



MINUTES OF THE PARKS COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 25, 2022, 5:00 PM

CITY HALL, ROOM 207

AMENDED

A. ROLL CALL.

Present: Parks Committee Chair - Alder Chris Wery, Vice-Chair - Alder Steven Campbell, Alder Mark Steuer, Alder Melinda Eck

Others Present: Alder Brian Johnson, Director Dan Ditscheit, Deputy Director James Andersen, Parks & Rec Staff - Ann Moeller, Pat Baye, Nina Robinette

B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ald. Melinda Eck to amend the agenda, moving item #2 to #1 for regular business.

Motion carried.

Yes- Steven Campbell, Melinda Eck, Chris Wery, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ald. Melinda Eck to approve. Motion carried.

Yes- Steven Campbell, Melinda Eck, Chris Wery, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None

D. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. Consideration with possible action on a request by Ald. Wery to install an ADA accessible walk at Colburn Park from the pool parking lot to the soccer field.

Moved by Ald. Chris Wery, seconded by Ald. Melinda Eck to hold on the request by Ald. Wery to install an ADA accessible walk at Colburn Park from the pool parking lot to the soccer field until the Colburn 9th Street parking lot reconstruction project is completed to determine if there is enough funding from that project to also fund this walk. Motion carried.

Yes- Steven Campbell, Melinda Eck, Chris Wery, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None

2. Consideration with possible action on the approval of the master plan for Leicht Memorial Park.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ald. Melinda Eck to approve the master plan for Leicht

Memorial Park. Motion carried.

Yes- Steven Campbell, Melinda Eck, Chris Wery, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None

3. Consideration with possible action on the approval of a resolution authorizing applications for grant funds to assist with the Leicht Memorial Park Improvements project.

Moved by Ald. Steven Campbell, seconded by Ald. Melinda Eck to approve a resolution authorizing applications for grant funds to assist with the Leicht Memorial Park Improvements project. Motion carried.

Yes- Steven Campbell, Melinda Eck, Chris Wery, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None

4. Consideration with possible action on accepting a \$10,000 donation of grant funding from the Nature Conservancy to fund habitat restoration efforts along the East River Greenway corridor.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ald. Steven Campbell to approve accepting a donation of up to \$20,000 in grant funding from the Nature Conservancy to fund habitat restoration efforts and stream bank erosion along the East River watershed. Motion Passed.

Yes- Steven Campbell, Melinda Eck, Chris Wery, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None.

5. Consideration with possible action on the request by Wisconsin Public Service to approve a 12' wide utility easement at John Muir Park.

Moved by Ald. Melinda Eck, seconded by Ald. Steven Campbell to approve the request by Wisconsin Public Service for a 12' wide utility easement at John Muir Park. Motion carried.

Yes- Steven Campbell, Melinda Eck, Chris Wery, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None

6. Consideration with possible action on the purchase of Parcel # 21-1979-3 near the intersection of Main Street and Elizabeth Street for the expansion of the Baird Creek Greenway.

Moved by Ald. Melinda Eck, seconded by Ald. Steven Campbell to approve the purchase of Parcel # 21-1979-3 near the intersection of Main Street and Elizabeth Street for the expansion of the Baird Creek Greenway. Motion carried.

Yes- Steven Campbell, Melinda Eck, Chris Wery, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None

7. Consideration with possible action on modifications to the fee schedule for the new banquet/meeting hall facility at the Wildlife Sanctuary.

Moved by Ald. Melinda Eck, seconded by Ald. Steven Campbell to approve the staff recommended modifications to the fee schedule for the new banquet/meeting hall facility at the Wildlife Sanctuary. Motion carried.

Yes- Steven Campbell, Melinda Eck, Chris Wery, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None

E. INFORMATIONAL.

I. Staff update on seasonal staffing levels for the Pools, Summer Playground Program and Bay Beach Amusement Park.

Moved by Ald. Mark Steuer, seconded by Ald. Steven Campbell to receive and place on file the staff update on seasonal staffing levels for the Pools, Summer Playground Program and Bay Beach Amusement Park. Motion carried.

Yes- Steven Campbell, Melinda Eck, Chris Wery, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None

2. Director's Report on updates and recent activities of the Parks, Recreation & Forestry Department.

Moved by Ald. Melinda Eck, seconded by Ald. Mark Steuer to receive and place on file the Director's Report on updates and recent activities of the Parks, Recreation & Forestry Department. Motion carried.

Yes- Steven Campbell, Melinda Eck, Chris Wery, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None

3. The next Parks Committee meeting is scheduled for June 22, 2022.

F. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Melinda Eck, seconded by Ald. Mark Steuer to adjourn.

Motion .

Yes- Steven Campbell, Melinda Eck, Chris Wery, Mark Steuer, No- None, Abstain- None.

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Sorry.
- Okay, I'm not going up after what's next time, I'm gonna hurry that up.
- The Parks Committee will come to order and let's have a roll call, Alder Steuer.
- I am here.
- Alder Eck.
- I am present.
- Alder Campbell.
- Here.
- Alright and Alder Wery here, all present. Can I have an approval of the agenda?
- I vote motion. Make a motion to approve the agenda.
- I second it.
- There's a and . . . Alder Stevens to approve the agenda, any changes?
- Campbell.
- I would like to .
- You said Stevens, but it's Steve Campbell.

- That's alright, don't worry.
- Got it.
- Yeah, we're off doing wonderful start.
- Yeah that a-way, I'd like to move number two, up to number one.
- All right.
- A motion by Alder Steuer to move number two first.
- I'm second around.
- You're second to that? Alright committee?
- Oh, that's fine.
- Okay so we will go two then one.
- So can I clarify? Instead of approving the agenda, you want to actually modify the agenda.
- Modify the agenda.
- That is-
- So we're not approving?
- We didn't really take a vote on that one yet.
- We're reconsidering that.
- Oh okay.
- It's just gonna be Steuer and Eck to move two to one.
- Gotcha.
- Those in favor?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carried. Can I get, see approval of the minutes?
- So moved.

- Second.

- Motion by Alder Steuer, second Alder Eck to approve the minutes, any changes there? Those in favor?

- It's uni.

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. Number two, consideration with possible action on the approval of the Master Plan for Leicht Memorial Park.

- Thank you.

- And I am just handing out the Master Plan that's in the agenda packet. So it's nothing in addition to what's there already just sometimes easier to look at paper.

- And it's in color, nice.

- All yours.

- Okay.

- In 2005, the city constructed Leicht Memorial Park, and at the time there was only enough funding to construct a portion of the Master Plan. So items such as a permanent stage and the shelter with restrooms were desired but there wasn't enough funding to implement these and install them. So in that first page, on the agenda packet, that's a Master Plan of what is current and existing. So it's the black and white image. So in 2001, the City Council allocated just over \$4 million in TID funding to invest in Leicht Memorial Park. So the funding was to go specifically towards dock wall improvements, sculptures, winter lighting, walkway paving, a permanent stage, and shelter with restrooms. So the dock wall improvements are nearly completed. So if you go out there, you'll see all of the renovations nearly done. And that leaves about \$3.2 million left in TID funding to put towards additional improvements to the park. So with such substantial improvements to the park, we thought it'd be a good idea to actually revisit the Master Plan. Make sure that what's out there matches our needs and if not, what would we do differently? So we hired ISG, they're a local engineering multidisciplinary firm located literally right across the river from Leicht Park and they're responsible and under contract to create a new Master Plan and also create construction documents for phase one development, which are the items that I previously listed. So we first started out by putting together a review team consisting of several park members, the Mayor, Alder Johnson's on that committee, along with several Broadway business owners and along with other Board Members from On Broadway. So On Broadway is gonna take the lead on programming of the permanent stage with active events and activities within the park. So we thought it was really helpful to get their input on what the design is and what it should be since they're gonna be doing the programming for it. So ISG, they already completed three initial concepts. And as a design team, we reviewed all three concepts and we narrowed it down to the concept that you see in front of you. So if you look at, we can start going through these images and I'll kind of review the concept with you in a little more detail. So you can see in this aerial photograph, it shows the highlighted projected project location. And it just simplifies things for you just so that you can see what we're proposing to redevelop. If you

go to the next page, there's a bubble diagram showing Leicht Park as a whole. So you see that the project location is bubbled out and that's the same area that in the previous air photo was highlighted in the white bubble, and that is the current city owned property. So we own that, we maintain that, we have jurisdiction over that property.

- Which property?

- Where it says project location-

- Okay just wanted to -

- In the public diagram map.

- I assume that.

- Yep and then just to the north of that, there's something called short term lease space. So that property is owned by the property to the north, which is Graymont, and we currently have a 10-year lease with them to operate that and use that area for park purposes. That lease is kind of nearing the end. We've already... we started that lease maybe about 15, 20 years ago. We already renewed it once over a 10-year span. Now we're to the point where that lease expires in the next year or two, and we've had discussions with them to see if they have any interest in selling. At this point, they don't. So we're still treating them as a short-term lease property but they are willing to extend it another 10 years. So we'll be bringing that easement and lease agreement back to the committee as soon as it's drafted and ready to go. But we didn't want to invest a lot into a Master Plan or into developments of that property because that could all go away at any time because we don't own it and manage that property. Then along the shoreline, along the Fox River, you'll see a strip of land right along the dock wall called long-term lease area, long-term lease space. That property is a 50-foot strip right along the dock wall, where we have a long term, I believe it's a 50-year lease with Graymont. So we have improved that area because we use that for new various docks. Hoping we get some cruise ships dock in the near future, but we use that for the tall ship events and everything else. So we did previously invest significant funds into that long term lease space improving it. But for the Master Plan itself, we're focusing on the area that's bubbled out called project location. And if you turn to the next page that shows the conceptual diagram and the revised Master Plan of what the committee as a whole really felt strongly, that this is a great concept and we should hopefully move forward with this. So I'll kind of step you through some of the key elements to this Master Plan. So you see the parking lot to kind of the west side or the north side of the park. That parking lot is existing. So it's there. We have to keep that parking lot in place because it's also the access for Graymont to the north of the property. So they need that parking lot access so that they can get to their warehouses so we really can't do much with that parking lot. So what's there is pretty much gonna stay there as it is. But as a committee, we felt that it was really important to take a closer look at the entrance itself and maybe look at controlling that entrance a little better. Right now, I believe there's gates but for the most part, they're open all the time. What we're proposing here, and that would be items they're called two, three, and four. Those are kind of gateway entry features, which is a more prominent focal point as you drive into the facility. But then we could also maybe sell tickets there or at least control access at that location. But those would be kind of formal, artistic buildings of some kind and maybe a gateway arches, maybe how you could view that. Then the next really thing that we needed to figure out in the Master Plan is where would the stage go if we were to put a stage here? Where the stage currently is located, it's not an ideal situation. And Alder

Johnson can attest to that because where it is in the afternoon sun, the sun is setting right in the eyes of the performers on the stage. And so we've gotten a number of complaints in the evening when they're performing, which is typically when they perform. So it's really not an ideal setup. So it was really it either needs to go to the north end of the property, or it needs to go to the south end closer to the road. And as we looked at it, we were as a committee, we really felt that the best location for it was to the north edge, where it's shown on this concept. Because for several reasons, one is, we're looking at that permanent stage as more of an artistic statement piece architecturally. And so you'll really get tremendous views of that stage as you're crossing over the bridge. And so it really is a statement piece, or could be if it's designed properly and becomes a really artistic feature. And that would mean that you kind of sit towards the road and face towards the stage. And what that allowed us to do is really take a close look at the shelter that we'd like to build. So the shelter, if you can imagine what it'll be, it's primary use is restrooms for the most part, cause we do not have permanent restrooms in this park at all. We only have porta potties so that's our primary focus, but then we also want to do an enclosed rental space. Wouldn't be a very big rental space, it'd be kind of smaller, but we could really focus doing concessions in there or maybe selling beer or a soda out of a concession counter. So if you've ever been to the botanical garden, they built a similar type of building off to the side of their amphitheater that they built to kind of compare it to that. But it would be programmed a little bit differently. And the fact that we would see this as actual programming space, where in the winter months and summer months, you could actually maybe sit in there or have a meeting in there cause it'd be a year-round facility. But what we really liked about having that in the location that it's shown right adjacent to the road is there is a grade change. So the road is higher than the park. So what that will actually be, is we'll be able to actually very easily build a rooftop garden where we can have seating up on the top, which could be viewed as kind of the premier viewing location for the stage. Maybe we could sell that space or be VIP seating. And when there's not a stage or an event going on there, it's still a wonderful space because it would be elevated a little bit higher than the road. It still kind of ties into the Broadway District a little bit better than if that building were kind of set back into the park. It becomes kind of a building within the Broadway District versus a park building. So really a combination of those two reasons really set us up for this design as it's shown with the stage where it is and the restroom with concession area where it is. Then as we kind of step through this Master Plan and the site work, a lot of it falls into, well, how does the circulation go? How do people sit? Where do they go? How does things relate to the waterway? You'll see that where there's number 212 listed that would be an outdoor seating area, plaza space. Where the public could sit there and eat or drink depending on how that concession stand is being used but then they can also view the stage. And then item where 22 is listed, that would be kind of grass seating for the stage. Then there's a series of walkways that all kind of create a statement with kind of a curvilinear walk towards the shoreline and towards the stage. So you know how that pavement is designed, it would really draw your eye towards that focal point, which is the stage. Then there's a lot of smaller elements in here such as item 20, is a potential water feature that could be built right into or right adjacent to that concession stand where that would just be maybe a small little waterfall just something artistic and creative, but kind of adds to the ambiance of the site. In addition, we have several features of storm water management features scattered throughout the site, which will be required if we redevelop the site. We have to incorporate storm water management into this and then when you get to the shoreline portion, what they're proposing to do is expand the docks that are there. And really create a little better user experience for the docks than what's right there now. Right now there's just one gang way that leads down to the floating docks. This creates more of a space and it's more of an experience as you're walking down to those floating docks. And then finally, the other big element to keep in mind here is you'll see under item eight, that is shown as a future pedestrian bridge. So for those of you who are

familiar with the site, there is a railroad, an active railroad line just to the west of the site, which separates the old Titledown restaurant from our park. And that is an active railroad so it is fenced so that people are not encouraged to cross the tracks wherever they want. And the fencing causes a problem because people do wanna cross right where that pedestrian bridge is located. And so occasionally people do just jump that fence in that location. And especially with all of the residential condo developments that are going on just across the way there, we expect that that's gonna... that demand is even gonna increase as the housing gets developed there and people want to walk to Leicht Park, cause they obviously wouldn't want to walk completely around the fencing down to Dousman Street and then back up into the park. So we felt that we needed to incorporate some sort of an above ground walkway over the parking lot for people to cross in that location. It's shown here but it's one of those things where maybe that might end up being one of the last things we fund in this park. We're not sure yet how that fits in with the budget, but we wanted to at least incorporate it into the Master Plan cause there is a demand for it, it's just a matter of what we ever find the money for it, I guess that remains to be seen, and we'll go from there. Then I want to talk to you a little bit about the budget and the cost estimate for all of this. So I think I included a rough cost estimate in the agenda packet, it's not in this packet I just handed out, but it shows that if we were to develop everything in this Master Plan as shown, it would cost roughly \$6.2 million. Of that, approximately \$2 million is for the buildings, which would be the stage and the rental shelter with restrooms. About \$580,000 for that pedestrian bridge that I discussed. And then... about \$860,000 for docks and boardwalk, and improvements to the shoreline. I have to pull out my agenda packet cause in my notes, I'm missing a line item here, just give me a second. And then about \$2.8 million for second work and features. So that gives you the \$6.2 million. As I previously stated, we only have about \$3.2 million available in the budget. So how we're viewing this is we're going to build this in phases as our budget allows. So the first step in engineering is going to be to engineer what we can do within our budget. And the items that I previously mentioned with the stage and the building and a few other things that I mentioned are our top priorities for that funding. And then if there's additional money to do some site work or water improvements, we'll do that. Now one thing that we're looking at doing is On Broadway has indicated that they're willing to potentially fundraise for a portion of this, some of the shortfall. So we are having active discussions with On Broadway to determine what that looks like, and right now we haven't, we don't have any set plans in place as far as what that fundraising goal would look like, what the timeline is. But as we continue to work through some of that, we'll be coming back to you with more information on if that's going to happen and if so, what does it look like? And if for some reason it doesn't happen, we'll proceed with doing the phase one construction with what we have funding available for. So really what we're looking for and I just have one more thing to say, and then I'll open up to Alder Johnson just to make some additional comments, but really what I'm looking for at this meeting is just approval for the Master Plan saying, you support the Master Plan. You like what you see, what I described to you matches your vision of it, and you think that this could be an exciting option. And we really have to get the Master Plan approved by Parks Committee and City Council so that the engineer can then take it to the next step and start the actual engineering documents of specific elements. We're really hesitant to start continuing work on that real detailed engineering. If the City Council isn't supportive of the Master Plan and the phasing plan and budget as I presented it. So from there, I guess I'll open it up to Alder Johnson to maybe say a few things and add to what I said.

- Thanks, Director. Welcome aboard.

- Hello folks.

- Johnson.

- So that was a great overview by Director Ditscheit. Just a little bit of maybe additional context, particularly for those who weren't here when we had discussions around TID 5. So this is all really being driven by the closure of TID 5, which is gonna have \$5 million of surplus funding over the next couple of years. And I'm trying to remember when we did that, but essentially, it was at the end of the year, end of 2021. We had to pass a resolution that basically dictated how that funding was gonna be invested and per the TID plan, it has to be invested within half mile of that site and there are very specific things that it can be spent on. And so of that, I know there was some shoring up the dock walls, which is what you're seeing, work that's already been performed. There were some electrical and lighting upgrades that were part of that. And then part of that, well there was some... I think Park Lake grant funding was part of that, some public art installations but the biggest chunk of what you're seeing right now is specifically related to the park. So that is the \$3 million-ish that Director Ditscheit is talking about. So as he mentioned, you're looking at about \$6 million overall total project. And so initially when some of the TID 5 proposals come forward, one of the proposals for this park was a basic restroom facility that would service the needs of the park, which is desperately needed. As someone who programs events in that park regularly, I can tell you that it is a need. And this is when I came to Dan and we talked to Council and RDA and said, "Hey, what if we could "do some type of public, private partnership "that could get us something a little bit more robust, and a little bit faster, than what the city could do on its own." And so that is what Director Ditscheit is referring to when he talks about On Broadway doing some fundraising. So our Board is committed to that. We are gonna be doing a capital campaign launching this fall that's going to look at both the public market, as well as this. We're gonna do them both at the same time, and our board just authorized funding last night or Monday night, sorry. We met on Monday night, for us to retain our Capital Campaign Consultant to start assembling those materials and donor lists and all of that. So that is a process that is moving full speed ahead for us. And I can tell you obviously, Director Ditscheit, talked about a \$6 million project, city having the capacity to contribute about half, which leaves half. And I think that it is understood that that is the expectation that we would come to the table with. So for those of you not familiar with other campaigns that have existed from other parks that is a very substantial investment from a private investment group. So, and we're willing to make that. And as part of that agreement though, when we did that TID 5 resolution at the end of the year, one of the things that was contained within that is that On Broadway would come to this body, I believe by July with a draft of a management agreement for the facility. So you'll see a lot of these questions answered, I think, when that management agreement comes forward, kind of expectations of city, expectations of On Broadway and how all that'll look. So I just kind of wanted to give you a little bit of context there and let you know that, that detail is forthcoming. But what Director Ditscheit looking for today, and what's really most relevant is the site plan that you see in front of you today. As he mentioned, there's been a great stakeholder group that's been invested on this. ISG is a wonderful firm that has really facilitated. I think a lot of different opinions sometimes, and has found a way to almost bring us to consensus, which I think is really hard to do. So you have about a half a dozen folks from City Hall, including Parks Department in the Mayor's office, and about a half a dozen from On Broadway, including myself as a representative. So, it's an equally balanced, recognizing that equal investment into the facility. And we all agree, I believe there's, I mean, unanimous consent in the room that this is the right direction. There were multiple options. They typically come to you and say, do you like this option, this option, or this option? And then they narrow it down, narrow it down, narrow it down. And so this is through a series of meetings, a lot of hard work, a lot of really smart people who understand this, and they've done a really good job with getting us to the site plan that makes the most sense, given a lot of the constraints on this site,

including that easement from the new water line. That takes out a big chunk of the park, obviously the easement for the parking lot, that Director Ditscheit I talked about and the access that you have to create for Graymont, in addition to not really owning the land up in the north. So that didn't really impact our design decisions much. So at this point, you can't engineer, you can't drill down further really until we just have that preliminary concept agreed upon. And that's kind of what we're looking for today. Just say, "Yeah, we like what we're seeing. "Think you're heading in the right direction." Or if you have feedback that you'd like us to incorporate, obviously we want to hear that and we want to incorporate that. There's probably just one area that Director Ditscheit and I, respectfully probably disagree a little bit and that's the phasing. And the reason I bring that up is phase one, obviously from a parks perspective is, "Hey, we wanna do the stage in the concession area." I'm telling you that from a capital campaign perspective, I cannot raise money for sidewalks and storm water management. I can raise money for a stage and a concession stand. So I think we have to find a way for these things, to come together at the same time and how that timing works. We all agreed that we're still gonna work on that and I don't think that that's a definitive decision that has to come outta here today. But I do think that that is a consideration that we want this body to really take is how do those things come together so that we can ensure that the private investment coming into this park so that, that initiative can be successful. Happy to take questions.

- Ready for some questions?

- I think Mark's got a page here. Why don't we start our Alder?

- Go ahead, maybe you'll answer my question.

- We can go back and forth. Thanks for comin' down Brian. There's a couple things here. As you know, we talked about the lease agreements. Is the group satisfied with the way that's set up right now? That that we're comfortable enough with the 10-year and the 50-year?

- We really don't have a choice that's been driven by Graymont so-

- But we've done that okay with it as well as can be expected with this plan?

- Yeah, we had Director Ditscheit reach out to Graymont and inquire if there was any interest in talking about a purchase before we went too far down this path and at this time, there just wasn't. So those are the constraints we have and-

- Right.

- But look, I like the fact that we have a lease because it still allows us to program and utilize that space. And so when you look at the park, obviously one of the questions that may come up is that it's kinda looking in the opposite direction of that field and that's okay. When you look at events that are programmed in this park, and we program a lot of them and participate in a lot of them, with a park that size, you need two stages anyway if you're going to use the whole thing. So what this does allow, is it allows a really sort of intimate, and by intimate I mean one to 2,000 people, this park can accommodate. And that's exactly what you want out of a site this size. By contrast, the shipyard site is going to be intentionally designed for larger scale events, five to 10,000 people. And that'll be used predominantly for temporary equipment. Whereas this is equipment that stays in play place and allows you to program it multiple times a week so-

- I just-

- Yeah.

- Okay, thank you, Brian. I got a couple, just a few more. The TID 5, okay that's closing out, correct?

- Correct.

- And there's 5 million available but you're looking for three of that?

- Well that decision's already been made. So that was done when that resolution passed at the end of the year because by law we were required to do so.

- I just need to be refreshed on that a little bit. So there's money available. Alright, as far as, is there any thoughts, was there any thoughts of any permanent seating at all here? I know you got the open lawn area so we're just gonna go that route.

- Yeah we did not talk about permanent seating. I mean, obviously that will add to the cost and then you'd have to figure out where does that go but...

- Well, I think at one time there was some talk years ago of having a larger facility there along the river. A concert venue, so to speak. So considering what we have here, you feel this is the best option.

- I do and I see Director Ditscheit taking notes and we can kind of bring up that idea with the group and kinda see if that's something that can be incorporated and what that would look like.

- Okay as far as a number of folks that normally could gather there, is there any kind of crowd size that we're looking at maximum?

- One to 2,000.

- How many?

- One to 2,000.

- Okay.

- Really, I mean you're looking at one as you can see on the northwest part of that stage, that number 22 it gets blocked off a little bit. Again, those are the constraints of the set design. So those folks obviously have a hard time seeing a concert on the stage from that angle. So that's why we say one to two, you can comfortably get a thousand in front of the stage. You can get another thousand off the side there.

- Okay.

- But that's why you're kind of in that range.

- So the stage is set up so that the sun won't bother it as much. I mean, obviously with that angle-
- The new water utility easement is what creates the biggest obstacle for us. You have to have a 10 foot easement set back.
- Okay.
- Thanks, Alder.
- Okay so you had mentioned the stage now, there really isn't a stage now, it's just where they put a portable one.
- Right now we just have pavement in the size of a stage. So we have power to it so you can easily hook stage equipment up very easily in the location but it's not a formal stage, it's a platform.
- Okay, all right I just was... Wanted to make sure I wasn't-
- To give you an example, when we program that space, we actually bring in a stage, it's set on top of that platform.
- Okay, all right.
- So you're still paying right to bring in portable stage and to be able to effectively use the space.
- Yeah, I've been there for different things where, that was all the way on the north end filled in. Okay so you mentioned private funders in addition to, so in addition to the city funds or the TID, so what does that look like if they don't have owning rights or anything. It's just a matter of-
- That'll be defined in the management agreement when that comes forward, but you'd likely be looking at naming rights of some sort.
- Okay, that's what I wrote in. Naming rights or what. Okay so they would want naming some kind of naming rights. So it may not necessarily stay Leicht Memorial Park? Or maybe they would want the shelter named after them or something.
- Yeah, there's a couple of options there. We did have the Parks Department look into whether or not there was a requirement to retain the name of the park, but I don't think we necessarily have to change the name of the park. It could just be naming of the structures themselves. So it could be naming the pavilion, naming the concession stand, could be selling of bricks and pavers, things of that nature.
- Okay and so my questions are kind of I think, could be for either one of you, I don't know but the next one's then, could it be easily expanded if, say we were able to buy the Graymont property.
- Yeah, so obviously at that point we would develop a Master Plan for that part of the property. We're hopeful that what we're designing now can easily be tied into that in some way, shape or form. So the consultant is cognizant that someday that might become permanent park land so what we're

designing now really has to tie into that space, whether or not it happens or turns into something else.

- Okay, and then they access to Graymont with the bridge over it. I don't know, do they have big trucks going back there?

- Yeah, they do have semis that go back there. So we'd have to raise it high enough that they could get whatever size truck through that they needed, and so you can see on the Master Plan that there's a series of ramps that go off to get you to the top.

- Okay.

- It's hard to tell what that is but now that I explained it, it's probably obvious as you look at it.

- And it has to be high enough for the trains too, right? So if it's high enough for the trains, it's high enough for the trucks.

- Makes sense. Yeah, I love it.

- And the phasing piece?

- The whole thing I love it.

- So even though we might be swapped on phase one and phase two, some of these other things can come later too, right? So when you think about the docks or that pedestrian bridge, those are things that can come when the funding is available but having phase one and phase two in place right away to me is ideal where those things happen simultaneously.

- Well-

- I just wanted to expand on that a little bit.

- I don't think we're in disagreement on the phasing plan, what I'm saying is, phase one will consist of whatever money is available at the time. And if the fundraising money is available, that becomes phase one and so I think we'll be able to work jointly together.

- Oh, for sure yes.

- And figure out what phase one is going to look like.

- Well, I think phase one makes it usable right away. I mean, that's what I see anyway.

- Yeah.

- Thank you, thank you.

- Yeah, Campbell?

- I have question. That third part, I didn't turn that part off but that's just an easement at northern part with the 50-year.

- The 50-year is just a lease, it's a 50-year lease.

- I mean, how many-

- There's not enough to put parking, that's more probably gonna get used for dock space or something?

- Yes, correct.

- So the stage would be part of that viewing. So I added up just the seating there in front of the stage. I got 18,000 square feet that you have acquired there not including the tables up to the pavilion, but I don't know if that's adequate for a couple thousand people. I guess my question with what's been going on lately, as far as emergency escape outta here in case something tragic would happen. You know what I mean? Does it give us enough, enough to get out of there? You know what I mean with the fence and such? I mean this would be a place where something might happen.

- And as part of-

- And with the river being on one side, that really creates a one-way event, and that's kinda scary setup.

- That's part of the approval process for the design itself before we're allowed to build anything, we have to submit a site plan for approval. That gets funneled through all of the different departments where they get to review it. The fire department does review all site and submittals, and they do question things like that. Can we get a fire truck in there if there's an emergency? Are they gonna be able to turn around? How would they do it? So if they have issues or concerns, we're going to address it with the fire department well in advance. But if they have additional concerns, it'll come up during the site plan review process.

- It's a good question. A good observation, I can tell you that-

- I wasn't... Not so much fire as worried about safety or some kind of a terrorist thing, you know?

- Sure.

- So-

- And we do have some of those, we produce safety plans right now when we do events in the park and we do have to address some of that. And in fact, even from the... when you have those unfortunate circumstances, right? You have to be prepared for them. There was some, the federal government agency, it's Department of Homeland Security grant money that came in and so a lot of the bollards and other things that you see in there are actually safety mechanisms that were put in with that grant funding years ago. But they're still in existence and won't be replaced or removed.

- Then the only other thing I see possibly is, I'm sure a lot of boaters would maybe come up to here probably just to use the bathroom. Being that it's so far away, I see there's a proposed one over in the corner there?

- Yeah, that would be kind of an auxiliary bathroom and if funding allows, we'll build kind of a secondary bathroom in the northwest corner of the park.

- And I suppose on section 11 there, you could still put a porta pottie or two there.

- And for large events, we're still gonna have to bring in porta potties because this restroom facility that we're talking about, we haven't really figured out the size yet, but maybe it'll have five stalls in it. So it's not gonna be a huge bathroom that will accommodate thousands of people at a time. It will accommodate, traditional average use for a smaller facility for a smaller event.

- And when we do events like IgNight Market or 4th of July down in there, I mean, we're bringing in 50 to a 100 porta potties so it'll definitely be a continued need.

- Anything else Alder Campbell?

- Nope.

- Alder Steuer?

- Said everything.

- Alright, again I like the plan. It's very nice, nicely put together and I know that there was a lot of time and effort put into it. Brian, I was just gonna ask as far as the fundraising, in a perfect world, you'd like to see it happen fairly quickly. Do you have any idea or feel for timeframe on something like this?

- Well, I mean the next couple of months is our feasibility study. Feasibility for the campaign. And that doesn't talk about necessarily your ability to raise the money, but what does your messaging look like? And so that's the first phase working with our capital campaign consultant. And then that will migrate into actual identification of your capital campaign cabinet and then that turns into your donor recruitment. So we anticipate that the actual campaign will kick off sometime this fall. Probably around August, September. But all the preliminary work all occurs right now.

- Okay, with all that being said then as far as the completion of this plan, there's a couple factors that go into play, the fundraising, and the TID, and all that. But as far as looking at the plan, do you have any kind of an idea as far as a projected date that you'd like to see?

- Yeah, I think Director Ditscheit and I have been talking about some different options, but we haven't nailed it down yet. And I think it'd be premature right at this point-

- But just-

- But yeah.

- Okay, alright.
- But it is a discussion that we're having.
- Thanks, Alder Steuer. Alder Eck?
- Oh, I just wanted to clarify, so is the building five, the concession shelter with stairs. Does that also have bathrooms in that?
- Mm-hmm.
- Okay.
- That's the primary restroom.
- Okay, alright. Yeah.
- And I thought I picked up a start date, completion date 4/1/23 to 12/1/24 somewhere in the packet I read, does that sound right?
- I don't know. I don't know if that was in there or not. We really haven't set those dates yet. So if it was in there.
- Could be a preliminary. You got the extra copy.
- I did copy it.
- I think part of that was set on what the consultants contract stated as far as what the recommended schedule was but that was prior to us having discussions with Alder Johnson on fundraising.
- Go ahead.
- No, no go ahead, I'm good.
- I was just wondering and maybe it's yet to be determined but the Zachary Taylor statue, I didn't see it on here.
- It's still to be determined.
- Okay.
- It's actually further, I think isn't it?
- Yeah I mean, right now we haven't as a committee, we haven't really decided what to do with that. Whether it stays or gets relocated to the museum or some other location. I know we've had those discussions in the committee, but we haven't come up with a final decision on that.
- Leads me into my second question, which you already know-

- Fort Howard.

- What's Fort Howard? So when I was on the Larson Green site.

- We have talked about that and the thing is Fort Howard was actually was not located where Leicht Park is.

- Right.

- And as you may know, at the rail yard development, Elmore Commons has been dedicated as public space. And I've got some ideas around that that I'd love to sit down and share with you, but we do gotta get something up.

- Okay, cause I know, I mean, I know Alder Steuer and I've been hounding on it for years. I just don't want it to be lost in the shuffle. It seems like it gets bounced back and forth between the Larson Green, rail yard site, and here Leicht Park and back. And then I don't want to just years go, "Well, neither site did it now we don't have anything." And it could be really, I mean, you've traveled a lot Alder Johnson and you can really do some neat interactive history things and people who come to see a concert down here just to see the water can learn a lot and say, "Wow, I didn't know this was here." And it could really be amazing.

- Yeah, totally agree.

- When you said Fort Howard, sorry. I just wanted to clarify what, what you meaning by Fort Howard?

- The original Fort was right in that area.

- Oh okay.

- So it'd be nice to acknowledge that and teach about our history.

- I would say in some respects, it's the oldest piece of Wisconsin property. There're seven different nations that resided at one time or another, four native tribes and then French, British, and English. So I think it's important that we had talked about maybe possibly a half acre of land at one time. Just something and you could have kiosks, you could have different, just different things that are there that talked about the history and I think it's very important.

- Yeah and I can tell you, and at least with our organization that is not lost. And even with the committee, we have actively talked about it.

- So we'll definitely chime in right?

- Definitely, yeah.

- There's a reason I knew what you were gonna bring up because we've talked about it.

- I always do, I just don't want it to be forgotten.

- So, I would just kind of maybe close with one thing, and when you think about precedent projects, we've talked about if you've ever been to Leicht Amphitheater. Now that site's about twice the size of this one but just to give you some perspective of how this facility could be managed and operated on the waterfront.

- I just have-

- Mm-hm.

- We talk about the shipyard project. I think that's in your district also.

- Yes, sir.

- On Broadway. Is that gonna compete with this? Or is it just a different size? I don't know what the plan is for that, I guess.

- Yeah, because that site is so much larger, the types of programming that you would do in Leicht Park would actually just be so massively under scaled at the shipyard. You could have 200 people at the shipyard and feel like it was dead. So the smaller events you'd still want to drive to this facility, shipyard will be more primed for some of those larger acts.

- Well, there's been, I mean, you had the hot air balloon thing, pullout of Leicht Park, so there's been some pretty large scale things there.

- Yep, tall ships is another big one, 4th of July.

- Yeah.

- Alright any other questions from the committee? Or Director or sure.

- One, the gated. It says gated coming in, people wouldn't have to pay to come in would they?

- Not necessarily but it would depend on the particular event and what the needs are. I mean, for the most part for a typical day, when that park isn't being programmed, the gates would be open and people could come in and park.

- Okay.

- It's just per the program, we might limit access or parking or charge for parking depending on that particular event.

- Okay.

- And there's a secondary purpose. And I will say without a doubt, there will be ticketed events there because that's the only way to make the work on the management of the facility. But the secondary piece is that Dousman Street is obviously a busy street, and so when you have certain events where

you don't want car traffic plugging that up, you wanna gate that off so that way your cars actually don't have access to it so that it becomes more of a pedestrian experience. Now, that's not every event.

- Yeah.

- But for certain events.

- Okay, I just wanna make sure. I go there all the time, so I wanna be able to go there so-

- Oh yeah, that's been a very active part of the discussion. This is an open park.

- Yeah.

- Yeah.

- Alright, anything else? Alright, very good. Thank you.

- Good, thank you folks.

- Anybody else here for this item? Anybody else? Alright, any other questions for our staff? Anything else Dan, you wanna throw in? I agree with the phasing, if we can do it kind of more all at once, kind of be dependent on a wonderful Brian and his group, our fundraising, piece of cake.

- Exceptional.

- Yeah, I don't . . .

- Although I guess before we make the motion, I would be concerned about the ownership of it being with the City. I mean, do you know what I'm saying? You mentioned the possibility of it not being, and the naming rights is one thing but actually owning the property?

- No, this is city ownership.

- Okay.

- Yeah.

- I think it would be just a name.

- Yep and the management agreement would define how money flows in and out with sponsorship, naming rights and things of that nature, but-

- Okay.

- It would be city ownership.

- Brian, then you're in charge of all the events here or is it a shared thing?

- Well, that'll all be defined in the management agreement.
- Oh.
- So to come.
- So yeah and I think it'll be a combination I think-
- With council.
- Go ahead I'm sorry.
- I think On Broadway will probably take the lead on programming, but Parks will probably do some programming along with that too. So the key is to activate the space as much as possible and how we achieve that will work out through this management agreement.
- Alright, thank you. I'll entertain a motion.
- I'd make a motion to approve.
- Motion by Alder Steuer.
- Second.
- Second by Alder Eck to approve.
- The Master Plan for Leicht Memorial Park.
- The Master Plan for Leicht Memorial Park. And any discussion on that? Those in favor?
- [Alders] Aye.
- Opposed? Alright and motion carries. Thank you, thanks Dan, well put together.
- We appreciate you bumping it up.
- He's sticking around. He's not leaving is what he's saying.
- You're sticking around?
- You moved it up but he's staying.
- This is fine, it's in person. We're in person.
- Now he'll know what we're voting on.
- You have to get your committee to do this.

- And everything of course do tonight, we parch to council two weeks.

- Two weeks.

- Two weeks from yesterday so.

- June what?

- City Council.

- Something like that.

- June 7th.

- So June 7th that is.

- Number one, consideration with possible action and request for Alder Wery to install an ADA accessible walk at Colburn Park from the pool parking lot to the soccer field. I lost unless I have a Colburn item on-

- I know.

- Well, this is something, to be fair that I've talked to Director Ditscheit about for years. I mean, I just to talk about it a little bit, I used to play soccer there, coach soccer there. I still referee soccer there. And I see people, older people are disabled, can't get from the parking lot to watch their kids or grandkids down to the parking lot. And so just some way to make it easier cause right now it's just kind of a flow, an outflow of the water that comes off the parking lot. Right and I know, you know that we've had that discussion, but I'd be curious to see what you have for us.

- Yeah so, this area does get a lot of use by the public not just for the soccer games, which are almost the weekly or a nightly event in the summertime. And people have to walk from the parking lot, which is here to the soccer fields, which is here. And it's not ADA compliant and there's no walkway to it, so it can be difficult for somebody who's mobility impaired. And so the other thing though, besides the soccer games, is that area is used for cross country meets, and if you've ever been to that park during a cross country meet, it's hundreds, and hundreds, and hundreds of people. That park is jam packed and that's where that soccer field is, is the primary start and stop locations for the race. So everybody has to get down into that space and you have hundreds of people going down there. So it's also problematic on those events also so, the only downside to installing a walk in the location shown in the map that I provided, is it's gonna be a fairly expensive walkway to install. So we haven't completed a detailed engineered estimate yet, but preliminary estimates range in the cost of about possibly \$50,000 to put that walkway in. So the cost just to do the paving would be about \$25,000. That does not include the cost to do the regrading because you can't just pave it at the existing grade, you have to slope it out and bring in fill to get it ADA compliant. And then with that amount of site disturbance, you'd probably have to cut down a tree or two in order to do that. And then in addition, if you disturb over X number of square footage within the park, you have to do storm water management. So then that's the cost of hiring a consultant to actually design some storm water management feature and then that gets added to the construction cost too. So it's not a

simple project to do, but it's not terribly expensive either. It's just a matter of with that funding, when's the right time to request it and are there other priorities ahead of it? So right now, the only potential funding source that we would have to do a project like this would come out of the bond money that we bonded last year for the reconstruction of the Colburn 9th Street parking lot. So we recently last year we bonded \$200,000 to repave that parking lot. We recently got the bids in and the bids are our quantity basis so we're not going to know the total cost of that project until it's actually built. And we take quantity measurements as they're building it. But preliminarily, we're thinking that we will have enough money left over in that project that if you wanted to make this a high enough priority to use that funding, we could potentially build this walk next year. The funding for the parking lot, isn't gonna get built until August or September. So we're not really gonna be certain we have enough funding for this walkway until the parking lot is done. Other than that, we don't have any other available funding for this. We could save a little bit of money by not paving it and do kind of a crusher dust gravel walk instead that could maybe be saved \$20,000, but there's maintenance issues with that too because you have a gravel surface that weeds creep up on. So I would say on a yearly basis, maybe even several times a year, we'd be spraying Roundup along that to keep the weeds off of it, if you have a big storm event, you might have wash out of the gravel into the turf area. So there's ways to save money if you need to, by not paving it, but there's additional maintenance that comes along with it. You know, if you want my opinion, as far as whether or not this is the highest priority within our entire park system for putting \$50,000 into an ADA accessible walkway, I would say that there probably is higher priorities within our park system, but I do think that this is a high enough priority that it's worth discussing and I would support using that money for this project if that's something you wanted to proceed with.

- Thanks Director, when are the bids coming in for the-

- Well, the bids already came in, but they're kind of quantity costs so we're making some assumptions as far as how much quantity of gravel we're gonna use, how much excavation's gonna be needed. And we're really not gonna know until we start removing the asphalt and we start building it as we go. But we're thinking it'll cost anywhere in the range of \$130- to \$150,000 when it's all said and done. But I can't give you the exact number because we did not... it's a contract part of a bigger DPW contract. So it's just a part of a bigger project, let's say.

- When do you think we would know that? Not until August?

- We're not gonna know until construction occurs and we can actually take measured quantities. But like I said, construction is in August through September, and after that, I'll be able to give you an exact dollar amount. But our numbers, our estimated quantities are showing it'd be in the range of \$130- to 150,000.

- And I think I appreciate you bringing that up because the council did allocate \$200,000 towards Colburn. And we did think it was gonna be all for the parking lot and I appreciate council seeing that as a priority, instead of some of the other things that were on there. I think it would be fine if we hold this item until we know the cost of that parking lot and then bring it back and inform us. It's gonna be technically already paid for with that money. But Alder Steuer?

- I was just gonna add that, we're talking about fundraising on the last issue, about fundraising possibilities, maybe some of the neighborhood associations, that might be something, some grant

monies, whatever. A lot of times with the project, when the city puts up some money and such, another group can come in and fundraise along with it, that really bodes as well.

- Well, I will say as having fundraised a million and half dollars-

- You've done your share.

- Only to have the million dollars turned down, I'm pretty sure the Colburn area is not gonna want to fundraise for anything for Colburn Park.

- I do wanna mention, I do want to mention also that, even going off of what Alder Johnson said, a lot of times it's easy to fundraise for a specific amenity. It's hard to fundraise for site work and walkways. Usually that's much more difficult to do. Not impossible, but it's more difficult so just something to consider.

- I mean, is it really, I haven't walked back there a whole lot but I've been in the park quite a few times. Is it kind of a safety issue as well? You just said that for folks that are disabled, it's very difficult.

- Yeah.

- It's grass, it's trees, whatever.

- So you go from a parking lot to a field and from here to here, it's a slope.

- It's steep.

- And it's just open ground and grass and rocks and...

- You could get hurt.

- Yeah, I mean I've seen grandparents that are struggling to get down there, so we have a great park, we should fully utilize it. And if we have some money that we're not going to spend, why not use it for this? And I think it's something we can wait. Wait until the end of summer and see what comes back and make a decision at that time, there's no rush.

- I would definitely.

- Can we wait?

- Yeah, that's fine. I just wanted to get it on an agenda cause I can. I've talked about it for so long. I thought, you know what? It doesn't get done unless you bring it up and ask.

- My biggest challenge is finding parking's spot in there. Just sayin', it's so packed cause we've done soccer. I'm a soccer mom.

- Well, hopefully we're hoping the new parking lot, which is excellent on the other side by the ball diamonds will help, you'll just have to come in a different way.

- The long way.

- We looked at expanding this parking lot, but the loss of trees was pretty substantial to expand this one and the best choice there was to build the other one. Remember we marked it off, we walked it out, and saw how many trees we had to cut down? It was fairly sizeable. Well, I'd make a motion just to hold this item until the bids are in for the upper parking lots so we can see what monies might be left.

- I second that.

- So no decisions until we find out if there's anybody left.

- Okay.

- Second by Alder Eck, any discussion on that? Those in favor.

-Aye.

-Aye.

- Opposed? That motion carried, thank you. Let's get some low bids.

- You just post out your own project that's...

- Well like I said, the bids are already in, it's just a matter of what the quantities.

- That's what I meant. Details, details, details. Alright, number three, consideration with possible action on the approval of a resolution authorizing applications for grant funds to assist with the Leicht Memorial Park improvements project. Director?

- The city recently applied for a DNR Stewardship Grant for \$1 million towards the construction of Leicht Park Master Plan improvement. So it's the same project we just spent some time on reviewing with you. One of the requirements of the grant application is that the city has to formally adopt a resolution in support of the grant application. So you'll see that resolution in the agenda packet for your reference. If you look, and then along with the resolution, I included some support documentation of the actual grant application itself. And how we worded it and what the dollars were, specifics of how it was broken down. So you'll see in the support grant documentation that we list the total construction cost of \$2.7 million with the city funding \$1.7 million and the grant funding \$1 million. Now that's different than what we said before because we told you that was a \$6.2 million project. The reason we did that is because first of all, the fundraising isn't completed yet so we didn't want to rely on that for our grant application. But more importantly, the DNR stewardship program only funds certain elements, they don't fund every park amenity out there. So we were very selective about saying, okay, if we were to get this grant, the grant, the total project for \$2.75 or \$2.7 million, along with the funding that the DNR would put in, was very specific and tailored to what they would fund as part of grant program. So all of the stuff we knew they wouldn't fund, we just kept out and we said, we'll do that at a later date., or it's not part of this grant. So that's why the dollars aren't the same and what the difference is. So and when you read over the resolution, it simply states that

the City Council supports the project and that you recognize that city funding is required as a match to the grant if it's awarded. It doesn't actually commit the city to approve the funding, it just shows that you recognize that additional funding is necessary. But in this situation, the funding's already been approved as part of the TID, and so no additional funding is needed. So, there aren't a lot of questions or comments as it relates to the budget on this particular grant itself and the resolution.

- Alder Steuer.

- Thank you, sure. Dan, I was just gonna, as far as this million dollar grant request like I said, is there any kind of timeframe on something like that? Or it all depends on-

- It depends on the grant itself. Usually it takes the DNR about six months to award the grants and then they have a very specific timeline for when you can build it.

- So we're looking fall?

- Well, I think it'll be fall before they even award it. And then we have to see what the terms and conditions are to the grant contract. And so if we receive this grant, the city currently has \$3.2 million. This would add another million to the pot.

- Okay.

- If we receive it, if we don't receive it, we still have \$3.2 million.

- Brian's really rooting for it. Okay, any other questions, otherwise I'll just initiate a motion to approve?

- Second.

- Was that a motion for motion?

- Yeah, I was asking I'll entertain-

- I'll make a motion to approve.

- Oh, I thought you were saying, your motion to approve, okay.

- I was just entertaining it.

- You did last-

- I will second.

- I skipped that one.

- Sorry.

- No, no.

- Oh yeah, that's right he's chair he doesn't do motions.

- Second to approve. Generally not, unless is Colburn related. Those in discussion? Those in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. Number four, consideration with possible action on accepting a \$10,000 donation of grant funding from The Nature Conservancy to fund habitat restoration efforts along the East River Green Bay Corridor.

- The Nature Conservancy received \$40,000 in grant funding from a program called The Fund for Lake Michigan. So the funding is intended to be split between various municipalities in the Green Bay area within the East River watershed to implement native plantings and address stream bank stabilization and erosion. So The Nature Conservancy has been working with park staff, City of Green Bay, the Town of Ledgeview, and the Village of Allouez in identifying shovel ready projects that can be implemented or engineered within the 2022 calendar year, which is required for this funding. So the goals for the grant funding include improving habitat for pollinators along the river, improving water quality of the river through nutrient and water uptake by plantings, improving aesthetics of the riverfront and the East River trail, reducing municipality park maintenance costs, and then finally supporting East River inter-municipality planning project development and new funding opportunity. So that's in essence, the mission of the grant and what the funding has to be spent on. So if you approve accepting this donation, park staff would continue to work closely with The Nature Conservancy to select the appropriate projects that meet the intent of the grant. We haven't selected the projects yet. And of the \$40,000, \$10,000 of the funding has been dedicated or earmarked to go to the City of Green Bay to install native plantings along the East River or do other similar type projects. And the hope is that the plantings will be in places where they could supplement, expand, and fill in gaps in already existing natural areas or new areas, particularly if it enhances the river bank protection and, or storm water infiltration. So the funding covers the cost of the plants and the cost to install them. So one of the projects that we're considering and having discussions with them on, is native plantings in a bio-filter area on the East River trail expansion by St. George Street, where we're looking at doing the East River trail expansion project kind of by Webster Avenue. In addition to that \$10,000, there's another \$10,000 designated to be used for both Green Bay and Ledgeview for stream bank stabilization. So we don't know at this point how much Ledgeview would get and how much the city would get of the second \$10,000. It's kind of dependent on which projects are selected. So the stream bank erosion project would include engineering, design, and permitting to put in a project at a later date. So we might even be able to do some work in Baird Creek because that is within the East River Green Way watershed. So we may be able to look at some stabilization along the creek. So I'm looking for a motion to just accept the donation of up to \$20,000 in grant funding from The Nature Conservancy, and then if you approve that, we'll then work internally with them to select the projects.

- I'll make that motion.

- Oh, well I just wanna clarify, cause it says \$10,000 on here.
- It said \$10,000 when the agenda packet was put out.
- Okay.
- I wasn't aware of the second \$10,000, so that's why I'd like the motion to say up to \$20,000 because that second \$10,000 will be split between Ledgeview and the City of Green Bay, depending on which project's selected. And there's a potential that we might not get any of that second, \$10,000.
- The more, the better. We have a motion Alder Steuer to approve?
- Yes.
- You're second?
- Second.
- Campbell.
- Keep wanting to say Stevens. Well that's Steve Campbell throws you off.
- Those in favor? Opposed? Motion carried.
- Alder soup.
- Alder soup.
- I can do that. Consideration with possible action on the request by Wisconsin Public Service to improve a 12-foot wide utility easement at John Muir Park.
- So WPS or Wisconsin Public Service approached us with a request to do a 12-foot wide easement. If you look at the agenda packet, you'll see not only the easement language that's there, but you'll also see a graphic that shows where the easement would be located. And this would be located on the north side of the park and also the east side of the park following the right of way in both locations. The reason for the proposed easements is because currently they have overhead electric in those spots. So along the east side of the park, the actual overhead line is right on the property line between the right of way and the park. On the north side of the park, that overhead line is actually across the street on, kind of following the neighbor, the residential properties. They would like to remove both of those overhead lines and bury the utilities within the easement and by doing so, they're proposing to move the overhead utility from the opposite side of the road to the north onto park property to the south side of the road. So as part of that, the reason that they're proposing to bury it is kinda twofold. One is the utilities, the overhead electric is 60 years old, so it really needs to be replaced anyway because they're having problems with it. It's just dated and they need to upgrade their facilities. Secondly, because of the large amount of trees that are in that area, when there's storm events, they have a lot of incidents where they have down power lines because of branches falling on those overhead lines. And so there is a significant number of power outages in the

neighborhood because of that, and by burying these utilities, they can avoid that. So that's what the request is for. One thing to note is, they will have to install probably several transformers within this easement, I think they initially told me three transformers throughout the entire easement. And these would be three by three above ground cabinets. In addition, they have to install several one by one pedestals. So these would be kind of post sticking out of the ground, so there'll be several of those located within the utility easement also. And then finally they did tell me that there's a cable company and let me see which one. Charter Cable will be also installing upgrades to their facilities within this easement, if it's proposed and they will likely also have a few pedestrian pedestals also on top of what WPS is doing. So if the city doesn't approve this easement, they do have other options, but they're not as desirable options. So option one is work with adjacent property owners and put the easements on their property. They would still need the same number of transformers and pedestals, they would just be not on park property. The second option is they could look at putting these facilities within the right of way. There's utility easements within the right of way, today, I had a discussion with Jim Burnett and I think the desire from Public Works is that, that right of way is very congested already with existing utilities and allowing those utilities to go into that location would just kind of compound the congestion issue and would cause issues down the road when we want to replace our own facilities within the right of way. It's just two more utilities you have to work around, and keep in mind too, that if these utilities were put in the right of way, they would still need the same number of transformers and pedestals. They would just be closer to the road instead of offset from the road. So those are the various options. So at this point, the law department did review the easement; we have no changes to it, we're supportive of the easement. From a Parks standpoint, I'm supportive of this request. We oftentimes grant WPS or Wisconsin Public Service and other utilities easements within the parks in order to just maintain and upgrade their facilities so by us allowing it to happen, we're providing a service to the public and allowing WPS to provide that service better than they do now.

- Thanks, Director. Alder Steuer then Alder Eck.

- Just a quick question. Looking at it, it seems like that would be the best option. I'm just looking at the surrounding homes around there. It looks like there's almost 20, maybe 22 homes. That would be quite a project trying to cut through all those areas and I don't know, I could see that being a bit of a nightmare. So I'm just looking at it now, I think I agree with Director Ditscheit, I think this would be .

- Thanks, Alder. This is your area, right?

- It is my neighborhood, so yeah, I wanna comment. And I've lost power many times, so I've worked hard to help put WPS, get this word out in our neighborhood, at our Neighborhood Association meetings and things, so I'm definitely in support of it. We do have a lot of trees and we've been without power overnight, so yeah, just wanted to put my 2 cents in there.

- And I do wanna point out that WPS will be boring the lines in the location instead of trenching. If you look at the air photo, you'll see that there's a large number of mature trees, right in the easement location, so by boring it they'll be able to save all of those trees for the installation.

- Yeah and they did explain that to the neighbors about the-

- Excellent.

- Do you wanna make a motion Alder Eck? Your area.
- He gave me 2 cents.
- Just helpin' out.
- I make a motion to pass that as listed.
- Motion by Alder Eck, second by Alder Campbell to approve. Discussion? Those in favor?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed? That motion carries. Number six, consideration with possible action on the purchase of parcel 21-1979-3 due the intersection of Maine and Elizabeth for the expansion of Baird Creek Green Lake.
- So if you look at the agenda packet, you'll see a graphic showing the parcel that we're proposing the purchase here. Approximately 15 years ago, the Parks Department installed a portion of the Baird Creek Trail from Main Street to Henry Street. And if you're familiar with this trail, it's in a highly urbanized industrial area of the city that was previously developed before we put the trail in. So at the time when we put the trail in, we did not, the city did not own any of that property where the trail is located. So we worked with the various property owners to either purchase the property or purchase easements from the property owners, allowing us to install the trail in the location that's currently situated. So for this particular location and this parcel that we're talking about, the property owner at the time did not want to sell the property to the city. They wanted to maintain ownership of it, but they were open to selling us a permanent trail easement. So at the time we paid nearly \$33,000 for that trail easement. That went through committee and council for approval. We bought the easement from them and then we installed the trail and that happened in 2004. A few years later, the property ownership changed and in 2016, the new owners came forward to the Parks Department and asked to donate this parcel to the city because they didn't want to pay taxes on it because they're not using it, the city's using it. It did go to Committee and Council, and they approved accepting the donation in 2016. But after it went through committee and council, the owner backed out of it and said, "Well, I decided not to donate it after all." So that never happened in 2016, even though it went to committee and council for approval. After that, the property changed the third time and what happened at that point is the property owner, the current or the property owner at the time, the third owner stopped paying taxes on it so it went into foreclosure. So currently Brown County, through the foreclosure process, took ownership of that piece of property. That was finalized in the last few weeks so they do have ownership now. So for a cost of \$889.11, the city can purchase that property from the county and it will become city owned property, and that dollar value was calculated because that's the past back taxes that were due. So instead of the county eating that money, the city would pay the back taxes as the purchase price of it. That's a pretty typical way of foreclosure and the process that it goes through and with foreclosed properties, the city always has the first shot at buying a foreclosed property that the county owns.

So we're the first people they've come to with, to see if there's an interest to buy it. If the city doesn't buy this property, they'll continue with the foreclosure property and offer it to the general public to see if they wanna to buy it; and that's the process if we decline purchase from it. So I would recommend at this point, going ahead and approving the purchase, we do have enough money in our bond acquisition account from previous projects to be able to fund this dollar amount so I would recommend approval.

- Questions, I'd just like to make comment on it. I took my dog and my wife on a little bike ride through there last weekend, I think over to the Dairy Queen and it's very nice little area, looked like it was cleaned up even a little bit, a lot of trim along the way there. I don't know who did that but-

- That's the city so the Parks Department maintains that.

- I don't know if that would be like a picnic table area. The only thing I thought about it as we rolled through there. I mean, there was some people here and there, a couple people fishin' in the crick and whatever. There's a little bridge that goes behind there, mean it's pretty isolated back there, I wondered a little bit about the safety part of it. That's about it. But looks like I kind of figured they did a lot of the trimming just to open it up, to make it safer that's what it looked like, but it's nice blacktop through there and everything. It's very nice little ride.

- It's a nice trail, if you haven't been there, it's really kind of a unique area of the city.

- I've been out twice already.

- I'll have to check it out.

- Yeah, I'm glad you went back or took a look, I'd like to check it out too. And I think one of the goals that we have in the city, a lot of us are looking at the connectivity of trails. So no, I think this will help with that overall plan. And I suppose we have a map or something that would show the trails that we do have and proposed, et cetera.

- Yeah, I can share that trail map with-

- Yeah maybe bring that out to our next meeting, I'd like to see it.

- There's a billboard that crosses Main that's a little tough to get across there. That's about the hardest part there, and that goes across over East River to Joannes Park and then it hooks up back and goes back the other way or hooks up at the East River Trail, goes all the way out to where we were just talking about. So yeah it's a nice little setup there.

- Wanna make a motion?

- I'll make a motion to pass the number six as written, or add the purchase, I guess is the...

- All right.

- I'll second Alder Eck compel to Alder Campbell to approve the purchase of parcel of 21-1979-3 for the expansion of Baird Creek Green Way for \$889.11. Discussion? Those in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? That carries. Number seven, consideration with possible action and modifications to the fee schedule for the new banquet hall meeting facility at The Wildlife Sanctuary.

- So in 2019, the Friends of The Wildlife Sanctuary built and donated a new banquet meeting rental facility, which is connected to the existing Nature Center. So I'll give you some bearings of the property that we're referring to. We recently hired a Wildlife Sanctuary Events Coordinator to work 20 hours per week to promote and assist with running and managing this facility. Since that person was hired a few months ago, our rental bookings have dramatically increased over what they were so she's doing a good job right now. And as part of her job, she's been doing quite a bit of research as to what other facilities are charging and fee structures that they have in place. And we're getting a lot of requests to maybe look at our fee structure a little bit differently than what we originally laid out in our budget last year. So typically at budget time, we set all of our fees and charges and we make any suggested changes at that time during budget. So when you look at the attachment, there's two different spreadsheets. One shows what was approved at budget time with our budget and fees, and then down below is kind of what we're proposing to do. And all the items highlighted in yellow are kind of the proposed changes to our fee schedule that we'd like to make. And all of these proposals make it a little bit more flexible for potential renters and will hopefully bring in more rental revenue than how it's currently set up. So I'll just kind of touch bases on a few of these changes. So the first one that's highlighted in the uppermost column or row I should say, is to clarify what our daily rate is for the meeting of the banquet room and the meeting room for Sunday. So we have a new line item in there with a dollar amount stating what it is for Sunday, it just wasn't clear before because the meeting room and the banquet rooms were separate costs and you had to do the math yourself. So really the fee structure for that first row doesn't change, it just clarifies things. The first change that we really made though, to the fee structure, is we're proposing a discounted rate of \$3,000. If someone wants to rent the entire weekend from Friday through Sunday for the entire banquet facility. So if you do the math from what we originally had in there in our fee schedule, it would cost them about \$4,100. And we're proposing to do it at a discounted rate of \$3,000. The reason that we're doing that is we're getting some requests to rent for the whole weekend, but the fee structure, nobody really wants to pay that much for the whole weekend, but there is a benefit to the city by renting it to one person for the whole weekend because we have less staffing. We don't have to go in there and change setups, we don't have as much staffing and cleanup that we would normally have if we had separate events on those particular days. So we feel that we might get actually more rentals by offering that discounted rate for the entire weekend. Secondly, what we wanna do is we wanna offer half rate discounts, so you can rent the facilities for half a day for half the rate, but we would be very selective on doing that because we would only do that for events that are very short term. So maybe something that's two weeks out, typically when somebody rents this facility, it's long term. They're booking it out six months in advance or a year in advance because there's so much planning that has to be done. By offering this discounted rate where you only have a few weeks to do the planning, we know that probably no one else is gonna rent that facility because it's very short duration. So at least by proposing, half rental rates for these half days, it's not a half rate for the full day. It's a half rate for a half a day. We're hoping that we can bring in more revenue that typically somebody wouldn't have used that space anyway so at least we're making some revenue on it. And then if somebody still wanted to do a short-term full day rental, they still

have that option of paying the full rate. And then the final thing that we'd like to create is a rental fee for just the caterer's kitchen, we never had that in our fee schedule before. So our rental rate for that we're proposing \$300 per day or \$150 per half a day. And again, this would be kind of as needed and it'd be a real short duration because what we would hate to do is rent the kitchen out a year in advance for only \$300 and then we can't rent the main room because the kitchen is booked. So again, we would only allow this on a case-by-case basis, and only if we're very certain that the rest of the facility isn't going to be rented. So what we're hoping is these proposed changes would allow us flexibility in generating additional revenue on the days when we know nobody's gonna be there.

- Thanks Director, questions Alder Steuer?

- Thanks, Director. So we've had this now for how long a year, a year and a half maybe?

- I think in probably 2019 is-

- So two and a half?

- I think 2020 is when it opened.

- Two and a half years. Do we have a number as far as amounts of money we have brought in so far?

- We can generate that, I don't have that here, but I will tell you that initially we relied on word of mouth. And so we had a few press releases where we announced that we're officially opening. We gave tours and had a press event out there. It was somewhat successful, but it kind of petered off and those rentals stopped coming in. So that's why we took the step a few months ago to hire somebody whose sole job duty is really to promote this facility, advertise it, meet with people, go to different conventions, such as there's always a wedding conference or not conference, there's a wedding event at the new-

- Resch?

- Conference center across from Lambeau Field. I don't remember the name offhand, but she attended one event there and we actually received several wedding bookings from her attending that event. And so now it's picking up quite a bit, and she's also looking at different ways to program the space so we're getting creative. So we're looking at maybe running our own events where we can sell tickets to create some additional revenue there also.

- So the monies that come in then, that goes into the general fund or it goes to your budget, how does that go?

- It goes into the general budget as income.

- Dinner with the Director.

- Yeah.

- Everybody'd want to take it for that though.

- Okay. Any other questions?

- One question.

- Alder Campbell?

- Director so where they have the polling station, is that considered the meeting room, then?

- That would be kind of the banquet facility, yeah. So that's the larger space.

- That's the larger space.

- Yes.

- Okay.

- So that, on that fee schedule, that would be called that's the banquet room. The meeting room is kind of a smaller room off to the side with some partition walls. So, but where the polling is, that would be considered the banquet room.

- 216 people, any other questions?

- Alder Wery?

- Yes, oh.

- Just make a comment. So all of that sounded good with the exception of one of them and the half off for half a day, two weeks or less. I mean to me, it gets so complicated to understand that, that I don't know that it will actually be effective. As someone who used to rent venues for four to six events a month, for 10 years, I can tell you that the industry normal standard would be that you would actually charge a premium for late reservations as opposed to a discount. Because if someone's calling you two weeks in advance to rent a space it's because they're desperate, they need something, they want something, they will pay any amount to get it. So it just seems odd to me that we would give it to them at a discount. So just feedback for what it's worth, I'll let the committee do it that what they like or let Dan respond to that. But that to me just seems like a, something that would be kind of counterintuitive to what you normally see in the marketplace.

- Record, did you have any, is this what the person we hired recommended?

- Or-

- Yeah, and James could probably speak on that-

- I can comment on that. That's a really valid point Alder Johnson, and I think typically as we go forward, this is gonna be, I will say kind of an evolution of what this ends up looking like over the years. But right now we're getting a lot of requests for somebody that maybe wants a Saturday. And they say, "You know what? I'd really actually like to prep everything on Friday, but I don't want to pay necessarily full price on Friday." And they also want to maybe even rent Sunday, but they don't want

to pay full price on Sunday for, because they want to come back and maybe do their... If it's a wedding, they might do their gift unwrapping on Sunday. But what I'm trying to say is, they would be willing to pay half a day on Friday to come in and prep everything on Friday, get everything set but then they want to come in on Saturday and just go to their event instead of prep on Saturday morning. It's a lot of requests like that. It's a little bit different perspective than what you were saying, but I understand where you're coming from too.

- So yeah, I didn't realize it was kind of like a rider if you will, to add on something if it's available. So it's totally different.

- Yeah and we are getting a few, it's not just two weeks out. It'd be more, even within a month out or even two months out, 60 days out, where instead of turning down a possible reservation or having something else in there, then we could at least get half the revenue instead of coming in vacant on a Friday night.

- That makes more sense, thank you.

- Alder Eck?

- Oh, well I, and looking at the chart, I see that it's the kitchen only, that would be \$150 for a half day or the full day. It doesn't have another one on here. Or well, on the bottom dividing, is a renter charge. "It may be renting for half a day at half the daily cost." But my thought was, is when you made the comment that it's kind of a chance to fill it because it's not filled. So, you're getting that coming in. So that, I guess I look at it as well, it's better to get part of the money than nothing at all.

- That's how we were looking at it too.

- Yeah.

- Well, as you said, it's an evolution we find there's great demand for the staff days then it can be talked about later. Entertain a motion or another question?

- Just a ten second question. As far as Director, as far as the amount of rentals in that, is it for usually fully rented during the year? Or I mean...

- Not yet, I mean right now, like I said, prior to hiring this new individual a few months ago, we only had a few rentals over- So it's headed in the right direction.

- Okay.

- And we fully intend on programming it as much as we can and renting it out. And at some point we might have to look at turning that part-time position into a full-time position if we're successful with that. But then the revenues from that building will be able to fund that full-time position. But for now we're not there yet, I mean it's still sporadic, but it we're doing a lot better than we were six months ago.

- Okay.

- I'm good, thank you.

- Entertain a motion.

- I'll entertain a motion to modify the fee schedule for the new banquet meeting hall facility at the Wildlife Sanctuary as listed on the schedule.

- All right.

- Motion by Alder Eck and you're second.

- I'll second it.

- Second by Alder Campbell, any discussion in that? In favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Opposed? Motion carried. Alright, informational staff update seasonal staffing levels for pool summer playgrounds and Bay Beach Amusement Park. All good news, right?

- We'll see. So as you know, we've been talking about this for two years now. Seasonal staffing is a big issue for the Parks Department and everyone as a whole. We are not isolated in the problems that we're having so really today, what we're gonna focus on is our discussions as it relates to pools, as it relates to our Summer Playground Program. And as it relates to Bay Beach Amusement Park because those are the things that people just need to know, well which pools are gonna be open? Are all of 'em gonna be open? Where are the Summer Playground Programs gonna be located and how is Bay Beach affected? Our other staffing issues are more maintenance related and really don't affect the public directly with the programming for these spaces so that's why we're just gonna focus on those. So we'll start with the pools, in the agenda packet I've included a very detailed description on the history of our pools, our staffing history, what we did at budget time last year, which was giving increased pay raise to the lifeguards of about a dollar an hour. And then in addition, the City Council allocated an additional \$20,000 for additional bonus pay for the lifeguards to help attract people to the lifeguard industry or to our pools specifically. So I list here what the specific bonus pay plan is and what was set up for that. And then we'll talk a little bit about where our current staffing levels are for the pool. So for Colburn Pool, we need 12 lifeguards and 8 attendants in order to operate that pool. For Rush Aquatic Center, we need 15 lifeguards and 16 attendants, and for Joannes Aquatic Center, we need 20 lifeguards with 16 attendants. So to run all three pools for the entire season, we would need a total of 47 lifeguards and 40 total attendants. Where we're at right now is we have 35 lifeguards and 20 attendants. So as you can see, we do not have enough lifeguards to open all three pools at this time. But we're doing much better than we were last year at this time, which is encouraging. So what we are proposing for pools this year is to open Joannes Aquatic Center and the Rush Aquatic Center. In the past, the last two years, we've opened Colburn Pool and the Rush Aquatic Center and we were not able to open Joanne's because that's our largest Aquatic Center that needs the most number of lifeguards. And we just couldn't do it the last two years so we're very excited that we have enough lifeguards to open the two pools that takes the most amount of staffing. So we're in good shape but we're still not there yet. So Colburn will be open for swim

lessons and it will be open for swim team practices. So already, I think the pool is pretty much filled. We're still working on maintenance. We're trying to get that facility open along with our two Aquatic Centers. And there is a potential that Colburn Pool could open to the public for open swim, if we're successful in just getting a few more applicants and lifeguards. So I'm not saying no to Colburn at this time, but I can't commit to it at this time either. So I mean, we're real happy with where we're at with the lifeguard numbers but we wish there'd be a few more. Let's talk a little bit about, let's lead into the Summer Playground Program now. With the Summer Playground Program, a little bit of background in history for the new Alders. So prior to this year, we had 32 Summer Playground Programs in our allocated in our city budget. But because of staffing levels, the last two years we were only able to staff 16 locations. So although we budgeted for 32, we could only fill 16 cause we just couldn't find the seasonal staff to run the program. In last year's budget, well budget process for this year's budget, the City Council amended the budget to reduce the number of sites to 16 in sites. So officially this year we only have enough money in our budget to fund 16 summer park playground location, and then the thought process here is there was concern with budgeting that much money for a program that we can't even fill with staffing needs anyway for the program. So that's the initial reason why it was temporarily reduced. As the seasonal staffing shortages maybe fix itself over time we can reconsider as a Council and a Park Committee whether or not we want to increase it back up to the original amount or find someplace in the middle or keep it at 16 sites. There's also a thought process and a desire that maybe we should reimagine the Playground Program and instead of doing it the same way we've been historically doing it, maybe you reimagine the program and look for alternate funding sources. So maybe we can keep the 16 sites as it is but maybe figure out kind of a different type of playground program for the other sites. And today we haven't put together any proposals on how to we could achieve that but we're gonna work on it. So right now, in order to run the 16 sites we have budgeted, we would need 32 Playground Leaders and 10 Sub Leaders for when people take vacations, along with two Managers. Currently, we only have 20 Playground Leaders hired to date with nine subs and two managers. So with only 20 Playground Leaders, we usually have two Playground Leaders at each park. For safety concerns, we really don't want to have one person there by themselves because there's a lot of issues that come up throughout each day that you really should have two people there. So that means that with our current staffing levels, we can only operate 10 sites this year instead of the 16. We're hopeful, we'll get some more applicants but to be truthful, usually these applicants are college students. Not all of them but the majority of them are. For the most part college is done or nearly done for most people and college students already have their jobs lined up for the year. So I mean, realistically, I don't see us getting a large number of applicants moving forward beyond what we currently have, but if we do get more applicants, we will add to the number of locations that we provide. So I do have a list in here of where the selected locations would be for the 2022 park locations. And there's always a question, how did you select those locations when you're looking at reducing the number playgrounds? So what we did in this situation is we had 16 locations last year where we had sites. We looked at who the top, which sites were the top 10 as far as attendance goes. And in this situation, the top 10 sites that had the highest attendance also had the same number of east side sites versus west side sites. Plus, they were pretty evenly dispersed throughout the city so you didn't have two sites right next to each other. So for this proposal, we are proposing to select the 10 sites from last year that had the most attendance throughout the entire summer. So that's how we ended up with the location, so the 10 selected parks would be Marquette, JFK, Mather Heights, Astor, Fisk, John Muir, VT Pride, Red Smith, Fritsch Park, and Joannes Park. If additional park locations do come up because we get additional staffing, we will look at doing Seymour Park, Eastman Park, Colburn, McCullough, Beaumont, and Wilder. And we would do it in that order, and again, that order is somewhat selected by the number of attendance last year, but it's also going alternating from west to

east, west to east as we get additional staff. There are three parks that we're proposing, I believe three that we're proposing this year that were for alternate sites that were not on the list last year. And I believe that's Seymour, Beaumont, and Wilder, is that correct? So those would be the three new sites that we would propose. Historically, those sites always did very well and some of the sites last year just didn't do so well. So for example, Tank Park, typically historically that was a site that had a lot of demand for the Summer Park Program, but the school implemented a wraparound program, which severely had an impact on how many kids come to our program. So some there were a few sites that we didn't put into contention and a few more that we brought in but we kept Eastman, Colburn, and McCullough on the list because those did fairly well, but not as great in attendance as the other parks. So that's how we came up with those, and our criteria like I said, was equal number of east west locations scattered throughout the city, past participation, attendance numbers, and then looking at what amenities and shelters are included within the sites also. And then finally, I'll just give you a brief update on Bay Beach Amusement Park. So in order to operate the entire park at the schedule that was originally presented last year for the 2021 season, we would need 80 full-time seasonal ride operators. We currently only have 61 ride operators on hand and obviously we're looking at hopefully hiring more as they come up, but ride operators need to be over 18 years old so we're kind of pulling from the same college student pool of people, and it's really hard at this point to find new people to apply for those. In order to operate with the schedule that we had originally listed we have to do a shift change. So we would need X number of employees for part of the day; and because we were advertising we would be open for 11 hours a day we would have to shift change with more ride operators and accomplish it that way. Because we don't have enough ride operators to do the shift change, we now can only be open for eight hours a day. And so if you look at the revised schedule, I did include that in the agenda packet. The first schedule shows what the original advertised hours were, the second schedule shows the revised hours showing that we have to go down to an eight hour day just simply because we don't have enough ride operators. This schedule is on our website currently, and we're being advertised through social media. And so people are aware of this and we're hoping that we'll get the word out by bringing it to Parks Committee also. This item was put on the agenda as informational only because typically for these decisions, as far as which facilities we're gonna run, that usually is not a City Council function. The function of the City Council is to provide funding and give us some general guidance. But then it's up to staff to figure out the day-to-day operations of how that's going to work with the resources that the Council provides us. So we try to take a very educational approach to this and do it to the best of our knowledge with trying to keep the facilities open as much as we could, so I guess from there I'll open up to questions.

- Thanks, Director.

- Thank you, Director. Thank you, Chair. I was gonna ask Director Ditscheit, just going back to the park locations, they had 10 parks. With those parks, you said you're gonna do things on social media just getting the word out. I would think that folks will be driving from other areas of the city to go there. They'll be fully aware, or try to be, try to make them as aware as possible of these locations that'll be on the website.

- Yeah, we'll update our website accordingly and advertise where these Summer Park Program locations will be.

- I figure we would. Okay, alright that's good.

- Thanks, questions?

- No, no questions. I'm glad to see John Muir's on there from a selfish standpoint, but I'm guessing that these all have, I'm not familiar with every one of them but they have shelters.

- Yes, they all have shelters and with restrooms.

- No parks are mine but... Oh Bay Beach I guess.

- Yeah, that counts.

- That's a big one.

- That's pretty big one.

- Yeah well, I'm sad to not see Colburn open, I'm glad it's opened at least for the swim lessons and the swim teams. And I know the last two years that Joannes hasn't been open, so we should get it back open again. So I understand there's east side. So thanks for dealing with... It's better. I mean, it's not worse so that's good. I mean, it's unfortunate with the hours at Bay Beach. I'm sure that's gonna hit us in the income part, unless we get the same amount of people in a small amount of time but-

- Yeah and so pools are better than last year. Playground program is worse than last year. And we are continuing to have problems with our other seasonal staff job opportunities. So I think at budget time we will have to take a closer look at our seasonal salary pay scale citywide, not just for park facilities. I know other departments such as Public Works are struggling to find seasonal help, and we are also on other end, other sides of the Park Department, such as our maintenance crews. We're down quite a number of seasonal employees.

- Yeah, I would encourage you, look around the state, around the country, see what others are doing that's working and I'm sure the Council, the Committee and Council, would be receptive to ideas because we have such great assets that we need people to run 'em. It's just a mind-boggling thing. I know my daughter's friends one's a Parky and one's on the Forest U-Crew, so I'm about tapped out for college kids.

- No, I've been, I've been promoting it, I can tell you that.

- My kids lived there for many, many years. They walked for my business down to there. They've fed 'em lunch, they came back at the end of the day. Mom picked them up, took them home. They were safe, that park was packed busy. They used to serve 'em lunch, right and you didn't have to feed 'em? Do they still do that?

- They still do that.

- Wow that's nice.

- The School District does.

- It'd be nice to see that open again.
- I'm trying my best.
- I got five kids coming up.
- Guess where they're gonna be working.
- The first one is working the summer.
- Okay.
- Trying my best.
- Dan, did you say Seymour Park was first on that-
- Seymour Park is first on the alternate list.
- Thank you.
- Yes.
- We'll push for it.
- We just need two people to open it. Comes in pairs?
- With the sub.
- Yeah so be creative push as much as you can and we'll support ya. If we have to compete with the surrounding communities, let's compete. Let's bring our A game, thanks.
- Entertain a motion to a . . .
- Motion to receive a place on file.
- Motion by Alder Steuer.
- Second.
- Alder Campbell, discussion on that. Those in favor?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carried. Next Parts Committee meeting is June 22nd. Entertain a motion to adjourn.

- I was just gonna say I thought that was your report. It seemed like a report but... oh wow, he just pulled out a big hook.

- I'll give you the next hour.

- I do.

- Do you want another one?

- You know what? I'll have another one. Although can I look at it? Are you gonna go through it?

- I'm not gonna.

- Okay then, that's fine. I got one at home.

- Before I go to be tonight.

- Yeah, these are excellent.

- So for Directors Reports, the only thing that I have to add other than what's in here is this is a copy of our Park Recreation and Open Space Plan. We update this plan on a five-year basis because you're a new committee, I just wanted everybody to get a copy of this for your reference. We used this to secure grant dollars from DNR so without this, keeping this plan up to date, we don't qualify for stewardship grants, but really it's a good planning document so that you can see where our parks are, what amenities we have, and what are we proposing to change in the future. And Alder Steuer, you mentioned a trail map. There is a trail map in here so...

- Look at that.

- I just wanted to share that with you.

- Thank you.

- Yeah.

- Thank you, Director. Any other items to report?

- No.

- No?

- Thank you, motion to adjourn.

- Second.

- Motion to receive a place on file.

- Oh!

- Motion to receive a place on file.
- Okay.
- And I'll second.
- Motion by Alder Eck, second by Ald. Steuer to receive a place on file, those in favor?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carried. Now you can adjourn.
- Motion to adjourn.
- Motion by Eck.
- Second.
- Motion by Steuer to adjourn, those in favor?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Opposed? Motion carried. We're adjourned.
- Okay, thank Director.
- I need 20 seconds.
- Yeah. Before we move to the next... oh wait, I have to leave the meeting. You have to remember to leave the meeting, right?
- Dan, when was the last time Parks took this long?