

**VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE  
PARK COMMISSION  
Village Hall Auditorium  
9915 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Pleasant Prairie, Wisconsin 53158  
May 1, 2012  
6:00 p.m.**

A regular meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Park Commission was held on Tuesday, May 1, 2012, 6:00 p.m. Present were Michealene Day, Rita Christiansen, Glenn Christiansen, Monica Yuhas, William Mills, Cindy Schwab (Alternate #1) and Jim Bandura (Alternate #2). Steve Kundert was excused. Troy Holm was absent. Also present were Mike Pollocoff, Village Administrator; Tom Shircel, Assistant Administrator; John Steinbrink, Jr., Director of Public Works; Jean Werbie-Harris, Community Development Director; and Ruth Mack-Stoner, Executive Secretary. No citizens were present.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. ROLL CALL**
- 3. MINUTES OF MEETINGS**

Michealene Day:

Minutes of meetings. I don't know that I read mine, I'm sorry. Did everyone get a copy of the minutes from last meeting?

Monica Yuhas:

I did and I'll motion to approve them.

Michealene Day:

Can I have a second?

Jim Bandura:

Second.

Michealene Day:

All in favor?

**Monica Yuhas moved to approve the Park Commission Meeting minutes of the April 4,**

**2012 meeting presented in their written form: Seconded by Jim Bandura. Motion carried 7-0.**

**4. CITIZEN COMMENTS**

**5. NEW BUSINESS**

**a) Receive Village community garden update.**

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Madam Chair and Park Commission, last weekend I met with Kate Fields, Barb Larson, Cindy Schwab, Jenell the wellness coordinator at RecPlex, Ruth Mack-Stoner and myself to talk about the project of the community garden. And the results of that were we have talked with the Tremper construction group, and they have volunteered to build us three more boxes, and they are being built this week, so that will bring our total boxes up to six boxes for our community garden. We are looking at moving a storage shed that we're not using at one of our park sites to the community garden so we can use that for storing tools, supplies, hoses, items like that, so that will be happening next week.

And we're looking at using a combination of volunteers as we had last year, the Master Gardeners from the Master Gardener program at UW Extension. And Jenell has been heading up a walk, week and feed program as part of a fitness and lifestyle program at the Lakeview RecPlex, so they will basically start at the RecPlex, do a small talk there, walk half way around the lake to the north side of the lake where they'll learn a little bit about gardening, pull some weeds, do some maintenance to the gardens and then they'll walk back. So it's kind of a cross between some fitness and gardening. So we're very excited about that program hopefully taking up well. We're looking at planting the beds in May with the date to be determined. And we'll probably have a press release out on that a week or so before we decide to do that weather pending.

Michealene Day:

Perfect. Any comments?

Monica Yuhas:

I would just like to say I'm happy to see that the comments that were made at the last meeting from the citizens have been incorporated into what's moving forward. So it's always nice to have that input because who would have thought about the shed?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

That's correct.

Michealene Day:

Cindy, how do you think it went?

Cindy Schwab:

Very good. I ran into Jenell and she was saying that [inaudible] sign up would be interested in that walking [inaudible] four people that work there. Oh, my gosh, that's great, I really want to do that. So she said so far [inaudible] but she said already there's been [inaudible] from staff [inaudible].

Michealene Day:

Terrific. Thank you for your help. Any other comments or questions?

**b) Review Master Park Plan 2012 - 2016.**

Mike Pollocoff:

Did everybody receive a copy of the draft?

Voices:

Yes.

Mike Pollocoff:

Just to reiterate what we talked about at our last meeting, my intent on this is to spend some time going through it, and we don't have to complete the whole plan tonight, and we don't have to complete it in the next three meetings or four meetings. But I wanted to give us an opportunity to go through the plan and look over. I have some comments on it, and I'm sure the rest of the staff here have some comments that we can interject into it or include. Everything, of course, that we're doing here is on the machine, and we'll be able to get that incorporated in as a change. And, to be honest, if we think there's some more maps or plans that we need to include in this that's fine as well.

The Rec Commission is going to be starting – their plan is in better shape for lack of a better description than this one. But they're still going to be going through it. They're just not going to make an adoption of it. But I want to be honest with you. As you read through this, one of the recommendations was reintegrating recreation and park together. And as I became more convinced as time went on through that process of the plan development that that wasn't going to work for a number of reasons. Probably the biggest reason in my mind is that the recreation enterprise being self-funding, they really

run on a different mission than parks in the sense that they want to provide good recreational services as best they can, and it's obvious we've given them a facility that provides the opportunity for that to happen. But in order to make sure that happens they really run recreation as a business enterprise and not as a community supported, tax based supported entity which is what we always envisioned parks being.

Fundamentally parks are those open spaces or those even developed recreational spaces that everybody has open access to, you shouldn't have to pay to use them, they're there for the public in general, and if we do something there that's over and above what you might have in that space, if we have baseball games or if somebody wants to rent something specific that's fine, but the basic fundamental structure both in the charter accounts for the State and how we account for our money, and how we've operated all along is that parks should be in their basic level open to everybody and not have a cost assigned to them. Now, that cuts both ways. The funding of them always is tenuous. All of you have been around here for enough budgets to know that parks doesn't always get everything funded that it would like, but we've tried to fund every year as much as we can. But it still is a tax based funded thing.

I just think given the size and the scope of RecPlex I just don't see the two merging carefully. Now, that being said, I don't think there's a reason why there shouldn't be some people from Rec or from Park that want to get together and work on projects that [inaudible] to recreation or the open spaces that can be recreation oriented, those special things can come about. I think I leave that up to both Commissions to identify people who want to do that. But in order for the Village to guarantee that the recreation enterprise is self-sustaining, we need to make sure that its efforts are focused on those revenue generating items that pay for the personnel and the facilities that we have to pay for for recreation.

That was really why we separated it to begin with. It really got to be I think for the members that were here back when we were doing it, it just got to be a real drill. And I think that conflict between we should be doing this for everybody or we should be doing it for the members or we should be doing it for people who are users really got to be a conflict because it is two different issues. So I'm just telling you ahead of time I'm really going to be pushing from the staff's perspective that that is not a good thing to incorporate.

But if you disagree with me, that being said, if you disagree me by all means voice it out. It's not my decision, it's your decision how we structure that. But my goal is to have both Commissions kind of follow the mission they are. We have a hard enough time keeping the parks set up with what we want to do rather than having that diluted by recreation. I'm really more worried about recreation diluting the effort in parks than I am parks diluting recreation. So, that is kind of sprinkled through this plan, and I'll be doing the same thing with the Recreation Commission. So if you hear anything from your compadres over there, that's the same story I'm giving them.

Michealene Day:

Well, that was one of the things I had marked at the very executive summary, the primary goals of this plan on page X-1 was explore to create a new Parks and Recreation Commission, so I guess I was going to say I didn't think that that was such a good idea.

Mike Pollocoff:

Yeah, and I don't think the consultant really processed that our completely. I think it's pretty standard in places. It's very typical of parks and recreation, but it's not typical to have a 300,000 square foot recreation facility that's as big as RecPlex. It's the elephant in the room, and there's some rooms we don't want that elephant in. Is there any other comments on the executive summary?

Michealene Day:

The other thing that I think that the consultant really did not listen to us with was the Lake Michigan Park. I think that he was pretty insistent that that park needs to be developed and go in, and I've been there and done that with that area, and you're spinning your wheels. Nobody wants it except for this consultant wants it. And so there's monies in the study about it. There's talk about it, and truthfully when we were first talking about it and we had that meeting I thought I was lucky to get out of here without being tarred and feathered. I would really like to keep the skin on my body. I really don't want to do that again.

I just don't see that the populus here is really all that interested in developing that park. And if we have resources we have a lot of other projects to invest our monies in. So I guess I just don't see that as being one of the area that we need to concentrate at least in this initial five year plan.

Mike Pollocoff:

Right. I guess I don't know what everybody else thinks, but there's been a few changes in people since we went through that skinning as you aptly described it as to what people think. What they came up with was a nice little plan for the beaches there, but I don't want to say politically, but just from the neighborhood standpoint it's a different kind of cat. I don't want to pick on Cindy because she lives down there.

Cindy Schwab:

I guess my concern with what they did is, one, the space. There's already not enough parking down there already to try to draw more people without really – the streets are narrow.

Michealene Day:

That was the initial –

Cindy Schwab:

And there's not enough places for people – when you see people down there on the beach, the beach is packed, and they're talking about taking more space away from people to actually sit and enjoy the beach, to put a building and an outhouse. And I think people really just want to enjoy the beach. They don't want to worry about a shower and all that. That was my biggest concern was it's taking space away from what people really enjoy doing at the beach which is playing in the sand, laying out. Pleasant Prairie doesn't really own a whole lot there, and that space [inaudible] there's not even enough space [inaudible].

Monica Yuhas:

Do we have any numbers as to how many people throughout this summer used that beach?

Mike Pollocoff:

I think the PD might have some that they've gotten. There's times when it gets quite a bit of use. And it really is, at least from the cars, there's a lot of people that are from Illinois. People that live in the area can just walk over there.

Glenn Christiansen:

That was going to be my question because recently Rita and I spent some time visiting some of the different beaches. We started up by Racine and went all the way down to parks down in Illinois, and it was kind of strange when you think about it, this is a small park, very limited, let's not even talk acreage. We're talking about square feet. By comparison these other parks have enormous beaches, and the reason why they're coming here, unlike the other beaches, the road is right up to the sand and the water is unrestricted, and you're missing the one big element, and I think that [inaudible] either you dedicate traffic cops down there that control the parks and then put in the infrastructure and all that or don't bother [inaudible]. I think Cindy is right. Do we really want to go there?

Rita Christiansen:

I also have an additional comment if I can jump in. One of the things on here is construct specialty park elements such as dog park, etc. If there is parks throughout the Village to provide a variety of exposure to other parks other than Prairie Springs Park. So when I

read through this and really had time to really digest what that really means is we want to try and get the community out to the other parks. And it gave me an opportunity to rethink some of the conceptual plans that we've done, etc., especially in regards to perhaps for an example would be the soccer field. When we think about it we want to move people to other areas.

There's an opportunity, Ingram's got 31 acres. It's a flat surface. It may not be quite as expensive to put the soccer fields there versus impacting a perhaps environmental corridor on the north side of Prairie Spring Park. So for me this was great, although I do have multiple tags and things that I like to say. But I think we need to keep that in mind how we can spread it out to the other parks to get people to utilize those other parks and not focus everything. I think that's been what we try and do sometimes, but really let's try and get things away from Prairie Springs Park when we can so we can get the community to enjoy the other parks and not have so much weight on that park, too. I imagine John could tell us it probably takes a beating sometimes because there's so much traffic. And Ingram is only like a mile away, it's not that far. So, again, it's an opportunity for us to maybe rethink some things.

Glenn Christiansen:

Another something in this process that all of a sudden kind of made me want to step back and look at the whole picture, instead of looking at snapshots on the map, and that's kind of how we've been looking at it in a sense, all of a sudden you start to realize that [inaudible] and Prairie Springs Park for all practical purposes are really two parks. They're completely different in natural area from Lake Andrea and the RecPlex. You could almost start to say it's three features all tied together purely by geography but having little in common otherwise. Because you have a lake that has manicured borders and not [inaudible] has an awful lot of very important aspects to it. You have the RecPlex, but we all realize the tremendous facility to say the very least. And then you have the natural areas that have so far remained totally undeveloped. But it's a completely different element from the lake for the RecPlex, and to try and combine them when you look at it as one big park [inaudible].

Michealene Day:

Well, I guess we should, because this is a huge, huge document, Mike would you suggest that – because I don't want to get into theories and that kind of thing right now. What I would like to suggest is maybe we go page by page and see what – and that was pretty much what I started out with because the rest of it is really just indexing with the first page. And I don't know if that's how we would want to start doing this is if there are any issues –

Mike Pollocoff:

[Inaudible]

Glenn Christiansen:

I agree.

Michealene Day:

Also on that first page I had a question about the importance or one of the primary goals would be to create a nonprofit entity to assist the Village with park improvements. Is that something that is a primary goal?

Mike Pollocoff:

[Inaudible]

Michealene Day:

But I mean I don't know that I would list that as on your very first page one as one of your primary goals of the plan. I'm sorry, Jean?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

[Inaudible] but that's actually their number one goal [inaudible].

Michealene Day:

Yeah, I know.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

[Inaudible] so these maybe are more purposes of the plan [inaudible]. And we talked about this in the past [inaudible].

Michealene Day:

It is not.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

[Inaudible] or some other group, and we can go through it later [inaudible] a good way to get the community involved [inaudible]. Many other communities have a lot of things that are dedicated [inaudible] so it's not a bad goal. I don't know if you want to [inaudible] because I thought they were giving us all the goals in the first place. [Inaudible]



Michealene Day:

I saw that and I did have a problem with that being our number one goal, but we were only on page 1 of 77.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

These aren't in order of priority.

Michealene Day:

Oh, it's not, okay.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

[Inaudible]

Michealene Day:

No, but I mean when we get back to page 77, which I didn't mean to jump ahead, but that's goal number one, and I thought, well, I don't know if that would be the Park Commission's first goal is to form a –

Mike Pollocoff:

[Inaudible]

Michealene Day:

So I don't know if – I just brought it up because that's what I saw that page one right away was that I did not feel that that was – I think we have a lot of stuff on our plate, and I did not feel that it was one of the major goals that I would think would be first priority. But we've got a large Commission here so I don't know what everybody else thinks.

William Mills:

I had the same comments. The two on page one I struck out, explore the opportunity to create a new Parks and Recreation Commission very much like Mike had mentioned. I had the same thing about striking the nonprofit entity. One of the things that I wonder if we shouldn't add to this, and it kind of goes back to when we did this in 2006 or '05 it was, is I think we're trying to maximize grants as well. I mean that's one of the things that maybe as we are thinking about it's very similar to what we did at the last point, and to be maybe thinking about what grants there are that are available and how we craft a

plan to maximize that would be my only other suggestion.

Rita Christiansen:

And actually the plan does address grants and a suggestion of finding someone to write those grants and identify them, etc. So perhaps outside of the Village staff there might be somebody that could do that. So I think we'll get into that later on.

Glenn Christiansen:

I have a comment, what Mike was saying before about the [inaudible] we do have different missions really. I agree with that. This [inaudible] nonprofit entity, the one thing is my experience over the years, I've been on boards of directors for [inaudible] nonprofits over the years, and they have the ability to do things like we were talking about that the Village can't do. A good example when the Kenosha/Racine Land Trust was evolved with the Des Plaines River [inaudible] grant. Without their assistance that never could have happened. So having a nonprofit group constituted to carry out those kinds of things could be of enormous benefit here, because they can go after money that the Village cannot go after. And is that something that people from this group and from the Rec group, the one woman made that comment, I can't remember who it was, about raising money.

Mike Pollocoff:

There are ideas [inaudible] some of our better nonprofit relationships are where people got together [inaudible]. I think my only comment on that, what I'm trying to get at is I think nonprofits [inaudible] but we shouldn't be creating [inaudible]. More citizens come to us and say we really need a roller skate park or whatever it is [inaudible].

Michealene Day:

Exactly.

Glenn Christiansen:

And a group outside of the Village government but within the Village so to speak because that was one of the problems that we wrestled with. There was a group of us from Kenosha County in the Land Trust, and those were the ones with the addition of [inaudible] who oddly enough was from Racine who really felt passionate about the Des Plaines River. So it would be great if you could get a group of people who would say, hey, what can we do with some of the stuff in the community? How can we work to restore some of these woods, deal with the Des Plaines River, what can we do to help down at Chiwaukee Prairie and so on and so forth. But, yes, it should be separate.

Mike Pollocoff:

I'd recommend [inaudible].

Glenn Christiansen:

But not be the Village.

Jim Bandura:

Right, just like start a seed then just put it out there to say, hey, you know these are our parks, what do you think? How can we raise funds and not us being the head of the not for profit.

Mike Pollocoff:

[Inaudible] it goes farther and the people that are doing it are happier doing it [inaudible].

Jim Bandura:

When you pull somebody in like that, how do you really pull them in? I'm just thinking of advertising.

Mike Pollocoff:

[Inaudible]

Jim Bandura:

Yeah, and I think you just mentioned the seed. The seed is once this is completed just put it out there for the public, and that seed just put it out on the table.

Michealene Day:

Okay, then we're suggesting and everybody is in agreement that instead of create a nonprofit entity we would encourage a nonprofit. Okay, we finished one whole page, and it only took us 35 minutes.

Cindy Schwab:

I actually have a question. To me this doesn't – maybe I'm just being particular, but this sentence about what will be unique about this plan [inaudible].

Michealene Day:

What paragraph are you on?

Cindy Schwab:

The first paragraph. It says prepared and [inaudible] for the Recreation Commission. Shouldn't it say for the Park Commission?

Michealene Day:

Yes.

Mike Pollocoff:

[Inaudible] eliminate the language [inaudible].

Michealene Day:

Yeah, we're going to take all of that out. We don't want to merge.

Mike Pollocoff:

[Inaudible]

Glenn Christiansen:

Do we need a vote on that and get it over with right now?

Michealene Day:

How does everyone – do we want to merge with the Rec –

Glenn Christiansen:

I make a motion no.

Michealene Day:

Rita?

Rita Christiansen:

No.

Michealene Day:

Me, no.

Monica Yuhas:

No.

William Mills:

No.

Cindy Schwab:

No.

Jim Bandura:

No.

Michealene Day:

Okay, unanimous.

Jim Bandura:

Mike does make a very valid point about that they need to bring in the revenue for the RecPlex.

Michealene Day:

So I guess our recommendation is to exclude anything in the plan that says we're going to be one Commission.

Mike Pollocoff:

We'll bring this back to you [inaudible].

Monica Yuhas:

Do we have a mission statement?

Michealene Day:

Yes, we do.

Rita Christiansen:

Thank you for asking that question.

Monica Yuhas:

And does that mission statement need to be revised to go with what is going on currently with the –

Rita Christiansen:

It says here that we don't have one but we do and, Jean, I was actually going to call today and I apologize, I would have to go back into my dusty book from way back in the beginning of time. Do you remember what it was by any chance? We'd have to look it up and get it to everybody.

William Mills:

We could have that for the next meeting.

Rita Christiansen:

But we definitely could review it.

Monica Yuhas:

Because mission statements tend to be effective for so long because times change, communities change and you have to move with it, and I could not find a mission statement anywhere.

Rita Christiansen:

We do.

Michealene Day:

We do have a mission statement.

Rita Christiansen:

The three of us were part of the original group that crafted that. Were you involved in that, too?

William Mills:

No, I think that goes back to the documents [inaudible].

Rita Christiansen:

We'll have to find that. I'll see if I can find it and I'll send it to –

Mike Pollocoff:

Dust that off and [inaudible].

Monica Yuhas:

I think it should be included in the plan.

Rita Christiansen:

Absolutely.

Glenn Christiansen:

I agree.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

And actually the statement of philosophy that's on page three does refer to the mission statement. And I guess that was something that I would think that the Park Commission would take a special look at to see if this is your statement of philosophy of what you believe that the role and the goal is of the Park Commission and the park system for the Village [inaudible] tied together.

Mike Pollocoff:

[Inaudible]

Michealene Day:

Was there any other changes that people saw on page xi, the very first one?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I just found one typo on the third line. The original Park and Open Space Plan was 2006-

2011, so we just corrected that.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

And actually is it a Park and Open space or a Parks and Open Space. I think it's Park, right, so we have to correct all those without those.

Rita Christiansen:

There were so many typographical errors and grammar it was pretty sad actually. The quality of the workmanship of the document was lacking.

Michealene Day:

Any other corrections on page xi? Xii?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

There are two typos on that page but we'll correct those.

Michealene Day:

Okay. Anyone have any problems with the verbiage at all on that page?

Rita Christiansen:

No.

Michealene Day:

Then we move to introduction. Any comments on page 1 on the introduction?

Rita Christiansen:

John, I do have a question just to verify. It says the last paragraph, the third sentence. Regarding the acquisition of proposed additional parklands, the 2006 plan recommended the Village of Pleasant Prairie acquire three community parks over the next 25 years. Is that what we recommended? I don't remember. Is it? Okay.

Michealene Day:

Hearing no objections to page 1 we move onto page 2.

Jim Bandura:



Jean, I do see where you mean about parks and park, parks and open space. It's referred all different ways.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

We'll correct all those.

Michealene Day:

Any questions on 2? Page 3, format of the plan. Under that section anyone have any comments?

Rita Christiansen:

None.

Monica Yuhas:

I guess with all the documents I've read in the last five years I've never seen where they tell me that a chapter is the longest.

Michealene Day:

Yeah.

Monica Yuhas:

When you look at the first sentence in the second paragraph on page 3 to me that's not pertinent and it doesn't belong in the document and I'd like to see that removed.

Mike Pollocoff:

The sentence or the paragraph?

Michealene Day:

No, just the words.

Monica Yuhas:

That Chapter 4 is the longest chapter. How is that significant? The whole document is lengthy.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Going back to page 2, the last sentence, with a time line for implementation this plan may actually happen.

Michealene Day:

I didn't see that.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

I would like something more positive put in.

Michealene Day:

Yeah, I think so, too.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

It just made me chuckle.

Michealene Day:

Yeah, I read through that twice now and I missed it.

Rita Christiansen:

You're okay with the sentence before that, Jean?

Monica Yuhas:

I'd like to see it end at better agency, period.

Rita Christiansen:

Yes, exactly.

Michealene Day:

Take out the last two sentences.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

And I don't like the word agency because we're really a community, not an agency, and

that word is throughout the document, and I've corrected all those and took out agency. Because sometimes it might be Park Commission, sometimes it's Village. But if we just refer to us as the community I think that's a better word.

Mike Pollocoff:

That's an Illinois word.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

It is an Illinois word.

Michealene Day:

So agency equals community.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

And actually the third paragraph on that same page I'd re-word some of that language as well.

Michealene Day:

Alright.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

So on page 3 is that where you're talking about maybe inserting the mission statement and kind of dovetail that with the statement of philosophy? Is that where you were looking at putting it in?

Monica Yuhas:

I think so. I should be at the beginning of the plan so people have an idea as to why the pages preceding are following that mission statement.

Mike Pollocoff:

I think he took a lot of license in already integrating recreation and parks throughout that whole thing.

Michealene Day:

The whole statement of philosophy I just think that our mission statement should go

there. I don't even think that the statement of philosophy is relevant if we just put our mission statement there. Then, again, it does need updating.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

How long is the mission statement? What does it say again?

Michealene Day:

I don't remember.

Rita Christiansen:

I'll have to look it up.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Does it talk about a financial budget and things like that? Does it talk about all those things in there?

Rita Christiansen:

I don't remember.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Maybe it does need to be updated.

Michealene Day:

It definitely needs to be updated because it was done very early.

Rita Christiansen:

I'll try to see if I can find it. Peggy may have it also, that's how far back it goes. I'll look for it and send it on if I can find it.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Because these paragraphs do make some sense, and especially the last paragraph does make some sense.

Michealene Day:

On this page or on page 4?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Yeah, on page 3 I think it's good.

Monica Yuhas:

That's the paragraph I liked on that page.

Michealene Day:

So just integrate this statement of philosophy with our mission statement then. Okay.

Glenn Christiansen:

But we'd have to update our mission statement.

Michealene Day:

Oh, I'm sure.

Rita Christiansen:

We need to know what it is first.

Michealene Day:

Page 4. Did we anywhere in this booklet have, and I didn't see it but I didn't really read it 100 percent, we reference on the very first paragraph of the very first sentence about the 2010 bicycle and pedestrian trail plans, but we don't really – someone reading this they're going to say, well, what is that plan? Do we need to say anything about it, or is it just fine leaving that sentence in there?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I thought that the bike and ped plan was actually an amendment to the original Park and Open Space Plan. But I would presume that that would carry over to be a part of that.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Are you asking for just a sentence to explain it?

Jim Bandura:

I think it should be integrated into this. I was unclear on, okay, our deal was to bring the bike paths through the parks and to some of the parks and things of that sort. So I think this has to be a little bit more integrated into this.

Mike Pollocoff:

It just wasn't a very artful sentence to describe the two being together [inaudible].

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

And so we're actually going to take the bike and ped plan and incorporating it on the tail end of this plan? So when you look for the bike and ped plan it is actually located within this document.

Michealene Day:

I believe it should be because this is the newest. No one is going to go back to the old one to see what it was.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

As an appendix, John?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Correct.

Mike Pollocoff:

Make sure that all the ties [inaudible]. I didn't check that at all.

Jim Bandura:

I don't know, just out of curiosity, because when that was mentioned I went to the very first map because there was a little – on the legend it said on street bike route, and then I started looking to see if there was an overlay to show which way the bike trail was going to go and how they were going to hit the parks so that's my recommendation.

Michealene Day:

Yeah, it doesn't hook them together very well at all. So if you're going to mention the bike path and bike and pedestrian trails plan it's got to tie into each other and a map. Jean, is the last paragraph correct in its statement?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Yes.

Michealene Day:

Any other comments on page 3 or 4? Okay, number 2, community demographics, regional context and Village history.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I don't think the very last paragraph on the bottom I don't think it's quite 39 square miles, 33 something.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

33.57, just under 34, I checked today.

Michealene Day:

Okay, so we'll have to correct that.

Cindy Schwab:

I didn't really like the today the Village of Pleasant Prairie is a unified municipality. I guess that sentence just sounds like we weren't unified, like we weren't a sense of community. The last sentence.

Michealene Day:

It starts on 5 and goes to 6.

Mike Pollocoff:

We weren't as a town.

Cindy Schwab:

I guess I understand that because it's referencing the paragraph above, but then there's this gap that they start talking about the square miles. I don't know, I just think the wording of it is really choppy. I guess you know because you know the history, but I guess grammatically it's really poorly written, when you're asking someone to reference back to the paragraph before. So if we could maybe make that a little bit more cohesive.

Mike Pollocoff:

We can wordsmith that. I can kind of see where they picked this up, like pieces from the website.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

From the website, some from the comp. plan, yeah.

Cindy Schwab:

And that's what it looks like.

Michealene Day:

Like somebody copied and pasted.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

But the previous one really didn't give us much history at all. So actually I thought that he did a much better job in tying this together. That last sentence I had a question like where did that come from.

Cindy Schwab:

That's what I feel like.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

There could be a little bit more to explain. I mean the Town was the Town, and they really weren't doing development. There wasn't growth and there wasn't really a park system that they wanted to build and expand. When I came here that wasn't one of their missions.

Mike Pollocoff:

We did have Tobin fighting with Carol Beach and Carol Beach fighting with – we had all these little enclaves of knuckleheads.

Cindy Schwab:

It's really the word though. I mean if you would just say today the Village, but it's today though.



Mike Pollocoff:

Yes. I don't know if it's important that [inaudible].

Jean Werbie-Harris:

I didn't want to be critical. I thought maybe we could do a little bit better on that map.

Cindy Schwab:

Yes, I agree.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Because it's not really clear exactly what the – I mean we're in the regional context but we're a dot. So it doesn't really show that we're really 34 square miles.

Michealene Day:

Yeah, we're a dot there. See that little dot?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

With that being said, there aren't a lot of really good maps of the Village on the internet if you ever go out there. There aren't a lot so you'd have to probably create one.

Monica Yuhas:

That's why we have GIS.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

This is true.

Mike Pollocoff:

There's a good map of WisPark [inaudible].

Jean Werbie-Harris:

From the marketing stuff. And maybe we need to look at ourselves from a more marketing, because this really wants to be reader friendly and that map's not doing it. Sure, good idea. New map.

Michealene Day:

Page 6, natural resources, anyone have any issues with that segment?

Glenn Christiansen:

Up near where it says natural resources and then four seasons recreational opportunities [inaudible] water resources, concentration of high quality wildlife and vegetation, vegetative habitat for Chiwaukee Prairie, Carol Beach and Des Plaines River, I would like it to say critical habitat for numerous plant and animal species. Because there are several documented rare, threatened and endangered plants and animals both down in Chiwaukee Prairie and on the Des Plaines River. There's at least reports of one endangered reptile, threatened reptiles, numerous threatened bird species. I know for a fact one endangered plant species, threatened I can't begin to count how many plants of special concern at the Des Plaines River. Some of these show up in other areas. But I think we should include critical habitat.

Michealene Day:

Anyone have any problems, Jean?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

No, I think that's a good point to be a little bit more specific with respect to that. My first question was that four season recreational opportunities, that doesn't relate to the other two, so I'm just wondering where that came from and why that's there. I don't know how that relates to natural resources.

Glenn Christiansen:

[Inaudible]

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Oh, okay, I didn't realize that. I don't think that that should be there.

Michealene Day:

I don't think so either.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

It doesn't fit with the others.

Mike Pollocoff:

He was merging the two.

Michealene Day:

So take that four season recreational opportunities out and incorporate Glenn's comments on critical.

Glenn Christiansen:

Critical habitat. I don't know how somebody would word that.

Rita Christiansen:

Critical wildlife and vegetative [inaudible].

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

We have it noted down so we'll make sure that we change that [inaudible].

Michealene Day:

Climate, any issues with climate?

Mike Pollocoff:

It was great this year.

Michealene Day:

Okay, soils.

Glenn Christiansen:

If we could back up for a second talking about climate. We talked about critical habitat. I don't think a lot of people realize that Kenosha County is probably the only County that they actually consider to be in the Chicago region, and that's why there are so many plants that are of critical concern because they don't typically show up outside of the corner of the State. So in a sense climate does tie into the critical habitat.

Cindy Schwab:

With that said we might want to mention what zone we are in the climate, because that is really important to why we have those things. So one simple sentence saying that we're zone 5. I think 5b now, they might have just changed that.

Glenn Christiansen:

It's not so much that it's called the Chicago region. I can't think of a book to reference out of, but if you look up plants in the [inaudible] it would talk about the Chicago region.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

For zone is that the growing climate zone?

Cindy Schwab:

Yes. But that makes a difference with your temperature and daylight and [inaudible].

Jean Werbie-Harris:

For plants.

Cindy Schwab:

We're 5. They just switched it. It's been switched for the first time in like 35 years and they switched it in January. So I think we're a 5a.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

We probably need to expand on that. I don't think the typical lay person knows what 5a or 5b means, right? If we're going to put it in there I think we need to expand on that and define what it means.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

We can do that.

Mike Pollocoff:

Or give a source to check it out.

Cindy Schwab:

It's published by the government. If you look up climate for anything you're going to have that referenced in there what climate you are. So I can send you something in an

email tomorrow with the map and everything of what we are [inaudible].

Michealene Day:

Any issues with soils?

Cindy Schwab:

Yeah, I take issue with the whole thing. You don't reference – when we're doing something for recreation we don't reference it. And since it's farms we should be going with the national geographic – what the federal government would say. Like we have a sandy loam and not what percentage is farmland. The US soil map should be referenced, all of that, not this. Or, if you want to include it both, but definitely our soil type is critical.

Mike Pollocoff:

Because I really think it ties back to the [inaudible] it's really a mix of the soils and climate.

Glenn Christiansen:

Some of the plants that are of critical status they grow here because. It's just like a wetland. People don't realize it's not wet soil, it's [inaudible] soil. And those soils 10,000 years after the glaciers to look like they are today, and you can't create that soil.

Cindy Schwab:

And it's also really unique the Village has two completely different soils, and that's very unusual. So that in itself gives us a lot of diversity in plant life. I think that should all be mentioned in there.

Mike Pollocoff:

We can check with you [inaudible].

Cindy Schwab:

A better [inaudible], yeah.

Michealene Day:

Okay, so Cindy, you're going to get that for us?

Cindy Schwab:

Sure.

Michealene Day:

Water bodies and watersheds.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Should we reference Jerome Creek in there, too, along with Barnes and Tobin, a short perennial stream. I don't know that it really doesn't empty into Lake Michigan. I mean the watershed does, Jerome Creek.

Glenn Christiansen:

Jerome goes to the Des Plaines and the Mississippi and everything else – you really have the subcontinental divide going through the Village, so you have two completely different watersheds. One is the Great Lakes and the other is the Mississippi.

Mike Pollocoff:

He doesn't say that, but he says [inaudible] Illinois River.

Glenn Christiansen:

And that's partly what makes the Des Plaines River unique, because some of the plant and animal communities are different out there because of the river, and some things do come up from Illinois. So I'd like to see the subcontinental divide [inaudible].

Rita Christiansen:

I think it is in there, Glenn. If you look under number 3 it's the second sentence bisecting the Village. And then there's a spelling error in there, but you guys will correct all the spelling errors, right? Encompassing the wester two thirds of the Village, the western.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

You'll find at the top of the next page, too, southeaster first paragraph. They must not have spell checker.

Jim Bandura:

Do you think we need them to mention all of the tributaries, like you said Jerome and

Barnes.

Michealene Day:

Yeah, if you're going to list two you should list all of them.

Jim Bandura:

All of them, right.

Mike Pollocoff:

And Pike [inaudible].

Rita Christiansen:

Where is Paradise Lake?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

South of 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, south of 104<sup>th</sup> Street, right at the end of 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, south of 104<sup>th</sup>. You can't see it driving down 104<sup>th</sup>. It's on private land.

Glenn Christiansen:

It's completely private. Was that an old quarry? We talked about this a few years back if I remember. I remember the conversation.

Michealene Day:

Vegetation, number four.

Rita Christiansen:

Would that be at the time when the Indians were here?

Michealene Day:

At the time of European settlement you mean?

Rita Christiansen:

Yeah, really. I mean we do have the Jambois trail, right?

Mike Pollocoff:

I think he just is talking about [inaudible] granted there's not a lot.

Rita Christiansen:

So do you need to have at the time of European settlement, does that need to be in there then? Is it relevant?

Glenn Christiansen:

It does place time.

Jim Bandura:

When was the European settlement?

Rita Christiansen:

Yeah, exactly.

Glenn Christiansen:

Maybe it would be better to put 1835. That's really the dividing time. The documents that Jean gave me the other day when I was reading it, what was his name, Fred Afler, actually he gave a very good paragraph or two on pre-history.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

And he gave that specifically for Pleasant Prairie. So a lot of the references are southeast Wisconsin. I don't know if you want the southeast Wisconsin reference or Pleasant Prairie reference or doesn't it matter?

Michealene Day:

We'll leave it up to you, Jean.

Rita Christiansen:

I think we've established we're in southeastern Wisconsin already, so maybe we need to start talking about Pleasant Prairie.

Michealene Day:



Okay.

Monica Yuhas:

We should have ownership.

Michealene Day:

You're right, Pleasant Prairie, good idea.

Cindy Schwab:

Would we want to go through and list the endangered species that are found in Pleasant Prairie?

Michealene Day:

We're right now on four.

Glenn Christiansen:

I don't think you'd want to. You would mention it but never list it. Because one of the things that I was told very clearly because of some of the things I know you should never mention anything specific on where because they don't want people to go there.

Cindy Schwab:

I know not where, but I guess because like in the next [inaudible].

Michealene Day:

So we're good with four.

Rita Christiansen:

Can I ask is that a true statement, the last sentence, some native prairie habitat also still exist along the Des Plaines River? Are we discounting other areas? Or, should we say native prairie habitat exists within the Village of Pleasant Prairie.

Mike Pollocoff:

Throughout the Village.

Michealene Day:

Throughout the Village, yeah.

Rita Christiansen:

Throughout the Village. Let's keep it a general statement. Because, again, you don't want to say Des Plaines River. You have people digging through there.

Glenn Christiansen:

I was talking about Chiwaukee Prairie. Is that really regional or is that national [inaudible].

Mike Pollocoff:

It's definitely regional.

Glenn Christiansen:

It's definitely regional. I know that it's considered one of the most unique prairie remnants, because I don't believe there's another documented in the country that includes as many plant species growing in one small area.

Cindy Schwab:

It's also one of the few mesic prairies.

Glenn Christiansen:

Yes.

Michealene Day:

Wildlife habitat?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

I wanted to mention that there's a natural areas plan that was done by Southeast Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, and specifically that plan shows the wildlife habitat areas special vegetation areas and shows a lot of information. They don't reference that plan. But maybe when we're talking about referencing other plans maybe we reference that there, and we don't have to get into the details here. If people are really interested in looking at this document it is southeast Wisconsin, but there is a section specifically on Kenosha County and on all these special habitat areas in Pleasant Prairie.

So we'll just reference that, and then we don't have to get into a lot of that detail here.

Jim Bandura:

Would you incorporate it in here, the plan?

Rita Christiansen:

Just the verbiage, reference.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

The reference, yes.

Michealene Day:

I think that's a good idea. Thank you, Jean. Six, Chiwaukee Prairie, Carol Beach.

Glenn Christiansen:

Draws visitors from all over the world. I've heard of people coming from Europe to see it.

Michealene Day:

Because of we soils, again, spell check. You might not catch that because we is a correct word. I suppose it's supposed to say wet.

Mike Pollocoff:

Is it national or natural [inaudible].

Glenn Christiansen:

I think it's considered national.

Mike Pollocoff:

But is it national or natural. It doesn't sound right. Because you can't put out phrases you can't take back.

Michealene Day:

Chiwaukee Prairie is classified as a national natural landmark.

Rita Christiansen:

On page 17, Mike, they have it referenced as Chiwaukee Prairie State Natural Area.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

That's the State's reference.

Mike Pollocoff:

I'll check that.

Rita Christiansen:

It says it's recognized as a national landmark in the State natural area.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

The SEWRPC plan will tell us, it will have it defined.

Michealene Day:

Okay, page 8, population characteristics. I guess we'd have to rely on staff.

Mike Pollocoff:

I've looked at those for a couple of the uses and they're current. The only thing that isn't current is the median home values that went down again. So we'll insert those things. The income [inaudible].

Michealene Day:

And then land use planning and projection of growth.

Rita Christiansen:

And there's a sentence that didn't get completed. It looks like they got interrupted and came back and –

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Second paragraph, last sentence.

Rita Christiansen:

The Village current has a well defined. Public Research Group has coordinated [inaudible] with the Park Commission. I'd get rid of that last sentence. It doesn't make any sense there.

Michealene Day:

And then you're right, finish the last sentence.

Rita Christiansen:

Or take it out, whatever that was.

Michealene Day:

The Village currently has a well defined.

Rita Christiansen:

Blank.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Land use plan. We have a land use plan that's well defined because that's the next page. So I thought maybe they were referencing that. You think maybe?

Rita Christiansen:

I think you're right.

Michealene Day:

Then I got the two maps. I don't have a next page after well defined. Then I have two maps. Then we go into 3.0. So well defined what?

Rita Christiansen:

We don't know. That's what we're trying to figure out.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

And I think that in the text the figures all need to be referenced. So when you're talking about the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, what it shows, it should be referencing Figure

2.2 and the next which is our Development Plan 2009, we should be referencing these figures so you know where to find them and what they're specifically referring to.

Michealene Day:

I agree. Any questions or concerns about the three maps that are included in your packet?

Mike Pollocoff:

The last map I'm not sure [inaudible] but technically I'm not sure what they were doing there [inaudible].

Jean Werbie-Harris:

I don't know because those aren't the special use areas of the Village. So I'm not really sure. I was thinking, as Mike was saying, that maybe those are industrial areas. That's what I was thinking.

Mike Pollocoff:

[Inaudible] we made it up.

Rita Christiansen:

It says you're the source.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

It is our map, but I don't remember ever highlighting this particular area.

Michealene Day:

And calling it special planning district?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Yeah.

Mike Pollocoff:

We just have to call it what it is [inaudible].

Jean Werbie-Harris:

And not all of it either. So the WEPCo land and Ocean Spray land shouldn't be highlighted.

Mike Pollocoff:

We can take it and put [inaudible] on here and retitle the table. I don't know if that tells you.

Monica Yuhas:

Does it have to be in here?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Well, it does give you the neighborhoods. And, again, the whole focus of what we've done from a planning perspective is neighborhood planning. And so it helps to define what community parks and neighborhood parks are located within a planning district.

Michealene Day:

There you go because you've got Highpoint, Whittier Creek, Lakewood, Prairie Lane.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Wouldn't the neighborhood plan just in itself be better than this plan?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

I would think so, but I don't know what they were getting at.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

We don't know what this is portraying really.

Monica Yuhas:

I would like to see the neighborhood plan in here.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I would, too.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

It's similar.

Mike Pollocoff:

Let's do that one, take that out for the neighborhood plan.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Okay, Village neighborhoods and get rid of the special planning district. And then the only other thing I didn't know if the development plan for 2009, we could take a look at it and update it. I don't know what's really changed, but we could certainly look at it and we could change the date to 2011.

Monica Yuhas:

I was going to ask you is there any updating to these maps?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Well, we haven't really updated because there hasn't been any new development. But we could look at it and say this is current through 2011.

Michealene Day:

Yes, because we're looking at a new plan. Correct, that would be a great idea.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

We can make it current. I don't know that we have to make any changes.

Michealene Day:

That makes it easier for you. Existing park system.

Mike Pollocoff:

I think the second paragraph, the one sentence paragraph is wrong. There is no inefficiency. It works the way we want it to work. Choices have been made [inaudible] but that's not an inefficiency.

Michealene Day:

I think that whole second paragraph should come out.



William Mills:

I do, too.

Michealene Day:

Okay, so we're going to take that second paragraph out.

Mike Pollocoff:

And the Park Commission is a policy advisor Commission, not just advisory. It's a policy advisory Commission to the Village Board [inaudible]. And they meet monthly with staff. John is the [inaudible] professional staff.

Michealene Day:

Correct. And then do we even need Pleasant Prairie also has a Recreation Commission as advisory?

Mike Pollocoff:

I'd leave that in because to me that sets the designation [inaudible].

Michealene Day:

Okay, I was just thinking this is our park plan so why would we?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Do you think we should say separate from the Park Commission is a Recreation Commission blah, blah, blah.

Monica Yuhas:

Here's my question. Is this the only time we're going to reference the Rec Commission is in this sentence?

Mike Pollocoff:

I think there's a couple of places where recreation usage takes place in the [inaudible]. I just think that it needs to be referenced that it's another governmental body that we do interface with. Where he's including merging the two together.

Michealene Day:

I just don't like the sentence. The way Jean worded it if it has to be in here is better, separate from. This is our plan.

Mike Pollocoff:

Now, the Rec Commission their master plan is essentially recommending that we [inaudible]. It's still the Rec Commission but it's structured differently [inaudible]. What Jean said is true. That would be good language [inaudible].

Monica Yuhas:

I understand why you're saying it needs to be in there, but when you're reading this it's all about parks community, and then you're throwing in the RecPlex. And you're grabbing it out of the air and putting it in here.

Mike Pollocoff:

Probably what we want to get across is Park exists and they coordinate with the Recreation Commission for recreation programs that occur in the parks.

Monica Yuhas:

But if they're going to change they're not going to be existing.

Mike Pollocoff:

[Inaudible]

Monica Yuhas:

So are you going to give it the new name in this plan?

Mike Pollocoff:

I think they're both moving along at the same pace. I think the [inaudible]. We can put a hole there and leave the space and see how that [inaudible].

Monica Yuhas:

It's just that it's not consistent with the plan. And then if you're reading it it's like, oh, did they just add that in there? To the common person who may read this it seems out of place.

Mike Pollocoff:

Okay.

Jim Bandura:

I think it just needs to define that we have two separate entities, and that whole paragraph needs to be kind of like re-worked to define that we have a rec whatever it's going to be called and a Park Commission.

Monica Yuhas:

But why? What does the Rec do with the Park?

Jim Bandura:

One of the things that makes me think of the parks is that a lot of municipalities have the parks and recreation. So if somebody picks this book up at least we can distinguish that we have two separate ones.

Monica Yuhas:

But the Rec is not involved in the Park, though. It's two separate things.

Jim Bandura:

But like Mike said, though, we still interface with them. So to have that definition in there that might help clarify the intent of this more so when we start referencing the Park Commission and this being developed for the Park Commission. So we're doing two different books here so to speak.

Rita Christiansen:

Can I ask a question, Mike? When did we separate from one into two?

Mike Pollocoff:

2005 or '06.

Rita Christiansen:

So maybe under previous planning efforts on page 1 you reference at that point. You say previously this is what we did and we became two separate entities. And then you don't

have to ever say it again because you've already mentioned it.

Mike Pollocoff:

A good part of John's budget is not coming out of tax dollars. RecPlex pays park operation funds. They go out and maintain fields [inaudible] so there is park staff that spends a significant amount of time supporting recreational activities that occur in the park.

Rita Christiansen:

So say that.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

He does in about the fifth paragraph down. The Village does an exceptional job at offering a diverse selection of recreational opportunities through the RecPlex and other facilities. That's kind of where it goes on from there. We could expand what Mike just said right there.

Rita Christiansen:

But should we put it up further front in the document to explain it?

Mike Pollocoff:

We have to acknowledge it.

Rita Christiansen:

Correct, I agree.

Mike Pollocoff:

That a lot of our resources are [inaudible] recreation entities.

Monica Yuhas:

I guess it's just the wording.

Michealene Day:

The way that this whole page was structured I wasn't thrilled. It's basically talking about recreational offerings and not so much parks, it's really more rec.

Jim Bandura:

It's a strange introduction.

Michealene Day:

For the existing park system. It's more existing recreational systems.

Jim Bandura:

Right. It's a strange description of what this is all about.

Michealene Day:

And, again, they used agency residents instead of community. I don't even know why you'd need any word in there, 1,000 residents is fine.

William Mills:

It's almost like the last paragraph on that page should be the first if you look at it. Because the last paragraph kind of gives a description of how many parks there are, recreation and open space.

Rita Christiansen:

I agree, and then you can go into the more detail about the public works maintaining them. But right now just the whole page doesn't flow right.

Michealene Day:

And making improvements to existing spaces and expand recreation programming. Well, that's not what the parks do is expand recreational programming.

Rita Christiansen:

So the suggestion would be that the last paragraph goes to the top and make it flow based on what John does and how the interaction occurs?

Michealene Day:

Yeah.

Mike Pollocoff:

We do recreate [inaudible].

Michealene Day:

Correct, that's true, very true.

Mike Pollocoff:

And also throughout he identifies RecPlex, IcePlex, AquaPlex. It's just a RecPlex [inaudible]. Let us rework that because that's a good idea [inaudible].

Rita Christiansen:

So I have a question. Sorry, Jean, I saw you raise your pen too late. The fourth paragraph, the sentence that reads since the growth has slowed nationwide over the past years, the emphasis on park and open space planning has not been to acquire open space but make improvements on existing spaces for residential enjoyment and expand recreational programming. So are they just talking about what's happening in the past and not the future growth? I'm confused. So they're saying it's slow so we're not doing anything but just kind of tidying up what we have. But yet when you go back into this document they're telling us we need to acquire more land.

Mike Pollocoff:

With growth slowing down we don't have development dedicated.

Rita Christiansen:

Correct, I understand, absolutely.

Mike Pollocoff:

So without that all we're doing is [inaudible].

Michealene Day:

But I guess this is the existing and now not the future.

William Mills:

On the other hand since the slow down we've had three exceptional gifts to the Village, Ingrams, C94 Partnership, Sorensen Woods. I took a walk in Sorensen Woods the other day and that is exceptional.

Mike Pollocoff:

The good thing is [inaudible].

Jean Werbie-Harris:

And actually that's true.

Rita Christiansen:

So I guess my point the emphasis is on park and open space planning and making improvements on existing. I don't know. I just don't like that sentence at all, sorry.

Monica Yuhas:

Jean, we'll let you re-work that page.

Michealene Day:

Like we had said we like that last paragraph.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

And whenever you use our, or me or me I don't ever use those in a document like this because I'm not sure who our is. Is it our meaning Park Commission, our meaning Village, our meaning the consultant? They should never be interjecting what their personal opinions are. So I circled those throughout the document. There's like two or three on this page.

Michealene Day:

Okay, good.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

But the second to last paragraph they state residents are looking for more opportunities and passive activities. I think that's good, and I think that might have come from their survey and the public input that they received, and I just interjected based on public input and survey results. I know we're going to talk about the survey later, but we should base their opinions on the survey work that they have done. They do that a couple of different places. And I just think we should remind ourselves about the work that they did, and that's how we're getting the information and the direction that we're going.

Michealene Day:

Okay. I don't know how tired everybody is or how long you want to go. We've got ten minutes of scheduled time. Did you want to go into just finishing up the next page 14 and 15 or quite at special open spaces, go through the parks?

Jim Bandura:

I think we could finish this up. I've got a little bit of a comment on this because it says existing parks. Why wouldn't Ingram Park be included in this?

Rita Christiansen:

Well, not only Ingram. You don't have Momper's Woods, Pleasant Prairie Farm –

Michealene Day:

That's what I meant. There's a lot of work to be done in here. So we can go until eight o'clock, I don't care. I just didn't want to get part way into this discussion and say it's seven thirty let's quit. So I guess it's up to you guys if you want to continue and finish this existing and recreational facilities, or do you want to start on this the next time we meet?

Jim Bandura:

I think that would be a good starting point for next week.

Michealene Day:

I do think in the next group there's a lot of changes in my opinion in here, and I don't know if you want to get part way into it and quit, or do you want to continue to work until eight o'clock. It's up to you guys, I don't care. But I just thought I'd ask you now and then instead of somebody watching the clock and say we said seven thirty.

Rita Christiansen:

I think we should honor the time.

Jim Bandura:

I agree.

Michealene Day:



You want to start or do you want to just quite and then start fresh on this? It's up to you guys.

Jim Bandura:

I think if we start fresh on this, because like you say there's a lot of meat that needs to go into this and looking at it. I think if we take a step back we'll be able to really –

Rita Christiansen:

Yeah, I've got a lot of notes on this next couple pages.

Jim Bandura:

So I'm not opposed to ending it here.

Michealene Day:

What does everyone think?

Monica Yuhas:

My question is at our next meeting are we going to get the revisions to review and discuss again before we move forward?

Mike Pollocoff:

You'll get them before the meeting.

Monica Yuhas:

But on the night of the meeting are we going to discuss those revisions? And is that going to take as long to go over the revisions?

Michealene Day:

I wouldn't think it should take as long.

Mike Pollocoff:

Hopefully if you've read through them.

Glenn Christiansen:

It will be just like reading minutes.

Mike Pollocoff:

And if you have further changes we can make them. We can go through them and then get a motion to approve them so we've got something done [inaudible] and we'll just keep adding.

Monica Yuhas:

But it's not the final document, it is still a draft, correct? So just because we approve it –

Mike Pollocoff:

Well, no it's not the final document, but this is going to be the document as revised. You're going to have to make an adoption [inaudible] after our hearing.

Monica Yuhas:

But my question is when this is all done after all the revisions we're going to have one finished product, then we're going to have to review it one more time just to make sure that it flows and it's good and everything tied out.

Mike Pollocoff:

[Inaudible]

Monica Yuhas:

Right, that's my question. I just don't want to approve something and not be allowed to go back.

Mike Pollocoff:

[Inaudible]

Monica Yuhas:

Okay, this is my first plan going through so I want to make sure.

Michealene Day:

Like I said, I was just looking at where we were and the chapter. How often – do you want to meet more than once a month? Do you just want to meet once a month? I mean

we didn't get too far.

Mike Pollocoff:

No, you're okay. It's your first one for a while. I'd say let's go for once a month through the summer. We have a lot of staff vacations and you guys will have people coming and going for vacation. And then once we get to September we may step it up to every two weeks.

Michealene Day:

Okay, so I think this was a good learning experience for me especially, too, because not knowing exactly how to go on this, and now we know how we're progressing. So hopefully next month we move a little faster.

Rita Christiansen:

I don't think so.

Michealene Day:

Well, the glass is half full. And there is a lot of maps and stuff in here. Okay. Is there some homework staff would like us to do or anything before the next meeting to make it productive for you?

Mike Pollocoff:

I'd say bone up on everything from our existing park facilities. You have a lot of maps. If you get 3 and 4 or 3 for sure. If you get 4 that's fine.

William Mills:

What page is that?

Mike Pollocoff:

Three ends at 48, four is 49, but four is pretty big.

Rita Christiansen:

We went through the whole thing twice already so we're good.

Mike Pollocoff:

One of the things that [inaudible] I think looks pretty good [inaudible] I'm not sure other than the grammar issues and pulling things together. I don't know [inaudible] integrity I don't think we want to mess with the findings. The presentation might look better [inaudible]. My recommendation is to [inaudible]. The findings, leave them the way they are, but if we want to describe them better –

Jim Bandura:

Reference them a little more, yeah, I agree.

Glenn Christiansen:

As we go through them we may have some thoughts as far as that.

William Mills:

The survey actually looked pretty good I thought just having looked through it already. I thought there was a lot more data than what I had seen on what we had done in the past. A lot more information.

Mike Pollocoff:

To be honest with you that's just what we paid for.

Monica Yuhas:

And it shows.

## **6. PARK COMMISSION COMMENTS**

## **7. ADJOURNMENT**

**Monica Yuhas moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Rita Christiansen. Motion carried 7-0.**

Meeting adjourned 7:30pm.