

**Minutes of the Waukegan Park District
Special Meeting of Board of Commissioners
February 4, 2014**

The Board of Commissioners of the Waukegan Park District met in a special meeting on February 4, 2014 at the Rose Administrative Center, 2000 Belvidere, Waukegan IL.

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by President Kilkelly at 4:30 p.m. who directed a call of the roll.

II. Roll Call

Present: Commissioners Duffy, Foley, Sarocka, Bridges and President Kilkelly.
Absent: None. Also present: Executive Director Greg Petry, Board Attorney Charles Smith, Scott Hester of Counsilman Hunsaker, and Doug Holzrichter of PHN Architects.

III. Public Portion

No member of the public asked to address the Board.

IV. Review, Discuss, Decide

A. Park and Recreation Facility Construction (PARC) Grant for an Indoor Pool. The Board reviewed the procedures and advisability of applying for a PARC grant for an indoor pool.

Mr. Petry advised that Governor Quinn has made funds available for these grants, and while the Waukegan Park District certainly would fit many of the criteria for the grant, he stressed that it will be a highly competitive process. A grant of up to \$2.5M may be available for a pool. Staff estimates the cost between \$7M and \$7.5M for an indoor facility.

Doug Holzrichter reviewed the grant program, the rules and regulations and advised that the period for the grant application is from January 24, 2014 to March 10, 2014. Accordingly, the Park District has very little time to put a grant application together. The maximum amount of the grant available is \$2.5M. There is a \$300 non-refundable application fee and a \$5,000 grant award fee. Projects include natatoriums, pools and several other recreational facilities. The applying park districts must be able to demonstrate the ability to finance the project without the grant. Requests must be reviewed by a certified public accountant to certify the financial feasibility of the plan. The grant could be used to either build a new facility or to rehab an existing facility. There will be no multiple sites, but multiple applications could be made. The Park District could make separate application sfor both Hinkston Park and Belvidere Park, but could not make one application for both sites.

Mr. Holzrichter then reviewed the priorities established by the Department of Natural Resources for the grants and stressed that the Department will be looking for a facility that meets the state-wide goals and will have the greatest cost benefit to the

community. They will also be looking at recreational diversity and public support for the plan.

The commissioners then asked questions of Mr. Holzrichter, Mr. Hester, and staff concerning the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats to the Hinkston facility and Belvidere Park facility.

Commissioner Sarocka asked what the mathematical odds are of obtaining such a grant. He was advised that based on previous grant applications that there would probably 1-5 chance of being successful.

Commissioner Duffy asked about completion requirements and was advised that the project must be completed within three years.

Mr. Holzrichter reviewed the dimensions of indoor sites. The Belvidere Park site would be approximately 16,200 square feet and cost between \$7M and \$7.5M, would have a 6-lane pool plus approximately 1,000 square feet for a therapy pool.

An artist's rendition showing the potential layout of the pool at Belvidere Park was reviewed. The same analysis was done at Hinkston with a similar size pool although the staff and commissioners noted that a slightly smaller pool may be utilized at Hinkston.

Commissioner Duffy asked about the capacity of the Ganster Pool and the potential capacity of a 6-lane pool.

Mr. Holzrichter advised that Ganster Pool capacity is 485 people and the potential capacity of a 6-lane pool would be 415 people.

Mr. Holzrichter made notes of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats at each location.

Following the detailed analysis of each location, President Kilkelly asked to poll all the commissioners, staff, and others present at the meeting relative to their preference for the grant application as to either Belvidere Park or Hinkston Park.

Commissioner Duffy stated that with the limited dollars that the Park District has available for construction and the likelihood that there would not be construction for a considerable period in the future, he favored Belvidere Park.

Commissioner Bridges stated that the Park District needed to make a commitment to the south side of the Park District and therefore favored Belvidere Park.

Mr. Lerner stated that the one component missing from the FieldHouse is a pool and therefore recommended Hinkston Park.

Ms. Anderson stated that the focus of the pool should be family swimming and therapy and felt that the Hinkston location was more desirable and it would be easier to staff that location.

Mr. Glogovsky stated that the FieldHouse location presented a better revenue potential and stressed that the Belvidere Park facility is already heavily used and that adding a new indoor facility might overtax the available resources at Belvidere.

Mr. Trigg stated that he is very familiar with the OSLAD grant process and feels that there is a better chance of obtaining the grant if the Hinkston site is chosen. He further stressed that the Park District Master Plan would be a better process for addressing the Park District's responsibility to the south side of the community and that we should look to fill the major improvement at Belvidere for that area of the city.

Ms. Freeman stated that because of the grant process and the membership at the FieldHouse, she felt that the Hinkston site would be best.

Commissioner Foley stated that she favors the Hinkston site for a number of reasons, but stressed that the Belvidere building in particular would need a massive amount of work in order to be operational.

Commissioner Sarocka stated that he is torn between the two locations and felt that the process that the Board had gone through for over 2.5 hours of analyzing the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of each location was very worthwhile. He stated that a pool is needed at both locations but favors Belvidere as the best site for the majority of the constituents.

Mr. Petry stated that his analysis is that the best chance for getting the grant is Hinkston but stressed that there is no wrong answer to the application. He wants the south side to receive a complex that is a full facility instead of a limited facility such as this indoor pool would be.

Board attorney/secretary Chuck Smith stated that there are advantages to both locations but because the Park District has closed one facility on the south side and that the SportsPark and Fieldhouse were new facilities, that Belvidere should be the focus.

Mr. Holzrichter stated that in his opinion Hinkston presented the best avenue for recovering revenue.

Mr. Hester stated that neither he nor Mr. Holzrichter had any bias or interest in either location, but stated he really was concerned about the ability of a stand-alone aquatic facility to generate revenue and that the association with the FieldHouse would make that the better location for the pool.

Mr. Petry also commented that there are economies of scale that could be recognized at Hinkston that could not be at Belvidere.

President Kilkelly stated that because of her concern about adding on to an old structure at Belvidere and thereby not being cost effective, and the potential to lose health club members if the facility was not built at Hinkston, that she would favor Hinkston.

Motion by Commissioner Duffy, seconded by Commissioner Bridges, to proceed with the grant application with the location being Belvidere Park. Roll call to the motion: Ayes: Duffy, Sarocka, Bridges. Nays: Kilkelly, Foley. Absent: None. Motion carried.

Motion by Commissioner Sarocka, to direct staff to prepare a second grant application and to submit applications for both Belvidere Park and Hinkston Park. Motion died for lack of a second.

B. Executive Director Contract and Compensation. The commissioners reviewed the draft contract with the Executive Director.

Commissioner Bridges expressed his appreciation to Mr. Petry for waiving the January 15 deadline by which the Park District was to have given its notice of its intent not to renew the contract.

Mr. Petry stated that he felt that the contract negotiation process had been extremely fair and that he wanted to see a new contract drawn and was not concerned about the deadline.

The commissioners were satisfied with the terms and conditions of the contract and directed that it be posted as required by the Open Meetings Act and that the contract be placed on the agenda for February 11, 2014.

VI. Closed Session

There was no motion to adjourn into closed session.

VII. Questions from Commissioners

There were no questions or comments from the commissioners.

V. Adjournment

Motion by Commissioner Foley, seconded by Commissioner Bridges, to adjourn. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 7:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles W. Smith
Board Attorney/Secretary