

**VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE
PARK COMMISSION
Village Hall, Auditorium
9915 39th Avenue
Pleasant Prairie, Wisconsin 53158
Tuesday, February 7, 2006
6:00 p.m.**

A regular meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Park Commission was held on Tuesday, January 7, 2006 6:00 p.m. Present were Michaeline Day, Rita Christiansen, Glenn Christiansen, Michael Russert, William Mills, Kathleen Burns and Alex Tiahnybok. Also present were Michael Pollocoff, Village Administrator; John Steinbrink, Jr., Superintendent of Parks; and Judith Baternik, Clerical Secretary.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. ROLL CALL**
- 3. CONSIDER APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 6, 2005 PARK COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES.**

Michaeline Day:

If you had a moment to read through the minutes, if there's not any additions or corrections can I have a motion to approve.

Michael Russert:

Motion to approve the December '05 meeting minutes.

Michaeline Day:

Could I have a second?

Rita Christiansen:

Second.

Michaeline Day:

All in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

Michaeline Day:

Motion passes.

4. CITIZEN COMMENTS

Michaeline Day:

Do we have any persons in the audience that would like to make any comments. Yes, sir. The only thing that we ask is that you give us your name and address please.

Gustav Hauser:

My name is Gustav Hauser and I live at 143 113th Street in Carol Beach. I would like to point a few things out in Carol Beach Park. I live right on 113th Street like I said. I'm right by the park, and in the park after the revetment was put up, that was many years ago, the sand and the soil shifted considerably already. There are a lot of holes in the ground, especially during the wintertime when the snow is on the ground. It's easy to step in between the cracks from the concrete. That's a safety issue. There's a lot of holes in the grass itself that should be taken care of and filled. Some of the concrete blocks have steep pieces sticking out. I think as a Village you open yourself up to liability if you don't take care of those things. I would appreciate it if somebody could take a look at that situation and if possible correct it. Thank you very much.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you. Could we have someone drive by and take a peak at it?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

We will have somebody drive by this week and check that out.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you, John. Thank you, sir.

5. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Presentation by Vandewalle & Associates of the Village Park and Open Space Plan: 2006-2011.**

Megan MacGlashan:

Good evening. So here we are at the public hearing. The document that we have this evening is the culmination of a seven month planning process which began back in August. We had our first public meeting at the end of September, and throughout the process we worked on detailing concept plans for five different parks. Our first draft was

completed in December, and this evening represents the final opportunity for the public to make comments on the plan.

What I would like to do is just kind of broadly go over five general themes that have stuck out in my mind throughout this entire process and have helped to ultimately guide the final recommendations that are presented in this draft of the plan. Then I will allow time for comments and time for you all to make your comments, revisions, anything you would like.

The first major theme that has filtered through all of this process is relating to the size of Pleasant Prairie. I think we dealt with very early on the fact that the Village occupies a very large area of land considering its population. And this has been both a challenge and presented an opportunity in terms of park planning. It's been a challenge because we wanted to make sure that in providing for future parks and trails that we were distributing the acreage and the facilities evenly through the population and directing those new facilities towards areas where the population is going to expand. It has provided an opportunity in that I think it's given us a chance to recommend a diversity of different types of parks, so not just small tot lots and active recreational facilities but also larger natural resource oriented parks and also a fabulous trail system.

That leads me into my second major theme which is, of course, this idea of a connecting trail system. This is something that cropped up from the very beginning. It was the number one comment that we heard at the visioning workshop, and it's certainly something that is going to really vastly improve upon the park system in the Village. And while this particular plan is not a trail plan, it doesn't give specific details about the trails that we recommend. It lays out a nice framework for where those trails are planned to go in the future.

The third major theme relates to the RecPlex, IcePlex and Prairie Springs Park, and this is just an incredible fabulous facility. I think everyone agrees from the first time they see it that it's just such an asset to the community. However, when we were thinking about planning for future facilities we had to make sure that we recognized that the RecPlex and Prairie Springs tends to focus a lot of especially active recreational facilities to the west side of the Village. So we wanted to make sure we were providing the same opportunities for those who live on the eastern side of the Village as well. So what we really want to do is to be able to utilize Prairie Springs Park and the RecPlex and the IcePlex as sort of the heart of the park system, as a focal point where everything else can stem off of.

And then the fourth theme relates to Chiwaukee Prairie/Carol Beach area which is another incredible asset to the community. It's just beautiful and wonderful. I think that through this plan we have identified opportunities to improve upon what already exists in that area by working with the DNR, The Nature Conservancy and other civic organizations to promote the use of universal signage throughout the entire Chiwaukee Prairie/Carol Beach area, adding interpretive exhibits so that people can understand the ecosystem that surrounds them, and also kind of really promoting Kenosha Dunes on the north and the large tract of prairie land on the south as sort of our acre points. They might make nice places for trail heads and ultimately can really tie the entire area

together into one cohesive park.

And, finally, the last major overall theme that I kind of pulled out of this process is this issue of the Village's daytime population being so much different than its actual census residential population. And this was important because it puts extra pressures on our park system, and so we wanted to make sure that in planning for future facilities we were recognizing that these facilities and these parks are often used by people who don't actually live in the Village. So this kind of ties into the idea of the connecting trails. We don't only want the trails to connect the schools and the parks, but we also want them to connect the major job centers to the parks. And one of the big recommendations in this plan is to have a pedestrian bridge ultimately span across I-94 to connect the future development that will go on the west of I-94 to Prairie Springs Park and the Town of Bristol to Prairie Springs Park.

So that in a nutshell is kind of how I think about this plan. What I would like to do now is just ask you to give me your final feedback on the draft that you have in front of you and then we can move on from there.

Michaeline Day:

Since the draft is 72 pages long and we don't want to really go page by page, and I would not like to see everybody bombarding poor Megan with a thousand questions all at once which we normally do here, we're pretty free and liberal, I would like it to be a little bit more in order. So if someone has any questions, which I'm sure we all do, that you do ask through the Chair so that we can all hear the question and Judy can get it down and that it can be answered. So, at your will.

Michael Russert:

Megan and maybe Mike and John can answer. Page 6 when we talk about the natural resources, it's mentioned that 42 percent of the Village's land has national prime land. I guess my question is how much land in the Village is actually being farmed. Is it 42 percent?

Mike Pollocoff:

No, I doubt it seriously. We're probably I want to say based on the last zoning map, zoning work we did, through the ag 1 district which is the ag preservation district, and then ag 2 which would be general agriculture, we're probably around a little bit over 30 percent, close to a third. Then of that third we probably have maybe five percent that's in actual farm ownership where it's not leased land, its land that has been put in a preservation program that is actively farmed.

Michael Russert:

Then I guess to that point, then when we go to page 10 where it says occupation distribution, for farming, fishing and forestry we have zero percent. So I don't know if we need to make a tie there that there's actually 30 percent of our Village land as being

farmed, but on Figure 5 we're saying zero percent.

Mike Pollocoff:

Megan, unless the percentage numbers bring it down to zero. You guys pulled that off the 2000 census. I know the occupational group at that time wasn't zero.

Megan MacGlashan:

It might be .002 and that's what the census--

Michaeline Day:

It just rounds it to the nearest tenth.

Megan MacGlashan:

I imagine that they do, yes.

Michael Russert:

And then I guess another recommendation would be then maybe is it a little deceiving that . . . would think that this is a farming community with 42 percent being classified as national prime farmland if we're only utilizing 30 percent of it actually being farmed. Do I have a better figure?

Megan MacGlashan:

Sure.

Mike Pollocoff:

In an urbanized area that ends up being a wild card. You might have a lot of farmland as we do, but the long-range goal for that land is not to stay in farming, even by and large the people are farming it. But I'm not sure that--we could see it from a zoning standpoint and maybe if you guys were to check with the Department of Agriculture and see if you could pick up, based on what people are putting in for crops, what the actual number is. That's one of the problems when you start a study like this. We're at 2006 and we're relying on 2005 data. As fast as we're growing it dates itself significantly.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you. Anyone else on the Commission has a question?

William Mills:

On page 8 it talks about that the population growth over the next ten years is 12 percent. Isn't that actually 46 percent, because 12 percent would only be about 2,000 people, correct? Actually I think it shows here that it's supposed to grow from 18,993 to 27,740.

Megan MacGlashan:

I'll check the math.

William Mills:

It's just 12 percent seemed like not that large of a growth pattern, but 46 percent obviously is a terminus population growth over a ten year period.

Megan MacGlashan:

Yes, you're right. I'll check on it.

William Mills:

Then in page 26, and it might be just the terminology. We talk about that objective, in B, number 2, "Ensure that at least one park and recreational facility is within a safe and comfortable walking distance" When I think recreational facility I guess I'm thinking kind of like a RecPlex and maybe that terminology is incorrect. It seems like a rather weighty goal I guess if a recreational facility is something like RecPlex within a safe and comfortable walking distance. That's just something to point out.

And then my last question is on page 44 and it's maybe more of a question for Mike. In A, number 1, when we're talking about community parks we talk about the fact that 65 acres of Village owned land an additional 22 ½ acres of adjacent land will be owned and maintained by Kenosha Unified. It kind of almost in the reading makes it out that it assumes that we're already working together on that land, but then there's another community park where it recommends that in the future we should work together. Are we already working with Kenosha Unified?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes. There are developers that began the process to prepare preliminary plats or neighborhood plans for that area. We work hard, and it's not that there's resistance, but it's just getting all the points put together to get Kenosha Unified involved early on if it's a site where the comprehensive land use plan for the Village indicates that there's going to be a school. So in that area there we're going to be working on dedications that the Village is going to be looking for as far as parkland dedications, and being able to make sure there's a reservation for school sites so that the schools can plan far enough ahead to make an acquisition shy of not being able to levy an impact fee to collect that which would allow us to get an exaction of that land. We need to get it queued up enough so that the school system can plan out far enough ahead for a referendum to purchase the

land.

In our land use plan where we identify the park, we do have an impact fee so we'll be able to do the acquisition but the schools won't. We need to lock up that reservation for them, and as much as we can leverage the platting process to enable that to happen to do that. But at the end of the day it's going to be up to the voters of the district. We'll come to a point where they'll have to spring for the land. And the other one that's mentioned, the development process isn't mature at all. The comprehensive plan shows we need something there, but right now there's no developer at the table to work with.

William Mills:

That's all the comments that I have.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you.

Kathleen Burns:

I just wanted to comment on the professional quality of the plan. It's well organized, easy to read, understandable. And from someone that hasn't had a lot of background in this I really appreciate that as a Pleasant Prairie resident I think anyone could pick up your plan and get a real good picture of the community and what the vision is and as representing what we're doing here. I thank you. It's very well done.

Megan MacGlashan:

Thank you very much.

Alex Tiahnybok:

In the body of the document it states that this is a five year plan. Previous documents shared with the Commission included a time table for actual implementation of the various projects. My question is, is it appropriate for a sort of spreadsheet time table kind of thing to show what the intended progress of development is? Would it be appropriate to have something like that in this document, or are we just going to kind of leave it up to an ambiguous five year plan?

Mike Pollocoff:

I guess, Trustee Tiahnybok, I'd be looking at we could prepare that now just so people have an idea. Ultimately, though, it would fall into the Village's five year capital improvement plan for funding. There's nothing in here that would really be enterprise generated. Everything in this document would either be tax levy or developer contributions to the impact fees or grants. Those are the three sources. So as we prioritize as a Plan Commission, and that's one of the things we'll be doing once we complete this project, is really sit down and get ready for the budget process that the

Village will be starting in July to load those projects up in here that we've directed the consultant to prepare, the five projects.

Not to say we're going to fund those all this year, but come up over that five year plan how we're going to tackle it, what grants we're going to apply for specific projects, what projects are going to have that mix of impact fees, tax dollars, grants and prioritize them in a way that's going to be compatible with how development is occurring and capacity of the Village's budget or to the extent that the Village may want to consider once the Park Commission, Plan Commission and the Board have gone through this and done that prioritization and look at the schedule, put it out to referendum for financing. It would be not a one year levy but a five year sunset levy if you want to do these many parks or this much park works and have the taxes be X in each year to fund that out. The funding is a little bit trickier, not trickier, just more difficult to do. There's nothing really tricky about it, just how you want to spend it and how you want to roll it out to the public. But it's really got to happen through this planning process which still needs to evolve after you've adopted this plan and do more work to specifically identify those parks and have that ready for the budget process in July. Then it will be up to the Board which way they want to fund it anything over and above impact fees and grants.

Alex Tiahnybok:

The total of the five projects shown, and I don't have the exact number, but it looked like about \$5.7 million approximately. That does not include some necessary land acquisition that would be needed. These are for improvements of the sites, correct?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I would like to see, and I'm not sure it necessarily has to be part of this document, but I think as a Commission to report to the citizens of Pleasant Prairie and from my opinion, it would be a good idea to not only have a plan of the entire scope of the project, but an implementation plan so we can actually tell people this is the project that's going to happen first. I understand the funding issues that are going to make this all somewhat fluid. The projections for impact fees at this point over the five year period do we have a feel for what we think that's going to generate for part of this?

Mike Pollocoff:

Probably not for five years. We're better for two years out, but we can run out a five year projection. That's going to be key, because as you look through this document some amenities, Village Green, High Pointe, those are all developer driven parks. You have some parks that are solely levy and grants. Carol Beach is one that very little impact fee dollars are going to be rolling into that one.

Michael Russert:

For impact fees is it per, like Village Green, will those impact fees just go to that park, or will it be for the finance of the five parks?

Mike Pollocoff:

We have a split on it.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

We do have a split on it. We kind of broke it up into either neighborhood parks or community parks. And I believe that 40 percent of the impact fee on the park portion of it goes towards the neighborhood park where we broke it up I believe into 13 or 14 districts we had talked about earlier. And so any new development that's in that park impact fee district goes towards that neighborhood park, and then the other 60 percent of that goes to the community park and trail system that would tie them together.

Michaeline Day:

Anything else? Thank you, Alex. Rita or Glenn?

Glenn Christiansen:

I guess I just wanted to make the comment that I read through this probably two or three times and this is an awful lot of work on paper here. It's very ambitious. I hope we can make it happen or make a lot of it happen. It's going to be a lot of work going forward even after all of this to say the least. I think everybody understands that. That's about all I have to say.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you, Glenn. Rita?

Rita Christiansen:

Mike, did I hear you correctly to say that once this is approved as such then we'll put together some kind of a time line as Alex said on where we plan on starting first? Or, is it just going to be based on the 40 percent impact fees going to the neighborhoods and we'll start with the neighborhood areas first?

Mike Pollocoff:

Once the plan has been approved and as we go through this approval process, the Village is going to receive greater amounts of input from people as both the Plan Commission level and at the Village Board level. We'll probably put this out on channel 25 and get it out in a newsletter to get as much information out as we can. As John indicated we're

going to put this as a PDF on the website to bring as much input into the Village as possible. And it's going to help the Commissions begin the process of prioritizing where we want to start.

A couple of things are going to drive that. You're going to be responding to development on one side. You have developers that are cranking along and they want to get going, and we have to tell them what it is we want them to do. And then you have citizens that want park improvements in other places so there's going to be that balance. So what the Park Commission is going to need to do to help the Village Board and the Village as a whole to get this process going it to prioritize where we're going to start with the project list we have here and to what level we want to get at it. But we really need a completed document so everybody is working off the same page and same numbers for where we need to go.

Michaeline Day:

Mike, isn't another arm of that would also be what the Federal and the State government is projecting their grants to be. At certain times they have certain pet projects that certain politicians and certain groups will want to and, like you said, Carol Beach will be a lot of either funding or grants, and so if the State or the feds come up with some interesting programs.

Mike Pollocoff:

That will be the mix. I mean now that we have the plan, once it's adopted, we'll be able to have something to submit for grant application that will tie in with that next step of work that the Park Commission would do as far as establishing that priority and saying, okay, here's what we want to have happen. We have so much in contributions and aid of construction that will occur from a developer. We have a certain amount of money that's going to be available from the levy, and now we need another bundle of money from the State or another entity that would be granting funds. So that will be part of the mix as you prioritize where we start. What's the most critical project and what's the project we have to respond to soonest in order to keep a developer squared away so we can exact overly what's not unfair, but they want to get ahead and do their business and we need to tell them what it is they have to give the Village in terms of impact fees or land dedication.

Rita Christiansen:

So area like, for instance, Momper's Woods, which has a wonderful plan laid out for it, would probably basically be paid for by grants, etc., versus impact fees because currently there's no other development around there, is that correct?

Mike Pollocoff:

Well, you're right. It would receive I would think some of the regional park impact fee as far as some of the work that would happen, so we would be building a fund up there. Without pushing you towards any prioritization now it would seem that Momper's Woods would be one that we want to do but maybe on the tail end because, again, we're not dealing with any development pressure or citizens that are without a park right now. The parks you have here--Momper's Woods sometimes the best thing we can do with that one is just leave it alone until we're ready to go and not get in there and get something half started. I think that's one of the policies you guys need to come up with is which parks can wait and which ones we're going to need to address sooner than later.

Michaeline Day:

Do we have someone on staff that monitors or can monitor or will monitor, once we have a plan established and when we can start applying for grants, do we have someone who will monitor because they do come up at different periods of time and what's going to and how to file for that grant?

Mike Pollocoff:

Oh, yes. Between myself, Kathy Goessl, our Finance Director, and John has some particularly in parks, too. We're scavenging all the time. One of the best things that we didn't have is this to really have a document to be able to present and say here's our plan. It's really been kind of hit or miss up to this point.

Michaeline Day:

Because there's several communities in areas across the State that are applying for grants, so isn't having a draft or a plan one of the key implements in being able to get a grant by the State is to have a document or a plan?

Mike Pollocoff:

We had a plan but it just wasn't up to date.

Michaeline Day:

That's what I mean, though. You really do need something for the State to say or the federal government to say we'll even consider your request?

Megan MacGlashan:

For many of the State park and trail oriented grants you have to have a DNR certified plan that's been updated every five years.

Rita Christiansen:

So, Megan, a question for you then, based on this plan that we have here and knowing what we currently have in place for the Village residents, is there some kind of time table or recommendation that your group would have as to where you think we'd be best to start?

Megan MacGlashan:

I would say that those decisions are really policy decisions. As Mike was saying you have to basically prioritize and you have to be able to balance making the improvements that you need to make to existing parks and existing facilities and trying to get under way with the new parks. But a lot of your new parks will come with development, and until the development is there there's no need to focus on them so you can direct some of your resources towards existing facilities. So it will be partly driven by the phasing of the development. But in terms of prioritizing that's a policy decision that needs to be decided by the Village.

Rita Christiansen:

Thank you.

Michaeline Day:

Any other comments?

William Mills:

How long does it normally take for the DNR certification of a plan like this?

Megan MacGlashan:

I actually spoke with the guy from DNR today. I had sent him a draft of your plan in December just to say could you give it the DNR blessing. Not to read it but make sure everything was there. I spoke to him today and he said he had handed it off to staff and they were crazy busy and hadn't gotten around to it. He said that he would try and have it at least reviewed generally by the end of the month, so hopefully we'll get some comments back from them. I don't anticipate that anything will be missing because we followed their criteria in writing the plans. But in terms of certifying it I'm not exactly sure how long it takes. I imagine it has to do with their staff capacity and how much they have going on. But at least we'll have somewhere to start. They'll have at least seen it.

Mike Pollocoff:

We'll try and get an answer for that for you by the time the Plan Commission meets on it. That's a good point. That's a key benchmark to be able to proceed is to have that approval.

Megan MacGlashan:

Yes, because the deadline for a lot of those grants is May 1st.

Michaeline Day:

Any other questions?

Michael Russert:

A couple more questions. Map 8, page 51, from our previous meeting in December we used to have a soccer field and now it's removed. Page 51, Creekside.

Rita Christiansen:

Can you repeat what you said, Mike?

Michaeline Day:

He said that there was a soccer field that was removed from this. I'm sorry I don't remember.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

One of the things that we did have to do--was that on the Creekside Park that you were talking about?

Michael Russert:

Yes.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I'll just go from memory. There was a large floodplain area in there, so we did take the soccer field and we actually shrunk the size of the park a little bit towards the east just kind of for the safety. It is something that is somebody would want to go ahead and plan in that area it's something that is open, but it's not going to be a Village maintained space. It's actually going to be owned by the homeowners association for that development.

Michael Russert:

And then just formatting. When going through the plan the maps are labeled at the bottom of each page and more towards the front where it's 3A and 3B. I had a hard time finding the actual map numbers.

Megan MacGlashan:

I see because they're smaller. Okay. I can have them made bigger.

Michael Russert:

And then my last question is after the plan is approved, what role will then Megan's firm have after the plan is approved by the Commission and then by the Board?

Mike Pollocoff:

Under our agreement with Vandewalle, they're done. But what we would be doing is if we say is that Carol Beach ends up being the priority number one park, the Commission would issue an RFP for design services to design the park and take it to the next level from what we have here, actually get some civils done, do some landscape architecture for it, put a bid package together, and then as that goes through the process, the financing process, then it would go out to bid. Vandewalle has an understanding and I would hope in an RFP they would be able to be very competitive since they've been through the drill with us, but that would be their next shot at the cat, as would everybody else who would want to respond to the RFP.

Michaeline Day:

Any other comments? I have one. I would like to thank Megan. I think she did a wonderful job. But I would also like to thank the Commissioners that have attended all the meetings, have attended a lot of meetings, have looked at all the maps, have looked at all the ideas, listened to a lot of citizen comments. I'd like to thank the citizens that came to our workshop and gave a lot of terrific ideas to Megan and to her staff and to us, and I think that it's been a lot of hard work as everyone has stated here on this Commission that there's a lot of hard work done here. But I also want to say that it's a lot of hard work from everybody sitting in these chairs, and I want to commend them that a lot of us are novices, and as was said just plain old Pleasant Prairie citizens, and I want to thank them. I think they did a terrific job. I've been on this Commission for more than one or two years and I've seen a great deal of commitment by these present Board members, and I just want to personally thank them very much and I have a round of applause for them. Thank you.

William Mills:

I do have one other comment that I noticed. In the resolution I know that Mike Russert is mentioned as Park Commission secretary, but in the acknowledgments of this plan he is not, even though the other Commission secretaries are.

Rita Christiansen:

And also, Megan, if you could spell Glenn's name with two n's, G-L-E-N-N Christiansen.

Megan MacGlashan:

I'll change that, thank you. Sorry.

b. Consideration of Park Commission Resolution #06-01 for the Approval of the Village Park and Open Space Plan: 2006-2011.

Michaeline Day:

Would I have a motion to accept this from draft to working piece of art?

Kathleen Burns:

I move to accept it.

Megan MacGlashan:

Did we open the public hearing to accept any citizen comments?

Michaeline Day:

We did now, but we can do that. Would you have any citizen comments, sir?

Gustav Hauser:

My name is Gustav Hauser and I live at 143 113th Street. I'm also the Vice President of the Chiwaukee Prairie Preservation Fund. I thank the Commission for the special consideration for the Chiwaukee Prairie. Our area is kind of unique like everybody else knows, and our group, the TNC and the DNR is working very hard to preserve that area. I don't think that actually belong in the meeting right now, but at the moment there's kind of a controversy because in Carol Beach there's a small area that's dedicated at Barnes Prairie, and that area is kind of in limbo at the moment. Some lot owners they cannot fill their lots, they cannot do anything with it. They cannot even dedicate it to our organization or to the TNC or the DNR because the Village apparently does not look favorably on that. We are working at the moment that we can come to somehow a conclusion with the Village. Either that area can be once dedicated as a Village Park or at least dedicated over to the DNR. But the lot owners they do not know what to do with that area. Like I say that area is wetlands. The whole area is wetlands but they cannot do anything. They cannot even deed it over to us. So if there's something that could be done in that area that the Village looks favorable at least the DNR or the TNC acquires those lots I would appreciate it very much.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you very much for your comments.

Gustav Hauser:

We were approached from some lot owners and that's why I bring it up.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you. I would like to entertain a motion from someone to—

Mike Pollocoff:

If we could close the hearing first.

Michaeline Day:

I need a motion to close the hearing.

Michael Russert:

I make a motion to close the hearing.

William Mills:

I second the motion.

Michaeline Day:

All in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

Michaeline Day:

Now I'll entertain a motion to accept the draft of the park and open space plan.

Kathleen Burns:

I move we accept the draft of the park and open space plan.

--:

I'll second.

Michaeline Day:

All in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you very much. The Resolution 06-01 passes.

- 6. SUCH OTHER MATTERS AS AUTHORIZED BY LAW.**
- 7. ADJOURNMENT.**

--:

I make a motion to adjourn.

Kathleen Burns:

Second.

Michaeline Day:

All in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

Michaeline Day:

Motion carried. This meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much.

MEETING ADJOURNED 6:45 PM