

**VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE  
PARK COMMISSION  
Village Hall, Auditorium  
9915 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Pleasant Prairie, Wisconsin 53158  
Tuesday, May 2, 2006  
6:00 p.m.**

A regular meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Park Commission was held on Tuesday, May 2, 2006, 6:00 p.m. Present were Michaeline Day, Rita Christiansen, Glenn Christiansen, William Mills, Kathleen Burns, Michael Russert 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 APRIL 4, 2006 PARK COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES.**

Michaeline Day:

Are there any corrections or comments on the meeting minutes?

William Mills:

I'd like to make a motion to accept the meeting minutes.

Michael Russert:

I'll second them.

Michaeline Day:

All approved?

Voices:

Aye.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you. Now it's your turn.

#### 4. CITIZEN COMMENTS

Judy Juliana:

My name is Judy Juliana and I live at 8743 Lakeshore Drive. I want to thank everybody for having this open meeting tonight and to have us residents talk about the concept plan for the park. I think the plan on the left, the one that has the soccer fields, baseball diamonds, it's a really good plan but not for our neighborhood. I think something like that should be in a neighborhood that is much larger than ours. It's very invasive. The area that it's in infringes on the animals that live in the prairie area long side of it. If we put in a very active park, where are these animals going to go, number one?

Number two, I live in the area. I don't live on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue abutting it but I do drive by it every day. I would like to see a very passive use of the area. I would like to have the basically green mowed lawn where the parks department all they'd have to do is come in and mow the lawn. You wouldn't have to worry about people coming in from other areas. The other thing, too, is if we put anything else in there besides passive use we're going to get people from across the tracks coming over there. We're going to have people coming in at night. We're going to have to clean up all their debris. We know what happens when people come at night and they park in the cars at night. We're going to have things thrown out of the window. We're going to have debris in the neighborhood. It's going to create a lot of unnecessary upkeep, calling of the police. I really think that we have to rethink how we want to use it. If we can't put in a completely passive green space area I would like to have that area deeded to the DNR as part of the Conservancy.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you, Judy.

Mike Pollocoff:

If I may, maybe one thing that will help the Commission in their deliberation is before we continue with citizens' comments, and Judy made good comments, but I know we talked to a lot of people individually and in groups, but maybe we could have John, Jr. just describe the two park plans, the two concepts and what makes up each one of them so that everybody can hear from the Village staff at the same time what we have and what we're looking at. I think the first question the Commission is going to need to answer when we get to the next item is which concept does the Commission favor, and then secondly to what extent does that concept build out. Maybe just for the record we can have John make a quick presentation on that so that everybody is dealing with the same information. As people come up if they would indicate to the Commission which plan, if any, and if they don't like any of them then we need to hear that, too, but one or the other would be helpful to everybody.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Good evening, everyone. One of the things that the Park Commission worked last year on starting I believe back in the fall was developing a Master Park and Open Space Plan for the Village of Pleasant Prairie. RFP's went out and then one of the requirements was the development of five neighborhood parks and Unit W was one of the parks that was laid out to have some sort of a concept plan developed in that.

In September of 2005 we had an open house and we invited just the general public to talk about park and open space plans as a whole in the Village, what would you like to see on this end or that end? Would you like to see tennis courts, trails and everything with that. And so we took all the comments from the residents that lived in Carol Beach and we developed this color plan that you see in front of me here. A lot of the people said they wanted to see a little bit more of an active recreational park in that area, and maybe something a little bit larger than what the existing Village land is.

The Village currently owns this parcel just north of 90<sup>th</sup>, and with the way the sum of the wetter lands are in that area there really isn't too much area that you can have a lot of active recreation in there. Based on a lot of the surveys that we had the highest ground is kind of in this northeast quadrant of that Village owned parcel. And so one of the recommendations that came up was to acquire through grants, through a land swap or some sort of a purchase the Morrow property or the old Town Club property and try to make some sort of a larger neighborhood park. That was based on a lot of the recommendations we picked up at the September meeting.

So we had our park consultant go through and develop a couple of concepts for the Park Commission to look at over the course of the years. So the one concept that we have in front of us which was originally in our park and open space plan, but then it got pulled up by the Park Commission just so we could have a meeting and that's the meeting that we're having this evening just to find out from the residents what exactly you guys are looking for in a park. One of the things to keep in mind is this is your park. This is going to be the Carol Beach Unit W park, so your friends and your family will all be using this and whatever means we end up having.

So we're looking at having the softball field up in here. One of the comments we had was reorienting the softball field so that we're not breaking a lot of windows in the house. We have an area identified for a soccer field, UA soccer is just kind of the size of the soccer field. It think it's based on what an eight year old would play soccer for. We have a parking area, a shelter, some tennis courts and then some trails going around the wetland area. And another one of the comments we heard this evening and we thought it was a great idea was somehow tying in a walking path on this DNR property and tie it into the existing trails. So anyone that lives in this area up to the North they wouldn't have to walk all the way around or drive around. They could just walk in from the north and enjoy the park. So this is one of the options that we have on the park tonight.

The second plan that we have is a little bit more of a passive park. It really doesn't have

the soccer field. It doesn't have the tennis courts. It does have a tot lot, it does have a shelter, a very small green space, and there's another area in here at which we looked at having a dog park.

One of the things to keep in mind with both of these plans that you're seeing this evening is that it is just a conceptual plan. It's saying that we can put a softball field in there. A shelter takes up about this much area. A path could be roughly so much area. And so these are basically the two options that we're looking at.

I guess the third options is just not having any type of a park at all. That's always an option any time that you go through something. So these are the three options this evening. Just kind of keep this in mind that we either have the option of having it on the Village owned property, the option of doing some sort of a park on the Town Club property, and then also whether you'd like to see more of an active or passive park. I'm sure at the end of the day the Park Commissioners are going to listen to what all the residents want. Thank you.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you. Anyone else who would like to speak?

Rick Frederick:

My name is Rick Frederick. I live at 8808 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue. What I have here is several comments that we've put together from people, about nine of us, who live along the 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue area that we have been looking at the Town Club for a number of years, both when it was up and when it's been sitting idle for several years and finally torn down. When I finish I'm going to give you an idea for a proposal. I gave one to you, didn't I John, about some of our thoughts.

Basically it boils down to this. The Village of Pleasant Prairie is never going to have an opportunity like it has now, in our opinion, to take this entire area and turn it into an environmentally friendly use not only for this generation and for my grandkids but for future generations. Right now there are 18 soccer fields that are in use 40 percent of the time according to Art Strong at Anderson Park.

We also have a tour that several of us took around the area in Carol Beach. There are approximately 22 families with children and in every back yard there's a jungle gym, there is those sand box things and you crawl all over them. My grandkids and one of my family lives on Lakeshore Drive, and Alex knows where they are across the street, and they have a very active area in the back where the kids play. So it's not like you're depriving these children in the families of the Carol Beach area of having any type of active program.

The third point is when we look at the wildlife that has come back into this area especially over the last three years since we have seen this be reclaimed by nature, and in this you'll see we have deer, we have coyotes, we have a beaver, and I think John Mattioli, one of my neighbors, will tell you he's been kind enough to put some screening

around the trees so they're not all gone because we have a very active beaver over there. Am I right, John? Thank you.

But we love to see this. We walk around this area. We really are stewards of this area. We have been stewards for years since the Town Club was finally demolished. We believe that if you're going to use any plan at all, at least in my opinion, you consider a passive plan in which people will have a chance to walk through this area, utilizing the University of Wisconsin Office, the Master Gardener Program, and schools. I honestly believe you would find just a tremendous interest in coming in doing native plantings and reintroducing some of the grasses and some of the plants that are not there. We could do this. We could maintain this and keep this into a passive state to be used today and for future generations.

I really personally don't feel, and believe me I have seven grandchildren and I know how active they are, but I don't believe they have any more fun than when they have a chance to walk around and look at some ponds, look at the deer this morning, two of them were out there, and to just take a look at what's out in nature. We go to the dunes and walk the dunes. You have a chance to reclaim this property and you're never going to have this chance again when I look at all your park plans. I would personally from my standpoint, and I think from some of my neighbors, really take advantage of the opportunity you have. Who would you like me to give this to on your Commission? To you? Okay.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you very much, Rick. Anybody else?

Len Brandrup:

Len Brandrup, 8816 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue. I want to just share with you and echo a lot of the comments you saw Rick present as far as the neighborhood is concerned. In fact, we as a neighborhood have talked among ourselves. We support the idea of the acquisition of that property for the public sector. We do support the idea of passive use, the return to nature idea, the idea of not putting ball diamonds, not putting soccer fields there.

One of the things I also wanted to share with the record and we did the last time you had your meeting over the Park Plan, unfortunately we haven't found anybody on the adjacent part of the Town Club that knew about the meetings in September. Now, that's our fault for not reading the notices and we apologize for that. But I want to share with you we would have had our comments on the plan to Mr. Steinbrink and Mr. Pollocoff at that time had we understood that this area was being considered. So it's not that we're late to the game. Unfortunately we were blind, deaf and dumb during the process. So this is our opportunity and we appreciate the opportunity to comment and to share our ideas on how you could work with this.

Tonight is the first time that we've seen the concept for W, what you call your option A. The more passive uses don't get me all excited as a negative. I think it's reasonable for us to look at this as an extension. And as we look at combining the two pieces of the two

parcels it absolutely makes sense for us to acquire the old Town Club, the Morrow property. We, in fact, as neighbors have thought about creating a buffer so that we could assist you with that acquisition, so that's an active issue that your staff is aware of.

But as we look at this, we certainly are concerned that the more active uses aren't exactly what your neighbors for the park are seeing as the highest and best use to that, and we really believe the return to nature concept makes much more sense. Thank you for your time.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you. So, Len, you are in the using the passive and walking trails and that idea?

Len Brandrup:

Yes. I'm one of the property owners right here. We've used the property daily literally. We walk the property. Our neighbors walk the property. We have been the stewards of the property. We're the ones with the lawn mowers out there keeping the grass down. We're the ones that have tried to keep the area so that it was open and accessible and not overgrown at this point in time. That's been a neighborhood project. Thank you.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you very much. Anyone else?

Marie DeVito:

My name is Marie DeVito and I live at 8608 Lakeshore Drive. I am against the very active park in Carol Beach. My reasoning is that the age of the residents is probably leaning toward 50 as the median age, maybe even 55. The number of children in Carol Beach if it totals 30 it's going to be a lot. So if we're going to build an active park and kids are going to come from other areas what's going to happen is they're going to cross the railroad tracks and that becomes a very dangerous situation for children.

I think about the cost of maintaining the park. I live across the street from a public access. I can't get that maintained. Myself and my neighbors we mow the grass, we cut the hedges. We have another public access to the lake that we were promised was going to be cleaned in the winter when parks are slower. None of that has ever been done. So does this mean if we have a park we have to hire more people now at a higher cost to taxpayers to maintain the park? Also added police patrolling. Teenagers will be teenagers, and when there's a park even though there's no lights, kids are going to be there. People are going to be there. We see that in the beach area down by the lake so you're talking about once again now more an added cost for police maintaining.

None of your plans call for a bathroom. What do people do? I mean they're going to a park for a couple hours. Children, all of a sudden someone has to go to the bathroom so there's no plans for a bathroom which I don't know how cool that is and even no plans

for water fountains. My thought would be if Pleasant Prairie really feels that it needs another park why not put it in an area where there are more children and more people who would be able to use it. Thank you.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you.

Gina Tiahnybok:

Gina Tiahnybok, 8757 Lakeshore. I moved here in 2001, September. Moved in in October of that year. I'm a mother of two young children. I thought to myself what a beautiful area that I live in. How fortunate I am that I live here. Is there anyone my age around here? Is there anyone that I can have hang out with my kids? Is there any park I can go have a stroll with my kids to in the stroller? Fortunately enough I had an elementary school teacher who was really, really an excellent teacher of mine and I ended up making contact with her prior to me moving into Pleasant Prairie. Her son moved into a house being a bachelor and all and had a play set in his back yard of his house. He said, hey, I'm not going to need this, do you need it? So fortunately enough my husband checked it out and realized it was okay, and that's why I have a play yard in the back of my house.

It is true there probably are plenty of people within Carol Beach that have these nice play systems but there's a reason for that. It's because there isn't a park close to our house. We have to get in our car and drive three miles away. Or we have to go ahead and walk the sand dunes to go to Anderson Park. I understand a lot of people here, the community obviously the median age is 50 or 51. But some people have grandchildren and that's great that they have the opportunity to see the nature.

I'm fortunate enough where I live that I have a backyard. I have a place to go ahead and do stuff. But there are people within Carol Beach that don't have that same opportunity that I have. I didn't have that opportunity making that connection with other families. I think if there was a park there with other families that they were able to go to and be able to see each other and be able to realize I'm not the only one here. Part of the reason why I did that to get involved in our community and I know my husband as well is to get to know more people in our community, Carol Beach and Pleasant Prairie and all, and we got ourselves involved. That was our way, that was our outlet. Personally hanging out in my back yard by myself with our play system is a lot of fun, but I would prefer to have the camaraderie, the community that any Village or subdivision should have. A park would be a good thing.

In regards to your plan I never saw the Option A. Although when we did move in there was lots of talk about how great this former Town Club was and for whatever reason I lived on the analogies of everyone telling about how wonderful it was before we moved in. Then they told us, yeah, by the way there's going to be a park in your area, you want to have a park, and of course a young mom and wanting to meet people and wanting to

know there's more parents out there with kids I was looking for this Unit W and the A plan or option. I, too, have not seen this plan. This is the first time I've seen the option or A plan.

I did have an opportunity to see this option B plan and I understood the concept that it was strictly a concept plan. What you guys did was took some ideas from people and platted it onto a poster so you had an idea of what actually could fit in that space. Now, in regards to what I feel is good about the space, the concept plan of B which I appreciate the most, I think the idea of having a spot, and I concur with Marie DeVito, I think there should be a spot for people if they have to use the washroom. One of the biggest complaints is that the Lake Michigan Park residents who live near there is they've seen people urinate and basically not a pleasant site when you want to look at the water. But now even the people who live on 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue I'm sure wouldn't want to have people doing the same thing in their backyard as well.

I didn't ever realize that I guess maybe having an open field where you possibly could go ahead and play softball or not strictly one with an actual field with diamonds, but even an area for a green space would be considered active. So maybe I think the terminology needs to be clarified in regards to active versus unactive. I think green space where people can have the option to throw a ball would be nice. I also think the washroom facility would be good for people who are walking around the trail. I also like the idea of having a space where people could congregate and bring their kids and grandchildren and realize there are more out there because I believe there are. Maybe I'm naive. That's okay.

And I personally do agree with this idea of this walking path. I think it's really a great idea. Whoever came up with the idea of possibly bringing it in through the north route I think that's excellent. I think the concept here, like I said, for everyone to understand is that it's just basically set up to give people some ideas flowing. I'm excited that this is moving forward. I have lived here for five years and 12 years in the making to get my house to where I'm at now. I was looking forward to a park and I'm glad it's finally up in front for discussion. Thank you.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you, Gina.

Kathy Shawncheck:

Kathy Shawncheck, 8720 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. I was inquiring about the lands here. I was once told the lots that go up to 8720 . . . is Village owned land . . . . (inaudible).

Michaeline Day:

Mike or John would be able to answer that.

Mike Pollocoff:



Alex asked me to look at the map. We do own--on that north side north of the yellow area is a 60 foot wide strip that's a right of way so there's a street right of way that goes to 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue that's on the north side of that lot. And then the Village owns the property that has the western boundary that's the same as that black line going up to 80--

Michaeline Day:

John, can you point that out what he's telling us.

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

So we do own that land. It's north of Parkside right there. Where his pen is--

Kathy Shawncheck;

I think it goes to 8720--

Mike Pollocoff:

No, it goes all the way to 85<sup>th</sup>.

(Inaudible)

Michaeline Day:

Kathy, they won't get it on the minutes. You're more than welcome to join in the conversation, they just can't hear you. Come on up. The tape machine can't hear you.\

Kathy Shawncheck:

We were just interested in nature trails. We thought of that as an option knowing that the Village had owned that land. And someone had said now that there are trails in there?

Mike Pollocoff:

There might be some paths people walk through, but what we'd need to do is that area is zoned C-3, Scientific Conservancy, so we'd need to meet with DNR and get some input with them on where we could scope this thing out and make sure there's no threatened species or anything that we'd want to encourage people--it's possible but it just take a little more work to come to it.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you, Kathy.

Bill Whyte:

My name is Bill Whyte. I live at 8822 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue. I built my home about 36 years ago, and unfortunately I'm one of those that brings the average age up in the area. Basically my back yard would be adjacent to about the south end of the soccer concept. At the risk of being a little bit redundant, I'll try not to, I agree with what Len had to say and what Rick had to say. I like the concept that this become public land. I favor an open type of passive use of the property. The thing that concerns me is if we start to see soccer fields and baseball diamonds the next thing we're going to see are a lot of stockade fences in our backyards, and that I believe would have a very negative impact on the sense and the feel of that neighborhood, but I know that would be the next reaction to it and I wouldn't like to see that.

As to plan A versus plan B, obviously Plan A is not adjacent to my backyard so okay, fine, that might be a better plan from my perspective. But I think the more important thing is whether it's A or B or a combination of both, and that may make a lot of sense, I would like to see it be a much more passive, open, wildlife friendly area. Thank you.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you, Bill. Anyone else?

Connie Bezanson:

Thank you. I'm Connie Bezanson. I'm at 9043 Lakeshore. Is plan A or plan B an either/or proposition?

Michaeline Day:

No.

Connie Bezanson:

Do I not understand this? Does plan A come all the up as far as plan B?

Mike Pollocoff:

Doing both together is going to be fairly expensive, and the concept between splitting them up is that plan B, the development site, is in private ownership now. Plan A is owned by the Village. It was dedicated as a park originally but it was filled with whatever back in the early '80s. One of the ways to be able to finance this improvement would be to take and apply for a grant or a couple grants and be able to take the land that as filled in option A, take that fill out of there and do a wetland restoration and bring it back so it's the like the rest of the prairie, and then do that smaller development area on the Town Club property that's not in the wetland. It would still all be in public ownership and it would still be the Village's property. Or, ultimately everything we own

that's wetlands when the plan is fully implemented goes to the DNR or The Nature Conservancy where it is, but it would be in public ownership. So in essence it will still be part of the plan, but especially if people want a passive property or a passive park we would really only look at developing one or the other.

Connie Bezanson:

So if I understand you correctly who owns the plan B property right now?

Mike Pollocoff:

A guy names Ralph Morrow.

Connie Bezanson:

An individual?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right.

Connie Bezanson:

And he's going to sell the Village that piece of property?

Mike Pollocoff:

We don't know that yet. So what we would do is in the grant application we would get an appraisal on this property and apply for the grant and say we're interested in acquiring it. Here's the value of it, whatever the value ends up being, and try to either negotiate with Mr. Morrow on the acquisition of it. Or, if the Village decides they want it and they're going to set money aside for doing it in order to secure the grant funds which is about a 50/50 split, the Village could make the ultimate step and say we're going to condemn it and put it in public use as a park.

Connie Bezanson:

Has Mr. Morrow indicated that he was willing or ready or wants to sell his property?

Mike Pollocoff:

That property has been for sale since he acquired it.

Connie Bezanson:

And what was the asking price?

Mike Pollocoff:

It's been all over the place. It's been as high as \$700,000. There's different views of what that land could be. He's viewed it from being a conference site, single family homes—

Michaeline Day:

Several single family homes.

Mike Pollocoff:

So all those different types of uses were going to generate a different value. The Village views it as park and rec land which, again, has it's own value.

Connie Bezanson:

And what was the last number and the last date that we actually had a hard number from him?

Mike Pollocoff:

I don't know. I can't recall.

Connie Bezanson:

So has it been in the last year or the last five years?

Mike Pollocoff:

Oh, no. We've had our dealings with Mr. Morrow. The people that abutted that property before it was razed the Village had been in litigation for Mr. Morrow for a couple years to try to get him in compliance and get the nuisances down there. I can't say that we honestly have the best relationship with him so he's not conversing with us. But we know about what he's up to is typically when a potential buyer like the Park Commission saw one at their last meeting who'd come to the Village and say I can do this and this and this is say this is what I want to do, and that's how we usually find out what Mr. Morrow is up to.

One of the policy questions that the Plan Commission and the Board is going to have to say is we've dealt with whether or not this land is going to be developed. The staff and the Board and the Park Commission have heard for quite a while that Carol Beach wants a park up at that end of Carol Beach. Do we want to solve two problems? One is to put this land in public ownership so we don't deal with the ongoing relationship of whether it's going to be developed or arguing with somebody about that property and make that public improvement for the benefit of everyone? Or, do we stick with the piece that we have now and develop that and fight the fights that come up with the Morrow property as

they come up?

Connie Bezanson:

Is the Village talking about eminent domain in this case?

Mike Pollocoff:

That could be. That could be the ultimate. I mean we try to stay away from that and try to negotiate to do that, but if the Board decided on the Park Commission's recommendation that the acquisition and construction of a public park there is important to the health and well being to the Village, and to leave it in private ownership is causing some negative impacts, then they can authorize an acquisition through eminent domain.

Connie Bezanson:

Is the Village Board on the verge of doing that?

Mike Pollocoff:

No. The Village Board won't--we don't have a plan to act on right now.

Connie Bezanson:

My whole point in asking is I think that our taxes in Carol Beach are extraordinarily high as it is, and I'm interested in knowing what the initial financial impact in one or both of these are and what the maintenance impact would be on my taxes.

Mike Pollocoff:

I can tell you that right now there's no money in the budget to do anything for those parks. Right now the Village's budget has been virtually frozen for four years as far as the total budget for general operations.

Connie Bezanson:

For the next four years?

Mike Pollocoff:

For the last four years.

Connie Bezanson:

So it isn't frozen for the future but it's been frozen in the past?

Mike Pollocoff:

It's frozen in the future, too. We're under levy limits. So the money we have now is the

money we have.

Connie Bezanson:

And there's none for this?

Mike Pollocoff:

There's none for any park.

Connie Bezanson:

So what are we talking about here?

Mike Pollocoff:

You mean as far as money?

Connie Bezanson:

Well, we don't own the land and we don't have the money to develop it.

Mike Pollocoff:

I think when you're looking at park development and a master plan for parks and a master plan for the Village, you either as a community decide what is our vision for our neighborhoods, what is our vision for our community, or you wait for a developer to tell you what your vision is. So many of the parks that are in this Master Park Plan might not be developed for 10 or 15 years. But as a community when somebody does want to develop property, we want to be able to tell them as you develop land in a certain area you are going to have to dedicate land, you're going to have to pay impact fees to improve that land so that the people that live around there have a park.

We didn't do that when Carol Beach was developed and that's why we sit here today trying to figure out what we're going to do for parks. So, yeah, we may not have money for it now, but you have to take the long view and you have to take the 50 year view as to what we want for our community and where do we want it to be. Maybe it doesn't happen right away, and you're right today we don't have enough money to mow it and we don't have enough money to build it. At some point as we get this plan put together it would probably end up being a referendum.

We have a few parks in the Village that are not going to benefit from impact fees because most of the land around those parks is already developed. We can't bill anybody for the impact of that new park so that has to go on the tax roll. This is a classic park where you have that problem. Another one is on the other end of the Village on 104<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Connie Bezanson:

This is really good information and I appreciate it, but have you figured out what plan A and/or plan B is going to cost in today's dollars?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes. I don't have it off the top of my head.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

And another one of the reasons why we do need to have a plan even though we do not have any money is that to apply for grants we need to have this park as one of the parks identified in our park and open space plan. So without even having a plan we're not even eligible to apply for the grants.

Mike Pollocoff:

The Unit W park option B our estimate is \$491,122.

Connie Bezanson:

Initially, and then did we compute what it's going to cost to maintain it?

Mike Pollocoff:

No, we didn't. But maintenance would probably be about 5 percent of that a year.

Connie Bezanson:

Annually.

Mike Pollocoff:

Assuming they mow it. I'm not discounting what people are saying about a passive park or whatever, but if you just assume that's all grass that's green and you put in a portable toilet, you've got your tennis courts there and you'd have to resurface them, it would probably be a safe estimate of \$40,000 a year.

Connie Bezanson:

I'm strongly against anything that's going to increase my taxes. And if you decide to go ahead with this anyway good luck, and I will support the community because I love living here. I think these parking spaces are a terrible idea. We invite boat parking and RV parking and mischief parking. I think if you are going to incorporate parking spaces at all they should be all the way out on the main street. I think that's 91<sup>st</sup>, isn't it? It would be where part of plan A is right now because they're not hidden. But I don't see how we can have a great safe neighborhood play space where our children are completely surrounded by wetlands and parks. We put the responsibility for their care on the people who live in those houses. So I think that the parking space disturbs me a bit with this

one. I would want to see it out on the street so everybody owns the responsibility for it. Thank you so much. That was very helpful.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you very much.

John Page:

John Page, 8743 Lakeshore. First of all, I'd like to agree with one of the earlier gentlemen who said that this is a unique opportunity for the Village and I'm glad we're taking it up at this time. I think that we have a chance now using the Village property already owned to the north and the portion which is called option A to the south to add this to the whole Chiwaukee Prairie. Even though we may not develop anything right now, I'd certainly like to encourage the Village to do what they have to do to make sure we don't have another four story condo going up there in the near future.

I think that an active park would be a disaster. We are terribly close to Sheridan Road and two very large mobile home parks with lots of kids. And if we have a big path in from the north, and a speaker already addressed this, they're just going to come across the railroad track and come right in there. You're also going to have a lot of activity at night which you can't control in addition to all the maintenance and everything else. So my vote is for a passive park. Let's let the animals have that. Sure, we can have some paths and things like that to benefit the nature lovers which we all are, but I'll vote for a passive park. Thank you.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you, John. Any other comments?

Dave Moresi:

I'm Dave Moresi. I live at 104 87<sup>th</sup> Place. I first want to mention that I received this mailing about a week ago and I thank you. This was the first that I had heard about any plans in the works. So I went over there on foot Sunday morning in the rain and was amazed and impressed with what a beautiful spot the colored map portion is. I hadn't been over there much before. I was there again yesterday.

I formulated some thoughts which I have printed up for you all, and they're also hopefully posted on the Carol Beach website. I attempted to do that so anybody who wants to see them. I am not going to try to go through this whole thing except to say I guess basically being there it's immediately apparent how much time and effort and restraint has gone into creating what is there now, and for that I applaud my neighbors. It's obvious a lot of hard work went into that, and I suggest I guess the word is passive to continue that. I think the construction of a softball field or a soccer field or anything like that would be a crime against nature.

I realize also in trying to maximize the usage of a facility such as this realize that there's



an official on road bike path which is 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue which passes within a half a block, and also an unofficial but very popular on road bike path which is Lakeshore Drive which passes within two half blocks of this site. And I would certainly like to see somehow tie the bike paths in with the parks such as this, even if it's just a sign on 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue in the bike lane saying bike rest area or biker rest area or something like that over here. I'm sure bicyclists would love, and I am one, to take a rest over here and enjoy the beautiful view and so on.

I don't have a lot more to say, although it's in here. I do like the concept which I see was included in plan A of an off leash doggie park. I think that's a great idea. There's a lot of dogs living in Carol Beach as pets, and it would be a great facility, a great thing, for dog people and the dogs to get together. So with that I will with your permission pass these out to you all and you can read them at your leisure.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you. If you could give them to Judy and then we can get a copy of them. Thank you very much, Dave.

Linda Swan:

Hi, my name is Linda Swan. I live at 8766 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue actually abutting the softball diamond there. I have lived down there for 17 years, and I can tell you that the wildlife down there is quite prevalent. I've lived down there during the Town Club existence all the way to what it is right now. I've seen a lot of things go on in that area after the Town Club was ripped down, a lot of parties, a lot of just fun activity, a lot of trash, a lot of garbage, and I applaud Pleasant Prairie for coming out and putting up the barriers to block the traffic from coming into that area because that has since solved a lot of the problems that we have had back there.

Opening it back up to this type of facility this magnitude doesn't really make me happy. I have seen a lot of coyote that walk right through my yard, a lot of deer that walk right through my yard to get to this area. I would hate to see that replaced by a lot of children riding their bikes through my yard to get to this area. I am for more passive parkland back there, much in favor of more walking trails. We've got a lot of Chiwaukee Prairie down there, and my husband and I walk a lot of that. It would be nice to see that carried forward into this area, too. Thank you.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you.

Jeff Swan:

My name is Jeff Swan, 8766 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue. I think the park idea is a great idea. The only thing I want to say is I think it would be a shame if we didn't set aside some green area

for the kids. Thanks.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you, Jeff.

John Mattioli:

John Mattioli, 8754 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue. My property would be right next to the softball field also. I've lived in the area for 18 years. I'm a very active person, and I probably with Mr. Frederick have walked the area so I know the area quite well. There are deer trails that go north all the way to the sand dunes, and there's deer trails going south all the way to the Chiwaukee Prairie. I'm really not in support of any massive park. I'm more looking for a passive park because I'm afraid for all the wildlife. And not only the wildlife but the plant life, too, that would be similar to the Chiwaukee Prairie. It's not uncommon that you would see six or seven deer running right through that area. The pond area is just beautiful. They come right up and drink right out of the pond. There's coyotes every day and you see them running through the area.

I even thought of purchasing the property myself to keep it natural. I have talked to Mr. Morrow about this. Actually I made an offer to purchase to buy the property. I had an idea to make a camp there, Children Without Parents. I did talk to Jean Werbie about this maybe a month ago. I don't have a problem. I know Ralph Morrow. I've bought property from them before and I know what the property is worth. The City has it assessed for only \$200,000, so if we had to acquire the property we could probably get it at a very reasonable cost. I did make him an offer, just a verbal offer, but he thought it was worth more than that. His figures the last I talked to him was maybe 30 days ago and he was talking anywhere from \$850,000 to \$1 million which I think is really ridiculous because you would have to bring sewers down to the property to develop it, and you would have to go underneath the railroad tracks down 91<sup>st</sup> Street and down 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue. So it really isn't cost effective. So that makes the property worth a lot less and that's why the City has it appraised for only \$200,000. So I think the Village could easily purchase it at a fair rate of possibly under \$300,000.

Again, I really would hate to see bulldozers coming in and tearing down 200 year old oak trees where the softball is projected to be put in. So I just really thank you for your time.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you, John.

Ted Laabs:

Hello. I'm Ted Laabs from 8780 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue. I guess I'd be right in the right field area on the map. I've actually just moved into Pleasant Prairie. I've been here for about a year and a half, and I'm actually a transplant from northern Wisconsin where I was fortunate enough to grow up in an area that had lots of wildlife with deer in my backyard and all kinds of animals and it was very natural. It was a great childhood for me. Some

day I hope my wife and I will be fortunate to have kids and to maybe have the same opportunity to show our kids the natural state of the plants and the animals and everything that we've been seeing in our backyard. I guess I'd have to say I'm for plan C in keeping it and going back to the natural state of the prairie. We live in Pleasant Prairie and it would be great to have some prairie left. Thanks.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you, Ted.

John Danko:

Good evening ladies and gentlemen. My name is John Danko. I live at 8706 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue. I haven't lived in the area that long, but I do have concerns and unfortunately they're more negative than positive regarding this area and the development of it. My first concern is pollution, whether it's water, sewer if some day restrooms do go onto the property, whether it's lights, if lights are put up for the tennis courts or however the property is developed. I consider these all pollution aspects. Water, sewer, light, sound, different activities make different kinds of sounds. Depending on what time of day, what time of night it's a form of pollution. Same with the trash. Trash is pollution. Deer, wildlife eat trash if it's not picked up in the early evening. They will feed on it and they really do not need it. The other thing that I consider pollution is graffiti. We all know graffiti happens. Unfortunately it's part of our modern civilization. That's my first concern. I consider those all pollution.

My second concern is vandalism. Vandalism happens. I'm not saying that Carol Beach residents are vandalistic, but once a park or an area that is somewhat secluded is realized by outside area people it will be used to their advantage which can bring on vandalism. I'm sorry if I'm being negative. That's not my point here. I'm just trying to bring out the realistic aspects of what could possibly happen.

Third, dumping. As we all know that land has been used for sofas, refrigerators, grass clippings, whatever. What guarantee do we have that even if this property were developed as a park that it can't be used as a dumping ground. I frequently walk into the sand dunes just north of me and to the park directly north I believe it's Sanders Park, I could be wrong, but it's amazing what you find in those areas. It's not even considered a park.

Fourth concern is I thought that area was ecologically sensitive. I know in the dunes they do have signs posted to that nature. And I assume that property is owned by the DNR, I don't know, but I would think that people are not conduct to wildlife or an ecologically sensitive area. That's my perception. Maybe I'm wrong.

The last thing is nighttime use. Once again, the dunes is used for nighttime use. I know it's Kenosha and not Pleasant Prairie, but many a time I have seen panties, condoms and beer bottles laying around. Do I hope this happens in either one of these proposals? No. Is it a possibility? Yes. Those are my concerns.

How we address those concerns possibly you need feedback from the Police Department on how they would try to curtail that activity. I don't know. I thank you for your time and have a good evening.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you, John.

James McSwain:

My name is James McSwain. I live at 8759 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue. I don't disagree with the parks completely because I do have children. My children are not hand-hold children. They go and play on their own. And like many of the kids on my street they get out and ride their bicycles in the street. Yes, I have a jungle gym in my back yard. That's a staple with the family. I don't agree with the soccer fields and the ball fields. I do not agree with the parking that far down. If they're going to have parking for the parks it needs to be out on the main street.

I come from a background of law enforcement, and that background tells me that if you have a secluded park like we're talking about building here, you're going to drag all the riffraff from the rest of the City is going to wind up right there. We're going to have drug paraphernalia that's going to be left there at night for our children to pick up and play.

I live right across the street from where the pond is. My children can go back there any time and play. If this park comes in, I wouldn't let them go back there by themselves and that's the whole idea of having a community park just so your children can go and play. I would not feel safe with my children going back there the way these parks are designed right now. And if I can't let my children go play there, then what's the use of having a community park? We might see a police cruiser come through once in a blue moon, so we know that's not going to happen. They spend all their time on the other side of the tracks dealing with things further out in Pleasant Prairie. The way it's set up now it's not safe for the children. I would love to have a place for the children.

The other thing is the traffic. Like I said, my kids and my neighbors kids ride their bikes in the summertime and in the spring and fall out on the street. We don't have to worry about them because all the parents look after all the children. Yes, the interest in the park is on the south side, but they're not going to leave there and go right back out to 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue. They're going to come back through the neighborhoods and that's going to increase our traffic, which means we can't let our children just go like they have been. Thank you.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you, sir.

Penny Wheeler:

Penny Wheeler, 8805 Lakeshore Drive. I think one of the reasons that people move to this area is because we have so many beautiful natural areas here, and I think that the best use and the long range of view of use of that land would be to develop it as a natural area with walks. I know the people with young children have a problem with the playgrounds and so on, but for a long range view I think that would benefit all property owners in this area. So I would favor a natural development of it. Thank you.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you, Ms. Wheeler. Anyone else? Last chance. Thank you very much for all your input. It was greatly appreciated.

## **5. NEW BUSINESS**

### **a. Discuss and Consider Adoption of Unit W Park Back Into the Park & Open Space Plan.**

Mike Pollocoff:

Madam Chair, if I could, I've taken a lot of notes. I heard a couple words and I want to make sure semantically we're talking about the same thing. Maybe we could have a show of hands. When you use the word passive do you mean putting it back to prairie with no active areas? How many people are in favor of that? Getting it back to a conservancy situation?

Michaeline Day:

With a walking path or something like that, correct?

--:

Twelve.

Mike Pollocoff:

Because passive in park terminology really means open mode spaces where you can do anything in. So what you're looking for would be identified as open space. It's open the way it is and that's it. And then how many people prefer that--the other thing I was trying to get a feel for, how many people want the Village to acquire option B or the land identified in option B?

--:

Acquire it?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right, just acquire it first. I want to find out how many people don't want it. Okay. That helps me dice up my notes.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you.

Rita Christiansen:

I'll start. Thank you first of all for everyone coming this evening. It's very important that we listen to what you have to say and take that into consideration. I think it is very important that we think of community and a gathering area for families. I think it's important that we have, from what I'm hearing from you, a passive open space area to keep it as natural as possible. But at the same time looking towards the future some type of small area where people with young children, etc., could come and gather. I think that's critical because it's part of being a community, a gathering place. So I would like to suggest that we pursue park A as passive and, again, please keep in mind that what you see up there is not in stone. An the acquisition of the Town Club land for future open space by the means that we have available.

Michaeline Day:

I think that the audience should be aware that originally we had our workshop, and in fact not just Carol Beach's W park but all the parks in Pleasant Prairie before we developed our wish list, so to speak, and desires and we had all the Village come. We spent an evening with the developer of the plan and the community as a whole. This Board did not decide on what we wanted to see in W park. The impact or the decision on how we came up with this development was through this workshop and dealing with. I have to say I don't recognize any of you so I'm sure none of you were aware of the meeting. But there was a large constituency of Carol Beach residents that came in and say they wanted, just like Gina had said, an area where the kids could play baseball together or softball together. That is how this park became designed. Again, it's just a concept.

This conversation here is new to us. This input was not given to us during our hearings. We have been working on this for over a year, so this is new and that's why you see us all kind of looking at each other going okay.

—:

We look like those deer you see walking around Carol Beach only now they got caught in the headlights for a second.

Michaeline Day:

This was not the input. This was not the group that came to our hearings, that came to

our workshops, and they had a distinct--you were there, weren't you, Alex? And that was not the conversation that we had gotten from the majority of you. So while you might be looking at us going what the heck are you doing to our community, it was a development of ideas from people in your area. We didn't come up with the ideas. Other people in your area did come up with these ideas. And that group didn't show up tonight.

Kathleen Burns:

Based on that, in all honesty the showing this evening is larger than the showing that came out on the 28<sup>th</sup>. You certainly have come forward with a feeling that you want it to be more passive than those folks that were there earlier. I guess I need to know from what is expected of us this evening if we're looking at the plan that we did develop, it sounds like most of the people present are overwhelmingly against the soccer field and the baseball. It sounds to me like I don't know that I heard anyone that said they were really strongly in favor of that.

If we try to get this back into the plan, are we able to say we want--I know it's a concept, but to take that portion out, and I'm just saying potentially because I really don't know what we do when it's already drawn up and everything like this, that if we want to acquire this property because it's in the best interest of Carol Beach, that this not be developed? Everyone wants it passive. Everyone wants it pristine. Then probably the best interest is for the Village to purchase it. If we take out that concept at this time and work towards keeping it more passive, can we make an adjustment like that and put it forward? Or, do we need to go back to these folks?

Mike Pollocoff:

On the agenda we can adopt a Unit W plan based on the input you've received. I think you have to be cautious that you received a lot of it, but we stopped this because we received input that was contrary to what some people said so we got more input. Then the Commission needs to envelop all of that and come up with something together.

You could direct staff to do another alternative and get it back again. Just based on, if I could, the Commission would be within our authority if you wanted to form a compromise plan based on everything we've heard, to take this plan B and move to make that an acquisition area, make it a passive--

Michaeline Day:

An open space.

Mike Pollocoff:

And I take that to mean get all the improvements that are out, where the tennis courts were or whatever, get it back to a natural state, and then the Commission has heard from people as we started this plan that there wasn't active areas, places for kids, your more traditional park type uses in the area, and there isn't. I've been here for quite a while and Unit W this park option A has floated up periodically. We want a park like everybody

else.

One option might be to take this and make it passive and then take the smaller, not passive in the sense that it's conservancy area, but it would be green space, a little playground and maybe a shelter that would be in order of magnitude a lot smaller, but provide either a landing spot for mothers with kids to go to play on the bouncie bugs or the slide, that kind of tot lot. A sand box and maybe have a washroom facility there.

Michaeline Day:

A neighborhood cookout.

Mike Pollocoff:

And you could have a cookout there, some picnic tables, and then have the trails lead through there. That might give everybody the most of what they want. I think there's a larger contingent of people who will want to see the park as an open green mode space. There's no doubt that a lot of people in Carol Beach because they're comfortable with the prairie and the conservancy area and they're alright with it. So that might be one way to complete the plan for Unit W and incorporate some part of an active traditional park that would be more use oriented. I can't remember the gentleman that made the statement that you're going to have all these nasty things. If there really is only small children attractions typically you're not going to have other people going in there is our experience.

Michaeline Day:

When you have just a tot lot.

Kathleen Burns:

Do we have that one in our--I know obviously we have the--do we have that one in our history?

Mike Pollocoff:

This one they did this up for us but it never got any farther than this and we bumped up to acquiring the Morrow property. So this one never really did get a full workout. The people that saw it the first time said we don't have enough room for fields, we don't have enough.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Mike, how many acres in the option B plan? I think it was 20 and something, wasn't it?

--:

Twenty three.



Alex Tiahnybok:

The LAWCON grants that you're talking about, maybe--I assume there was a tie between acquiring those grant dollars and moving forward with these plans. Is it contingent on--it sounds like the hybrid plan that we're talking about now assumes that we'd acquire the entire option B land and then not return the option A land back to conservancy which I thought was a tie.

Mike Pollocoff:

It is. I'm assuming that if we take that upland area that's over there and bring it into some kind of conservancy that might be the offset. We may take that dog park area and lower it a little bit. Not make it wet, but that's something we have to work out. So we would spend less money on capital improvements on it, but at the end of the day show that we've taken land that could be developed out of development and we've minimized our other site. But it could be a push. It makes it more expensive to do both.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Another risk that I see of adopting the plan today this way would be the notice was sent out regarding option B. Now, if we are considering option A, anyone on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue that may have been motivated to come here to speak on option A wasn't noticed about that so that's a risk I think we have to take into consideration. How about--I'm not opposed to the option A plan at all as long as we do some kind of improvements, the parking area, some mowed area, playground equipment, etc. I think the points about some kind of restroom facilities, whether it be portable toilets, water fountains and all that kind of stuff are good ones.

An alternative that hopped into my head is when we look at option B I think in general there's a consensus that we want to acquire that land. I don't think anybody in this room wants to see that land developed into additional housing. So I think that's a fair statement. It's just a matter of exactly what we do with it and how we do it. Clearly I agree with other comments that there's an overwhelming perspective on behalf of a passive use, meaning basically a nature preserve kind of area. That plan, as I see it right now, is essentially 50 percent that anyway, is it not? The yellow area is all conservancy not to be touched.

Mike Pollocoff:

Right.

Alex Tiahnybok:

The green areas and the brown areas, of course, are the parking spots, the tennis courts, and at least in the current plans the playing fields. Obviously the laying fields are clearly not desired so I think we need to scrap those. How about if we as an alternative, and again I'm not against the option A plan, but designate a percentage of the option B land to improvements, meaning if there's 13 acres we limit 30 percent of that land to an

improvement and keep it in the southeast corner of it. This way there would be some room for parking, there'd be some open space and playground equipment, and we'd be able to stay on track today. My concern is if we go to the option A plan we're going to have to do this again.

Mike Pollocoff:

And one of the options is the Commission can direct the staff as to--we've already spent our money for our park plan to take place. We don't have enough funds to have the consultant take another look at it. We can prepare something that's maybe not as pretty as option B but do some alternatives. If you want us to sketch up some alternatives and bring it back, send another notice out and get some feedback. There's no deadline on this. We've already missed the deadline for grant application this year. This is next year's. It would be the 2008 cycle.

Kathleen Burns:

That would give us an opportunity, too, to look back. I brought the draft from the last one because it was taken out of the park plan, and in all deference to those folks that did come in September, to be able to go through that list it's in the notes similar to the notes that we took from you folks tonight that we'll be getting from Judy. There were notes taken then and some of those did include some sort of playing field, improvement at the beach, more facilities. So to try to best represent the Carol Beach folks that at least care enough about their community to have attended the meetings, I think I'd feel better if we could follow what Mike possibly suggested, to come up with something I guess that's different than what we have here that could take in what I consider a very strong response tonight.

Michaeline Day:

As we seem to have missed our grant opportunity to do much until 2008, I don't know that there's any urgency to throw this plan right back into our open space plan without further discussion. Does anyone feel comfortable in making a ten minute judgment on what everybody said to say this is how we want to alter it and then present it to the Plan Commission again and to the Board? I think in my opinion we need--

William Mills:

I think we need to take another shot at this, to be honest with you, but at the same time we don't want to forget about it though either. It sounds to me that everyone overwhelmingly talks about that they want to see the Village acquire this land. It looks like the first pass here was more active than what most of the people in Carol Beach want. But I think we also heard that there was people out there that do want to see at least some small portion of this be an active area. It seems like to me that maybe it's not going to be as grand as some of these things look like, but maybe if Village staff can, especially since we've all taken a lot of notes here and the meeting minutes have been recorded here, that we take another stab at this. I would agree that it's nothing that has to be done imminently that we have to make a decision tonight. But let's try to take another

stab at this and see if we don't get more of what people want the second time around.

Michaeline Day:

Other than we're all in agreement that we should try to purchase or some how and some day acquire. Mike, you're looking at me like what the heck is she doing?

Mike Pollocoff:

No, no.

Rita Christiansen:

Mike, do we need a motion then if we wanted to recommend that staff review the minutes from tonight, look at redesigning based on input from the citizens of the Carol Beach W park, and then hold another meeting to get feedback so we have it locked down as to what people are seeing and what they said so there's no misconceptions at all?

Mike Pollocoff:

You're talking about all the meetings we've had in addition to tonight. The feedback we've had tonight along with the previous?

Rita Christiansen:

Correct.

Mike Pollocoff:

That's fine. You said I was a little troubled. I guess I'm torn.

Michaeline Day:

I don't know that we need a real pretty picture.

Mike Pollocoff:

I'm not worried about that. The reason when you say there's no hurry you're right there is no hurry because we don't have any money. But it would be nice to get control of the B parcel.

Michaeline Day:

I'm just saying we don't need to do it tonight, but I think we should have a deadline that by September we can self-impose a deadline on us and say by September meeting we have something to go to the Plan Commission for?

Mike Pollocoff:

Sure.

Rita Christiansen:

We could also pursue a motion that the Village pursue the acquisition of parcel B, the Town Club land, for future open space by means available.

Mike Pollocoff:

Sure.

Rita Christiansen:

So we can move forward with that acquisition should the monies become available in a grant.

Glenn Christiansen:

I do believe there are provisions for applying for a grant after the fact, but I think that's something you need to check into. It's a little more complicated.

Mike Pollocoff:

Any time it involves the grants a little bit, if we decide we just want to make it conservancy then some other pools of funds become available and we can't use the LAWCON funds for this park because we don't have a plan that's approved.

Michaeline Day:

Correct.

Mike Pollocoff:

So even if we approve it shortly it's going to be 2008 before we can do that.

Glenn Christiansen:

I have one other thing I could add to that. I wonder if you could approve the plan as it is because of it being conceptual and do less and amend it later on. I don't think that these things are so thoroughly etched in stone that you can't change things. You just have to have them approve the changes as I recall from some of the conversations I had with Dan Keever in the past from the DNR stewardship fund. You just have to be careful that you get all the details.

Mike Pollocoff:

You're right. We could do that. But one of the problems I think we have is the communication and the common understanding of what we're proposing. The softball field and the soccer field is a perfect example. Those reflected on that map a proportional size. This is how big this area is. It didn't mean it was going to be built there. So we have a group of intelligent people that all looked at the map and said I don't want that behind my property. So I think in order to make sure everybody is on the same page I'd rather not have that plan get adopted and then have people think the softball plan or soccer field plan has been adopted. There's clearly a difference of opinion and we just need to work through it and come up with another alternative or two for people to look at.

Alex Tiahnybok:

It's 7:30 now and two and a half hours since we started, and a lot of these people came here because I think they wanted some kind of sense of closure in terms of what direction we're going in. Going back to square one obviously is going to necessitate a whole series of meetings. And then one similar to this in the future. I think what we heard tonight is an overwhelming statement on behalf of keeping it mostly passive. My recommendation would be that we set a limit on a percentage basis on how much of that land--to move ahead with the acquisition plan when the funds become available, position ourselves properly for the grants, and so that the people that came here tonight are satisfied we say maximum 20 percent of the option B space to be developed. This way 80 percent is going to remain passive, untouched, and we're not back to square one.

Michaeline Day:

I don't know if you're making that a motion?

Alex Tiahnybok:

I'll make that a motion.

Michaeline Day:

Okay, now we'll need a second if anyone is in agreement and then there's discussion on that. So if you are not in agreement that you want to at this point tie our hands or if you want more discussion we can let the motion die or we can discuss it more. Does anyone want to second his motion?

William Mills:

I guess I just wish to discuss. I can see in some ways setting a percentage off to the side, but I'm not sure what it gets us to be honest. I guess in terms of grants by just adopting a measure like that does that get you anywhere in terms of being able to apply for future grants if you just set aside 20 percent for active?

Mike Pollocoff:

It would be a very conceptual plan. We'd probably just have a yellow area and a green

area and fit the green area in a spot. That can be done. It's a little more conceptual than you want, but given the nature of the grants we'd be applying for, which would be more conservancy based, they would probably be--they may be comfortable in reviewing it that way. I guess also just as a procedural matter, Madam Chairman, we probably to discuss this we need somebody to second the motion for discussion purposes and then you can vote her up or down after that.

Michaeline Day:

Yeah, but I'm just saying if no one is in agreement with the 20 percent as the motion is, then there's no sense for discussion.

Mike Pollocoff:

We shouldn't have discussion unless there's a second.

Michaeline Day:

If no one wants to make it your motion dies. I'm sorry. But anyone else?

Rita Christiansen:

I'd like to make a motion that staff redesign the Carol Beach W park based on the comments received from the citizens, bring it back and hold a meeting and have you all come back and the people in your area and review and let us know if we've given you what you wanted. And also is it possible, Mike, for us to move forward with the acquisition of the Town Club land for future open space and leave it in conservancy? Is it possible to move forward with those two motions then?

Mike Pollocoff:

Oh, yeah, that motion would be acceptable. I just have to also tell you without having the plan done it will be tough to start the acquisitions.

Rita Christiansen:

But we could have two motions on the floor.

Michaeline Day:

One at a time.

Rita Christiansen:

Correct. One being the motion that staff redesign the Carol Beach W park based on the feedback based on the community and then hold another meeting to have a review and

make sure that we understand exactly what it is you're asking. That would be my first motion.

Michaeline Day:

So we have a motion on the floor. Is there a second?

William Mills:

I second the motion.

Michaeline Day:

Now we have discussion on the motion that we ask staff in house to kind of draw up what we've heard from notes from both parties. Any more discussion on that motion?

Kathleen Burns:

I think our Commission meetings are open for participation. I guess with the people that have come out today, instead of having another huge informational meeting, if you're going to come back with a plan I would suggest that folks come to this meeting and have the comments. That we could possibly give the plan to them as they come. That they could look at the plan and have comments at a time such in the agenda that the folks would have an opportunity to have reviewed it. So if I could make a friendly amendment to the motion that you brought up. Because I think, as Alex mentioned, it's intensive to be here from 5 until 7:30. I think people gave us a lot of input tonight. So I'm hoping that they trust us enough that we'll take that input to heart and come up with something that is more acceptable to you folks as people that live in that area. That was a very long friendly amendment.

Rita Christiansen:

So amendment to the motion would be that at the next Park Commission meeting the input from the community would occur and we'd be ready hopefully at that point to move forward.

Kathleen Burns:

And if the next meeting might be too soon I don't know I guess I would have to again question it.

Mike Pollocoff:

In your motion, if you really want a neighborhood workshop like we did with the first plan before we come for adoption.

Rita Christiansen:

I think we need to get input from everybody.

Mike Pollocoff:

As part of the plan development we can draft up our concept plan and get everybody in for one-on-one review before it goes to the Commission for consideration?

Kathleen Burns:

Actually I was thinking that maybe we could give folks the plan the day we get it at the next Park Commission meeting and people that wanted to come could get it at that meeting and during comments. Or, does that not give people enough time?

Mike Pollocoff:

We could mail it to the people.

Kathleen Burns:

If it could be mailed that even sounds better. I would just think that then you could review it and people could review it at their leisure. Have some time to think about it.

Mike Pollocoff:

We'll send out a mailing announcing the meeting anyway.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

We can have the exhibits ready probably within a week or two in enough time so we can have it on the June agenda.

Rita Christiansen:

So we're looking at having it available to the community two weeks after this meeting giving them another two weeks to review it and then come back to us with adjustments accordingly.

Kathleen Burns:

During comment time, correct? Is that what we're all understanding?

Rita Christiansen:

Correct.

Kathleen Burns:



That's what I'm understanding during citizen comments?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes.

Michaeline Day:

So we have a motion and we have a second. Any more discussion?

Alex Tiahnybok:

Let's ask for a show of hands before in terms of participation based on the current plan. I'd like to know the people here that remained at 7:30 who would want to participate in another open house session and discuss the plans.

Glenn Christiansen:

Just a couple quick comments. I understand what Alex is saying when he made his proposal a few minutes ago. I think we've all come to the conclusion that it's important to get this thing going. I think everybody knows that I'm a very strong believer in conservation in the first place. Sometimes it needs to be said out loud. But this thing is important. I think this is probably the proper way to handle it, but let's try and get this done as soon as possible but give it enough time and some input so that everybody feels that we're comfortable with what we've put on paper. Let's do it right.

Michaeline Day:

So you'll get something out in two weeks?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Yes, we will.

Michaeline Day:

So next month first Tuesday of the month at six o'clock. We have a motion and a second. All in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

Michaeline Day:

All opposed? Okay, the second motion you wanted to make?

Rita Christiansen:

I would like to make a motion that we move forward to acquire the land listed as concept on B by means open to us and possible to move forward to guarantee that the community as we know it down at Carol Beach remains passive and open for wildlife observation.

Michaeline Day:

We have a first. We have a motion to acquire the land there, the old Town Club land. Do we have a second?

Kathleen Burns:

I'll second it.

Michaeline Day:

Any discussion? All in favor say aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you. I guess the discussion for the Unit W park is temporarily put on hold. We look forward to seeing all of you the first Tuesday of the month.

Rita Christiansen:

And please spread the word among your neighbors down at Carol Beach and thank you so much for coming. We really appreciate it.

**b. Review and Consider DNR Acceptance Letter for the Park & Open Space Plan from 2006-2011.**

Michaeline Day:

In your packet there was a letter drafted from the DNR accepting our park plan.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Our plan was recently adopted and accepted by the DNR per the letter that you saw in your informational packet. I did give all the Park Commissioners a copy of our Park and Open Space Plan as it was approved on the Plan Commission several weeks ago. I think it's a really good process that the Park Commission went through with all of the Village

residents. I'm sure that a part of this plan is going to be updating a lot of the newer parks that might be coming on board as part of the development over future years and adding onto it and then reviewing it every couple years as per the recommendation of the Park Plan.

Michaeline Day:

So do we need a motion to accept the acceptance?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

No, we do not.

Mike Pollocoff:

Motion to receive and file.

Michaeline Day:

Can I have a motion to receive and file?

Alex Tiahnybok:

So moved.

--:

Seconded.

Michaeline Day:

All in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you.

**c. Consider Erecting a Phil Sanders Memorial Sign along STH 165.**

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

This was actually an agenda item that was brought on board by one of the Park Commission members. I'm not sure, Glenn, if you wanted to address some of this.

Glenn Christiansen:

Sure. I'm not sure if everybody here knows who Phil Sanders was. He passed away a month ago or a month and a half ago. Phil Sanders was probably best known in the area for his belief in local history and nature, the outdoors, wildlife and so forth. Phil is someone who contributed greatly to the community. He was the director of the Historical Society. I think, as we stated in our last meeting, I think it's important that communities memorialize people who contribute to the community, especially people who do something that's probably unique or above and beyond what most people would ever dream of doing. That certainly would be very applicable to Phil. So I think it's something that's very appropriate.

The site that was talked about a few times informally a few years ago oddly enough is an area that was--what we're talking about here along Highway 165 is an area that Phil probably spend much time of his life hunting and walking and enjoying as anyplace else in the County. So I think it's something that would be an excellent idea. I know that there are a few people around the community who I think would be very much interested in making a donation to doing something like this. There was a discussion about this a few years ago and the people who were willing to do it at that time wanted to do it mostly to do it and take Phil out there and show it to him while he was still alive. Knowing how modest a person Phil was he would have nothing to do with it. He just did not want to--I think if you were to ask him he would say go out and plant a tree, go out and save a portion of the prairie. Don't erect something in my name.

On the other hand, a lot of Chiwaukee Prairie in the end became preserved because of Phil. He probably started pushing the idea of that becoming a State Preserve of some sort back in the late '20s when he was one of the first people to recognize how important an area it was. I could probably go on for another hour and I'm not going to do that because I don't think it's necessary.

Michaeline Day:

Any other comments about Phil or any opinions about erecting a memorial sign?

Rita Christiansen:

I think it's important to recognize, and I agree with Glenn, that people that change our lives and sometimes that change is not good and sometimes that change is very good. Phil Sanders had a wonderful impact and will continue through his efforts. It will continue to affect the community in a positive manner. So I would agree with erecting some type of memorial sign letting the rest of the world know how important it is to be part of the community and contribute as Phil did.

Michaeline Day:

I think it's an excellent idea. Alex?

Alex Tiahnybok:

Where on Route 165 are you talking about?

Glenn Christiansen:

Originally it was talked about being put directly across the south entrance to Prairie Springs Park in front of those ponds. There's probably no one particular place that's more appropriate over the other. I know some people who are involved in the discussion, and this was an informal discussion outside of the Village, they felt maybe closer to the river. I think it needs to be someplace where it's easy to maintain and easy to keep an eye on it. I don't know if right now is necessarily the time to decide on details of something like this. I think it's probably more important if we all agree that this is something we should try and work towards doing. If we all feel that it is something to try and accomplish, then we should probably put it on the agenda for further discussion in an upcoming meeting. Whether this happens this year or next year or two months from now is probably less important than we start moving towards accomplishing something like this.

Michaeline Day:

Mike, I have a question for you. This kind of falls into Item d as well. I know that in the budget there is no little pocket that we can reach into and build these memorials or these signs. How do we go about doing this? As Glenn had suggested there's probably people out there that would want to donate a brick or do something to do Phil Sanders or a veteran's memorial or any of the above.

Mike Pollocoff:

I guess my thought would be if, in fact, you want to name that slew or prairie area on the south side of 165 after Phil we could come up with a conceptual marker or sign that we would propose putting it up there, and then take that and walk it around the community or put it on Channel 25 or put it on our website or see if we can get the *Kenosha News* to do an article and say we're soliciting for donations to pay for the sign and any kind of site improvements that would be on that. I don't think it would be the kind of thing that people would be able to drive up and see because there just isn't any room there.

Glenn Christiansen:

I think one of the things that we had talked about and I think Jean Werbie liked the idea when we had discussed it a couple of years ago was to erect a wooden park sign, one of the things that might be four foot by six foot or similar to what's west of the river on 165 that was erected by The Nature Conservancy, for example, or something on that order. I think that would be very appropriate.

Mike Pollocoff:

That's probably like \$7,000 to get a good one. There are the usual suspects that want to give and we know who they are. I think Glen's right that there's a lot of people that given the opportunity to do something to recognize Phil for what he did I think would do that. We could lay that out and get a price on it to be sure what it would take to do it.

And an announcement that we want to do it, and the Park Commission could recommend to the Village Board that that land be named in honor of Phil. The Board could do that and it would be dedicated with the construction of the sign. Maybe we could do that at Family Days when everybody is out there and we close the highway down and we could have a ceremony out there to do it that way.

I really think not that there's urgency, but as time goes on and the community changes over and we get more new people here, a lot of people don't know who Phil was and what he did. I kind of think the sooner you memorialize what the guy did people will learn more about him. In the scheme of things that's not big money. That's something that should be accomplished through donations pretty easily.

Rita Christiansen:

So we would need a motion then to have you gather facts and data, or staff gather facts and data, and bring it back to the next Park Commission meeting with your findings for us to review, and at that time look at making a motion to move forward?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes, that would be fine.

Glenn Christiansen:

Should we make that a motion and if so I'll second it just to move things along.

Michaeline Day:

Any more discussion about trying to set up a memorial for Phil? All in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

Michaeline Day:

Opposed? None.

**b. Consider Erecting a Veteran's Memorial in the Village.**

Rita Christiansen:

Glenn had actually asked about this and we haven't talked about this, but we've just recently come back from some traveling, and we've seen veteran's memorials that are so simple but still speak volumes where you have some type of a monument maybe in the middle and then surrounded by flags. It doesn't have to be anything elaborate. It can be as simplistic as we want it to be. So with that in mind if we would think about a

veteran's memorial, and you think it needs to be a quiet place for remembrance. So I don't think it needs to shout because it will shout on its own. But I would love to see something that we could do to remember those people.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I think it's an excellent idea, and if we move ahead on the roundabout plan for Route 165 that could very well be in the center of the one of the roundabouts.

Rita Christiansen:

Except you can't get out of your car in a roundabout.

Glenn Christiansen:

Obviously there are a lot of possibilities.

Rita Christiansen:

I agree.

Glenn Christiansen:

I think it's just something that we have to do something that is tasteful and so forth. Something that really reflects—

Rita Christiansen:

Mike, do you have or would staff have an idea where they would think different areas that this might be something that could be done.

Mike Pollocoff:

If you think back about seven years ago we laid out a site and it was pretty magnificent as far as what was going to be on there.

Rita Christiansen:

Cost.

Mike Pollocoff:

The cost was incredible. I think it was \$145,000 or something like that. So that sat on the shelf. But the area was over on Terwall Terrace right after you came in off of 95<sup>th</sup> Street, and there was kind of a flat bermed area there that was high. You looked at the lake and across the lake with the woods it was really a nice site. You could do something just like what we talked about, a simple memorial and some flags, a concrete terrace. Since then when we expanded the RecPlex and IcePlex we built that up higher with a

berm and we need to flatten that out and get it back to where it was. We have about \$3,400 that we collect money from, again the people who remember we had that fund to donate to, and we actually do have some seed money from that so we could at least start off with something.

Rita Christiansen:

Would it be possible to have staff come back with some kind of recommendations for cost, etc. for the veteran's memorial.

Rita Christiansen:

Revisit any information we may still have on file from past discussions and start with that and see where we go.

Michaeline Day:

I just want to remind everyone that next month we do have a rather hefty agenda again with the W park that we just told everybody to come to. So I don't know how long that meeting will last. Is this something we want to give staff a little bit more time to say instead of putting this on next month's agenda, the veteran's memorial, if we can ask them with next month June to maybe to it in July?

Rita Christiansen:

July is bad because people are on vacation.

Michaeline Day:

But I'm just saying to ask them to come up with more information. They're doing the Phil Sanders one because we need to get that for Pleasant Prairie Days.

Glenn Christiansen:

Why don't we allow the staff to decide if they have the time to get it together. Because the other side of it is, like you're saying, we're loading up the next meeting already and perhaps the best thing to do is—

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I don't mind doing it. Obviously I want to move everything along as quickly as I can, but it probably will take a little bit of time to put all the information together and everything else. But then on the other hand our budget cycle for capital is starting I believe in June or July, so if we could have something by July or August complete with some plans and some costs we'll still be able to incorporate that into our capital plan for the parks.

Michaeline Day:



You just committed yourself to June then. Thank you, John.

Rita Christiansen:

And, John, what I was actually just thinking about if we maybe do a dedication to the area perhaps at Prairie Family Days, and then from then we could move forward with whatever the decision is for what we want that to look like.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

If I could just ask whichever Board members have any comments on that just to e-mail them to me or any pictures you might have taken at other sites pass that information along to me and I can use that in involvement of the plan.

Michael Russert:

What's the current memorial on the south side of the lake by the two flags?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

That is the Joseph Andrea.

Kathleen Burns:

And what we might want to look at as a Commission, too, is as these issues start to come up as we develop other parks or as people have--I didn't know Mr. Sanders but there may be other memorials that we need procedures in place or a protocol as to how this could be considered or how the fundraising might begin or what we might want to do so that if I came forward and said as a citizen I had this idea for the parks to dedicate to something that we might have something developed to say here's the protocol before we consider a memorial in one of the public parks.

Rita Christiansen:

Is there something currently on the books regarding that?

Mike Pollocoff:

I think there is a resolution that the Board adopted about 15 years ago. It's been nothing but hell for me since they did it. But they made the conscious decision that you shouldn't wait until people die to recognize them.

Michaeline Day:

Well, Mr. Sanders has.

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes, we wanted to do this all along and we couldn't get to it so I'd have to research what that is. And we also did that I think in conjunction with naming the trails down in Chiwaukee Prairie. I'll dig up that. It's been a long time since I've looked at it.

Kathleen Burns:

Just some guidelines I think might be helpful for the future if someone had someone else that they felt strongly about that asked us to make a decision. If we didn't have any guidelines it might be more difficult or less objective.

Michaeline Day:

So then, John, you'll have both the Mr. Sanders and the veteran's memorial?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Yes.

Michaeline Day:

We had our meeting set at six and I just told everybody six, but is this a lot? Should we move this earlier or leave it at six?

Mike Pollocoff:

Leave it at six and just go late.

Michaeline Day:

Okay, six o'clock.

## **6. ADJOURNMENT**

Michael Russert:

I'll make a motion we adjourn.

William Mills:

I'll second.

Michaeline Day:

All in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

**ADJOURNED: 7:50 P.M.**