

Cary Park District
Board of Commissioners
Planning and Development Committee
September 10, 2009
Cary Community Center
255 Briargate Road
Cary, IL

Minutes

Committee Members Present: Renner, Harvey, Stanko

Commissioners Present: Hill, Krueger

Staff Present: Cherveney, Glenn, Jones, Raica, Mayer, Hughes

Chair Renner called the meeting to order at 7:30pm.

The minutes from the July 9, 2009 Planning and Development Committee were presented for approval.

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

There were no items from the Public or Staff. Stanko commented on the existence of some debris on Park District property.

Under Items for Discussion/Direction, the Committee discussed the Cary Veterans Park Pond Improvement Recommendation. Cherveney provided a comprehensive overview of the activities that had taken place since the last discussions, and included information on District options for handling the contaminated sediment (which does not have to be removed) per EPA TACO standards.

The memo spelled out four possible approaches:

1. Do nothing; leave the sediment in place and attempt to make improvements at a later date;
2. Complete a full dredge of the sediment to known pond bottom depths;
3. Complete a nearly full dredge of the sediment based on budget restrictions; and
4. Complete a partial dredge and install spray aeration; remove enough sediment to provide for an adequate depth for spray aeration equipment.

Renner began by straw-polling the group as to whether or not they wanted to dredge. The initial reaction had all but Stanko indicating “yes.” The next question put to the Committee was regarding the necessity for more information before that decision could be made.

Consensus indicated that no. 1 was not an option. Also, “partial” solutions to this issue were not an immediate choice.

Commissioner Stanko disagreed with this approach, indicating that he believed the Committee was not following the established rules of order by conducting a straw poll and not allowing additional discussion. Others present disagreed with his assessment and asked if he would clarify his concern. *Commissioner Stanko left the meeting in protest due to the belief that the meeting was not being conducted in accordance with Park District Policy.* Stanko left meeting at 7:45pm.

The discussion resumed and revolved around the possible open-ended cost of the project. Also, if the pond were dredged, tested, and the disposal handled adequately, what would be the insurability of the surrounding land? Would testing be necessary for the entire park site?

The issue of insurance was also part of the discussion. Although the carrier will cover costs of certain pollution-related activities, how long will the claim be left open? What happens if a new issue arises when the Park District has considered the matter complete? Would the insurer provide its own consultant? What are the financial obligations to the Park District if an additional consultant is retained?

The unanswered questions led to the consensus decision to seek further information for all the unanswered questions before a decision is made.

The biggest questions needing resolution were the approximate cost of the full dredging; insurance obligations available from PDRMA and whether time or cost would determine the process.

There was no vote necessary on this matter.

The next item discussed was the ITEP Grant, Phase 3 Engineering Contract.

The District had already handled Phases 1 and 2, and an update was provided concerning Phase 3. It is expected that funding will approach 80% between the ITEP grant and other dollars available for the trail enhancement.

The Committee recommended that the Board authorize the Executive Director to execute Joint and Engineering Agreements with IDOT for the ITEP project pending the necessary IDOT approvals to move Phase 3 work forward for the project.

Motion by Harvey; second by Renner. All voting aye. Placed on regular agenda.

The Committee recommended that the Board authorize the Executive Director to execute the Phase 3 engineering consulting service contract with Kimley-Horn & Associates Inc., once the District receives IDOT Phase 2 approval to proceed.

Motion by Harvey; second by Renner. All voting aye. Placed on regular agenda.

The Strategic Plan, 2009-12, Board Activities, was presented by Cherveney.

Items were discussed as to relevance and cost, but no priority was provided.

In the Recreation Programs and Facilities Operations list, item no. 4, “Develop support for the coordination of community-organized youth and adult sports groups that function in cooperation with the Cary Park District”, there was consensus that every effort should be made to accommodate adequate fields for the various youth sports. A suggestion was made to set up a meeting with the heads of the sports organizations to assure them that the Park District is committed to their continued successful operation with fields for use.

For item no. 5, “Support the development of the remainder of Cary-Grove Park with proceeds from the Hoffman Park land sale”, it was determined to strike “with proceeds from the Hoffman Park land sale” since the completion of Cary-Grove Park was a desire of the Board regardless of the outcome of the land sale.

In the Administration list, item no. 8 “Develop support for, or consider direct annexation of, the remainder of the Village Oakwood Hills into the Cary Park District corporate boundaries”, it was suggested to strike “direct” from the language.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the strategic plan update, “Vision 2012, Strategic Plan-Board Activities”, as amended.

Motion by Harvey; second by Renner. All voting aye. Placed on regular agenda.

Under Discussion/Information Items, the Hoffman Park Phase 1 Development Project I update announced the October 8, 2009 date for the Village of Cary ZPB meeting to present plan variances.

The ITEP Grant update reiterated that the next step for the preliminary engineering needed to be completed as quickly as possible.

There was no need for closed session.

Motion to adjourn by Harvey; second by Renner. All voting aye.

Meeting adjourned at 9:20pm.