

Cary Park District
Board of Commissioners
Parks & Recreation Operations Committee
June 10, 2010
Cary Community Center
255 Briargate Road
Cary, IL

Minutes

Committee Members Present: Krueger, Stanko
Commissioner Absent: Hill
Commissioners Present: Renner, Harvey
Staff Present: Cherveney, Glenn, Jones, Raica, Hughes, Mayer, Rea

Stanko called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

The minutes from the January 14, 2010 Parks & Recreation Operations Committee were presented for approval.

Motion by Krueger; second by Stanko. All voting aye. Minutes accepted as presented.

There were no matters from the Public or Staff.

Stanko had two comments. The first referred to an item on the evening's AFP agenda, the RFP being sought by the Village for a consultant regarding the establishment of a park zoning ordinance. The question was "Who is paying for this?" and he was told it would be shared equally by the Village and the Park District.

The second comment concerned the Pin Oaks at Candlewood Park. Stanko said they looked distressed and Rea said he would look into it.

Under Direction items, Resolution **R-2010-11-01**, July as Parks & Recreation Month, was presented.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve Resolution R-2010-11, July as Parks & Recreation Month, at its next meeting.

Motion by Krueger; second by Stanko. All voting aye. Placed on regular agenda.

For discussion was the Park Property Infringement Issue and a proposed survey of Community Center property which has not been done in a long time.

The striping of the parking lot brought to light the Village's "use" of our property for the drop box that resides on a peninsula, taking up a parking space that is on Park District property, and the presence of a sign disallowing parking beyond it, when, in fact, the parking spaces beyond it belong to the Park District. This is quite obvious since the Park District's spaces are now lined yellow and the Village's are white.

The proposal has been made to have a survey done so that the property is identified correctly in view of the infringement and also to serve as a guide if the property across the parking lot is used to build an administrative center.

Krueger – against spending the money. Even if the drop box is documented on our property, what would be done about it? This would be up to the Board to determine.

Stanko was concerned about liability if a child were to hit the drop box. If it is not ours and it is on our property, so at the least, it should be removed. Survey is a good idea to have exact boundaries with which to work with if remaining property is developed. Survey is expensive, but liability is his main concern.

Renner questioned amount of survey fee, but upon explanation, found it to be fair, although he felt this issue should be settled "Board to Board" and perhaps the survey was unnecessary.

Harvey. No opinion. Feels the drop box issue is "nit picking" and approaching in that way is not a positive way to deal with the Village.

Cherveney explained the purpose of the survey would be to determine what is ours. A survey has not been done in a long time, and having the documentation would put us in readiness to develop the remaining property at some time in the future. It would answer questions about the driveway/roads that are not clearly defined at this point.

He felt a license agreement should be put into place so that the location and ownership is defined in case of incident.

In all, everyone could be comfortable with going ahead with the survey except Krueger. At the least, more estimates should be sought before any decision is made.

The next discussion item was the report of a dead tree down in Jaycee Pond that prompted a letter from Mayer Kierna to Harvey asking for its immediate removal.

Trees near water have long served as fish and wildlife habitats, and that determination must be definitively made before any removal would take place. Another issue is to determine if the tree is on Park District property and if it is the District's responsibility to begin with. The pictures presented did not identify the tree in question beyond a doubt.

Stanko suggested that the staff determine the safety issue and the ownership issue.

It was suggested that Harvey communicate with the mayor since the letter came to him. It was suggested that they meet on site so that the exact location of the tree and the assessment of any danger, unsightliness, etc. be co-determined.

Harvey suggested that all Park District property be declared conservation area thus disallowing tree removal. Krueger said to determine safety and ownership. Renner felt the Board should follow up and not staff to staff. Stanko felt this could develop a pattern of the Mayor always getting involved in day-to-day operations.

Cherveney noted that it could be a long time before a storm water issue would emerge if that was one reason for requesting the removal of the tree and he didn't feel it was of immediate concern. Renner agreed with this assessment.

The issue was left for Harvey to communicate with the Mayor and for staff to determine ownership of the tree.

There was no need for closed session.

Motion to adjourn by Krueger; second by Stanko. All voting aye.

Meeting adjourned at 8:23 PM.