

From: Michael Varda <vardam-33@uwalumni.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 23, 2022 2:07 PM
To: Parks Facilities, Programs and Fees <parksfpf@cityofmadison.com>
Cc: Michael Varda <vardam-33@uwalumni.com>
Subject: Comments re Programming Plan for Glenway to Facilities Programs and Fees Subcommittee Mtg on 1/24/2022 Agenda Item 69413

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

:Corrected re-submission to identify subject:

Dear Sir or Madam:

Attached in pdf format are my personal comments related to qualified support of the Programming Plan for Glenway Golf Park, Agenda Item 69413. If you are unable to open the attachment please contact me and I'll forward as an email message.

Very truly yours,
Michael Varda
608 843-3920 (c)

January 23, 2022

To: Facilities Programs and Fees Subcommittee (Parks)

From: Michael Varda
Member, Programming Committee for Glenway Project

Re: **Comments and Request for Conditions if Glenway Golf Park Programming Plan (2022) is adopted**
Agenda Item 69413 for January 24, 2022, Meeting

General Comment: Support with Modifying Conditions.

The Program Committee was given the difficult task of wrestling intangible goals for multiple uses and potential audiences into a concrete set of scheduled access times and operations for use of Glenway’s physical facility. Staff should be thanked for its imaginative and generally successful handling of so many diffuse concerns, especially given the work issues caused by the Covid-19 pandemic and the short timeline in which to develop a plan. Though the Programming Plan (“Plan”) proposes a new name, The Glen Golf Park, for convenience, this memorandum will use simply “Glenway.”

Notwithstanding the good work in the Plan that deserves support, I ask that the three concerns discussed below be addressed as conditions (or amendments or modifications, depending on customary terminology) to the Subcommittee’s potential adoption of the Plan. I had hoped to present these to staff for amendment to the Plan, but I only received the Plan on January 20, 2022, leaving too little time to seek changes.

Concern No. 1 – Fair treatment of Leagues Desiring to Return to Glenway.

The Plan falls far short on specifying how those golf leagues, such as the KC 531 League of which I am a member, will be treated upon the reopening, assuming it desires to return to Glenway.

The Plan states an intention to consider forming 4, 6, and 8 weeklong leagues. The KC 531 League, and, other leagues, go 16 or 17 weeks. The KC 531 league is currently 24 players, taking six tee times commencing at 4:50 or 5:00 p.m. on Monday evenings, at Yahara for this past season. The league has been in existence for at least 15 years or more. This league is a significant chunk of revenue that could run between \$6,000 and over \$8,000 per season, depending on the fee schedule in effect.

The Plan fails to say anything about the treatment of 16-week leagues desiring to return to Glenway. It is obvious that the shortened 2022 season at Glenway may well compel leagues with long seasons, like KC 531, to stay where they are for at least one more season. But what happens in 2023? We are given no idea in the Plan, and it’s not fair to long time course users and key supporters of the city’s Golf Enterprise Program to be left hanging. Nor would it be fair to “move the goal posts” for 2023 by treating any new short-term leagues (4, 6, and 8 weeks) created in 2022 as “incumbents” having any kind of access priority over those leagues forced to move due to the closure of Glenway for the 2021 season. Those leagues that were moved are the true “incumbents” at Glenway.

Because of this unaddressed transition issue, I propose the following condition to the acceptance of the Plan.

Recommendation for Condition to Plan Acceptance: Those golf leagues having seasons longer than 8 weeks shall be given priority access to open golf weekday evenings (after 4:00 p.m., but starting time may vary slightly) at Glenway in 2023 and each season thereafter, if:

1. They were at Glenway in 2020 (season before closure for renovation);
2. They affirmatively express a desire to the City to return to Glenway in 2023; and
3. Each season thereafter without a seasonal break, they affirmatively seek evening access for league play at Glenway.

Concern No. 2 – The Unexplained Removal of Monday Evening Golf (Page 5 Schedule, Plan) is Arbitrary and Should be Rejected.

This concern ties to the first concern as a related, unaddressed transition issue. The Plan fails to explain why Monday night, on which the KC 531 League and another league played Glenway, is removed from golf

access in favor of alternative programming. The sample programming calendar (Page 6 of Plan) shows cyclocross as a Monday night activity, ousting two long-time leagues from their traditional golf night. While there is no right to a particular night, the unexplained removal of Monday when open evenings are clearly available on Tuesday and Wednesday, reveal an arbitrariness of this proposed scheduling change. The action seems unconsidered at best, and punitive at worst, when it comes to accommodating golf users.

Moreover, there is no fiscal analysis of the removal of this golf revenue night, or that of any other time slot for that matter. The Plan unnecessarily hurts a significant and known revenue-producing league. Glenway as an in-city course is far more convenient for working adult league members to quickly access after work hours than Yahara. This past season's experience with Yahara was telling. The time for members to get to Yahara was greatly extended due to Beltline traffic jams, tending to discourage rather than encourage use of City courses.

The removal of the Monday evening golf slot (5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.) appears arbitrary and unnecessarily disruptive.

Recommendation for Condition to Plan Acceptance: The alternative uses time period for Monday evening after 5:00 p.m. is removed, or, in the alternative, shifted directly to Tuesday or Wednesday evenings after 5:00 p.m. This condition is mandatory for the 2023 season, and is applicable to the 2022 season where feasible.

Concern No. 3 – The Proposed Continuous Improvement (Page 10, Plan) Needs Defined Reasonable Measures or Metrics for Evaluation of the Plan.

The Plan promises continuous improvement, but more data metrics are absolutely needed to evaluate the success (or not) of multiple use programming for a type of plan that might “be replicated across the system.” (Page 10, Plan). I am not versed in City systems or procedures, so I would defer to Subcommittee input or changes that help the better secure the objective identified here.

Administration of golf-only parks is seemingly simpler because of the strong focus on golf and its net revenue objective. The multiple uses proposed in the Plan create administrative complexity, with many uses that may not be trackable and others that create new, added administrative costs, both direct and indirect. Soliciting new alternative user groups, tracking their use of Glenway, and their imposed “on the ground” costs, along with other Plan development costs, should be “visible” to the management of the Parks Division. New branding efforts for the Glenway experience need some kind of cost/benefit analysis. Especially important will be access to data that shows how much subsidy golf provides (or not) for the alternative uses.

My suggestion is that the implementation of the adopted Plan be identified as a specific cost and revenue collection point within the fiscal reporting apparatus of the Parks Division. This reporting device should encompass all one-time and continuing costs as they are incurred and include the overhead cost of staff time devoted to the Plan's implementation.

The foregoing does not preclude use of anecdotal or non-fiscal evidence, but it seems to me that additional study is needed by staff to identify what kind of anecdotal or non-fiscal evidence is useful to an overall evaluation and how it should be gathered. The outcome study should be adopted as a formal supplement to the Plan.

A final point is that 2022 will only furnish a partial season's worth of information. Monitoring the Plan's implementation should at least run through 2023 in order to provide useful data.

Recommendation for Condition to Plan Acceptance: Staff is directed to return to the Subcommittee within XX [suggestion: 45 days] days a memorandum setting forth reasonable fiscal and non-fiscal metrics, applicable in 2022 and 2023, by which to evaluate the Plan for the transition of Glenway to The Glen Golf Park.

cc: Lisa Laschinger, Assistant Parks Superintendent
Glenway Project Program Committee members (as available)

January 24, 2022

To: Golf Subcommittee (Parks)

From: Michael Varda
Member, Programming Committee for Glenway Project

Re: **Comments and Request for Conditions in any adoption of Glenway Golf Park Programming Plan (2022)**
Agenda Item 69413 for January 27, 2022, Meeting

SPECIAL NOTE: The comments below were also submitted to the Facilities Programs and Fees Subcommittee meeting of January 24, 2022. The Golf Subcommittee is hereby requested to concur in with the FPF Subcommittee, or adopt directly as procedure requires, the recommendations set forth below.

General Comment: Support with Modifying Conditions.

The Program Committee was given the difficult task of wrestling intangible goals for multiple uses and potential audiences into a concrete set of scheduled access times and operations for use of Glenway’s physical facility. Staff should be thanked for its imaginative and generally successful handling of so many diffuse concerns, especially given the work issues caused by the Covid-19 pandemic and the short timeline in which to develop a plan. Though the Programming Plan (“Plan”) proposes a new name, The Glen Golf Park, for convenience, this memorandum will use simply “Glenway.”

Notwithstanding the good work in the Plan that deserves support, I ask that the three concerns discussed below be addressed as conditions (or amendments or modifications, depending on customary terminology) to the Subcommittee’s potential adoption of the Plan. I had hoped to present these to staff for amendment to the Plan, but I only received the Plan on January 20, 2022, leaving too little time to seek changes.

Concern No. 1 – Fair treatment of Leagues Desiring to Return to Glenway.

The Plan falls far short on specifying how those golf leagues, such as the KC 531 League of which I am a member, will be treated upon the reopening, assuming it desires to return to Glenway.

The Plan states an intention to consider forming 4, 6, and 8 weeklong leagues. The KC 531 League, and, other leagues, go 16 or 17 weeks. The KC 531 league is currently 24 players, taking six tee times commencing at 4:50 or 5:00 p.m. on Monday evenings, at Yahara for this past season. The league has been in existence for at least 15 years or more. This league is a significant chunk of revenue that could run between \$6,000 and over \$8,000 per season, depending on the fee schedule in effect.

The Plan fails to say anything about the treatment of 16-week leagues desiring to return to Glenway. It is obvious that the shortened 2022 season at Glenway may well compel leagues with long seasons, like KC 531, to stay where they are for at least one more season. But what happens in 2023? We are given no idea in the Plan, and it’s not fair to long time course users and key supporters of the city’s Golf Enterprise Program to be left hanging. Nor would it be fair to “move the goal posts” for 2023 by treating any new short-term leagues (4, 6, and 8 weeks) created in 2022 as “incumbents” having any kind of access priority over those leagues forced to move due to the closure of Glenway for the 2021 season. Those leagues that were moved are the true “incumbents” at Glenway.

Because of this unaddressed transition issue, I propose the following condition to the acceptance of the Plan.

Recommendation for Condition to Plan Acceptance: Those golf leagues having seasons longer than 8 weeks shall be given priority access to open golf weekday evenings (after 4:00 p.m., but starting time may vary slightly) at Glenway in 2023 and each season thereafter, if:

1. They were at Glenway in 2020 (season before closure for renovation);
2. They affirmatively express a desire to the City to return to Glenway in 2023; and
3. Each season thereafter without a seasonal break, they affirmatively seek evening access for league play at Glenway.

Concern No. 2 – The Unexplained Removal of Monday Evening Golf (Page 5 Schedule, Plan) is Arbitrary and Should be Rejected.

This concern ties to the first concern as a related, unaddressed transition issue. The Plan fails to explain why Monday night, on which the KC 531 League and another league played Glenway, is removed from golf access in favor of alternative programming. The sample programming calendar (Page 6 of Plan) shows cyclocross as a Monday night activity, ousting two long-time leagues from their traditional golf night. While there is no right to a particular night, the unexplained removal of Monday when open evenings are clearly available on Tuesday and Wednesday, reveal an arbitrary of this proposed scheduling change. The action seems unconsidered at best, and punitive at worse, when it comes to accommodating golf users.

Moreover, there is no fiscal analysis of the removal of this golf revenue night, or that of any other time slot for that matter. The Plan unnecessarily hurts a significant and known revenue-producing leagues. Glenway as an in-city course is far more convenient for working adult league members to quickly access after work hours than Yahara. This past season’s experience with Yahara was telling. The time for members to get to Yahara was greatly extended due to Beltline traffic jams, tending to discourage rather than encourage use of City courses.

The removal of the Monday evening golf slot (5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.) appears arbitrary and unnecessarily disruptive.

Recommendation for Condition to Plan Acceptance: The alternative uses time period for Monday evening after 5:00 p.m. is removed, or, in the alternative, shifted directly to Tuesday or Wednesday evenings after 5:00 p.m. This condition is mandatory for the 2023 season, and is applicable to the 2022 season where feasible.

Concern No. 3 – The Proposed Continuous Improvement (Page 10, Plan) Needs Defined Reasonable Measures or Metrics for Evaluation of the Plan.

The Plan promises continuous improvement, but more data metrics are absolutely needed to evaluate the success (or not) of multiple use programming for a type of plan that might “be replicated across the system.” (Page 10, Plan). I am not versed in City systems or procedures, so I would defer to Subcommittee input or changes that help the better secure the objective identified here.

Administration of golf-only parks is seemingly simpler because of the strong focus on golf and its net revenue objective. The multiple uses proposed in the Plan create administrative complexity, with many uses that may not be trackable and others that create new, added administrative costs, both direct and indirect. Soliciting new alternative user groups, tracking their use of Glenway, and their imposed “on the ground” costs, along with other Plan development costs, should be “visible” to the management of the Parks Division. New branding efforts for the Glenway experience need some kind of cost/benefit analysis. Especially important will be access to data that shows how much subsidy golf provides (or not) for the alternative uses.

My suggestion is that the implementation of the adopted Plan be identified as a specific cost and revenue collection point within the fiscal reporting apparatus of the Parks Division. This reporting device should encompass all one-time and continuing costs as they are incurred and include the overhead cost of staff time devoted to the Plan’s implementation.

The foregoing does not preclude use of anecdotal or non-fiscal evidence, but it seems to me that additional study is needed by staff to identify what kind of anecdotal or non-fiscal evidence is useful to an overall evaluation and how it should be gathered. The outcome study should be adopted as a formal supplement to the Plan.

A final point is that 2022 will only furnish a partial season’s worth of information. Monitoring the Plan’s implementation should at least run through 2023 in order to provide useful data.

Recommendation for Condition to Plan Acceptance: Staff is directed to return to the Subcommittee within XX [suggestion: 45 days] days a memorandum setting forth reasonable fiscal and non-fiscal metrics, applicable in 2022 and 2023, by which to evaluate the Plan for the transition of Glenway to The Glen Golf Park.

cc: Lisa Laschinger, Assistant Parks Superintendent

From: Owen S Hoytomt <owen.hoytomt@wisc.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, January 26, 2022 5:36 PM
To: parksgolfsub <parksgolfsub2@cityofmadison.com>
Subject: Comments on Golf Subcommittee Agenda Items

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Item 69413 Glenway Golf Parking Programming Plan

The Potential Combined Programming Schedule (page 5) includes 22 hours of non-golf activity between the hours of 7 AM and 8 PM and 69 hours for golf for a total of 91 hours per week. The costs associated with the non-golf activity should be fully supported by the Parks Dept. rather than being charged to the Golf Enterprise Fund (GEF). The costs should include a pro rata share -- 20% to 25% of all maintenance of grounds and building and all salary costs.

The Golf Enterprise Fund had deficit in their Unrestricted Net Position of -\$1,615,060 per the FY2020 Audited Financial Statements. The Recreational Programming does not benefit GEF and will negatively affect the bottom line because there will be significantly fewer hours available for tee times.

Owen Hoytomt
653 Hilltop Dr. Madison

608-515-0300
owen.hoytomt@wisc.edu

From: Michael Varda <vardam-33@uwalumni.com>
Sent: Monday, February 21, 2022 1:04 PM
To: Parks Facilities, Programs and Fees <parksfpf@cityofmadison.com>; Laschinger, Lisa <LLaschinger@cityofmadison.com>; Knepp, Eric <EKnepp@cityofmadison.com>
Cc: Michael Varda <vardam-33@uwalumni.com>
Subject: Comments to Revised Glenway Programming Plan (2022) -- Item 69413 FPF Subcommittee 2-21-2022

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

All,

Attached are my further comments to the Revised Glenway Programming Plan (2022), up for action before the FPF committee this afternoon. I apologize for not getting this to you sooner, but the comments are an elaboration on matters already raised.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Very truly yours,
Michael Varda

February 21, 2022

To: Facilities Programs and Fees Subcommittee (Parks)

From: Michael Varda
Member, Programming Committee project team for Glenway Project

Re: **Comments and Request for Conditions in any adoption of Glenway Golf Park Programming Plan-Revised (2022)**
Agenda Item 69413 for February 21, 2022, Meeting

General Comment: Support with Modifying Condition and a Staff Direction.

As I commented before, the Program Committee was given the difficult task of wrestling intangible goals for multiple uses of Glenway's physical facility. Staff should be thanked for thoughtfully responding to further comments in preparing the Revised Plan. Below are a condition and a potential staff direction.

Costs.

Very importantly, the Revised Plan, chart at page 11, contains a metric for "Cost Analysis of Programming." At the time the line was added at the February 17 team meeting, I thought it was adequate, but I am not so sure now. Having worked with costing issues with the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin for many years, I am aware of a maxim that comes into play here: "Costs are as costs are defined."

--The identified metric line will need an adequate definition of "costs." Costs can be "direct," that is immediately triggered by a program for use of the park, or "indirect," such as extra maintenance that might be needed for a fairway heavily used for an outdoor movie night.

--The clubhouse and grounds costs should be allocated according to when and where golf and alternative uses are occurring. For a rough example, suppose no golf is occurring on Sunday afternoon and the clubhouse is open for public use, shouldn't the allocable portion of the available hours (1/2 times 1/7) of the weekly costs be allocated to alternative programs and not golf? Reasonable allocations can be more complex if the golf and alternate uses and simultaneously using portions of the course. Staff can figure out allocation formula(s).

--There could also be "opportunity costs" in revenues lost altogether. For example, if the Parks Division decides it is unwilling or unable to reach a "mutually beneficial" (Revised Plan, page 10, line 8) arrangement for a league to play at Glenway the way it had prior to the renovation, and the league leaves, then it seems that the alternate uses are at least an indirect cause of the lost revenue. This "cost" should be identified. This does not necessarily mean that the cost is unacceptable. The City can make the qualitative judgement that that cost is acceptable in achieving its other purposes. But the cost should be known and available for all to see.

--Finally, the separate cost accounting should have a starting date. Once the Board of Parks Commissioners has approved a revised Glenway Plan, the date of approval should immediately trigger appropriate internal cost accounting. Necessary accounting program changes and staff instructions for billing should be ready to go upon any final approval of the Revised Plan.

Propose condition attached to the Subcommittee's approval: "Staff is directed to identify direct and indirect alternate use costs, create reasonable allocation formulas for golf and alternate uses of physical facilities, prepare to account for foregone golf league revenues, and prepare accounting for alternate uses upon Revised Plan approval by the Board of Park Commissioners."

Transition:

At the project team meeting on February 17, Ryan Brinza indicated that the return of leagues to Glenway likely could be accommodated. Even if not specifically written into the Revised Plan, the Subcommittee should direct, if appropriate to its oversight, that those longer-season leagues seeking to return to Glenway in 2023 be given a right of first refusal.

cc: Lisa Laschinger, Assistant Parks Superintendent
Eric Knepp