

Study Meeting
Monday, March 17, 2014, 5:30 p.m.
Bloomington Civic Plaza
1800 West Old Shakopee Road
Bloomington, Minnesota 55431-3027

Call to Order Mayor Gene Winstead called the study meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Roll Call *Present:* Mayor Winstead, Councilmembers C. Abrams, J. Baloga, T. Busse, A. Carlson, D. Lowman, and J. Oleson.

**STUDY ITEM #1 –
Community Center
Overview**

Diann Kirby, Community Services Director explained per Council's request at the January 6th Council meeting, she will be presenting information regarding the current condition of the Creekside Community Center as well as providing a history of what alternate options for a future community center facility have been explored to date. She said staff last updated the Council on what was happening with the building in May 2013 so this is another overview of Creekside's history and options for the future. Her presentation included the following slides:

- Definition of a community center
- Community Center: Past
- Creekside Elementary School: Opened as a school in 1960.
- Community Center History
- Community Center: Present
- Creekside's Current Uses: Only 40% of the building is used by people over age 60.

Winstead commented 25% of Bloomington's population is over the age of 60.

- Bloomington Citizen Surveys: 2012 & 2013
- Maintenance Issues
- Essential Improvements for Functionality: 0-5 years
- Essential Improvements for Functionality: 6-10 years
- Community Center: Future
- Key Goals of Community Centers
- Typical Amenities
- Local Gyms and Health Clubs:
- Public Community Centers: Examples given with built-in gyms: New Brighton, Shakopee, Apple Valley, Chanhassen, Maple Grove, Eagan, Eden Prairie, Monticello, Chaska, Victoria

Council questioned the population size and acreage of the cities with community centers.

- Potential Center Options: \$186/square foot, which doesn't include parking at \$4,500 per space. Estimated number of parking spaces is 500 for an estimated cost of \$2.25 million.
- Option A: 242,638 square feet = \$51,298,058

Winstead said Option A includes space for a public health clinic as well as office space and suggested it be taken off the list and listed as an add on.

- Option B: 90,688 square feet = \$22,189,339
- Option C: 75,188 square feet = \$18,484,684
- Option D: 53,288 square feet = \$13,057,615 (closer to the size of Creekside)

**STUDY ITEM #1
continued**

Busse said the costs shown are for construction but asked about the operating costs for each community center example.

Kirby replied it is approximately \$2 million.

- Option Comparisons
- Potential Financing Options: Lease revenue bonds are the most viable option.

Mark Bernhardson, City Manager commented this is how the City financed a portion of Civic Plaza.

- Estimated Debt and Potential Monthly Property Tax Impact: *(just capital impact)*
- Potential Sites: Public Health, Motor Vehicle & Public Works Maintenance, Civic Plaza East, 1900-2000 West 98th Street, between Civic Plaza and Creekside, Civic Plaza West, 98th Street & James Avenue (VEAP site), 3100-3200 West 98th Street (east of the Bloomington Ice Garden-BIG), 3800 West 98th Street (west of BIG), former Hyland Greens driving range, former Lincoln High School, Lincoln Stadium, and NW corner of 90th Street & Penn Avenue.

Kirby said Presbyterian Homes has been interested in purchasing the entire Creekside and park site, which if sold, could help finance a new community center in a new location.

- Community Center Draft Timeline: Would select a consultant to do a more formal study. Construction could occur in January 2016 to July 2017 (a guesstimate).
- Next Steps: A formal community center study using a consultant is estimated to cost between \$150,000-\$200,000. There is currently \$50,000 of carryover funds set aside for this.
- Question: Should staff proceed to developing a Request for Proposals (RFP) to begin the consultant process?

Bernhardson said a task force could be formed that would include one or two Council members.

Council comments/inquiries:

Winstead requested the populations of the cities with community centers and the usage of their gymnasiums/activity centers compared to their population (a per capita gauge). He asked for information on how Bloomington's gymnasiums and the activity centers in the high schools are being used. He said some sites shown have great potential for shared parking and some in proximity to this building. He also said the cost for a consultant to conduct a formal study is high.

Baloga said he was on the citizens' park task force 7-10 years ago when there was a lot of focus on what a community center might entail vs. what is actually needed in one. He said the smallest proposal would be double the size of the current building. He had questions regarding what will be going in there, how the building will be utilized, and the cost. He said make sure services aren't being duplicated.

Winstead said it's about identifying the needs in a community center or if there are any.

Baloga commented Creekside is a good sturdy building so it shouldn't just be abandoned. He said the Council needs to look inward first and foremost to get those needs defined by asking what does Bloomington need and how will it be utilized. He asked if a large banquet room was a City requirement, as that would go against Bloomington's hospitality industry. He added he's served at loaves and fishes at Creekside and commented that space is definitely inadequate.

Carlson said the City has a building it paid \$500,000 for but it needs \$1 million in repairs so something needs to be done with it. He suggested a Needs Assessment be conducted, which shouldn't cost more than \$50,000. He said if the services the community center provides could help the City break even, that would be adequate. He said it's not about making money. He suggested locating the center on a transit route and asked about identifying locations on the east side of Bloomington. He questioned whether it should be an RFP process or some intermittent steps along the way.

**STUDY ITEM #1
continued**

Oleson said a Needs Assessment was his first thought, as a simple survey would not get people to think about what options there could be in a community center. He said a Taj Mahal-type probably wouldn't produce enough activity to pay for itself. He said the location for accessibility is very important. He questioned whether the cost to conduct a formal study would be less if some of the options in Option A were eliminated.

Bernhardson replied not from a Needs Assessment standpoint.

Busse suggested looking at the east side necessity. Regarding accessibility, he said look at the big picture to see how a community center fits into everything else that has gone into Bloomington. He said the City needs to take care of what it already has in its parks before it commits to a significant investment in a new community center.

Winstead suggested using the allocated \$50,000 to conduct a Needs Assessment, which will start to hone in on whether or not a community center is doable or not, what it could include, where it could be located, etc.

(There was Council concurrence for staff to move in that direction.)

Abrams encouraged the Council to avoid missing any opportunities and used the Lincoln stadium and property as an example. She said the Needs Assessment should be done with full knowledge of what the School District is planning, their properties, future enrollment, future use of their buildings and properties, etc. This would be a chance to get this right for the citizens if the City works with the School District.

Lowman asked about partnering with the private community. He suggested collocating with some of the businesses.

Bernhardson said the City will see what kind of Needs Assessment can be done for \$50,000 and will involve the School District, the park group, etc. in that process.

Baloga volunteered to serve as a Council representative on that committee when it's formed.

(There was Council concurrence for staff to proceed with developing a Request for Proposal process for the selection of a consultant to assist staff in preparing a full community center study.)

**STUDY ITEM #2 –
Draft Solid Waste
Management Plan
and Community
Engagement Report**

Jim Gates, Deputy Director of Public Works introduced Dan Krivit, Senior Project Manager, Foth Infrastructure & Environment. They jointly presented the Draft Solid Waste Management Plan.

Krivit said they will summarize the Plan; the first half of which is completed. He said Council can decide how it wants to proceed for the next study session. He said there are no preconceived notions on what the outcome should be. Foth is providing the technical process. Their presentation was as follows:

- Upcoming *Plan* Schedule of Events
- Goals of the *Plan*: Ambitious goals to make improvements in recycling and solid waste.
- Strategies: 16 strategies listed in hierarchy order.
- Alternative Residential Collection Scenarios: #1 Current System, #2 Hybrid of Open (trash and yard waste) and Contract Collections (recycling and organics), and #3 Residential Collections Fully Organized.
- Scenario #1: Current System: (There are 7 collection systems)

Krivit commented the bulk of the trash and recycling is in the commercial sector.

Abrams asked how much of the 66% that is commercial trash and recycling is attributable to the organized collection at the Mall of America (MOA).

Krivit said an industry matrix was used to determine that percentage rather Bloomington specific data. It was commented the MOA accounts for a large portion of it.

**STUDY ITEM #2
continued**Residential Collection Options:

- Scenario #1: The assumption is a total of 12 trucks on collection day currently.
- Scenario #2: Hybrid of Open and Contract Collections: Hennepin County will soon be requiring residential hauling of organics. It was stated Hennepin County Commissioner Randy Johnson is leading the charge in this direction. It could reduce the number of trucks on collection day from 12 to 10.
- Scenario #3: Residential Collections Fully Organized: Could reduce the number of trucks from 12 to 4.
- Scenario #1: Current System Economics of Solid Waste Management (at the household level). (Current System) Total monthly costs range from \$22 to \$57 and do not include organics.
- Scenario #2: Estimated Cost to Residents (Hybrid System) Total monthly costs could range from \$24 to \$64.
- Scenario #3: Estimated Cost Savings to Residents (Fully Organized) Total monthly costs could range from \$19 to \$58.
- Community Engagement - Methods
- Community Engagement - Themes
- Discussion Matrix: There's been an evolution from pre-1989 to the present. The Curbside Cleanup Program is a service that could be carved out as a separate issue.

Winstead said the Curbside Cleanup Program is getting harder for one hauler to handle. He said staff can work to improve this but the focus needs to be on the solid waste, recycling, yard waste, and organics for residential.

Krivit said the City is set for the 2014 Curbside Cleanup but discussion for an RFP for that service in 2015 can be discussed at a later time.

- Questions to the Council:
 1. Additional information or data needed?
 2. What are the desired next steps?

Winstead directed staff to keep this rolling and to bring it back at a future study session for Council to chew up the issues and receive clarification, as there was no time left for questions tonight.

Bernhardson asked the Council to send him their questions and to reference them by page number. He asked the Council to identify their top five key issues so staff can consolidate them for more discussion. He said as the study sessions in April are already full, he announced there will be a study meeting devoted to solid waste on April 14th.

Regarding the report, Winstead said it would be helpful to know the capacity of each hauler (large and small), the average number of homes each hauler serves, and if the City goes with an organized collection, how could they be accommodated so that a small hauler could bid on and maintain his market share in Bloomington.

Bernhardson said staff wanted to wait on that information until Council determines if they want to go in the direction of an organized collection.

Abrams suggested all Council members submit their garbage bills to City staff for analysis and requested recycling data on the Mall of America and other commercial entities in the city.

Oleson said there is an assumption that the general public and the Council understand why the landfills need to be reduced. He said that education needs to be out there.

Baloga asked about the tactical methods the City will be using to achieve a reduction in landfills. He said doing it through education is too broad and asked for specifics on how the objectives can be achieved and evaluated.

**STUDY ITEM #2
continued**

Winstead said tactics on how best to communicate a consistent message to the public was touched on in the Pros and Cons section but wasn't listed in the Tactic section.

(Council was directed to organize their thoughts and send them to the City Manager prior to the study meeting on April 14th.)

Adjourn Meeting

Mayor Winstead adjourned the study meeting at 6:55 p.m.

Barbara Clawson
Council Secretary