

**VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE  
PARK COMMISSION  
Village Hall Auditorium  
9915 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Pleasant Prairie, Wisconsin 53158  
June 3, 2010  
6:00 p.m.**

A regular meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Park Commission was held on Thursday, June 3, 2010, 6:00 p.m. Present were Rita Christiansen, Glenn Christiansen, Monica Yuhus, Troy Holm, Jim Bandura (Alternate #2) and Steven Kundert. Michealene Day and William Mills were excused. Also present were Michael Pollocoff, Village Administrator; John Steinbrink, Jr., Director of Public Works; Tom Shircel, Assistant to the Village Administrator; and Ruth Mack, Executive Secretary.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. ROLL CALL**
- 3. CONSIDER AND APPROVE THE MAY 6, 2010 PARK COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES.**

**Jim Bandura moved to approve the Park Commission Meeting minutes of the May 6, 2010 meeting presented in their written form: Seconded by Troy Holm. Motion carried 6-0.**

- 4. CITIZEN COMMENTS**
- 5. NEW BUSINESS**
  - a. Consider and Adopt Resolution #10-02 related to amendments to the Village of Pleasant Prairie Park and Open Space Plan 2006 - 2011 and recommend that the Village Plan Commission and the Village Board adopt said amendments pursuant to Chapter 390 of the Village Code.**

Rita Christiansen:

Do we have some dialogue around this, John?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Sure. Madam Chair and members of the Park Commission, included in your packet was a resolution that I guess in summary it goes through and it takes the work that we've done

in Ingram Park and it allows us to introduce it into the Comprehensive Plan and then also into the Park and Open Space Plan.

I have a couple of slides up here. The first slide that we have really just shows the area that revised of Ingram Park where off of 93<sup>rd</sup> Street it's just over a 30 acre parcel, and then included with that is the Phase II which is an area just to the west on the north end of the property which was included on the neighborhood plan as being an open space plan, and then a conclusion part would be a Phase III down in the southeast corner of it. Then it really kind of squares up that park very nicely. So at the time when it does develop it will develop into this park especially for Phase II and III. There really is no set time frame for it, but at the time when it does develop it will be recommended by the Village to be part of the Ingram Park.

This other slide that's up here is a little bit busy but it kind of shows where some of the parks are located and where the service areas are. So I guess to properly read this anything that's covered in green is covered by community and neighborhood parks. And you can see by the amount of overlay that the residents in Pleasant Prairie really do have a lot of park opportunities. So the community parks are some of the larger parks with the red outline, and the C are the neighborhood parks or smaller parks with the red circle in the end. Then the schools are identified also on there just for your reference.

I guess I can answer any questions that the Commission may have about the Ingram Park or the addition II or the addition III at this time.

Rita Christiansen:

Questions?

Glenn Christiansen:

. . . talking about . . . a Village resident asked me the other day or commented to me I should say that they were under the understanding that Ingram Park was really not going to stay within the boundaries of the Ingram property, that the Village was going to be taking other peoples' property. And I'm going like, boy, that's not something I had heard anything about. I was really confused by what they were talking about. Ingram Park is staying within the boundaries of Ingram's property is it not?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

It does right now. But for Phase II and Phase III we are looking at expanding the park outside the boundaries. Almost the same way that Prairie Springs Park has added on over the course of time also.

Mike Pollocoff:

So when that land develops to the west of Ingram Park–

Glenn Christiansen:

It's from that development–

Mike Pollocoff:

It's not part of that park developers–his dedication to the Village for his park requirements is going to be that second phase. Third phase more than likely that would have to be something that either that property owner would offer to sell to us or we'd offer to buy. But we wouldn't condemn for it. It would just be–the use would stay residential, or the next highest use would be park.

Glenn Christiansen:

I think now I recall that when we went through the planning we talked about there being an area just to the northwest that was going to be added at a later date. Yeah, I recall.

Rita Christiansen:

Any other comments or questions?

Monica Yuhas:

I have a question. Under site amenities, as far as the benches, lighting, playground equipment, that's all going to come back to us at a later date as far as design and style?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Yes, it will. And that later date will be at the time when either a grant is available or some sort of a donation. But the Commission will be sure to see any sort of detail on what types of benches, what types of pavilions and some of the details that would be included. It's very similar to the Village Green Park and some of these other parks that have passed through the Commission in the last several years.

Monica Yuhas:

Thank you.

Jim Bandura:

Just a quick question. John, getting back to the different phases, is that going to be fenced between the first phase and second phase?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

No.

Jim Bandura:

That's going to be open back there?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Yes, it will be. The only fencing that we're calling for in this park is around the dog park.

Rita Christiansen:

Isn't there a utility line that runs down one side of this all the way?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Yes, there is. There is an easement on the eastern component of it. The property it owned by ATC with some overhead lines. And there's no improvements planned for underneath those lines but it is a part of the park area.

Rita Christiansen:

Any other comments, questions, concerns?

Troy Holm:

Do we have anywhere on here, and it could be there just because I'm not looking carefully enough, but is there—are we going to have this also hooked up to the Pleasant Prairie Police Department with security cameras?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

There's not a call in—we don't have any parks currently. Well, Prairie Springs Park has some cameras, but our other remote parks do not have any cameras. That's probably more of a budgetary issue than anything else. Once the access road is in there police will be able to patrol it on a regular basis. We are in the process right now of cutting in the

road. And probably within the course of about six weeks we should have probably 80 percent of that roadway installed with gravel base. And there's probably enough gravel tiled in one of the parking lots to start making some of those trails as soon as funds are available through a grant or donation.

Rita Christiansen:

John, has Mrs. Ingram seen this drawing?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Yes, she has.

Rita Christiansen:

Okay, and did she have any comments you want to share?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

She's definitely very excited about it. I probably speak with her on a regular basis, probably once or twice a week I stop over there. There is a lot of activity going on right now with the construction of the road. So I make sure that we stop over there on a regular basis and update her with what's going on. We introduced her to the contractors. I just let her know what's going on. Just kind of being a good neighbor.

Rita Christiansen:

I agree. Thank you for doing that. Appreciate that.

Steven Kundert:

This question really is based from my short tenure here on the Commission so I apologize if it's been covered before, but can you speak to briefly to the history of the bidding of the costs? Was this actively bid out in terms of a company's cost estimates.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

We have not had to pay for any of the work that's been done so far. It's been included as our paving program. So, for example, the topsoil that we're taking off of here for construction of the road we're using as topsoil in our Springbrook Innovation Center. So then we ended up pulverizing that parking lot and we're taking those millings on a back haul and hauling them back here to use as gravel road base.

Another component of our paving program this year is resurfacing and reconstruction of

the Meadowdale Farms, the Meadowdale Estates and Meadowdale Addition over by 39<sup>th</sup> and 93<sup>rd</sup>. So in that process they'll be taking the roadway and pulverizing it up into like inch and a half pieces of stone, and then they need a place to dispose of it. Well, we're having them dispose of it right along this roadway. We don't have to pay for any stone as part of that. We don't have to pay for any trucking. And then they will also be doing some reconstruction work on Cooper Road where we have about 100 loads of this pulverized roadway that we're looking at hauling it in and bringing it in here.

So it's been our goal to do everything that we can right now without any major expenditure. The only expenditures that we've had so far was our erosion control permit with the DNR and then a little bit of design work just to make sure that the road is at the right elevation and that everything drains properly.

Mike Pollocoff:

But we did put out as far as going out to bid the pulverizing of the road and the materials and the trucking. That was bid competitively as part of the paving work. So when we're done with this we'll have that amount of in kind resources that we can apply to any future grants we apply for.

Steven Kundert:

And what about the site amenities? I'm certainly no expert but just looking down this cost estimate and seeing \$1,500 per unit cost for trash receptacle just strikes me as high. That could be my naiveté. I don't know.

Mike Pollocoff:

That was the budget estimate that was prepared as part of the conceptual plan. And that conceptual plan we used to apply for a grant from the State. So the actual bid numbers you're probably right that is fairly expensive for a trash can or trash collector. All that would be bid out and it will be its actual cost. Given the fact that we didn't really have a date certain when we're going to start the procurement process, those are conservative estimates to get it out there so we had a budget number. As we apply for grants or get some money we could say, okay, here's what we're looking at as far as the prices.

Steven Kundert:

Okay, thank you.

Rita Christiansen:

So as a lead on to the question that he asked, so are we in essence then agreeing that these costs are acceptable for the Board when we move or consider this resolution? Is this part

of our agreement that we're saying these costs are acceptable?

Mike Pollocoff:

No. All we're saying is those are the projected estimates that were set forth by the plan. Nobody really makes a decision on what the costs are or what the expenses are until it's bid.

Rita Christiansen:

Alright, just for the record I just wanted it clear. Any other questions at all about the resolution as you look through it, any clarifications?

Monica Yuhas:

I just have one question. Regarding the public hearing on June 14<sup>th</sup> that's going to take place at the Plan Commission meeting, and then will it go to the Board the following Monday?

Mike Pollocoff:

That's right.

Steven Kundert:

This could be just a typo, but given that it's in the public record, in the third whereas on the resolution, is that date correct? Is that May 3, 2010 or was that actually May 3, 2009 when the initial resolution was adopted?

Mike Pollocoff:

That was May 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Steven Kundert:

Of this year?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yeah. And basically that adoption was really just the adoption—the Board didn't make a commitment as to supporting or not supporting the amendments, but that resolution got the process started to have the hearings and get going. We have to do that. A public body, either the Village Board or the Plan Commission, has to adopt the resolution to start that process going so we start our hearings. And that usually happens right before

we get going on it.

Rita Christiansen:

Do we have any other questions?

Glenn Christiansen:

I just have one question. In regards to map 4 I notice that it has a lot of detail on the rest of the map in regards to the trails and so forth. But when we get into the area around the Des Plaines River it doesn't show all the land that the Village owns. It doesn't show any of the trails or anything. I'm just curious why the map is lacking those details.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I guess which trails are you talking about, Glenn, and we can-

Glenn Christiansen:

Well, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Trail Plan from last year.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

The one that comes down River Road and Highway C?

Glenn Christiansen:

Well, all of those trails that were put through that area in that plan. I'm just curious. And then it shows the one that goes to the pedestrian overpass running out through the floodplain. That would be a very difficult trail to put across. I have never seen that line before. I'm just curious of some of these details.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I do agree this overlay it doesn't have some areas in it. And it should have been the one that was just recently adopted by us. I think what this is, this was the Park and Open Space Plan, this was the map off of our original plan that we had. And an addendum to this is our Bike and Ped Plan also. So this is what the Park Commission and Village Board adopted back in 2006 as our plan. So I think all we're really looking to do with this is just show the physical location of where Creekside Park is. And in the Bike and Ped Plan really take it much more further into detail as far as the exact locations of where they are. So we are looking at revising our Bike and Ped-I'm sorry, our Park and Open Space Plan I believe expires in 2011, so probably next year we'll be working on a revised plan and then we can update this map at that time.



Mike Pollocoff:

The Bike and Ped Plan is really just a subset of the Master Park Plan.

Glenn Christiansen:

I wanted a clarification because it clearly shows inaccuracies and lacking information. I was just curious if it becomes a legal document to the resolution or if this is just a reference for this little postage stamp area in the middle of the map. And I take it it's really just for reference to the postage stamp area in the middle of the map then.

Tom Shircel:

Glenn, can I just comment on that as well. If you look on the resolution tonight one of the amendments, the first one, number one expresses exactly what you're referring to. It says Chapter VII, Subsection F entitled Recreational Trails is proposed to be deleted and recreated as to read, and I'll read it for you, Recreational Trails, See the Village of Pleasant Prairie 2010 Bicycle and Pedestrian Trails Plan as adopted on April 19, 2010 by Ordinance 10-27 for information related to recreational trails. So that will clear that up.

Glenn Christiansen:

I did see that. I was just curious why we see a map like this instead of that map. Okay.

Rita Christiansen:

I think it's a good point to clarify. This is my opinion, it would be nice if we're going to have these presented to us to have the most current map available instead of a little of this or a little of that. Because it says revised May 4, 2010 so that would in my opinion lead me to believe that this is the most current map reflecting exactly what's happening at the Village at this time.

Mike Pollocoff:

The only thing that was revised on this map, though, is what's being presented. So what you're saying is every time there's a change on a subset plan you want to go back and re-adopt the Master Park Plan.

Rita Christiansen:

No, I'm saying I want a current map. Is that re-adopting, Mike, is that what you're saying?

Mike Pollocoff:

We can make a current map but it won't be a map that will have the legal standing that the Park Plan has. In all of our plans you have that point in time where you've adopted them, and then from there on there's either a subset or a specialized plan where there's park or pedestrian plan or whatever. We can work on making up a list, but the plan document that we use that we show is adopted is what it was at the time, and then we reflect amendments that are shown in other plans that are subsets of this. Other than that, what we'd have to do is the Rec Commission would have to make a decision or commitment every time one of these things is adopted is to re-adopt or amend all the plans that have been in place up to that point. As a practice that hasn't been done. We can come up with a map for your use or staff use that shows everything that's on there rather than the other ones. It's just that they tend to get a little busy after a while.

Rita Christiansen:

I just figure staff is using a map that does have everything on it.

Mike Pollocoff:

We have different maps that we have altogether, but we don't have a map that has everything on it.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

And the title of this map is Map 4, Plan Park and Recreational Facilities, which my interpretation is just the physical location of where some of these parks are going to be located at.

Rita Christiansen:

Okay, thank you.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

It's definitely a point well taken.

Rita Christiansen:

Thank you. Anybody else any questions or concerns? So, does someone want to make a motion to adopt Resolution 10-02 related to the amendments to the Village of Pleasant Prairie park and Open Space Plan 2006-2011 and recommend that the Village Plan Commission and the Village Board adopt said amendments pursuant to Chapter 390 of the Village Code.

**Jim Bandura moved to adopt Resolution 10-02 related to the amendments to the Village of Pleasant Prairie Park and Open Space Plan 2006-2011 and recommend that the Village Plan Commission and the Village Board adopt said amendments pursuant to Chapter 390 of the Village Code. Seconded by Troy Holm. Motion carried 6-0.**

## **6. PARK COMMISSION COMMENTS**

Glenn Christiansen:

I have a question. I received an e-mail the other day in regards to a request that I had made at the last meeting about having a briefing on the Des Plaines River restoration meetings that we had up until a couple of years ago. And I received an e-mail stating that it was not an actionable item if I recall correctly. I'm not familiar with that term. I don't think I've ever heard that term used before. Because I did ask and you said that we could have a briefing, Mike.

Mike Pollocoff:

We can have a briefing I guess but, again, it would be something that we'd need to be able to put enough information into the minutes so that when people are looking at the agenda and they saw the agenda they would have a good idea what would be talked about and what a possible end result of it would be. So for the purposes of open records and public notice of meetings, what we do on our agenda is we say what the item is going to be and what's being considered, and the Plan Commission is either going to consider it, adopt it, conduct a hearing, take some specific action on it.

To just open it up for discussion without having an end to it the risk is from the Village's standpoint is we're talking about an item, the Des Plaines area park, it's a big park, and the discussion could not lead to anything where the Park Commission would direct staff to do any number of things that they might want to have happen because that wouldn't have been noticed. Just like under citizens' comments or even under Plan Commission comments questions can be asked or information shared, but it really needs to be things that are fairly light in nature so the public has the opportunity to know what's going to be discussed at the meeting rather than have it under a general subject.

When I visit with John when we're doing this the scope of this is fairly big. If we wanted to have a working session that no action could come of where we talked about the planning process similar to what we did when we were working on the Master Park Plan where input was getting received and the planners were getting direction or input from the citizens or the Commission on what they want to do, that's possible. But I don't want to start us on the process where we take a discussion about the Des Plaines watershed, talk about it, and then have direction come out of that without having the residents or anybody who would be interested in coming to the meeting to have the opportunity to

know they're going to talk about what it is that they're going to do to the woods, or they're going to talk about what are they going to do with the trails. I won't know that. All I know is there is a discussion about the watershed for the Des Plaines.

Given the time constraints that parks is under and planning, that's going to be a fairly extensive thing to put together to get out and discuss. So when we look at it I think we need to do more than just say put it on and talk about it. I think if the Commission wants to set up a work session where we can go over the information we have or have somebody come in and talk to us or what have you, with the understanding in our work session there's no votes that are taken, there's no action or item on it so people know that that's not going to happen. If they want to come and be educated or find out things they can do that, but they can rely on some certainty that something is not going to happen that they didn't know about.

Rita Christiansen:

So I guess I would ask is it acceptable to ask for an update on items, because then it becomes an agenda item. I'm trying to understand what you're saying. Take me through it. So if I ask for an update on if it wasn't the Des Plaines but Ingram Park and—

Mike Pollocoff:

An update is fine, and that's going to be here is where we are and that's it. It can't be, well, I think you should be doing more or I'd like to see the study go this way or get these other things done.

Rita Christiansen:

I can see to your point that should be in a workshop discussion. But I just want to be clear if we can ask for updates to different items we may have talked about. Not to make it a workshop discussion but just can you give us an update. How is the park equipment going that you put in Prairie Springs Park or whatever and how is that working? You can just give us a high level update. That's still acceptable then?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes.

Jim Bandura:

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

Right. It's not just this Commission. We've had a few Boards that have bumped against this and the penalty is severe. I don't want to see anybody sitting up there getting a notice from the DA's office that they've skirted the open records and public notice law. And there's been times in the past where we've been kind of lax about it, but it's just not worth the penalty. And I think it's not good government to not let everybody know what you're going to talk about and that you could be making a decision that's going to affect them without them really being able to decipher that from the agenda.

And the problem is I know some of you guys have got some strong feelings about the Des Plaines River watershed, and it wouldn't be unforeseeable for somebody to say here's what we want to have happen, here's what we need to do, here's what I want to have happen. Pretty soon you guys are just making decisions on policy and no one from the public had a kick at the cat or know that that was going to happen. The Board does this in the budget. We have a budget work session where information is moving back and forth and we're talking about what the priorities are, the funds that are available, the things we have to get done, but they can't make any decisions in that meeting. They can ask all the questions they want, it's open to the public where they can see what's going on, but that document gets completed by staff and then the Board sees it as a sitting Board at a meeting and we notice it and they say we're going to be talking about these items for budget and making decisions on what's going to happen.

Rita Christiansen:

Just to recap what you said is that we can have a high level discussion, just a high level update, but anything that we would want input or decision making on would have to be done in a workshop setting—

Mike Pollocoff:

No. Input and information you can do that in a workshop setting because that's going to be noticed as no decision will be made. And ideally given if it's a project that has a lot of information or a lot of things to bring to it, I think that's a better way to go just like we do with these various park plan components that we've done. There's a lot going into them. We do a lot of work without making a decision before we get to the point where we really do it. That's a line that I want everybody aware of.

Sooner or later someone is going to come up and say I didn't know you guys did that, and we're not going to be able to say we told them we were going to do it. We have to say we thought it was a good idea when we were talking and we nobody knew we were going to make the decision.

Glenn Christiansen:

I can certainly see your point. I guess the reason why I raised the question in the first

place was I'm just curious to know a) what is the status of the meetings that we were holding. I don't think the Park Commission was ever really made aware of much of any of it at all. Is it still an active program? I know several of the participants at those meetings, Don Reed in particular the last time I talked to him about a year and a half ago or a year ago when I ran into him and he says what's happening? How come we're not having any more meetings? Has the Village lost interest? He said, boy, I really was convinced that we were going to do something. He said, I was ready. He said, boy, I was talking to Steve Eggers from Army Corps of Engineers and I thought we were ready to do something. He said, I think that area is really overdue for a close look at and all of a sudden nothing. Has everybody lost interest down there? I said, I don't have an answer for you.

Mike Pollocoff:

I can tell you that this project along with the other ones really succumbed to levy limits and to budget restrictions.

Glenn Christiansen:

I know that Ducks Unlimited and Fish and Wildlife Service they want to put money into it. I know there are other programs that are offering money for it, and if it's part of the park plan there's other money available. So I'm not even really sure if there's really much more than time involved but we don't sit down and talk about it.

Mike Pollocoff:

Well, the time involved typically is going to be professional staff. We allocate out where the planners or John's time is going to go. I'd be surprised to see if they're willing to compensate the Village for us either getting some help so that we can cover something in other areas so that Jean or Peggy or Tom or whoever is going to work on this is going to be able to do it. Quite frankly, that's the constraints that we're living with with how much money we can collect off taxes and do things. So I know there is money to do it and help in maybe the later planning stages or some of the development, but there's still a significant amount of work that John and Jean do to get something ready to have it go.

The work we did on Ingram's happened kind of off budget and we had to reallocate out time for them to work on this and get this put together because of the nature of that project. But as far as exactly where we left off and how much more work we have to do I'm not sure where that is. I think that's something we can work up as part of the budget following some workshop setting to see what everybody is going to invest in doing it as we establish our priorities. But one of the problems we're having is that the parks and public works has got a limited amount of resources to do whether it's street construction, storm water construction, park development. We have to work within the budget we've got.

Glenn Christiansen:

Okay, I understand what you're saying. I just became very confused because I was told last year we were going to have a meeting and then in January John said he was going to try to schedule a meeting in February and I never heard anything about it. So I guess our answer is at this time it's a dead issue.

Mike Pollocoff:

It's not a dead issue. It's just an issue that given what we went through last year where we lost Jean for a big chunk of time and we had to make some adjustments in another department, John picked up utility responsibilities, we just really are short on staff time. That being said I think if the Commission wants to have a work session and bring some other people in and sit down and talk about where everybody is to date, what are some of the current changes in thought or what they'd like to accomplish that could be done. We could put that in the process to see whether or not that's something we want to allocate resources for.

Glenn Christiansen:

I think in the long run it would be a shame—some period of time in the future have the Village decide to go ahead with this and then talk to, say, Ducks Unlimited and all of a sudden Ducks Unlimited said, well, you know we had money a few years ago but we decided to take the money out to the Mississippi because nobody was interested around here. They've tried for years to spend money around here and they never could get anybody to cooperate with them one way or another.

Mike Pollocoff:

The watershed is what it is. The Village has always been straight with The Nature Conservancy and the DNR and everybody else that we would work on these projects to the extent that we had resources available. And back when we acquired this property and we started doing this stuff there was no such thing as a levy limit, expenditure constraints, controls on our taxes and what we had to do, let alone a recession. And it's just a different financial picture now than it was even three years ago, and it's significantly different than it was five or six years ago. We try to pick the projects that are going to have the most return for us when we have an immediate chance to leverage grant funds where we can. But the Des Plaines project just by the area of it and the scope and the magnitude is a really large project.

We've been doing everything we can to secure land to control more land in that area over time, and I think we've done that. We've taken a lot of land out of private ownership and got it into public ownership that gives us some more leverage to do some things. That's

not getting a plan put together or setting up priorities for funding, but I think the Village Board and myself have a commitment to do what we can to secure that ownership and control that property and go the next step.

Glenn Christiansen:

Since you brought up that point about ownership of land, we had that meeting back in January with Dan Kammerer between the donations of the two pieces of land that totaled about two and a quarter million dollars in grant money that could be used directly to purchase other land. Was the Village going to follow up on that?

Mike Pollocoff:

We did submit an application for the Ingram Park portion and we haven't heard back, but that was submitted before the deadline. With the donation that was made by the I-94 Partners we're looking to do that before the next deadline.

Glenn Christiansen:

Because you had expressed an interest in pursuing. I won't name the property or the two properties that had been discussed, but I'm just curious if either of those properties were still of any interest to the Village.

Mike Pollocoff:

I think they are, but I think from a policy standpoint the commitments that were made to Ingrams when their property was gifted to the Village was to come up with a usable park. That's kind of what we came up with. I mean that was really some of their requirements. So to have taken that donation and use that to leverage land acquisition in another area I think we wouldn't have been keeping faith with the commitment we made to the Ingrams. But the other land that the Village has received through gifts or the land even if we could find a way to make it work for the land that the Village Development Authority has purchased and find a way to massage that in to being eligible for leverage in getting more land, we've always had as a goal from 165 all the way up to 50 to acquire as much land as we could along that floodway.

Glenn Christiansen:

Yeah, I'm familiar with that plan. I know it's not one that most people have ever seen. I was very active. Tom was active or assisted in the process of drawing up that map. Okay.



Rita Christiansen:

Any other comments? Thank you.

**7. ADJOURNMENT**

**Monica Yuhas moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Jim Bandura. Motion carried 6-0.**

Meeting adjourned 6:40 p.m.