

Cary Park District
Board of Commissioners
Committee of the Whole Meeting
September 12, 2019
7:00 PM
Community Center
255 Briargate Road
Cary, IL

Minutes

Board Members Present: Renner, Victor, Stanko, Hauck, and Frangiamore.

Staff Present: Jones, Kelly, Rogus, Hughes, Hall, Nesler, Krueger, Raica, and Lee.

Guests Present: Brad Porter, Lauterbach and Amen
 Brian Dawson, Resident
 John Miles, Foxford Hills Golf Club

President Frangiamore called the meeting to order at 7:02 PM.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Frangiamore asked if there were any matters from the public.

Resident Brian Dawson stated that he is very interested in the Board's discussions about the Legacy Development Project. He explained that he recently visited Zehnder's Splash Village in Frankenmuth, MI, and the aquatics there were enclosed in a glass structure so the pool could be used year-round. He stated he does not know the cost to enclose a pool in glass, but thinks it should be something the Board should consider if an outdoor aquatic facility were to be built. He explained the facility could be used by residents for swim lessons, recreational swim activities, seniors, and the D155 swim team year-round. He explained the roof of the glass enclosure in Frankenmuth could open up when it was nice out, or vents on the side of the building could be opened to let in a cross-breeze on windy days. It's a light, bright, airy facility. The Board thanked Dawson for providing his input and the pictures provided of the facility discussed.

Under items from Commissioners, Hauck stated she would like the way the Board handles public comments during meetings to be reviewed. She explained how it upset her at the last meeting how a member of the public raised her hand to ask a question during a non-designated public comment time, and the Board would not listen to her question. She stated if the public shows enough interest to show up to the meetings they should be allowed to comment or ask questions when relevant to the current conversation. Frangiamore stated he doesn't disagree, but there would need to be a change in Board Policy for that to occur. Hauck stated that the Policy needs to be changed.

Victor agreed with Hauck and stated she would be open to changing the Policy about public comment at meetings. She then stated she heard Fall Family Fest went well and heard positive comments back from the community about the event.

Stanko stated that any Board member can move to suspend Robert's Rules of Order temporarily if a member of the public wants to ask a question during a meeting, so Policy would not need to be changed.

Renner stated that there is a difference between Robert's Rules of Order and Policy when it comes to public comments. He does not see a need to change the Policy.

Frangiamore stated he did talk to the public present after the meeting and heard what they had to say, and he personally invited them back to the next meeting to share their views with the Board.

Under items from Staff, Jones stated he will be sending out an operations report tomorrow as part of his weekly update. There are many great things occurring at the Park District and he encouraged Board members to review the report. He explained that the summer camp participation numbers increased, ET enrollment increased, as well as dog park memberships and dog park usage increased.

Jones stated that the new shelter area at Lions Park is very inviting and was a popular area during the Fall Family Fest. He also stated the splash pad will be closing at the end of September for the season.

Jones asked Hall to update the Board on an upcoming recreation event being offered. Hall stated there is a national movement called PARKing Day that the Park District will be participating in this year. The concept is to turn parking spaces into a pop-up park. Staff will be downtown Cary on Friday, September 20 from 10AM-12PM and will turn one of the parking spaces on W Main Street into a pop-up park by bringing artificial grass and some games for the public to participate in on at the pop-up park. She encouraged the Board to stop by and visit during that time frame if they were available.

Jones explained that a revised set of minutes from the August 8, 2019 COW meeting was passed out this evening. The highlighted section was corrected to emphasize that Frangiamore wasn't at the meeting, but rather Jones was introducing information he and Frangiamore had discussed prior to the meeting.

The minutes from the August 8, 2019 Committee of the Whole meeting were presented for approval.

Stanko moved to approve the minutes as presented. Second by Victor.

Voice vote: 4-0, Abstain – Frangiamore. Motion carried.

The first Direction items discussed was the replacement, 2004 John Deere HD200 Sprayer/Utility Cart and 2004 John Deere 2500 B Triplex Mower.

Jones explained that there are two items from Foxford Hills Golf Club (FHGC) up for replacement that are on the CERF. The cost for each item is more than \$25,000 so the purchases need to be approved by the Board. The items are part of the approved budget. They will be purchased via a cooperative purchasing program.

Renner moved to recommend Board approval of the purchase of a 2019 John Deere HD300 Select Sprayer (\$14,173.24) and a 2019 John Deere Pro Gator 2030A (\$26,182.32) from J.W. Turf, Elgin, IL in the total amount of \$40,355.56. Second by Hauck.

Under Discussion, Miles stated the equipment is used to spray herbicide, insecticide, and fertilizer on the golf course. It covers all the greens and the target greens on the driving range. Last year the sprayer was used 138 times to keep the course in playing condition. He also explained the fungicides were sprayed a lot this year due to the warmer weather conditions. Miles presented pictures of the equipment pieces to the Board.

Roll Call: Yes – Victor, Stanko, Hauck, Renner, and Frangiamore. No – None. Motion carried.

Renner moved to recommend Board approval of the purchase of a 2019 John Deere 2500 B Triplex Mower from J.W. Turf, Elgin, IL in the amount of \$28,830.75. Second by Hauck.

Roll Call: Yes – Victor, Stanko, Hauck, Renner, and Frangiamore. No – None. Motion carried.

The Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, for the Fiscal Year Ended April 30, 2019 was discussed. Krueger provided an overview of the audit process to the Board. She explained that last fiscal year was very busy for her staff with additional items such as accounting for the Lions and Kaper Revitalization Projects capital assets, the ITEP Trail Grant, and implementation of GASB 75. She explained that accounting for capital assets such as the Lion's Park and Kaper park projects is more complex and time consuming then accounting for other capital assets such as a piece of equipment. In conjunction with the ITEP Trail Grant, staff must now file a Consolidated Year-End Financial Report (CYEFR) on an annual basis until the ITEP project is complete. New this year, staff needed to implement GASB 75 accounting and financial reporting for post-employment benefits other than pensions. Additionally, she stated the Park District takes the audit to the next level by issuing a Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR). The CAFR provides a broader picture of the Park District than an audit and includes a Transmittal Letter, Management Letter, and a statistical section.

Next, Krueger introduced Porter, the Audit Manager on the Park District's audit from Lauterbach and Amen (L&A).

Porter thanked Krueger and Nesler for their hard work getting the audit done. He explained there are three pieces of communication he would go over tonight, the CAFR, the management letter, and the SAS 114 letter.

Porter pointed out the Park District received the Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting for the fiscal year ending April 30, 2018. He stated that the Park District would again be applying for this certificate this year. He then reviewed the Independent Auditor's Report, and he stated that the Park District received the highest review possible.

Porter reviewed various accounts of the Park District listed in the CAFR. He explained there is a lot of useful information in the Required Supplementary Information Section starting on page 70 to the end of the report and encouraged everyone to read the content.

Porter then discussed the management letter provided to the Park District by Lauterbach and Amen. The letter is used to identify issues that do not need to be disclosed in the annual financial report, but the auditor feels the items need to be commented on. The two items listed in this year's letter addressed items from FY2017-18. The first item was the fund deficit for Foxford Hills Golf Course Fund in the

amount of \$96,133. In FY2018-19 staff looked into the issue and transferred funds from the Corporate Fund to the FHGC Fund in order to pay for the acquisition debt of the course. Due to the transfer of money, the net position of the FHGC Fund increased to \$1,261,860.

Porter stated the second item in the management letter addressed GASB Statements 74 and 75. GASB Statement 74 is the financial reporting for post-employment benefit plans other than pension plans. GASB Statement 75 addresses the accounting and financial reporting for post-employment benefits other than pensions. GASB Statement 75 applies to the District's financial statements for FY ending April 30, 2019.

Porter stated that both comments have been implemented and will no longer be repeated in the future. He then asked if there were any questions. None of the Commissioners had questions.

Frangiamore asked Krueger if she had additional comments. Krueger elaborated more on the management letter issued by L&A. With respect to the deficit at FYE 2017-18 in the FHGC Fund, she stated that the debt, for the most part, will be paid off on December 15, 2020. At that time, the repayment of the intercompany loan should be discussed by the Board.

In reference to GASB statement 75, Krueger stated that staff worked with Segal Consulting to provide the District with OPEB actuarial calculations required to implement the provisions and requirements of the new statements. Additionally, staff worked with Lauterbach & Amen who assisted with the implementation of the new statements, provided the framework for financial statements and answered questions staff had related to the implementation process and/or requirements.

Krueger then echoed Porters comments and thanked her staff, especially Nesler, for all of their extra efforts throughout the year to ensure a successful audit.

Frangiamore asked if there were any questions. None of the Commissioners had questions. The Board thanked Porter for his time.

Renner moved to recommend to the Board of Commissioners the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal Year ended April 30, 2019 for acceptance. Second by Victor.

Voice vote: 5-0. All voting yes. Motion carried.

Stanko stated that the staff does a great job every year with the audit.

The first discussion item was Audio/Video recordings. Jones explained that Commissioner Victor first introduced this item at the June 13 Committee of the Whole (COW) meeting where she was directed to request that item be placed on an agenda for a future meeting. At the June 27 Board meeting Commissioners reached a consensus that this item should be discussed further at the July 11 COW meeting. At the July 11 COW meeting, staff was directed to gather additional information about this item and bring it back to the Board at a future date. Staff has reached out to a total of 27 different agencies asking if they do audio and/or video recordings of their Board meetings. Of those 27 agencies, 22 responded. A total of 82% of the agencies who responded neither post audio or video of their meetings.

Jones reviewed the various agencies that do audio and/or video recording of their meetings. He explained the Glencoe Park District captures only audio of their meetings using a basic hand held recorder, and the quality is poor when listening to the recordings. The Downers Grove Park District has live broadcasts of their meetings done by the local public access cable channel. The meetings are also audio recorded and only audio is posted to the Park District website. Vernon Hills Park District video records their meetings and post the content to their website after the meeting. Batavia Park District has their meetings recorded by a local cable access television station (BATV). BATV uses their own equipment and posts to their own YouTube channel after the meetings. The content is not posted on Batavia's website. Vernon Hills Park District pays a videographer \$175 per meeting to do video recordings. They also have their IT Manager attend the meetings who is responsible for posting the video to their website.

Jones explained how all of the agencies who do participate in audio and/or video recording have dedicated Board rooms for their meetings with dedicated equipment to record the meetings. Jones also stated he spoke with the Village of Cary (VOC), who also has a designated Board room for their meetings. The VOC pays someone to be present at each meeting and record and produce their content which is streamed live and posted to YouTube.

Jones reviewed the information and provided some conclusions drawn by staff from the research conducted. The current setup of the Park Districts Board meetings is not ideal for audio and or video recording due to the room being multi-use. As late as 5:00-6:00pm on a Board meeting night the Oak Room is being used for other programming uses before it is converted to the Board set up. The IT consideration would also be very challenging as the Park District uses an outside contractor for its IT and would need to get them heavily involved to move in the direction of audio/video content capture and posting. He also stated that he understood from those he spoke with that if the choice is made to pursue this, it has to be done well. The public will not understand issues with recordings like inaudible or not capturing content. These things would undermine the goal of providing the audio/video to the public.

Jones stated that the items presented by staff tonight were for informational purposes, and this item is for the Board to decide. Jones asked if there were any questions.

Renner asked if the Village Board has Planning and Zoning meetings on Thursday nights, and Jones stated yes. Renner stated if the VOC were willing to share their space for Park District Board meetings, he would support that, but since the VOC has meetings on Thursday at the same time as the Park District meetings that is not an option. Jones stated the logistics of holding Park District meetings at an offsite location would be a challenge to staff.

Victor thanked staff for reaching out to other communities to see what they do for audio and/or video recording. She explained that due to the cost of installing equipment in the Oak Room she is okay waiting until a more ideal space is available for Board usage before discussing this item again. She would support going to the VOC, and that option would be a step in the right direction if it were possible.

Stanko stated at the present time, he is not sure that the focus of the Park District should be on audio and/or video recording of Board meetings. If there is a time and situation for this to be done

successfully, he will support it, but now is not the time. There are things that are more basic and fundamental that need to be focused on right now before this can be explored further. He is not in support of further discussion of this item.

Hauck stated that she did not know the VOC hired someone to produce and post the video recordings of their meetings, but she would be in favor of using the Village Board space at the VOC if it were available. She thinks at this time it is not something to pursue, but something to think about in the future if an opportunity were to present itself.

Frangiamore stated that Board rooms that aren't multipurpose are a waste of space, but if a space were to be built or made available for audio and or video recording, he would want to do it right. He explained that the Park District would need to have the location and space to do it properly, and right now, that is not an option.

Frangiamore stated that based on the comments this evening, the consensus of the Board is that audio and/or video recording of Park Board meetings will not take place at this time.

The next discussion item was the Legacy Facility Development Project. Jones stated at the August Board meeting, the Board discussed various options for a Legacy Development Project. It is the Board's choice to discuss various options, but staff is looking for guidance on the next steps for the project. It is the job of staff to make recommendations, but staff will do what the Board wants done.

Jones explained there were two items he was asked to bring back to the Board. The first item was asking D155 if they would want to contribute to the cost of an indoor aquatic facility. D155 explained they are currently interested in improving their own current facilities. Jones next answered the Board's questions about when a referendum could appear on the ballot. He stated it could be on the ballot for the referendum as soon as March. It could also be on the ballot in November 2020 or in March of the following year. If it was the Board's desire to do a referendum, staff would recommend it be done no earlier than fall 2021 so it could be done properly.

Jones asked the Board to answer three questions. What type of facility would they like to see built, where do they want the facility built (Hoffman Park or Cary-Grove Park), and do they want to go to referendum in order to finance a larger project beyond what available funds would allow.

Jones explained that if the Board wants to further consider Hoffman Park for the location of the build, staff will need to work with architects to create a site plan which could take 4-6 months and several thousands of dollars to complete. He also stated that Cary-Grove Park has been focused on and has items such as the Site Master Plan that will score higher if the PARC grant were to be released.

Jones explained staff feels strongly that a referendum would not be the way to go. With the known current financials of the Park District, it would be a difficult message to sell to the community to do a referendum when there is enough money to already build a facility without raising taxes. He also stated that a great deal of work will need to be done to investigate the public's opinion of a facility and if they would support a referendum.

Jones explained the Board always needs information to react to and provide thoughts. Schematics of buildings and aquatic centers, feasibility studies, and models have been presented to the Board for Cary-Grove Park. He explained if the model of the outdoor aquatic facility was not up to the Board standards of having only 75% return, then further discussion could be held with consultants to raise or lower the return number.

Jones asked if there were any questions on the memo provided.

Frangiamore stated he would like to keep moving forward with the Legacy Development Project. A lot of work has been done, such as the Comprehensive Master Plan for Cary-Grove Park and a feasibility study, and it needs to keep moving forward. He also stated the Board needs to be respectful of staff's time and would like them moving in the right direction. He also stated the Park District needs to be prepared if the PARC grant becomes available.

Victor stated that after a lot of thought, she would say the outdoor aquatic facility is what she would support at Cary-Grove Park. If the Park District could add something like the glass enclosure presented tonight, she would support that as well. In the future she would like to see an indoor recreation center added at that site if possible. She stated she is favoring the outdoor aquatic facility since the current pool is aged and needs to be replaced.

Frangiamore asked Victor if she would be in favor of going to referendum for the project, and she stated she does not want to miss the opportunity to apply for the PARC grant, so she is supporting staff's recommendation of not pursuing a referendum at this time. She would want the outdoor aquatic facility at Cary-Grove Park due to the central location for the community. If it were at Hoffman Park it would be more challenging for people in Cary to reach the facility.

Stanko stated that he is in support of an outdoor aquatic facility. He explained that if an indoor recreation center were to be built over a pool and the pool becomes non-functional, that does not make sense. The pool is a basic offering of the Park District. Stanko explained he hasn't heard anything that would override the argument to continue to provide the Park District residents with the same type of opportunities it currently has. He would support an outdoor aquatic facility. There are enough finances to do the project well and within a timely manner, so he does not support a referendum. The PARC grant is a wonderful opportunity, but he isn't in a hurry. If staff needs to pass on the grant this year in order to finish Kaper and Lions Parks, he is supportive of that. There is enough time to move forward and plan for 2021. He is worried that staff is being overexerted.

Frangiamore asked the last time the PARC grant was offered, and Jones stated it was in 2014.

Stanko stated he sees a lot of similarities between Cary-Grove Park and Hoffman Park. He then passed out a chart showing the pros and cons of building a facility at Cary-Grove Park or Hoffman Park to each Commissioner. The chart will be added to the end of the minutes for reference. He would like to see a discussion take place about Hoffman Park and would like it to still be considered. He said the traffic conditions is something to be considered on Three Oaks Road if Cary-Grove Park is decided upon. There are many activities going on at Cary-Grove Park and to diffuse some of the traffic he thinks considering Hoffman Park would be a good idea. By putting the outdoor aquatic facility in the center of

town, it brings everyone to one place, and he isn't sure the best situation is being considered. He is struggling with the traffic impact on residents that live in the area of Cary-Grove Park.

Stanko stated when this decision is made, the Board can't think about the people coming that specific day to use the facility, but all residents need to be considered using Three Oaks Road and how that will work.

Hauck stated she is in favor an outdoor aquatic facility at Cary-Grove Park. It is more appealing when it comes to the cost to develop the site. She is fine with going to a referendum, but if the project can be done without going to referendum, then great. She supports doing an outdoor aquatic facility without the referendum.

Renner stated he is in support of building an outdoor aquatic facility at Cary-Grove Park. He feels the size of an indoor recreation center that would be appropriate for the community is more than what the Park District can afford. He explained either choice made is still going to be a great asset to the community. He was not in favor of an outdoor aquatic facility due to the expense and the limited three month usage, but he spent a lot of time at the pool this summer and there were a lot of kids who use the current pool even with its age and limited features. He explained there is going to be a lot a lot more usage of the new facility than what will ever happen at the current pool.

Renner stated he would be interested in raising the return and see what the design team would come back with whether it be increase the bather capacity or something else to increase revenue.

Frangiamore stated he likes the idea of the indoor recreation center and it is one of the top items the community is requesting. If there is enough money to build one type of facility, and then a referendum occurs and fails but the facility were to be built anyway, he doesn't think that will sit well with the community. He does not support a referendum. The current pool still is used heavily even though it is outdated. He can't justify building an indoor recreation center if the pool fails. An outdoor aquatic facility is something he supports and feels it should be built at Cary-Grove Park for many reasons including cost. The cost to do it at Hoffman wouldn't be a viable option. A lot of time and effort has been put into Cary-Grove Park. Previous Board were in support of Cary-Grove Park and he still supports that decision.

Frangiamore stated with the ball fields at Maplewood going away in the future, he wonders if another community atmosphere could be created at Cary-Grove Park. He sees it as bigger picture than the outdoor aquatic facility. He sees the whole future vision of the park such as creating multi-use fields in the future. He is focused on developing the park as a whole. Frangiamore stated that he does see a need to leave a footprint at Cary-Grove Park for a future indoor recreation center and possible indoor aquatics as well.

Frangiamore mentioned the seniors and his concern about the Kraus Senior Center. Money needs to be saved for the current Community Center. He stated conversations need to take place once the Preschool moves to 100 Cary-Algonquin Rd and how the rooms at the Community Center can be converted to senior needs. Frangiamore stated his biggest concern is to develop that park and address the senior needs.

Jones restated his understanding of the discussion and consensus of the Board as a result of the discussion, to focus on the development of an outdoor aquatic facility with Cary-Grove Park as the site. He stated that staff will start the process toward this consensus which will include more input from the Board as well as from the public. Hopefully while the process occurs, the PARC grant will open up.

Stanko moved to adjourn the meeting; second by Hauck.

Voice vote: 5-0. All voting yes. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 8:43 PM.

Daniel C. Jones, Secretary
Park District Board of Commissioners

Aquatic Facility Location Issues

My own analysis with items placed in no particular order. Other issues could be included.

ISSUE	CARY-GROVE PARK	HOFFMAN PARK	COMMENTS
ACCESSIBILITY	Much easier for residents to reach a park located in center of town. Non-residents will be driving into center of town.	More difficult for residents to reach a park located of Rt. 31. Non-residents will be kept out of center of town.	People are going to come either way. Regardless of how many times you attend the pool, people will be attending the pool every day.
LAND READINESS	Preliminary site engineering still needs to be done.	Preliminary site engineering still needs to be done. May require additional site work depending upon placement of facility.	To really understand the differences a study needs to be done for Hoffman Park like the one for Cary-Grove.
ANNEXATIONS	Need to deal with the Cary to annex property.	Need to deal with Cary to annex property and with Lake in the Hills to de-annex property.	Either way this is a benefit to Cary.
STREETS	Need to address the question of First Street extended.	Need to address the question of West Main extended.	Both issues will be contested. Can you argue putting one street through and not the other? Closing off one street and not the other?
SEWER & WATER	Lines needed from Cary at Three Oaks street.	Not realistic to run water from LITH. Lines needed from Cary at shortest location to attach to mains.	Cary has the sewer and water capacity. To really understand the differences a study needs to be done for Hoffman Park like the one for Cary-Grove.
TRAFFIC	Traffic will be directed to the center of town. By having multiple facilities at this one location will concentrate traffic to the center of town.	Traffic will be directed to Rt. 31. By having facilities at different locations will diffuse traffic and move some traffic away from the center of town.	Rt. 31 is better able to handle traffic. Regardless of whether you are using the facility or not, the traffic will be coming daily to use the facility. Residents will have to deal with the traffic on a daily basis.

EXPANDABILITY	Capable of being expanded. Limited space available.	Capable of being expanded. More space available for expansion at Hoffman Park.	Scope of facility may change with location and provide increased options for residents. To really understand the differences a study needs to be done for Hoffman Park like the one for Cary-Grove.
KEEPING TAXES DOWN	Facility can be modified in an effort to increase its revenue generation.	Facility can be modified to increase its revenue generation. Capturing greater non-resident revenue may come from this location.	Hoffman will capture users from a larger user base. To really understand the differences a study needs to be done for Hoffman Park like the one for Cary-Grove.

For me the issues boil down to a view that takes into consideration the impacts to ALL residents, not just the ones who will be coming to the facility. Depending upon the location of facility, it will impact both residents and non-residents as well as those who use the facility and those who do not use the facility.