

**VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE
PARK COMMISSION
Village Hall, Auditorium
9915 39th Avenue
Pleasant Prairie, Wisconsin 53158
Wednesday, July 5, 2006
5:00 p.m.**

A regular meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Park Commission was held on Wednesday, July 5, 2006, 5:00 p.m. Present were Michaeline Day, Rita Christiansen, Glenn Christiansen, Kathleen Burns and Alex Tiahnybok. Michael Russert and William Mills were excused. 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 JUNE 6, 2006 PARK COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES.**

Michaeline Day:

If everyone had a chance to review them? The only correction I had on the very second page I actually think I said you're free to comment on anything, not on anyone. I didn't say you could talk about anyone. I think I said you could talk about anything but that's no big thing. I just didn't want to say we're going to stand up here and talk about people. That was the only thing I saw. Can I have a motion to approve the minutes?

Rita Christiansen:

Motion to approve the minutes of June 6, 2006 with correction.

Glenn Christiansen:

Second.

Michaeline Day:

All in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

Michaeline Day:

Minutes approved. Thank you.

4. CITIZEN COMMENTS

5. NEW BUSINESS

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

Mike Pollocoff:

We've had two meetings specifically about Unit W, and where we are with this thing is that's hanging . . . we have the Village Board tonight is going to be adopting a modification of the impact fee ordinances. The Plan Commission has discussed at length the impact of 477 on both the comprehensive land use plan in total and the park plan specifically. And where we think we're going is now going through the process of preparing an economic model to do a fiscal analysis on every development proposal that comes in to determine whether or not those proposals are going to have a negative impact on the Village's finances since our budget is frozen. We can't increase it beyond the rate of growth at two percent. Those impact fees that provided capital in the way of equipment have been eliminated. So as new development comes on we're going to see whether or not it's actually development that's sustainable since we don't have any room to grow.

I think the feeling of the Plan Commission, and after the staff has looked at it, our recommendation is rather than amending the park plan is to, in essence, fold what the outgrowth of the park plan was as far as development of the park structure that was identified in the park plan, maintain that, and if a development is not either able or financially it doesn't pay its way to implement the goals of the park plan, or if the developer is not willing to do it, is then reject the development.

The park plan, as you all know, went through a fairly rigorous process to identify the trails, the larger neighborhood plans that are going to be anchoring the trails, and there's a plan coming up tonight that's for consideration by the Village Board where the developer has indicated and reflected they would make, irrespective of the law not requiring them to make those payments, that they would make those payments to do a number of things, but as it relates to the park plan specifically be in a position to say, well, I'll make those contributions anyway both in land dedication as well as contributing \$200,000 which is what staff evaluation indicated would be needed to make those park improvements.

So the staff isn't recommending and the Plan Commission isn't supporting modifying the park plan. What we're going to hang out hats on is the fact that's our plan. If the development doesn't pay its way sufficiently to do it, or if the developer won't do it, then we'll be recommending rejection of any proposed developments that come in.

Now, as it relates to, and the reason I kind of started backwards on this as it relates to Carol Beach Unit W Park, I don't think we're on as good a footing on that because the impact fees were collected at the point of building permit. The lots are already created.

The plat already exists. So we did look at some level of contribution under the old system for a park such as Unit W because it's fairly well built out but there was room to say there's more to be had. That's not going to be the case there. Unit W falls to solely taxpayer's support. I think the State has done a pretty good job of taking away our ability to levy those fees other than a land division or a creation of a plat.

Michaeline Day:

I believe that at the last Board meeting we all pretty much agreed that we spent a great deal of time and effort along with the Village spent a lot of money on developing this park plan and we're in agreement with it. I don't know where W would actually fall into it anyway because the Planning Commission pretty much slapped us around and took that out anyway so it's not part of the park plan as it stand now, is it?

Mike Pollocoff:

No, but it will fall into the plan, whatever we end up coming up with.

Michaeline Day:

Because whatever we do with W we have to ask them to amend our park plan to put it in one way or the other because Unit W is not anywhere in our park plan.

Mike Pollocoff:

Right. I think from our standpoint it keeps a good planning document intact minus that one revision. I have no doubt that there's going to be developers that will want to litigate with us or fight with it because by State law it says they don't have to pay, and they're going to say we don't have to pay, but at least as of yet the Legislature hasn't taken away our ability to review and say what we can afford and what we don't want to do. My thought is that will be the next step, but I guess we deal with that when it comes up.

Kathleen Burns:

Would the grant process continue though in that would any of these potentially be funded through grants that Pleasant Prairie could apply for?

Mike Pollocoff:

Sure.

Kathleen Burns:

So if those are awarded that could possibly, again, include W or any of the others?

Mike Pollocoff:

It definitely is in there, but what we could use for match is diminished.

Kathleen Burns:

It won't match, okay.

Michaeline Day:

Any other questions? Any conversation? Am I correct in that we all sitting here are shaking our heads yes because you can't hear it, that we are in agreement that we'd like to see our park plan stay and that we really don't see any alterations to change it to fit into the Wisconsin Act? We like it as it is?

Alex Tiahnybok:

I think you're better off having a plan and reach a part of the plan than not having a plan at all. Naturally we've spent money on this and I think it's taken a lot of time of this Commission and citizen input so I think it would be a shame not to. Especially if the Plan Commission supports the idea of retaining I think it would be a shame to alter it.

Rita Christiansen:

Also, Mike, weren't we, and I don't know if the correct term is mandated, but it was suggested that we put a park plan in place for specific reasons and that's why we went forth with the commitment to work so hard to put something in place?

Mike Pollocoff:

There was a mandate. For the Smart Growth law we had to have a park plan which we do but it was dated. So we needed to get that thing put in place. The park grant funds are drying up. As governmental funds start drying up, I can tell you right now the park and open space funds will be the first to go, so we want to be able to get as much outside funding as we can. That ends up being the irony of government in Wisconsin. On one hand you've got the Smart Growth compliance which says do all this planning, looking at what you need, figure out a way to fund it, and on the other hand let's take away your ability to fund it, let's freeze your taxes and here you go. So that's where not just the Village but where every community sits.

Rita Christiansen:

And at the same time, too, legislation can change just as rapidly. With that in mind I would like to see us keep what we have in place for the future.

Kathleen Burns:

Mike, does the Village always have the discretion to reject a developer? I mean obviously with race, color or creed or any of those kinds of things, but just saying no we don't want you to build here?

Mike Pollocoff:

Not easily. The developers have pretty much had their way with the Legislature the last eight or ten years. Once something is in the preliminary plat it's next to impossible to say no. Once they've filed that preliminary plat and it's been approved for a period of two years you have to act on everything that's submitted to you. The Village inserted that additional step before that called a conceptual plan, because what would happen before that is you really couldn't make any choices until you're faced with the preliminary plat. So we do the conceptual first for the community and the staff and the Commissions and Boards to be able to take a look at it before it goes to final plat. I think that's good public policy to have that look at it before you go final. But once you've gone preliminary plat 90 percent of the rights are invested with the developer and 10 percent are vested with the Village.

And the only reason the Village can deny a preliminary plat renewal or a final plat approval, if there's a significant departure on what the developer submits as his final plat versus what was on the preliminary. But if they submit the same preliminary that you approved, even though conditions have changed for the community, whether it be our ability to fund, roads, whatever, it doesn't matter. The developer's right supercede what the community can do. And if development is in compliance with the comprehensive land use, that's some rights of the developer. If the land is zoned that's even more rights for the developer. So we tread cautiously when we're making denials.

I really believe in talking with our counsel that if the State didn't have a freeze on the budget, we probably couldn't use this economic analysis as a means of denying an approval. Under some court decisions that were rendered before the budget freeze was even though it would cause you to raise taxes if the development was in compliance with the land use plan you had to approve it and adjust your taxes accordingly. It's really a by and large a developer environment if everybody is playing above board.

Michaeline Day:

Moving right along then.

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

Michaeline Day:

In your packet you have a picture of what was discussed the last two meetings about what we were going to do as far as putting in a new cul-de-sac and just a tot lot with a covered pavilion type thing.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Right, that's correct. We really don't have any dimensions for the tot lot or pavilion. It's just showing that we're going to have some sort of a small covered shelter that can be used for people while their kids are in the tot lot or while people are doing nature walks.

We'll have a place to congregate.

So this plan calls for the purchase either by Village funds, which Mike has said are running really slow right now, or by grants to somehow purchase the old Towne Club property and turn most of it into a natural state with some sort of restoration, putting it back to a natural prairie, and just a very small play or tot area. Staff feels that it's important to have a cul-de-sac for turning around, one, for people that are using the park and the trails, and secondly for emergency vehicles whether it's the plow truck or garbage truck that comes by on a weekly basis. So I really don't want to see any of those large vehicles backing up in a t-turnaround or in the driveways right next to a park.

So we've done a lot of alterations to this plan, taken a lot of citizens' comments. We've probably got more comments from the Carol Beach Unit W area versus the other parks because there is a population around that area, where Village Green and Creekside right now are pretty much unpopulated. That might come over time. But we tried to find the best placement for the park to be as unobstructive as we could to the neighbors, the side yards. Make sure there is some adequate parking without making a large parking lot. So from all the comments that we've heard from everyone that this is the best plan and I would recommend that the Park Commission vote to adopt this into the Master Park and Open Space Plan.

Michaeline Day:

Any questions or comments to John?

Alex Tiahnybok:

This plan shows revision date June 1st.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I forgot to change the date. We'll update that.

Alex Tiahnybok:

That's not important. The Commission, though, at our last meeting on June 6th Rita had a motion for a two part concept where we would put the playground area in the south section, and then if funds ultimately became available for us to acquire the north section and return it to conservancy that we would move forward on that. But this Commission voted and approved the idea of the tot park being in the south section. So I really don't think this plan or this drawing is consistent with what we approved on June 6th.

Mike Pollocoff:

I understand what you're saying. We can do that, but in order to be able to secure the grants necessary to justify the acquisition of the Towne Club property, we need to show a public improvement that would be placed there, otherwise it would be acquire it and let it sit. I don't think we'd be able to secure the funds. So what this shows is the ultimate,

where we'd ultimately be if everything is approved. If we take and put the park in the south area, leave the north area open, we're not going to be able to--I don't think we're going to have enough points to be able to secure grant funds for the acquisition.

Alex Tiahnybok:

So we could use this as a tool currently to try to forward the grant process, but if we're not successful we would go back to the--

Mike Pollocoff:

We would do it as the Commission stated. We're not going to get all of our money in one year. But if we don't show our ultimate plan to what we want to eventually happen, then it takes away your reason for the grant application to pick up the money.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Okay, it makes sense.

Rita Christiansen:

Thank you, Alex. I had noticed that also. So, Mike, what you're saying is that based on it being right there, I'm having a hard time hearing tonight, I don't know if your microphone is close enough, leave it here so we can't put it where we proposed it and say there's a trail to another part of a park up in here eventually?

Mike Pollocoff:

As the staff understood your request it's a two step process.

Rita Christiansen:

Correct.

Mike Pollocoff:

The ultimate step being the park would be where John has showed it. So in order to go in and acquire the funds to get grant funds to do that, we have to show that there's a public need that's going to be put there, a public improvement that would be the ultimate improvement rather than the phased improvement. Just like on the Master Park Plan we identified in all those parks what the ultimate build out is going to be and not what the phased build out is going to be because we apply for the grants based on that.

Rita Christiansen:

Okay, thank you. Is there going to be a dog park on this, too?

Michaeline Day:

I don't think so.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

We don't have a dog park as part of the plan at this time.

Michaeline Day:

If this Commission then agrees with this, then it goes to the Planning Commission. I suppose we should be there this time.

Mike Pollocoff:

We'll make sure they know what it is, and the action they would be taking would be amending the comprehensive land use plan to reflect the ultimate plan for this park modification onto the Village's master plan.

Rita Christiansen:

John, I do have a question, though, based on this playground area with the pavilion. There was a lot of discussion at our last meeting about soft use. Just so when we get asked the question from the people of Carol Beach would this be considered soft use?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I believe we'd define the soft use of just having, as we talked about in the meetings and again this evening, having a park bench where you can sit, having some sort of a small covered shelter. By no means will there be any pavilion like we have out at Prairie Springs Park or Carol Beach Unit 1 Park. I don't think it will be anything like that large of a structure. I'm thinking like a small gazebo type, maybe 10 foot round, a small structure to keep out of the sun and a meeting place, a couple of park benches, a swing set, a slide and some monkey bars and that's about it. So it's going to be a very small park, and I believe that will meet the definitions of soft as we talked about it in past meetings.

Glenn Christiansen:

I've got a couple of comments. Now that I heard everything I think I understand exactly what we're talking about. I know some people want to see the tot lot way down on the south end, but you have to justify the purpose of acquiring this land. The world is full of compromise and sometimes that's just the way it is. We're going to stretch this one as far as we can to make it work is maybe a way of putting it. And maybe in the end what

you could possibly consider doing is flipping the cul-de-sac over so that it looks like a P instead of a Q on paper, and move the tot lot down along the west side and you keep it on the Towne House property. We have to accommodate everybody's wishes possibly just to get the thing and this is what we're going to have to do. So as far as I'm concerned the basic ingredients are addressed. It's the best we can do for the moment. I recommend we accept this as the best we can do for the time being, and we'll probably have to address the exact layout--

Michaeline Day:

It's all conceptual anyway.

Glenn Christiansen:

Right, we'll have to address the exact layout of it at a later date because who knows what will change between now and then, and there's no point in spending a lot of time trying to do anything more with it until that time.

Rita Christiansen:

My only concern is that a lot of people had expressed they wanted nothing more than a bench and an area for kids to run versus a lot of equipment due to the conservation area down there and wildlife, etc. So accepting this, again, so people understand it's conceptual. It doesn't mean that there's going to be all this detail in it. That's what I want for the record.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

If you'd like we could put some other wording in the map that would kind of define what the soft uses would be and not to exceed a certain size or something like that.

Rita Christiansen:

I'd appreciate it. Thank you, John.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I'm personally okay with moving forward with the location as it is. But I'm looking at what we voted on June 6th and this is not--again, if we're using this as a tool to be in a position to get those grant dollars I understand that. But if we're not successful, according to Rita's motion from the last meeting, if we're not successful with this then the park will go in the south section. If you read the motion, though, if we are successful with this we're still going to put that tot park in the south section. I'm willing to be flexible on this but that's what we agreed on last meeting.

Mike Pollocoff:

My understanding was it was two step and we'd put the park in at the north section. If not, then we need to just--if that's really not what the Commission wants then take it out and move it to the south.

Rita Christiansen:

My understanding from the residents was they wanted the Towne Club property left as a natural prairie state, and if a bench was put in with a green running area it would be in the south section. That's what I thought we had said. Is that what you heard from the people that lived down there, Alex?

Alex Tiahnybok:

I think maybe something even slightly more substantial than a bench, even a swing set kind of environment. I think that was consistent with the general needs and wants.

Glenn Christiansen:

I would say obviously you're going to have to put a cul-de-sac in there because that's just good planning in the first place. So where do you put the tot lot? I understand what Alex is saying and it does make good sense that the paperwork being right, but on the other hand we also have to justify the park. So do we clean up the paperwork so to speak, or do we just accept it? I guess we have a dilemma between the two issues.

Mike Pollocoff:

From my standpoint I really don't have a dog in this hunt. It's whatever you guys want. Our understanding was that the second phase, that passive area or the soft area was moving farther north. If you want to keep that green minus the cul-de-sac we'll do that. It's just going to make it tougher--

Michaeline Day:

I think the original thought process was that to put in a cul-de-sac and a small pavilion and a small tot lot was relatively inexpensive compared to buying the whole big piece of property and putting it there. So in the time scheme of things, especially since it was going to be tax dollars to do this, that even so much with the grant, even if we got a grant, I think the thought process was that it was probably doable to do it on the south end and get something going instead of hinging it all on the fact that, one, we get a grant and we get another \$150,000 to \$200,000 to buy that property and then put the equipment on. I think that was probably the reason why, as I remember it, we divided it up into two parts was that as far as time schemes go it seemed like putting it on the south seemed more of a doable thing versus trying to do something as grants.

Mike Pollocoff:

I agree. In the park plan we have to show what our ultimate goal is just like we did on the other parks, what we ultimately want to do. And if what we ultimately want to do is

keep it green then we need to show it that way. If we ultimately are saying that we could put that park improvement in the acquisition area then we ought to show that.

Michaeline Day:

So conceptually we could say this, and then in the meantime while we can't afford to do it this way, move a tot lot back from one side to the other side is not a big deal.

Mike Pollocoff:

Until we can get it, yeah, we can move the tot lot–

Michaeline Day:

You can move it wherever you want.

Mike Pollocoff:

Until the acquisition takes place. If it doesn't take place, you can put the tot equipment on that south lot. That's doable, but in pursuing land acquisition grants our ultimate plan shows why we want to acquire that.

Glenn Christiansen:

Really it comes down to in order to get a grant we may have to put the tot lot up there to justify for the grant purposes.

Mike Pollocoff:

Maximize your grant, yeah.

Glenn Christiansen:

So that's the compromise if that's what we have to do. I hate to say we put so much time into it and we're down to where we're going to put the tot lot. If it comes down to we insist upon putting the tot lot down by 90th we may not get this. Let's just go with it.

Michaeline Day:

So, we have some experts and staff and knowing what the grants are or how to get a grant. It would be my suggestion to entertain a motion to accept the staff's conceptual plan for Lot W and present it to the Board.

Glenn Christiansen:

I'll make the motion that we accept this.

Michaeline Day:

Alex, you're in Carol Beach. Will you second that? We can still have discussion after that.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I'll second it.

Michaeline Day:

Further discussion? Kathy?

Kathleen Burns:

No, I agree. It's been explained. I'm for it the way it is.

Rita Christiansen:

I'm not very comfortable with this only because this was not what we had discussed in front of so many residents. I don't want them to think in any way that we don't hear what they're saying, but I think Micky put it eloquently last time, don't throw the baby out with the bath water. So if it means that we're going to be able to acquire the natural area or the old Towne Club property, then the compromise is to put the playground pavilion area here. That's correct, right?

Mike Pollocoff:

If you're going to acquire the land there has to be a public purpose for it.

Rita Christiansen:

So considering we already have the property to the south and we could restore that to prairie, but the goal is eventually the bulk of this be returned to prairie. So that being a compromise even though I'm not doing back flips about it I'll accept it.

Glenn Christiansen:

To me it appears we're doing everything we can to try and accommodate as many people and as many needs as desires as we possibly can. And if this is the one thing we have to change to accomplish it.

Alex Tiahnybok:

The survey that I did essentially supports a small park either in the north or south section. But it also very strongly supported the concept of acquiring the north section. So in order for us to be positioned properly to acquire the north section, if putting the playground area in the north section, and again this is a concept and if we need to work on the exact location I think personally from an aesthetics perspective where it's positioned right now

is fine with me. But I think it would be the least irritating for the people that were opposed to any development if we put the tot park immediately west of the cul-de-sac hugging the border between the two lots. I think rotating it to the nine o'clock position would be probably what the objectors would probably like to see. You've got it right there. So, again, we're not agreeing on the exact location. And in order to position us to acquire the land and apply for the grants I think this is a worthy compromise just as Rita and Glenn said, so I'm okay with it.

Michaeline Day:

With a first and second any more conversation? I call for a vote then. All in favor say aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Michaeline Day:

Opposed? Motion carries.

Rita Christiansen:

Thanks, John, and you guys for doing such a great job on this. A lot of work.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Thank you.

c. Discuss and Consider Options for Development of Lake Michigan Park Lands & Beach.

Michaeline Day:

In your packets we have several items concerning that.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

With the last Park Commission meeting, and I believe this even started about a year ago, there's been a lot of discussion about the development of the Lake Michigan parkland located roughly around the Tobin Creek area. At the last meeting the Commission had asked us to put together some preliminary budget numbers for what it would cost to provide the capital and some labor expenses and everything else that would be needed.

In your packet we received some numbers from the Park Commission I guess I'll start off with the staffing of it. Staffing that park seven days a week from 10:30 to 7:30 p.m., having three staff on call, so that would actually be two staff that are doing the guarding and patrolling and one on break I believe, there's some requirements that one is on break

and do the rotation, at the part-time rate that the Village will be paying at \$8.88 an hour plus some other different things with lead lifeguards and trainers comes to just over \$42,000 in labor to staff that park as we had talked about.

The next thing that we talked about was some of the equipment that we had looked at doing. Nicole Zeller from RecPlex had taken time to put together a cost estimate. For the lifeguard chairs, the umbrellas, the telephone it looks like she was very in everything needed to operate the park and to operate it safely, which I believe is very important, comes to \$11,400 on top of the \$42,000.

And then in part of the public works and parks budget we put in the restrooms, the buoys, the chain, the rope, anchors, the signage of the restroom and everything else needed to complete the capital, and I believe that the total cost would be just over \$62,000 with the majority of it as \$42,000 being the annual operation of that just with the guard and the staff.

If you take a look at your Lake Michigan parkland map, kind of one of the Achilles heels that we fall into with this is you can see up to the north area there is a large area of land that the Village has acquired over time. There is one parcel that is still privately owned, and that's the area where everyone is currently parking right now, and then the area just south of the Tobin Creek by the footbridge is pretty much where the beach area is over by the jetty area. One of the problems that we're going to run into, and I guess I don't have a good answer yet on how we're going to solve it, is where we're going to park these people. We really don't have the right to develop any sort of a parking lot on private property, and that's the area where everyone is parking right now just north of the Tobin Creek area. And there's a small area that we have in the Village owned park boundary just to the north where you could probably park about 20 cars at a perpendicular angle to the road.

Lakeshore Drive does function as a bike trail, and I believe it's marked with a wider shoulder on the east side of the road, so I would really discourage any sort of parking along any of the bike lane for safety reasons. So to start some discussion, those are some of the capital and operating costs and one of the issues that we have with the parking situation if this does move forward to be developed for the '07 season.

Rita Christiansen:

John, what about water testing?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

The Village staff would be testing the water on a daily basis.

Mike Pollocoff:

We do that now.

Rita Christiansen:

Is that counted in here or no?

Mike Pollocoff:

We do that now as part of our requirements from the State. We have to do that no matter what.

Glenn Christiansen:

Just out of curiosity, what is the usage been on the beach this year considering the weather this year has been cooler and wetter? Has the situation been anything the same as last year?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I haven't been down there on a regular basis. Maybe Alex since he lives in that area can comment on that better than I can.

Alex Tiahnybok:

You read my mind. I drove past there yesterday, and that zone that you have marked as private property, because it's less structured, it's basically chaos. Cars parking in all sorts of different directions. Yesterday, without a doubt well into--the area south of Tobin Creek I think is blocked off with those bollards, right?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

That's correct.

Alex Tiahnybok:

So there's really no practical access for vehicle traffic there. The area immediately to the north of that private property where you see what looks like three cars parked, there were at a minimum 20 cars parked, three of them with trailers with jet skis and there were no jet skis on the trailers. The Village Board passed an ordinance at our last meeting prohibiting the launching, and now in hindsight maybe just using the word launching was a mistake. Maybe we should have said launching or landing. Because something I guess in practice could go to North Point, launch their watercraft, have somebody drive the watercraft over and then drive over to the beach with their vehicle with the trailer hooked up, and now we really don't know whether or not they've used it contrary to the way the ordinance was written. But without a doubt there were many, many vehicles parked perpendicular to the street, some trailers intentionally backed in to be less obvious--

Glenn Christiansen:

Or to be used.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Exactly. I wasn't there and I didn't witness any launching or not. But they were there. Question, John. Can we contact a municipality like Lake Forest or Highland Park or Glencoe or something, because they all have beaches that I believe are municipally managed at least, and precedence is always a good guideline for making decisions. I'm sure they've worked off some kind of plan for, first off, covering the cost of operating a beach like that, and also in terms of access fees and all that sort of stuff. So I think it would be a great idea to at least look at a model that's working already because they are. The cost of the program obviously looks like a lot, but I think whether we tied it to access to Prairie Springs or not I think we could generate this kind of revenue from the usage.

To answer the question about how much this has been used recently, well the weather has been pretty bad on the weekends. Every weekend so far has been pretty much a washout, but yesterday was pretty busy and it was chaos, and the people that were concerned about this issue were in contact with me. Enforcement is going to be a problem and I think we all realize that.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I guess in answer to one of your comments, we can go down to Lake Forest and model it after something, but we did model this after our own beach at Lake Andrea which has been very successful over the last seven or eight years. So we used the same numbers and staffing and capital that we would use at Prairie Springs Park to develop this beach. We actually saw a lot of similarities for how you would staff. It's not like we just kind of pulled these numbers up. Nicole used these numbers based on if she would have to add on a new beach based on what we currently do at Lake Andrea. So that's how we came up with the model with that.

One of the numbers that aren't included in my spreadsheet obviously, we have the expense but we don't have the revenues. We had talked that if you were a RecPlex member that would carry over to the entrance into this beach the same way you would be allowed into Lake Andrea beach. You would be available to go to the beach over at Lake Michigan parkland. I guess for the sake of being conservative, we kind of went under the assumption that if most of these people are out of State and they're just using this beach because it's a free beach, once we start charging \$8 or \$10 or \$12, there's a chance that they'll just go to a beach that's a little bit closer to where they live. Just to try to be conservative that's why we kept our revenue numbers down or actually really weren't included because we're not sure how many of the local people that are not RecPlex members would be using this beach.

Mike Pollocoff:

The Lake Andrea beach rules and pricing methodology was borrowed. We took a look at Lake Forest five years ago, and down there the price is actually fairly reasonable for the local. If you're not a resident it's \$300 and that's where we are with Lake Andrea. If you're not a Wisconsin resident you have to buy a season pass and the pass is \$300 or

whatever it was at that point. As I recall, I don't think the park department at that time checked Glencoe but I do know they checked Lake Forest, so we kind of used that same model. I think what Lake Forest does is for the residents that the nominal fee they pay comes out of the general taxes and everybody else is a user charge.

We'll need to take a look from a budget standpoint if we make it a privilege of RecPlex members. That means if it doesn't pay its way RecPlex will be paying for the lifeguards in the shortfall. So we want to make sure there's a nexus. There's a closer nexus between RecPlex and Lake Andrea than there is RecPlex and Lake Michigan. I'm not saying we couldn't do that, but I guess we would need to think through that so we could tell a member of RecPlex, oh, and you can also go down to Lake Michigan and swim there. I don't know.

The other thing that I toyed with a little bit, and I talked to Nicole, is maybe not making it a lifeguard beach, because there are days that you can't swim down there. If we get any rain in the area, Carol Beach is on septic and the sewage runs out of the streams in the Unit 2 area from the conventional septic systems and the water is contaminated. Or, if there's been a big rain and there's a bypass in Milwaukee or something like that we'll see that a few days later. So there are a number of days that you can't swim down there. Maybe the other alternative to having lifeguards there is do what the City says that you're on your own as far as swimming, but they do have parks employees there that clean up and shag the undesirable uses out of there or get people out of there that's doing something that's contrary to the ordinance. It doesn't get you a lot of savings, but if we were going to run it like a beach like we do at Lake Andrea these are the numbers that will get you that.

Rita Christiansen:

Alex, do they charge launch fees at the marina down the road then?

Alex Tiahnybok:

Not at North Point. It's a free public launch. From my personal preference I would love to see a fully staffed lifeguarded beach that obviously can sustain itself. But we certainly don't want to add dollars to taxpayers or take it out of RecPlex. If we can figure out a way to cover these expenses, this would be my preference. But short of that then at least a build out similar to the budgeted costs with the buoys and actually create a no motorized craft area. You just go south of the State line right around the corner from the free launches at North Point there's between Prairie Harbor Yacht Club and Winthrop Harbor North Point Marina there's a public beach there and it's very well marked no watercraft. So you have people swimming in the water and all that's sticking out is their heads. I see watercraft zooming up and down the beach here in Pleasant Prairie all the time and people in the water and it's a really bad mix. So I don't think we're up to making any decisions here today, but I think one or the other ultimately we need to do, but not to do either would be irresponsible.

Rita Christiansen:

John, did you need an answer from us tonight because this is part of the 2007 budget, right? You were going to put it in, correct?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

That's correct.

Rita Christiansen:

So they do need some kind of answer.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I guess that we would need a decision on which direction the Park Commission would like us to submit this to the Village Board.

Rita Christiansen:

What is better serving the residents of Carol Beach?

Alex Tiahnybok:

We know what the lifeguarded option would be. Do you have any idea--because this is basically a fixed equipment cost which would be--

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I'm not sure which sheet you're looking at.

Alex Tiahnybok:

The 2007 budget, that's minor equipment, \$7,800.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Right, that is the buoys and the chain and the restroom.

Alex Tiahnybok:

It would apply in any case whether we make it a lifeguarded beach or made it more of a passive use at your own risk beach, right?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

That is correct.

Michaeline Day:

If we chose the no lifeguards and just went with the parks grounds people keeping it clean and that kind of thing, how much of a yearly savings? I know you didn't do that, but plus or minus?

Mike Pollocoff:

About \$5,000.

Michaeline Day:

Marginal. So you're really not saving a whole lot of money, \$5,000, considering that you'd have the extra safety involved with having lifeguards. One person having an issue is probably worth the \$5,000.

Mike Pollocoff:

I guess my recommendation to the Commission would be if you're not dead set against having guards, the guarded option, it would be to recommend that. Let us start through the funding process and see how it goes, and maybe as we go through--I'm thinking we're not going to have the money for this, but on the other hand we haven't shaken the revenues out either. So if we've got the revenues to make it work then we're there. If not, then carve it back to some level where the revenues do work.

Rita Christiansen:

So, Alex, do you think that's what Carol Beach wants is the lifeguards, is that what you're saying?

Alex Tiahnybok:

Yes. And if we need to--I'll motion that we approve the plan as submitted pending further analysis of revenue stream from this, and if we need to scale down that's what the Board will be doing in the fall. That's my motion.

Rita Christiansen:

So you're recommending include the lifeguards?

Alex Tiahnybok:

The lifeguards, the full blown option.

Michaeline Day:

Kathy, any ideas or you want to second that?

Kathleen Burns:

Alex, you're saying the lifeguard and all the first time equipment that would have to be purchased

Alex Tiahnybok:

Pending a revenue of revenues, etc., at least for a starting point.

Kathleen Burns:

I'll second the motion.

Michaeline Day:

Terrific. Any more discussion? We'll call for a vote. All in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

Michaeline Day:

Those opposed? Motion carries.

Rita Christiansen:

John, thanks for putting the numbers together.

Michaeline Day:

Just a housekeeping issue here I have. As we have approved the Unit W to go to the Planning Commission, when will that go in so that we'll know when we should attend?

Mike Pollocoff:

It will go in August. It needs a 30 day publication period. Their first meeting in August which will be the second Monday.

Rita Christiansen:

What time do they meet?

Mike Pollocoff:

Five.

Michaeline Day:

I would hope that we have a strong representation on the second Monday of August at the Planning Commission so that it does follow through.

Mike Pollocoff:

Judy will send you an agenda with the staff report.

Rita Christiansen:

Can we get little reminder by e-mail, Judy, possibly just in case? Thank you. I appreciate it.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Rita Christiansen:

I make a motion to adjourn.

Glenn Christiansen:

I'll eagerly second that.

Michaeline Day:

Any discussion? All in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

ADJOURNED: 6:00 P.M.