

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

A regular meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Park Commission was held on Tuesday, June 6, 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 MAY 2, 2006 PARK COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES.**

Michaeline Day:

In your packets you have the May 2<sup>nd</sup> Park Commission meeting minutes. Did everyone had a chance to review them? And if no corrections or comments could I have a motion to accept?

Alex Tiahnybok:

Motion for approval.

Michael Russert:

Second the motion.

Michaeline Day:

All in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

Michaeline Day:

Then it's approved. Before we start, I want to thank you all for coming all this evening. Because you're here now we're getting big high tech. We now have PowerPoint on the side and I'm so impressed. It's time for citizen comments. If there is anyone that would

like to make a comment please come forward to the podium. What we need is your name and your address and you're free to comment on anything you want to talk about. Does anyone have any comments?

#### 4. CITIZEN COMMENTS

Fred Whyte:

My name is Fred Whyte. I live at 8730 Lakeshore Drive in Pleasant Prairie. My feeling about the discussions about this park is that the worse thing that could be done is to leave it the way it is. I believe that they should purchase the property, make a park that's not something that's objectionable to the residents on 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue as far as putting in lights and ballparks, but turn it back to grass or something where kids could play ball or something like that on a pickup basis. To build a tot park that could be accessible. Unfortunately, this piece of property is not very accessible except to the southern entrance. I know there are people that are concerned about that but maybe that improvement could be made.

Quite a few years ago I lived in Morton, Illinois, and I was confronted with a very similar situation. There was open land behind my house. The town came in, built a park, built a tot park, built sidewalks so people could come and go and it was a wonderful thing for us. Our yard backed right up to it. It was like having a huge, huge backyard and I think something similar could be done here. I think most things from people that I've heard that are objectionable that is to make something that is attractable to people from the outside. I think if they don't overdo it, it won't be attractable to people outside because those people in different areas around the City have plenty of places close enough to them to use. It should be purchased, and I know the planning people will make a nice park out of it. I just don't think that people want to see lights and that sort of thing that's objectionable to their backyard. Thank you.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you for your comments.

Laura Bush:

My name is Laura Bush. And for those of you who don't know me it really is Laura Bush. Throw that out there right now. I'm at 8622 Lakeshore Drive. Before I get started I just want to confirm the Towne Club property is not owned by the Village but the property in front of that, if you will, all the way to 90<sup>th</sup> we do own, is that correct?

Mike Pollocoff:

We do own the corner parcel. We own more than the corner, but we own everything on the west side of 5<sup>th</sup> and down to the point of the Towne Club property.

Laura Bush:

My husband and I have a six year old and a three year old. We moved into the neighborhood prior to children so we weren't really thinking that we didn't have sidewalks or a park for the kids. Now we like to take walks, we like to get out, and it actually is pretty dangerous. We're always saying a car is coming, kids pull over, stop, wait for the car to go, so having a tot park of sorts would just be a wonderful thing for the neighborhood. I think it would bring more families into the neighborhood. I think if we had had the children we wouldn't have looked into Carol Beach to live because it is a hard place to be outside. There's nowhere to go to walk and that sort of thing. My thought is that since we already own the one portion let's work with just that . . .and how long it will take if we can even purchase the Towne Club land, and to also start small. Just have a tot park and enough green space to fly a kite. Like Fred was saying perhaps a little ballpark or something for a pickup game or something like that. So something for the neighborhood would be a wonderful thing. And that small side I think would make sense for the community for people who live around it. It wouldn't get overcrowded or overpopulated. Thank you.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you, Ms. Bush. Anyone else?

Neil Murray:

My name is Neil Murray and my wife and I live at 8830 Lakeshore Drive. Like the previous speaker, I also am from northern Illinois. I have a good friend who is helping to develop the extraordinary preserve system that is in northern Illinois. I don't know how many of you have been to . . . Lake and some of the other rather exceptional preserves that have been developed in Lake County. The premise they work on is if you give land to constituency people will care about it. If you give them access they become a constituency. So their philosophy is very simple. Create beautiful trails and minimal other facilities other than shelters. They basically have little kids' parks if you've been to any of those preserves and they have trails and they have shelters. Almost no athletic fields or anything like that.

My wife and I would like very much for us to purchase the Town property so we have a contiguous piece of land there, and we would like to see a minimal park developed and a trail system. Personally I also happen to be President of the Kenosha Running Club, and the Club itself is interested. We've been speaking to the Village and to DNR and so on about further developing the trail system along the lake there. I think it could be a wonderful community facility and, again, create a kind of constituency for all of that land to create simple access to it. So our argument is simple, minimal, purchase the land and simple, minimal kind of development of it. Thank you.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you very much.

Judy Juliana:

Judy Juliana, 8743 Lakeshore Drive. I think what everyone has done has been really commendable, but my only concern is I would like for us to develop the current property that the Village owns and create a small green space with an area for the little children to go and to play, and eventually when we can afford it to buy the Towne Club property and turn that back into a nature area and just keep it natural. I really think we have to be aware that if we put anything active in that area it's going to be very difficult for the neighborhood children to play in that area because it's going to attract all of the people that drive down 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The people from Sheridan Road will be coming over there utilizing that park. So, therefore, it will no longer be a neighborhood park.

Like Laura did mention, there's no place for the little kids to go and to play a game of kick ball or softball or for the mothers during the day to bring their kids to just congregate. I think a nice green area, no soccer fields, no ball parks, no tennis courts, no outdoor lighting. Any of that will just create another problem. But I think the survey that was sent out was really a good thing and I really do appreciate our representative putting that out and getting everybody's input. Thank you.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you.

Sarah Drunthee:

My name is Sarah Drunthee. I live at 8921 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue. I don't think I totally disagree with anyone that's come to this podium at this point. I, too, feel that the property down by the old Towne Club certainly needs to have a solution. Living on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue I have in my off times, which was a little bit larger a few years ago when I wasn't working, observed a lot of traffic into that area. And it isn't traffic from our local area. It was traffic from probably all over the Kenosha area. A lot of young people, a lot of drinking, probably other things as I have observed them coming from the prairie. A few individuals caught in some embarrassing positions. This is what I observed. And one day I counted and there were 20 cars that went up and down my street. 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue is a dead end street into the Towne Club. It's a very narrow street.

Again, I don't think that I am in disagreement with anyone getting a solution to the old Towne Club property. I, too, love the idea of the prairie there. However, a park of any sort across from my home on my narrow street is not going to work well for me. At times now I have a great deal of difficulty, because there was a new home built down the street, getting into my driveway. On an annual basis I'm replacing at least two or three of my pop ups for my irrigation system where people have been over my property in parking on that street.

I met with my neighbor, with Alex, I think a solution and it was that he did indeed put into his questionnaire would be if we purchased the Towne Club property to have the tot park be more to the north of that property. That would not put it into any of our neighbors' backyards on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, nor would it put it in our front yard and on my street with the traffic on 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue. I think that that would be and could be a very viable solution.

As I did explain, I am not by any means an anti-child person. I have three grandchildren, and we have very much enjoyed going down to the old Towne Club property and looking at the lake and that type of thing. But I do have a great concern about what elements will be brought into and onto my street depending on the type of construction or the type of plan that we come up with. And as I indicated in my first e-mail to you, it would be I think interesting to see how often the police have been down in that area, because I have called them any numbers of times. One of my neighbors said perhaps this will increase the policing of that area. And my response to that is I don't want to pay our police to police a park that will draw all kinds of elements. I would prefer to have my street paved. So, again, I appreciate your time but that is my opinion. Thank you.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you.

Frank Hartle:

Hello everyone. My name is Frank Hartle and I live at 8911 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The present revised plan which calls for the Carol Beach Park to be on the Village owned property actually would put that park from that door to that door from my front door. And there are some concerns personally that I have in that sense, because this is the first meeting I've been able to attend because of being on business. But through e-mails and such I stated that I don't think that any resident within Carol Beach should be negatively impacted in any way with any of the plans that are called there. And stating that I don't think that any development that's done or proposed should be right in someone's front door or back door like the ball parks were before and all of that. Especially when there are other options to consider.

The purchase of the Towne Club property I'm in favor of that. I'm in favor of turning as much of that into conservancy as possible, keeping as much of this property as conservancy. I don't believe I'm alone in that Carol Beach has a flavor and has a personality all of its own in having a lot of nature, and I think a lot of people have situated themselves in that area because of that. I'm also not opposed to anyone that has children and such, and I believe that a viable solution and compromise can be obtained by simply . . . any tot park, keeping development minimal.

I agree with this gentleman here, some running trails or minimal development. But put it a little bit away from anyone's house in an area that's not wetland just north of the proposed cul-de-sac and create an area that would have some self-contained parking there so as not to create any parking problems on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue. It could be a compromise because that would put that proposed plan, just re-situate it a little bit so it's not in anybody's front yard, backyard or anything. A natural barrier of trees, and it's something that I would like for this Board to at least consider and to seriously take into consideration all residents of Carol Beach and especially with whatever you decide to do as to what goes in and where it goes in for property values, for noise pollution, for all of the factors that could have a negative impact and all the things that happen in parks that we all know that shouldn't be happening in parks. Thank you.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you, sir.

Bill Whyte:

Good evening. My name is Bill Whyte. I live at 8822 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue which just to reorient you my backyard would back up to the southern goal, concept only, soccer field. I think the dilemma that we're all going to have, and I appreciate everything the people on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue are saying about not wanting an active park across the street right in their front yard. That is very understandable. I have concerns about and some of my best friends are kids, I have some grandchildren as well and I don't dislike children, but on the other hand I do agree with what was said that Carol Beach does have a flavor. I'm not sure where you're going to find a location to put an active or semi-active park within either the existing land that's owned by the Village or the Towne Club property. I think people will be affected one way or another.

The bigger concern I had, if there is any kind of a tot park located somewhere within the Towne Club property, I think having parking and roads back in there is a potential for real disaster as the lady said. I don't know how many times I had to call the police. We had people in that area before the Village put up the barricades continually. It was a haven. And I think anything that we put in there that's off street parking is going to be a problem. The other side of that coin is so is on street parking. So I do think that the dilemma, as I said before, is how do you place a tot park or a recreational area that's usable beyond just the prairie in a place where no one is going to be impacted by it? I don't know that that's, frankly, possible.

From a purely 100 percent selfish perspective I would like to see the Village take ownership of the property and make it conservancy and not develop it. Of course, from where I live that's an obvious conclusion. Thank you.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you very much, Bill.

Alma Louise Grosko-Hartle:

My name is Alms Louise Grosko-Hartle. I used to work as one of the coordinators of the Board of Ed here, and I have been on line. I've seen the model for this Pleasant Prairie Carol Beach area, and it's quite contradictory when I see the preservations, your models. I think it should be up on your bulletin board. And equity. I also have not a Masters, that's in education, but I also have a real estate license for both Illinois and Wisconsin. I do not practice. I moved from Vernon Hills and married my husband, and what enticed us to Carol Beach was the fact that it was quite a unique place. I compare it to Oak Park.

Now, right over the train tracks I know that area because I've been up and down, and there's a homeless lady that I've been mentoring through. It's only a matter of crossing

right over into our area. We are entertaining all that element on the other side. I don't want to be a snob, but the reality is we have drug houses on Sheridan Road. The police blotter can state that. It's only a matter of entertaining that element over to our side where it's quite enticing. My neighbor informed me of all the ruckus in that area. In just the short time I've been there I'll tell you we've had a couple of incidents with one of our neighbors. I am concerned. I've been out there.

One of the most concerning things to me is as it is now every morning my neighbor can testify she saw me with a garbage bag. I literally had to pick up a garbage bag the day after I think it was a graduation party down by the lake, and I know that Lakeshore people have the same problem at the beach area, the very same problem, where garbage is all over the place. I lived in Vernon Hills and our greatest problem was garbage with the parks. People from outside would come in. So I do beg the Board and whomever else please minimize whatever activity you're going to do because it will impact you. Today me because I'm right in front of the park and that element will flow right through. Kid us not. It's there. And we have to be conscientious of our children. There are elements that you do not want to open the doors to. And as an educator, believe me as an inner city school educator, as a suburbanite educator, and now I'm in publishing with my husband I can't tell you if you open Pandora's box you will cry later.

I agree with the gentleman of running. I love activities. My husband and I jump on our bikes and we go through the path. I can see that. I really can. But I do think that we need an activity community where we all partake in picking up garbage. Every morning I see McDonald bags. Every morning there's a diaper out there. Twice I've had to pick up garbage. I don't mind. I live there. That's my home. That's my area. I love parks and it's something that I've nurtured within my son as well. But it takes a community to keep together.

I think that's really the beauty of Carol Beach outside of any other community that I've really seen here. So please heed that today's solution may not be tomorrow's and we all do have a vested interest in our property value. The last thing I want to do is invite people into our community where we're going to have to spend more tax dollars for garbage and for policing. Lakeshore people they know it. They've got it. They have it right now. Just drive up and down Lakeshore Drive and you'll see my point. You'll see people from Illinois with Illinois plate there.

I think we should do something comparable to what Highland Park, Illinois did. They had a permit only. I'm not saying let's be ogres. I'm not saying let's be elitists, but I am saying let's be diligent and let's be futuristic about whatever we do because I'm all for a kiddy park but let's be careful. Let's be realistic. How much of our tax dollars are going into that park maintaining it. As it is our taxes are high, very high. And will you want that area there garbaged? It's going to affect us all. It's going to be a ripple effect. The million dollars homes will not be a million dollars. I now that for a fact because I have spoken to people interested in the area. There's a few things that hinder that. We're now on the down side of real estate. It will pick up at some point. Let's keep Carol Beach what it is. Let's keep it as pristine as we have it now and I think it can get better because the garbage is really--I'll tell you that really irks me. Get some garbage cans out there, something, because it really takes a community to preserve what we have. Let's not lose

that little diamond right now. Thank you.

Michaeline Day:

Anyone else?

Kathleen Burins:

I'll be brief. Kathleen Burins. I live at 8739 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue. I'm very much in favor for a tot park maybe being on the southwest corner of the property we already own so it doesn't impact the people on 5<sup>th</sup>. As far as buying the Towne Club, personally I don't see a reason for it to building. To developing a soccer field absolutely not. It does invite everybody then to come in and I don't think that's what we need. As far as the Towne Club there are coyotes there. I don't know what the other wildlife impact would be on people or children or whatever, but let's build a tot park. Thank you.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you.

Lynn Brandrup:

Lynn Brandrup, 8816 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue. You've heard me suggest on several other occasions, and I would hope at this point in time that the previous ideas for the full development of the full park on the Towne Club make no sense for the community, make no sense for the neighborhood, and we personally in our household are opposed to that.

I would encourage the Village to put on their plans the purchase of the Towne Club property. My perception has been for the four years that I've lived in our current home site that this has been an issue that's been out there. I know that the Village doesn't need to continue to worry about what type of development may occur on that site, and so acquisition of the property is the right thing to do and it needs to be included in your planning process so that at least those issues are taken off the table.

Per the use of the property, the conservatory needs a gap filled with the pond and with the site. The idea of looking at a more natural investment in the site working with the garden folks in the region and working with the folks that can help us bring that property back to a more natural state absolutely makes sense. That's a cost effective solution that doesn't require a lot of assets invested beyond the purchase of the property.

Having said that, in terms of the currently owned property, I'm sympathetic to the neighbors, and certainly not in my backyard is an issue that we have. We have grandchildren also and we'd love to have an opportunity for them to walk the area to participate in activities, but sympathy with all of our neighbors as we move through any process and planning puts us in a position where we become a destination park as opposed to a neighborhood park will create challenges for the community and challenges to retain the natural state of that property.



Routinely we have a couple of deer that visit the garden. That's a challenge for us but it's also an opportunity. The coyote visits us on a regular basis. The others, ducks and geese that are now nesting in the pond, provide an attraction for the neighborhood so retention of those opportunities make a lot of sense. We want to thank you for your consideration. We want to thank you for purchasing the Towne Club since I know that that will be the vote as you deliberate this. And I want to thank you in advance for that wonderful decision to put that in your plan for acquisition. Keep it natural. Thank you.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you, sir.

Gerald Horvath:

Good evening. My name is Gerald Horvath. I live at 9047 Lakeshore Drive. Really I came with two reasons tonight. One was to ask if there was any sort of an impact study done relative to the wildlife and how they would be impacted by this park if that is, in fact, transformed into soccer fields and baseball fields and such. So that would be my first question.

Michaeline Day:

I know that there was some discussion with the people that we had hired to look into that but I don't know what the results were.

Gerald Horvath:

Because obviously for us that live down there that is a high traffic area, and as was mentioned earlier the coyotes and the deer and I think that would negatively impact the wildlife that we currently enjoy down in Carol Beach.

Secondly, I wanted to share that some time ago I served both on the Board and was president of an association where we developed a subdivision with 70 home sites on 144 acres. And after a few years a very similar setting came up to where they wanted to develop the area closest to the lake where we did put in a soccer field and we did put in a baseball field and we did put in a road and parking. And as the president I take responsibility for all that as I shared in that decision. But within a short period of time-- and I would also let you know that we were three and a half miles from a main road. It was Lake Haven Subdivision in West Bend, Wisconsin. Within the first year the problems that were mentioned here with the teenage kids coming in and driving down that road and the obvious things with teenage kids with drinking and problems in the cars, and we had the police there where in the first five years we never had one incident.

Since that point in time the soccer field has grown over, trees have been planted, they've maintained the baseball field, but they now have a gate and a chain and it has to be tended to, and that was the result of taking a natural wildlife area and opening it up into a park setting. My fear is that we would experience the same thing especially with the easy

access off of 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue. So I wanted to share that with you and ask that question. And ask that if something is done from a park standpoint or for tots that if parking is at all down there it would be minimal. The parking was the biggest problem we experienced. Once we created a lot for kids to come to it drew them like a magnet. So if it is in fact for the community in Carol Beach, than make it accessible more so than driving their cars and parking there. Thank you.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you.

Art Mauer:

Good evening. My name is Art Mauer. I live at 410 90<sup>th</sup> Street. It's the house directly west of the site in question. I've been there about 20 years in the Carol Beach area. I'm on two lots. I agree with everybody that the Village should purchase the Towne Club area and develop it into a nature preserve or a walking or a running trail. I could conceive park benches spread out through that area. I also have four grandchildren, and I love to walk them through around that little lake. Right now it's a dangerous area to walk around. I could see nice trails through that area and, again, park benches at different sites that all of us whether young or old can enjoy this beautiful community that we decided to move into.

I am not in favor of a tot park and I do have four grandchildren from 4 to 12 years old. My two daughters live in our area and they have their own little tot parks. I don't think we should develop parks for residences. If you want a little swing set for your kids I'm sure most of them have them for our kids already. So I am in favor of a natural preserve. Thank you very much.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you. Anyone else?

Terry Wruck:

My name is Terry Wruck and my husband Kurt. We're both here today, again, thanking you for giving us neighbors a chance to come up and speak. We live at 8815 Lakeshore Drive. And while we're not directly near the park area, we are residents of the beautiful Carol Beach, and I think everyone in Pleasant Prairie has to agree that we have a wonderful jewel with the lake and with the Chiwaukee Prairie. And we also do like people to enjoy it. We've heard some things about the bad element, but there isn't a day and especially weekends when the weather starts turning nice that we don't enjoy seeing all the extra bikers and motorcycles and cars come by just to enjoy the cool drive and catch a glimpse of the lake and, obviously, the prairie as well to see the nature and things in a natural state. This is something we get to enjoy every day as residents and share with our guests and the people who come through.

So, again, none of us, and I don't believe I heard--I agree with all the comments in part or 100 percent. But I think what we're saying is we don't want to do anything polar opposite of the jewel that we have and the jewel is the natural beauty of Carol Beach, lake, Nature Conservancy, Chiwaukee Prairie. So if you're trying to improve an eyesore and a problem that's been used with the bad element, think in terms of all the words and the things your residents are saying. Make it natural. Make it minimum. Don't make it into a city park because that is not what this area is. We have enough of those. Again, we've got to take care of and preserve the few natural places left in our community and this happens to be one. Thank you.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you, Terry.

Tim Roskoviak:

Good evening. My name is Tim Roskoviak. I live at 11283 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue in Carol Beach. I've been there for a few years since late '93. We moved there to raise our family and have a family. We got married and moved there and have had three children since. One of the things that concerns me is the fact that I agree with everybody that there is a special silence and uniqueness about Carol Beach compared to some of the other Village. That's pretty much not by its own design but by the design of everybody there.

One thing that we have been running into is there have been a lot of people outside of Wisconsin that just come over the border. It's been a haven for people to--for instance the park down on 1<sup>st</sup> and 110<sup>th</sup>, which is not a park but a beach access which was remodeled and renovated with the pylons on there and the big bridge, there's a lot of people that come in there and they just park all over, throw all their garbage out on the sand. We've seen power boats get backed in over the rocks. We've seen jet skis, wave runners, and a lot of license plates when we drive by on a typical Saturday or Sunday afternoon once the summer is in full swing they're not people that live there who can't even get in there because there's other people there.

I know everybody is talking about another park and another development and that's great, but I think we need to also take care of what we have already. One of the things that I was hoping to propose was like what we do for Lake Andrea, sponsor some parking stickers for the residents that live there that take care of the property, that pick up garbage, and sponsor two people that could be life guards out there. Charge the people who are not residents or not even part of Wisconsin a daily fee. And those who live there have a sticker so they can go to both parks, Lake Andrea and also down by Carol Beach as well. Just to get some guidance there and have some order I guess.

I'm not asking for a policing event, but there's a lot of kids that swim there, too. People go there and swim. Yeah, they've got a sign up there once in a while, but we really could use two life guards there, we really could, especially with the accidents we've had there the last few years. I've mentioned this to a couple Trustees before. It's a lot different I think and more intense than putting pylons on and saying no wake zone. We really need

some guidance.

The other thing is that we need some more police patrol down there. Just this past weekend we've had a group of kids that came by and dumped everybody's garbage cans this past Sunday over 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 116<sup>th</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, and we're just putting garbage out. We've got to make the six o'clock pickup in the morning on Monday, a lot of us work late or early and we need to have that out there. I think we need some extra patrols there. So I would ask that the Board make the recommendation to the police department to get some more guidance there.

We've also seen that people are parking there not actually at the beach because it closes at dusk but parking on the corners of the actual streets, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and then they walk over to the beach and have a small campfire and drink and they leave all the beer bottles all over the place or they're smashing our mailboxes. I guess when we have more development I guess that's probably what scares me is the fact that we need to kind of take care of what we have already. One start is to have the patrols and the other thing is to take care of the beach that we have now and issue passes on our windshields. Those that don't have them pay the \$12.

Lake Forest just put into effect, and they had everybody from Waukegan going to Lake Forest Beach, they had put a parking pass into effect and now the residents go there. You have to pay \$12 you'll pay \$12 but decent people won't tear it up. They want to go and enjoy it. People who don't care who don't live in the area are going to come by and destroy it. It's just something I think needs to be done. I know that I speak for people on our block that have talked to me in passing and they're more than for it. So I think that's something we need to do when we're talking about another park.

I encourage the grooming and developing of the park, our Nature Preserve, but I guess speaking with some people we need to keep the riffraff out and how do you do that? We don't have enough police to go around, but I think if we do some proactive things with some patrols. If we get some lifeguards for the kids that do come there and swim, there's a ton of kids on the block that want to use that beach, but sometimes they can't. I think we should make it accessible because a lot of people can't with their schedules get people up to Lake Andrea. So you've got one park up here and another one down there, so there's two sides of the town that we really can take care of and enjoy. That's all the comments I have. Thanks. I appreciate it.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you very much.

Rick Frederick:

My name is Rick Frederick. I live at 8808 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue. Aldo Leopold stated it best. He said, "Life in change, growth is optional. Choose wisely because there will never be any more land." As I said at the last meeting and the meeting before that, you really have an unprecedented opportunity, in my opinion and in the opinion of a number of us, to create

an environmentally friendly natural area from the Chiwaukee Prairie all the way through and ending in the dunes. Safety has been addressed from across the tracks, and a lot of people don't realize it, but when I was a child that would have been a cakewalk to walk across those tracks and across 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue. I don't want to be responsible, and I'm sure the Village and the residents of Carol Beach do not want to be responsible for one injury or one death.

I also have talked, and I also have mentioned it in the last bit of information we shared at the last meeting, I've talked to the UW-Extension people, I've talked to the schools and I've talked to the Master Gardner people. These are people who are willing to come and help with those trails, help with natural plantings, and continue to make it environmentally friendly.

As much as I can empathize with the people who would like to have a tot park or any other type of park, I have to kind of stop and think why did we move to Carol Beach? There weren't any parks there. There weren't any tot parks. We moved there to get away from that. Most of us thought there were plenty of parks throughout the community. Now you have a chance to create something that no other community in our area has, a kettle moraine of this area. I really hope you consider that when you make your decisions. Thank you.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you, Mr. Frederick: Anyone else? Mike, I have just a question for you. I received a correspondence from a resident up there. I'm sorry, we have one more gentleman.

Allen Zahn:

My name is Allen Zahn, and I live at 11262 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue. I just want to reiterate, and I know this is about another park, but what Tim Roskoviak was talking about on 112<sup>th</sup> by the beach there. There was problems there a long time ago and you put pilings up there to prevent all that parking and that helped somewhat. But more and more people are from out of the area going down there and causing a lot of trouble. I'd like to see if you guys will address that issue with parking stickers or fees or whatever and life guards to watch over the kids. That's all I wanted to say. Thank you.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you. Now I guess I'll ask my question. We received a letter from Howard and Mary Cooley from 8731 Lakeshore Drive in Pleasant Prairie. I believe that, John, you got the original. My question is do I put this into the minutes as it's addressed concerning Park W or how do I do that?

Mike Pollocoff:

You can either read it into the record, or does anybody else have a copy of it? Did everybody get a copy of it? If you want to give the audience a synopsis of what it is and then just recommend that the letter be entered into the record.

Michaeline Day:

Howard and Mary Cooley were not able I don't believe to attend this evening's meeting, and they had a further option. They called it D. Basically they left it like they had had it with a tot lot but they suggested a fenced in dog park as well. They would like to see the old Towne Club property restored as a passive park like you had suggested. They did like the tot lot, but they'd like to see a dog park area in the one corner. They didn't care where. A small fenced area gives the pets of law abiding citizens a place to run off leash and chase a frisbee or two. These are unlawful activities elsewhere in the Village. They would be--I'm just kind of reading through it because it's a relatively long letter here. But all that is needed for this addition would be some fencing and clearing and leveling to provide for mowing. Perhaps some grass seed, a few benches, and two or three gravel parking places off of 90<sup>th</sup> Street. The area between the dog park and 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue should be left a natural buffer area shielding the park from home sites. They suggest that if this plan is adopted they would be pleased to donate \$5,000 towards the cost of fences and benches. Sincerely, Howard and Mary Cooley. I'd like to enter that as one of the comments as well. You have a copy so you don't need this?

Mike Pollocoff:

No.

Michaeline Day:

Does anybody else have any comments? I'd like to thank all of you. You've showed a lot of dedication and a lot of forethought to come forward. I really appreciate it. Several of you came last month and you've come this month, and I want you to know that this Commission has listened to every word that you've said and we appreciate it, and we will definitely take everything that you have said to heart. We hope that we can come up with a solution. Sitting right here we have some of you for tot lots, some of you not for tot lots, all of you not for a big activity based plan which was kind of nixed at the last meeting pretty much from all of you. But there is a decision to be made here and we will try to make it as conducive to all of your wishes, but of course we can't make everybody happy.

Laura Bush:

What is the price tag on the Towne Club property?

Michaeline Day:

We don't have a price tag on the Towne Club. We have not heard. We're not in negotiations with Mr. Morrow at this moment, right?

Mike Pollocoff:

No.

(Inaudible)

Michaeline Day:

You have to come up to the podium. In the last minutes and you probably weren't able to come, but we don't have any--we're not in negotiations with him. We've heard numbers as high as \$700,000 or more, so we don't know. This plan is a conceptual plan to go into our parks plan. There's nothing in writing that says exactly where it's going. We don't have the funding for this park at all in our budget at all. So these are just the conceptual plan of what we would like. So if ever we have the funding or the availability to build this thing then we actually then come and say now we have some money and maybe we can do something and it comes back again about exactly where we're going to stick the tot lot and where we're going to do this and what we're going to do there.

Laura Bush:

What is the time frame? Is it a short term or long term?

Michaeline Day:

A long term.

Laura Bush:

Like ten years? Who knows?

Michaeline Day:

We don't know. Mike?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right now the Park Commission and the Plan Commission and the Board have adopted the Master Comprehensive Park Plan for the entire Village, and the Carol Beach Unit W park was pulled out of that study because there was a need to look at it further. What we use that plan for is a vehicle to be able to apply for grants and assistance to be able to develop parks, and we can't apply for those grants until we have an adopted plan that shows what our intent is. As Chairperson Day said that doesn't mean we have everything tied out exactly where it's going to be but it's a conceptual plan. Based on the type of park that's being developed there are different grant funds. If it's a passive park and more natural there's a few more pools of funds that are available. If it's a typical urban park there are probably less funds, but sometimes those grant funds are greater in quantity so it's a mixed bag. And then, of course, we're competing with everybody.

So one of the reasons the Park Commission is interested in getting this thing going is for this park here once we, and when I say we it's the neighborhood, the Park Commission and the Village, have decided this is the best plan or the most acceptable one, amend the

park plan so we can get it included again so we can get it on the queue to be able to apply for grant funds so we can get a level of assistance for us. If it ends up being 40 percent or 70 percent or whatever, then at that point we know how much we have to come up with.

Laura Bush:

Is it a fair market thing or is it just whatever he wants to sell it for?

Mike Pollocoff:

My supposition on that property is there's a big gap between--I can't remember his name now. Mr. Oatsvall owns it, what he believes it's worth and what we believe it's worth. We've had some numerous inquiries about developing that as condominiums, high density residential.

Laura Bush:

Would that ever happen?

Mike Pollocoff:

Well, you can't stop somebody from asking. Whether that happens is really dependent upon the Plan Commission and the Board agreeing to rezone the property or doing something. What we try not to do is put the Village in a position where we're absolutely denying him any use of the property because then at that point a court is going to tell you what you're going to do with it rather than yourself. The land right now is zoned park and recreational. We felt that was the best way to--even before . . . to protect the Village. Now, that being said if we told Mr. Oatsvall we're not going to give you residential development on your property because we have it zoned as park and recreational, and then we don't turn around when we have the opportunity to do something park and recreational, he's able to say, now wait a minute, you can't have it both ways. You can't say I can't do anything with it because it's park, and then when it comes time for you to do something that's park you won't do anything either. At that point we're really playing with his property rights.

It needs to be addressed sooner rather than later. My suspicion is that we would have to do this anyway. I think if there's any resistance on his part to sell use a tool that has gotten a bad name recently but that's eminent domain. We'd have to really find what the value of that property is to condemn it.

Laura Bush:

We wouldn't spend something like \$700,000 on it, would we? That's not an option?

Michaeline Day:

I don't know. That's not our decision here.



Mike Pollocoff:

If we decide to get it, it really ends up being a condemnation commission decision what that value is.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you all very much again. With citizen comments now close we'll move onto new business.

Mike Pollocoff:

There seems to be a lot of people here for the Carol Beach item if you want to modify the agenda.

Alex Tiahnybok:

This has impact, doesn't it?

Mike Pollocoff:

Pardon me?

Alex Tiahnybok:

The next item sort of has impact.

## **5. NEW BUSINESS**

- a. Discuss alterations needed to Village of Pleasant Prairie Park & Open Space Plan 2006-2011 as a result of Wisconsin Act 477.**

Michaeline Day:

I think as we get later they might want to hear what this new law is so we'll go in order here. I don't know if you read in the paper, I brought it with, back on Friday, June 2<sup>nd</sup>, law alters fees, local municipal leaders fear limits on services. It is the Wisconsin Act 477, and it will affect the park plan as we had spent the whole last year developing. So maybe Mike has had a lot more knowledge about the Act and maybe you can kind of explain it and how it's going and what our options are.

Mike Pollocoff:

Sure. This is evolving. The Board met last night and we talked about it at length, and I've had additional correspondence from our attorney about it today. Suffice it to say when you think back to your civics class how a bill becomes a law there's a lot of hearings and meetings and deliberations about it kind of like what we're going through

tonight. This law rocketed through the Legislature relatively fast so there's not a lot of-- some of the legislative intent isn't clear. Some things are very clear. Some of the things that probably aren't park related the Village's impact fees identified funds for equipment like fire trucks, ambulances, snow plows, so that when a subdivision came in you're adding in the case of snow plows miles of road. And what we've said to the developers is you have to give us enough money for each mile of road so when it comes time to buy a snow plow, and a snow plow is about \$90,000, that we have that money there so that the taxpayers don't have to pay for it, that the new users of those roads are going to pay for it. Same thing for fire trucks and ambulances They're really driven by the number of . . . what equates to that is very expensive. An engine is close to a half million dollars. An ambulance is \$160,000 to \$180,000.

So when the Board adopted the impact fees we took a look at what the effect of each incremental house coming into the Village is and then what that cost is so that we collect that money and hold onto it until such time as we're ready to go with it. Another one is the pool. We have a pool out at RecPlex. As the Village grows and there's more people there, there's enough money there to put in another pool. The pool has been eliminated by the law and so has equipment.

The park component, and even our attorney is going to give us a more thorough opinion, but my latest information from him was is this relates to park. In particular our park plan, as we decided, we as a community developed the park plan, we went away from numerous small individual parks and subdivisions and went to the larger park sites which would be High Point, Foxmoor and having a trail connecting those, the Village Green trail and the Kenosha Bike Path trail. So you have some developers that would be developing subdivisions and not having any parkland in their subdivision but making a payment in lieu of parkland dedication to the Village. That money in turn would go to acquire land from another developer, because one developer might have more land being taken out of his subdivision for this larger park and that money would go for that or go for trail development to get there. And then the impact fees that are collected from each and every house would go to make those improvements in the larger parks.

The Village's counsel his question on this is the way the law is amended one of the things that's changed or that's problematic is you can still pay for parks and you can still pay for park improvements with impact fees, and they removed something called other recreational facilities which is the code word for pool, and then they added athletic fields. Specifically athletic fields were put in. That works pretty well.

The concern that he has and then speaking with some staffers from the Legislature and with the people that are going to be reviewing the plans from the communities, the DNR is, park is not defined. The definition of park is not clear. As we look at it does park mean that trail that gets you from one big park to the other? When you think about the Village Green park, we had those bowed out areas with recreation opportunities along side the park on either side that got you to the big park. The intent clearly in this legislation was that from the interest groups that got it through was to limit the ability to spend this money on something that's not specifically identified. So that's one problem.

The other thing is that plat approval, and I have to read this because I just got it, plat

approval cannot be conditioned on the payment of fees or charges to fund the acquisition or improvement of land, infrastructure or other real or personal property. So in Pleasant Prairie we've got two different things going on with parks. Tonight is the perfect example of one situation. An area that was platted quite a few years ago, land was set aside in Carol Beach for parks all throughout Carol Beach, and almost every single one of those areas is wetlands. It's not a developed park. And we have some areas where you've got this kind of friction where you have some people that want a more traditional urban park, people that want a passive park, and some people don't want any park there and just leave it the way it. But the land was dedicated to the Village and we own it but there was no money that went with it.

What the park plan anticipates that we adopted was when we said we're going to maximize our park impact in these bigger areas, get these parks set aside away from existing urban development, and that's one of the key things I think that we heard tonight is once the people are there they don't want the park there by them. The decision has been made in their mind I bought this house, and there might be a park platted across the street from me but it's not there. I'm here and I'm buying this under these existing conditions and I don't want to have the park kind of put on me.

So the park plan anticipates that in some of these major areas where subdivisions are created and they're not there yet the park plan is in place, and as those subdivisions are developed two things are going to happen. There's going to be dedications immediately around that park plan that's going to dedicate land to the Village for the park, and as other subdivisions go in they're going to make a payment in lieu of dedicating land because they won't have to dedicate any land. They get to develop every inch of their property, but they're going to have to give us money to buy additional land from that developer who is giving up land so that he doesn't get cleaned out because that's the Village's plan.

What the new law says is you can't do that. You can't have as a condition of approving a plat or a CSM any dedications, which brings you back to if you want parkland and you have somebody developing it, the only way you're going to get any land from the developer is to change your plan and go back to many small parks and go away from big parks, or you take the park plan that we've adopted and you bring it to the Village residents and say do you want to levy a tax to pay for this park plan acquisition since we're not able to fund it all through development and pay for it that way.

We have a mix. The Board approved a grant application for the acquisition of a house by Pleasant Prairie ballpark last night, and that's in one of those neighborhoods where those impact fees address Village wide impact fees and also neighborhood specific impact fees that is having some of the Prairie Ridge development pay for the acquisition for that house as a match for the grant. We'd probably be trying to do something like that here if it's the ultimate decision, whatever we do, whether we're buying Towne Club property and making it all conservancy or if we're putting a tot lot in, whatever, we'd be using some of that, it's just at Carol Beach there's not that many lots left that we can put an impact fee on to get it.

The policy question that the Village is going to have to deal with is how do we want to

proceed in modifying the master plan to deal with the vast--we have some big areas that are going to be developing that we anticipated we were going to be able to leverage impact fees to get those improvements put in. The biggest area is right across 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue between here and Highway 31, between 93<sup>rd</sup> Street and 165. That's where Village Green Heights is. It's a lot of vacant land. Jean Werbie has close to a thousand lots that are not all going to be here in a year or two, but what we want to do is guarantee that we can collect that money so that the parks are created and those people have paid for those parks and that doesn't end up being a tax roll question later on. The same thing as you go down the bike path. That's a chore, or we take the path of least resistance, modify the park plan and go for smaller parks in greater number and do it that way.

Of course, when we did the park plan one of the reasons we looked at having larger parks is the ability to do more things, minimizes our maintenance expense. That's where it's at. The Board talked about some alternatives. It wasn't an action item for a decision, but they did say we may want to look at crafting a narrow moratorium that doesn't affect the whole Village but it kind of puts these areas on a freeze until we figure out what it is we want to do. We have to be cautious with that, because again you're playing with somebody's property rights that they might be depending on being able to sell their land for development or develop it. We owe it to them to take a good look at it and a quick look at it.

Right now under the law that's going to be effective June 13<sup>th</sup>, that portion of the impact fees that is Village wide which we've collected about \$40,000 a good chunk of that is going to fall by the wayside. That's really where it's at. Again, it's evolving. When I talked with the Board last night we've collected close to half a million dollars in impact fees in about nine months from everything from police, public works, fire and rescue, the pool, parks. In fact, it was stated in the *Journal Sentinel* by the contractors' lobbyists that this law change here was a good start, that they were going to come back for more. And also in the *Journal Sentinel* they were able to give the Legislature \$140,000 in contributions and the Governor a quarter million. You've got both parties in it. It's not one party or the other and they both bob into that special interest money and there we are. I don't think that's going to stop unless you guys all want to start contributing so we can make a municipal deal with the people but I don't see that happening either.

As it affects the Carol Beach park it just really shortens up our leverage in being able to get more money for the park. And it really kind of starts putting these financing questions or coming up with money back to a referendum, taking it all out to a referendum saying we need more money because the source of impact fees has been taken away from us so we keep falling back to the only source of funds we have to do this is the property tax. We're under a levy limit freeze right now. We can't raise taxes without a referendum. The levy limit that we're under now gives us based on this year's budget \$69,000 of added that we can tax for next year over and above what we do for a \$9 million budget. Gasoline and fuel will probably take that and utilities will take up that. So there isn't a lot of spare cash in the budget.

Michaeline Day:

I'd like to entertain any questions that the Board might have. I'll start with Bill. Do you

have any questions at all?

William Mills:

I don't think I do at this time.

Kathleen Burns:

So, Mike, if I understand correctly then, what we're discussing right now is whether we put a moratorium on until we can make decisions about whether we are going to stick with this plan which when we developed it, it was based on the hope that we would be getting fees. I mean the reason we developed larger parks and did this was with that understanding that it wouldn't be a tax increase base?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right.

Kathleen Burns:

So what we're looking at is putting it on moratorium until we can look at that thoroughly and decide whether we want to keep what we're doing with the understanding that the only way we could do it would be through a referendum, or possibly adjusting it to be the smaller parks?

Mike Pollocoff:

The policy recommendation that the Park Commission should be making to the Plan Commission and the Board is the State is telling us in those undeveloped areas you're going back to single small lots. Do you think it's good policy? If you do or you don't, the Plan Commission and the Board needs a recommendation, because then we believe in it so much that we're willing to go to referendum. I'm not saying you fund the whole thing at once, but this is how we want our plan to go, or do we say don't swim upstream and let's just do a park in every subdivision. Alex, what do you want for a recommendation?

Michael Russert:

No comments at this time.

Rita Christiansen:

No comment.

Michaeline Day:

Glen or Alex?

Alex Tiahnybok:

Of course I have a comment. To answer your question, Mike, I think obviously if some kind of redesign of our master park plan down the road becomes a necessity we're going to need to look at that and fund it properly. But the subject at hand today in new business Item b. is what most of these people are here for, and I believe what we're talking about in terms of the Unit W Park sort of qualifies as a neighborhood park anyway. So from an impact by this specifically it's probably not as severe.

Mike Pollocoff:

No. Unit W is going to almost need to be totally funded by property taxes. There's not a lot of vacant lots there to draw from.

Michaeline Day:

But the question we have and we're still working on a. is that this Board has to decide do we believe in the plan that we developed, as Mike said, with the trail system and not a bunch of little small parks all over the place, and do we believe in that that we want to tell the Plan Commission and the Board we'd like to stick with it for a while, or do we say, well, we-

Mike Pollocoff:

I don't know if you want to make the decision tonight. You might want to sit down and study it and take a look at the alternatives. Again, this legislation rocketed right out. You don't even have the people in Madison clean on what's happening with it. You may want to set up another meeting. By the time we have our next meeting we'll have a month behind us that we should have the Village attorney giving you complete information and then figure out what our risk is in taking it on.

I've heard from some attorneys taking the scheme of if that's what the builders wanted was to make you put a park in every area, take the parkland dedication, take that land, flip it, sell it as lots and then take the money and buy some more--put it back in your big park. So everybody is going to work it however they want to work it. If we wanted to take a full look at that. I don't think a decision is necessary tonight, but I think that you need to know that the park plan as it sits today is in trouble. It definitely is noncompliant with the statute.

Michaeline Day:

Can I request that we put it on next month's agenda so that by that time you'd be able to have more legal opinions?

Mike Pollocoff:

Oh, you bet.

Michaeline Day:

And in the meantime everybody give it a little bit of thought on what you would like to see happen.

Mike Pollocoff:

As we get some information we'll make sure it gets out to you so we don't wait until the next meeting. If you have any questions by all means give John or myself a call.

Michaeline Day:

It's a major problem and a major issue. We spend a year and we really believed in what we did so hopefully we can work it out.

Mike Pollocoff:

I just signed the last check for Vandewalle.

Michaeline Day:

Okay, thank you, Mike.

Glen Christiansen:

I've got to leave . . . .

Michaeline Day:

Thank you, Glen.

**b. Discuss and Consider Revisions to Carol Beach Unit W Park Plan of the Village of Pleasant Prairie Park & Open Space Plan 2006 - 2011.**

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Commissioner Day and the Park Commission, over the last year Village staff and the Commission, along with a lot of input from the residents, had been working on developing the Master Park and Open Space Plan, and specifically one of those five parks we've been working on is Unit W. That park has been taking a lot of changes over the course of the last year. Back in September we had an open house and it was overwhelming from the people that attended the meeting back in September that they wanted to have an active park.

Up on the screen is what we had originally put into the Master Park and Open Space Plan based on the recommendations that we had from all the residents. When this plan went before the Plan Commission, there was a need to take a little bit closer look at if this is a true representation of what the population wants for a park out there. And so we held another meeting I believe it was last month and we threw out some more concept plans. It was an overwhelming majority of the people that spoke last month who said they wanted a little more of a natural park area, preserve it with maybe a potential for a small tot lot, but definitely having the soccer fields and the baseball diamonds and the tennis courts taken out of that plan.

The one I have up on the screen right now is an option that we had to choose from also for the master park and open space plan. And this is just taking the Village owned land that we have and developing a very small tot lot just east of that little creek area. One of the recommendations that we've been kind of hearing throughout in the Carol Beach Unit W area is having some sort of a dog park. This option also shows the dog park. Most of the residents that the Park Commission has heard from has wanted to acquire the land to the north.

On May 8<sup>th</sup> staff came up with this concept plan keeping it a little bit more of a natural area on the Towne Club property and potential doing some sort of a small tot lot just to the west of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue. As soon as I mailed this out a couple weeks ago I received numerous phone calls from some of the people that lived in that area, and they did have some concerns about parking issues that we might have, especially with that lot along 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue and the location of it.

So based on some more of those comments, staff just this week put together another plan that basically just takes the tot lot area and moves it up to the end of the cul-de-sac, and that would allow people to park at the end of the cul-de-sac. Our staff does feel that it's important to include a cul-de-sac in this park so we can have maneuverability for snow plow trucks, garbage trucks on a weekly basis, have the police and fire trucks in case they have to get through. So we're really not looking at a parking lot per se with this final option, but parking would be allowed along the outer perimeter of the cul-de-sac and keeping the balance of it natural.

Another one of the requests that we've been hearing from residents is to have some sort of a trail access from the north, so the green line on there represents one of the possible routes you could take from 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue along the west side of the pond area and then access the small tot lot and pavilion like a small picnic area and pretty much keeping the balance of the area in a natural state. So kind of the progression of how our park and Unit W has developed based on the response that we've been hearing from the residents. I can bounce back and forth between these options based on whatever comments that the Park Commission may have.

Michaeline Day:

I'll start again and start to my left. Do you have any comments?

William Mills:



No comments at this time.

Kathleen Burns:

It seems to reflect what we heard the past two months from what I can see.

Michael Russert:

I guess my only comment is we still don't have ownership of the old Town Property, so going in this plan I guess it hinges on if we are able to purchase it. So I guess I'd be more in favor of looking at the land that we currently own, and then if we do purchase the property then look at plans at that time.

Rita Christiansen:

I would agree with Mike, Mr. Russert, and the fact that we don't currently own the property. I'm not so sure after listening to the people that live in Carol Beach that they are in agreement with the cul-de-sac. But I heard several people comment on the fact that there's a lot of activity in this area at various times of the day and night. It may be more conducive to have instead of a parking area or a turn around area no parking on the street some people had recommended, and walking into the park. Again, we don't own the Towne Club property. John, could you go back to the one slide where it shows what we do own? And just leave it a walk in park. I would like to see us purchase the Towne Club property and return it to all natural, taking out the cul-de-sac, etc., and I am in favor of having some type of small tot lot. I have no opposition to not having any parking on the street. That's fine if people want to walk to the area. But I'm not so sure that the cul-de-sac, after hearing what the citizens had to say, would be in the best interest of what they're finding is a troubled area on weekends, etc.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Fifteen people spoke today, and from past meetings I think the Park Commission was kind of blind sided at the last meeting by the very negative reaction to what I call the full blown park plan. I live in Carol Beach, and a lot of people that I spoke to and spoke here tonight are personal friends. They're certainly neighbors. As their local Trustee I felt as though anything short of trying to take a scientific approach was going to leave somebody angry.

So what I did, and I strongly believe in the democratic process where majority rules, first off take one step back. The Carol Beach Property Owners Association discussed this at our last meeting, and there was, surprise, surprise, enough of a differing opinion on the Board of Carol Beach that the Association chose to take a neutral stance on this matter. So as sort of, quote, unquote local Trustee, I tried to assess basically a circle of impacted area. John, if you would put my PowerPoint up please.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

You must have a lot of pictures. It's still loading.

Alex Tiahnybok:

It's pretty small. What I did is put together a survey. It's seven questions and I'll go in detail on what they are.

Michaeline Day:

Let me interrupt. You did this as a Park Trustee or as the President of your Homeowners Association?

Alex Tiahnybok:

And I just commented that the Association decides they'll take neutral position on it so I did this as a Village Trustee. The circle which from a geographic perspective basically puts the intended two sites of the park in the middle bounded by 86<sup>th</sup> Street on the north, 93<sup>rd</sup> Street on the south, 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue on the west because there is nothing on 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Lakeshore Drive on the East.

Seven questions were asked. The first question is whether or not there was support for spending tax impact fee or grant dollars to acquire the former Towne Club property. The second question is I/we support building out the former Towne Club Property with full park improvements, basically what I think was called Plan B. I/We support building out the former Towne Club property with minor park improvements on the Towne Club property site with walkways and play area as has been discussed tonight. The fourth question is I/we support a small park in the south section, meaning the Village owned property, and the Village staying out of the former Towne Club property, meaning leaving it private and subject to potential development. The fifth question is I/we support a small park in the south section and the village acquiring the former Towne Club property but leaving it natural. Six is a no park option, I/we want no improvements on the south section and leaving the north section private property, again subject to improvement. And the seventh question is basically the same but the Village acquiring the north section and returning it to a natural state.

As of today I have 55 responses but when I put this together this morning I had only 53. Of the 201 that's a sampling of 26 percent which I think most people recognize is a good response to the survey. The results to the first question, which is spending money to acquire Towne Club, as you can see 29 people voted yes and 16 people votes no.

Michaeline Day:

I'm sorry, we didn't have the questions here for us to see. That was the Village buying the land?

Alex Tiahnybok:

The Village acquiring funds, grants, impact fee dollars, any source of revenue to acquire that land, spending money.

Michaeline Day:

Other than raising everybody's taxes, that's the Village buying it?

Alex Tiahnybok:

Taxes included. Second question was the full park build out, Plan B. Obviously there was a very strong opposition to that concept. The Village doing a minor park installation, meaning tot lot, walkways, just about split. These are interesting. Doing a minor build out on the south property but the Village staying out of the Towne Club again was very negatively responded to, 5 to 39. The next question was south minor improvements and acquiring the north section and making it natural, obviously 30 to 17. The sixth question was leaving the south natural and taking a hands off policy in the north section was obviously not desired. And the last question was leaving the south and acquiring the north property and making that natural and that was basically an even split.

Graphically I think this kind of shows the very clear results. Anywhere there's a big cap between green and red is where the community favored, and the two favored areas, of course, were acquiring the park, and the other one which is question 5 was minor development to the south property and acquiring the north property and leaving it natural.

Trends just using the numbers that were shown, 2 to 1 of the respondees were in favor of acquiring the Towne Club property; 4 to 1 opposed the full park build out. I think that's pretty evident today. Basically 1 to 1 in regards to the minor park build out on the Towne Club site. 8 to 1, obviously very strong, against the minor build out in the south and leaving the north parcel subject to development, but 2 to 1 were in favor of minor improvements on the south parcel and returning the north parcel to the natural state. 5 to 1 were opposed to making the south parcel natural and leaving the north parcel subject to development. And a 2 to 3 split opposed to leaving the south parcel natural and acquiring the north parcel and also making it natural.

And I think one very clear aspect to this is the respondees do not want the future development of the Towne Club property to be left to chance meaning development or whatever. I think there's a clear voice that they want the property to be acquired. And really when you look at the numbers whether it's a minor park development on the south or north section I think is sort of equally balanced. I think that's pretty much in line with some of the other comments that the Park Commission made today in terms of either/or depending on the acquisition possibilities of the Towne Club property.

Again, I did this because just casual conversations led to a very clear opposing views. I think this shows us, at least on 25 percent of the respondees to the area what action is desired.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you, Alex. This I think proves Mike's and Rita's comment to stay with the tot lot area on our property. My only concern was you with the cul-de-sac was more of a safety

issue and not so much for parking, is that correct, is that why you envisioned the cul-de-sac not for parking but for access for emergency vehicles?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Emergency vehicles and just weekly vehicles like the garbage truck. That really is a narrow road down there and it really causes a lot of havoc backing a garbage truck or a snow plow truck down that road during not ideal conditions.

Mike Pollocoff:

That, plus if you're going to have a tot lot park there you're going to have people stop their cars and kids running and people leaving the park. And if they can't pull ahead and turn around and see where they're going then they're backing into the driveways of the people who live across the street and turn around and backing out. It just makes sure it gives everybody an opportunity not to have a bad mistake.

Michaeline Day:

I'm not being rude, but during this session we can't entertain citizen comments. I'm sorry. So I'm not trying to ignore you but it's just the rules. Thanks. Any other comments?

Kathleen Burns:

As we considered these plans in all the other parks we always did look at safety issues. It's one thing that this Commission brought up many times about the safety of the children and the safety of the people using it. So I want to make sure we come to the right decision about that cul-de-sac as to whether or not how that could possibly impact the safety of children if we're looking at accepting a tot park there. It's just something that we've discussed at many of our other meetings as we've brought these park plans forward. So I do want to make sure we get that consideration.

Alex Tiahnybok:

In regards to the concerns of the residents on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, an alternative concept that was brought to my attention, and perhaps John and Mike can comment on this, is there any reason if we were to locate the developed portion, if it was a tot park or whatever, is there any reason why it needs to be located adjacent to 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue and it couldn't be with our south parcel if that's where it was to be put, is there any reason why it couldn't hug the west border of that property?

Mike Pollocoff:

The northwest border?

Alex Tiahnybok:

Northwest or southwest, anywhere on the west border naturally leading to access from 90<sup>th</sup> street rather than 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue and leaving 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue alone?

Mike Pollocoff:

My preference would be from a safety standpoint to get as far away from 90<sup>th</sup> as you can get it. That's where the more traffic is coming down 90<sup>th</sup>, and it's that time of the year where the weeds are up higher or somebody is not looking. I think we're better having the smaller kids away from 90<sup>th</sup> and if so the northwest corner, whatever side of that drainageway that wouldn't cause a problem would be better. I know that's not what the people on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue want to hear, but to me with the tot park there you've got to get it away from 90<sup>th</sup>.

Alex Tiahnybok:

But if we put it in the northwest corner and we had access from 90<sup>th</sup> Street.

Mike Pollocoff:

Put a drive in from 90<sup>th</sup>?

Alex Tiahnybok:

Exactly to a small parking lot if that was decided to be the correct solution, we actually could satisfy everyone's needs because it would be off of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue. It would be very far away from 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue. If we kept the improvements down to something that's not an attraction I think everyone's needs could be met and we could incorporate a trail system if we acquired the Towne Club. I think that would be a viable solution.

Mike Pollocoff:

Put in a drive and a parking area—

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

On the Village owned land is what you're talking about?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right, on the Village owned property.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

We looked at some of the soil conditions and they were a predominantly wetland area down there and a pretty wet area, and that's kind of why we bumped it a little bit towards the east and the north on a little bit of higher ground.

Mike Pollocoff:

The only other trick is to say it's a pedestrian park and post the area no parking. The only way to get there is to walk there, but that goes for the people on 5<sup>th</sup>, too, and that's not where they want to be.

Michaeline Day:

Again, though, we do have the issue for garbage and police or ambulance problems. As this is just basically a conceptual plan that it really isn't written in stone where we're going to put it, just that we do want to put a tot lot and leave it as natural as can be, do we necessarily have to designate where this tot lot is going to go to the exact location at this moment? If someone wants to make a motion that we present this to Planning in using our existing property for a tot lot natural setting?

Mike Pollocoff:

I think the Commission should say whether or not the tot lot is going to be on the south lot because we own it and we say that's where it's going to be, and that the second part of the park development plan would be the acquisition of the Morrow property to get the trail to go up to that back end of 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue. If it's not specific enough, we're going to have to have a hearing on the grant, and if the people say that's not where I wanted it or that's not where I thought it would be, then you end up at that point going back to the drafting board. I think as long as we know if the Commission says we want it on the south lot, the property we own, we know exactly where it is. I think the application is going to get kicked if the park is close to 90<sup>th</sup>. We might as well get it as far away from that as you can, and then just identify that the trail is on the Morrow property and that acquisition would facilitate that park improvement.

Rita Christiansen:

Mike, I have a question. What do you consider soft use? If you don't say tot lot, what is the definition of soft use?

Mike Pollocoff:

Tot lot is a classic. Soft use, probably the next would be a picnic table, a bird watching stand. There's a few things. I think what the Commission should do rather than getting bogged down in that semantic is what is it we really want the people to be able to do there? Do we really want a place where people take little kids to be able to burn off some energy there and this is what we want? Or, if it's going to be totally natural it's really a place for people to get their gear, set it down, and hike into the trail or do whatever. The ultimate soft use is a totally passive park where we just put a trail in.

Michaeline Day:

Anyone want to entertain a motion that we can then discuss? Alex?

Alex Tiahnybok:

Could the motion have two parts, one being contingent on the acquisition of Towne Club? Does that make sense?

Mike Pollocoff:

I'd just go ahead and--I don't know, I don't know what you're going to say. If you think you want to make that part of the motion, do one thing and acquire the Towne Club. You mean so if we didn't get the Towne Club we could still have one part of it? Is that what you're heading at?

Alex Tiahnybok:

Whether it's at the 11 o'clock position, if the Village believes from a public safety perspective, etc. that a cul-de-sac is necessary at that site, then again I think it would probably, and I'm guessing, instead of the tot lot being at the 11 o'clock position I would guess it would probably be more desired at the 9 o'clock position. That really kind of takes it away . . . between these two directly west of the cul-de-sac. This way it takes it further away from 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue, it honestly truly keeps it west of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue. I guess that would be my recommendation is positioning it there. But that obviously is contingent on acquiring the Towne Club.

Mike Pollocoff:

From where I'm sitting and listening to the citizen input, I heard very few people say that we shouldn't get the Towne Club. That was a desirable goal, and your survey reflected that as well.

Michaeline Day:

But I hate to throw a monkey wrench into this, we have a very select group of people here, and if it has to go to referendum to the whole Village to say how many of you want to buy the Towne Club just so the people in Carol Beach can look at deer, how many people are going to say, yeah, let's buy it? Because of this new law I don't know if you can make it contingent. Do you want to throw out the baby with the bath water? Do you want to just hold onto what we have with the tot lot and keep it natural and hope to be able to sell so we can buy this? I don't have a crystal ball and I don't know what the whole Village of Pleasant Prairie is going to feel about spending money to buy the Towne Club at a half a million dollars just so the neighbors can walk through it and not have special passes so that I can't use it. I can pay for it but I can't drive through it or use it because I live on the other side of town. Why would I want to do that? So I guess do you want to have a contingent everything, all or nothing, or do you want to just say we want to do this part on the south end and hopefully we can buy the Towne Club as well?

Alex Tiahnybok:

There is some grant money that we could apply for, correct?

Michaeline Day:

Yes.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Approximately 50 percent of the purchase price, whatever that would be?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes.

Alex Tiahnybok:

\$700,000 being an astronomically high number?

Mike Pollocoff:

I think a condemnation of that parcel is going to be a lot less than a half million. The reality is a lot of that is wet and there's no utilities. I don't think it's going to be that bad. I think if the Park Commission was to say our goal for that is to be a conservancy area that opens up more pools of money to go for.

Alex Tiahnybok:

If it winds up being \$300,000 let's say and we can get \$150,000 of grant dollars, now we're down to \$150,000. And, frankly, I appreciate your perspective but there's a lot of money flying out of Carol Beach and there's not much coming back. So if it enhances Carol Beach and the residents of Carol Beach to acquire that piece of land and avoid development. Take a look at 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue in terms of quality of roads. Take a look at the average tax bill in Carol Beach. I don't think the people should be denied. Of course, if it's a referendum I think the people will speak. But there's a net flow west from Carol Beach in terms of tax dollars I assure you of that.

Michaeline Day:

I understand that, but when people are looking at do I spend \$150,000 on a fire engine or do I spend \$150,000 on a piece of property, I serve on the Park Commission and I've been here for a lot of years and I appreciate it, and I wouldn't be here if I didn't believe in parks, but those are hard decisions. And when people are saying we don't have the money to buy an ambulance and we don't have money to buy fire trucks because of this new law, and now we've got to pay tax dollars, and they say we want a fire engine we've got to have that and we've got to have ambulances, but do we really need the Towne Club for \$150,000. I want to see as much of this developed as possible, and I don't want to tie it into saying if we can't afford to buy the Towne Club right now then we're just



going to let it all sit here and do nothing.

Mike Pollocoff:

This is one of the problems with levy limits in that it's forcing a community of 20,000 people to function under a town government where whoever comes to a meeting, take a vote and everything goes to referendum. The reality is we're a representative government and elect a Board to make those decisions because you are going to have people that have a vested interested one way or another, and until that shakes out, we're at a stalemate.

The other thing I just want to throw in just for perspective for the Park Commission is I don't want anybody to think that Carol Beach has been totally left out in the dark. We've spent hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars to create the shore protection, the parks down on Lake Michigan, to save 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue. There's not too many communities along Lake Michigan that have that asset. The Park Commission took a, and Micky was there and I think it was even previous to Rita that that was very unpopular to spend any money down in Carol Beach, and that was done. Those are nice recreational amenities that we have. We spent a lot of money and effort in preserving the prairie and doing the things that we have to do down there. That doesn't say that the people in Carol Beach aren't entitled to as much government service as we can afford, but the Commission hasn't been neglecting them. And these are difficult choices.

Michaeline Day:

So what's your desire?

Rita Christiansen:

I'd just like to make a comment in regards to what Alex said. When this Commission took forth the effort of planning parks for the Village, we felt it was important that we look at the Carol Beach area because you were so outside of the some of the bigger parks and possibly present you with something that as maybe passive or presented different ideas. So in all due respect we did consider the contributions that that area and the residents make in their taxes and the way that they care about their property.

Having said that, I would like to put before the Board that we split this into two areas in regards to--because I like Micky do not want to have anything hinge on something else in the event that this new law and grants that something fails, and then someone come along and develop that property which was said at our last meeting someone actually wanted to purchase the property to put on it a residency . . . no place to go.

So keeping that in mind and knowing everybody wants everything restored in a natural area, my proposal would be that we begin by having a passive park usage and a soft south area of the land that Pleasant Prairie currently owns because that's all we can do at this point. The second part of the proposal would then be as grants for funds are made available look at purchasing the old Towne Club property to a natural prairie state based on the input that was received from the citizens.

Michaeline Day:

Okay, Rita made a two part motion. Does someone want to second that?

Michael Russert:

I second the motion.

Michaeline Day:

Is there any discussion?

Alex Tiahnybok:

Rita, would you mind defining what passive means? Does it mean the–

Rita Christiansen:

Mike defined that earlier. Mike, would you like to define again what passive use is so we have it clearly for the record?

Mike Pollocoff:

It could be a minor tot lot.

Rita Christiansen:

Park bench.

Mike Pollocoff:

Park bench, picnic benches, wildlife viewing stand which would be like a deck, and then a grass mowed area.

Michaeline Day:

You did say tot lot?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right.

Rita Christiansen:

And keeping in mind that this is not in stone. When it comes to the actual part of the development this will come up again.

Mike Pollocoff:

The level of improvements would probably be like the tot lot that is on the west side of Lake Andrea if you can visualize that one. It's probably not much bigger than the stage area. Bouncie bugs, a little slide and a small swing.

Rita Christiansen:

Or a park bench.

William Mills:

So the first part of your motion, Rita, was for the south part of the property to actually have the tot lot—

Rita Christiansen:

No, to have passive use.

William Mills:

Passive use.

Rita Christiansen:

Based on the definition that Mike just gave this Board.

Michaeline Day:

And then the second half would be to acquire the Towne Club with grants and monies available?

Mike Pollocoff:

To be put back into conservancy.

Rita Christiansen:

That's correct.

Alex Tiahnybok:

So we move forward on part A regardless, and if we acquire Towne Club then we move forward on part B.

Rita Christiansen:

Correct. And not saying that you couldn't approve part A and at the same time apply for

grants and part B also happens.

Michaeline Day:

And do it altogether.

Rita Christiansen:

But because we don't want one contingent on the other and then taking the chance of ending up with the residents having somebody going down and wanting to build townhouses or whatever they may be in that area. Better to split it and let the Village and staff go forward and apply for what they need to try and assure we can keep that property in a natural state.

William Mills:

Mike, that would allow you to go forward in terms of applying for money from the State, grant money then if we leave it that undefined I guess?

Mike Pollocoff:

That's not totally undefined. At least as we draw this up as this goes up we're going to show the Towne Club as an acquisition site for conservancy restoration, and then that south site with that passive use and landscaping I guess for lack of a better word on the south site. Then both components of that plan are going to move forward. If that's approved by the Plan Commission and the Board then we'll redo the plan showing that change and then be able to go out for grant applications. We're going to miss the cycle we're in right now but we'll catch it next year.

Michaeline Day:

So we have a motion and it's been seconded. Is there anymore discussion? Then I'd like to call for a vote. All in favor of the proposal say aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Michaeline Day:

Those opposed? Motion carries. So then our next step then would be, Mike, you would present our proposal to the Planning Commission.

Mike Pollocoff:

Would you want to have us bring it back for you to take a look at before you go?

Michaeline Day:

Sure.

Mike Pollocoff:

Right now we want to do it but it's not a rush. We're out of cycle.

Michaeline Day:

Then you'll bring that back to us for next month?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes.

Michaeline Day:

If you guys want to talk to us after the meeting we'll be more than happy and have a few seconds to talk.

Rita Christiansen:

One thing I would like to say is that in regards to a presentation, as a professional courtesy I would ask that any presentations be made available to this Board at least one week prior to our meeting so we have time to digest facts, figures and graphic designs such as the drawings, etc. It doesn't give us a lot of time to consider everything that we need to consider if we don't have it prior to the meeting. So I would just as a professional courtesy if we could have that consideration I would greatly appreciate it.

Mike Pollocoff:

Before we adjourn, one of the items that was brought up tonight was Carol Beach along Lake Michigan parks. Our complaints are starting to ratchet up in that area. We talked about it during the budget process about what to do. You can't take any action on this because it's not an item on the agenda, but I have Nicole Zeller, our aquatics coordinator, who is manager in charge of our beach operations, to come in here and just give the Commission a quick scope of what it would take to do it, what's involved, and for you to think about and digest. Again, I know from what we're hearing at Village Hall, the complaint levels are starting to come up about what we're going to do down there. I think it might be a good opportunity to see what it's going to take and at least get a perspective from what we do at Lake Andrea and how that would fit at Lake Michigan.

Michaeline Day:

Sure. You probably don't know the drill. We do need your name and your position.

Nicole Zeller:

My name is Nicole Zeller and I'm in charge of the aquatics department or aquatics coordinator at the RecPlex. I'm with the recreation department. I do oversee all of the indoor aquatics department and seasonal outdoor including Lake Andrea. I do oversee all the lifeguards that do participate in running that during the season. On a daily basis we are open from 7 in the morning until 7 at night. We operate based on daily basis, RecPlex memberships and seasonable passes for the year. We kind of monitor the windsurfers that are on the lake, any boat rentals throughout the day. We do have a small boat rental. Otherwise, daily operations, cleaning, maintenance, the beach pavilion during the summer also.

Mike Pollocoff:

Nicole, you could actually take a look at what just from a preliminary standpoint what it would take to staff up and be able to manage the Lake Michigan beach.

Nicole Zeller:

Based on what I've kind of overheard in the area that it would take to monitor we'd probably at least need two staff and then just general maintenance or a start up fee to get this beach operating would probably be close to like \$28,000 just based on the equipment we would need to operate it similar if that's what you guys are looking for, similar to the Lake Andrea beach based on what is needed. Then obviously daily or lifeguard staff wages.

Rita Christiansen:

Alex, maybe at your next meeting down at Carol Beach you might get a feel for what the residents would consider or like to see in that area because there was some discussion this evening about having lifeguards, at least from one gentleman, or if we're talking about patrolling the area in some fashion and maybe better defined what that really means. And maybe staff could come back with clearer definitions and we could get input to see what the feeling is in the area there. Because it is a beach, it is public, it is open to the public. You are not going to keep everybody out of there . . . public, etc.

Mike Pollocoff:

We do use fees as a way at Lake Andrea to do two things. One is to collect money to pay for the guards that are out there, and it also regulates where people come from. If you have a season pass at Lake Andrea it's \$30 for a resident.

Nicole Zeller:

For a resident. And for a Wisconsin resident how much is it?

Nicole Zeller:

I think it's \$60, and for out of State for a family membership is \$300.

Rita Christiansen:

And it may help, too, with the jet skis and speedboats and that type of thing. So a lot of things would need to be considered to kind of get a general idea of what the residents may or may not like. But, again, thinking about how the area could be controlled is this one of the ways that could be done in a manner that would be suitable for everybody.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Rita, I appreciate the advice and it has been discussed. We discussed it during budget discussions last fall. I actually brought it up at the Board meeting last night. I suggested that we put together maybe a resolution or ordinance prohibiting a launching. One gentleman, Tim Roskoviak, indicated that people are, and this confirms what I stated yesterday, that people are actually picking up watercraft. It's a relatively narrow beach from the street to the water, and they're actually lifting small watercraft off of trailers and carrying them across the beach and launching them from the beach. And the reason it's attractive is because it's a narrow spot and it's also one of the unrestricted areas within probably 50 miles up and down the Lake Michigan shoreline where you can actually technically get away with it.

So at least on the Village owned stretch of Lake Michigan park there my recommendation is that the Village enact an ordinance prohibiting launching of watercraft. Every other public beach has a no wake zone, no powered craft zone. We don't have jurisdiction in the water, literally people can launch and land watercraft on public property which I think would be the first slice at perhaps creating a disincentive, especially if there were some fees and fines associated with it to discourage people from using it that way. And it's also a liability I think for the Village, because it is our property and if somebody uses it and gets hurt who are they going to come looking at? So that's something we need to look at. I think the concept of applying the same kind of daily licensing requirements or whatever that we do at Lake Andrea would probably be a smart move also.

There's a member of the Carol Beach Board that lives immediately across the street from Lake Michigan Park who last year her car was stolen and she found naked people in her bushes and people using the side of her house as a restroom. So it gets out of control sometimes and we do need to look at it.

Rita Christiansen:

And prior to your joining the Board we had also talked about this and looked for solutions. So thank you so much for coming. And, again, if we can provide some kind of input. We also talked about the legalities of launching craft, etc. So that would be in the formal record.

Mike Pollocoff:

We can ordinance that. The trick is enforcing it.

Rita Christiansen:

Correct.

Mike Pollocoff:

At Lake Andrea we pretty much control everything that happens there. It happens because we have to staff it and have people out there, because people will be idiots given the opportunity. It's just at the right environment. They've got a big motor and usually they're drinking something and good times. Nicole can tell you story after story, but you have to have somebody there to manage it.

Rita Christiansen:

We should institute something like the border patrol, the lake patrol.

Michael Russert:

Does that \$28,000 include improvements for parking? I know that was one concern early on in the planning process that there wasn't adequate parking for the people that currently utilize with the watercraft.

Nicole Zeller:

No.

Michael Russert:

Just strictly the maintenance and staff?

Nicole Zeller:

Yes. Start up for the lifeguards and us to monitor it. No capital plans.

Michaeline Day:

We have to be real careful on how far we get involved in this conversation, correct, because it's not on the agenda.

Mike Pollocoff:

You can't take any action or direct any.

Michaeline Day:

We could ask, though, Nicole to gather up the information so we can discuss it and report back so we can get the information and discuss it at the next Board meeting so we're into the season so we're not having issues. We can get it sooner than later?



Mike Pollocoff:

Sure.

William Mills:

So have we basically missed this summer's period? Because if you report back to us it's going to be the first of July basically and summer's end here—

Mike Pollocoff:

Nothing is funded. This year is done.

William Mills:

So we're really looking at 2007.

Mike Pollocoff:

Right, but Nicole is starting her budget in two weeks for next year. So this is a good time. But as far as actually doing something out there this year we're going to have to get by the best we can.

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

Parks will have to come up with a . . . .

Michaeline Day:

Thanks, Nicole.

Michael Russert:

The comment you said about moratorium. So do you need a recommendation from the Commission here that we're going to put a moratorium on the current park plan?

Mike Pollocoff:

I'll be looking for that at our next meeting. Like I said the legislation is pretty new. You might want to be thinking about that. It's a big step. It will irritate people significantly if they're looking to being able to sell land or build a home or whatever and then all of a sudden we hit the slammers. So it would have to be structured. It wouldn't be everywhere, every house. It would really be those areas that are affected by the master park plan where we're looking at having to do those payment in lieu of fees which is a big area. We're probably talking about 20 square miles out of 34. That's just an estimate.

**6. ADJOURNMENT**

Michaeline Day:

A motion to adjourn?

Michael Russert:

I motion to adjourn.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Second.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you very much.

**ADJOURNED 8:10 P.M.**