

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

A joint meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Park Commission and the Pleasant Prairie Recreation Commission was held on Tuesday, December 6, 2005, at 6:00 p.m. Present from the Park Commission were Rita Christiansen, Glenn Christiansen, Kathleen Burns, Michael Russert, William Mills and Alex Tiahnybok. Michaeline Day was excused. Present from the Recreation Commission were Dino Laurenzi, Gregory Scheppler, John Skalbeck, Linda Godin, Steve Kumorkiewicz and Travis Laib. James Becker and Robert Marfechuk were excused. Also present were Michael Pollocoff, Village Administrator; John Steinbrink, Jr., Superintendent of Parks; Cathi Klaver, Recreational Director; Terry Cooper, Clerical Secretary; and Judith Baternik, Clerical Secretary.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. ROLL CALL**
- 3. MINUTES - NOVEMBER 2, 2005 (PARK COMMISSION) AND NOVEMBER 8, 2005 (RECREATION COMMISSION)**

Rita Christiansen:

Do we have a motion to approve the Park Commission minutes from the November 2, 2005 meeting?

--:

I motion for approval.

Rita Christiansen:

Do we have a second?

--:

I second the motion.

Rita Christiansen:

Motion made and seconded. All in favor?

Voices:

Aye.
Rita Christiansen:

Opposed? Being none the motion passes.

Dino Laurenzi:

I'd like a motion for approval of the Recreation Commission minutes of November 8, 2005.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

So moved.

--:

Second.

Dino Laurenzi:

All in favor aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Dino Laurenzi:

All opposed nay. Motion approved.

4. CITIZEN COMMENTS

5. NEW BUSINESS

a. Final Review of Master Park Plan (Vandewalle & Associates)

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Good evening everyone. Staff and the consultants, Vandewalle & Associates), primarily Megan and Jim and Mark have been spending a lot of time putting together a lot of the information that we've acquired starting from the meeting we had from the RecPlex back in September, taking that information and putting together some drafts of maps, taking the park plans and revising them as we have, and this is our first draft report we have to show to the Commissions.

What I'd like to do this evening is take a little time and go over each of the five park plans that we have designed. They should have all been included in your packet. Find

out if there's any last comment that you might have on them. We tried to take the comments and the concepts from everyone, but with so many different sources and so many different people being involved in this, we have found out that it's virtually impossible to get everyone's comments into all of the park plans that we have. But we did try to incorporate as many as we could from both the Commissions and from the residents and based on staff recommendations. Then after we go through with the five parks we will take any comments that you have on the draft report for the master park plan.

The first park that I would like to start with is the Carol Beach Unit W park located just east of 7th Avenue and north of 90th Street. One of the things that we looked at doing on this park is taking the privately owned land, trying to make a land swap with the existing property owner so that the Village would somehow acquire that land and make some sort of an active park in that area. It was the recommendation of both the Park and Rec Commission to somehow develop some sort of an active parkland in that Carol Beach Unit W area. There really was not enough space to do what we needed to do on the Village owned land that's just to the south of what is shown on this map. So staff believes that it's needed to acquire some more land, and the layout you have on the screen there and in your packet also is what we came up with. It includes keeping the existing parking lot pretty much intact where it is. A U8 soccer field on the southern portion of it, a recreation softball field, some trails going around the wetland and the pond area, two tennis courts, a playground and a shelter.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Excuse me, John. I think we are all lost here where you are at. Are we in this here?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Everybody should have received by e-mail a series of PDFs and Word documents, and then when compiled would put together the draft plan of the master park plan. We were not able to send it as one document just based on the pure size of all of the color PDFs and then the amount of text that we all had. So we sent out all the information in different stages and hopefully you were able to go through and assemble all of them together. This I believe is one of the last maps, map number five I believe, as per that e-mail.

I guess I should back up a step. Was everybody able to receive all the e-mails and assemble the draft document? I do understand that it probably was a very cumbersome project, but it is a very large document to send by e-mail.

Are there any questions or comments on what we have proposed for the Carol Beach Unit W park?

Rita Christiansen:

Park Commission, any questions or comments?

Alex Tiahnybok:

Acquisition wise what's the process, what's the status of that land currently? What's the next step?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

The status of that land currently is that it is privately owned, and then as a procedure to get some acquisition of stewardship grants, working with the DNR, trying to find some sort of funding available to gain some monies to acquire that land in that Unit W area. And then doing a land swap with our existing land also.

Rita Christiansen:

Any other comments on Carol Beach Unit W Park? No further comments from the Park Commission?

Dino Laurenzi:

Any questions or comments from the Recreation Committee?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I guess I would ask then if both of the Commission would recommend moving the Unit W draft as our final version?

Rita Christiansen:

Do we have a motion from the Park Commission in regards to the Unit W Park master plan?

Glenn Christiansen:

I'll make a motion that we move forward with adopting the plan proposed.

William Mills:

I second.

Rita Christiansen:

I have a motion and a second. All in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

Rita Christiansen:

Opposed? None. Motion carries.

Dino Laurenzi:

Do we have a motion from the Recreation Commission to accept the Unit W Carol Beach master plan?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

So moved.

--:

Second.

Dino Laurenzi:

All in favor aye?

Voices:

Aye.

Dino Laurenzi:

All opposed nay? Motion approved.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I will now move forward to talk about Creekside Park. Creekside Park is located just north of 93rd Street, east of Highway 31. The developer, Mastercraft, has been moving a lot of earth and actually has the phase 1 of that park almost complete with the rough grading. There are some roads that are in and the bridge is in.

It contains a little bit smaller area of a park on the southeast portion of it with just a playground area in there. And then having a trail that ties in the southern portion with the northern portion of the park. We've having some more of the active amenities in the park on the northern end. The park on the northern end has a tennis court to the far north, a parking lot, a pavilion . . . kind of its active area that will be available year 'round.

The soccer fields that are shown on there, the three U8 fields are located in the area of the basin that will potentially flood during large rain events. And so this is an area where we can take advantage of probably 51 weeks out of the year allowing recreation to take place on those soccer fields, and then during large rainstorm events when there's water ponding in that area they would have to be off of there. We chose to have soccer on there versus other active amenities because all you really need is a soccer goal, something you can have with metal and make it portable, move it around. If it floods a little bit it really

won't hurt anything. If you have a softball field a lot of the dirt could get washed away or eroded.

The water elevations are not going to be that deep where it's going to flood very quickly or rapidly. But staff did feel that it was important to somehow utilize that green space if it's something that can be used for basically year round unless a large rain event happens. Any comments or questions on the Creekside Park Plan as it's shown?

Rita Christiansen:

Any comments or questions from the Park Commission?

Michael Russert:

For the small park on the bottom of the map would that be street parking since there's a lock on the top part?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

It would just be street parking. We would probably encourage or assume that most of the people that will be using that small tot lot area would probably walk to that tot lot area, and so there is no parking designed on there. It's under the assumption that either you can have the on street parking or the residents would just walk from their homes to that park.

Rita Christiansen:

John, I have a question. The tot lot is proximity to the stream. Is that an issue as far as flooding, or how close is that going to be to the water?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

It's going to be just from looking on the map I'm guessing around 100 feet if I'm reading the scale right. There is a large brush buffer that's on there. We really don't feel that it's of any danger to anyone using that park. It's a very gradual slope off to the bottom of the creek bed, and again that creek is something that only really has a lot of water during large rain events, and then it drains out relatively quickly.

Rita Christiansen:

Any other discussion?

Alex Tiahnybok:

John, just so I don't have to ask the question over and over again, maybe in addressing the other park plans you can comment on the status of the land, whether it needs to be acquired. This I believe was set aside by the developer for the parkland?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Right, that is correct. The Village does have in its possession, and it's been approved on the final plat the boundary of the phase 1 Creekside Park which is the southern portion of it. I believe that Creekside is in the preliminary plat going to final plat for phase 2 if I'm correct on that, Mike, on the land for the norther portion?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right.

Rita Christiansen:

Any other discussion? Seeing none we need a motion then to accept the Creekside Park master plan as designed. Can I have a motion?

William Mills:

I make a motion to accept the plan as presented.

Rita Christiansen:

Do I have a second?

Glenn Christiansen:

I second the motion.

Rita Christiansen:

I have the motion and a second. All in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

Rita Christiansen:

Opposed? Seeing none, motion carries.

Dino Laurenzi:

Any questions or comments from the Recreation Commission regarding the Creekside Park master plan? If none, can I have a motion to accept the Creekside Park master plan.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I make the motion.

--:

Second.

Dino Laurenzi:

All in favor say aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Dino Laurenzi:

All opposed nay? The motion passes.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

The third parkland that we'll be looking at this evening is the Momper's Woods area located directly west of Highway 31 several hundred feet . . . of State Highway 165. This is a very exciting park. It's our one passive park. It really has a lot of educational basis when we were putting this together. We have such a great piece of land that has some very significant history behind it with the Jambeau Trail and some of the other trails on the western portion of it. There is the large boulder that's down there that kind of identifies the Jambeau Trail through there. It has a very large oak savannah in that area also.

We tried to develop this park so when you drive in off of Highway 31 you really see a lot of the natural beauty through there, so there's kind of a large roundabout drop off area, parking on both sides. We have some rentable pavilions that we're showing. I believe there's three of them. There's one on the north, south and one just west of the nature and education center. I guess our vision for the nature and education center would be like a building where you could use it for lectures. You could have group organizations. You go in and learn about some of the history of that area. You learn about the conservation of that land and what it took to get it and where it's at today.

One of the requests that we have is from the local community with the Eagle Scout projects. Eagle Scouts are always coming up and saying I'm going for my Eagle Scout badge and what can I do to get this badge and something I can really better the community with? A lot of these interpretive trails and exhibits and different areas that are out here are really great opportunities for Eagle Scout projects over maybe the next ten years or however fast they come in. So we're really trying to get the community involved in a lot of the development of the trails and everything else we have going on in here. So it really is an exciting piece and a very important piece of history to try to preserve. Any questions or comments on the Momper's Woods?

Rita Christiansen:

Any questions or comments from the Park Commission?

William Mills:

What would be the plan to actually finance . . . it looks like this piece of land is something that the facility will cost a fair amount of money. But a lot of the trails and parking lots would be less cost. What's the thoughts in terms of just trying to financing the different phases of this piece of land?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

One of the things that is identified in the plan I believe is actually doing a phasing process for this land. This land currently is owned by the Village of Pleasant Prairie, and we'd probably phase it in three different areas. The first thing that we would probably just do is go and cut in the road, make a small gravel parking lot, and start identifying and creating some of the trails that are in there. Phase 2 you would go through and start building some of the rentable pavilions that we have to start generating some revenue for any . . . that you might have to do. And then the final phase would be the nature and education center, building that.

The primary source of money is going to be from impact fees, and we will be looking for any donations or grants obviously on top of that that we can acquire for this. I'm sure Megan can probably speak on this better as to what grants are available out there for something with the educational value that this might have.

Rita Christiansen:

Any other questions or comments? Seeing none, do we have a motion then to accept the Momper's Woods Park master plan?

Glenn Christiansen:

I motion to accept the Momper's Woods master plan.

William Mills:

I second.

Rita Christiansen:

Motion made and seconded. All in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

Rita Christiansen:

Opposed? Being none the motion carries.

Dino Laurenzi:

Any questions or comments concerning the Momper's Woods master plan?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Yes, I have one question. I was looking at the appendix and I see the cost of the drinking fountain \$3,000 each in each one of the parks. How come such a high cost of that?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

A lot of these costs were had to have--they're not just your standard go-to-Menard's-drinking-fountain. It was going to be landscaped I believe it's called. I'm not sure what the word is, but it's a landscaped fountain where it's a fountain that might have a rock base and it comes up. It's a very esthetically pleasing drinking fountain I guess it would be. It's not just something that's kind of a stainless steel something that's put out in this beautiful area. We really tried to take whatever we could to really keep this land looking good. And I believe the same is true for the garbage cans. We're really not looking at just going and picking up a metal 55 gallon barrel for \$10 somewhere and just placing it out there, but actually putting a garbage can that maybe is shaped like an oak stump or something like that out there. That was kind of our thought up front to do whatever we had to do esthetically with some of the amenities to preserve the beauty of the site.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I was looking and it seems to be that's a pretty high price. I'm noticing in each one of the parks . . . all for the same price . . . includes running the water to the drinking fountain or just the fountain itself?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Maybe that's something that can be addressed a little bit closer to the time of construction and we can see how our funding is, what kind of grants and what kind of donations that we might have coming in.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

So this is just an estimate of the cost?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Sure, this is just an estimated cost based on the information that Vandewalle was able to put together.

Kelly West:

Thank you, John.

Dino Laurenzi:

Any other questions or comments? We need a motion to accept the Momper's Woods master plan as presented.

Travis Laib:

I'll make a motion to accept the Momper's Woods master plan as presented.

Linda Godin:

I'll second.

Dino Laurenzi:

All in favor of the motion say aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Dino Laurenzi:

All opposed nay? Motion carries.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

The fourth park that we will be looking at this evening is Pleasant Prairie Park. Pleasant Prairie Park is located just west of 104th Avenue and just north of Bain Station Road. The Village currently has ownership of the land from the softball fields that you're seeing, down to the wetlands, and then we do not own the area where the dog park or disc golf course is shown on here. That's something we plan on in a future acquisition.

We spent a lot of time actually walking through that area and based on the rolling terrain that's out there and the amount of trees that are out there trying to do something that--we really hated to go knock down all the trees and put down a soccer field or another softball field. So we had a lot of interest in having a dog park in the Village, and we thought this would really be a nice area for a dog park with some of the trees and the rolling hills. One of the comments that was brought up at I believe the Rec Commission meeting was having a disc golf course. The sport is getting more and more popular, and it's something that you can't do a full 18 just because of the size restrictions of the road and the wetlands, but it is something we could put a small nine hole disc golf course in the future.

The Village also does not own the land where the playground is or the parking lot. Actually just the area just north of the area I believe is just under about half an acre, and

that's something we do plan on acquiring in the future. The layout of the softball fields are going to be very similar to where they are now. The parking lot will be where the original parking lot is and extended out to the west, but then we will have--some of the new things we're looking at out there is that U12 soccer field and some tennis courts and a skate park off to the northern area of it. The other areas that are not yet owned by the Village are where the basketball or the two smaller U8 soccer fields are, and those are areas that might be under future consideration for acquisition. Any questions or comments on Pleasant Prairie Park?

Rita Christiansen:

John, I have a comment. I noted that the playground is still off to the side, if you will, in this format, and there was some concern by the residents that the playground be more centrally located for those people that are in the softball fields. That at the time seemed to be the most usage of this park and now we're going to have other usage obviously. So I would just be concerned about the location of the playground.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

That was something that we did spend a lot of time looking at. Staff felt that the playground was centrally located whether you were--I mean if you would have somebody playing baseball, someone doing soccer, if you're playing tennis, so we tried to position that playground so it was kind of in the center of all three of those major activities, and we also took into account that if you just want to go to Pleasant Prairie Park to use the playground you could come in the parking lot access to the north, park your car there and have a playground very accessible to it. So we tried to position the playground at an area that was between the soccer softball and tennis courts.

Rita Christiansen:

Any other comments from the Board? Then I need a motion please to accept Pleasant Prairie Park master plan as so designed.

William Mills:

I make a motion to accept the plan as presented.

Rita Christiansen:

Do I have a second?

Glen Christiansen:

I'll second.

Rita Christiansen:

Motion made and second. All in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

Rita Christiansen:

Opposed? Being none the motion carries.

Dino Laurenzi:

Any comments or questions from the Recreation Commission?

James Becker:

I just have one regarding the dog park. Do you know what size that is? I'm looking at it and it's roughly the size of a ball diamond I guess width wise, but would that be roughly 300 feet by-

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Just by looking at it, and I don't know the actual acreage, but just looking at it I would assume it's 300 by 200 which is about 60,000 square feet. That makes it just about an acre and a half.

James Becker:

Is there any kind of study on how many dogs that could hold at one time? I mentioned before that I thought that the dog park either has to be very large or really not at all. That to me sounds like it only fits one or two dogs without worrying about fighting and issues like that.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I guess just with this size of an acre and a half that's about the size of about five Village lots. So that is a pretty large area. I'm sure you would not have any problem putting a dozen dogs in there playing. I'm not exactly sure on what the ratio is between acreage of dog parks and dogs, but that's something we can look into. One of the restrictions we had was we're still providing an acre and a half for recreation for the dogs. Based on our restrictions to the north, road off to the west and softball fields off to the east we were really kind of limited to what it is for right now.

I have seen some other parks around, and the dog parks range anywhere from just about an acre in size to about 20 acres in size based on the available land that is out there. So we are on the small end of that with an acre and a half, but we're still providing that for the residents.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

John, that's my opinion that I would like to see more, in my opinion, dog park a large one, because it is . . . noise when you get several dogs at the same time. When you look at this park here . . . my dog was . . . the only one over there . . . dragged all over the place. I don't think that park is big enough for that.

Travis Laib:

Is that a fence around the dog park?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Yes, it is. It is a fenced in area that has a dual gate system at the entrance point.

Mike Pollocoff:

Through the Chair a question to the consultant. Are there any standards on proximity of a dog park to an existing single family residential area? That would be one question about the location of this one.

Megan MacGlashan:

I don't know of any specific standards. It's something I can research if you want. Just from my experience I have seen them very close to residential areas and then in more natural areas. As far as size goes, this might be a little bit small. I know we have a dog park in Madison that is maybe a quarter acre. It's tiny and it's utilized. People just like to have a place where their dogs can socialize with other dogs and let them off a leash and run, so it is small, but if there appears to be more demand for it in the future then you can certainly plan for additional acreage or additional areas.

Mike Pollocoff:

Thank you.

Travis Laib:

Another comment is it looks to me as if down the road you thought this dog park is not quite working out you could add nine more holes of your disc golfing.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

That's correct.

--:

John, can you talk a little bit about the skate park?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

There was some demand from residents at the open house that we had to have a skate park. It's something that I hear as Park Superintendent very often, why don't we have a skate Park, they're building them in the City, they're building them in Whitewater, they're building them all over? And we thought that this would be a good location to have one. The City has some along our northern perimeters by Nash Park. I believe that there's one off of 75th Street by Southport, and one northern yet by Washington. So we wanted to geographically have a park more on the western end assuming that would give any residents on the western end of the Village a place to go, where any residents that are on the northern end already have something that's very close to them in the City by the Nash Park area.

Dino Laurenzi:

Any other questions or comments? Do we have a motion to accept the Pleasant Prairie park master plan as presented?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

So moved.

Dino Laurenzi:

Do we have a second?

Travis Laib:

I'll second it.

Dino Laurenzi:

All in favor to accept the Pleasant Prairie Park master plan as presented say aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Dino Laurenzi:

All opposed nay? Motion passes.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

The final park we'll be looking at this evening is the Village Green Park. The Village Green Park is all the land that is currently still owned by developers but it has been identified in our neighborhood plan and in our preliminary plats for Devonshire and some of the other subdivisions encompass this that the land will be given to the Village from the current developer.

It has a large amount of woods. I believe it's just over 17 acres of woods that we have to the eastern portion of it. It has a very nice picnic pavilion on the southeastern portion of it. It's an opening where if you wanted to go there for a birthday party or a small gathering it's a very nice clearing in there. It has a volleyball court, a basketball court, playground area, U10 soccer fields, baseball field and tennis courts. It has a retention pond just on the southern portion of it. Both of these ponds will be owned and maintained by the neighborhood associations that are located around this neighborhood park.

There is a trail system that we have that will be tying in. It's actually one of our main recreation trails that ties in, the Kenosha County Bike Trail to Lake Andrea. This is one of the main thoroughfares, probably about a mile in distance across in what we're looking at. If you're at RecPlex or IcePlex and you want to travel to the bike trail, you will be traveling through the trail that's shown on this Village Green Park. Then the trail extends across Cooper Road. We wanted to do something with the road elevation, whether it's a stamped concrete, different color, something that really identifies it as a pedestrian crosswalk. It was a concern of both the Commissions to make sure that safety is the number one priority. So we are incorporating different traffic calming designs along Cooper Road that will slow down traffic and make it safe for everyone.

Then we have a larger retention pond just west of Cooper Road. And then we added a split rail fence along the northern boundary of that pond just for safety so if someone is roller blading or doing something they'll run into the fence before they go in the retention pond. It is far enough back where we feel that safety won't be an issue at all.

We spent a lot of time, probably the most time of all the parks, on the Village Green Park because getting a situation where the developers are making all of their plans at this time, so we want to make sure that the Village gets what we want as a neighborhood park versus just what we get from developers if we're not on top of it. So the timing especially for the Village Green Park was very good timing, and it looks like a very nice park. Any questions or comments from either of the Commissions?

Rita Christiansen:

Park Commission comments or questions?

Michael Russert:

I've got a question. Parking for the picnic pavilion, they'd be utilizing the streets?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

It would be on street parking in that area there. We actually looked at more of it again very similar to what Creekside is. With the high population of people in that area people would just walk to that picnic pavilion. People that are walking along the path would stop and take a break if you're going from the bike trail to RecPlex. It would be just a stopping point on the path or something where you would walk and just stop and visit or

play frisbee or do whatever activity you have there.

Rita Christiansen:

Any other questions?

William Mills:

The asphalt path is that what is proposed for that entire east/west Village trail?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Yes, it is.

William Mills:

And that doesn't include the other trails that are shown on here?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I believe we're showing an asphalt trail running east and west and then a mulch trail that completes the loop around.

Rita Christiansen:

John, I notice some of the amenities that are in this park that are not in others such as lighting. Are we talking about obviously after hours and is there any concern at all about the neighbors and having the lights?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Like on the tennis courts you mean?

Rita Christiansen:

Yes.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

That is something that would be on a timer where you wouldn't be able to have the lights on after nine o'clock or ten o'clock, whatever time it would be, and the parking lot also would have some lights very similar to any other parking lot. It's more of a security and safety issue I guess in just having the lighting in the parking lot. It's not going to be lit like a ball diamond, for example, where you can see every inch of everything with the light, but it is something where when you pull in there is some light that kind of identifies that when you're driving down Cooper Road that there is something else going on there. We'll make every effort during the design to make sure that all of the areas that the lights shine onto are not impeding the privacy of any of the residents north or south of that park.

Rita Christiansen:

So could you then--I notice again this is the only park that has lights as far as the tennis courts, except there's tennis courts at Pleasant Prairie Park. Is that intentional just to have lights at this park versus none of the others?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I had thought that all of the tennis courts were having lights for some reason.

Rita Christiansen:

This is designated on the map as lighted.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

That might just be a designation on the map that one park is showing it and one park is not, but I'm pretty sure that all of the tennis court areas are lit so they could be used a little bit later into the evening.

Michael Russert:

Will the baseball diamond also be lit?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

No, it will not.

Michael Russert:

So the only baseball diamonds would be at Pleasant Prairie Park to be lit?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Right and Prairie Springs Park would be the only two. We will be using this baseball field and soccer field as more practice fields. I guess the situation would be a neighborhood team from the Village Green Subdivision, all the kids are friends and they all want to be in the same baseball team. They want to go practice and don't want to drive all the way down to Prairie Springs Park, so this kind of gives them a nice maintained park to have their practice at. It's something that could be scheduled for games on Saturdays, kind of used as an overflow park until the Highpoint Community Park is developed. And the same thing with the soccer fields if you want to have soccer practice.

One of the things about this Village Green Park and this whole corridor you're having a lot of residential population just north of 165 and south of 93rd Street. So there's going to be a lot of kids moving into these new homes. I guess I really would envision both of these in the summer months or late spring or early fall as being a spot where you would

actually reserve this field as part of a RecPlex program or if you have a hard time getting on diamonds at one of the other ones. Then it's something where parents don't have to travel as far. If the kids are junior high school age they could actually just walk to practice on their own, meet their coach at practice and walk home. We're trying to bring that type of atmosphere into this park.

Rita Christiansen:

Any other questions?

William Mills:

You mentioned that the intention was that all of the tennis courts were to be lighted. Is the intention also that all parking areas are supposed to be lighted or are they different across the different parks?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I believe that any areas that do have parking lots there will be security lighting. Again, it's just security lighting, maybe something at the entrance that identifies where cars will be coming in and out, but not something that would light the whole parking like at Shopko or Menard's for example.

Michael Russert:

One other question, John. You had mentioned about maybe having the soccer fields or baseball fields be rentable to reserve practice time. Do you see that happening to the other parks we have discussed so far?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I guess that would more of a policy decision for the Recreation Commission on which parks would be rentable or if not even rentable I guess reservable is probably a better word to programs at the RecPlex. I guess I really don't have an answer right now of all the parks. I don't know why--if you would have a neighborhood park and you had a bunch of kids that lived in that neighborhood that were in some sort of recreation program it would only make sense to reserve that park like at Carol Beach Park, for example. It's something that's available but it's something that's not done that much now. So if we could make that baseball diamond a little bit nicer, a lot of the residents east of 39th Avenue would want to reserve that for practice.

Mike Pollocoff:

A lot of programs right now, when you sign up for softball, in that program it's a RecPlex program and recreation enterprise, and as part of that fee that field for the coach is going to get some reservation time, and right now that's time that's typically at Pleasant Prairie ballpark and they can switch over to Becker or Carol Beach or the other parks. But as the park system grows, and assuming that the Village decides to maintain recreation as the

enterprise collects money for people to sign up in either soccer or softball, one of the things that fee does is help support having the fields available for when the Village kids practice if the field is off the game site.

So if we've developed a major soccer field say at either Prairie Springs or at Highpoint Park, they're envisioning that being a major soccer field or on 39th Avenue, those fees just like right now the recreation center probably pays the general fund \$16,000 a year for maintenance of the Prairie Springs field and the Bohat's field for getting the fields ready and maintaining them. And that's picked up out of the fees that the people pay when they sign up for programs. I think that would continue, but it wouldn't be a specific you're going to practice on Wednesdays and now you've got to give us some more money.

Rita Christiansen:

Any other questions? Seeing none, do I have a motion to accept the Village Green Park master plan?

William Mills:

I make a motion to accept the plan as presented.

Glen Christiansen:

I'll second.

Rita Christiansen:

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

Voices:

Aye.

Rita Christiansen:

Opposed? Seeing none, the motion carries.

Dino Laurenzi:

Do we have any questions or comments from the Recreation Commission? Do we have a motion to accept the Village Green Park master plan as presented?

James Becker:

I'll make a motion to accept the plan as presented.

--:

Second.

Dino Laurenzi:

All in favor to accept the Village Green Park master plan say aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Dino Laurenzi:

All opposed nay? Motion passes.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I would like to thank both of the Commissions for all their hard work and all the time and all the comments that were put into the development of these five neighborhood parks. It's something that I believe was very well done and the community will be able to enjoy for a lot of years to come. Next I'd like to talk about any draft report comments. I'll defer this portion over to the author of that, Megan from Vandewalle.

Megan MacGlashan:

As John mentioned earlier, this big Word document that you have in front of you is our first crack at a complete draft of this plan. I met with Jean and John this afternoon for about two hours, and we already have some pretty significant changes to the plan so it's really evolving before our eyes. I would like to give you all an opportunity to comment as well. I know that it's a lot to digest. I hope that you feel like you had enough opportunity to read through it.

What I think I'll do since you have already seen bits and pieces of this draft as we've moved along here, I'll just point out a few of the major substantive changes since the last time it was presented to you, and then I'll just open it up to any questions you may have, or if you'd like me to elaborate on the other sections I can certainly do that.

The first section that I'd just like to comment on is the needs assessment portion of the plan. That's Chapter 8. We don't have page numbers yet because they're bound to change. Starting on page 35. Who doesn't have a copy? Everybody set? Okay. There was some significant discussion after we presented to you the first draft of the needs assessment of this chapter about the various characteristics that make Pleasant Prairie unique and things we need to address such as the fact that there's so much land area. So standards for recreation trails don't really work so well for Pleasant Prairie and the fact that we do have the RecPlex here. So there's so many recreation facilities in the RecPlex that are indoor facilities and how do we account for those? And also the fact that the Village has so much special open space, environmental corridors, isolated natural resources features and the like.

So what we did to account for these characteristics is to add a qualitative analysis section of this chapter. Basically it just culls out those characteristics of the Village that should be taken into special consideration. It kind of changes the way that we interpret the results of the quantitative analysis which is the first section of the needs assessment, and this is where we apply the SEWRPC standards for park and recreation facilities and helps us interpret those in a way that's better for this particular Village.

The other section that I would like to touch on is obviously the most important section is the recommendation chapter of the plan. As I said, this is evolving before our eyes, and there have been some major changes to this map even this afternoon. But I will go over generally what we've recommended.

Recommendations for the future neighborhood parks are for the most part based on the Village's impact fee assessment that was done earlier this year. We kept with the recommendations that they foresaw when they did the assessment. So we have neighborhood parks all down in this area indicated by the N's. This one, Paradise Lake Park, is no longer there as of this afternoon. We have a couple that have moved a little bit, but for the most part the neighborhood parks are where they're going to stay on the map. We also recommended two community parks, one of which is Highpoint which is going to be in the next five years or so. The second will probably be many years down the road. This community park right here has changed now. It's not going to be there. It's going to be more over here just to the west of Paradise Lake. Then also Jean brought to my attention the location of some additional future school sites that will be added to this map.

In terms of trails we have separated the trails between first priority trails and trails we could develop along the way down the road. This thicker line indicates our first priority trails. Those trails are right here. We'll have an off road trail through Prairie Springs Park and then headed south towards Illinois. Then we also have an east/west corridor that will connect Prairie Springs Park with the Kenosha County Bike Trail, and that will eventually connect up with the Chiwaukee Prairie/Carol Beach area. Those are the main points. We also have general recommendations for all of the parks, and we've also included specific recommendations for the upgrade of existing facilities.

The concept plans that John just presented to you a few minutes ago, discussions of those plans are kind of integrated into the text for the recommendations where they are appropriate. So at this time I'd just like to open it to you and allow you to ask questions.

Rita Christiansen:

Park Commission any questions, concerns or issues? This was a lot of information, Megan. You guys did a great job. I do have a question. At the back of this on page 44 you have recommendations for specific existing parks. Currently is Momper's Woods considered one of our existing parks? Gentlemen, do you know? It is?

Megan MacGlashan:

We have it designated currently as a special open space area.

Rita Christiansen:

Okay, because I notice Creekside Park and Village Green are not on here. I didn't realize Momper's Woods was already a park by definition.

Megan MacGlashan:

Again, we have it as a special open space area which is kind of a gray area. Kind of a park but not really. The land is already owned by the Village which is why we kind of put it under existing facilities because it's kind of already there. It just needs to be developed and enhanced so that it can function more like a park or a nature center or a facility that the public can really utilize. Anyone else with questions?

Dino Laurenzi:

Any questions or comments from the Recreation Commission?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I have a comment to make. I see that the Park Commission got this folder with the numbers. When you were talking about page 35 they found it. I got the same thing with no numbers so I don't know what to look at. So I think when you guys send this stuff out everybody has got to get the same folder. I see this one here has numbers but the one I've got doesn't have numbers.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

All the e-mails that were sent were sent in one group e-mail to both of the Commissions. Maybe the one you're looking at was something that was printed out independently I would assume maybe. I'm not really sure where the one that you're reading is coming from.

Dino Laurenzi:

Steve, did you have any other questions or comments?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I guess we'll have to live with what we've got right now.

John Skalbeck:

On the trails that are constituted as first priority, what constituted first priority versus second priority? One thing I noticed is that existing parks like Pleasant Prairie Park and some of the other school parks are secondary and they're already existing versus primary parks are parks that aren't developed yet.

Megan MacGlashan:

Are you speaking about parks or the recreation trails?

John Skalbeck:

The trails, but the idea is the trails are to go from park to park, and the primary trails are going through parks that don't exist yet versus--I'm looking at Pleasant Prairie Park as that trail which should be a relatively short one and makes sense possibly to the RecPlex as being a secondary trail.

Megan MacGlashan:

Sure, I understand what you're saying. You could argue that all these trails are priority. Ultimately we want a fully connected and integrated system of parks and trails. Where we got the first and second priority trails is through discussions we've had with Village staff and it came out of the public workshop that we held. Once we did a compilation map of everybody's comments from the workshop and then integrated the comments from the Village staff there were areas that just kept coming up again and again and again that we want a trail here. Those are really these areas. Especially with this east/west corridor, there was really a desire to have a good trail that runs from the west side of the Village to the east side of the Village I think primarily because of the presence of Prairie Springs Park over here and Chiwaukee and Carol Beach over here, two very significant Village features. And there was a need and a desire to connect those. So that's why this is kind of a first priority. And with this one, too, just to have some sort of north/south corridor to complement the east/west corridor. They're all important certainly.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

And if I could just add one more thing to that, Megan. We are looking at having a connection, like Megan said, from Pleasant Prairie Park to Prairie Springs Park. The purpose of this plan was to develop ideas that will happen within the next five years. The main basis or the main path that the path is going to take from Pleasant Prairie Park to Prairie Springs Park is really going to hinge on the abandonment of the Sewer D treatment plant that's located right off of I believe Highway C around the 101 block. At the time that gets abandoned, a gravity flow sewer line would be constructed that would go down to the 165 lift station, which is just on Highway H just south of the Highway H entrance to Prairie Springs Park.

And so the maintenance road that will be used for maintaining that sewer line will also function as a park connection trail. But that's probably something that's not going to happen for at least five more years. And so when the next park plan gets revised in five more years and then based on the timing with the DNR for abandoning that sanitary sewer plant, that will move up from a second priority up to a first priority. It really doesn't make sense to make a trail and make a path if you have to go through and make a sewer along that same line. Where down the road in five or six years you can do a combination really creating that path for very little cost, because it will already be there by default for the maintenance path for the sanitary sewer line.

Dino Laurenzi:

Any other questions or comments from the Recreation Commission?

Rita Christiansen:

The Park Commission has a few more questions or comments from the members?

Michael Russert:

Megan, can you explain on street trail versus off? Is that going to be a trail next to the roadway or is this going to be defined as a roadway?

Megan MacGlashan:

On street trails . . . they run just off of the road, sometimes they run in more neighborhood areas and sometimes in little bit more rural areas. And then there's also really rural walking paths that are going to go through wooded areas and environmental corridors and so forth. So we tried to identify places where it would probably be an on street facility versus locations where we're looking at more of a multi use path.

Michael Russert:

And they'll be marked bike lane or trail?

Megan MacGlashan:

Yes. And one of the other things I should mention is the draft that you have is very ugly. It has no pictures and it's not formatted yet. The final draft will have pictures, and particularly in this section it will have pictures illustrating what these different facilities look like. It will show bike lane and how they're marked and the appropriate signage and so forth, so yes that will be included.

Rita Christiansen:

You do list in there the standards of recommendations for widths of the various trails in this document also?

Megan MacGlashan:

Yes, we have appropriate design standards for each of the different kinds of facilities.

Michael Russert:

And my last question is for the cost for estimates, those are for today's price, right?

Megan MacGlashan:

Right.

William Mills:

Is the trail that goes through Village Green represented accurately on the map? Because on the park map it shows what I tend to believe is an off road trail, but on the map here it looks like it's an on road trail.

Megan MacGlashan:

This portion right here is in error. It will be changing. It will be off street. Portions will be on street, but there will be a large section that's off street.

Glen Christiansen:

Obviously I think it's already been said that there's a lot here to digest in such a short period of time. I've tried to read a couple things in here and have gotten confused. Maybe it's included and maybe it's not, but I'd like to point at something on the map up here for everybody. There's an area here that I think kind of blends in with some sizeable portions of land and pieces of land that the Village currently owns. Prairie Springs Park extends all the way out to the Interstate here taking in quite a bit of the environmental corridor and natural areas. And then up here the old Power Mill property. There are some other areas that are in the primary environmental corridor which are also wetlands and floodplains that I think would be a nice thing to see these included.

The properties that are not currently owned by the Village, this property up here, this down in here, perhaps some of the river floodplain itself not to go into a long explanation why, but it kind of ties these areas in together. I don't know if people fully appreciate the use by migratory birds in this area very heavily in the spring and fall. I think it's something that local residents probably don't appreciate because they don't see it very often. It's a shame to include such a large area here and up here and then not get some of these areas in between. They also are excellent areas for trails and for walking purposes and so forth, to observe nature and so forth.

Megan MacGlashan:

So you're saying that there's actually properties in these environmental corridors that are Village-

Glen Christiansen:

No, the Village owns properties in here and here, the light green, and then all this dark green down in here, so there's some odd areas in here. It would be nice to have some specific language that includes that. Whether it ever becomes a reality or not it would be nice to have it included.

Megan MacGlashan:

Including language that suggests that those properties be acquired in the future? There is a part in the recommendation section . . .

Rita Christiansen:

. . . I think, Megan, on Map 3, existing park service areas that it's one of the areas that is partially encompassed in the circle here that he's talking about so it is part of what you're discussing.

Megan MacGlashan:

The service area that's up in that area is for Pleasant Prairie Park and then obviously for Prairie Springs Park. I think if I understand you correctly you would like to see a recommendation that addresses the acquisition of land specifically in those areas?

Glen Christiansen:

Yes . . . what I have talked about . . . there has been some interest in the past that this area be acquired, and if it was specifically addressed in here it would only kind of strengthen. I don't like to go into all the explanations why it would, but I think it would be a good add on.

Megan MacGlashan:

I will work with John to make sure that we revise the statement that we currently have that mentions the Des Plaines River watershed to better accommodate what you're saying. I'll work with him on that.

Rita Christiansen:

Any other questions or comments?

Alex Tiahnybok:

Map 4, the . . . schools, the one that's basically in the center of the map, the cross-hatched blue circle, and then the one more in the southeast those are the two that are referred to on Page 41, community parks?

Megan MacGlashan:

The community parks currently are identified here, Highpoint and down here. This one, however, is not going to be that way anymore. That's moving.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Is that because of the change in Kenosha Unified's status on that land?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Jean Werbie was in conversation with Mr. Fennemore with Kenosha Unified yesterday, and based on their conversation with Kenosha Unified and Jean Werbie, and with our meeting today, it will reflect all of the accurate land areas for schools on the map. So we did get involved with the KUSD to make sure that our schools are shown where they want them shown and everyone is on the same page as much as can be done.

Mike Pollocoff:

I'm going to really have a strong recommendation against the site that Unified has identified just from a storm water management perspective. I think that I've dealt with that farmer for a number of years in that area. Unless we're going to give those kids floaties, that's one reason the land on the other side of the bike path really sits up nice and high. I think everybody is going to stand to benefit. Otherwise, we've got one school site on 116th that's in a hole, and I don't see putting in a second site because it looks good from a spacial displacement on a map. Once somebody really starts looking into the topography of that it's really just a nightmare. That's something I've been working with over the years.

As you sit down and start working on those I really think that's one reason we put a lot of our eggs in the basket on the . . . property ten years ago was because we did some work back at that point to say this site--it's got some wet areas not that's not really encumbered so much that you can't use it, but it will be nice and there's some woods, but it's really high land. At that time the School District indicated we came to the table with \$15,000 per acre for our site which would be comparable to the parklands around Lance. That's what we have here along with the elementary school site. I'd hate to see a really good piece of land--you saw a lot of land. As we're looking through here we have a lot of low value open space land. That's nice and you're going to protect it, but when you look for active recreation potential sooner or later you've got to get some good upland. We've got it. I'd hate to see that go away.

Alex Tiahnybok:

That's being updated then?

Michael Pollocoff:

Yes, it's the first time I saw it tonight.

Rita Christiansen:

Any questions from the Park Commission?

Dino Laurenzi:

Any questions from the Recreation Commission?

Travis Laib:

I see longevity of water problems.

Rita Christiansen:

John, do you need anything from us?

John Steinbrink Jr:

Just need a motion to authorize the changes we made this evening and to move forward with the Master Park Plan final draft.

Rita Christiansen:

We need a motion to proceed.

Michael Russert:

What would the next step be? What about community involvement?

John Steinbrink Jr.:

There will be another public hearing before the Park Plan is adopted by the Village Board. Mike, do you have any comments?

Michael Pollocoff:

My recommendation would be to decide if you want a joint hearing or a separate hearing to give citizens two chances, in case there is a problem. It can be figured out now rather than later. We will use that document to go to the Board for final approval.

Rita Christiansen:

Do we have a motion to accept the Village of Pleasant Prairie Master Park Plan revisions and move forward to finalization?

William Mills:

Are we approving the final?

Rita Christiansen:

We are approving the changes and the authorization to the forward.

Megan MacGlashan:

We will provide a draft of the changes.

Michael Pollocoff:

Can the Commission give Megan direction on a time limit for the final?

Rita Christiansen:

How much time will you need?

Megan MacGlashan:

The Christmas Holiday is coming and I will be on vacation for ten days. We can have it ready by mid-January.

Michael Pollocoff:

How much time does the Commission need to review the final draft?

Rita Christiansen:

We could have the hearing at the end of January or beginning of February.

Michael Russert:

Have the hearing mid February.

Kathleen Burns:

Will we have the public hearing before or during the Park Commission meeting?

Alex Tiahnybok:

March 7th would be the next meeting date.

Megan MacGlashan:

Yes, or we can work through John to provide you a draft.

Rita Christiansen:

What is the original time line for the Park Plan completion?

Michael Pollocoff:

Department Heads will be working on the budget in June. Will need to be done by June.

Rita Christiansen:

Megan, can you get the final to us by June?

Alex Tiahnybok:

That would give us three weeks to review. I motion we plan for mid January.

William Mills:

Second the motion.

Rita Christiansen:

Village Park & Open Space is the first motion.

Glenn Christiansen:

I motion we accept.

Michael Russert:

I second the motion.

Rita Christiansen:

All in favor?

Voices:

Aye

Rita Christiansen:

All approve, no nays. So passed. We need a motion for the February 7th meeting for Park Commission and open meeting for public to review the Park & Open Space Plan.

William Mills:

I motion we have open meeting for public to review Park & Open Space Plan on February 7th.

--:

Second motion.

Rita Christiansen:

All in favor say Aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Rita Christiansen:

Any opposed? All in favor, no nays. So passed.

Michael Pollocoff:

To the Recreation Commission, you'll get the same draft of the plan. Your input has been valuable, though you are not required to conduct a public hearing.

b. Approval for 2006 Park Commission Meeting Dates (John Steinbrink, Jr.)

Rita Christiansen:

We are done with Item 5A, so we can move on to Item 5B regarding the Park Commission meeting dates for the 2006 year.

John Steinbrink Jr.:

There are some conflicts on the usually Tuesday meetings dates. We have worked out the dates with the Holidays, Village Board meetings and Elections dates.

Rita Christiansen:

Are there any questions? I only have a concern with July 5th, as many people may be gone on vacation. Do we have a motion to accept the 2006 year meeting dates?

Kathleen Burns:

I motion we accept the 2006 meeting dates as listed.

Michael Russert:

I second the motion.

Rita Christiansen:

We have a motion and a second. All in favor say Aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Rita Christiansen:

All say Aye, no nays. Motion passes. If there are no other items, could we have a motion to adjourn?

6. ADJOURNMENT

Kathleen Burns:

I motion we adjourn the Park Commission meeting.

Glenn Christiansen:

I second the motion.

Rita Christiansen:

All approve say Aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Rita Christiansen:

All approve, no nays. Motion accepted.

ADJOURNED: 7:25 p.m.