

**VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE
PARK COMMISSION
Village Hall Auditorium
9915 39th Avenue
Pleasant Prairie, Wisconsin 53158
April 3, 2013
6:00 p.m.**

A regular meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Park Commission was held on Wednesday, April 3, 2013, 6:00 p.m. Present were Michealene Day, Cindy Schwab (Alternate #1), Jim Bandura, William Mills and Monica Yuhas. Rita Christiansen and Glenn Christiansen were excused. Troy Holm and Steven Kundert were absent. Also present were Michael Pollocoff, Village Administrator; Jean Werbie-Harris, Community Development Director; John Steinbrink, Jr., Director of Public Works; and Ruth Mack-Stoner, Executive Secretary. No citizens were present.

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

Ruth-Mack Stoner:

I would just like to remind everyone to make sure your microphones are on and please speak into them when you speak.

3. MINUTES OF MEETINGS

Michealene Day:

In your packet earlier you received the minutes of the last meeting. If there were no additions or corrections can I have a motion to approve.

Monica Yuhas moved to approve the Park Commission Meeting minutes of the December 4, 2012 meeting presented in their written form: Seconded by Jim Bandura. Motion carried 5-0.

4. CITIZEN COMMENTS

Michealene Day:

As we have no citizens in the audience Item 4 is complete.

5. DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS REPORT

John Steinbrink:

Madam Chair and Park Commission, I do have one brief report. During our Veteran's Memorial that we had at Prairie Springs Park there were donations set up for the Stars and Stripes Honor Flight of Wisconsin. It's an organization that allows our veterans to go to DC to view the memorial. During the donation process they were able to raise \$225. And so that was very successful first time doing it. And we did receive a letter from the Stars and Stripes Honor Guard thanking the Village for that contribution to make that possible and that the money will go to good use and thank you very much. So that's all I have to report.

Michealene Day:

Thank you, John. Any questions?

6. NEW BUSINESS

a) Discuss and Approve Village Park Signage

Michealene Day:

You were handed out some signs and can you report on that?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Yes. Back in 2006, the Village Park Commission took a look at putting together some type of dedication type monument sign for Phil Sander. At that time there was some concepts with respect to putting up some type of really a public interest sign that identified a little bit about his life, what he's done for the community, photograph, things like that. And since that time my understanding is that it really hasn't gone too much further than the initial concept in the parking lot and where it would be placed. And I don't believe any text was written or any fundraising was done.

And my staff was approached by a Girl Scout Troop, in particular a Girl Scout trying to earn a silver star. And she was very interested and had learned a little bit about Phil Sander. And she wanted to find out whether or not she could take it upon herself, with Village staff, to raise the money to put a public interest sign in the Village to commemorate Phil Sander. I mentioned to her what had been done in the past.

And the more we talked about it as a staff we thought maybe it would be better than doing one huge monument sign. The previous one was three feet by ten feet which would have been about 30 square feet. Maybe we'd try to standardize these signs. And I've tried to enclose some examples of, for example, there's a rain garden sign that's actually at Prange. And then I included

some other signs. One was from when I was down in Gatlinburg, and I think it's about four feet by two feet, something like that. It's on plexiglass. It's more of a vandal proof type. It's not paper underneath so it would withstand rain and snow. And it was more on a metal framed sign, and it was on a metal post.

So I was thinking that since both John and I often have Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts and other groups that are interested in doing some type of project, maybe we could develop a standard for public interest signs. And then those groups could help do the fundraising, and we could work together to put the language together, the signs would be installed by public works, then they would come back and landscape and do things around those signs. And to me it just seems like I don't think this would be the only one in the Village. We have a number of areas, the Chiwaukee Prairie, we've got Momper's Woods, we've got Phil Sander. We have people, places, we've got different artifacts. We have a number of things that might be of public interest to the community.

So I am just looking for some very quick discussion tonight since we have a longer agenda ahead of us as to what direction that the Park Commission would like us to go. And, again, the Village I believe doesn't have the funding for something like this, so we would like to come up with some type of standard I think that the Village could use along with logo and things like that that we could incorporate throughout the parks wherever there's a specific public interest identified.

Michealene Day:

I like the idea very much. I think it's a great idea to have standardized sizes, and I like the idea of being able to work with the organizations like the Scouting. I think that's a terrific idea. Anybody else any comments?

Jim Bandura:

I agree. I totally agree.

Cindy Schwab:

Yeah, I think it's a great idea.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

And our thought was since there is not a lot of funding at this time for different types of signage like this, if it's very specific and unique there are target groups out there, depending on the interest sign, that might be willing to fund. And I actually have the first one. I think I have that taken care of. But we'll have the Girl Scout and her mom go to the group and discuss it with them. And I think that they will cover the funding for the first sign.

Michealene Day:

Terrific, terrific.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

So if I can get some direction from the Park Commission and John and I so that we can have a motion in support of that direction. And we'll bring everything back to you before we go any further. Because the Scout does need to make a presentation to you as well.

Jim Bandura:

So, Jean, you're looking at like you've got a tag here, a sheet here, Enviro Signs?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

That was the only one that we found in very short order as to who makes these types of signs. But a number of different companies probably make them. We just have to figure out who it is and then get some cost estimates put together as to what they are. We're concerned about the durability. Again, the one for th rain gardens is beautiful, but it's also located adjacent to a municipal building. I'm just concerned that any sign that's just out in a park someplace it better be a lot more vandal proof. I don't want anybody to tag it or damage it.

Michealene Day:

I would agree. So you're just asking us for a motion to go ahead with this to use --

Jean Werbie-Harris:

To give us some direction, provide direction that you're interested in this type of signage, and now we'll actually do some real research as to what the costs are, the cost for the different sizes and so on and so forth. And we'll bring that back to the Park Commission before anything gets decided.

Monica Yuhas:

I'll make a motion to authorize staff to investigate the signage for the Village and report back as to size and cost at our next meeting.

William Mills:

Second the motion.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Yes, and I think at one of our next meetings the Girl Scout who is working on her silver start and her mom will probably be here with the research that they have done up to this point at least for this very first sign.

Michealene Day:

That would be perfect, thank you. We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? If not, can we have a vote? All in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

Michealene Day:

Opposed? Ayes have it. Thank you very much, Jean. It's been sitting there like you said for many years and nothing's been done. So thanks for taking the initiative.

b) Review and Approve Master Park Plan - Chapters 4-8.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Madam Chairperson, what I would like to do is I'd like to provide a summary of Chapters 4 through 8, unless you prefer me to go through page by page. But I doubt you would.

Michealene Day:

No.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

So what I'd like to do is provide an overall summary, and then we can go chapter by chapter with any comments, questions or concerns that you might have. But, again, I'm not going to go through every page. Let me begin by saying Chapters 1 through 3 are done. We have completed the formatting, we've inserted all the pictures, and it looks really nice. So the intent is to get the narrative for all of these chapters approved tonight. And then I will give it to Peggy, and Peggy and I will look through the appropriate photographs and the additional documents, and we'll get it all inserted so that next month at your May meeting it will be a final document for you to approve.

Tonight I'd like the initial approval of the final draft, but then we'll have it all finalized. And then next month right immediately after the Park Commission it will go to the Village Plan Commission for public hearing for inclusion in the Comprehensive Plan, and then it will go onto

the Village Board. My understanding is that there are some grants that the public works department has applied for. And one of the conditions of those grant applications are an adopted park plan. So we need to be moving quickly on this.

With that, the first chapter that you had seen previously, but I actually rewrote portions of it, and that's the Chapter 4. And the reason why I did that is in looking back at not only our Comprehensive Plan but actually the parks that we have in the community, what I realized is that a number of parks were missing. And there were some other aspects of the parks missing as well as trails and some other things. And so what I wanted to do is put together as comprehensive of a list as I could along with some updated and corrected information from the previous park plan that was done by the consultant.

So I've gone through and I've added corrected information for the regional parks, the community and the neighborhood parks. Sat down with John and Kevin on his staff and they updated all of the tables that you see in Chapter 4, 4.1 with respect to the different amenities and lineal footage of beach and all the different existing amenities that we actually have in the Village.

I also wanted to make sure it was very clear that we have a lot of areas other than the active parks, and they're very important to the community because they really are used by a number of people, and they include the special open space passive areas, and that starts on page 4. I added more information with respect to Chiwaukee Prairie, talked about some of the open space lands that we've acquired with Country Corner, Des Plaines, Momper's Woods. I've added some newer ones, the Kildeer Farms, Sorensen Woods. Gave a little bit more explanation about the corridors. I've also included information on the special open space active areas, that while they're not owned by the Village they're very important to the community such as golf courses, Halter Wildlife and Prairie Harbor Yacht Club.

Then I do have some information on the trails, and I include now the Chiwaukee Prairie Trails, the Kenosha County Bike Trail and, of course, the Pleasant Prairie Farms and the Prairie Springs Park Trails. I put in some very little information on the bike lanes, and that's because we have a specific separate plan for all the bicycle. And I just want to really -- and later on we actually just refer to that plan. We don't need to reiterate all of that information here.

With respect to other recreational facilities of the Village, I go into a little bit more detail with respect to the Village RecPlex because they have so many facilities inside and outside. And also we have special agreements with a couple of our neighborhood parks, neighborhood school parks. I'm not sure if the Park Commission is aware of that. And so because of that it was very important that all these neighborhood schools that have park amenities, soccer fields and basketball goals and tether ball poles and all those types of things those should all be included as part of our park inventory because those facilities are there. And so we did a complete inventory on those and put all of those in here as well.

Then we modified all of the maps that the other consultant had done, put them back into the Village's format. And actually most of these park maps were actually done already by the GIS

and through John's department. And so we actually just pulled these maps out, kind of put them in a little bit different format. We still have to number pages, and there's some things we have to do. But I just wanted the plan to be consistent with respect to the information that we were providing. I took out a lot of the big logos and things like that. We don't need to mark it on these maps and things like that. So I kind of tried to make it a little bit more consistent with respect to that.

Michealene Day:

A lot easier to read.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

That's what I thought. So that was Chapter 4. Chapter 5 what I did was I read through the previous consultant's Chapter 5 about 20 times, and they have a lot of really positive things to say and a lot of good information. It was just a little bit hard to read at times. And there were some things in there that I showed to many people and they didn't even understand what they meant. So some of those things I pulled out. But their survey as a whole was actually pretty good. And I just reached a couple of other conclusions that they did. But I just rewrote theirs.

I worked with Peggy and John in order to redo the figures. We made them a little bit more standardized. We modified some of the pie charts to make them a little bit more readable. We also tried to put a little bit more ease to the read. So the paragraph, the pie chart; the paragraph, the pie chart. So it's very easy. You don't have to be searching to try to figure out what table or pie chart refers to which statement. I thought that the information, again, was pretty good with respect to the questions that they had picked out. Unfortunately I don't have all of the answers and the results of some of the surveys for other questions. So we pretty much stuck to the questions that they had analyzed and evaluated. And I can answer any questions that you may have with respect to any of these charts or graphs.

Some of the other things where they had a number of questions where they had open ended responses I didn't feel that that was very effective for a Park Commission or for any group that would pick it up and take a look at it. So where it was appropriate I summarized the most popular response right with the figures. And then it's not shown in this chapter because it's in the appendix, but basically what I did is I identified the open ended question, I wrote it out, and then I summarized and categorized the responses.

So instead of 12 pages of ongoing open ended responses which I felt was of very little value, we have that information, but to put it into the appendix I thought it would be good to put it in very succinct, readable comments that if there is a goal or objective or something you're looking for you can actually read through and you can see, well, these were the positive comments from the survey respondents, and then these are some of their experiences, recommendations and comments. And just simplify it. And, again, if it was one comment I really didn't say this one was seven times, this was eight times. I actually put it in alphabetical order. It was much easier

for me to read, and it just made a whole lot more sense to me. So I did that with a couple of questions.

And there was also an open ended comment question that really had to do with the RecPlex facilities. And since the survey was part of the RecPlex I actually still included it in here. Again, there's not much that we go into the detail because I don't want to go into that other plan because that's a separate plan. But since a lot of the information kind of was bouncing back between Park and Rec and the RecPlex, I thought that it might be of some benefit for you to understand and know what some of those open ended responses were because they did affect the outside of the park.

Some of the other things that I did with respect to this chapter is I removed some information as it reflected some of the ongoing discussions with the park staff. I kind of summarized it into four bullet points. I didn't leave all that narrative in here with respect to the Park Commission and Rec Commission visioning sessions. I went through each of your visioning sessions and, again, I bulleted based on a summary of what you talked about. And then we put together a different figure. The figure that they put in was a little confusing, so we kind of did it a little bit different so that it still reflected the comments from that discussion and everything that we've done during the meeting.

One of the other final exercises was the mission statement. I heard that loud and clear that's something you wanted to have included and that was part of your exercise as you were going through this process. So we made sure that that was clearly placed in here. This is the one that I had gotten from Tom Shircel that I think the Park Commission had finalized.

And then to end that chapter there were some public informational meetings. I sat in a couple of them, and I actually broke down all of the comments and kind of broke them down into some bullet points. And, again, probably ten bullet points. So we do have all of the detail from all of these open ended responses, but it didn't seem to be very productive to put all that in because it just went on and on and on. And so I tried to summarize it. So that is the chapter on public participation in the survey.

William Mills:

Jean, maybe just one quick question. When I was reading through this numbers that sort of bothered me was figure 5.12. What struck me by this was the fact that Prairie Springs Park is identified as having less usage than Pleasant Prairie Park. And I went back, so I was trying to how could that be? And I was looking at previous numbers that they had quoted. And I look at page 3, figure 5.2, it seems to indicate that the number of people that used Lake Andrea five times or more is 16 percent, I guess 16 percent females, 18 percent males. But then when you look at Prairie Springs Park on figure 5.12 it seems to indicate that only 9 percent have used it five times or more. So maybe I'm missing something here, but this figure seems to indicate that we have more people going more times, five times or more, to Pleasant Prairie Park, and I don't think that that's accurate. And it doesn't seem to be consistent with what some of the other numbers are in the chapter.

Mike Pollocoff:

I think the difference, Commissioner, is that 5.2 stratified the data out so it only looked at who uses the beaches, not the park. So 5.2 it's specifically addressing beach use. And then in 5.12 it's total park use. Because there are people that go to Prairie Springs Park and do things other than the beach. And really at the Lake Michigan beaches there's nothing else to do but the beach.

William Mills:

Maybe I'm reading this incorrectly. To me 5.12 seems to be indicating to me that more people are going several times, more than five times, to use the Pleasant Prairie Park as opposed to Prairie Springs Park. And do we as Commissioners feel that's really accurate?

Michealene Day:

So you're saying that you think that as you're reading it Pleasant Prairie Park there on HH is being utilized far greater than Prairie Springs Park?

William Mills:

Yes.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

And the conclusion that I made was that, you know what, maybe the folks don't know that it's called Prairie Springs Park. Maybe they just know it as the RecPlex park and they don't know the name of it. That's the conclusion that I came. Because otherwise I couldn't explain the two. And that's the only thing that I could think of. Pleasant Prairie ball park everyone has known that, it's been one of our first parks, everyone has utilized it for ball and soccer and the playground. But just those two signs I'm not sure how much advertising that we do for Prairie Springs Park because we talk about Lake Andrea and the RecPlex.

William Mills:

That seems to make sense. I just couldn't --

Jean Werbie-Harris:

That was just my thought.

Michealene Day:

That they're just confused about what park is what.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Which when you see later on in some of the recommendations maybe one of the jobs of the Park Commission and the staff is maybe to do a better marketing job so that people understand the names of each of the parks that they're actually going to. Because I think a lot more people actually go to that park because of all the amenities. It's a regional, community, neighborhood, it's an everything park. And there aren't too many that I know that haven't gone there.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Would it be appropriate to make some sort of a footnote or comment?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

I certainly can.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Stating that in case anyone else agrees.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Again, that was my assumption or conclusion, and so I didn't want to interject it unless others agreed. I don't know what else the reason could be.

William Mills:

I think your thought process makes a lot of sense. I was more concerned about, hey, is this an error of some sort. But I think how you've thought of it is that it probably is a reflection of not understanding what that park's name is makes a lot of sense.

Jim Bandura:

It's a reasonable assumption.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

I can add a footnote as one of the possible reasons why the numbers appear to be lower.

William Mills:

I'm an engineer so numbers start to bother me I guess. I couldn't draw a conclusion myself as to why those numbers would be that way.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

And, Jean, on that same note on page 3 like Mike had indicated would it make sense on figure 5.2 use of Lake Andrea beach by gender since so many people are used to just calling the entire park Lake Andrea.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Yes.

William Mills:

Thank you.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Sure. The only other thing with respect to this chapter and that is in the appendix we did put a copy of the survey. And, again, we've tried to get all of the data for that particular survey, and the only data that I was able to really get was the answers or the question responses for those that they analyzed. Otherwise I could not get any of the raw data. And they have an SPSS program, I haven't used that program in 25 or 30 years and we don't have that here. And they could not readily go back and tell me and provide to me any of the data.

Michealene Day:

You're kidding.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

And we asked many times. So as a result I think we'll just put in the survey, and then we highlighted the questions that they analyzed. And I think that these were the most important things that we were looking for, so I think that we'll still be okay. I just don't have the raw data that I would like to have.

The next chapter is Chapter 6. Again, this is a new chapter. This is the analysis of the existing park and recreational facilities. I did a complete quantitative analysis, again, based on information provided by John and his staff that talks about the existing park acreage, needs in the Village in 2010, existing needs for 2035. Again, we projected to 2035. That's when our Comprehensive Plan projects out to. So the plan, obviously, the plan years are somewhere in between. But you always do a projection year at least to your Comprehensive Plan year.

Again, I've worked with them, used the standards that were previously established by our park plan. I've gone through a qualitative analysis basically looking at a number of things, not only at the existing parks and what we have in the parks and if we were going to be meeting our

standards, but I also looked through all of the survey, the survey results, the recommendations, the comments. And I pulled information from there, and I tried to include some of those comments in here as well. And I went back to the comments that the Park Commission made and the public informational meeting. So I tried to include that information in summary as much as I could from all of the different resources that we had in putting the information together. And I put some of my own comments in as well.

The geographic analysis with respect to the parks we talk about that, and actually later in the chapters we physically actually show where all the parks are located and do the concentric rings to see which areas are being covered. Obviously the whole Village is being covered by the regional park, so I don't have a separate map on that. But we talked about the community parks, the future community parks, the neighborhood parks and the school neighborhood parks as well.

Again, I do mention in this chapter a little bit about and I reiterate the public input that was provided as part of our informational meetings in order to complete our analysis. And then one of the other things that I did was I obtained a copy of the Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreational Plan which is SCORP, and I went through that particular plan and did a brief summary of the plan. And then I started to pull out a couple of elements that really were reflective and I thought would be beneficial for our plan.

I talked about some of the top growing recreational activities in the State of Wisconsin that they have documented over the previous five years. And what I'm seeing is those are the same amenities that the Park Commission has talked about, public works, administration and the previous survey. So we're starting to see that, yeah, things are shifting a little with respect to the interest and what people want to do for outside activities and amenities.

And then I just added a couple of other things since you've been working on these projects is that community gardening and gardening activities are some of the more popular activities that are just coming to light. And with the activities that we're looking to do here with community gardens and what you've already started we're right on target with respect to some of the things that the community wants to see, farmers markets and things like that, and so that's why I've mentioned some of those things as well. And then, again, that map is also included.

And then going on to Chapter 7, policy recommendations and programs implementation. And I'm not sure, I think you might have covered this chapter before, I'm not sure. But this is where we actually broke down and, again, we define objectives, policies, recommendation programs. We define them differently than the previous consultant. I defined them here for you as well. But we break it down into I think four or five different objectives. And then based, again, on what you said we put policy recommendations and then the programs which are the active things that John might be looking to put into his capital improvements program and his budgets.

And, again, I guess the reason why there's quite a few programs in here and then it ends with this matrix at the end is that because the parks are so important to Pleasant Prairie, it's not just public works that does a lot of these activities. It's the RecPlex, it's community development, it's

administration. Many of our departments here in the Village have some impact with respect to acquiring land or developing land or doing planning or working with neighborhood groups or working with Scouts and other types of groups. And so a lot of these programs that have been defined and then the years identified specifically by John based on his CIP, they were included because there are a number of different departments that I don't know that it was really picked up. It was a previous version of the park plan. I don't know that you were aware that all these other departments really have some input and have provided assistance to John in helping to implement different things in the parks.

Mike Pollocoff:

I would want the Commission to -- there's two steps, and everything that's in here is a worthy goal and a program we want to achieve. But the gap between realistic funding of our programs and plans and what we have in here is significant, very significant. So as we adopt this we need to have our eyes wide open and say this all sounds really great and it's really good, but as a practical matter given the current funding restraints and levy limits and our inability to really increase revenues, we should be surprised. I don't want somebody to come back to the staff or the Board later on saying, well, you guys didn't get anything done. I want everybody to know right up front that a good part of this that I look at when I look at this is not going to be -- we'll nibble along the edges, but we're not going to really be able to do it unless there's some change in how things are funded.

The risk in this is that we can come to that agreement ourselves, but at some point when this plan gets evaluated when we use it as a basis for a grant somebody is going to come back and say you guys haven't achieved what you wanted. And how realistic was your -- what was the nexus between what you could actually fund and what you said you wanted to do? So kind of throwing everything out there that we could be doing all this, these are all the things we'd like to do and this is everything that could happen, and then not achieving it or not getting half of it or whatever the percentage is is a risk. It's one that could come back and bite us later on.

Or, at the best, my concern is it doesn't affect the credibility of the Commission to narrow in on the things that are doable, are affordable and can be implemented within John's budget. Like Jean said, everybody is going to help, but it's difficult. When we go to start funding cops and firefighters and keeping guys on the street, that's really where 80 percent of our money is going. That's the reality of it. And where we were able to massage our levy over the years and pick up some things here and there that's completely gone. And I don't see that changing in the near future to be honest with you.

I think that it would be my recommendation that there at least be some kind of mention or address that addresses the fiscal realities that the Village is facing with respect to funding park improvements and funding these programs, that these are things that we think are all worthy goals, that these are programs we'd like to achieve. But we also recognize that in the public finance climate that we're in right now it's going to be difficult to obtain them. We might get some people to donate. There's a lot of things that might happen, but I don't think anybody should be

surprised if these things don't happen or they don't happen as easily as we'd like.

Because we kind of got a taste of it in the last budget, and it's going to get even tighter in the succeeding budgets. It was one of my problems with the last plan, and it's kind of a concern we have on this one is this thing has to match up against what's real, what could really be funded. Because otherwise we're not really telling the public what our priorities are, for what limited resources we have what do we really want to get done? This says given these other areas this everything we could do or we'd like to do, but that's a danger. I think one of the things that we've been able to do over a few years is identify a few things that we really wanted to get done like Ingram Park or some other things, and we fund them and we get them accomplished and we don't dilute it. We don't dilute the overall objective of the Commission to get some of the key things done we want to do.

Jim Bandura:

Where would you recommend putting that explanation?

Mike Pollocoff:

I think that probably -- Jean has it in here that the current financial budgetary limitations of the Village I think what it doesn't say I think we just have to come out and say will significantly limit our ability to achieve the majority of these objectives because that's really what it is. We kind of talk around it. We've identified it as a weakness, but I think in order for you guys to be able to look citizens in the eye when they come to a meeting and say we want this, we want this or pay for this or pay for that, it's like our plan says we're not going to be able to fund everything.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

And that is actually I say it about three or four times in the plan. And it ends with in the chapter it specifically says it's important to note that any of these proposed programs were prioritized only based on some projected and anticipated staff time, but they are restricted by budget, financial resources, community donations and volunteer participation. And then I go on to explain that even further. Which then is a segue into the next chapter. Again, these are all the different things with a number of limitations. And, again, I've stated it at least three or four times that the final chapter which is Chapter 8 this is really the recommended park plan that we can afford.

And John has gone through this and I've gone through this as well, and what I've done is I've really pared that down in this chapter as to say, well, this is really what we think is realistic. All these other things, oh, if we get a pot of money, great donations, we get acquisitions, then we'll be able to take these other steps, community participation, maybe partnerships, then it's all going to happen. But this final chapter is really the implementation chapter. And that's where, again, I went through with John and his CIP and said, okay, as much as I'd like to do 20 things in Prairie Springs Park, well, I think we're only going to do six, and maybe it's extend a trail, maybe create monument signs, a tribute to Phil Sander, create design trails. It really skims it way back to what

has been budgeted and what I think is going to realistically happen. And then, again, each of the parks it might be add a passive amenity if funding allows, acquire additional parcels of land as donations become available.

So what we did was John and I went through each of the parks including Prairie Springs Park and the community parks that we own currently and all the neighborhood parks, and they all have maybe one, two, three, four at most items that we think that we could actually functionally do based on the budget restrictions that we have. And, again, I guess I don't feel that I overblew things in the previous chapter because I wanted to make sure that we wanted to know what are the possibilities, but we are restricted by budgets. We are restricted by levy limits. We are restricted by donations, by acquisitions, specifically by lack of development. I'm not getting the land development right now, and I mention that in the chapter, too, that without new development there's no new donations of land. I mean we got Sorensen Woods and a couple of others in the last couple of years, and that's through the lighthearted donation of a couple of Village residents. But we're not getting what we did before. And so those limitations and restrictions if they're not strong enough I can make them strong in here, but I know I say it at least three or four times in the two chapters. And I really restrict the Chapter 8 to what John thinks that he'd be able to accomplish.

Mike Pollocoff:

And I think Chapter 8 is --

Michealene Day:

Is the key.

Mike Pollocoff:

Is aggressive. I think it's aggressive, and I think Chapter 7 is aggressive. That's fine if you want to put it out there. And I don't want to be the one to throw water on the deal. John, I'm not saying that they don't think that we'll be able to do it. But I just know from last year's capital budget it's difficult. I mean we're trying to keep our road paving budget intact because we're not getting any more road aids. The price of asphalt isn't any less expensive, and we can't raise money. So in those situations we're not going to be diverting money out of paving roads to put it in the parks or to replace fire equipment. I mean that's the new reality that we're living under under the new State rules. I just want everybody to know that it's overly optimistic on what we're going to be able to deal with.

Monica Yuhas:

Mike, what do you think would be reality for the next five years out of those 15 programs that are listed in here?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Are you talking about Chapter 8? Because that's really what you need to look at.

Mike Pollocoff:

Yeah. If you look at 8 --

Jean Werbie-Harris:

We could eliminate the soccer field. I just didn't know if there would be any type of donations. But at one point I had talked to John about the acquisition and development of soccer fields. But all the others I think we're currently doing right now. So I mean the things that we're currently doing that's kind of what I put in here. I don't think I went beyond that, although the soccer fields I did and we can take that out if we don't think that that's going to happen for Prairie Springs anyway.

Mike Pollocoff:

I can just go through like Pleasant Prairie Park from the top. I think Ingram we're going to be able to nibble away at that over the life of the plan. At Pleasant Prairie Park I don't see us acquiring additional lands unless someone gives it to us. But for an acquisition we're not going to do that. Expanding existing recreational amenities in that area, we're doing everything [inaudible], we're just maintaining what we have now, and we don't really have the capacity to maintain additional fields.

The dog park and disk golf course that's probably doable. I don't see a skate park being in the budget. The system of board walks and interpretive exhibits some of that stuff isn't that expensive but, again, I don't think that's going to raise to the level of priority. Village Green Park I don't see us putting a baseball field or soccer field. If we're going to design a shelter and restroom facility I mean that in itself is probably like \$25,000 or \$20,000 to get that designed and have that put in although not building it.

Installing basketball and tennis courts, again, unless someone comes and gives us money to me we shouldn't treat that as part of the budget that we're going to achieve a certain level of donations. I think that's setting ourselves up for -- I mean every now and then we hit the jackpot and get something but that's far and few between.

Michealene Day:

I kind of like it being in here. I'm kind of like with Jean and John because it's optimistic, and it may be a little aggressive, but it gives us something to shoot for. And I do believe we kind of were in the same boat when many, many, many years ago when we were talking about we couldn't afford to keep Prairie Springs Park and we were going to possibly give it away to the

County. And the Village didn't do that, and had we done that because we were afraid that it was going to cost too much to fix we wouldn't be where we are today.

And it's five years. In my own business I've seen last year and this year things progressing a whole lot better. I think that maybe I'm looking at it with my glasses -- with my cup more than half full than half empty. And if we only achieve 80 percent of this or 70 percent of this it's something that we've achieved. It's still goal. Instead of going it's far easier for me to be aggressive and go we've got to make it, we got to make it, we got to make it, then hey, it's a cakewalk. We're not really pushing our limits. We're not really trying to get people out there to help us, the different community service groups and stuff.

Mike Pollocoff:

And I think I want to be an optimist on this. I'm just saying if the Village Board or myself I'm going to recommend to the Village Board that we're going to have to cap park funding, capital funding, at \$50,000 a year. How is this going to help you set a priority for determining what gets spent? And that's really where the rubber meets the road on this. John is going to have a certain amount of money that he's going to have to do this, and he's going to have to make that reality match up to a wish list that's five pages long.

I mean it's nice to have all this stuff out there, but it's a different environment. I can guarantee you for the next two years we're not going to get one more penny from the taxpayers, we're not getting one more penny from the State. And I can guarantee you that our cost of electricity, for employees, for asphalt, for everything we have to buy is still going to go up. And that will be fixed by law. It's not a matter of the economy getting better and all of a sudden we're going to do better, too. If we have more tax base we have to lower the mill rate. So statutorily we're in a downward drive on dollars.

Michealene Day:

You have to let us put windmills up.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Madam Chair and Park Commission, when I went through this with Jean, and maybe this was a fault at how I had interpreted this section was supposed to read, we did plan on not over the next 5 years but over the next 10 to 20 years was our intention. At least just throwing it out there what had to be done. And I definitely agree with Mike that it's going to be very difficult to do this in 5 years or even 10 years. But that was the intention. It may not be 5 years, 10 years or 20 years, but this is everything that has to be done over the next -- to really complete each of the parks or just so that they wouldn't go back to the wayside per se.

So maybe we could put a caveat on there or, like Mike said, try to do some sort of a priority with X amount of dollars per year on what we feel we can do. And it would definitely lengthen out 10,

20, 30 years. But the intent when staff wrote this was just to identify what had to be done. So even in 20 years once myself and everyone else is long gone, hopefully whoever else has this can understand the vision of what we were shooting for. And so it really wasn't intended for a 5 year completion, more of a list of what had to be done to complete them as a whole. So maybe we need to throw some language in there or prioritize it, or we can just take it out as a whole. Either way.

Mike Pollocoff:

I think it's going to be easier for the Board to find whatever money they can if we have something in the plan that's been adopted by the Park Commission that says this is the most important thing or the most important things we need over this next five years. All these things are -- I mean I would hope we could get all this stuff sooner than five years or whatever. But given the fiscal reality we have, of the list we have here what is it we want to focus on and get our resources aligned to be able to get.

At some point the Village has the opportunity to say the State has said you can't raise any more money, you have to cut back on what you have to do. But the State also gives you the opportunity to say you could have a referendum to have something more if the people say they want to have it. And I think if the Commission adopts a plan that says, okay, we're going to get these three things or four things and we want to get them, at some point the public starts saying -- in the data collection part there's people who wanted things in the park and they wanted them maintained.

So as the public start realizing that we're not delivering a lot of the park goodies that everybody wants like farmers markets or skate parks or whatever it is that people say they want on the survey, then we have to say we can't get that money, we're not allowed to spend anymore. If the community wants the park improvements everybody is going to have to agree to pay for it, and that would show up on a referendum. But until the public sees that we've gone through a process where we just aren't spending as much as we used to spend, and we are doing some park improvements that we determined were important and we got a plan and we're sticking to it, it gives us some credibility in the future to say when we raise more money that we're going to get more park improvements done. We're going to do what we said, and we just don't have this big shopping list of things that we want to buy. And I think that's the difference here is moving this from a shopping list to a prioritized realistic plan that this is what we want to accomplish in the next 5 years.

Michealene Day:

I don't have any problem prioritizing. I just don't want to have it removed totally out -- Chapter 8 just chopping it from whatever number 16 to 5. I think they should all still be there, and I don't have a problem prioritizing it to what's most important. I would hate to see it removed.

Mike Pollocoff:

To me that's the most important thing is getting in each one of these areas prioritizing out what is the thing that is our number one thing that we want to get done in that area. And then we could fund it out. We still might not get all of those funded, our highest priorities, but over a five year period what are the key things that we want to be able to accomplish. If we do more, great. But I really do think that if we want to maintain some credibility with the public that we're trying to do all we can with the money we have and what we say we're going to get it done, and we need more then we can say, well, if you give us more these are the things that we didn't do but we'd like to do. They're on the list, and we could do them if we had more money. I can see that the Village is plodding along, we're getting these things done, and we'd like to get them done at a better rate or a faster rate, and that could happen.

Michealene Day:

I've been monopolizing.

Mike Pollocoff:

Other people are going to look at this as like we threw it all against the wall and we're going to get as much of it as we can. And there isn't a prioritization or any logic to it.

Jim Bandura:

Then I guess as far as prioritizing it we would depend on you to say, okay, what's the budget numbers that we need or what you're going to budget for during the year and then prioritizing what we can accomplish, what particular items we can accomplish. So I think that would come under your jurisdiction in helping us.

Michealene Day:

The staff.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I would go through as staff if you would like, and I will go through and prioritize these in order. Because I'm reading these and, like I said earlier, even like in Pleasant Prairie Park these are all things that we'd like to do, but the one that may be most important is one that's towards the bottom. And so they're definitely out of order in priority. I'll go through and I'll take the recommendations of the Commission and Mike. I'll go through and I'll prioritize them, and then I'll identify the ones that are possible within the next five years as something else we can do that's similar in Chapter 7 is kind of put together a matrix of when you plan on doing it and then have a cost tied to them that kind of gives us some teeth. And then that gives the Board some direction.

Like Mike said if we have \$50,000 we'll be able to put together around \$50,000 a year for three years around a quarter million. I mean a quarter million is still a large amount of money. Identify them, and I can take some time and work with Jean and have this done for the May meeting based on all the comments and recommendations. And I think it's a great idea. I think it definitely puts it in perspective for the public, and it's something I'll be happy to do.

Monica Yuhas:

And just to add on to that I can tell you as a Board member when it comes to budget time it's always a hard decision, but you're always going to maintain your services first.

Michealene Day:

Sure.

Monica Yuhas:

And it's unfortunate that the amenities may not get as much as they need. And when you're sitting at a working session and parks comes up, what is the Commission's top three things they want to accomplish? And if we were to break it down we would have that direction. So it would be helpful. But it's also very helpful to have everything else in here as well to see down the road the plan in the future. See 15 years from now, 20 years from now, where do we want to be. But right now with shared revenue being cut, levy limits being in place, it's not like it used to be unfortunately. And probably not many residents are going to read the master plan.

Michealene Day:

No, they're not.

Monica Yuhas:

But the few that do I've been asked when are the soccer fields going in? It's in that plan. Well, we don't have money right now. But why is it listed in there? You may not get asked, but we do as the Board. And it does help to have those priorities listed. And I agree with John, I do think that working together with Jean and staff get those few important ones on there. Because, who knows, we may be down to \$30,000 next year or \$25,000, and it's because of where we're at. And taxes, no one wants to see their taxes go up. And unfortunately services are going to be a priority.

Mike Pollocoff:

And there really is under the way that the State's going to budget now there's a disincentive to grow. I mean you make it harder on yourself by having growth. Because what you do is you lower the mill rate with growth. You don't take those added dollars that the added development is

bringing in and using. So everybody ends up you getting less. The more you grow the less you get. So it's counterproductive. And until somebody up there realizes that it isn't an incentive to do a lot of that stuff, I don't think it helps grow the pot. I don't think it really helps grow the economy. But that's not what we're about right now. We're about cutting and freezing, and that's already -- that just isn't going to change.

They're going to adopt that budget here in a couple months, and I have no doubt that that's going to be what it is. We've been through two years of it and we'll do another two years. And you have to hope that two years from now that somebody in the legislature is going to feel like that an elected body and a municipality is going to make a decision on what the tax rate should be and do the right thing. But we're not there yet.

Michealene Day:

So as we need to get this completed so that it gets to the Board and we can get grants, is this something that we should have another meeting before the May meeting only so that -- because originally we were to approve this so that the final draft was in May. Should we meet again, you tell us, in two weeks or something so that we can just go over how we're going to prioritize this or do this by email or something so that the final draft comes to us in May to approve the final so that we're not another month away again?

Mike Pollocoff:

John and I could come up with the dollar amount and project our dollar amount out for you to look at. And then we can come up with some recommendations on what we can spend that money for off of this list. But then the real policy question is what's most important to you guys to get done. We can send that out to you so you could noodle over that before the meeting.

Michealene Day:

Because if you want to give us the final draft in May we should at least whether we do a quick 15 minute after your recommendations we come in here and we just meet for a half hour so that you have enough time to provide us with the final draft in May so that you can get it out and get it finalized.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

What we've done in the past with other things I think we've had enough discussion. We have some pretty good direction to staff. We can through and approve it pending a draft Chapter 8 per se. And then I can sit with Mike and administration, come up with a dollar amount, put something together, and if you guys have any changes during the May meeting we can just make the final changes and adoption based on those last final changes.

I'm probably going to have a hard time putting something together and back to you guys within

the next two weeks. And then we're back to three weeks, four weeks. So I think I have enough direction. If you guys are comfortable I would like just to make the changes, propose them at the May meeting, and then if there's any changes we can approve it based on those last couple changes. But I think with the direction that we have we should be able to hit it pretty close. I really don't think that we're that far away from where we need to be. We just need to put it in a different format a little bit.

Michealene Day:

Okay, because it seems like no one has a problem with 4 through 7 so that we're all approved of. I'm speaking out loud for everybody. Everybody is shaking their head yes.

Monica Yuhas:

I'm in agreement with that statement.

Michealene Day:

So 4 through 7 is perfect the way you have it. Jean, you did a wonderful job, by the way. And then you'll just clarify and prioritize 8.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Correct.

Michealene Day:

And based on what you guys give us that would be the final as 8 in May.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Correct. And then if you guys would have any comments based off of the Chapter 8 that we do in May, a couple tweaks you want to change, this program for that program, we can make the plan approval based on these couple changes and still keep it on track for Jeans schedule for Plan Commission and Board Commission approvals in May.

Jim Bandura:

But also you're priority list is going to be governed by the dollars allocated.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

It's going to be a very small list. That's why I'm not too concerned about it. It's not like we're going to have 100 things, 10 things. I may there may just be three smaller things funded, and we

won't be doing soccer fields, we won't be doing all these other things. So I guess that's why I'm being a little bit forward on it is that it's pretty easy to come up with \$30,000 or \$40,000 a year. It comes up pretty quick. So 80 percent of these projects are probably going to be beyond the five year scope. And then we may be doing some signs, extending a path, small stuff like that. But once you get into that range you really can't do much with that until the political climate changes. So I'd like to just take a crack at it. I think we can come up with something based on all of our comments, staff comments and speaking with the members of the Board. Have something for you guys in May, and then we can make any final changes and still have it on track.

Michealene Day:

Is everyone happy with that?

Cindy Schwab:

The only thing I have a question about is then when this chart -- we have it dated like X's in what year it was going to be done, but that in itself is [inaudible].

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Right, but that was just for Chapter 7 on some of this stuff. And one of my recommendations was making a five year CIP chart like we did for Chapter 7 for Chapter 8. It wouldn't be very long. It may just have three items in it per se for each of the years, but at least that would give us some sort of structure. And then identify other things that have to be done, but at least identify them beyond the scope of this plan.

Cindy Schwab:

So you still think this chart is doable?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I think everything in Chapter 7 is more public participation, talking to -- getting our parks out, fundraising, accepting donations, stuff like that. Chapter 7 really isn't very capital CIP oriented per se, where Chapter 8 really is where the money is going to be spent. So we would take that same format that would provide some consistency in the plan for 8 and 7.

William Mills:

John, you know I think that there's some things that are still capital intensive in this chart. I'm just looking at a couple of things, construct a new restroom, concession building for Pleasant Prairie Park. So I think you bring up a good point. I do think that there's probably some things in this chart with the dates on it that you have to go back and --

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Sure, sure. We can go through and verify Chapter 7 and Chapter 8 within the budget constraints that we've been given this evening and then go from there. Excellent. Thank you.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Again, part of the park plan also is not just to be a CIP just so that you understand. And while there are a number of qualifying statements both at the beginning and the end of each of these chapters and specifically Chapter 8, I think it's important that you still need to identify some ultimate goals for the park. And if we have to tie that to like what we said at the very beginning, 2035, I think we need to do that. Because if all of a sudden there's something that someone wants to apply for a grant for and it's not in the park plan, they're going to say why isn't it in the park plan? You really didn't need it to begin with.

So what I tried to do is go back to the previous park plans that have been done by the Village and say ultimately, yes, this is one of our goals. That at some point we would like to see this in our park, and that's why I qualified it so many times with respect to the budget considerations and constraints throughout the chapter. But at the end you're right, if we prioritize what's really realistic based on \$50,000 a year that doesn't mean that without receiving some grants or donations or acquisitions that other things aren't possible. And I just feel that if they're not shown in here it's not meeting the objective of what the park plan is supposed to be based on the outline I received from the State. So I just want to make sure that the park plan encompasses those things but qualifies that we are limited on what we can physically and what we can do based on our budgets.

Jim Bandura:

It's still a vision.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Right, and that's what the park plan is supposed to be, part vision but part direction of specific things you can accomplish within a reasonable period of time.

Jim Bandura:

So prioritizing then at least then captures in Chapter 8 based on dollars that could be allocated would at least answer that issue.

William Mills:

So it seems like to me Chapter 7 we mention in the verbiage that it was sort of aspirational sorts of thoughts. But listening to Mike's sort of concerns, and really when I went through it I really like

how you did this, Jean, because it's not only just capital. It goes into what we can do without even money through the chart that has the Xs on it. It looks like we've also put capital in there as well specifically for 2014 or 2015. And based on Mike's concerns maybe that's just a little too specific. I don't know what your thoughts are, Mike, but from what I'm hearing you say it's one thing to have it in Chapter 7 that, hey, we want to improve the concessions in Pleasant Prairie Park. That's aspirational. It's an other to put on here that we want to do it in 2014 or 215.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

So maybe the time frame gets taken out. That was something that the previous consultant put in there, and everyone here thought that was such a good idea so that's why I left it in. But maybe that's what's the problem. Maybe you leave some of these and we take those time frames out because maybe they really aren't very realistic.

William Mills:

And I was one of them that when I read this the other night I thought this was really good the way it was written out here. But maybe based on budget constraints that we have today we have to look at doing it a little bit more realistically.

Monica Yuhas:

I like the word focus, like what the Commission is going to focus on in the next five years. What are those priorities and are they obtainable. And that's not to take out anything else that you've listed, Jean, in case there are grants or there are donations like you said. You want to keep those in there just in case something does happen. But we need to have that focus and that realistic expectation that can be met on a yearly basis with the budget constraints that we are dealing with now.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

So in the Chapter 7 are you suggesting that we remove all the years for that stuff? Or --

Jim Bandura:

I think Chapter 7 is going to end up being like a wish list.

Mike Pollocoff:

If Chapter 7 is a priority [inaudible] instead of the years put it as a priority.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Priority one, two, three, four, five?

Voices:

Yes. That's a good idea.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Okay, because that way they're not tied to a specific year. Because it really depends on availability of staff time as well for the non capital intensive items. The last items in the chapter following Chapter 8 are all those conceptual plans. And, again, I really view this as an update to the previous park plan and each subsequent park plan should be. So as we continue to do conceptual plans I think that they should be added in here. The unfortunate thing is we don't have really any consistency as to how they're designed or drawn or anything, but I think that's okay. I think that they were all done at different levels, at different details, but I'm guessing the Park Commission may not even have known about some of these other neighborhood schools sites proposed and some of these other things. And so we were not going to change the format other than just numbering the pages but just keeping adding them so that it's an inclusive document as you continue to move forward in the next five years as well.

Michealene Day:

Good idea.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

There were two chapters in the previous park plan that talked about specific cost estimates for very specific parks. The question is whether or not they stay in here or we remove them. Are they still realistic? There were cost estimates done for Creekside Park and Pleasant Prairie Park and Momper's Woods. I'm not sure if that's needed as part of the park plan itself.

Michealene Day:

I would say no. I think that the cost, the cost would change so much since it's not something that we're going to be looking at developing within the next five years. What the cost in today's dollars would be in five or ten years would be so totally different that --

Mike Pollocoff:

My recommendation would be the Commission have the staff price out whatever ends up being on the priority list.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Right.

Michealene Day:

Yes.

Mike Pollocoff:

The rest of the stuff is I agree with you. Pricing CIP and construction out that far is not realistic.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

And then the last thing was that last appendix that talks about potential funding sources. I need to actually go through that because I think there have been some major changes in the State, and there's some major changes now with stewardship funding and such. So I'm not sure all of these funding sources are even still available. But I just wanted to let you know that we were working on that, and we will have that in the final one as well.

And then the last thing I just wanted to mention is, again, for the first three chapters we have already put it in its final format and then have inserted a number of photographs, documents, charts, different things that we have had in previous chapters. We're getting a lot of the pictures and everything but it takes time to do that. So we're going to on Monday start formatting all these chapters, and we're almost out of time because the notice gets published a week from tomorrow.

Michealene Day:

Oh, wow.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

So from our standpoint I need to try to get this in final format really within a week. I mean if there's a chapter or two, that one chapter, that Chapter 8, that probably will be a draft and we won't have that final maybe within the next couple weeks. But the other chapters are going to have to be finalized. Because once we publish I have to have it available.

Michealene Day:

Sure, I understand, and we seem to be fine with those.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Even though it's in draft at this point.

Michealene Day:

Any other questions? Hearing none, I guess can we have a formal motion then that we accept items 4 through 7 as amended or discussed, and we'll do the final on Chapter 8 I guess. Do you need a motion to accept?

Monica Yuhas:

I'll make a motion to approve the final draft of the master plan with the discussed changes to Chapter 7 and 8 draft.

Monica Yuhas moved to approve Approve Master Park Plan Chapters 4-8 with the discussed changes to Chapter 7 and 8 draft: Seconded by Jim Bandura. Motion carried 5-0.

Monica Yuhas:

Jean, thank you so much. I can't even imagine the hours that went into this and the detail.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

A lot, yes.

Monica Yuhas:

But it's so well written. Thank you for the time and effort that you've put into this.

Michealene Day:

Most definitely. I think the next plaque goes to Jean Werbie.

7. PARK COMMISSION COMMENTS

Michealene Day:

Any comments? The only comment I've had, and it hasn't been negative, just a question. We're not doing Pleasant Prairie Days this year? We're going to do something else. The concern was no children's activities then since we're not planning anything for family, if this is just an adult thing that we're going to do?

Mike Pollocoff:

We come back to that same old problem I was talking about. Since we made money on Family

Days last year only because we didn't shoot the fireworks off, outside of that it ends up being -- the Village general fund can't fund it. We have a hard time getting enough sponsors to fund it. We got that funded. RecPlex can't absorb a subsidy to fund it. They're looking at doing some kind of activities out in the park during the summer. We're going to have one less triathlon that's going to be replaced by a swim meet which financially is going to be good for the Village. But we just really weren't getting the turnout for Family Days like we did. And the major thing for Family Days was everybody wanted it to be at no cost. And that's just exceedingly difficult to do.

So part of the survey work that was done for the Rec Master Plan was everybody liked Family Days but they wanted it to cost less than they were paying at Family Days anyway which was not a lot. The next thing that people wanted was music in the park, they wanted art in the park. There were really big numbers for that. So the Rec Commission decided to -- we talked to the sponsor for the fireworks, I didn't but somebody did, and said that they're willing to have their name associated with that. So we're going to use the fireworks for the Music in the Prairie I think is what it is.

--:

Night in the Prairie.

Mike Pollocoff:

Night in the Prairie, and we're going to have a mix of music out there. I don't think there's going to be an art show there. I think it's just going to be music and see what we do. Because that was requested. But I think just the reality of having Prairie Family Days like we knew it, it was a better deal when it was easier to raise funds. Jean worked really hard to get the fundraising for the last one. She's the one out beating the community up for dollars, and we really don't turn out a very big turnout. The people that go there like it, but I was taken aback by how much people said it still costs too much to go to Family Days. But at the end of the day there's no free lunches anymore. And there's still a chance, we're still looking for sponsors for Night in the Prairie.

Michealene Day:

So then just so I can -- so the tournaments for the softball because that was always kind of in conjunction with the tournaments, so the tournaments will be held, they'll just go do the tournament and go home?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Not the same day.

Mike Pollocoff:

The tournaments will be a little bit later in the season for the tournaments. For a while there, there was a while when we were making money on it. And then there was a while where the Village was subsidizing it. Then we couldn't subsidize it, then RecPlex was subsidizing it. And RecPlex didn't want to subsidize it anymore because they didn't want to raise fees to subsidize a free event.

Michealene Day:

No, I totally understand. I was specifically asked since this is adult oriented was there going to be anything for family. Now I can tell them no, not at this time.

Mike Pollocoff:

Not at this time. We put out some requests for people to volunteer at Family Days and we didn't get --

Michealene Day:

Oh, no, nobody wants to volunteer, no.

Mike Pollocoff:

We didn't get any takers. But we did get them for the arts. They created an arts council for Pleasant Prairie. So in that respect the survey was correct. There were people fired up about getting involved in that.

Michealene Day:

Okay.

Mike Pollocoff:

Maybe Family Days will come back as a different thing. But right now it's just tough to get off the ground.

--:

Weren't there other activities, too, that day, Kenosha Area Tourism doing the dragon boat races?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes, there's going to be dragon boat races which is not really family. Families can watch it, but it's adults that compete against other teams on the same day as the music's going to be there. And

we talked about finding a way to have some of the things that people like like the boat rides and some of that stuff. But then that conflicts with the dragon boat races. And there just wasn't a ground swell. I mean I'm sure there will be a ground swell when it's time for people to go to a fireworks show. And they'll probably show up for the one we're going to have for the Night in the Prairie. But we're not going to campaign next year for fireworks at the Night in the Prairie either. Basically you really have to work people over to get \$15,000 to shoot it off in the sky that night. Our hope is that citizens come together that really want to get it going just like they have for the music and take an interest in getting it going and getting it started.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

And really that's the one thing that Mike has been trying to drive home from the very beginning is that it can't just be the Village staff that is coordinating and running all these events. In order to get the people, the community interested, you need to get them involved, the community involved in trying to coordinate and run it. And the group that they had formed initially was a little nervous, but now they're excited, they're enthusiastic and it's starting to take off. Really to make it more of a community event as opposed to a Village event, I think that's when the ideas and the creativity and maybe the money will come back to make these events more successful.

Mike Pollocoff:

In a way we spoiled some people. A lot of Village people are saying entertain me. Put something on that will entertain me. And after a while I think if the arts council grows and maybe some other things, we're open to helping people put something together, create the venue, do what we have to do. But to start from scratch and run it and then trying to leverage our finances at times like this against being able to fundraise is just out of the question.

Michealene Day:

I understand. I said I'd ask.

Mike Pollocoff:

I'm sure we'll get some push back when we come to the date and it doesn't happen.

Michealene Day:

And then this is not Parks at all, but I was asked to ask at the RecPlex as it's a health facility, and this is not me, it's not me, it's not me but I said I'd ask --

Mike Pollocoff:

The tanning?

Michealene Day:

The tanning is a cancer driven option, and why the heck, and it wasn't the word heck, are we tanning when it's such a detriment to your health?

Mike Pollocoff:

Again, that was when we did the survey of the members. That was like the number two item that people wanted.

Michealene Day:

Then this was the caveat, God, I hate even saying this. Then you should put just like cigarettes are posted this may be hazardous to your health. That a sign above the tanning booth should say that enter at your own risk, tanning has been found to be cancerous.

Monica Yuhas:

They do sign waivers, don't they Mike, to use the beds?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes.

Monica Yuhas:

So they're aware before they go in. They do sign a waiver.

Mike Pollocoff:

We don't want children or teenagers. We went back and forth over this, but it's what, like I said, it was a really high demand item. Almost any other recreation facility or club provides the same service. I think almost anybody who works there said you're not going to catch me in there because it seems contrary to the mission. I don't know how long that will last to be honest with you. But it wasn't that expensive to start it up and do it. And I think we're not going to make money on it, I think we'll break even. And if we start losing money on it, it will be out of there. It was kind of slow when we first put it in and now it's going crazy.

Michealene Day:

It's getting to summer and people want to look good.

Mike Pollocoff:

Look good before they have to go outside and look good. I don't know.

Michealene Day:

Okay, I did my due diligence by bringing it up.

Cindy Schwab:

I just have one other thing. In regards to the sled hill, I think next year maybe it should be thought out a little bit. Every time I was there it was scary to see the people that were nearly getting hit by cars. I saw two kids slide underneath cars. So I think maybe the parking we should maybe mark the parking because it was like probably -- I mean it was busy and it was popular, and I think that was the down side, but there wasn't places to park. So people were parking on that one side of the hill and kids were running into it underneath the cars. So maybe next year we can -- I don't know if it's a possibility to mark off a certain area.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Yeah, we are looking to making some improvements by paving the path coming in and the parking lot, part of our paving program this year. And the hill was intended for sledding on north and south, not east and west. And for some reason everybody decided to sled to the east. So it's our plan to plant some trees, put some fencing up, make some deterrents on the east side that eliminate people from sledding off to the east. And I do agree it definitely was a problem, and it just kind of all of a sudden it went from no one sledding to 80 people there sledding in one snowstorm. And we really weren't that prepared to have that much of an impact. So we are looking at staff on putting some signage and doing some things that will keep people from sledding east and just having them go north and south. So I do appreciate the comment, and we will work forward to do that.

Michealene Day:

Any other comments?

8. ADJOURNMENT

Monica Yuhás moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by William Mills. Motion carried 5-0.

Meeting adjourned 7:26pm.