

**CITY OF SHOREVIEW  
MINUTES  
CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP MEETING  
January 13, 2014**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mayor Martin called a workshop meeting of the Shoreview City Council to order at 6:00 p.m. on January 13, 2014.

**ROLL CALL**

The following attended the meeting:

City Council: Mayor Martin; Councilmembers Johnson, Quigley, Wickstrom and Withhart

Staff: Terry Schwerm, City Manager

Community Michelle Majkozak  
Center Staff: Gary Chapman

Park and Recreation Sarah Bohnen  
Commission: Kent Peterson  
Craig John  
Charlie Oltman  
Carol Jauch  
Cathy Healy  
Tom Lemke

BWBR Greg Fenton  
Architects: Mark Bonhover

**JOINT MEETING WITH PARK AND RECREATION COMMISSION TO REVIEW  
CONCEPT PLAN ALTERNATIVES FOR A POTENTIAL COMMUNITY CENTER  
EXPANSION**

City Manager Schwerm stated that BWBR was hired to analyze needs at the Community Center. Any potential project would not be like the expansion that was done 12 years ago that focused on an expansion of space to offer fitness opportunities. As a result of putting in a full service fitness center, membership revenue has grown from approximately \$350,000 to \$1.1million. The expansion being considered at this time is because of the growth in membership and growth in recreation programs, such as Summer Discovery and fitness. The goal is to improve the member and guest experience at the Community Center and maintain our membership.

The Council, along with staff and the Park and Recreation Commission have been having brainstorming sessions on needs of the Community Center. A number of alternatives will be presented that could be done as independent projects or in some combination.

**Mr. Greg Fenton**, BWBR stated that the concept plans he will describe are proposed to address the following questions:

- Are we meeting the needs of residents and members?
- Are we relevant?
- Are we providing services with revenue potential?
- Are we addressing changing demographics and trends?
- How do we maintain current operations during any planned expansion?
- How do we stay competitive?
- How do we maintain a positive experience for members?

**Areas of identified need:**

- Increase fitness area for space to accommodate adequate equipment and stretching areas
- Increase kids' indoor play area with accommodations for toddlers and parent areas
- Add multi-purpose rooms for fitness, Summer Discovery, and general purpose
- Add banquet space for groups of 300 - 350
- Add facilities to provide more family changing for the pool

**Mr. Fenton** described the following concept plans:

**Scope A:**

This is a wellness expansion that would add rooms off the north side of the gym on the lower level. This would have some impact to a group fitness room and the Wave area. This concept includes an expansion of the kids' indoor play structure into the current activity room. The work would be done on only one story but structured so that a second story could be added in the future. A hallway would parallel the north end of the gym.

**Scope B:**

Add 2500 square feet to the north side of the building on the upper and lower levels for banquet area on the upper floor and lower level would be more fitness space.

**Scope C:**

Cardio/fitness center expansion on the east side of the building on the lower level for more cardio space. New carpet and paint included. A few parking stalls would be lost and some work would be done in the parking lot.

**Scope D:**

Relocation of the indoor play area to an area adjacent to the lower entry and near the pool.

**Scope E:**

Work at west end of the current gym and paired with **Scope D**. Two multi-purpose rooms on the lower level and stairs to two multi-purpose rooms on the upper floor. The kids' indoor play area would be moved to a new space at the front of the building north of the pool (Scope A). The running track would be maintained.

**Scope F:**

An expansion to the south side of the building toward the upper level parking area. This would increase the community room space by 40%. The configuration could be flexible. There is a fresh air intake to the mechanical rooms in that location that would be relocated, possibly with

shafts to the roof that would solve the problem of car exhaust finding its way into the intake grate.

**Scope G:**

Add outdoor shallow water pool to the south. Considerable deck space would be added--1.5 square feet for every 1 square foot of surface water. The size of the pool would be approximately 2000 square feet and 3500 square feet of deck space.

**Changing Rooms**

Three options are presented for remodeling changing rooms near the pool. The first option would be to expand the changing rooms where they are located and tripling the number of changing areas. The other two options piggy back the restroom area with changing rooms. The offices located near the changing rooms would be moved. Mr. Schwerm stated that the changing rooms would be designed with individual stalls with doors for privacy. Showers would be in a common area to rinse off before and after being in the pool. The small birthday room would be eliminated, but the large one would be kept. The large one accommodates approximately 80 to 90% of reservations. Meeting rooms upstairs can be rented for private parties. Ms. Majkozak added that the small party room is only sometimes used on weekends. Mr. Chapman stated that one of the biggest complaints is from those taking swimming lessons and the lack of changing rooms. The added changing rooms would meet that need. Ms. Majkozak stated that people wait as long as half hour and then they use restrooms.

Mr. John asked if more toilet rooms could be added. Mr. Schwerm stated that Scope B or C could convert the men's and women's restrooms to unisex toilet rooms.

Councilmember Quigley noted that adding an outdoor pool will exacerbate the issues of changing and showering.

Councilmember Wickstrom stated that she favors keeping the toilet rooms close to the changing rooms. She asked for further explanation of the differences between Scopes B and C. Mr. Fenton stated that the main difference is circulation and access going to the pool or a meeting room. Mr. Chapman stated that Scope C is mainly adding a hallway.

**Pool Play Structures**

A picture was shown of a play structure that would be placed in the shallow pool area.

Mr. Lemke asked if a lifeguard will be needed for the outdoor pool area and whether it is a splashpad or water. Mr. Schwerm answered, yes, because as much as an inch of water requires a lifeguard present. It is a shallow pool of water. Mr. Lemke stated that if this investment is made into an outdoor play pool, he would like to see it enclosed so it would be used more than three months of the year.

Councilmember Wickstrom asked for two analyses of the outdoor play pool--one as enclosed and one open. Mr. Schwerm stated that an enclosure feature has not been studied. An indoor/outdoor feature could bring in a lot more revenue and pay for itself. An indoor/outdoor use would be a significant feature of a water park.

Lemke stated that he would like to see walls that could be raised or lowered to bring in fresh air.

Mr. Fenton stated that it would be important to consider the type of enclosure, whether a dome or inflatable or actual structure. Winter weather brings a number of risks that needs the right solution.

### **Council/Commission Discussion**

Councilmember Withhart stated that he likes Scope A as well as the idea of moving the indoor play area to a front location where it would be visible and very attractive. The indoor play area near the pool and outdoor pool area would be a good attraction for anyone entering the building. Mr. Chapman responded that moving the indoor play area to the front of the building will potentially present security problems with bypassing the check-in desk.

Councilmember Johnson asked the cost of moving the indoor play area. Mr. Schwerm stated that we would need to check on the cost from the manufacturer.

It was also noted that children also could leave without parents knowing if the play area is in front by the door. Mr. Schwerm stated that there are some programs that do not require people to check in. A check-in desk would be needed at the front door, if the play area were moved to that location. If the play area were expanded in its current location, the hallway would be a new access to the indoor play area and could be made attractive with glass and windows. This would channel traffic through the hallway and not the gym.

Mr. Lemke stated that he likes moving the play area to the front because the pool area and play area and outdoor pool area would be the main attraction for kids. The fitness area and walk track and gym for adults would be at the other end of the building. He likes keeping adult areas and kids' areas in separate parts of the building.

Mr. Peterson asked about windows in multi-purpose rooms. Ms. Majkozak stated that the rooms would be used for fitness, which would be nice to have windows and some natural light.

Mayor Martin stated that she likes Scopes A and B because a lot is achieved for the money with added space for Summer Discovery. She agreed with the idea of having the indoor play area near the front by the pool, but it may not be realistic now. Mr. Schwerm stated that Scope A could be done and could include an expanded gym space.

Mr. Peterson referred to the cardio area expansion into the parking lot. He asked the reason not to put the additional square footage wrapped around the side of the building rather than in front. Then the parking spaces would not have to be moved. Mr. Schwerm stated that to wrap around the building would lose space.

Councilmember Withhart noted that pushing the parking lot out further because of the cardio expansion makes access difficult for handicapped people. There are closer spaces at the upper level, but there is still a good walk to the door. Mr. Chapman noted that some handicapped spaces are taken for the Farmers' Market. Mayor Martin requested the architects to work on this issue.

Mr. Peterson asked if the extension toward the parking lot is the only way to expand the cardio space. Mr. Schwerm stated that an addition could be put on the north side, but it would not be as large. Mr. Fenton explained that the economy of cost for the L shape proposed is that expansion is easier to take out the windows there. As the addition moves west around the building, there is a gas meter and electrical panel to deal with, and the structure of the building changes so it would be more difficult.

Councilmember Johnson stated that she would rather complete one section and move to another section in another phase another year.

Charlie Oltman asked if bonding could be done. He would like to see the project done right and not as multiple projects because there is more cost and upheaval. Mr. Schwerm cautioned that there is some hesitancy to take up a significant part of the bonding resource for one project because there will not be the money available for other park projects and trail projects.

Councilmember Wickstrom noted that the options for expansion will become limited as the building size increases. In 10 years there will not be many options for expansion. It is important to get the most usable space possible with any expansion. The building is already close to the pavilion, and there is not room to add too much more in the future. She asked how often the parking lot fills. She would want to be sure parking is sufficient.

Councilmember Quigley stated that he is at the Community Center every other day and there is sufficient parking. Other than concerts and the Farmers' Market, there is adequate parking.

Councilmember Withhart stated that the A and D expansions would be less disruptive because current facilities could still be used. If banquet space were to be added, he would choose Scope F. Mr. Fenton stated that with the cardio addition, the disruption would be short. Everything would be built outside and then brought in.

Councilmember Quigley stated that he does not want to see a big impact to revenue during construction because users will focus on the difficulty of access. Mr. Schwerm stated that, to date, everything has been designed to minimize loss of revenue. He expressed his concern about the expansion of Scope B on the upper level, which will make rooms with loss of views harder to rent. Also, the pavilion would be closer to the Shoreview Room; it will feel like the building is on top of the pavilion.

Mayor Martin asked what the capacity would be if the Wedell Room were expanded. Mr. Schwerm answered that it could accommodate up to 350 people, about 100 more than its current capacity. It would be bigger than the Shoreview Room. Mayor Martin stated that if either banquet room is expanded, her preference would be the Wedell Room in front.

Mr. Peterson stated that the deck and lounge of the Shoreview Room would be a nice change and could be done. Mr. Fenton stated that making a deck off the Shoreview Room would turn roof space into deck space. Mr. Peterson asked if it would be more costly to wait a year and not have disruption at both entrances with the expansion of cardio and the Wedell Room.

Mr. Lemke stated that if he were to rent a room, he would not want a view of the parking lot with the expansion of the Community Room toward the parking lot. Also, the band cannot afford to lose its space in the Community Room. Mr. Schwerm stated that the band would still have the

use of the room. Mr. Fenton noted that the Wedell Room would be closed for approximately 30 days for carpeting and painting.

Mayor Martin asked preferences for placement of the indoor play area, whether to move it to the front. She believes it could work in its present location.

Councilmember Wickstrom agreed and said Scope F would provide more space. This design has addition of more rooms. It is a better layout, and she does not think anyone has trouble finding the indoor play area.

Councilmember Johnson agreed with Scope A and the additional multi-purpose rooms. She would prefer to save the expense of moving the play area.

Ms. Majkozak stated that the biggest plus about Scope A is the walkway and not having to go through the gym to get to the indoor play area. The biggest complaint received is having to walk through the gym when there are basketball or pickleball games.

Councilmember Withhart stated that he prefers the location for the indoor playground in D because then the current space can be used to add onto the gym or another multi-purpose room. He likes the WOW factor of the play area in front.

Mayor Martin stated that there are many children in the play area not supervised. Her concern there would be too much overlap with the pool and kids would go to the play area in their swim suits. Ms. Majkozak stated that if it is moved to the front, it would have to be staffed.

Mr. Chapman stated that at some time the play area will have to be replaced. At that point, that would be the time to consider putting it in front.

Mr. Lemke stated that the indoor play area will end up in front anyway in order to expand the gym. He would prefer to move it now.

Carol Jauch disagreed and stated that the play area was just put in and was costly. It does not make sense to move it. She likes Scope A and would like to see it on two levels.

Mr. Peterson asked the demand for meeting/activity rooms to justify extending Scope A to the upper level. Ms. Majkozak stated that the rooms would definitely be used.

### **Cost Estimates**

<b>Scope A</b>	Multipurpose Addition/Remodel
New Construction	7600 sf
Remodel	6250 sf
Project costs	\$2,200,000
Additional project costs	\$550,000 (factor of 25%--fees, marketing, changes, equipment)
Total:	\$2,750,000
<b>Scope B</b>	Multipurpose Banquet Addition
New Construction	5850 ad

Cost	\$861,000
Remodeling	0
Additional project costs	\$215,250
Total	\$1,076,250

**Scope C** Cardio Fitness Addition

New Construction	2600 sf
Remodeling	4000 sf
Cost	1,200,000
Additional project costs	300,000
Total	1,500,000

**Scope D** Kids Indoor Play Area

New construction	4,800 sf
Remodeling	
Cost	\$1,540,000
Additional Project Costs	\$410,000
Total	\$1,950,000

**Scope E** Multipurpose Remodel

Remodeling	7,000 sf
Cost	\$800,000
Additional Project Costs	\$200,000
Total	\$1,000,000

**Scope F** Community Room Addition Remodel

New Construction	4200 sf
Remodeling	4,000 sf
Cost	\$1,340,000
Additional project costs	\$360,000
Total	\$1,670,000

**Scope G** Outdoor Aquatics

New construction	2400 sf/3600 sf for deck
Cost	\$1,025,000
Additional project costs	\$256,250
Total	\$1,291,250

**Family Changing Rooms**

Remodeling	1050 sf
Cost	\$290,000
Additional project costs	\$72,500
Total	\$352,500

**Scopes D and E**

New Construction	4600sf
Remodeling	8215sf
Cost	\$2,440,000
Additional Project Cost	\$610,000

Total \$3,050,000

Mr. Fenton stated that all the numbers are good planning figures in identifying risk.

Mr. Schwerm stated that the CIP is at \$2 million with the idea of an expansion to the fitness center. The estimate for that part is in line with the CIP. Staff will look at finance options, such as the Community Investment Fund. Before bonding, an analysis of debt needs to be completed.

Councilmember Johnson stated that it will be important to know where dollars would be best spent for revenue return. How much of Scope A has capacity to be revenue generation? Mr. Schwerm stated that will be difficult to estimate because a lot of this work is maintaining the current revenue stream, keeping the building updated and enhancing it. He does not anticipate a jump in membership that was experienced with the last expansion. This will maintain that membership.

Mayor Martin stated that she would like to focus on what is needed most, the top priorities. The Summer Discovery program is a revenue generator but it is out of space. If that were expanded, revenue would increase.

Councilmember Withhart asked the demand for banquet space. Mr. Schwerm stated that in summer there are people turned away for weddings. It is enhancing the revenue stream with \$250,000 in rental revenue. An expansion would bring in perhaps \$25,000 more because more could be charged more for the additional space.

Mr. Lemke noted the current satisfaction in the recent survey and asked if a bond issue referendum would be passed. Mr. Schwerm stated that voters generally vote to raise taxes for schools, fire stations or public safety.

Mayor Martin stated that she would like to think big. If it means waiting a couple of years to build up equity in the Community Investment Fund, she would like to consider that option and have more financial analysis.

Councilmember Quigley stated that the City needs to continue to follow the business model that is prudent to make sure there is revenue generated and focus on those items that will do that. The primary items are the fitness center and outdoor aquatics. Staying with the business model and not bonding would be the way to proceed.

Carol Jauch stated that one thing that needs to be done, even though not a revenue generator, is family changing rooms. That cannot be avoided. Mr. John added that to not do those would be a deterrent.

Mayor Martin stated that nothing is wasted if any of these projects have to wait. She added that the indoor play area needs to be expanded so that there is activity for toddlers. That is a big priority, but that would not be done without the multipurpose rooms and walkway.

Councilmember Wickstrom asked for cost estimates to add an upper level to Scope A.

Mr. Fenton suggested putting the cardio fitness on the second level. All of the fitness would be in one area. The indoor play area would be moved down to the lower level where the fitness center is now.

Councilmember Johnson noted that to put the fitness on the upper level would mean higher ceilings and better air flow.

Ms. Bohnen stated that if renovation/expansion is considered only every 10 years, it is important to choose the right flow of new features and set priorities.

It was the consensus of the group to consider this concept further. Mayor Martin suggested another review of how that concept might look. Further, there was consensus the various options presented have merit with adjustments. These concepts can be stand-alone projects that can be phased. The next stage then would be for more financial analysis and to set priorities.

## **OTHER ISSUES**

### **Public Safety Committee**

The Public Safety Committee has three providers on their board for Allina, the Fire Department and the Sheriff's Department. However, they should not be voting members. If a bylaw or resolution change is necessary, he would propose a change to appoint 7 to 9 members; now there are 8 at-large members and the three provider representatives. The provider representatives would not have a vote. There was consensus to look into this change and make an appointment.

### **Cable Commission**

Councilmember Wickstrom reported that Comcast has given their formal proposal. There are 120 days to review it and accept or reject it. If rejected, then the matter will go through the courts because Comcast would appeal. An informal process is trying to negotiate outside the formal process. The proposal from Comcast drops the PEG fee down to \$0.44 per subscriber, considerably less than now. It would take 8 channels down to 4. Fewer channels would give better quality. Comcast states they are not obligated to take care of capital equipment.

Councilmember Withhart questioned the amount being spent and the benefit to the City. He asked if Shoreview negotiated separately, would the City Council and Planning Commission meetings be broadcast. Councilmember Wickstrom responded that there may be a cost to be paid by the franchise fees.

Councilmember Johnson stated that younger adults do not watch public access. They get their information from social media outlets. However, the aging population in Shoreview does use public access.

Mayor Martin asked Councilmember Wickstrom to report back when the Council needs to make a decision.

The meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.