J. Martin, J. Stanley)*
- Purpose: provide a recommendation to City Council, be part of a transparent process, represent defined user groups, define the future as well as current needs
- Norms/Protocols: respect!!, keep things moving (facilitator), provide clear and concise delivery of ideas, be sure all voices are heard, leave personal agendas at home  
*(M. London, L. Schmitz, M. Scallen-Failor, D. Cripe)*
- Purpose: large project in concept, to meet all the desires of the community, keep current aspects and add youth activities, continue the vision of engagement, provide an opportunity for intermingling of generations
- Norms/Protocols: respect input, take time to reflect (e.g., outside of meetings), it’s easier to hear ideas in small groups, balance the difference between rushing and dragging the meetings  
*(M. Bartolotta, O. Haaland, J. Oleson, J. Schatzlein)*

**Adjournment – 6:30 p.m.**

The meeting closed at 6:35 p.m. I. Fursman requested that Task Force members complete meeting evaluation forms found in the Community Center Task Force Binders. She stated the next meeting of the Task Force is May 3, 2016.

**Community Center Task Force**  
**May 3, 2016**  
**5:30 – 8:00 p.m.**  
**Room 105**  
**Creekside Community Center**  
**1800 W. Old Shakopee Road, Bloomington, MN**

**Call To Order:**

Irina Fursman called the second meeting of the Community Center Task Force to order at 5:30 p.m. in Room 105 at Creekside Community Center.

**Task Force Members Present: 16**

Maureen Bartolotta  
Dan Cripe  
Olivia Haaland  
Mary Anne Josephson  
Dennis Kane  
Diann Kirby  
MaryAnne London  
Jake Martin  
Jon Oleson  
Lorinda Pearson  
Maureen Scallen-Failor  
Lenny Schmitz  
John Stanley  
Randy Quale  
Charles Woldum (alternate for Tammy Galvin)

**Task Force Members Absent: 3**

Tammy Galvin  
Joshua Korthouse  
John Schatzlein

**Other Staff Present: 1**

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

**Facilitators Present: 4**

Irina Fursman, *Huelife*  
Eric Schoon, Senior Utility Service Specialist, City of Bloomington  
Brent Massmann, Senior Utility Operator, City of Bloomington  
Barb Wolff, Office Supervisor, City of Bloomington

**Members of the Public Present: 2 - Dwayne Lowman and Sandra Goldsby**

## **Welcome and Introductions/Agenda Review – 5:30 p.m.**

I. Fursman welcomed Task Force members and guests to the second meeting of the Community Center Task Force at Creekside Community Center. She requested that the members introduce themselves, share their position on the Task Force and what they observed about the Creekside building. The introductions were as follows:

- Eric Schoon is serving as a facilitator
- Brent Massmann is serving as a facilitator
- Barb Wolff is serving as a facilitator
- Diann Kirby is serving as a member of City staff (Community Services Director).
- Maureen Bartolotta is serving as a representative of the School District.
- Olivia Haaland is serving as a representative of youth in Bloomington.
- Jon Oleson is serving as a representative of the City Council.
- Dan Cripe is serving as a representative of the Creekside Senior Program.
- Maureen Scallen-Failor is serving as a representative of the business community.
- Lenny Schmitz is serving as representative of the Parks, Arts and Recreation Commission.
- MaryAnne London is serving as a representative of the community.
- John Stanley is serving as a representative of the community.
- Jake Martin is serving as a representative of youth in Bloomington.
- Mary Anne Josephson is serving as a representative of the Creekside Senior Program.
- Charles Woldum is serving as an alternate representative of the youth athletic organizations in place of Tammy Galvin who was absent.
- Dennis Kane is serving as a representative of the Human Rights Commission.
- Randy Quale is serving as a member of City staff (Parks and Recreation Manager).
- Lorinda Pearson is serving as a member of City staff (Human Services Manager).

D. Kirby reviewed the contents of the meeting materials which included the agenda for the May 3, 2016 meeting; the minutes from the April 4, 2016 meeting; a map of the Creekside community center; a 2016 Creekside community center facility facts sheet; a revised Community Center Task Force charge; the Community Center Task Force expectations; the Community Center Task Force meeting process; a revised Community Center Task Force representatives and alternates list; revised Community Center Task Force contact information; a schedule for the community center tours on May 10, 2016; the evaluation summary from the April 4, 2016 meeting and the evaluation form for the May 3, 2016 meeting.

I. Fursman reminded Task Force members of the charge given to the task force by the City Council which is “to study the 2015 community center needs assessment report and provide feedback to the City Council on the potential future of a new community center.” I. Fursman stated that the agenda for today’s meeting was to align expectations and reach agreement about protocols, understand the process and framework for the task force and review and reflect on the Creekside building assessment and market analysis sections of the HGA needs assessment.

I. Fursman presented the plan for the evening. She noted that the evening would consist of working in small groups to share what task force members learned about the building assessment and market analysis that was included in the HGA needs assessment. Each group would then

identify what was clear and unclear, and what the focus of more research should be in order to provide a quality recommendation to the City Council.

### **Agree on Expectations and Protocols – 6:00 p.m.**

I. Fursman asked the task force to review the expectations that the task force had produced at the previous meeting. R. Quale read bullet points under the “principles” header. D. Kane inquired about the second bullet point, “the positives/negatives and what would be best for Bloomington,” noting that it didn’t quite make sense. J. Oleson clarified the bullet point by stating that both the positives and negatives about a new community center would need to be taken into consideration when determining what would be best for Bloomington.

J. Martin read the bullet points under the “process” header. After reviewing the bullet points, M.A. Josephson stated that the last bullet point seemed overwhelming and questioned its inclusion. D. Cripe added that he didn’t feel it was a realistic expectation. J. Oleson suggested rewording the phrase to say “consider the needs of all people” instead of “meet the needs of all people.” The task force agreed on the change.

L. Schmitz read the bullets points under the “plan” header. He disagreed with the bullet point that stated “present a fully flushed out plan,” explaining that he did not feel this was part of the charge that was given to the task force by the City Council. D. Cripe disagreed, stating that he felt the consideration of space allocation would be part of the task force’s duties.

M. Bartolotta said she thought the bullet point “outline a plan to build Bloomington’s sense of community” did not fit within the charge, noting that this was something that would happen after actual construction. M. Scallen-Failor stated that she believed that only two of the bullets under the “plan” header reflected the charge and that the others could be discarded. She also noted that there was no mention within the expectations of the financial implications of a new community center. L. Schmitz suggested changing the end of the bullet point “produce a community center plan that residents and businesses will be proud to use” to “proud to support,” noting that the task force was not creating a specific plan, but rather a recommendation.

M. London questioned why the task force wouldn’t follow the exact charge that it was given. I. Fursman stated that this is an exercise to make sure that the all of the task force is on the same page before getting too far into the process. J. Oleson noted that he would like to leave the section regarding diversity within the expectations, saying that it was important to acknowledge. D. Kane suggested that the final bullet regarding diversity should be moved into the “principles” section.

I. Fursman brought the discussion to a conclusion by suggesting the following three bullet points be included in the “plan” section: “Determine potential future of a new community center,” “produce a community center plan that residents and businesses will be proud to support,” and “identify a community center concept that reflects the needs of the Bloomington community.” In addition to the remaining three points, the task force decided to add a fourth point, “understand the financial implications of the recommendation.”

Next, I. Fursman asked the group to break into four groups and review the protocols for the task force. After the small group discussions, each group presented what they felt were the most important pieces under each heading and if there were any recommendations for changes. The following responses were received.

Preparation: Solicit and share information with your stakeholder/constituent groups and get feedback to bring back to the task force

Interaction: This grouping should be titled “interactions and engagement” – it determines how we work as a group

Engagement: Perhaps title this grouping “facilitation process” as it better describes the process, recommended removing the last bullet as didn’t correlate with that grouping.

*(D. Kane, L. Schmitz, L. Pearson, C. Woldum)*

Preparation: Do your homework and come prepared

Interaction: Respect others throughout the process; be patient, professional and flexible

Engagement: Provide adequate time for each stakeholder to convey their ideas in small groups.

*(D. Cripe, D. Kirby, M. Josephson, M. Scallen-Failor)*

Preparation: Amend “accept the professional HGA assessment” to remove “if you don’t agree with it.”

Interaction: Delete the bullet point that states “leave personal agendas at home” and reword the bullet point that states “agree to disagree” to “contribute toward building consensus.”

Engagement: The word “efficient” sums it all up

*(J. Martin, M.A. London, J. Oleson, M. Bartolotta)*

M. Scallen-Failor questioned the deletion of the bullet point that stated “leave personal agendas at home.” She noted that she has a group to represent but also has her own personal opinions and suggested leaving the bullet point so that each person can adequately represent their own sector. J. Oleson said that some personal agendas may also match what the group that each member is representing feels. He stated that there is a responsibility to represent your group professionally. L. Schmitz noted that some members, such as a youth task force member, needs to take into consideration their personal agendas in order to best represent their sector.

Preparation: Do your homework and be prepared, utilize HGA as a framework for the process, stay on topic, group think is a good thing, work towards consensus for our recommendations

Interaction: Respect, listen to others

Engagement: Provide equal time when necessary, but be aware that there may be certain aspects that justify additional time.

*(R. Quale, J. Stanley, O. Haaland)*

Fursman stated that the facilitators will work on merging these ideas together and present a new list of protocols at the next meeting.

### **Break – 6:50 p.m.**

The task force took a break from 6:50 until 7:00 p.m.

## **Introduction of the Overall Process/Review Needs Assessment Executive Summary/Mission – 7:00 p.m.**

I. Fursman shared the meeting approach and overall philosophy that the task force will be following over the eight meetings. She noted that all people see and process things differently. She also said that group processes can be tiring because there are so many people with many different points of views.

I. Fursman highlighted the four stages of decision-making while working in groups. The first stage is objective in which people can gather as much information as possible and gain many different perspectives. Part of this stage is to accept that there are different points of view and realizing that all of them could be right.

The next stage is reflective. During this stage, group members will explore reactions and emotions that are associated with the facts that they have learned. For example, at the beginning of the meeting I. Fursman asked people to share their reaction to the Creekside Community Center building and each person had a different reaction or emotion associated with it. She noted that the first two stages, objective and reflective, are very personal and that not much can be done to change these phases.

The third stage is interpretive. The purpose of this stage is to come together as a group and determine what choices are available, leaving personal ideas and agendas aside.

The final stage is decisional, where a group comes together and makes a final decision taking into consideration all of the previous stages.

I. Fursman stated that this process will be repeated many times throughout the task force meetings. She referenced the meeting framework that was given as a handout to the members, noting that the meetings have been broken down into each level or stage. I. Fursman added that many people like to get to the decision-making level right away, but with this process the task force will come to a final decision at the eighth and final meeting.

## **Small Group Discussions – Identify Areas of Clarity and Concern – 7:05 p.m.**

Next, I. Fursman asked the group to focus on the building assessment and market analysis chapters of the HGA Community Center Needs Assessment. Task force members divided themselves into four groups based upon their interest and expertise. I. Fursman asked task force members to discuss in their small groups what was clear and what was unclear within their assigned chapter.

### **Market Analysis Chapter:**

Clear: Opportunities already exist in private entities or school facilities that serve various needs; the City is missing community gathering places; there are changing needs due to changing demographics; there is a need for an attraction for new/younger families; the city already has an established identity and is a credible resource for the community

Unclear: There is a disconnect between the recommendation and actual needs assessment; the competition/market share – what is the saturation point of facilities and needs; what are the Bloomington specific needs; what works in other communities from a fiscal standpoint  
(D. Kane, D. Cripe, C. Woldum, L. Schmitz)

Clear: There are unique income/age demographics in our community; 6 out of 10 homes are aged 55+; age 25 and younger are falling below the national average in Bloomington

Unclear: How long are people staying in Bloomington? Are we looking to meet current or future needs or be an attractor for younger families?

*(R. Quale, M. London, O. Haaland, M. Bartolotta, J. Stanley)*

#### **Existing Creekside Building Assessment Chapter:**

Clear: There is a need for the space to be flexible and multi-purpose; there are currently code requirements/safety issues; cost lot of money to upgrade and maintain; not meeting the needs of the community

Unclear: If we keep the existing building what programs and activities can be added after the upgrades are complete; what is the ongoing cost of the current building for upkeep, operations and maintenance and what is its efficiency; is it worth it to spend \$4 million on upgrades to existing building or invest this in a new community center

*(L. Pearson, J. Oleson, J. Martin)*

Clear: Lot of structural deficiencies at the current facility; doesn't meet needs of community; doesn't have flexibility to meet the needs; high cost to get to the facility to meet minimum standards

Unclear: Space deficiencies in the photos of Creekside activities are unclear; not really clear on how unsafe or safe the facility is, what is the life span of critical infrastructure (e.g., HVAC)

*(D. Lowman, M. Scallen-Failor, M.A. Josephson, D. Kirby)*

#### **Closing Reflection and Evaluation – 7:45 p.m.**

I. Fursman said that the questions that were gathered during the meeting will be incorporated into future meetings. She asked task force members to continue thinking about these questions throughout the coming weeks.

#### **Adjournment – 8:00 p.m.**

The meeting closed at 8:02 p.m. I. Fursman requested that task force members complete the meeting evaluation form found in the Community Center Task Force binders. She stated the next meeting of the Task Force is June 1 and reminded members of the upcoming community center tours on May 10.

**Community Center Task Force**  
**June 7, 2016**  
**5:30 – 8:00 p.m.**  
**Room 105**  
**Creekside Community Center**  
**1800 W. Old Shakopee Road, Bloomington, MN**

**Call To Order:**

Irina Frusman called the second meeting of the Community Center Task Force to order at 5:30 p.m. in Room 105 at Creekside Community Center.

**Task Force Members Present: 14**

Maureen Bartollota  
Dan Cripe  
Sandra Goldsby (alternate for Lorinda Pearson)  
Mary Anne Josephson  
Dennis Kane  
Diann Kirby  
MaryAnne London  
Jake Martin  
Joshua Korthouse  
Jon Oleson  
Lenny Schmitz  
John Schatzlein  
John Stanley  
Randy Quale

**Task Force Members Absent: 4**

Tammy Galvin  
Olivia Haland  
Lorinda Pearson  
Maureen Scallen-Failor

**Other Staff Present: 1**

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

**Facilitators Present: 4**

Irina Fursman, *Huelife*  
Eric Schoon, Senior Utility Service Specialist, City of Bloomington  
Brent Massmann, Senior Utility Operator, City of Bloomington  
Barb Wolff, Office Supervisor, City of Bloomington

**Members of the Public Present: 1 – Dwayne Lowman**

## **Welcome and Introductions/Agenda Review – 5:30 p.m.**

Irina welcomed the Task Force members and guests to the second meeting of the Community Center Task Force. She requested that members introduce themselves and share their position on the Task Force:

- Eric Schoon is serving as a facilitator
- Brent Massmann is serving as a facilitator
- Barb Wolff is serving as a facilitator
- Diann Kirby is serving as a member of City staff (Community Services Director).
- Joshua Korthouse is serving as a representative of the Advisory Board of Health.
- Maureen Bartolotta is serving as a representative of the School District.
- Jon Oleson is serving as a representative of the City Council.
- Dan Cripe is serving as a representative of the Creekside Senior Program.
- Lenny Schmitz is serving as representative of the Parks, Arts and Recreation Commission.
- MaryAnne London is serving as a representative of the community.
- John Stanley is serving as a representative of the community.
- Jake Martin is serving as a representative of youth in Bloomington.
- Mary Anne Josephson is serving as a representative of the Creekside Senior Program.
- John Schatzlein is serving as a representative of the diverse community.
- Dennis Kane is serving as a representative of the Human Rights Commission.
- Randy Quale is serving as a member of the City staff (Parks and Recreation Manager).
- Sandra Goldsby is serving as an alternate City staff member in place of Lorinda Pearson.

D. Kirby reviewed the contents of the meeting materials which included the agenda for June 7, 2016 meeting; the minutes from the May 3, 2016 meeting; a revised Community Center Task Force Charge; a listing of the Areas of Clarity and Concern from the May 3 meeting; fact sheet for the Eagan, Eden Prairie and Maple Grove community centers; community center questions and answers; the Creekside Community Center Facility Condition and Energy Use Analysis; the evaluation summary from the May 3, 2016 meeting and the evaluation form for the June 7, 2016 meeting.

D. Cripe inquired about question #7 on the community center questions and answers document, stating that he didn't feel that the response answered the question. He noted that although the response states what is included in a typical community center, it doesn't describe what exactly works and what does not. I. Fursman suggested that the Task Force may need to discuss what a working amenity really is, adding that just because something is making money, that doesn't necessarily mean that it is working. She recommended discussing this topic at a future meeting.

L. Schmitz requested a breakdown of what the operating budget of Creekside Community Center, to be able to better compare it with the information that was provided on the community centers that the Task Force toured.

I. Fursman reminded Task Force members of the charge given to the task force by the City Council which is "to study the 2015 community center needs assessment report and provide feedback to the City Council on the potential future of a new community center." I. Fursman stated that today's meeting is to reflect and share on the learnings from the community center tours as well as identify areas of agreement around Bloomington's community needs in relation to a community center.

I. Fursman presented to the Task Force the plan for the evening. She stated that they would be working in small groups for the majority of the evening, first reflecting on the community center tours that were conducted and then discussing community needs.

### **Community Center Tour Video and Reflection – 5:45 p.m.**

The Task Force watched a video that briefly reviewed the community centers that were toured on May 10. Following the video, I. Fursman asked each table to discuss the insights that they discovered while on the tours or while reviewing the information, as well as any questions that arose after the tours were conducted. The following responses were received:

**Insights:** Use a sense of caution when it comes to partnerships; encourage sponsorships or donations; need space flexibility and the ability to reconfigure spaces, especially seasonally; be “plan-ful” with the design in order to create a seamless plan for expansion; strongly consider location that is easily accessible and includes outdoor space and connections to walking trails

**Questions:** What is really wanted in a community center in Bloomington? What kind of space is available to build this type of facility in Bloomington? What areas within the community center generate the most use? What areas generate the most revenue? What areas generate the least use? What areas cost the most to operate?

*(J. Korthouse, D. Kirby, M. Bartolotta, J. Schatzlein)*

**Insights:** Storage space is important; accessibility and appropriate flow throughout the building should be strongly considered; plan for flexible uses including complementary uses, not conflicting or competing; have the ability to partition off or lock down certain areas of the building for events.

**Questions:** Member-based vs. program-based fees? What is the best model of operation? How do we find out about the unique needs of Bloomington? What are the pros and cons of a private partnership? What is the time frame for the community center project? What are potential revenue sources? Will the facility be focused on banquet rentals or programs? Who might be willing to donate as a sponsor? Will the current users continue to use the facility if the operations include fee based activities and usage?

*(R. Quale, J. Oleson, M. Josephson)*

**Insights:** Match current demographics to the amenities that would be offered; community centers do not make money; they are a place to build community.

**Questions:** What are the age and income breakdowns of other community centers compared to Bloomington? How much of the fees are going toward the total cost of operations and how else are the operations funded? Are the membership fees listed for the community centers monthly fees or annual fees? What is the definition of a community center vs. an activity center? What is the funding source for a community center?

*(J. Martin, S. Goldsby, L. Schmitz, J. Stanley)*

**Insights:** Common themes include pools, gym space, fitness, meeting rooms, banquet rooms and lack of senior space; a community center needs to address all ages, for example, an indoor playground that meets the needs of children and their parents.

**Questions:** What were the existing amenities in each community when they decided to build a community center and how did they factor in the decision-making process of the current amenities? What are the existing alternative amenities such as the high school activity centers and is a need still unmet? How will the community center generate income? Is the Bloomington Art Center at capacity and is there a need for additional space? Should the community center include a food aspect such as a café or coffee shop?

*(M. London, D. Kane, D. Cripe)*

**Break – 6:55 p.m.**

The task force took a break from 6:55 until 7:05 p.m.

**Space Needs Discussion (Identify Areas of Clarity and Concern) – 7:05 p.m.**

The Task Force separated into two groups to discuss the question, “What are the community needs we are trying to address in Bloomington?” Each group brainstormed ideas individually and then in pairs. The ideas were then shared with the larger group and common themes/categories were identified. The following themes were created using the individual ideas listed below:

**Dedicated Physical Space**

- Fitness
- Gym
- Cardio
- Swimming and aquatics
- Daycare
- Teen Center

**Flexible Public Spaces**

- Flexible meeting space
- Meeting rooms
- Classroom spaces
- Dining and kitchen spaces
- Café/gathering space
- Stage

**Dedicated Multi-generational Programming and Services**

- Activities indoors and out for all ages
- Intergenerational center to include seniors, teens and more
- 50+ programs
- City services including human services and all income levels

*(M. London, D. Kane, D. Cripe, J. Martin, S. Goldsby, L. Schmitz, J. Stanley)*

**Various fitness/programs**

- Aerobics/fitness
- Walking/jogging track
- Fitness center

**Gym Space**

- Gymnasiums
- Gym space

**Indoor Pool Space**

- Aquatics
- Aquatic Facility

**Large Space for Community Gathering**

- Large multi-use space
- Banquet/large meeting space
- Community gathering space
- Flexible/reserve-able space
- Space for meetings, weddings, events

**Serving Seniors**

- Senior center and programs
- Senior programming
- Senior programs

**Serving Youth of Varied Ages**

- Children's play area
- Youth center and programs
- Tots and teens gathering spaces

**Community and Health Services**

- Community services
- Public health services
- Public health
- HOME help services

**Community Attraction/Adding Value to Community/Building Community**

- Building a sense of community
- Attractive outside space
- Public use of space
- Add value to the community
- Easily accessible location
- Attractive to families
- Serving different generations

*(R. Quale, J. Oleson, M. Josephson, J. Korthouse, D. Kirby, M. Bartolotta, J. Schatzlein)*

**Adjournment – 8:00 p.m.**

The meeting closed at 8:02 p.m. I. Fursman requested that Task Force members complete meeting evaluation forms found in the Community Center Task Force Binders. She stated the next meeting of the Task Force is June 22.

**Community Center Task Force**  
**June 22, 2016**  
**5:30 – 8:00 p.m.**  
**Haeg Conference Room**  
**Bloomington Civic Plaza**  
**1800 W. Old Shakopee Road, Bloomington, MN**

**Call To Order:**

Irina Frusman called the second meeting of the Community Center Task Force to order at 5:30 p.m. in the Haeg Conference Room at Civic Plaza.

**Task Force Members Present: 14**

Maureen Bartolotta  
Dan Cripe  
MaryAnne Josephson  
Dennis Kane  
Diann Kirby  
MaryAnne London  
Joshua Korthouse  
Jon Oleson  
Lorinda Pearson  
Maureen Scallen-Failor  
Lenny Schmitz  
John Schatzlein  
John Stanley  
Randy Quale

**Task Force Members Absent: 3**

Tammy Galvin  
Olivia Haaland  
Jake Martin

**Other Staff Present: 1**

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

**Facilitators Present: 3**

Irina Frusman, *Huelife*  
Eric Schoon, Senior Utility Service Specialist, City of Bloomington  
Brent Massmann, Senior Utility Operator, City of Bloomington

**Members of the Public Present: 0**

**Welcome and Introductions/Agenda Review – 5:30 p.m.**

I. Fursman welcomed the Task Force members and guests to the fourth meeting for the Community Center Task Force. She requested that the members re-introduce themselves at their tables.

D. Kirby reviewed the contents of the meeting materials which included the agenda for June 22, 2016 meeting; the minutes from the June 7, 2016 meeting; an updated Community Center Questions and Answers Listing; a Bloomington Community Amenities Map; a listing of the Bloomington Schools Pool Locations; the Bloomington High School Community Center Poll Results; the evaluation summary from the June 7, 2016 meeting and the evaluation form for the June 22, 2016 meeting.

I. Fursman reviewed the past three meetings with the Task Force. During the first meeting, the Task Force examined the charge that was given by City Council and agreed upon protocols. At the second meeting, the Task Force discussed what was clear and unclear in the HGA Community Center Assessment report. At the previous meeting, the Task Force reflected on the community center tours as well as started to discuss community center needs in Bloomington. M. Bartolotta then read the outcomes for the day which included, “Reach group consensus around community needs for a community center” and “Identify criteria for a successful community center.”

### **Review and Reflection of Community Center Questions and Answers and Map of Bloomington Amenities– 5:45 p.m.**

Small groups were asked to talk about the following questions regarding the Community Center Questions and Answers Listing that was in their packets:

- What questions or responses resonated with you?
- What is becoming clearer?
- What needs more clarity?
- What ideas emerge?

After discussing the questions, I. Fursman asked each small group to report back to the full Task Force the following: “What insights or learnings would you like to capture or share with the group during your discussion?” The following responses were received:

- Creekside is a financial drain on the community and is not meeting the needs and will not meet the needs in the future; Creekside is no longer an option for a community center
- Where is a good location for the community center that benefits the whole community and where is there land available?
- We need to meet the needs of the community for today and in the future – what are those needs and what are the goals and objectives of a community center?
- How would a partnership with the business community work and how does a community center meet the needs of the business community?
- What are the funding sources for the community center? Some ideas could include sponsorships, individual or corporate naming right and user fees – but which are the best?

*(M. London, L. Schmitz, M. Bartolotta, J. Oleson, M. Scallen-Failor)*

- There is a lack of flexibility with Creekside and it has lots of issues that would be costly to upgrade – it’s not an option to keep it
- Need more clarity on how to integrate needs of seniors and youth together
- Maybe a separate senior center might be needed and the potential cost of a separate building or maybe a separate wing for senior programs

- Need more information for comparative purposes such as median age, income and other demographics
- Where in Bloomington will a community center be located?
- Is there a low cost option for the senior program? They like that the current facility is low cost and want to maintain it and keep it that way – how do we do that and still bring in revenues and operate the facility?

*(J. Stanley, D. Kirby, D. Cripe, M. Josephson)*

- While reviewing the questions and answers, the questions related to Creekside (Questions #1-6, 13) are irrelevant at this point as Creekside is no longer an option
- True community centers build and draw the community
- The community center needs to be built for current and future needs/wants
- Be “planful” about all the programs, services and activities that can be built into a space, balance revenue and service the community
- What location would be utilized for the community center?
- Even high school kids see value in the programs that are offered in a community center
- Work with transportation providers to get people to the community center easily

*(R. Quale, D. Kane, L. Pearson, J. Schatzlein, J. Korthouse)*

I. Fursman stated that the additional questions that repeatedly were reported, such as site options and funding sources will be discussed at future meetings.

### **Break – 6:25 p.m.**

The task force took a break from 6:25 until 6:35 p.m.

### **Finalize Community Center Needs – 6:15 p.m.**

I. Fursman asked the group to review the responses that were gathered in small groups at the last meeting regarding the question, “What are the community needs we are trying to address in Bloomington?”

L. Schmitz stated that his group looked at what components would be necessary for the community center, not the details of the programs that would be involved, as their group thought that those details should be developed by City staff. The first category was dedicated physical spaces. L. Schmitz described this category as places that are hard to move and need to be more permanent such as cardio equipment, a daycare or an aquatics facility. The next category that the group came up with was flexible public spaces. Amenities in this category consisted of items such as a stage, café, classrooms and others. L. Schmitz stated these amenities could easily accommodate different programming needs. L. Schmitz said the last category, dedicated multi-generational programming/services, covered the needs of activities for all ages, indoor and outdoor space, City services and others.

D. Kirby asked the group if they could describe in more detail the difference between dedicated and flexible spaces. L. Schmitz stated that a pool is a very defined single purpose space, while there are other spaces such as classrooms that could have multiple uses.

R. Quale then presented for the next group, stating that his group focused on the types of use and tried to tie facilities into those uses. The categories that the group came up included serving

seniors, providing community health services, serving as a community attractor, building a community focal point, gym space, indoor aquatics space, and serving youth of varied ages.

J. Korthouse stated that he saw many similarities in the two groups, and that the common theme was to provide many services under one roof to be as efficient as possible. M. London inquired if the idea of integrated or dedicated space for senior programming was brought up. R. Quale responded that there dialogue about providing some unique spaces as well as generic spaces that could be flexible, as long as storage needs were accommodated.

I. Fursman then asked the group to identify similar needs and move them into larger categories. She also asked the group to focus on the needs of the community, posing as an example the question, “Why is a pool needed?” J. Stanley stated that without a pool, there is no community center, noting that most other large city community centers have pools as an important part of the facilities. He also stated that although the schools provide the physical amenity of a pool, they have limited availability and don’t necessarily provide recreational amenities for tots. L. Schmitz agreed that a recreational pool with water slides and play features and other amenities would serve as an attractor for families and others. J. Schatzlein asked if staff could request attendance numbers for Edinborough Park in Edina, noting that this facility includes many of the amenities that were mentioned such as an indoor play area and a pool.

The group developed another category based on this discussion: “Creating a family attractor and retaining young families.” I. Fursman asked the group what else could fit into this category. Scallen-Failor suggested that a gymnasium could be added to this category.

J. Korthouse stated that the aquatic facility could also retain others such as seniors, noting that they do not want to use the middle school facilities either. L. Pearson also mentioned grandparents would want to use an indoor facility with their grandchildren. J. Stanley suggested changing the name of the category to “attracting and retaining all ages and families” to more inclusive. After further discussion, it was determined that an aquatic facility can also meet the need of “providing a year round, indoor space.” Schatzlein also suggested adding the indoor play area to both categories.

L. Schmitz suggested the next category of “serving Creekside users.” J. Korthouse stated that it would be good to accommodate all of the services and programs that are exciting and well used at Creekside. M. Josephson noted the potential of expanding programs at a new facility.

J. Schatzlein stated that he was having a hard time grasping what residents under the age of forty would be looking for in a community center, noting that not many of the task force members belonged to that age group. J. Stanley noted that the high school survey could provide some of that information. J. Schatzlein stated that the subset of those under the age of eighteen was the least represented, but the group that that the city wants to keep growing. After further discussion regarding inclusiveness of all ages, the category of attracting a diverse and ever changing demographic was added to the board. Health and wellness and access to transportation were also needs that were briefly discussed. Scallen-Failor mentioned although access to transit may seem important, other facilities such as the Eden Prairie and Eagan community centers were not located on transit lines.

The group unanimously agreed that a category for community gathering spaces, both large and small was a need in Bloomington. M. Josephson highlighted that needs for serving 200-250

people or more for specific senior programming that is already conducted at Creekside as well as serving the need for a space for the Loaves and Fishes program.

I. Fursman asked the group about fitness programs. L. Schmitz stated that his group talked about the amount of competition for fitness centers mentioning the high school activity centers as well as a number of private entities. M. London opined that the community center does not need large and expensive fitness equipment like elliptical and treadmills. She stated that other low cost options like free weights, stretching bands, yoga mats and other similar items would be more valuable and could be used in a flexible space. This flexible space could also be used for classes such as yoga or other aerobics that are not currently being met by the community. L. Pearson noted that Community Education does offer a lot of fitness classes, but was unsure if they were at capacity. M. London stated that Community Education classes were spread out at school locations around the community.

J. Oleson noted that he kept coming back to the idea of a “one stop shop” when thinking about a community center. He stated that it could be a different place for different people; for example, a child could go to a play area while the parent was working out, or a senior could have a meal, work out and find health information all in the same place. J. Korthouse built on this idea, saying that providing motor vehicle licensing services could bring in more traffic and give more visibility to the community center. L. Schmitz questioned the idea of including City services such as motor vehicle, noting that if the service model was fee-based, it would be hard to have the free services available unless there were separate entrances. L. Schmitz also shared his concern that with a limited budget and limited space, that the community would fall short in offering new amenities to the community just because the current facilities such as the public health building have been ignored for so long. He said that just because it would be convenient to include a new motor vehicle building as a part of the community center doesn’t mean that it is the best choice. D. Kane noted that when City services was discussed in the past, it was current City services that were offered at Creekside, not necessarily new offerings such as motor vehicle or public health. After this discussion, the idea for a “one stop shop” was left on the board.

The last category that was added was “community image.” Following the addition of the final category, discussion regarding diversity arose. It was requested that staff provide more information on identifying the diverse cultures within Bloomington.

The final categories that were determined by the Task Force are below:

- One Stop Shop
- Low Cost Fitness Programs
- Attracting and Retaining All Ages, Families and Diverse Community
- Year Round/Indoor Space
- Serve Creekside Users
- Community Gathering Spaces
- Community Image

I. Fursman stated that the next steps in the process will be determining the evaluation criteria for a successful community center.

**Adjournment – 8:00 p.m.**

The meeting closed at 7:49 p.m. I. Fursman requested that Task Force members complete meeting evaluation forms found in the Community Center Task Force Binders. She stated the next meeting of the Task Force is July 19.

D. Kirby asked the group about potential conflicts with the August 2 meeting and members' involvement in their National Night Out. It was decided that the August 2 meeting would be cancelled and reschedule for a later date. A new listing of the remaining meetings will be provided with the July 19 meeting materials.

**Community Center Task Force**  
**July 19, 2016**  
**5:30 – 8:00 p.m.**  
**Room 110**  
**Creekside Community Center**  
**9801 Penn Ave S, Bloomington, MN**

**Call To Order:**

Irina Frusman called the fifth meeting of the Community Center Task Force to order at 5:30 p.m. in Room 110 at the Creekside Community Center.

**Task Force Members Present: 17**

Maureen Bartolotta  
Dan Cripe  
Olivia Haaland  
MaryAnne Josephson  
Jared Leese (alternate for Dennis Kane)  
Diann Kirby  
Joshua Korthouse  
MaryAnne London  
Dwayne Lowman  
Jake Martin  
Jon Oleson  
Lorinda Pearson  
Maureen Scallen-Failor  
Lenny Schmitz  
John Schatzlein  
John Stanley  
Randy Quale

**Task Force Members Absent: 2**

Tammy Galvin  
Dennis Kane

**Other Staff Present: 1**

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

**Facilitators Present: 2**

Irina Fursman, *Huelife*  
Brent Massmann, Senior Utility Operator, City of Bloomington

**Members of the Public Present: 0**

## **Welcome and Introductions/Agenda Review – 5:30 p.m.**

I. Fursman welcomed Task Force members to the fifth meeting of the Community Center Task Force. She requested that the members re-introduce themselves to the group. She then reminded the Task Force of the dates of the final two meetings: August 16, 2016 and August 23, 2016, both at Creekside Community Center.

I. Fursman reviewed the purpose statement for the Community Task Force. She also walked through the results of the last meeting in which the Task Force collectively determined the needs that should be addressed by a community center.

D. Kirby reviewed the contents of the meeting materials which included the agenda for the July 19 meeting; the minutes from the June 22, 2016 meeting; an updated Community Center Questions and Answers Listing; an updated Community Amenities Map; an listing of the Needs Addressed by Community Center from the June 22 meeting; a listing of the Metro Area Community Centers; Bloomington Racial Distribution Maps; School District Enrollment Reports from October 2015; 2016 Citizen Survey Results Regarding Recreation by Demographics; City-owned Public Property Map; Potential Community Center Sites PowerPoint; the evaluation summary from the June 22, 2016 meeting and the evaluation form for the July 19, 2016 meeting.

## **Review and Reflection of Community Center Questions and Answers– 5:40 p.m.**

Fursman asked the Task Force to discuss within their small groups the following questions:

1. What is something new that you have learned by reviewing the new information or by talking with others that the rest of the group needs to know?
2. What gives you a sense of hope or excitement and what concerns do you still have for the community center?
3. What new insights do you have about a community center concept?
4. What should we be considering tonight as we explore the concept, criteria and sites for a community center?

The following responses were received:

1. Learned that Bloomington household income is low compared to other cities; it wasn't clear whether or not Somali was included in the school enrollment statistics; there is no cookie cutter community center style – there are different models that fit different communities
2. Excited about so many potential sites; the fact that the process is moving forward after so long and a lot of time and years of talking about a community center; priority areas have been identified
3. New insights include the possibility that finding a site will be difficult; getting all needs met in one facility may be challenging
4. Consider development versus open space versus eminent domain – which is the best option; issues when looking at sites such as bus routes or transportation – bus route maps would be helpful to the Task Force; explore the idea about a campus with other city buildings to create a one stop shop  
(*R. Quale, L. Pearson, M. London*)

1. Learned that the Bloomington median age is high and the household income is relatively low; the significant increase in student diversity and students living in poverty over the past few years; there is a need for the diverse community and those under 40 to have input
2. Excited about the chatter in Bloomington about this Task Force; concerned about the lack of diverse participation; concerned about potential sites; the challenge of all the various community groups fitting into one facility
3. New insights about the community center include awareness in the community about the Task Force
4. Consider transportation availability, centralized access and parking availability  
*(J. Martin, M. Bartolotta, J. Schatzlein)*

1. Learned about school enrollment trends; location options; there appears to be public support for a community center; lots of information and insight from the citizen survey data
2. Excited about discussing a community center at all; seeing the group come to consensus on certain areas including the idea that Creekside is no longer a viable option; many groups understand the mission; concern over other City buildings that need investment and balancing those needs with a community center; the community doesn't seem to be 100% behind the idea of a community center yet with concerns about cost; we may not be able to afford everything in a community center
3. New insights about what a standard community center is and that there isn't necessarily a one model fits all – each center has to meet each community's needs; creating a sense of community is important
4. Consider that site maybe a limiting factor on what can be built; we can't have everything; we may need to look at other possibilities; cost will drive site amenities; prioritize criteria in terms of amenity selection  
*(J. Stanley, L. Schmitz, M. Scallen-Failor, D. Kirby)*

1. Learned that 40% of people are staying in Bloomington for more than 20 years; Bloomington has an older median age compared to other suburbs; the city's older housing market is not cookie cutter; there are a rapidly changing demographics
2. Excited that everyone is on the same page and moving forward; the cost seems manageable; want to keep an eye on future needs as well as current ones; a community center can establishment of new relationship between the age groups; concerned about negativity regarding cost of a community center
3. New insights about expanding what we have at Creekside instead of just replacing; excitement over involvement of creative placemaking and other new ideas; opportunity to catch up to other communities
4. Consider the big picture for now; be creative before worrying about cost; think about ways to creatively attract people to our future community center; flexible work space  
*(M. Josephson, J. Korthouse, O. Haaland, J. Leese)*

### **Community Center Concept Discussion - 6:10 p.m.**

I. Fursman then asked the group to review the seven community needs that were previously identified and determine the one that stands out as a core element of the community center. M. Bartolotta suggested that serving Creekside users was a core element because a new community

center should include the current users. M. London stated that attracting and retaining families and the diverse community would be a core element. L. Schmitz agreed, adding that while it was important to serve the existing users, it was important to think about future generations. J. Korthouse suggested that serving Creekside users could be in the same category with attracting and retaining all ages, as that would incorporate the current users.

L. Schmitz stated that having community gathering spaces is also important because it creates the sense of community that people are looking for. Bartolotta agreed, adding that having more community gathering spaces was brought up frequently at a recent town hall meeting. J. Leese suggested that being easily accessible is important. O. Haaland stated that if it's not accessible for everyone then it would not be a community center.

M. Scallen-Failor suggested that the Task Force also needs to consider accessibility in term of ADA standards and beyond, not just transportation. She stated that although the ADA code spells out minimum needs, the community center should go above and beyond those standards to provide the service to people of all abilities. J. Schatzlein shared his experience working with U.S. Bank Stadium and the inclusive technology that is included in the facility. J. Stanley suggested that a fitness component is also a very important part of a community center.

The group determined that the three most important categories are:

- Attracting and retaining all ages including families, the diverse community and Creekside users
- Providing a year round facility with indoor and outdoor spaces
- Providing community gathering spaces that create a sense of community

Fursman asked the Task Force to choose one of the three categories that they would like to focus on in a small group.

### **Break – 7:00 p.m.**

The task force took a break from 7:00 p.m. until 7:10 p.m.

### **Review Community Center Sites and Parameters – 7:10 p.m.**

D. Kirby presented potential site options for a community center. When looking at sites, she stated that staff considered the following parameters suggested by the Task Force:

- At least 8 to 10 acres
- Low or no cost
- Central location
- Access to transit
- Access to trails
- Additional space for expansion, trails, parks, etc.

D. Kirby stated that both public properties and private properties were considered. In regard to privately owned properties, she said that the use of eminent domain is limited and that the City Council may not be inclined to use it for a community center. There are also potential limitations posed by City Code and zoning restrictions as well as the cost for purchasing land. Buying residential or commercial property could displace residents or business as well as eliminate

property tax dollars. D. Kirby noted the considerations of utilizing City-owned properties included zoning restrictions, site characteristics and compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood.

D. Kirby shared seven potential sites in alphabetical order. The first location was Bryant Park. This 12.69-acre site is located east of I-35W. The park has many highly-used amenities including tennis courts, hockey rinks, playground equipment, park buildings and softball diamonds. D. Kirby stated that some of the drawbacks of the site included no access to transit and limited access to an arterial street.

The next site was the current Creekside Community Center location and the adjoining Creekside Park. This site is one of the smallest options at 8.77 acres but it is centrally located, has access to buses, is highly visible and fits the campus approach that the Task Force had previously discussed. Schatzlein also noted that it has great access to trails. The Task Force inquired about the ownership of the storm water pond and the ability to use that land as part of the site.

Harrison Park was the next site that D. Kirby presented. This 10.91-acre site location is centrally located and has great access to trails. R. Quale stated that this land has a significant slope and there are questions regarding code.

The former Hyland Greens driving range was also discussed. This property is nearly 10 acres but is the least central of any of the options. M. Josephson stated that the shape of this site is a little odd, and questioned the ability to build a community center within the given space. L. Schmitz said that this site could have some creative opportunities such as including the clubhouse within the community center.

The next site, the former Lincoln High School building, was the only privately-owned site that was presented. The site is 21.44 acres, centrally located and next to a park and Lincoln Stadium. D. Kirby said the site was large enough to provide room for future expansion. M. London questioned if the community center would utilize the existing building or if it would be demolished. D. Kirby said the building was built in the 1960's and would likely need to be demolished. M. London noted that this would add more cost. J. Martin suggested that the current parking lots could be preserved to save money.

Penn and American was the next site that was presented. D. Kirby stated that the City currently owns 3 of the 4 parcels on the corner of American Boulevard and Knox Ave. These parcels total 9.12 acres. The property sits near several transit lines and is highly visible. Schatzlein stated that there is no trail access. M. Josephson noted the high-density traffic in the area.

The last site shown to the Task Force was Tarnhill Park. This 17.15-acre site has access to trails, is on an arterial road and is next to bus routes. The drawback is that it is not centrally located. R. Quale described the potential building site as a natural area with prairie grasses and some wetland. He noted that there are residential properties on three sides of this site. J. Oleson stated that at first he was not attracted to this site, but with the large acreage he thought it could be an attractive, natural setting similar to Woodlake in Richfield.

D. Kirby then asked the Task Force to share their thoughts about the potential options. J. Stanley stated that any of the sites that are not centrally located would probably not get support from the public. J. Oleson asked where the center of the Bloomington is based on population, not

geography. The Task Force requested a map, if possible, of Bloomington's population distribution.

J. Stanley inquired about the Valley View Fields location north of 90<sup>th</sup> Street. D. Kirby said the property in question is owned by the School District. L. Schmitz then asked if there were any properties owned by the School District that may be options for a community center site. He provided the example of the Pond property near the Kennedy Activity Center.

M. London suggested that the Creekside site would be best because it would not require displacement and current users are already accustomed to that location. She also noted that it is close to Civic Plaza. M. Josephson inquired about the size of the current Creekside site. R. Quale said that the current building and parking lot is 4.6 acres.

#### **Criteria Conversation – 7:50 p.m.**

The next item on the agenda was to discuss community center criteria. I. Fursman asked the group if they wanted to stay later to discuss this topic or if they wanted to defer to the next meeting. The Task Force agreed to move this item to the next meeting. I Fursman informed the group that they could be getting homework in their next packet related to this topic. She said that questions would be sent to the Task Force regarding criteria for a community center. Also at the next meeting, information on funding will be discussed.

#### **Adjournment – 8:00 p.m.**

The meeting closed at 7:53 p.m. I. Fursman requested that Task Force members complete meeting evaluation forms found in the Community Center Task Force Binders. She stated the next meeting of the Task Force is August 16, 2016.

**Community Center Task Force  
August 16, 2016  
5:30 – 8:00 p.m.  
Haeg Conference Room  
Bloomington Civic Plaza  
1800 West Old Shakopee Road, Bloomington, MN**

**Call To Order:**

Irina Frusman called the sixth meeting of the Community Center Task Force to order at 5:30 p.m. in the Haeg Conference Room at Bloomington Civic Plaza.

**Task Force Members Present:** 16 members and 1 alternate

Maureen Bartolotta  
Dan Cripe  
Olivia Haaland  
MaryAnne Josephson  
Dennis Kane  
Diann Kirby  
Joshua Korthouse  
MaryAnne London  
Dwayne Lowman (alternate)  
Jake Martin  
Jon Oleson  
Lorinda Pearson  
Maureen Scallen-Failor  
Lenny Schmitz  
John Schatzlein  
John Stanley  
Randy Quale

**Task Force Members Absent:** 1

**Other Staff Present:** 2

Alison Warren, Office Support Specialist, Parks and Recreation Division (to take minutes)  
Lori Economy-Scholler, Chief Financial Office, City of Bloomington

**Facilitators Present:** 3

Irina Fursman, *Huelife*  
Brent Massmann, Senior Utility Operator, City of Bloomington  
Eric Schoon, Senior Utility Service Specialist, City of Bloomington

**Members of the Public Present:** 0

**Welcome and Introductions/Agenda Review – 5:30 p.m.**

I. Fursman welcomed the Task Force members and guests to the sixth meeting of the Community Center Task Force. She reviewed the purpose statement for the Community Task Force, reminding the members that the Task Force was asked to provide broad recommendations to the City Council and not necessarily a detailed plan. I. Fursman then reviewed the past meeting and the three core pillars that the Task Force agreed upon: 1) attracting and retaining all ages, families and the diverse community; 2) providing a space for community gathering; and 3) a year-round facility.

Fursman then reviewed the plan for the meeting which included further discussion of the criteria for a successful community center, review of the financial implications of a community center and examination of the site options.

Next, I. Fursman asked the Task Force if there were any concerns that members felt needed to be shared. M. Josephson stated that she felt that exercise could be a large part of the community center recommendation, leaving the seniors behind. D. Cripe agreed with Josephson, saying that he thought that the space proposed by HGA did not have enough room for the current programs at Creekside much less any expansion of programs.

L. Schmitz stated that the purpose of the Task Force wasn't to determine a specific design but to recommend a plan for the current Creekside building and whether or not to build a new community center. J. Oleson agreed with Schmitz, adding that the group did not have enough time to get into all of the details. He noted that the recommendation needed to communicate support for seniors and adequate space for programs that currently exist.

J. Schatzlein shared his concern about the lack of people under the age of 45 that are participating on the Task Force, as well as the lack of representation from other ethnic groups. He suggested reaching out to other groups to gain more information. J. Oleson suggested convening focus groups throughout the community.

#### **Identify Criteria for Success – 6:00 p.m.**

Fursman asked the Task Force to separate into groups based upon the core pillar that they selected at the last meeting. She asked them to answer the following questions regarding their core pillar:

- What do you see in a successful community center?
- What do you feel while you are in a successful community center?
- What ideas do you have that make you feel successful?
- What are the criteria to accomplish this success?

The group provided their responses to these questions later in the meeting.

#### **Break – 6:45 p.m.**

The task force took a break from 6:45 p.m. until 6:55 p.m.

#### **Review Financial Implications – 6:55 p.m.**

The City's Chief Financial Officer Lori Economy-Scholler discussed the financial implications of a community center. The models she presented utilized the HGA community center cost estimates and show the financial impact for the years 2019 and 2021. The financial models created were with and without an aquatics facility as a part of the community center.

J. Oleson pointed out that the calculations did not take into account any potential partnerships or sponsorships that could help offset costs. He reminded the group to consider the return on investment, including things that may not have monetary value such as quality of life or increased economic development in the area. L. Schmitz referenced a research study that spoke about how well-maintained parks, open spaces and community amenities can drive up nearby property values.

### **Report Back on Identifying Criteria for Success – 7:10 p.m.**

The Task Force revisited the previous exercise of identifying criteria for success. Each group shared their responses to the final question – What are the criteria to accomplish success?

- Be more proactive than reactive
- Balance of indoor/outdoor activities
- Ability to expand, grow or transform
- Space with flexibility
- Right fit of activities with other private facilities
- Partnerships – School District, Hennepin County, others
- Do what successful community centers are doing for current and future users

*(R. Quale, D. Kirby, D. Lowman, J. Martin)*

- Connect to existing amenities
- Dynamic, evolving, long term solution that is plan-ful and has flexible use
- Preferred all on one site
- Consider partnerships and sponsors

*(L. Schmitz, M. Josephson, D. Cripe, L. Pearson, D. Schatzlein, J. Korthouse, D. Kane, J. Oleson)*

- Meet or exceed usage for seniors
- Has to be inclusive spaces
- Identify and meet the needs of the others in the community – dome, arts, etc.

*(M. Bartolotta, M. London, M. Scallen-Failor, O. Haaland, J. Stanley)*

### **Analyze Site Alternatives – 7:20 p.m.**

I. Fursman reviewed the eight potential site alternatives – Tarnhill Park, Penn American, former Lincoln High School, Hyland Greens' former driving range, Harrison Park, Girard Lake Park, Creekside Center and Park and Bryant Park. J. Korthouse inquired why Girard Lake Park was added. R. Quale responded that a Task Force member had suggested this site and it was added since it met the size criteria.

Fursman asked each Task Force member to select a site that they were most interested in exploring. She noted that some members could be working alone on a site, and some sites might

not be selected. After the groups were formed, I. Fursman asked each group to answer the following questions:

- What does this site bring as an asset?
- What gaps does this site have?
- What are the positive benefits of choosing this site?
- What are the negative consequences of choosing this site?

After answering the questions, Fursman asked the group to continue by answering the following three questions:

- What needs to be done for this site to meet all criteria and ensure that all needs are met?
- What are some options or ideas for partnerships?
- What are some funding options?

The following responses were received:

Girard Lake Park (O. Haaland, L. Schmitz, J. Korthouse)

- Assets – Large site, centrally located, lots of natural amenities, easy access, highly visible, on a major arterial road
- Gaps – Potential for a new intersection on France Avenue
- Benefits – No cost site, transit access, trail access, room to expand/grow, no displacement of residents or recreational features, ability to connect to existing community
- Consequences – Possible environmental impact, possible disruption to neighborhood
- Needs to be done – Nothing-choose Girard Lake Park
- Partnerships – Any business nearby, lots of options
- Funding options – donations, naming rights, partnerships

Former Lincoln High School (M. Bartolotta, J. Martin, J. Oleson)

- Assets – Large site, library nearby, centrally located, bus lines, lots of parking lots around
- Gaps – Access to bus routes, cost of demolition and purchase of property
- Benefits – No loss of continuity of Creekside during construction, football field on site, opportunity to explore uses of the field in conjunction with the community center such as a dome
- Consequences – Might displace some ISD 271 programs, is the site even available?
- Needs to be done – Determine if a trade with the School District is feasible, calculate demolition estimates
- Partnerships – School District, General Dynamics, local businesses
- Funding options – Partnerships

Tarnhill Park (M. London, M. Josephson, M. Scallen-Failor, R. Quale)

- Assets – Undeveloped and City-owned, adjacent to existing park, easy access off of 98<sup>th</sup> Street, on the bus lines, near trails, near Hyland Park, large site – 17 acres
- Gaps – Not necessarily centrally located
- Benefits – Could renovate existing park to tie into the community center, no homes are displaced, no loss on the tax roll, near the community college

- Consequences – Impacts on the neighborhood, increased traffic, determine if there are any wetland mitigations needed, reworking of 98<sup>th</sup> Street
- Needs to be done – Determine wetland mitigation needed, 98<sup>th</sup> Street modifications
- Partnerships – Normandale Community College, Bethany, Normandale Village businesses
- Funding options – Partnerships

Harrison Park (D. Cripe, D. Lowman, L. Pearson, J. Schatzlein)

- Assets – Arterial streets for access, City-owned property, potential for expansions, lots of green space, on bus routes, close to City buildings, close to Moir Park and trails
- Gaps – Shape of the space, topography of the land
- Benefits – Overflow parking available, most centrally located option, could spur development in the area
- Consequences – Loss of access to the park, loss of trees
- Needs to be done – Enhance public transit, ensure access to the park remains available
- Partnerships – St. Luke’s Church, surrounding apartments
- Funding options – Taxes, partnerships, sponsorships

Creekside Center and Park (D. Kane, J. Stanley, D. Kirby)

- Assets – Centrally located population-wise and geographically, well-known location, close to other City amenities, bus access, no cost of land, no trees harmed
- Gaps – Not expandable
- Benefits – Expanded programs, brand identity already in place, gets rid of an existing old building and revitalizes the area
- Consequences – Potential disruption of programming during construction, increased traffic, parking issues in the neighborhood, infrastructure in the area
- Needs to be done – Land deal exchange or partnership with Presbyterian Homes, site design that allows for continuation of programs while under construction
- Partnerships – Presbyterian Homes potentially for parking
- Funding options – Shared cost of new parking, partnerships/sponsorships

Fursman noted that three sites had not been chosen – the former Hyland Greens driving range, Penn American and Bryant Park. She asked the Task Force if there was any interest in working on any of the sites. J. Oleson offered to explore Bryant Park before the next meeting.

Fursman asked the group to review the recommendation template in their meeting packet and start thinking about what to include in the report. She stated that the Task Force will draft the recommendations together at their next meeting.

**Adjournment – 8:10 p.m.**

The meeting closed at 8:10 p.m. I. Fursman requested that Task Force members complete the meeting evaluation forms found in the Community Center Task Force binders. She stated the next meeting of the Task Force is August 23 at Creekside Community Center.