

**VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE
PARK COMMISSION
Village Hall, Auditorium
9915 39th Avenue
Pleasant Prairie, Wisconsin 53158
Tuesday, October 4, 2005
6:00 p.m.**

A regular meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Park Commission was held on Tuesday, October 4,, 2005, at 6:00 p.m. Present were Rita Christiansen, Glen Christiansen, Kathleen Burns, Michael Russert, William Mills and Alex Tiahnybok. Michaeline Day was excused. Also present were Michael Pollocoff, Village Administrator; Jean Werbie, Community Development Director; John Steinbrink, Jr., Superintendent of Parks; and Judith Baternik, Clerical Secretary.

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

Rita Christiansen:

Everybody have a chance to review the minutes from September 6, 2005? If there are no changes can I have a motion to approve?

--:

I motion to approve.

--:

Second.

Rita Christiansen:

Motion to approve and seconded. All in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

Rita Christiansen:

Opposed? Being none motion passes.

- 4. CITIZEN COMMENTS**

Rita Christiansen:

If you're going to speak this evening I ask that you introduce yourself. Give us your full name and address and where you reside. Do we have anybody that would like to talk this evening? Sir, would you step up to the podium please?

Gustav Hauser:

My name is Gustav Hauser. I live at 143 113th Street, Pleasant Prairie.

Rita Christiansen:

Sir, how may we help you this evening?

Gustav Hauser:

Two weeks ago we had a work party for the Chiwaukee Prairie, and a lady named Kathy Chapowski attended. She happens to be the daughter from Ms. Momper from the Momper Woods, one of the Pleasant Prairie Parks. She visited her old home and she said she was appalled. The whole site looks like a municipal garbage dump. About a week ago I stopped by the site and she's absolutely right. There must be loads and loads and loads of dumped garbage in there. It's not only garbage. It's bricks, soil, name it it's in there. It's plastic barrels and that is supposed to be Pleasant Prairie Park. Not too long ago there was an article in the *Kenosha News* and somebody else reported it, and the *Kenosha News* attributed to Mr. Pollocoff, our Village Administrator, that that site gets cleared at least once a year. I beg to differ. That garbage that's there has accumulated at least for two or three year already. I don't think it ever has been cleared out. It's just an ongoing process apparently that people come in there and dump not small amounts but huge amounts. There must be 600 or 700 cubic yards at least dumped in that site.

I urge everyone on the Commission to visit the park. It's the Pleasant Prairie Park. It's under your jurisdiction. Please take action on that one. That's a disgrace for the Village. Thank you.

Rita Christiansen:

Thank you, sir, for your time. We appreciate you coming in this evening. Do we have any other comments from citizens? Ma'am, state your name and where you reside please.

Charlene Smith:

First of all this is mainly about Chiwaukee Prairie so I don't know if I should wait for new business?

Rita Christiansen:

Actually you can go ahead and comment now if you would.

Charlene Smith:

Okay. My name is Charlene Smith. I reside at 162 122nd Street right in the middle of Chiwaukee Prairie. My main concern, and I understand the whole burning and getting rid of the brush and all that, and I briefly mentioned it to Steve before the meeting started. The area where the pond is or the lagoon or whatever you want to call it, which is on the corner of 122nd and 1st Court has a lot of thick vegetation around it. I personally like it that way because I have two young children. My neighbor has a young child, and my other neighbor has two children that range in the age of 6 to 10. They don't know the pond is there which I think is a good thing.

Not only that, but that's just one area thick with vegetation. The rest of the prairie doesn't look that way. It only looks that way right by the pond and I think there's a reason for that. So if you could just look into that before you cut it all down. I do have a bunch of pictures of this corner and the area right there if anybody wants to look at them.

Rita Christiansen:

Do you want us to keep those pictures?

Charlene Smith:

Sure, I don't care.

Rita Christiansen:

If you want to submit it to our Secretary. Judy, can you take those? Thank you for your time. Any further comments from any of the citizens? At this time, too, we also have a letter from a citizen, Kathy, and I'm probably not going to say this name correctly so I do apologize, Ciszewski who resides at 11105 82nd Street in regard to the parks. And one of her suggestions was she couldn't make the public information meeting on 9/28 but would like to see tennis courts in the Village. So I'd like that added to the record.

5. NEW BUSINESS

a. Public Hearing regarding Chiwaukee Prairie Management Agreement (Jean Werbie)

Jean Werbie:

Members of the Park Commission, at one of the last Village Board meetings it was discussed that The Nature Conservancy of Wisconsin as bringing forth a management agreement, referred to as the Chiwaukee Prairie Management Agreement, to take care of and manage the Village owned land which is south of 116th Street, the areas that are identified in yellow specifically on the map, and then there's a long stringing drainage corridor in between the southern area and then leading down to the Prairie Harbor Yacht Club. These are areas that are surrounded by the Chiwaukee Prairie, and we had received a request from The Nature Conservancy to incorporate these lands into their management

areas south of 116th Street.

What you have before you is the management agreement that was drafted by The Nature Conservancy and then reviewed by the Park Commission and then edited again by the Village Board and then brought back to The Nature Conservancy. But one of the questions that the Village Board had was whether or not, as part of this discussion, any of the neighbors in immediate proximity to the two park areas up there, if they had been notified or contacted or if they were aware or had any concerns regarding the management activities that The Nature Conservancy would undertake in those areas.

So specifically I had contacted Steve Richter from The Nature Conservancy of Wisconsin in order to come down and speak to the Park Commission and to speak a little bit about the management activities and the importance of the management activities. The other thing that I have done as well is I took some photographs of the areas, and I'm going to pass these around with the ones that the property owner has taken that pretty much show the same type of vegetation in that area that would likely be removed that's non native vegetation. And the purpose of the hearing this evening then would afford any neighbors the opportunity to talk about this and how it would impact them. With that, I'd like to continue the public hearing and first I'd like to introduce Steve Richter from The Nature Conservancy.

Rita Christiansen:

Steve, would you stand up by the podium.

Steve Richter:

I feel privileged to come here. I've been working for the Conservancy for about 15 years, and I have fond memories of Chiwaukee Prairie through all these years. In the past this project started literally 40 years ago, and it's recognized as one of the highest qualities and most diverse prairies in the nation, and we feel really honored to be working at this site through acquisition, education and land management activities.

We've focused our work probably up to last year on all the lands north of 120th Street which is a gravel/grassy lane that bisects the prairie that you see on the map there. As an example, a year ago this fall we did burn 80 acres of that land north of 120th Street which was the largest prairie burn that we've done at Chiwaukee Prairie.

Through decades and decades I think fortunately there has been wildfires set by railroad trains that have kept that prairie open, and that's why this prairie still exists today through the last I'd say 70 or 80 years, so one of our goals is to reintroduce fire. The Village has in the past given us permission to burn the parkland that's north of 122nd Street on your map so that's the highlighted area up there. And that's worked out really well, and hopefully in the future we can continue to do that.

In the years ahead we've received in collaboration with the Department of Natural Resources and The Chiwaukee Prairie Preservation Fund \$60,000 worth of grant money through federal and State sources that we will use on both the Department's land and The

Nature Conservancy/ University of Wisconsin-Parkside land. We want to try to focus more work south of 122nd Street. The conservancy south of 122nd Street has more of a checkerboard lot appearance, so that's where out of the 400 or so lots that are shown on that map we still have about 80 to go that we haven't purchased. And those 80 lots have really at times limited the amount of work that we can do to try to keep that prairie open and grassy, full of flowers, south of 122nd Street.

This year we're going to give it a shot. We're going to go in there and find the lots, not mow our neighbors' lots, try to start working on the lands we own before we lose all the prairie to shrub and brush encroachment, primarily a non native shrub called glossy buckthorn, which is very dominant on the land south of 122nd Street.

Charlene has raised some very good points that I think we all should consider, and I would be very willing not to probably even set foot maybe in that parkland, and maybe we just in this year ahead we take a kick at our work on lands west of that drainage ditch that kind of meanders through the land, and that I see what we can do with our winter work brushing out the prairie and not touch that land up in that corner. Because obviously if there's a safety issue none of us want to see that be an issue. I honestly don't know enough about that pond to really figure out what the long-term solution to that problem could be if there needs to be a solution. I'm assuming it's a manmade pond just from the little bit that I've looked at it and what the long-term future is. Maybe that would be something we could consider in the future. Maybe we do a wetland restoration and try to have that a seasonal wetland again and not full of water. So I think that should be one of the topics that you all may want to consider. I'm very willing not to open that up if there are some safety concerns. I never thought of that.

So as well we do hope to some day introduce fire south of 122nd Street. We have never done that. It's always been fire caused by trains or neighbors in Illinois burning leaves. I guess the agreement that I have in front of you then would probably still work but we would maybe modify the maps if we do want to pull that area out of concern. So I guess with that I could answer questions or give more information or we could potentially discuss this issue that Charlene has raised and try to get a resolution on that.

Rita Christiansen:

Jean, is that something that you want to discuss at this time, the lagoon issue?

Jean Werbie:

I think it would be good to discuss any issues related to this agreement because it's their intention to try to have this agreement signed up by later this fall, November, so they can commence their work. So if there's any issues that are outstanding we should discuss them at this point.

Steve Richter:

So I guess what the agreement would say is state that the parkland--maybe I'll point it out. I would like to propose is more of a long-term agreement to allow us to burn and

keep the brush out of this area. We burn it maybe once every five years. I have gone through the Village to get a permit or agreement for that. I'd like to continue to burn. The brush is in good shape there and we just brush it out occasionally. Clean out the roads so that we can at least for one reason to create fire breaks, so brush those out so that if the Village Fire Department needs to get in here to set backfires or to try to pinch off a wildfire that's maintained. Not work in this area, and The Conservancy does own these lots here. What I'm going to do is we won't work in this area, but potentially, and I don't know if I would get there in the year ahead, but this drainage ditch here if we are working down here with clearing out brush if we could potentially clear out the glossy buckthorn that's what I would like to see happen.

Rita Christiansen:

Steve, where is the lagoon exactly?

Steve Richter:

The lagoon is in here. It's labeled as pool. That's where the lagoon is, so that's park owned land that I would propose we take out of the agreement based on Charlene's concerns with the neighbors' houses which are right here on 122nd Street.

Rita Christiansen:

Jean, I don't see anything in here that says street designation of the area of concern as far as what The Nature Conservancy is going to work on. Do we have a listing? Do we need to get that specific, or perhaps have an exemption from the lagoon until further investigation regarding the citizens' comments and concerns are addressed?

Jean Werbie:

From the past we've allowed them to work on any Village road right of way down there where there has not been any public improvements constructed. So we can modify the agreement to make sure that is clear moving forward, that it includes all right of ways that were platted but never constructed. And I'll list them specifically.

Rita Christiansen:

And then an exemption from the lagoon until we further investigate?

Jean Werbie:

Yes.

Rita Christiansen:

Steve, is that okay?

Steve Richter:

I think that's fine.

Charlene Smith:

I think that's perfectly fine. I totally agree. I think the area south of 122nd Street does need a lot of work. It is prairie and it should stay that way. I like the look of it. I'm just concerned of that one area around the pond.

Rita Christiansen:

I want to thank you for bringing that to our attention. I appreciate it.

Charlene Smith:

And I don't know how deep that is. I've been there once in the winter when we first moved in and there is a pond there.

Rita Christiansen:

Thank you. Comments from the Board?

Glen Christiansen:

One suggestion I would make in looking at the pond would be the problem with leaving the brush standing the minute anybody walks just a short distance into the brush they're totally invisible from the road, and that kind of looking at it from a safety standpoint from a 180 degree different perspective, anybody walking in there is no longer observable. So it's kind of a double edged sword. You leave a screen and you can't see if somebody is there. You open it up and they can see it but you can see them. So I guess what I'm getting at is it probably warrants investigation and what would be the best approach for it. I agree with that completely. I also would like to compliment The Nature Conservancy for the fact that they have always been sensitive to neighbors' feelings and concerns. They've always tried to tailor their operations around that.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Jean, in the last Parks Commission meeting and the meetings since then we discussed adding verbiage to the agreement, and I'm assuming the first full paragraph on page 2 is what was added? I didn't compare it to the old copy.

Jean Werbie:

Yes.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Just scanning this, this sounds like The Conservancy is obligated to notify the Village

and adjoining property if they plan on taking any action in terms of clearing trees, burning, whatever. Is there any remedy if the abutting property owners such as Charlene don't agree with the plan? Are we accounting for that? Should we account for that?

Jean Werbie:

Steve, are you putting together a management plan for us with this that each year that you intend to do these activities, like Marty Johnson does for the areas north? Each year he re-evaluates the plan but it's like a three year plan that he has presented to us and each year we would look at the plan. And I think what they do is they put the green cards out on peoples' doors to let them know that they're going to be in the area and the weeks they're going to be there and they're going to be brushing or burning or what activities. They also let us know and we let the police and fire department know, too. So that's what we've done in the past, and I think you've followed similar procedures in the past. There just hasn't been as many residents down in this area.

Steve Richter:

Yes. I like that. We'll do that. Those are very good points. We'll definitely do that. In some cases given that we're taking that one area out we can still notify the residents in there, but we're fortunate that we're not right next door to houses south of 116th Street, so in some cases we're really blessed where our activities may not have as immediate an impact. But I agree with you that it definitely is really proactive to be contacting people and to let you all know ahead of time per year what we're up to. So, for example, this winter I could come back with you and say here's where we're going to start going at it this winter and give you a game plan of what we expect to get done on our lands.

Mike Pollocoff:

I don't think that's what you asked. You asked if someone doesn't agree?

Alex Tiahnybok:

Right. Now we've got the notification aspect covered, especially if we take the middle or the pond section out of it. If I recall our past conversation that's the only portion of this plan that's actually adjoining developed properties. Everything else is open land, correct? So if we take the middle section out it probably accomplishes everything we're talking about in the first place. I live in Carol Beach and, frankly, one person's treasure could be another person's junk. It all depends on perspective. There are areas where there are trees north of 116th Street that from a prairie conservation perspective may be viewed as junk trees or whatever, and yet a neighbor is getting their view affected in a way. I just want to make sure it's considerate specifically when it's adjoining private property that's developed.

Mike Pollocoff:

Basically in the past practice of the Village and dealing with DNR and The Conservancy is when it's time to burn it's time to burn. We've really requested that they give notice

so people with health issues can make accommodations. But when it's going to happen it's going to happen. There hasn't been a process whereby someone can say they don't want it to happen. And we've had people complain, but it's just that if you remove trees that gets to be a lot more permanent. There's no way to fix it once that's happened. I think the Commission and the Board wanted to give everybody notice before we start on this and notices were sent out.

Alex Tiahnybok:

And if anybody has a serious issue we can address those on a case-by-case basis.

--:

How many years has the burning actually taken place down there?

Steve Richter:

I can answer for The Nature Conservancy. Do you mean the DNR or The Nature Conservancy? I don't know what the DNR has been up to. You all might know better than me. Maybe they've been burning the last ten years.

Glen Christiansen:

I think it's been about the past 10 or 12 years at the most.

Steve Richter:

The Conservancy has been burning with staff since probably the late '80s working with Paul Guilbert, the Fire Chief. Before that volunteers occasionally did burn this prairie. In the '60s we have slides of volunteers burning the prairie. Maybe they didn't notify anybody back then. I don't know.

Rita Christiansen:

So what we need to do if I understand correctly is we need to take a vote on the agreement and ask that we modify this agreement to exclude the management of the lagoon property until further investigation, is that correct?

Jean Werbie:

That's correct. And I'm also going to add a provision that they provide a management plan to us in advance with proper notification to the neighbors each year of what the activities are going to be that year. So I'll just add those provisions as well.

Rita Christiansen:

Alex, is that alright with you?

Alex Tiahnybok:

That's fine . . . how many get notified. . .of the property.

Jean Werbie:

Probably similar to what we did with respect to notification. I think we went almost 500 feet all the way around, so we went more than our typical notification area. But many of the lots are actually owned by them, so we targeted every resident within that perimeter.

Rita Christiansen:

Based on the modifications do we have approval for the management agreement between The Nature Conservancy and the Village of Pleasant Prairie? I'd like to make a motion that we accept the management agreement for The Nature Conservancy and the Village of Pleasant Prairie. There's a motion made.

William Mills:

I second.

Rita Christiansen:

I have a first and a second. All in favor say aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Rita Christiansen:

Opposed? Being none, the motion carries. Thank you, again, Mrs. Smith for coming. Thank you, Steve.

- b. Review September 28, 2005 Public Visioning Workshop Documentation. (Vandewalle & Associates)**
- c. Review/Update Master Park Plan Meeting Agenda. (Vandewalle & Associates)**
- d. Review Master Park Plan Background Documentation (Vandewalle & Associates)**
- e. Review Master Park Plan Appendix A. (Vandewalle & Associates)**

Rita Christiansen:

We have our consultants here this evening.

Mark Roffers:

Hi, I'm Mark Roffers again with Vandewalle and Associates. I'm here with Megan MacGlashan. The next few items on your agenda are all kind of tied and interrelated to the completion of the park and open space plan. I just wanted to give a sneak preview before we launched into the agenda item you just mentioned.

What we hope to accomplish tonight would be a few things. Talking briefly about the needs assessment which you got a copy of in your packet, discussing the results of the vision workshop and, depending on the order of the agenda, that might be the good first thing to tackle. And then what we really hope to get from this meeting is some assent or direction from the Park Commission that we're on the right track. So sharing some ideas with you with respect to the Park Plan and getting further input. The reason we want to do that is over the course of the rest of the year we have two kind of primary objectives.

The first objective is to prepare a first draft of this park and open space plan document including all the recommendations for future parks, improvements to existing parks, trails and the like. And then secondly to work with you on improvement plans or development plans for five parks within the system that have been identified and talked about, and I'll run through those a little bit later.

So, one of the things you got in your packet was the meeting schedule, and what we would hope to do at our next meeting on the 2nd of November is really zero in on those park plans for five parks, and you'll see probably mostly for the first time Jim Schaefer who is our landscape architect on this project. We'll share that information with you, get some input and feedback on those five park plans, come back with refinements in December. So the ultimate goal is to have a park and open space plan document in draft form for you at your first meeting in January or your January meeting, and take comments, suggested revisions on that in advance of a public hearing on the park plan to be held tentatively in February of next year. With that, that's sort of the backdrop.

I'm going to turn it over to Meg who is going to talk a little bit about a couple of the items that are on your agenda here. I don't know if it's appropriate to blend this discussion. I think there's a few very closely related items that are in sequence on your agenda.

Rita Christiansen:

Any questions? Is everybody okay?

Alex Tiahnybok:

If we cover it all. I think we probably have to vote on things separately but that's fine with me. Thank you.

Rita Christiansen:

Great, thank you.

Megan MacGlashan:

Good evening. I'd just like to hand out a couple things that might help facilitate this discussion a bit. So what I'd like to go over with you right now is the most significant addition to the draft park plan that we've been working on, and that is the needs assessment. That's going to start on page 19 in your packet.

Ultimately, the needs assessment is going to be comprised of four main components, the first of which is a quantitative assessment which we're going to talk about in a minute. The second is a geographic assessment of your park system. We brought along a map to present to you. Then thirdly is the public input which we received from the workshop last week. And then lastly we're also going to review the State of Wisconsin's Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan to make sure that the recommendations that we present in the Village plan are in line with the State's plan.

I'd like to take a few minutes to talk about those first three components. Starting on page 20 you have some charts, and essentially these charts we have just applied the SEWRPC park and recreation standards that we've discussed earlier in the plan to your parkland and existing facilities. So these first two charts on page 20 are for parkland requirements. As you can see, the Village's park system is actually doing pretty well with respect to number of acres per 1,000 people. We do need to make some revisions to the neighborhood parkland acreage, because John told us earlier today that Carol Beach parkland, although it's shown to be 40 acres, actually only a very small portion of that is used for parkland. So that's going to drop down the neighborhood parklands quite significantly and probably drop it below the standard.

Then if you turn to page 22 again we've applied the SEWRPC facility standards to your existing facilities in the Village. Now, these existing numbers do not include any of your proposed parks. It's strictly just existing facilities. So Creekside, Village Green, all those parks are not included in these charts at this time. If you're looking at the facility charts, you can see that your biggest deficit is with soccer fields, and that remains true into the projection for 2030. There's also a deficit for play fields and tennis courts in particular.

Then on the last page, page 22, we've done the same thing, applied SEWRPC standards for recreation trails to the number of miles of trails you currently have in the Village. You're actually doing pretty well in terms of that. There's no deficit for number of acres. But, again, that doesn't take into account any geographic considerations. Does anybody have any questions about this part of the needs assessment.

Michael Russert:

I have a couple questions. For the community park that's located in Kenosha, and I guess the concern I would have is with Pleasant Prairie growing and Kenosha is going to grow, is the current acreage for Anderson Park going to allow for Pleasant Prairie's growth and Kenosha to grow?

Megan MacGlashan:

Just in terms of number of acres it does. But when you look at it geographically, which we're going to do in a minute, you can see that it certainly does not serve the needs of the community. We included it because it's located so close to the Village that it does currently serve part of the Village of Pleasant Prairie, but we'll show in a minute that geographically it will not.

Michael Russert:

And then on page 21 where you broke out the facility needs, you have basketball goals. Right now there's 42. And toward the end of the packet where you outlined what parks existing have I didn't come up with the number 42. I was just wondering how that number 42 was attained.

Megan MacGlashan:

A number of those are in the RecPlex actually. They're not outdoor, they're indoor goals.

Michael Russert:

Should those then not be counted since the RecPlex would have admission fee to use those and where the park would be able to go and spend your time with no impact.

Megan MacGlashan:

Sure, that makes sense. Mark, do you have any comment about that? We had discussed including basketball goals.

Mark Roffers:

We went back and forth on that, but you're making a good point is that it's almost functioning as a private club or a membership club, and we wouldn't include YMCA facilities or Gold's Gym facilities in a needs assessment which is a more comparable facility, so we can certainly adjust that, and that would affect numbers in a lot of different areas, not just basketball courts.

Michael Russert:

Then going down some of the numbers are off so I'm assuming you included the RecPlex with those?

Megan MacGlashan:

Yes.

Mike Pollocoff:

I'd like to respectfully disagree with Mike. Although the RecPlex is driven by an admission fee or membership fee or what have you, I think when we look at in particular the amount of resources that are going to be required to construct the outdoor courts and the standards for four months of use in a year and not evening use, that's what I think is one of the nice things about the RecPlex is that it's a year 'round facility with extended hours. That's not to say you shouldn't have anything outside, but I think to totally wipe out 42 courts because it's an admission facility I think is taking a big resource and taking it right off the table.

Given the nature of municipal financing that we're embarking on here where we're going to be in freezes and we're not going to be making a lot of expenditures, I think the existing resources we have have to be acknowledged some way. We can't pretend that those 42 courts don't exist. They're there. I think that municipal governments are going to be moving more and more towards a user charge model where people are going to pay some type of fee for using facilities. I think if we acknowledge the places and what are going to be the neighborhood parks or some of the community parks that there has to be maybe a court or two I can see that. But to take out all 42 I think takes a big asset and takes it off the table and doesn't recognize that it's there.

Jean Werbie:

In addition to that, whether it's basket ball goals or soccer fields, the same thing would apply. I mean when we sign up our children to play in these sports facilities, whether they're playing indoor during the winter, they're playing inside, that's an amenity that in many other places you don't have that opportunity to play inside. My kids play from December all the way through until the spring inside the facility. So we have to be able to count those fields or those courts. I don't know if it's counted the same way, but when we do general programming for recreational programs these are facilities that we have. They may offer different opportunities for different times of the year or they might be year 'round but they do need to be counted I think.

Rita Christiansen:

Isn't there a fee for a sponsor to pay when sponsoring a team for one of the recreational like for basketball or whatever, so in essence we're actually paying for usage of outdoor facilities for baseball or etc.?

Mike Pollocoff:

That sponsorship fee that basically doesn't begin to cover it. But what it covers, say for softball, it helps cover the cost for the parks department to go out there and grade the fields, mow them, line them, stripe, buys balls, buys bats, buys t-shirts, and then the program fee that the kid pays helps do that as well. So at the end of the day if you look at those type of recreational programs they net out. They're not money makers. They just basically cover our expenses or covers RecPlex expenses to the extent something is coming out of RecPlex.

I think the issue that Mike's worrying about is having whether it's a basketball court or a tennis court if you construct a tennis court in Wisconsin, again, you're going to guarantee you're going to get four months worth of use. If the Village became aggressive about tennis maybe we say we would have some outdoor and indoor courts so that people can use them all year long. But I think we need to come up with some type of criteria to recognize that the Village has made a significant investment in year 'round basketball, soccer, volleyball, whatever those things are. That's got to be addressed in this report otherwise we really understate what we have here. If we take that off the table and say we need to get back to for basketball 21 and we have zero now, I think that understates the assets we do have. I'm not sure if you guys have an idea on how to account for that.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I have two points but Jean actually stated exactly what I was going to say. Park district activities frequently include RecPlex as a venue for those activities. And I think your point about sponsorship is a good point, but I think a sponsor like Culver's would pay for sponsorship in the RecPlex and they also play for sponsoring a team playing at Prairie Springs Park which is a totally park district facility.

Of that 42, though, the second question are all 42 in the RecPlex or a portion of it?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

The RecPlex has 40 basketball goals, and then there's two basketball goals in Carol Beach Park just off 116th and around 9th Avenue.

Alex Tiahnybok:

So it would devastate that number if we took it out.

Michael Russert:

One solution I think is to be less definitive about this table and use it as a guide. Still having a column standard, the standard column, the second column, still having a facilities required based on national standards. And then for the final two columns have one that read total number of existing indoor facilities and a second one total number of existing outdoor facilities. So we could make I guess a more subjective judgment as to how many basketball courts you really need based on the facilities we have indoor and outdoor and the expected usage needs. I don't think we need to necessarily have this column that reads number of facilities need, which kind of puts everyone into a little bit of a corner and doesn't necessarily work well for Pleasant Prairie. It might be a nice way to organize a table for a community that doesn't have RecPlex but it maybe doesn't work quite so well.

The related point that I wanted to raise and a question really is how do we treat Anderson Park? It's right beyond your Village limits. It has 20 soccer fields on it apparently, and how do you want to handle that?

Mike Pollocoff:

Again, that's an asset. I think maybe there's an institutional issue that the Commission might want to think about is that the Village has not control over Anderson Field. If the City decides to do something else or if the City decides the Pleasant Prairie residents are going to pay \$10 every time you come in, it's just not our field and that's an issue. That would be to me the only constraint at Anderson Field. The location might be a little bit of an issue for some people . . . but it's not our field to control.

William Mills:

Doesn't that kind of work both ways, though, because of the fact that I'm sure there's a lot of Kenosha residents that use Pleasant Prairie Springs Park. So when you're taking a look at population for the Village, I think we have to consider that as well.

Jean Werbie:

I just wanted to mention that Anderson is a regional attraction. My children play there. They have the Castle program and they also have the United FC program there, and they have direct relationships and contract agreements with the City of Kenosha. Maybe we'll enter into some type of different relationships with other vendors at another point, but I see that as a main regional feature. They're building two new fields there, probably get them done by spring. So I think it's a major area that will continue to serve Pleasant Prairie. There are a great deal of Pleasant Prairie residents that use those fields, and it's driven just like all of our programs. We pay through the programs and you cannot be on those fields for practice and you cannot be on those fields to play unless you are in games or a tournament. Otherwise you may not use those fields. I'm hoping we don't get to that point here in Pleasant Prairie, but that's how those fields are. You may not be on them unless you're a member.

Michael Russert:

So is that a park then?

Jean Werbie:

It's a park but it's an exclusive park. I don't see it as too much different than the RecPlex. It's exclusive. If you're a member then you're allowed to play there. You can't just do a pickup game at Anderson. If you are there and they find out they will get you off those fields.

Michael Russert:

I guess that's where I'm going with the basketball courts. I'm a member of the RecPlex, but if I wasn't and I wanted to go shoot hoops with some friends or play a pickup game, I would be forced to pay \$10 to be going to the RecPlex and use their courts.

Jean Werbie:

Right, exactly. And that's what I'm saying, that that same operation or situation is at various locations. The other thing I just wanted to mention real quick is this number of facilities needed that's an important column. That's very important. That's the whole basis of park planning and determining exactly what facilities that you need or you want to plan for in the future. So in my mind and the analysis that I've done in the past on this stuff that's a very important column. You just need to make a decision whether or not indoor or outdoor and how it qualifies and then make some type of disclaimer or note on the bottom as to how you're making that interpretation. But that's very important because that helps us through our planning process to determine how much land area and what the developers are going to be helping to pay for, what we'll be doing with the impact fee money. I mean it's the whole basis. So as long as that determination is made I think that column is very important to keep on these tables.

Rita Christiansen:

Okay, any other comments?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I just have one comment for Mike is that when we're going through and determining what kind of amenities we're going to have at these recreational parks, we do still plan on having basketball goals in them but probably just not as high as we would if we did not have the Lakeview RecPlex. So we still plan on having those amenities available in the neighborhood parks for someone to use whenever they wish.

Alex Tiahnybok:

How about adding a line to the chart and having an identity for basketball courts indoor and basketball courts outdoor? This way we can identify what we think in the long run what we need and it secures the 40 spots that we have at RecPlex and we can count them. Leave the columns because that's the road map. I agree with you that you can't take it out.

Mark Roffers:

I doubt we have a separate standard that we could rely on for indoor versus outdoor. That would be nice. I agree that would be good. We'll look at that. We'll figure something out.

Michael Russert:

So, Jean, for Anderson Park to use that you need to pay or be part of the facility?

Jean Werbie:

You need to be part of the Castle or the United FC program. If you're part of those programs then you're allowed to use those facilities. Otherwise those facilities cannot be used for practice or during the week by the neighborhood.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Is that exclusive just for soccer or does that include the softball fields and the playground area?

Jean Werbie:

I think it's just soccer.

Rita Christiansen:

Any other comments?

William Mills:

Just one more comment. I guess I go back to if we include Anderson Park in terms of all of the facilities that they have at Anderson Park, but just include the Village of Pleasant Prairie population it seems like we're taking a credit. But obviously citizens of both communities are going back and forth, so that's my only concern.

Megan MacGlashan:

Definitely. Mark and I will revisit this and try and figure something out. We'll talk to John and see if we can get something that we all agree works for everybody. This map for those of you who were at the workshop the other night will recognize this map. This map relates to our geographic standards. Can everybody see it? I'll put it up. And to create this map we also used SEWRPC service radius standards. So for neighborhood parks the standard service area is between a .5 and 1 mile radius depending on population density. And then for community parks, which our only community park at this point is Anderson Park, is a 2 mile service radius. And Prairie Springs Park actually, because it's a regional park, has a ten mile service radius which is not depicted on this map because it would have eaten the entire map, so you can just imagine that one. Graphically what this does is allows us to see really where the gaps are in the park system. It's pretty evident just by looking at the map where those are.

So that leads us into a discussion of the public input component of the needs assessment which was our workshop last week. And you have in front of you a couple of handouts, the first of which is this long list. That's just a compiled list of all of the written comments that we received from the workshop. It does not include the comments that related to specific park areas because that's something we're going to discuss next month when we look at our concept plans.

To make this a little bit easier I just distilled this information down into four general themes. And for everyone who was there you will know that the most frequently mentioned topic was the need for a multi use trail system. That was mentioned 26 times. And given that we only had five different groups that's significant. I think that's something that everyone kind of agreed is a priority for the Village.

The rest of the comments were kind of evenly divided between the need for active recreational facilities versus more passive recreational facilities such as picnic areas and walking trails and nature study areas. And then, lastly, something that was mentioned a number of times was the need for improvements or upgrades to the parks along the Carol Beach area, need for restrooms, need for improved swimming areas and so forth.

And then the other thing that I did to compile the information from the other night was to develop a composite map of all of the information we received from our mapping exercise. I suppose before I move on I just want to make sure there are no questions about the geographic service areas map or about the other information that I presented from the workshop so far. Okay.

Essentially what we wanted to use this map for is kind of a springboard for a discussion of the things that you feel are priorities for the future park system. You can see here areas or groupings of areas where people think there should be future parks. A lot of people identified Pleasant Prairie Park that needed upgrades and improvements. And actually a lot of these grouped areas correspond to proposed parks that you all already have in your plans for the Village. We talked a little bit about this with John earlier this afternoon before this meeting, so we'd just like to continue that discuss with you.

The green dots represent areas where people wanted to see new parks. The red dots are areas where people thought there should be upgrades to existing parks or facilities. The yellow dots are areas that people wanted to see preserved, natural areas that they wanted preserved. And then the blue lines represent the proposed recreation trails. There's quite an extensive trail system depicted on that map which actually looks very much like the trail system that you all put together earlier this year.

Mark Roffers:

So a couple of the main products in the park plan is a park system map. We've put together with a little bit of anguish and some comments from John what existing parklands are owned by the Village and other people today. That becomes the basis or the foundation for a future park system map or a planned park system map. And over the course of the next couple of months one of our main products is to prepare that system map. So what we wanted to talk about with the group here tonight is whether we're basically on the right track with following some of the comments, taking some of the leads from the public session. Whether there are other ideas we need to incorporate on the first draft of the map. And then a little insight from you all as to what your ideas are for upgrades to existing parks which is another kind of theme we heard over the course of the public workshop last week.

If I could just talk about and draw what I take from this map and some of the priorities that I see. A, certainly developing a trail system, but identifying what are the highest priority trails, what we really need to focus on and certainly include the rest on a map but highlight and make the core, the spine of the bike system really pop on the map.

So what we just did this afternoon in talking with John is identified three or four primary

trails. Obviously you have the Kenosha County trail which is roughly in this vicinity. One of the top priorities identified at the meeting was to develop a trail through the Village Green area, through the High Point future community park and out to Prairie Springs Park, and furthermore connecting that trail ultimately across 94 to a future business development area on the west side of 94. So that was what we kind of drew as one of the top priorities for the trail system.

A second priority, and these are all directed to linking Prairie Springs Park more directly with the rest of the community without having to use a car to get to the park. There's a second primary connect I'll call it along an easement or along a future utility line, future sewer line connecting the waste water treatment plants down to Prairie Springs Park. So that's a secondary location for a potential trail along that line. It has an interesting side benefit of allowing maintenance vehicles to maintain the line and a lot of communities are doing that type of thing. Those are identified as at least our preliminary thoughts on the highest priority trails and we can talk some more about that.

Other what I'll call secondary priorities would be to get a trail from the Kenosha County trail with its terminus to the lakefront. To get some sort of trail from an Illinois trail that ends near the Village limits up to Prairie Springs Park. We have the Hunt Club property that provides a little bit of a barrier for that. I don't think helmets help stop bullets. And then the third idea to bring a trail up from this future community park, High Point to the north. So just kind of identifying and working and talking about a primary first priority and second priority trail systems among the other blue lines that you see on the map.

The other theme I see or future interest is, as you see, with this map you have a lot of overlapping park services areas on the northwest part of the community and on the northeast part of the community near Kenosha, but fairly large areas that are really only served by the regional park which in many cases is miles away. So a second kind of priority of the park plan is to identify opportunities for additional community park space to serve people in the growing areas in the central parts and southern parts of the Village. These are ideas I know have been discussed, the idea of a community park in combination with a school site and a nature preserve area in the High Point neighborhood. And a second community park potentially in conjunction with a school campus in the southeastern part of the community as well.

Then kind of a third priority is taking care of some of the existing and maintaining some of the existing facilities that you have particularly in two areas: Pleasant Prairie Park in the northwestern part, upgrading that park and acquisitions which are ongoing to enlarge that park and serve the surrounding population, and then some of the . . . sort of a snaggletooth pattern and taking advantage of opportunities to acquire properties as they become available in that area. So those are three overall themes that I see as we think about the park system map. There's other sources that we're drawing from including neighborhood plans that are in preparation or have been already prepared that have identified smaller neighborhood parks in different parts of the community that we would also propose be included on the first digital version of the park system plan.

But I think with that I'd just like to open up the floor to comments and other ideas related to how you would like to see this map look, with at least the trail and park ideas are in

line with your expectations or whether there are other ideas that we need to make sure we bring into the mix.

Rita Christiansen:

Comments from the Board please?

Jean Werbie:

With respect to your trail systems and as we get into more detail, are you going to be actually proposing cross-sections of these trails and materials and things, more the details of these trails?

Mark Roffers:

Yes. I think for this primary route that we're talking about that I've drawn in the thickened blue lines our recommendation would be for ten foot wide paved off road trail.

Jean Werbie:

I have a followup question to that. We've got some projects that are going to be coming up in the very near future where we're going to be looking at possible road widenings 10 or 15 years into the future, and those road widenings might identify the need for off site trail systems. Are those included on this? Are they adapted from any of the SEWRPC plans, or are we kind of looking at these as two separate entities with respect to trail systems? Are they operating differently or are they for different purposes?

Mark Roffers:

One of the things I do almost for fun nowadays is bike and pedestrian system plans. And you're catering to at least two different types of riders with any bicycle and pedestrian system, bike system. The family rider we'll call them that doesn't want to ride on any road that is outside of a subdivision, and the more experienced commuter or touring rider that feels comfortable and in some cases prefers riding on streets as opposed to riding on off street paths. So what I recommend in doing bike system planning is that particularly if you're dealing with something that ultimately might become a congested path to provide something else for the on street cyclist would be important. So I'm actually a pretty strong proponent on not extremely busy arterial streets like 50 necessarily, but on collector roads providing on street bicycle lanes.

As I understood what you're talking about and you can correct me if I'm wrong is more of an off street path where you have the roadway, you have a patch of green, a terrace area, and then instead of a sidewalk maybe you have a paved path. Those are fine where you have limited access to that road. Where you have frequent street or driveway access they're actually more dangerous than putting cyclists in bicycle lanes on the street.

So the short answer to summarize I think what we need to provide is recommendations for where those off street paths will be, whether they'll be along side of a road or in an

environmental corridor, and then perhaps where the on street connections may be advisable or even necessary because of development and other limiting factors that you can't possible connect everything off street.

Jean Werbie:

I have one followup question then. The needs that we were talking about previously where we talked about recreational needs in 2030, based on the chart it shows that we don't need any trails. I mean we've met our quota based on our population. But I think that Pleasant Prairie wants to be above that with respect to our connectivity of our parks as well as getting people from where we are and where we live to the big park and elsewhere in the community. So is that something you're going to go back to?

Mark Roffers:

I'm going to revisit those standards. I just don't buy them.

Jean Werbie:

Because that doesn't make any sense to us.

Mark Roffers:

No, it doesn't make sense for most communities as a matter of fact.

Jean Werbie:

And then are you going to look at for a standard recreational trail versus these off street bike lanes for the serious biker? I guess I was just wondering if you're going to distinguish that.

Mark Roffers:

Yes, I think we need to understand what that standard means, and if it's a recreational trail standard then I would not necessarily include the on street bicycle striped lanes with the little diamond in them that are used for that purpose.

Mike Pollocoff:

In order to make your work more efficient for the Village, to me it seems like one of the policy questions that the Park Commission needs to address is as we allocate resources, and I'm talking about the trails right now, do we want to create a policy or an image for the Village that we find ways to facilitate people through the Village abutting environmental corridors? I don't want to say in to the point where it's unusable because not all environmental corridors are usable. But do we want to be known for that and have that be a particular amenity in the Village that we've enhanced, or do we want to stick them on the roads and expand the road profiles?

I don't want to sound like I'm just talking about money, but it's pretty damn expensive to

get those things on the streets, because typically you get involved in that street process, the design, the bidding and you've got that terrace area and you've got the path, and the maintenance of that ends up being a big issue. In my own mind intuitively I just think that a lot of people like to be able to think about riding along a drainageway or a wooded area on a path especially if it gets them from one place to another along the way.

I think it's a policy decision that the Commission should make whether or not, one, we want to focus on one or the other, or do we want to direct the consultant to take a look at the off road paths and utilize the environmental corridors even if that means--it's going to mean land acquisition. Either way you're going to require additional right of way along a road or you're going to acquire some land for a trail. Which way should we direct them to and what are your wishes? I told you what I like but that doesn't mean anything. It's really what you guys like and would like to do.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I think a hybrid system is necessary, because as you described there's two totally different user classes. There's the family recreation off road biker that wants to be on a trail probably separate from any street, and then you take Lakeshore Drive on a summer weekend and there's a lot of sport bicyclists that cruise through the area and they don't want to see any gravel, and I don't think they necessarily want to be on a pathway separate from a street. They're satisfied being on a paved area. And whether or not a bike lane is going to serve any purpose I kind of wonder that myself.

Mike Pollocoff:

I'd recommend any trail be paved to be honest with you, whether it's off the streets or not.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I think having a bike lane plan in mind is a good idea, but I think they're entirely separate users, the people that use an unpaved gravel former railroad bed are not the same bikers that are going to be wanting to be competitive bicyclists on a paved street. They're totally different.

Jean Werbie:

So do you design two separate trail systems then basically?

Mark Roffers:

I don't think you'd design a trail system for the touring cyclist. I think you identify roads that work. If they're rural roads I agree totally with what you're saying, you don't need a bicycle lane. If they're busier streets to provide a separate striped area, so everyone, including the car drivers, know that there might be cyclists is a good idea.

Jean Werbie:

But I think you do have to look at that because as areas develop we need to make sure we have enough right of way and we need to make sure that that lane width is wide enough. So we do need to have that designed or in mind, and if we don't then we're not going to get the dedications from the developers and we're not going to get them to build the trails adjacent to the development. So I think that even though it might be separate, we still need to identify where they are and what we're going to need and what the cross-section would be so that it gets built as we go along. Maybe we don't put our dollars or resources into that and we focus on the other trails, but as development occurs we acquire.

Mark Roffers:

And most of the roads that I would consider putting bicycle lanes on, the striped lanes, are roads that are already in existence in the community, the mile roads that when they get urbanized and upgraded that they would be improved. It's basically the throughs that carry a fair amount of traffic. Most local streets in new subdivisions and connector or collector streets probably don't have enough traffic to warrant that treatment. Not all necessarily, but most of them probably don't. So in that case the most important thing, and I certainly agree with Mike, that the recreational cyclist would much rather drive through an environmental corridor than alongside Highway 50 or whatever, you pick the highway.

But the most important recommendation I offer any community that wants to develop a bicycle friendly community is just to have an interconnected local road network in your subdivisions and don't overdo it on the cul-de-sacs, which is a great way to make a community unfriendly and inaccessible to bikes and pedestrians.

Rita Christiansen:

I have a question. Jean, 165 from Kenosha Road east is that all widened? Is that all done as far as if I took my bike and drove down there would be expanded in the future to acquire some of that land for development.

Jean Werbie:

On 165?

Rita Christiansen:

Going east.

Jean Werbie:

On October 19th the Wisconsin Department of Transportation is holding their first public informational meeting, and they intend to bring forth some proposals and concepts for the widening of 165 between Sheridan Road and 31, Green Bay Road. And they will be introducing some various concepts for not only the widening of the profile of the

roadway but bike lanes as well as off road bike trails and systems and bringing various suggestions for the public, the Village and the Board and the Plan Commission and the Park Commission and everyone to take a look at. So I would encourage you to attend that so we can see what they are proposing for the next 10 to 15 year down the road time period. Again, October 19th here at the Village Hall from 4:30 to 7:30, so I'm anxious to see what they have to present as well.

Rita Christiansen:

Any comments?

Jean Werbie:

I have a question. With respect to the park plan are you also doing a section on special interest parks or special interest areas? Pleasant Prairie has a lot of them, and I think that for the residents and for others that are coming that would be great to let people know and have a section on Chiwaukee Prairie, on the Des Plaines River Watershed, on the Momper's Woods and the future Village Center. These are special interest. They don't qualify for neighborhood parks or community parks, but they are special interest parks and that should be included as part of the calculations.

Mark Roffers:

I agree. It's hard to quantify a demand for Chiwaukee Prairie. How big does it need to be to satisfy? It kind of defies quantification to a certain extent. But to identify as a community interest and a community need is definitely something that we would do. Most of the communities that we're preparing park plans for are moving towards providing and dealing with those passive use and open space facilities for a good reason. The population is aging. Activities like nature viewing and birding is gigantic and growing all the time. It's only going to get greater over the 20 or 30 years as the population continues to get older in general.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I'm definitely in favor of a corridor, whether it's on road or off road, be it the east/west corridor. I live in Carol Beach, and frankly the only logical route to take from Carol Beach to the RecPlex is 93rd Street and 93rd Street is not a good place to be biking. So some kind of enhancement, perhaps a grid system for road biking I would be highly in favor of. And then a trail system, as I mentioned before, I think is a separate need altogether.

Rita Christiansen:

So it's the feeling of this Board then we need to look at both options for the future then?

William Mills:

Yes, I think we need to look at that. As Alex had mentioned I think they're two separate

issues personally.

Rita Christiansen:

I would agree. I really like the environmental corridors off road paths, because I think that's more family friendly if you will. And I think it's real critical that we focus on that and at the same time secondary would be the road options that would be available. I think we need to keep it in our scope. But for myself I would just as soon focus on the environmental corridors and off road paths and identify those, because as we all know people are going to ride on the roads that are provided so those are there, whether they be 93rd Street or 165. But looking at the environmental corridors would be very important as a starting point.

Alex Tiahnybok:

If we come up with a plan my recommendation would be to look at the geography of the Village, look at where the logical traffic flows are. Mark indicated that the whole idea of a separate bike lane separated from the street actually creates more of a hazard than having a bike lane attached to a street. Maybe in our road plan if we have that concept in mind already that these are the roads that we think would be the natural pathways for on road bikers to use just keep that in mind when we do our road improvements so that when the opportunities arise we make the road an extra eight feet wider.

Rita Christiansen:

Or look at incorporating something.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Right, and take advantage of the opportunity when it occurs.

Rita Christiansen:

I think one of the things that we had originally talked about was the fact that we wanted to create safe biking areas for young people in the Village to go from spot to spot. And being able to do that my suggestion would be to keep them off the roads as much as possible and look at environmental corridors.

Mark Roffers:

And at least from my end a final comment on that. There may be situations where having a separate path right alongside the road is a good idea. For example, if we can't figure out a way to get through the general area of the Hunt Club, it may be that a path would logically run along County H in that area. So I wouldn't discount it entirely, but in those situations where you do plan for paths just make sure you don't have a driveway every 100 feet because those are where most accidents happen between bikers and cars that aren't anticipating something coming at them at 15 miles an hour.

Rita Christiansen:

And H does have a lot of industrial traffic, so just as a suggestion we really need to look at, like you said, the driveways and the traffic pattern, etc.

William Mills:

One of the other key roadways I think which does not exist yet is when Cooper is extended from 93rd Street to 165, because there's a lot of development and it's right in the area for the Village Green area as well.

Mark Roffers:

That's a good point. Any other comments on sort of the general direction? A lot of this has sort of been established through previous plans, but we need to bring a lot of that together. I think a lot of the thoughts that we had from the, frankly, great turnout, we had 35 or 40 people at that people, coincided. Probably not surprisingly we had moles in the groups, but it probably coincided with a lot of those previous plans and ideas.

Mike Pollocoff:

One other question. In Carol Beach Park's swimming areas, again from a policy standpoint from the Commission, does the Commission want to create in the Carol Beach swimming park areas, for lack of a better name, the same thing that we have at Prairie Springs Park. When I say the same thing, even though they might be swimming in sewage, it would be buoyed off and there would be guards there. There would be designated parking areas and there could be a fee to come in. Is that the kind of beach area you're looking at or kind of like what we have now only putting a portable toilet someplace? What do the swimming areas of beach mean to you or for us as we look at it or the consultant looks at it?

Rita Christiansen:

Comments?

Alex Tiahnybok:

I think we're at a crossroads with Carol Beach beach. This year was maybe arguably a unique experience. Who knows what it's going to be like next year. But if we're going to allow swimming, then I think we need to control it to a certain point. Right now it's a free for all, and as we discussed at our last Parks Commission meeting there are people dragging jet skis from their trailers in the parking area, across the shore protection and down across the beach. They're going to come looking for us if something happens bad. They're going to say why did you allow this to happen? So I think we're going to have to do something with it. Maybe something similar to what we have at Prairie Springs. Maybe it's time for that in Carol Beach.

Charlene Smith:

As a resident of this area I really feel that your suggestion is totally fine. I mean that area is so congested on the weekends and it's not residents there. The residents enjoy that area but we don't swim there. We might play on the beach there, but I don't know if there's something you could do like a discount for Village residents like you do at Prairie Springs. There's two different price differences, so I would highly suggest something like that. I would definitely say that area does need parking. That area does need a restroom. That's all I have to say. Thanks.

Rita Christiansen:

Thank you. As far as swimming there because we've heard about conditions related to the water, you'd have to do water testing before I would think you could authorize people to go ahead and go in the water. Once you've said yes or no, then you'd have to provide some type of lifeguards for them. But I would like to suggest first that we get control of the beach if that's at all possible in regard to the jet skis coming up. Start small and then work our way into what might be the next step. But it would be nice if we could have a cement bunker for a toilet there so no one could knock it over. But, again, I don't know what else we're going to do other than to tie it to telephone poles or something. John, if you have a suggestion here, because we can't seem to keep the bathroom in the correct direction versus the other way. For myself I'm more concerned with getting the jet skis. That seems to be the theme we're hearing constantly. Anybody else? Is there anything you'd like to see at Carol Beach Park, maybe a pavilion or some kind of amenity improvement?

Mike Pollocoff:

We just don't have a lot of land. That's the problem for a pavilion. I've seen some ways where horrible toilets have been--you build basically a cage and that gets put down and goes down to a footing. Then you push the portable toilet inside the cage. At the end of the day it's a see through cage and you shut the gate and nobody can get into the toilet and they can't float it or do whatever they're going to do with it.

We've had some success where we've controlled the shoreline where we've installed the bollards along the road and that keeps people--they can still get in it. From a pedestrian standpoint anybody can walk down there and get to those areas, and we're not too far off from having that down in the Carol Beach Park. But, and here's the big but, it's a big departure. You'll have Mr. Hauser and his neighbors once we start charging people for it, people down there, some people will pay the fee but it's not controlled now, but once we make it an improved park, just like Prairie Springs you will still see a lot of people there, and basically the money we charge our rates tend to keep out Illinois people at Prairie Springs Park at a prohibitive rate. The rate we have there is Village residents and County residents, and if you're not Village or County you might as well be from Mars because you're going to pay a high rate.

So we can do that, but once people see it's a nice park and we put some grass in there and we mow it and it starts looking nice it will get a lot of use. But getting it that way now it's not organized. I guess that's the direction I'm looking for. Do you guys want to take that leap and create a beach? We check that beach all the time for water quality. It's

really bad when it rains because that's when the septic in Unit 2 and in that area flush and that flushes out into the lake. If something happens up lake from us that's a problem, too. I would imagine more times than not, and this year has been pretty good because we didn't have a lot of rain, but more times than not the water is bad down there.

Rita Christiansen:

For me I'd just like to see, and from what I hear from the people that live down that way, there's a lot of boat and jet ski traffic. Let's see if we can get our hands around that a little bit better. I don't know if there's really a way to control that, Mike, is there?

Mike Pollocoff:

The Sheriff would be the one that would control anything on the water.

Rita Christiansen:

We'll leave that one alone.

Mike Pollocoff:

If I called him I'm sure he would be glad to send somebody down there.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Is that a Parks Commission thing to consider an ordinance that would prohibit the use of motorized water craft from a public beach?

Mike Pollocoff:

We can't do that. You'll have to put an access in. There has to be an access point. You can regulate it, but you can't prohibit it. One way or another somebody can come off the lake side into a public area. So you're going to have to deal with it on that end.

Glen Christiansen:

But I frequently see swimming areas, that's the bugaboo, if we designated a swimming area then we're condoning swimming and then you can prohibit powered water craft from entering.

Mike Pollocoff:

Right. You can identify an area where they can't come at all. So the swimming area--I just visualize that area from Tobin Creek down to where the first house is where the houses start, which is probably about 113th, say that was a swimming area then you can control the boat traffic out from there.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Because typically it's a couple hundred feet off the beach is a designated swimming area and they put buoys. Naturally, if it's a swimming area then you can't drag your jet ski across the beach and launch it. But do we want to make it a swimming area? That's the pivotal question.

Glen Christiansen:

Then the only way you could do it would make it swimming at your own risk with no improvements other than an area—

Mike Pollocoff:

The thing is if you want to control what people are doing down there, you're going to have somebody down there, and if you have lifeguards down there then they end up policing, or they've got a radio and they call the police when the knuckleheads come in. I think swim at your own risk that's okay, but I think we're trying to accomplish two things here, control the activity in that beach area and that's the most cost effective typically with lifeguards. You've got somebody that's watching what's going on in the park and the beach, and then another lifeguard in the chair and they cycle through. That's typically what happens. So you get some bang for the buck for having a lifeguard there.

Glen Christiansen:

Then you'd have to dedicate a person or two just to that park to patrol it and keep an eye on it.

William Mills:

I'm skeptical, I must admit, in terms of thinking that we're going to solve our problems by putting lifeguards down there, just in terms of, sure, I guess we'll solve getting the water craft out to the lake, but in terms of if we have a cold summer whether or not you're going to have enough people to actually be able to pay the lifeguards and make that cost effective, etc. It just doesn't make sense.

Rita Christiansen:

So we've come full circle.

Alex Tiahnybok:

To me it sounds like the absolute low cost solution from an accomplishing the job perspective would be to call it a beach. It's being used as a beach right now. Put buoys out there. Create a no swim zone. Put up signs saying swim at your own risk, and then without having patrol there of a lifeguard there or law enforcement, let's face it the police department does cruise the area and if it's a law that you're not supposed to have powered water craft in that area, our police department can take care of it on the spot and

the offenders are going to get the message. They'll stop doing it and I don't think we're going to have to enforce it that much. Kind of a low cost solution to the problem.

William Mills:

Could you make the ordinance more of a parking ordinance in terms of that you can't park water craft trailers? Just an off the wall thought. That way you could ticket the vehicle even if the police drive by and the water craft aren't there.

Mike Pollocoff:

You could bollard off the parking so they can't park at the beach are itself. But what you'd be doing is posting no parking signs along lakeshore or some of those areas along the side streets so people couldn't pull up and park and have a trailer there. They'd be less likely to hoof their sled that far. That would be the way we could do it. I don't know if we could post it no water craft trailers. I think the judge would say either you park or you don't park. That affects the residents.

Rita Christiansen:

Right, exactly. So do we have a solution?

Mike Pollocoff:

It's not a solution. I'm just looking for a policy direction. We can ramp this up and spend a lot of money on it, or it really depends on what you guys want to do.

Rita Christiansen:

Do we need to look at a legal opinion on this, Mike, regarding the trailers or signs saying no parking with trailers?

Mike Pollocoff:

I don't think a judge would convict anybody there with parking there with no trailers. The judge is going to say you can park or you can't park. It doesn't matter what you're driving. You can park there or not.

Rita Christiansen:

So would it be the suggestion of this Board then to take up what Alex said in regards to a policy of swim at your own risk zone with buoys?

William Mills:

I'd like to ask Mark in terms of have you come across this sort of situation in the past? Any suggestions that you may have for us since you've heard us debate this issue?

Mark Roffers:

I like the direction you're sort of heading, some way to be able to monitor that, the jet skis, the boat use. If this is an avenue to do that, that would be great. My observation on the tour that we took, and it's just a preliminary observation, is that some more formalized restroom facility would be good. Some more formalized parking would be good. I don't know if that answers your question.

The other observation I have is in the three or four months I've been working on this project I've tried to get my arms around all this open space and parkland owned and managed by different people along and near the waterfront. It's still kind of vexing to me. There's Carol Beach Park, there's Carol Beach beach I hear. Something we've been calling Lake Michigan parkland. I don't know where that name came from. We also have the Chiwaukee Prairie. We have different units of Carol Beach Park. We have the DNR lands. There's some sort of system out there of open space and I'm trying to get my arms around what it is. Is it all called Carol Beach Park?

Charlene Smith:

The residential area is called Carol Beach. From there to Lakefront Park

--:

It's called Lake Michigan Park.

Charlene Smith:

So there is actually a Carol Beach Park.

Mark Roffers:

Right, and that's with the basketball park that is not in the greatest shape. And then there's a second park that we're talking about planning for up north that we don't have a name. We talked about having a contest or something like that. I kind of get it now. Thanks.

Gus Hauser:

The whole area between Kenosha and . . . State Line to the south, Lake Michigan to the east and Sheridan Road to the west is all

Mark Roffers:

All the way from the City limits, okay. Thank you. At least I've got some sort of structure to build on now.

Rita Christiansen:

I think what we need to do here is move forward and look for a motion regarding a policy

on Lake Michigan Park, is that correct?

William Mills:

I do have one more question, Rita. I'm trying to look at it in terms of the parking issue. Is there any way, he had mentioned in terms of designating parking, that you can actually have parking by barricade or whatever where you couldn't get the trailers into that area?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes. We have an area where we could set up enough land for parking and it would be eight feet long, enough to get you off the road to direction in and you couldn't get a trailer in there. There's some creative things we could do. If some guy is the first guy there he's going to pull up and take three spots for the trailer, but that's one way to skin the cat.

Rita Christiansen:

Do we want a motion of some sort?

Alex Tiahnybok:

I'm going to go with my original idea. I'd like to propose a policy of creating a swimming only zone marked by buoys with no lifeguard services, swim at your own risk type signage, seasonal, and just have normal law enforcement enforce the fact that there shouldn't be any powered water craft in the swim zone.

William Mills:

Is there liability issue with swim at your own risk?

Mike Pollocoff:

No. There's recreational immunity, but you've got to show that you're not being negligent in what you're providing. I don't think providing a buoyed swim area gets the point across the threshold in my mind.

Mark Roffers:

I don't think it's any different than provide a skate park and just properly marking it according to appropriate standards for that facility.

Mike Pollocoff:

I think we're giving the consultant some direction.

Rita Christiansen:

So we have a motion to adopt a policy of having a no swimming zone down at Lake Michigan park, is that correct?

Alex Tiahnybok:

A swimming only zone.

Rita Christiansen:

A swimming only zone with buoys?

Mike Pollocoff:

I'll include that in the . . . and we know that as far as the budget.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I know there are standards. If you go just south of the Illinois/Wisconsin line there are buoys off of Northpoint Beach and it's a designated number of feet. I don't know what exactly it is, but follow their guidelines and I don't think that's patrolled either. The only time there's a boat on that beach is if a boat breaks down and drifts into shore. Otherwise it self-polices itself for the most part. People understand what it's about.

William Mills:

That seems like a logical next step to me. I second the motion.

Glen Christiansen:

I tend to think this is a good start. Perhaps we can add to it, but at least it's a good start at attacking the problem, and perhaps we could find other things to add to it at a later date.

Rita Christiansen:

Motion made. I have a first and a second. All in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

Rita Christiansen:

Opposed? Being none the motion is passed. Mark?

Mark Roffers:

If I can have a little bit of clarification when I work this all out. What are the boundaries that we're looking for? We're looking from the Tobin Creek area going south to where

the residential property starts?

Alex Tiahnybok:

It's the beach area bounded by the first private property on both sides. I think that's the best way to define the area, or is that not a good way to define the area?

(Inaudible)

Gus Hauser:

May I make a suggestion. have a designated parking area but make it short enough so you only can park cars but not trailers, and then barricade the rest of it off. That limits the area and that limits the access of the people that can come to that area. I live on 113th Street and in the area and I know the problems.

Rita Christiansen:

So, John, to clarify, we're saying from Tobin Creek south, was it 113th, is that what we were looking at, Mike?

Mike Pollocoff:

That's the one area that the Village has complete ownership on. As you go north it's pretty—

(Inaudible)

Rita Christiansen:

I'm going to have to restrict the citizen comments if we could, although I do appreciate you coming, believe me. So we're clear on the Tobin Creek south to 113th? Alex, you have something to add?

Alex Tiahnybok:

I think the only place we can designate a swim area is what we own, the Village property. So whatever Village property—

Rita Christiansen:

Do you need anything else from us then, John?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

No.

Mark Roffers:

I guess in conclusion I just wanted to get some direction or guidance from you as to what we wanted to do with some of the other ideas. One that came to mind was the idea for developing a skate park within the Village. Whether that's something or if there are other directions that you haven't heard of that you want us to pursue or explore as part of this planning process. Now would be a good time to let us know and investigate those and work with staff over the next couple months.

Rita Christiansen:

John, did you have any comments in regard to skate park or one of you here? Feelings, thoughts, liabilities?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I guess I can't speak probably as well as Mark can as Mark is the expert on that. I guess I'll have some question of mark. Mark, are there any other skate parks in other communities and what kind of liabilities and what kinds of things are they doing to restrict those liabilities of those skate parks?

Mark Roffers:

The liability, Mike talked about the recreational immunity, and as long as you're designing the skate park according to the standards for designing skate parks, as long as you're following those and as long as you're posting those areas you're covered in the same way you're covered in any park or recreational facility. I've known of communities that have had just wonderful experiences with skate parks and communities that have had very bad experiences with skate parks. It has a lot to do with a couple of factors, how accessible and visible those parks are from public streets and how easy they are to patrol and monitor.

Making them attractive for residents but not too attractive that they become a regional sort of destination, then you start to deal with a lot of the issues we were just talking about with the beach, that's certainly a factor. And then thinking about accessibility and how you get to those places. My most favorite example is the skate park right across the street from a brewery that's open. You have a wonderful mix of traffic with folks enjoying some beer and kids skateboarding down the same street. That's doesn't quite work very well.

Rita Christiansen:

Mark, are you familiar with a skateboard park that's up by Appleton, Neenah, Menasha?

Mark Roffers:

I'm not familiar with that one, no.

Rita Christiansen:

The other question would be if a skateboard park would be considered, where would the Board suggest that it be placed?

Jean Werbie:

Actually, my son is a skateboarder, so the skateboard park that he goes to is actually very small. It's the one in Kenosha right at the entrance of Washington Bowl. And the reason why that one seems to still be there and not be too much a problem is because it's right there. You can see it on the main street of 22nd Avenue, it's adjacent to the fire station, and everyone has to go by it and everybody can see it and it's wide open.

The other skateboard park which just closed, which was right behind Scamps, you couldn't see it. It was more secluded and hidden and it became a vandalism spot. Kids were getting into trouble there. They were jumping over the fence and skating when they weren't supposed to be skating, and it was more of an honor type system where you were supposed to go in and pay and skate there. So that didn't work. They had some great ramps and things that they had built for the kids and it didn't work.

Rita Christiansen:

Any recommendation of where you would see a skate park placed in the Village?

Jean Werbie:

I don't have any recommendations because I haven't looked at it in detail. But I would think liability is a number one main issue, because everywhere we went, at Scamps and other ones, we had to sign all these documents. I don't think you have to sign anything with the City of Kenosha to use that one and there's no fee to get into it. But I think you should really do some significant investigation before you commit any dollars or resources to that. It's a sport that can be kind of dangerous.

Rita Christiansen:

Mark, could you bring back more information for us?

Mark Roffers:

Sure, yes, we can definitely bring back more information on standards and what communities have done. Every community that has considered it has asked those same questions.

Rita Christiansen:

One of the other issues that came up on Wednesday was we had a young lady that thought it was very important that we have a dog park. I thought that was a great idea. We have an area where a lot of people have animals, and I'd like some consideration taken to that also, a dog park.

Mark Roffers:

I think both of those types of facilities require something like a larger park setting to make it work. You have obviously the space and some of the nuisance issues associated with both skateboarding and dog park. Particularly the skate parks that I'm familiar with the ones that seem to work the best are in community parks where there's a lot of other traffic there and they're not sort of isolated and tucked in. So either Prairie Springs Park or one of the future community parks may be a spot to at least talk about those types of special use facilities.

The other component that was mentioned several times was education, particularly with respect to nature preserves, how to use your parks as a way to interpret nature and the community and its history and heritage. I think that definitely should be a component of the park plan as well.

Rita Christiansen:

Is there anything you need from us tonight?

Mark Roffers:

I think that's it for now. We'll be bringing back information and sharing it with Village staff and then with the Commission over the course of the next couple of months kind of culminating in a full draft of the plan in January.

Alex Tiahnybok:

On the master park plan, meeting 5, next month November 2nd, is that intentionally a Wednesday instead of a Tuesday? I have every first Tuesday.

Mike Pollocoff:

That's election day.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Okay, I was just curious.

Rita Christiansen:

Good point, thank you. Thank you, Mark. I do want to take this opportunity to address the concern that was given by one of our citizens in regards to Momper's Woods and its condition. John, could you address that for us please?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Yes. As we had talked about earlier I believe last month, there was a small amount of

illegal dumping that was going on. A lot of the material that is out at Momper's Woods and Mr. Hauser had addressed at the beginning of the meeting, a lot of the concrete, a lot of the bricks, a lot of the material, a lot of the scrap lumber is all remnants from when the property was originally given over to the Village. There was a large barn there and there was a house. And I believe at one time there was a riding arena and horses and pastures and stuff like that. So I do agree that there was some dumping going on. Village crews actually this week have removed the dirt that was illegally dumped, or at least a large portion of it. Then they're in the process of starting the cleanup from when the site was razed and taken away.

Mike Pollocoff:

One of the things I think the Commission needs to know is that when the individual, I can't remember her name now, sold that land to WisPark, that land was not in good shape. They had used it as a dump. There was a fair amount of asphalt and concrete buried there. It was a rural site and they didn't haul things off. They just buried them there on the site. So as we went through and cleaned it up there was a significant amount of stuff that needed to be cleaned up that was just piled up or buried out there. I think that although she may have been shocked when she saw it, I can guarantee we were shocked when we saw it when it was given to us after they sold it to WisPark. John's people have done a--the Village has spent over the years a significant amount of time breaking up the concrete, getting the place cleaned up and we haul it out as we can haul it out.

Dumping is a problem in the Village nonstop. You go down to Carol Beach, Bain Station, any kind of road that gets a little bit isolated it's like ants to chocolate cake. They just go there and dump whenever they can. But I think we're making some good strides over there to get that cleaned up.

Rita Christiansen:

And in all fairness, too, Momper's Woods has been identified as a future site possibly as an educational facility and a park area, something to keep it more aesthetically, clean it up, make it a soft type of usage. We just recently took a tour there ourselves, and there was quite a bit of debris at the time. But, again, like you both pointed out we have a lot of areas in the Village that people feel free to dump whatever they want to dump and it's very difficult to keep your hands around that.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

And Village staff also just repaired the cable that goes across the driveway so that's back up now. So I'm very confident that it is being watched by a lot of organizations, by a lot of residents and by Village staff now. When we are cleaning up the site we have to be very careful about areas that we drive in. There's a lot of oak trees that we need to make sure not to damage. There's a lot of trails and a lot of historical information that are very sensitive around also.

Rita Christiansen:

I just wanted to let you know that we did hear concerns. I apologize for waiting so late in the meeting to address them, but John is aware of them as is the rest of the Board as we are, too, because we just, like I said, recently toured the site and think it's important to make sure that we try to keep areas clean. If you find anything in the future please feel free to contact us. We appreciate it. Is there anything else?

6. ADJOURNMENT

Rita Christiansen:

Being no other matters I'd like a motion to adjourn.

Glen Christiansen:

I make a motion we adjourn.

Michael Russert:

Second the motion.

Rita Christiansen:

First and second. All in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

Rita Christiansen:

Opposed? Thank you everyone for your attendance.

ADJOURNED: 7:58 p.m.