

**VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE  
PARK COMMISSION  
Village Hall, Auditorium  
9915 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Pleasant Prairie, Wisconsin 53158  
Tuesday, May 3, 2005  
6:00 p.m.**

A regular meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Park Commission was held on Tuesday, May 3, 2005, at 6:00 p.m. Present were Michaeline Day, Kathleen Burns, Michael Russert and William Mills. William O'Toole, Glenn Christiansen, Rita Christiansen and Alex Tiahnybok were excused. Also present were Michael Pollocoff, Village Administrator; John Steinbrink, Jr., Superintendent of Parks; and Judith Baternik, Clerical Secretary.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. ROLL CALL**
- 3. MINUTES - APRIL 6, 2005**

Michaeline Day:

In your packet you should have your minutes of April 6, 2005. If anyone has any additions or corrections at all I'd like to entertain a motion to accept the minutes. Any other additions or corrections? Could I have a motion to accept the minutes?

Kathleen Burns:

Motion to accept the minutes.

--:

I second.

Michaeline Day:

All in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

Michaeline Day:

Opposed? Motion is carried for the minutes being approved.

- 4. CITIZEN COMMENTS**

**5. NEW BUSINESS**

**a. Vendor Presentation of Master Park Plan Proposals**

**1. 6:10 p.m. - 6:40 p.m. Bonestroo, Rosene, Anderlik & Associates, Inc.**

Mike Pollocoff:

Thank you, Ms. Day. Tonight we have before us presentations by consultants for the preparation of the Master Park Plan for the Village. We've scheduled 30 minutes for each consultant to make a presentation and include questions and answers that you may have. We have also prepared some questions that the Commission may want to ask. If you have some additional ones that are general in nature I'd ask that you make a note of that question so you can ask it of the next consultant as well. If it's a followup question that's pertinent to something that these consultants would answer that wouldn't be necessary to keep that same question for the following consultant.

John has prepared a scoring sheet for you to use in evaluating the proposals. If you want to go over that, John?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

You should also have a sheet included for the Master Park Plan consultant selection. There are ten categories that we're looking at. Each of them vary in points. Some of them are worth 5 points, some are 10 and some are worth 20. We've used this in other selections of candidates for other proposals and it seemed to work good. So we just kind of tweaked it a little bit to make it relevant for here. So if you want to just put down on each of the ten questions zero being the lowest and either 5, 10 or 20 being the highest. I have also prepared a spreadsheet that will sum up all of the points and at the end of the day the consultant with the highest points will be the consultant selected.

Mike Pollocoff:

If you'd like, Madam Chairman, if you want to designate either John or myself to ask the questions for you so you can take notes, or if you want to ask the questions and do the follow ups.

Michaeline Day:

If it's alright with this Commission, I would prefer it if you guys would ask the questions and that way we would then have time to write it down and evaluate. Then at the end of your prepared questions if anyone else has a question that we could ask afterwards.

Mike Pollocoff:

Feel free to jump in with any followup questions on each one as we go, too.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you.

Paul Lohmiller:

I'm Paul Lohmiller and I'm with Bonestroo Associations and I appreciate the opportunity to be here with you tonight. We're going to talk a little bit about our qualifications to do a Master Park Plan for you. That's going to be primarily presented by Mr. David Burch. He is our landscape architect and the head of our natural resources and park and rec group in our Milwaukee office.

Michaeline Day:

Kathy, I hate to make you move but can you see that okay or did you want to move? You can see okay?

Kathleen Burns:

I can see.

Paul Lohmiller:

Our presentation is going to be broken up into four major components. We're going to talk about how our multi discipline team provides comprehensive planning and a design process for your Master Park Plan; how our experience and knowledge can guide you from start to finish, from vision to implementation. We'll talk about our interactive community process that helps to build awareness and consensus throughout your community for these facilities. And we'll also show you some examples of our proven project approach that helps to generate numerous ideas, different options tailored to your community and what you folks in your community desire. With that, I'm going to turn it over to Dave Burch.

David Burch:

Thanks, Paul. I like to walk around so I may pull this and walk around, but I won't sing and dance tonight, but I may move around. Thanks for having us here. We really appreciate the opportunity to continue our relationship with the Village. We currently do some work with the Village, but I have not done any park or recreation or natural resources type projects for you before. But we're excited for the opportunity. I think that one of the things we bring to the table is we do all of our work for this type of work in house. The team that I lead is really a multi disciplinary team, and we cross groups where we need to, but we have a pretty interesting mix of people that work on that park and natural resource group.

The things we bring to the table are landscape architecture which is key for doing any kind of park work in Wisconsin or anywhere for that matter. Planning, environmental science, natural resource protection those three elements, landscape architecture, planning and environmental science is strength in my background as well as the environmental scientists on our team that will be helping on this project. Brian Lenny

and Katherine McNally, I think most of the time Katherine would be spending on this project. Len, the environmental science resource protection to the team. Engineering and architecture our office has a wide variety of engineers. The types of engineers that we use for park and recreation projects are civil engineers, PE's that have experience with park projects.

Park projects can be more complex than people realize. Just about everything, every gamut of engineering goes into parks and architecture for structures. So we're fortunate to have those people all in one office within earshot of each other to coordinate these kinds of projects from a planning standpoint and from when we get into specific master plans and implementation.

Here's our project team that we've lined up for the Village and it's a great team. Paul would serve as our client service manager, and this would be a regular point of contact to manage QA/QC, make sure that we're delivering everything we promised to deliver to you. And so Paul we'll call him the hammer. He is the one that will be there to make sure we're performing for you on a regular basis. I will serve as project manager and lead the rest of the group. Amy Pakolik is our project engineer. Amy's experience is in environmental engineering and park engineering. She does a lot of trail design, bridge design, layout of athletic fields, has been doing a lot of green way trail planning and corridor connection planning, cross county and multi community type work. And from an engineering standpoint she does a great job with our park and recreation project. She is also involved with aquatic facilities and has experience with splash pads and pools.

Moustafa you may already know, our storm water resources engineer. Any coordination with storm water plan compliance or on site storm water issues we would coordinate with Moustafa and his folks. Tom Menning, water supply engineer. Any issues with running utilities or water into these sites we would certainly coordinate that with Tom. I understand he's doing some water modeling currently with the Village. Rich Blum is our project architect, our lead architect, and has done everything from small comfort stations that are unisex where the client had a \$150,000 budget and no more, to working on a DPW and park office renovation in Port Washington right now. So he can work on very small projects very well and very large projects very well in a park setting.

Eric Johnson is a certified planner but also our GIS person that would be working with us for all our mapping. All our colored deliverables that you see at the end Eric would be taking the lead on producing those maps and exhibits, which is key for public information meetings. When we get into talking about the public and what they expect to see great exhibits go a long way. Katherine McNally will be our environmental scientist in helping with resource issues, helping us look forward to when you do go to develop your parks what kind of permits you're going to need and what is the impact of scheduling costs for those permits.

Bonestroo's experience and knowledge guides you from vision through implementation. I think this is key because we like to be the idea people and work with you, the idea people, and refine that vision, but we also have a skill in taking to phasing it correctly and getting it done. We have a knowledge of comprehensive plans, and it's really your foundation for coordinated efforts. We've seen some communities do master plans for

their various facilities and then do their comprehensive plan only to find out that some of the master plans for specific sites don't line up with what their final comprehensive has shown. So we really recommend going through the comprehensive plan process first and really defining your vision for that, and that will set the foundation for your other park sites, your acquisitions and getting these other facilities designed correctly.

Smart Growth compliance, we see that in all our planning efforts now. It's really important to comply with what the State law says and what everyone is envisioning for January 2010, where we really expect to be going. So in our planning effort we follow that study methodology and try to hit on all those key elements, those nine elements, in Smart Growth law so that when your comprehensive master park plan is done that you've at least addressed in that particular element, called the agricultural, natural and cultural elements, of Smart Growth Compliance.

Community awareness and understanding. I wish we had an audience because it starts with the citizens. We can talk all we want and plan all we want, but really strong public participation is key to successful comprehensive planning and individual site park master plans. Without them on board early, it can be what I call a flaming hoop later when you go to final approval or budgeting for these things. The more people we can get on board early with an awareness the better.

Inventory, you're well on your way to having a good inventory. John gave us a great inventory of what you have for existing parks and what you're thinking in the next couple years. But it starts with a good inventory, knowing what you have and knowing what you want to link up to as far as neighborhoods, schools, other parks, adjacent communities. That inventory is key and we'll help you document that inventory and present it graphically and crisply for the community.

Park master plan process, the comprehensive master plan process for all your parks is a little different than park master planning for your individual sites where we really want to hone in on each site. The unique characteristics of each site, walk the site more than once, be familiar with the neighbors, know the history, now everything we can about the land, the vegetation, any existing improvements on it, waterways, the wildlife, everything we want to know we really dig into that as part of our park master plan process. Phasing implementation plans, cost estimates and funding are all critical for you to properly budget for and sell this to the community. We can't overemphasize the importance of logical phasing when you go to develop these so that it makes some sense financially. And there may be some cost deficiencies in doing certain kinds of work like all the utilities at once or all the mass grading at once or setting the foundation for buildings as long as the concrete person is there. So there's ways to phase and make some sense out of implementation plans.

Cost estimates, we do accurate cost estimates that are based on recent bids from 2004 and phone calls to area contractors. We actually call contractors in the area and say what are your unit prices for this so we can properly help plan the budget for what these projects would cost in the future.

Operational and maintenance plans go with long-term sustainability. If you don't have a

feel for how to maintain these and operate these pieces of land and these parks in the future and what that means for your operational budget, that is just as important to sell these days as what the development costs are. We hear the question all the time at Park Board member meetings, Commission member meetings, well, if you're going to build a \$300,000 park what does that mean for us operationally? Do we have to add staff? How much more acres of mowing is there? Those are just as critical in this master planning process as the development costs.

And community partnerships and consensus. We can help you identify logical partners. You live here and know the community and potential partners, but maybe we can help you come up with ones that you haven't thought of or find the right role for those community partnerships so you can align those with certain parts of the development with these parks.

Comprehensive master park plan process, this is some of the key elements that are included in our process. Again, the Smart Growth law indicates that natural culture and agricultural culture resources are what we look at. Strong public information, overview and existing plans, we want to get a good history which I think we've started that already. Demographic analysis, we want to know what is the current population and the makeup of that population and where is it going. What are the projects based on regional planning and county planning and local planning so we have an idea of how to project five and ten years out.

We want to know an inventory. Facility guidelines are critical because that sets the tone for how your parks will be developed, and when you're working with developers what they can come to expect when they may be working on a new neighborhood park or a park adjacent to a proposed subdivision. Setting those facility design standards are important when it comes to all the amenities, the types of active and passive recreation areas, what the trails look like, how wide the trails are, what materials you're using, lighting, signage, all the amenities like benches and water fountains. Those are all part of the checklist of facility design guidelines that we'll help you with.

Resources, we want to know everything about the land, water, vegetation and wildlife really from a permitting standpoint. The more we know about that from a future permitting, what we need to protect. If we're going to impact it in any way during development of these facilities we want to give the Village an early heads up about what that permit process might be and what permits you might need to procure in order to do the work.

Utilities, we need to plan ahead for the right size utilities in the right location. Circulation, motor vehicle, bicycle, pedestrian, bike and ped plans are big right now and we try to show every possible linkage. Not just loops within the park but how do they link up adjacent areas. Amenities I touched on a little bit and cost estimates. Those are all part of our park plan process.

These are some projects that we've recently been working on and have worked on, Town of Summit Park and Open Space Plan is about a six month effort with Henry Illing, the Administrator and Planner at the Town of Summit. They have a new Commission that

they're working with, too. They have also been struggling with the Aurora Hospital issue and some land use issues in the Town of Summit. You've probably kept track of that one, kind of controversial. So that one is just about wrapped up, but we've come up with a great end product that shows seven or eight new neighborhood parks in the future, a new community park that we helped do the master plan for and then several trail linkages.

Manitowoc County Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan was an effort to help Manitowoc County identify bicycle and ped facilities that they could get funding for and that could be aligned with future roadway projects in Manitowoc County.

Lindenhurst Park District Comprehensive Plan is one that we're working on currently. Lindenhurst is in Illinois, northwest suburb of Chicago. They have a beautiful park district system now but haven't done a comp plan in over ten years. So we're helping them update that and identify the same kinds of things, facility guidelines, future facilities, budgets. And that's one where one of their end goals I know is a community center or aquatic facility for their community.

The Comprehensive Aquatic Facilities Plan, our firm didn't do the comprehensive outdoor recreation plan because their own planners do it in house, but they wanted Bonestroo's expertise to do just the aquatic facilities. They had two old pools and they wanted us to take on just the aquatic facilities plan. We did that plan in about eight months and it has resulted in the first new pool for Waukesha in over 30 years and Horeb Springs aquatic facility. It's a small aquatic facility, 585 bather load, is currently under construction and due to open in July. Park Impact Fees Analysis Plan we're assisting the City of Waukesha to update this for work with developers. The southwest side of Waukesha is booming with development and they need to update what they get for park impact fees from developers when they approach them for new subdivisions.

City of Brookfield Greenway Implementation Plan was one that they had a master plan in place. Our role was to break it down into logical phases. It was really a phasing and implementation plan to help implement a master plan. Some areas were well laid out and others were not feasible and had to be replanned.

City of Manitowoc Park and Recreation Open Space Plan is one that we've recently completed and it was really working with their park and rec department and planning office to try to blend what they had worked on for almost two years and help boil that into a final document and one that could be approved.

These are some representative projects that we worked on that resulted in park master plans, specific sites. Pro Healthcare Park is in New Berlin. That's the upper left. Nature Base Park, a big corridor of wetland and waterway, they need to get some recreation fields in. There's a loop type trail system that goes all the way around the park. There's a formal rose garden here that the local garden club is taking on. Storm water features are all down here, parking, play area, shelter building and a future basketball court. The area for active recreation was limited. This is also the Butler's Garter Snake Habitat, one of the key protected sites in the area, so we had to really do our best to do buffers and preserve this core.

Rivers Crossing Park is on the Fox River on the south side of Waukesha. Again, a lot of nature based preservation trails. This area right here is really packed in with a casual play area, shelter building, future splash pad and a potential for a small parking lot if they want it and playground.

Ozaukee County another nature park with . . . shelter building that's currently under construction, parking, lot of nature trails and a beautiful boardwalk. This is an example of the boardwalk through the cedar swamp.

We won a few awards for some of our projects. New Berlin Calhoun Park was really a water resources storm water job that needed park improvements as well. That one we got some grant money for New Berlin as well we got them an award. It's a very popular park. It has fishing overlooks, trails, playground, shelter building and very popular and now a stable stream.

Tonko park in Greenfield was an old Milwaukee County landfill that had a number of challenges. In fact MMSD had wanted to build a regional detention pond here and decided against it once they remembered it was landfill. So our role was to get a trail system built, get a bridge across the Honey Creek and plan for these future improvements around the shelter building and a future play area and picnic area and shelter building on the south end.

Brookfield Mitchell Park is a beautiful park. The Cherlyn Wilson Art Center is there. We did all the engineering initially and then that led into some park design and landscape architecture. That's a wonderful facility for the City of Brookfield.

We have an interactive community process that builds awareness and consensus. One of our strengths is working with people. Each park master plan needs to comply with the vision set in the comprehensive plan, and we have checkpoints along the way to make sure that the master plan for each park doesn't stray too far from the original vision in that comprehensive plan. We have lots of opportunities for neighborhood input. We've gone into schools to talk, we've gone to libraries, we've gone to area service clubs. We helped send postcards out to invite people to meetings like this where we have design workshops and . . . . So there's lots of opportunities for neighborhood input. We found web based input is getting more and more popular. Send images out on the website and let people comment by e-mail. That works, too, and then we consolidate it and summarize it for you.

Alternative concepts offer choices. Probably one of the biggest values I think we can bring is not just one or two or three alternatives for each park master plan but multiple. We've gone as far as eight and ten alternatives to bring you really a cross-section of the community, what they may be thinking for this particular park, and then help you boil that down to two or three and the finally refine that to one master plan that meets peoples' needs. I think that's one thing that we do very well.

Staff and community input leads to final master plan. Working with you and the staff we'll take all that community input for those multiple alternatives. We'll rank them



numerically uses advantages and disadvantages, or we've done it with swaths, strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats and come up with a numerical ranking so you can say this one was 95 points and we really like this, or we like these elements from a couple different plans and we blend that to the final master plan.

Pleasant Prairie Park, we did visit the three parks that John indicated were a high priority to look at for master plans. Some of the key issues we identified was it was a partially developed park but had some opportunities for some other development. I know that trail linkage was one that he talked about along an interceptor sewer route. Also the acquisition of two to three additional parcels so that we can have a little more area to work with. I know the Village is working on that. Possibly add active use area for soccer as a possibility. There are some ADA challenges there. We need to make that compliant as we do for all the facilities, and there are some challenges there with some path design and hard surface design. We can make that a more compliant facility. Improve the parking lot, upgrade the lighting, and I think those are the key issues that we saw when we visited that site with John.

Carol Beach Unit W in know that it's in close proximity to the Chiwaukee Prairie. A beautiful, beautiful natural resource. That particular Carol Beach park site we looked at was overgrown and had a lack of definition. You don't know what's the park. It looks like a vacant lot basically. And how do we transform that to usable green space? I mean it could be a jewel if designed correctly and treated correctly. Some off street parking would help people get off the existing street. A walking path or a loop path might be appropriate, and really carve out a nice green space within the interior of that park. Dress up the entrance to it so people know it's a park and people can recognize it and treat it as a park. Add some benches and some user amenities, and I think we also talked about maybe a small play area there to serve neighborhood people.

Momper's Woods, it was kind of wet that day. We didn't wander real far in there. We kind of got out of the car and took a few steps and looked and took some pictures, but undeveloped 40 acres. What caught my eye was the mature trees and the sense that it's a woods worth preserving and has some significance because of the stately trees. There is a designation by the Kenosha County Historical Society as a landmark. But it's mostly an opportunity for some passive uses, trails, definitely a land management plan to help you manage the ground layers and what's there to really enhance that wooded area would be something that I think we could really bring to the table. There's probably some environmental education opportunities there with overlooks and stations and talking about the different plant communities. The mature trees I thought were beautiful even though it wasn't the best of days.

We have a proven project approach that's worked time and time again, but it also helps generate innovative ideas. You can't tell it from me talking now, but we really are good listeners when we stop talking. And we do take your ideas and the citizens' ideas and user groups' ideas and make them work and come up with a big list of innovative ideas and really blending those ideas so they work. It starts with a kick off meeting, and this is kind of a review of our scope if you've read our proposal, that really talks about kicking off the meeting with setting mutual expectations and vision and making sure we're all on the same page for goals, objectives, schedule, budget. When and what do we want to

communicate with the public, how are we going to do that, and really sets the parameters for our work together.

Data collection and information gathering we really started that when we first met with John. We have information already that we've collected and gives us a good foundation and understanding for what you have existing. Draft comprehensive plan and site visits we like to get out of the office, and I hope you do, too, because walking the sites and looking at these areas together makes a difference. You and I can sit in a room only so long and talk about a piece of paper or look at a map. Going out and physically looking at these areas with whoever is available and doing site walk throughs is extremely critical to a good process in our minds.

Staff, committee and public information meetings, we've had some meetings where representatives of groups come with us on the site walk throughs. We've had opportunities for the public at meetings like this to comment or at our workshops where we spread out the plans and have three, four or five alternatives and use their comments to generate another one right where we're sitting there. So we like to identify the logical times and places along the schedule where not only the staff and this group makes comments but the public makes comments.

Public information opportunities not everyone comes to these meetings. I've had groups as large as 200 and I've had groups as small as 1. So it depends how publicized and how far in advance it's publicized. But whether or not you get everyone in the Village to come or nobody to come we still need to keep the public informed. Websites, newsletters, those kinds of tools, exhibits at the library, the schools, Prairie Family Days and special events like that go a long way in communicating to the public that this is important and this is the progress that we've made to date.

Final plan and report presentation we've done that as a wrap up really. Here's the result of all the months of work. We do a presentation similar to this but have the bound report, copies that you'll be having before that meeting. And we present the process as well as the results at that presentation. Then we do a project close out at the end to evaluate the success of the project, what could be done differently or better, so if you go through the process again in five years you've learned something from it and it's documented.

We think we can deliver forward thinking plans, and we certainly appreciate the opportunity to be a part of the vision for this community. I think, again, our multi disciplined staff has the experience and knowledge to work with you. I think that our project approach results in innovative ideas and, most importantly, things that people will agree to and get consensus on.

One of the things that we talked about long and hard, one of the ideas we floated amongst ourselves was talking about what we could add that wasn't in your RFP. We're really passionate about long-term sustainability of these facilities. And it's not just coming up with a plan and building those facilities, but what can be done to manage them long term. So we would like to offer land management guidelines for long-term sustainability as part of our comprehensive planning effort and for each of the three master plans for these parks so that you have a tool for the future to help you manage it correctly and hopefully

enhance those facilities for future generations. That's our presentation and we'd certainly be willing to answer any questions.

Mike Pollocoff:

Let me run through some questions. I think some of these you've probably described in your presentation, but I'll give the Commission an opportunity to jump in. I think you've described your firm's experience in developing comprehensive master park plans in your presentation. Anybody need to hear more on that? The next question is the role of key personnel listed in your proposal to complete the above-mentioned comprehensive plans. In your proposal you listed out yourself and some of the other personnel. Can you give me a feel for the extent of involvement of yourself or the key contacts that are going to be working on this?

David Burch:

The people that are listed, and let me just pull out our proposal, I would be taking a lead role on it. And the people in the group that I mentioned, Amy Pakolik would also have a substantial role in this. Amy also has skills in public facilitation and public meetings. So a lot of times if it's a big crowd we'll work the room together. I recommend that anyway because not just one person can handle everyone's concerns at one time. So Amy from an engineering standpoint you would see her face quite a bit in this process. Moustafa you'll only see him if we have some tricky storm water issues or any coordination with storm water management planning. Same with Tom if there's any water issues. Rich you may see more often than not because a lot of our final master plans have architectural components, and that's also important from the facility guidelines that the architectural component we would want Rich involved with that process. I think those would be the key people that you would see.

Mike Pollocoff:

Any changes in personnel through the process would be notified ahead of time if someone drops off the project and goes somewhere else?

David Burch:

If that happens, I would call John immediately and say this is how we're going to fill that gap. I mean we would have a plan. Before I made that phone call I would have a plan in place for fulfilling our responsibilities.

--:

If we're awarded this contract, these are the people who will--

Mike Pollocoff:

Who will finish it up, okay. I think for our question number three you've explained the persons and the backgrounds that would prepare the plan. Can you give me a quick

summary of recent projects you've managed in relation to your estimate of time for task.

David Burch:

The Town of Summit, I'll use that as a good example, originally wanted that to be a four to five month process. They had a change over in some of their committee people. They also got impacted by other emergencies I'll call it. Aurora Hospital took Henry, he's a one man staff there, took him away from focusing on response to what we had given him. I think that's the variable that in any planning effort if we provide something to you, and if something comes up where we don't get responses or input back, it's hard for us to progress. I think that's the variable on managing these kinds of projects is having a good understanding that this task is going to take us four weeks to do, we're going to turn it back to you and you're going to have three or four weeks to respond and get it back, I think that is ongoing dialogue that has to happen pretty regularly to make sure we're staying on schedule and setting benchmark dates. And those benchmark dates are usually your committee meetings or another Village Board type update where we need to have shown progress. I think that we have those checkpoints in place in our schedule.

Mike Pollocoff:

What are the key park features your firm will design into the comprehensive master park plan.

David Burch:

I want to clarify your question. You mean what components of the plan?

Mike Pollocoff:

I think you've addressed those, but I guess what do you view as the most critical key component. You've outlined the components of the master park plan.

David Burch:

We've really tried to align our features or elements of our plan with the Smart Growth requirement so that you're positioned well to take that and incorporate that into a bigger Village comprehensive plan. Public participation is a big component of that. Another one is a good inventory of what you have. Preservation of the natural resource base is a big component and really identifying and knowing what is important to save and not impact future development.

But the other tool that I think is important is good, accurate cost estimating and the ability to use that for negotiating things like park impact fees and negotiating with developers when they come in to do a subdivision adjacent to that piece of land knowing here's the value of what we need to have in this park and this is what you need to step up with from a development standpoint.

Mike Pollocoff:

As a followup to that question, in your proposal you identified on your chart two specific occurrences where public input was going to be received. Then you also mentioned the other thing such as newsletters and websites. Are your efforts going to be focused in on those two points of input that's proposed in the chart?

David Burch:

We put two in there because we found that two are more effective than one. Sometimes that first public informational meeting--I'll use a real example. The City of Delafield the other night we did one of three public design workshops about a specific 40 acre parcel we're designing. We asked the people there how would you like us to communicate with you? How would you like to be informed and what do you think the community is expecting? From that meeting we got plenty of input on what they want us to do. I think that first public meeting is really a good gauge to find out how people want to be communicated with. We've taken comment cards from those meetings and turned them into PDF files that you can put right on your website, turned those into exhibits that you can post at the schools. I think we work together with you to identify the best way to do that outreach.

Mike Pollocoff:

So you would prepare documents or files for us to load up on our website or to reproduce into our newsletter to get out?

David Burch:

Yes. Let us know what format that is and we'll give you something that you can use to plug right in.

Mike Pollocoff:

What are the applicable industry standards to gauge the work effort that it may take to complete some work tasks identified?

David Burch:

I'll start at the national level. The National Recreation Park Association we typically use their standards for such things as service radius for certain types of parks, what service radius for population served, what level of service is needed to serve that service area. They have national standards for comprehensive planning and for park design that we work. The Wisconsin Park and Recreation Association has their guidelines that we also use. The State of Wisconsin Smart Growth law is another industry standard that we would use. If we get so far as beyond the scope of this work doing construction documents there's another series of standards that we use to develop plans and specs and cost estimates for those specific projects. But those are probably the three key industry standards.

But we also like to know what the Regional Planning Commission standards are, County standards, and when we're linking up trails what the area community standards are, because when you get to linking up facilities or even sharing some resources we really need to know the standards for the area communities, the county and the regional standards, state standards and then national standards. So we try to touch all of those.

Mike Pollocoff:

Is there anything we didn't include in the RFP that we should have?

David Burch:

I don't think so. We had a good site walk through with John.

Mike Pollocoff:

No limitations?

David Burch:

We didn't identify any that we saw were limitations. I know one thing that we always ask, if I could say one thing it would be sometimes it's hard to figure out what your idea of the final deliverable should look like, the final report or the final exhibit, a level of standard of that. And we usually get at that at the kickoff meeting.

Mike Pollocoff:

Explain the larger and specific tasks that you are expecting the Village to perform.

David Burch:

I think one of the rolls that you can play is help spread the word. A lot of it is word of mouth in a community of this is what's happening. Tell neighbors, family, friends that there's a process that we need public input on. Review time, when we have a schedule in place and we provide you with a draft document we need to stick to that schedule to keep up on schedule. So we need fairly prompt reaction to, whether it's good or bad or whatever your comments are. We need pretty quick response on what your comments are on that draft document so that we can keep going. We're big into meeting minutes and documentation that actually goes into our bound report at the end as an appendices, and I think when we produce those minutes we send them to whoever the Village contact is, and I assume it's going to be John, for comment and then publish those. That's usually within about a week of the meeting. So I guess it's reaction time.

Mike Pollocoff:

I guess in a synopsis why should the Village select your firm to complete our master comp plan?

David Burch:

Number one we really do have a passion for these kinds of projects. We really do enjoy and have fun working on comprehensive plans, master plans, knowing that someday two, three, five, ten years down the road we'll be able to drive by and kids will be playing there and families will be enjoying these spaces. We have a strong commitment to stewardship of the land and protecting environmental resources. For that reason we have a good relationship with the DNR which helps position communities for money and getting grants in the future. I also think that protecting the environment is one of our charges. It's one of the things we need to do when we design anything is how do we protect the resources we're given.

I think our multi disciplined staff in house all sitting within ear shot of each other is an advantage to you. We talk to each other every day. Projects like this we have regular internal meetings that you never see but it helps us brainstorm, stay on track in making sure we're meeting your needs.

Mike Pollocoff:

Do the Commissioners have any additional questions?

Michaeline Day:

Does this committee have any questions for Dave at all?

Bill Mills:

Just one question. You talk about the draft documents that you're going to provide us. What do you have built into your project execution schedule for us to return those draft documents?

David Burch:

We usually pin that down at the kickoff meeting. And one of the questions I ask is when we provide you with a chapter, we usually break it into chapters. We don't say here's the whole document and could you review it in a week. We break into the chapters. How much time do you think it will take for you to review it and comment and get it back to John and then get it back to us? I think we work that out at the kickoff meeting. Usually two to three weeks is what we a lot for that. Each community is a little bit different about how much they want to see.

Kathleen Burns:

You mentioned that you won a couple of awards. What entity awarded those?

David Burch:

I'm sorry, I didn't say that. Wisconsin Park and Recreation Association were the awards.

They have a variety of categories. Typically at the end of the year right before the fall conference in November they ask communities and/or consultants to submit projects that they think are worthy of the awards. It's the Wisconsin Park and Recreation Association.

Michaeline Day:

Dave, we do have a pretty aggressive schedule here, and I guess I'm going to again ask do you find you're going to have any trouble meeting the schedule by getting it done in the projected time? I guess Mike asked the question a little bit about relation to the estimate of time per task. Are we being realistic or are you being realistic in getting this done here, or are you just saying, yeah, we'll get it done and not really in our time?

David Burch:

No, I think it's still a realistic schedule, and we have the horsepower right now to do it.

Paul Lohmiller:

Would you call it aggressive? Would you characterize it as that?

David Burch:

The variable is the public. That's what speeds you up or slows you down and it usually slows you down when you want to get lots of input for consensus, but it can also be, well, we want to think about it a little bit. And it really depends on how far in advance we tell them. If you've told them we're going through this process already either through your website or are about to begin the process that helps speed the process up.

Michaeline Day:

And as a followup, as your work schedule is going or your backlog of work going, you mentioned Amy and Rick and you yourself. Are these people going to be exclusively on our project or are they working on four or five other projects at the same time that that could always be a time constraint? As a contractor I do know that at certain issues you think you've got a window of opportunity and then something else comes up and now you're trying to juggle four or five projects at the same time.

David Burch:

Good question. This is not the only project that any of us are working on. We all are working on multiple projects. But what we want to do is make sure we've allotted, especially when it comes time for the public meetings and updating the Board and committee type meetings schedule those very early in advance. We have availability to do this as per the schedule but it's not the only project we're working on.

Mike Russert:

On one of your slides you mentioned possible funding resources. Are there grants



available to help pay for the project?

David Burch:

There are planning grants that you would have had to apply for already to do this process. But there are acquisition and development grants through the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources Stewardship fund. Any water related projects there's Recreational Boating Facilities funds which is really through the Wisconsin Waterways Commission. There are trail funds available both through the Department of Transportation and through DNR. There's also opportunities for local foundations, if you have some strong local foundations or businesses to in the cost estimate identify here's a component or a playground. It's value is \$35,000. I don't know if you have a gift catalog yet, but it's something that all park and recreation departments and villages and communities need to have is when people go to plan their estate or decide what they want to donate every year, if you have a piece that is a list of potential development projects with their value and get that out in the businesses and large families that have some foundations and trust funds you may find that you get some donations that way.

Mike Pollocoff:

Okay, thank you.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you very much.

Paul Lohmiller:

I've got to add one shameless commercial to let you know, and it's my fault that I didn't do it early on, but we are currently working in your community. Moustafa works on storm water management issues right now. Tom Menning is working on a water system computer modeling program right now. We are anxiously awaiting to do some construction services for you, and our firm had a hand in the ice pads at the IcePlex. So we do have a history and we have some experience in your community and we look forward to doing so again. Thank you very much.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you.

(Inaudible)

Michaeline Day:

Oh, gosh, no. That's why I'm saying nobody has anything for you to do and then all of a sudden you've got 15 things coming up and then you're trying to juggle schedules, and somebody gets shoved aside, usually the one who does the least complaining.

--:

How does that work in the fall when everybody wants their projects blacktopped before deer season.

Michaeline Day:

Yes, and in Wisconsin it's a national holiday, too.

David Burch:

That's why I mentioned the chapter by chapter thing, because we found that's the way . . . chapter by chapter . . . .

Michaeline Day:

Thank you.

David Burch:

Thank you very much.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I guess I just wanted to take a minute while it's fresh in your mind to go through that point sheet. We can take a couple minutes before Crispell and Vandewalle come in to answer the question and assign points so it's as fair as possible.

Michaeline Day:

So the scale is zero to 10 or zero to 20.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I made up a spreadsheet.

Michaeline Day:

So as far as like question number four, previous experience and related projects, you would be best because you checked the references of these people, correct?

Mike Pollocoff:

I think I would just evaluate that question on what they presented to us and the presentation.

Michaeline Day:

Because you could have called Lindenhurst and they could have said they're okay, but.

(Inaudible)

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Is everybody ready for the next presentation?

Voices:

Yes.

**2. 6:40 p.m. - 7:10 p.m. Crispell-Snyder, Inc. w/ Vandewalle & Associates**

Mike Pollocoff:

What we'd like to do is have you make your presentation, then we'll have some questions to follow up and a little bit of interaction and we'll go from there.

Todd Weik:

Good evening. My name is Todd Weik. I'm with Crispell-Snyder Engineers. Joining me tonight is Makela Mangrich and Jim Schaefer with Vandewalle & Associates. We'd like to thank you for giving us this opportunity to present our vision for the comprehensive planning of your park project here in the Village.

Tonight's presentation is going to be based in basically four parts. We're going to be talking a little bit about our planning and design experience. We're going to talk about some of the general planning approaches that we're going to use in order to put this park plan together. We're going to talk about how we're going to maintain our schedules and our budgets so we get the project done on time and within the budget. And we're going to talk about our team approach on how we're going to get this completed.

We formed this team because we felt that Vandewalle can bring to the table unparalleled . . . amount of planning knowledge that really there isn't anybody in the State that can match, along with Crispell-Snyder's experience with the Village. We've been around for roughly 25 years working on various Village projects and have a very unique understanding of the Village. So combining those two elements we feel that we can give you what we think will be the best comprehensive outdoor recreation plan that you can possibly have. So with that I'm going to let Makela take over here and continue with the presentation. She's the project manager on the project.

Makela Mangrich:

I'm going to be the project manager on this project. I'm with Vandewalle & Associates. We're Wisconsin's largest planning-only firm. We do design services, urban planning services, park planning services and a lot of comprehensive plans. We do economic

development and redevelopment planning, a lot of TIF work . . . we've been around for about 25 years. We have one office right now and that's in Madison. We're opening a Milwaukee office in June and that's sort of a big deal for us so we've always been in Madison, we love being in Madison. We have a lot of collaboration in our company between our design team and our planners and our economic development specialists. So we're really a very comprehensive team of professionals. So having an office in Milwaukee would be nice, though, because we have so many projects in this part of the world.

One of the things that we pride ourselves on is having long-term relationships with our clients, and . . . but we really have clients that we've been working with for all of those 25 years. And we really love being involved in the projects here in the Village . . . . so as part of this project Vandewalle & Associates would be the overall project managers of this project. We would lead public participation events and we would be developing the planned document.

We are a diverse team of experienced planners and designers. The team is the three people you see there. Mark Roffers is my boss. He would be the principal-in-charge of this project. He would be involved in quality control and assurance of all the deliverables that go out. He's done a zillion park plans. He is a meticulous manager and has . . . attention to detail. We work very well together. Mark basically guides the overall process and provides direction to the project manager. I would be drafting the document. I would be doing the analysis . . . . public participation efforts and basically organizing and keeping things on track, keeping us on schedule and under budget. And Jim Schaefer is our registered landscape architect. He will be talking in a second about his park planning experience . . .

I'm going to talk a little bit about our park planning experience in particular. This map shows a graphic just of this part of the world, southeastern Wisconsin and Northern Illinois of the park plans that we have done. We've done a whole host of other planning projects for these communities, comp plans the whole gamut, but these are the communities that we've actually done park plans. As you can see the Village of Pleasant Prairie is really right in line with where we're already working. We recently completed in 2002 the Village of Silver Lake's park plan. That's probably your nearest neighbor.

Our general approach to park planning is fairly straightforward. Although we customize every project to our client's needs, there is an overall structure that we always follow. We do our homework at first. We do our data collection and review . . . plans. We look at existing . . . in the community. We assess the community's needs through a variety of ways. We try to figure out what is going to be needed in the future through population projections and that sort of thing, and then we also involve the public in helping us understand what their needs are and what their desires are for the future. We work with the Village or the municipality to set goals and objectives for the plan to sort of steer the overall policy and direction of what we're trying to do or accomplish in this plan. Then the outlying detailed facility recommendations and priorities. It's great to have a whole list of things we have to do, but we will also help you to prioritize what you need to be doing first, second and third. And then, of course, every plan needs an implementation chapter. We don't just have a couple of sentences. We really focus all of our planning

projects, not just park plans, all of our planning projects and how you get these things done. We believe very strongly in building plans that are real . . . . So in order to do that we provide . . . recommendations or ideas and other ways that we can involve the community in getting behind implementing a park plan and implementing this vision that we can create and articulate in these plans.

So a couple of recent projects that I'll talk about using that general approach. Two projects that you can look through, the Village of Grafton and the City of Whitewater were pretty straightforward planning projects. Then this one I'm handing out over here I'll talk about in a sec and it's a little bit different. Mark Roffers was the principal-in-charge of these projects. The map there is just an analysis of the existing park service areas. We mapped all the existing parks and then we looked at the service areas. As you probably know the National Park and Recreation Association specifies certain standards. A community park, for instance, services an area of about a mile and half diameter. So we can map those areas to understand what those service areas are for the different park types. The map on the right is recommended park and open space facilities for the Village of Grafton. We we've mapped, again, parks, existing parks, new parks and looked at some of those service areas for those parks.

Another project that we worked on is a conservation district plan . . . . This was for a conservation district which is a governmental agency in central Illinois right around Decatur . . . . we did some organizational planning . . . and we also helped in identifying conservation priorities to link up some of their existing natural areas to make those conservation areas more intact . . . functioning a little bit better there. Then we also worked with a subconsultant on this project, and that subconsultant helped us identify management strategies . . . . so they identified management strategies for native species and habitat for some of the species that they were trying to manage . . . . on time and under budget and a wonderful project and . . . a reference for us . . . .

(Inaudible)

Jim Schaefer:

Thanks, Makela. Thank you for taking the time for . . . I've been a landscape architect doing detailed . . . work for sites, parks . . . commercial . . . for about 12 years, and I'd be delighted . . . Pleasant Prairie . . . the previous eight years . . . Vandewalle & Associates I've worked in the Milwaukee area . . . . I think one of the best . . . Harborpark which I'm guessing some of you are familiar with, the interesting use of the Chrysler site . . . wonderful park system and multi use . . . interesting use . . . pathways . . . waterfront features, nice amenities . . . something I did last week in about a half a day . . . two park plans for the City of Montello . . . stewardship grant and they really worked together on the park plans and graphics . . .

(Inaudible)

Is this mike on? Can you hear me? . . . this is going way back. My first job actually I worked for a firm that really specialized in park design . . . this is one of a series of park plans for a State park . . . did three or four of these . . . just a demonstration. We have a

very good feel for how space should be laid out . . .this is something I just recently did for the City of . . . . this park space has now been surrounded by housing . . . . Fitchburg really because it's growing so fast really doesn't have some of those . . . meeting places, but this is the closest thing they have . . . reflect opportunities . . . nice custom features . . . I do think it's important not to set the mark too low. You have to start high and figure out . . . so that long range . . .

(Inaudible)

Todd Weik:

Crispell-Snyder, as some of you may or may not know has been involved with engineering work here in Pleasant Prairie for over 25 years. In fact up until about three years we were your engineer for everything . . . basically all of your engineering work. So Crispell-Snyder is actually like an historical depository for all of the infrastructure and engineering plans that have been completed for basically all the projects in the community. And it will be very handy to have that historic knowledge to bring to the table when we're doing this park plan. We won't have to ask you guys for a lot of stuff . . . so we'll work real close with Vandewalle to make sure that data is given to them and that there's a seamless interaction between the two of us and their needs from an engineering perspective and to a certain degree our experience in recreation planning.

I'd like to talk a little bit about that. A few years back in Pleasant Prairie, of course, and Mike was part of this whole process . . . and Jean and Mike really were instrumental in bringing the RecPlex to essentially fruition. And we have a picture up there and you all know what it looks like. But we got involved with everything from concept definition all the way up through construction development, how the parking lots work, how the utilities get to the facility and so on and so forth. And we continue to do that now with the hockey facility. I think it's also important to find out that Crispell-Snyder has also given something back to the community. We continue to be a corporate sponsor for some of your recreation programs to continue at the RecPlex. So not only have you provided us with fees and assigned opportunities, but we've turned around and said, okay, we're going to give something back to the community, too.

A little bit about some of my background in park and rec work and also in engineering work is I actually work at Crispell-Snyder as the director of water resources and storm water management, but I also have very extensive background in park and recreation planning. I've authored numerous park and recreation plans for communities like Hartland, Mukwonago and recently Sturtevant. And I, too, believe that plans have to be developed that you can implement. You have to have a plan that identifies all the elements that need to be addressed when looking at stewardship grant applications or look at issues related to whether or not a park can be filled. And that all goes to the idea of paying attention to the details. Can you get infrastructure out there? Are there wetlands that you've got to work around? Is the site actually a developable site? And as part of that process and ultimately the grant you want to be able to build a park.

So I threw a couple pictures of parks up here that I designed, master plan designed . . . actually came out of two of those particular plans. On the left here is . . . Park. It's a 135

acre park site along Highway 43 in the Village of Mukwonago. It used to be called the small farm park until they have the competition to call it Minnewoken. I don't know what that means. I think it means walking water or something like that. But, anyway, it's a four phase project. The first phase included the development of this area right here which is all soccer fields, four plex baseball, four or five soccer fields in here, there's a football field, there's a couple of softball diamonds. It goes along the rear here and it goes along the highway corridor and comes back up here. Here is camping and more active rec areas along here . . . there a beautiful old oak savannah along here where they'll put picnic areas and structures such like that. And then there will be a trail system that runs through the whole thing. We had to bring sewer and water out to the site because we wanted to provide, obviously, for bathroom facilities and shelters. And another interesting item of that park is that there are three archeological Indian site . . . along the interpretive trail that was planned for it.

The other park here is Army park in the Village of Sussex. A fairly standard park. There's nothing that dramatic or unique about it except for this piece right here which is an ice skating rink in the winter and it's a roller skating, board . . . in the summer. Sort of the challenge there was to be able to bring water to that area so they could flood it and keep it flooded in the wintertime and yet be able to drain it so that you actually had a pond that was dry in the summertime. So there were a couple of challenges. it was an extremely flat site so it was a real challenge to move water from point A to point B. So that was one of the challenges that I had to face from a . . . perspective. That's something we'll look at when we're evaluating sites here in Pleasant Prairie. Do they have drainage problems? Can we get the infrastructure to them? Is there infrastructure out there? With our historic knowledge of the community we've got those resources that we can provide that information and make sure those sites are developable.

Makela Mangrich:

We're going to talk a little bit about the project approach and the time line for the project. I've broken this down into eight major tasks. Task one is where we assemble that background information . . . look at the park impact fee document that you all have worked very hard on. This has a lot of great information on what we would plan to do. A lot of this data is . . . review it, make sure that it meets all the standards, and basically incorporate it as much as we can into the plan. That's one of the reasons we felt very comfortable that we could do this project for the amount that we proposed because so much of this legwork has already been done and it looks great from what I've seen, and Mark has seen it as well and said they've got the . . . of a park plan ready to go.

Task two would involve a free park and open space vision workshop. This is a two to three hour large public meeting that we would have to better understand the community's needs. It would inform all of the recommendations and decision making that we all make together later on in the process.

Task three is an opportunities analysis. That's where we put all this information together and start looking at where the needs are and where and how we can start meeting those on that . . . based on population growth, based on what the public said in the vision workshop.

Task four is not real glamorous but it's basically where we put it all together. We package it in a planned document.

Task five is where we prepare the concept site plans for five parks. What we've decided to do, and I know your RFP specified that you wanted us to create detailed park designs for a variety of parks. There were I think 19 parks listed, 11 new ones and 8 existing ones where there would need to be work done. What we would like to propose to you is creating detailed concept plans for five of those parks. And those would be high priority parks that you plan to implement in the next five years. The reason for that is that there's no sense in creating detailed concept plans for all of your parks because you're going to probably need to update this park plan to five more years to maintain stewardship, eligibility for stewardship . . . so what we would like to do is really use your resources wisely and put that towards Jim's time in developing fairly detailed concept plans for five parks.

Now for all of the other parks that don't make that high priority list, what I would like to do or propose to you is that we review the recommended park facility infrastructure that you recommended in this document . . . so what we would want to do here is look at these recommendations and start doing some conceptual . . . and analysis on how feasible these ideas are, so that then you take that information as a basis for your next . . . if that makes sense. So that you're really targeting your resources on this plan . . . five parks that you're pretty certain you're going to be actually building in the next couple of years . . .

Task six is where we develop final recommendations and draft the whole document, the whole plan. We want to make sure that you have time to review that.

This public hearing in task seven would be either a public hearing or open house, however you wanted to do it. That would make sure that the public had time to . . . the plan. It's also . . . DNR to review the document to see if they had any suggestions.

And then task eight is where we would . . . revision on the document and then work with each of the document plans. We've identified an 11 month time frame to accomplish this work, and we've outlined budget amounts for each tasks.

A couple of notes on costs. The reason that we've come up with these numbers, they're not rounded to the nearest tenth, but what we're doing here is giving you our best guess of what these things are going to cost. Todd, Jim, Mark and I have all reviewed it with other projects like this. We've tweaked numbers. We've gotten it to the point that we're very comfortable with what these numbers are based on our experience and what we think it will take. We know where the pitfalls are and we know how to avoid them, and that's why it's a very streamlined budget.

Another note, we use administrative staff . . . I've never seen an organization work as well including people doing tasks that are appropriate to their abilities. You're never going to see Mark Roffers making copies. I promise you. Not at this billing rate. We've got people to do that. Nicole is our assistant. She rocks. She's great. She's been with us



forever and she bills a fairly low rate and . . . doing that stuff. So we just use our resources very effectively, and I want to make sure you know there's not a lot of fat . . .

You asked us what your role needs to be in this project. Not a lot basically. I need you to help me understand the local conditions, get some data put together. Todd mentioned we already have a lot of this information, but that would be an expectation of ours that you help with that. Of course, you need to help us guide the policy direction of the plan, listening to what the public says, helping us interpret that, and then making some of those tough calls about what your policy decisions are going to be. I will give you the information hopefully that will give you--I will give you all of the information that you will need to make that decision, but you all will be making the decisions . . .

And then finally . . . community just to provide that . . . that you all are involved in this, that you are interested in it . . . just shows your commitment.

So in closing why you should use . . . we have the local knowledge, the ties . . . create this plan . . . visionary . . . and create . . . vision . . . This is important for funding. And it's important also to get the public behind you to implement these projects. We also are experts in . . . we've got Jim on our team for par design, he does that very well, and Todd as well to help us with that detailed park designing . . . And then finally our . . . responsive and participation-based. We really like . . . love working with the public and we're very proud. And with that we can open it up to questions you may have.

Mike Pollocoff:

Our first question is your experience developing comprehensive master park plans, but I think everybody is comfortable with that. There's a followup to that, though, with respect to the public participation component of the plan. You identified I think it was a month or \$1,800 for the vision workshop. Would that be your primary outside of the public hearing where you would select information or disseminate information to the public?

Makela Mangrich:

Yes. There would be two large scale public participation events, the vision workshop and that public hearing/open house at the end of the project. That said, there are . . . series of meetings throughout the process, and all of those meetings would be open to the public, so they would be noticed as public meetings . . . public commentary. If you would like to do additional public participation events, I would be so happy to accommodate you. We do survey . . . we also do some interesting public participation, some interesting events involving we call it the home town . . . survey where we give people cameras to take pictures of their favorite places and their not so favorite places in the community, and we would focus it specifically on natural areas. We did that for the Macon County Conservation District plan. That helped us understand what people really liked and what they didn't like about their open spaces, and also it helped us to get some . . . I've not scoped any of those in this . . . if you would like I can give you costs for what those would be. The special places notice survey can be fairly expensive. We give people disposable cameras . . . steering committee if you like or pick someone from your

church or whatever. That usually runs about \$1,000 to do that.

The survey would really depend on how many households it went out to. Generally it's about a buck a pop. So if you wanted it to go out to about 7,000 households it would be about \$7,000. So that just adds a level of costs to the project that we kind of kicked it back and forth but it's really going to be up to you when we go through contract negotiations as to what you wanted to add. But those are a couple of ideas that you can consider.

Mike Pollocoff:

Would you be able to provide the Village for us to post up on the website . . . concept plans for feedback as we move along the process?

Makela Mangrich:

Absolutely. The way that we would do that is basically provide it to you as a PDF or a JPEG for you to post and make it small enough in file size so that you could have people with dial ups still be to download. We have a low res and a high res version of that. We didn't mention that in the scope but it's definitely part of what I would expect . . . .

Jim Schaefer:

Just the very nature of the way documents . . . there are a lot of really cool . . . photo shop and demonstrate . . . so everything we do have today is easily transmitted to you . . . .

Mike Pollocoff:

I think you've described the role of key personnel and proposal. One of the things the Village requests is there any anticipation that some of those personnel could be pulled up the project due to upcoming work?

Makela Mangrich:

That's a good question. When we scope projects we don't do the bait switch approach. Generally, the key people that we outline in the proposal are the people that are going to be doing the project. We have the capacity to do this project. I personally have a project that completes in the end of May so my capacity opens up the beginning of June. Generally we don't try to even go through the process of any projects unless we know we can do them because it wastes everybody time.

Jim Schaefer:

Just to add to that, part of what we submitted identified . . . assisting in doing that. He's a ten year veteran of engineering. He does a lot of public works and does a lot of storm water work . . . and he'll be assisting me in putting that stuff together. So there is some assistance coming from my end but it's jut Rich and I. So what you see is what you get.

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

I think we covered number three, explain the person and his background who will be doing the master park planning. Can you give a brief summary of recent projects that you managed in your relation of estimate of time per task.

Makela Mangrich:

Yes, we asked for clarification on this question. Tell me more about that. I don't really understand that question. Do you want me to talk about like the Macon County Conservation District and what costs are associated with tasks based on that?

Mike Pollocoff:

Or if you can give me a similar plan in scope and the extent to which you were able to make your project estimates.

Makela Mangrich:

With the Macon County Conservation District it was a \$91,000 project. We spend about \$96,000 on it so we went about \$5,000 over, but obviously . . . that's because I'm a little bit of a perfectionist on all this and I want it to be just right. I really wanted to do a good job for the client. In terms of tasks, per task I don't think we really went over on any single task except maybe the vision workshop. The vision workshops always vary based on how many people come, how much prep time the municipality or the orientation wants, how involved they become. The more involved they become the less that I have to do in terms of getting publicity and all that. And, obviously, the more people come the more comments we have to report at the end of things that people told us. So that one varies a little bit. I think that's the only one that I recall can sometimes go over . . . because there's just know way to know . . . .

Mike Pollocoff:

What are the key park features your firm will design into the comprehensive master park plan.

Makela Mangrich:

It would vary quite a bit based on what the public said and what you all want.

--:

We sort of assumed that the question was directed at physical . . . .

Mike Pollocoff:

I think a lot of firms have a hallmark concept that they like to design into a park plan, a comprehensive plan. Do you have that and what is it?

--:

I don't think there's any hallmark or trademark or typical thing in our design plan. We're really trying to figure out what it is . . . community tick. I can't honestly say that I know that right now . . . learn about this community.

(Inaudible)

Makela Mangrich:

Something I'll add to that is we are up to date and current on a lot of the new ideas . . . related to . . . parks and all the new ideas. But I really don't think it's my place to say this is what you all need. That said, I can give you great options and we can talk about what those look like and how they play out based on demographics.

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

What are the applicable industry standards to gauge the work effort that it may complete some work tasks identified.

Makela Mangrich:

Applicable standards would be the National Park and Recreation Association standards for . . . . I would probably rely on . . . population projections, unless you all had population projections that you wanted to use instead. I know you had some updated . . . that would be fine. And in terms of methodology I talked a little bit about methodologies, but all of our methodologies use the most current data and . . . appropriate for projections.

Todd Weik:

And I'd like to just add going back to the engineering aspects of looking at parks, there are new state regulations out there . . . performance standards . . . storing water . . . as well as issues related to wetland developments and developments close to wetlands . . . so from a perspective of planning, we're going to take a look at how those regulations might affect the park plan . . . what are its attributes and what are its pitfalls. Certainly we have to take into account those State standards related to those particular attributes in order to give you a viable park plan that makes some sense in that we're not just going to say that farm field looks good and find out it's three quarters wetland . . . alternative analysis . . . so we're very familiar with the State regulations. I was part of the team that was helping write the . . . so I'm very familiar with it. And I was part of the team that has written the State standards for all the erosion control standards that are now published on the DNR website. So I'm very familiar with those issues and we'll bring that the table

also . . . .

Mike Pollocoff:

A follow up question on this is given the fact that your proposal focuses in on detailed planning for five parks, how suitable will this park plan be for inclusion and submission as we develop our Smart Growth plan?

Makela Mangrich:

Your park plan should be adopted as a subcomponent of that Smart Growth plan in order to make it as fully legal as possible. Basically what you do is when you're finished with your comprehensive plan you will create a resolution--or actually when you adopt your comprehensive plan, that adopting resolution or adopting ordinance you will say in this process we are also adopting our comprehensive outdoor recreation plan as created as of a date in 2005. The reason that we recommend you do that is because, as you all know, in 2010 all of your land use decisions should be consistent with that comprehensive plan, so that means that planning documents that you create and that we all create here together in 2005 will have the full weight of the law behind it in 2010. So in other words you have other people that come in and let's say they decide that the park plan that we identified they don't like it and they want to change it all. Well, they can do that, but what they'll need to do is also update your comprehensive plan. And in order to update your comp plan there's a four step process . . . you have to follow that and notify by public hearing, Plan Commission resolution and then . . . for adoption. So it's a process. It doesn't mean that this park plan is set in stone, but it means that there's got to be . . . if you want to change that. And actually in 2010 you'll probably be modifying that anyway.

Mike Pollocoff:

So coming back to the one part of my question, if we the plan focuses in with detailed planning on five parks and this is what we roll into our Smart Growth plan, how adaptable under your proposed format will that be as opposed to what was identified in the RFP?

Makela Mangrich:

What I understand you wanted in the original RFP was detailed site plans for 15 parks or all of the parks. By putting together site specific plans for only five, it allows you to implement the vision of those in the near term in the next five years and then when you update in the next five years you can do . . . I'm having trouble making the link between that detailed planning and Smart Growth.

Mike Pollocoff:

When we go to update the park plan what the Village is seeking is not to be stuck in a cycle where we have to update the comprehensive plan because we're updating our park plan. And if our park plan is really set for five parks to have detailed work, my question

is the base park plan under your proposal going to meet the requirements for Smart Growth, or if we focus our efforts on five parks is the detail going to be sufficient for the remaining parks that don't have detailed planning to meet the requirements for Smart Growth.

Makela Mangrich:

Yes, they will be. The requirements for Smart Growth for the agricultural and cultural resources chapter of your Smart Growth comprehensive plan those requirements are so general that you will be able to meet those requirements with your park plan basically modifying that park plan . . . . Does that answer your question?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes.

Jim Schaefer:

I think what you're getting at is there going to be enough detail in the park plan since there's so many and we're saying . . . . yes. Basically the design for all the parks . . . they don't ask for a concept diagram.

Mike Pollocoff:

I just didn't know how much you were going to skinny it up to work on the five.

Jim Schaefer:

(Inaudible). . . really detailed . . . but to do that for 20 parks that would a half million dollar . . .

Makela Mangrich:

. . . we could do it . . .

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

Was there anything that we didn't include in the RFP that we should have?

Makela Mangrich:

That's a good question. In terms of tasks? No. I think that the approach that you came up with and the approach that we came up with is good. I really, really do. I think that's going to give you a document that is uniquely tailored to your needs. I don't understand everything about what the Village is going through. I know you're growing fast, and if you have 11 new parks identified you're growing really fast. But I think that if you want

it, it's going to be up to you guys. If you want more public participation we can definitely talk about that. It's really a question of knowing your constituents and knowing how actively involved they're going to be in this. I love public participation so you bring it on as far as I'm concerned. That might be the only thing . . .

Mike Pollocoff:

Explain the larger and specific tasks that you're expecting the Village to perform.

Makela Mangrich:

That is making sure we have the local knowledge, making sure we have the data. From what I've seen of the . . . that's great . . . directly transferable to our system . . . help us in policy direction . . . you're not going to be creating documents. You'll be reviewing documents, obviously, and giving us suggestions . . . but I'm not going to be expecting you to draft parts of the plan. I'm not expecting you to create copies of the plan . . . to have . . . do copies for you. We have an in-house production team that does a great job of that. Policy direction, public input, participation, attendance and data.

Mike Pollocoff:

And, finally, why should the Village select your firm to complete the comprehensive park plan. A synopsis.

Makela Mangrich:

We have great local knowledge. Our firm has been here for a long time. We create visionary plans. We articulate the vision in a creative and compelling way. We have experience in park system planning. We're eager to do this plan. We're eager to be here. We have expert park design skills in Jim, and we feel like we have a really responsive approach that will be what you need and not a lot of extra bells and whistles.

Michaeline Day:

Bill, did you have any questions?

Bill Mills:

I've got two questions actually. The first being have the two firms worked together before?

Todd Weik:

I don't believe we have to be honest with you. However, I have worked with some of the staff members they have there in another capacity . . . another firm on a professional basis. As a landscape architect . . . I've worked on some projects with a couple of their staff members that were more public service type projects. So I have worked with them . . . EPA, so we have a few . . . of the firm . . . personally I've only been with Crispell-

Snyder the last four years. I don't know that they've actually worked with Vandewalle. I suspect they may have . . .

Jim Schaefer:

. . . worked with Crispell-Snyder . . . I don't see any issue there.

Bill Mills:

And my second question is there's going to be several draft documents obviously. What is your expectation for this Commission and the Village staff to review those documents to keep you on schedule?

Makela Mangrich:

Time wise you mean. A reasonable time frame. We'll be fairly flexible. But I think that what I'll probably do is as soon as we do the background check for task four, we'll have a couple of months to get that. I want that sort of reviewed before we move into . . . so that you're not reviewing a whole big old document to begin with, so that you've got it sections at a time and we can check that box of f. . . . In terms of the final plan document, we've actually got five months to go from draft to adoption. And in my experience that's about right. Time frame four weeks. I would probably give it to you two weeks in advance of the committee meeting, then we can talk about it in the committee meeting and get comments back on that . . . present it to . . . before that public hearing. So there would be a draft, draft number one would be task six. We would create draft number two which would be the public hearing draft. That's what we would send out to the agencies and let the public look at. We also call it the public review draft sometimes. Then revisions of that for draft number three. And each time a couple of weeks, three weeks, four weeks, whatever you guys need. And hopefully that background section is done so we're just focusing on . . . recommendations.

Michaeline Day:

Mike, do you have any questions?

Mike Russert:

No.

Michaeline Day:

I did ask as a contractor your work in progress. You pretty much have answered that question about your window and your team. So you do feel your staff will be able to complete this project and not have any issues with other jobs or other issues. You did mention that.

Makela Mangrich:



Yes, absolutely. We make a commitment to our clients. That's one of the reasons that we have had them around so long.

Michaeline Day:

And, Todd, your work in progress and your scope you wouldn't have any issues with completing this project in time?

Todd Weik:

No, none whatsoever. We're really capable of supporting whatever they need . . . staff availability . . . and I have a lot of experience in this type of work, so this isn't alien territory at all. I've done a lot of this stuff before . . . time frame . . .

Michaeline Day:

Kathy, or anyone have any questions? Okay, thank you Makela, Todd, Jim.

Mike Pollocoff:

Thank you very much.

Makela Mangrich:

If you guys think of questions we didn't cover, please call me.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you.

(Inaudible)

Michaeline Day:

Now, with the first people, we didn't really discuss the other parks. They had mentioned three and I guess I didn't notice in the proposal the other--like you had a question of Makela--

Mike Pollocoff:

Well, she had a different completely different concept of how to approach it. That's something we want to think about. I understand Vandewalle . . . probably going to do some pretty light . . . I have a feeling that Vandewalle felt that Crispell had such a presence here that they jumped in with them. They took a different approach and there's a lot to be said for it. We don't have money to build out 15 parks. So pick the best five . . . part of your plan should be to update your park plan every five years . . .

Michaeline Day:

And that's what we should be doing.

Mike Pollocoff:

So that's one way to look at it. As part of the process let's pick our five parks we want to work on, spend our planning money to have them prepare a plan that's ready for bidding . . . we're going to do it-

Michaeline Day:

Because things can change in five years.

Mike Pollocoff:

Bonestroo really kind of said--they didn't say they would have that level of detail for all the parks . . . .

Michaeline Day:

They really didn't mention the other ones at all, did they?

Mike Pollocoff:

No. So that was my question to her . . . I don't want to be left with . . . take a spot in Smart Growth . . . and we have to redo the entire Smart Growth plan.

--:

Are the other 11 sites already identified?

Mike Pollocoff:

They're identified but Smart Growth--I disagree with her a little bit. You have to do more than just say here's the site . . . so that would be something if we chose Vandewalle to give them the contract we have to lay out some specific . . . language . . . Smart Growth standards so we don't face that.

--:

Can we see the documents that they received, the RFP? Is that possible at some point.

--:

I do have some copies with me here.

Michaeline Day:

Because Bonestroo did not mention--all they mentioned were the first three and not anything else about the other 11 or 12 or 13.

Mike Pollocoff:

We don't know that they were our priorities, but those were parks we were kind of working on . . . these are our three.

Michaeline Day:

I wasn't sure if that was in the RFP that you mentioned those three that they had picked out.

Mike Pollocoff:

We picked out . . . Pleasant Prairie Park out by the . . . we've always had work going on there . . . Momper's Woods is the other park that we've had a lot of comments and questions on . . . it's south of 108<sup>th</sup> along Highway 31. If we think back to four years ago . . . Nitto Denko built a building there and they cut down an acre of piece of woods that WisPark sold them. As part of the negotiated settlement or the sale we got Nitto to give us 20 acres of woods that was really the better part of the woods. So that wood was deeded by Nitto to the Village so it's our land. So we did kind of what people . . . soccer in there because there's a big open meadow there so it was back and forth and back and forth . . . I think we've had some concepts early on that it would be a nature center in there, more passive . . . . So that's why we identified those three but only because there was just stuff going on. No one had gone through the . . .

--:

Todd had mentioned they were the primary firm up to three years ago for the Village. Is there a new firm that has a preference now?

Mike Pollocoff:

No.

--:

Crispell-Snyder petitioned?

Mike Pollocoff:

They did 100 percent of the work. They were the engineer when I came here 20 years ago and they're a good firm. We had had some issues with quality and responsiveness and they addressed those issues. We also felt like we were getting pretty bring and we wanted to bring some other firms in. Bonestroo is another firm we brought in. They're doing the storm water management plan and at initial flush they're doing a pretty good job on it. They're helping us with our water model which is the model we use to balance

the pressures for water system . . . low tech stuff. And they also were the design engineers for the IcePlex, the interior . . . .

--:

They're a big firm?

Mike Pollocoff:

I won't say they're quite national but they're regional, a lot bigger than Crispell. But we are using other firms . . . . do you have the results?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Yes, I do. Out of a possible 400 points, Bonestroo, the first people that presented, 312 points. Crispell-Snyder and Vandewalle 343 points, so there was a difference--actually Crispell-Snyder and Vandewalle had 31 more points based on your point system.

Mike Pollocoff:

How about your review of the references?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I went through and I called all the references that were listed out in the proposals. There was a very consistent theme between both of the companies. I'll start off with Bonestroo. When I called everyone at Bonestroo they had worked on some plans that are very similar to what we're doing. Everyone said Bonestroo they're a good company, we like them, we're kind of new with them, worked about two months. One of the people declined to answer. That was a comprehensive park and open space plan. So I was a little bit concerned about why he would decline to answer and he was very short with me and said that's about the end of it. I confronted Bonestroo on it, why would you put a reference out if these people aren't going to praise you? And they said it's kind of an ongoing project, something that they had picked up in mid stream was the reasoning for it. So it was a product that had gone bad, some really bad feelings with the public and everyone else. So they kind of came in and they kind of displayed themselves as being the white horse, came in and fixed the product and left. But when we talked specifically to the park and recreation department director he declined to answer and that was the end of it.

Michaeline Day:

So it wasn't quite the white knight.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

It wasn't quite the white knight, so they kind of had a little bit of conflict with the one person. The other five references all said good company and I'd hire them again.

When I called Vandewalle & Associates, and I kind of concentrated on the Vandewalle & Associates references because Vandewalle is a little bit more of the park expert, more so than Crispell-Snyder, and everyone said outstanding, these people are great, I am so happy, their participation was excellent, working with the staff and the Chairs and the committees was excellent. So in the references what I got out of the two was that Vandewalle left an impression from everyone they had worked with as excellent, I love them. One of the people said if you work with Mark Roffers, who is going to be the project coordinator for that, he said exceptional work. The adjectives used to describe Vandewalle were a lot more praisable than what were used to describe Bonestroo. So they were happy with both, but it appeared that the Vandewalle people were very, very happy. And that's who the Commission had chosen based on our point system also.

Michaeline Day:

I know that on a personal note our company did the work for Harborpark. We did the infrastructure for Harborpark, DK Contractors did. And I know if that Jim Schaefer actually did do some of the design and some of the work it was very complete. We had very few plan revisions, and when we did have any revisions it was a prompt reply. It was not like some engineering firms that we dealt with who would say just start the work and then we'll kind of do it in the process of. So I thought that they were very responsive. But I don't know him personally. I mean he used it as an example and he's not with that firm, but if he's going to do some of the work we worked well with the firm that did it.

Kathleen Burns:

From a public speaking aspect, if they're going to be doing public outreach, they certainly had a stronger presentation. The PowerPoint is easier to watch. You think we're more interested in the technicalities sitting here, but if that's the kind of thing they can pull together public speaking wise I think they have it.

Michaeline Day:

So is this Commission comfortable then with the way we all did our point system that we would think Crispell-Snyder and Vandewalle would be the group that we would recommend to the Village to use? I guess I would need that in the form of a motion. Someone? We need a motion to choose one or the other.

Mike Russert:

I guess I'm in favor of Vandewalle & Associates to the Board.

Michaeline Day:

Is there a second?

Bill Mills:

I second it.

Michaeline Day:

Is there any need for any discussion or are we all in agreement? We'll take a vote then?  
All in favor of Vandewalle and Crispell say aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Mike Pollocoff:

I'll take that recommendation for a contract award to the Village Board on the 16<sup>th</sup>. We'll turn them loose. We'll probably have a couple more meetings than normal. You saw in that process . . . less structured meetings . . . but that would be a good thing for you guys . . . .

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

If I could just make one more comment. One of the questions I'm sure I will be presented with by Bonestroo & Associates is going to be what really were the deciding factors, why you really didn't choose their company. I'm sure it's something they'll want to have as feedback. If the Commission could offer me any sort of response. I already have one from Ms. Burns about the presentation wasn't quite as good with how just the overall feel of it, the public speaking wasn't quite as good. Any other thing that was kind of a factor that I can present to them in feedback when the time comes.

Mike Russert:

I think for me the proposal of five parks, and I think their estimate was \$25,000 for Vandewalle, and then Bonestroo's was three parks at \$21,000. So if we're going to get two more parks at only an additional \$4,000.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

And actually now in that RFP they did have some charges that were underlying on the bottom that did bump their total right up to \$25,000, so both of their proposals were equal at \$25,000 I believe.

Michaeline Day:

Myself I felt that the team that came in here actually explained more of their background. I understand that Dave is a PE and so and so is a PE and the other guy is a PE, but what is your background? What have you worked on personally? I thought that Vandewalle did a much better job explaining different projects that they've each worked on so that you knew what their expertise was more so than--I mean they explained to us the other two guys that were in waste water management, but on the second hand they said but you

probably wouldn't be working with us because you don't have those water issues. Well, then why did you even bring them up?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Thank you very much. I'll just relay those comments back to them when the time arrives.

**b. Consider entering into Executive Session subject to Section 19.85 Wis. Stats. Re: Land Acquisition.**

Michaeline Day:

We do need a motion to go into Executive Session with a second.

Kathleen Burns:

And what is that?

Mike Pollocoff:

Executive Session . . . the minutes . . . relative to Section 19.85 of the Wisconsin Statutes for the special land acquisition. And the reason we need to be in Executive Session is we're going to be talking about, one, whether we're going to be interested in acquiring the property and at what price. The reason it's Executive Session is you don't want any offers out there . . . opportunity for the Commission to think about . . . what numbers we're talking about so we can approach a property owner.

Michaeline Day:

You don't want to let the owner know that we want to give them X.

Mike Pollocoff:

There's other people who want the property, so we don't want them to know what our number is.

Mike Russert:

And will this be used for future park land?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes.

Michaeline Day:

Do we do need a motion and a second to go into Executive Session.

Bill Mills:

I make a motion to enter into Executive Session.

Mike Russert:

I second the motion.

Michaeline Day:

And do we need a roll call for acceptance? I agree.

Kathleen Burns:

Yes.

Mike Russert:

I agree.

Bill Mills:

I agree.

**c. Return to Open Session**

Michaeline Day:

Are we looking at the next few months starting at 7:30 just so we have some idea and having longer meetings like this?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes.

Mike Russert:

The Board is meeting at 7:00 or 7:30?

Mike Pollocoff:

They were meeting at 5:00. And the feeling is they were looking to exclude people from the public process so they moved it to 7:30 and now we're moving everything to 7:30. We used to meet at 7:30 for years, and we had the public scream at us that they had to work the next morning.

Michaeline Day:



I have no problem if that's what the Board asks us to do.

Kathleen Burns:

Do we have any input if this does end up being 11:00 or 11:30 meetings? Are we able to come back and say, you know what, there's no public here or there's two public here and can we bump it back up to 6:30?

Mike Pollocoff:

I think that's what a lot of the Commissions are . . . typically people don't come unless there's something . . . .

Michaeline Day:

I can see when we're having our actual hearings for the comprehensive plan to move the time for 7:00.

Mike Pollocoff:

I think what we'll end up doing is a carry over so that we're not here late . . . and then finish the agenda. We're going to have to try and keep your docket . . . there might be some times that we have . . . issues we want to do another night.

Michaeline Day:

Our first meeting was always the first Tuesday, but if they decide to go with--if they vote on the 16<sup>th</sup>, if they need us to meet before the next one because that would be not until June 5<sup>th</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup>. So that's three weeks. So if they need us to meet beforehand does anybody have a problem to meet before the June 7<sup>th</sup> meeting?

Voices:

No.

Michaeline Day:

So it sounds like if you need us to meet beforehand except for Kathy. Maybe we can get her by phone or something.

## **6. ADJOURNMENT**

Michaeline Day:

We need a motion to adjourn.

Bill Mills:

So moved.

Mike Russert:

Second.

Michaeline Day:

We are adjourned.