

illinois

Volume 40, Number 4 | July/August 2009

P&R

PARKS AND RECREATION

The magazine of the Illinois Association of Park Districts and the Illinois Park and Recreation Association



maintenance & infrastructure

PLUS: Parks Day at the Capitol
The IAPD Legislative Reception - The IAPD Legislative Conference

25 Years

PDRMA

Risk Management Excellence

BEST BE SAFE AT WORK AND PLAY CAMPAIGN CHALLENGE

**PDRMA Congratulates the Winners
of our "Make a Healthy Choice
Everyday" Campaign Challenge!**

**MAKE
A HEALTHY CHOICE
EVERYDAY**

The challenge asked PDRMA members to promote the concept of making a healthy choice everyday in the areas of home safety, work safety and wellness. Independent judges evaluated submissions on reach, content and creativity. Winning members received prizes including \$3,000 in video/website production services, a healthy catered lunch for their staff and award plaques. Congratulations to all PDRMA members that participated in the campaign.

PDRMA will share many of the innovative member campaigns on our website in June 2009. Members are encouraged to use these outstanding program ideas to promote the benefits of making healthy choices everyday at home, at work, and to stay well.

THE WINNERS



Large Category Winners

- 1st** Park District of Highland Park
9 Dares for 2009
- 2nd** Arlington Heights Park District
Active Healthy People Do
- 3rd** Bartlett Park District
The Amazing Safety Race

Medium Category Winners

- 1st** Northwest Special Recreation Association
We've Got Your Back
- 2nd** Lemont Park District
Struttin' to Sonoma
- 3rd** Darien Park District
Simple Solutions

Small Category Winners

- 1st** Hickory Hills Park District
We Fit
- 2nd** South Suburban Recreation Association
Make A Healthy Choice Everyday
- 3rd** Warren Special Recreation Association
Absolutely Fit



IN THIS ISSUE



FEATURES

- 10 Parks Day Raises Awareness at the Illinois State Capitol
- 19 Governor Addresses 31st Annual IAPD Legislative Conference

SPECIAL FOCUS

- 12 A Partnership for Park Revitalization: East St. Louis and the University of Illinois
by Bruce Wicks, Joseph Altshuler, Mari Gordon, Dee Kaiser and Wendy Kniepp
- 16 Building a Capital Improvement Plan to Last
by Lise Valentine

DEPARTMENTS

- 4 From the Editor
- 5 Get on Board
Boardmanship
- 7 Eye on the Profession
If You Build It, They Will Come...
- 8 Statehouse Insider
Even in a Tight Economy Voters Favor Investing in Preservation
- 21 People and Places

FROM THE EDITOR



No doubt the house was a big, beautiful bargain: A largely restored two-story, century home with two full baths, a parlor, a formal dining room, two bedrooms downstairs, three bedrooms up (one that would serve better as a library), a powder room, an upstairs butler-type kitchen. And the porches: a ground-level that opened into the park across the street and a second-story porch set just above the park's tree-line – a perfect place on summer nights to sip cool drinks and watch the fireworks that followed the final out of the independent league ball games played at nearby Robin Roberts Stadium.

The owner was our landlord. My wife and I rented the top floor, and, when he decided to sell, he asked us first before he put it on the market at a price that (even in a 'recovering' neighborhood) we thought was probably much too low.

Today, when I drive past, I still think to myself that we could have bought that big, big house on the park.

But that thought is tinged with equal parts regret and relief.

My family was saved by the timely realization that there is a huge difference between having purchased something and actually owning it. As wonderful as that house was (did I mention the perfect woodwork?), it had some major drawbacks for us. Having been converted to apartments, it had two of everything: two old furnaces in the basement, two sets of utility hook ups, two noisy air conditioning units that looked to be held together with chewing gum and good wishes, and I don't even want to think about the 100-year-old plumbing. I have a hard time fixing (or hiring to be fixed) one of anything. But two?

Sure, we could have afforded to buy that house, but we might have gone flat broke trying to keep it.

Your agencies are often likely in the same situation my family was. Having something new is terrific. The state senator shows up when it's time to put the gold shovel in the ground. The community waits patiently at the ribbon cutting ceremony. But twenty or thirty years later, it seems nobody but the board is around when it's time to appropriate money for the necessary wiring upgrades, and nobody but staff are on hand when a pipe bursts in the middle of the night.

Very often this magazine and others like it run stories about new, innovative, state-of-the-art park and recreation facilities. But I'll bet most of your time is spent keeping your existing capital assets in great shape, or in rehabilitating those facilities when they've just gotten too worn. That's why I'm so delighted that this issue carries a couple of stories about doing just that (see pages 12 and 16).

Yes, it's great to plan for and build something shiny and new. But the greater feat is keeping the shine on the trusty and old.

— RODD WHELPLEY
Editor

illinois **IPRA** PARKS AND RECREATION

OFFICES

217.523.4554

FAX

217.523.4273

E-MAIL

rwhelpley@ILparks.org

WORLD WIDE WEB

www.Ilparks.org
www.IIpra.org

MAIL

211 East Monroe Street
Springfield, Illinois 62701-1186

Managing Editor

TED FLICKINGER,
President and Chief
Executive Officer, IAPD

Editor

RODD WHELPLEY,
Publications Director, IAPD

Graphic Design

GOSS GRAPHIC DESIGN
217.423.4739
www.gossgrfx.com

Advertising Sales Representative

BETH SALTZ
Arlington Publishers Representatives
P.O. Box 1555
Arlington Heights, Illinois 60006
847.509.9810
FAX: 847.509.9816
bsaltz@arlpub.com

JOINT EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

IAPD Representatives

MARY ANN CHAMBERS
Northbrook Park District

ANN AUSTIN
Rock Island Park and
Recreation Department

WALLY FRASIER
Mundelein Park and
Recreation District

ROBERT GELWICKS
Downers Grove Park District

MIKE KROST
Chillicothe Park District

IPRA Representatives

LAURA BARRON, CPRP
Oakbrook Terrace Park District

ARNIE BIONDO
Carol Stream Park District

CHERYL CRISMAN, CPRP
Plainfield Park District

MIKE DOTY, CPRP
Mt. Carroll

ELSA FISCHER, CPRP
Northbrook Park District

ALLISON SOHR
Batavia Park District

ILLINOIS ASSOCIATION OF PARK DISTRICTS

COLETTE KUBIESA
Chairman
Elmhurst Park District

GEORGE LONGMEYER
Chairman-elect
Schaumburg Park District

MIKE KROST
Immediate Past Chairman
Chillicothe Park District

DON ANDERSEN
Vice Chairman
Oak Lawn Park District

WALLY FRASIER
Vice Chairman
Mundelein Park and Recreation District

LINDA JOHNSON
Vice Chairman
Crete Park District

WILLIS "BILL" LOGAN
Treasurer
Springfield Park District

MARY ANN CHAMBERS
Northbrook Park District

CAROLYN EDLEY
East Saint Louis Park District

DAVID HANSEN
Itasca Park District

JERRI-LYNN KLEINA
Alsip Park District

DIANE MAIN
Westmont Park District

NATHANIEL "NATE" MARTIN
Rockford Park District

LOIS NICKSON
Macomb Park District

JOSEPH PETRY
Champaign Park District

D. DEWEY PIEROTTI JR.
Forest Preserve of DuPage County

CHRIS RILEY
Decatur Park District

FRANK SCARPELLI
Dundee Township Park District

IAPD HEADQUARTERS
211 East Monroe Street
Springfield, IL 62701-1186
217.523.4554
www.Ilparks.org

TED FLICKINGER, Ph.D., CPRP CAE
President and Chief Executive Officer

CINDY DEITERS
Marketing Director

BOBBIE JO HILL
Public Relations Director

ALAN HOWARD
Finance Director

SHERRI KHILE
Executive Secretary

PETER M. MURPHY, CAE
General Counsel

SHANNON SARTAIN
Legal Secretary

SUE TRIPHAWN, CMP
Educational Services Director

RODD WHELPLEY
Publications Director

ILLINOIS PARK AND RECREATION ASSOCIATION

RON SALSKI, CPRP
Chairman
Lake Bluff Park District

CARRIE HAUPERT, CPRP
Chairman-elect
Bolingbrook Park District

TRACEY M. CRAWFORD, CTRS, CPRP
Immediate Past Chairman
Fox Valley SRA

CAROLYN NAGLE, CTRS, CPRP
Fox Valley SRA

RON OESTREICH, CPRP
Bolingbrook Park District

JOHN MCGOVERN
Recreation Accessibility Consultants

MIKE TOOHEY, CPRP
Lisle Park District

LORIKAY PADEN, CPRP
University of Illinois

MIKE STERBA, CPRP
Coloma Township Park District

MARY JEANNE HUTCHINGSON, CPRP
O'Fallon Parks and Recreation

CRAIG CULP, CPRP
NSSRA

GAIL ITO, CPRP
Chicago State University

DEE KAISER
University of Illinois

DEBBIE KOPAS, CPRP
Homewood-Flossmoor Park District

STEVE NEILL, CPRP
Arlington Heights Park District

RICK SCHRAM, CPRP
Winnetka Park District

LISA SHEPPARD, CPRP
Gurnee Park District

ALLISON SOHR, CPRP
Batavia Park District

IPRA HEADQUARTERS
1815 S. Meyers Rd., Suite 400
Oakbrook Terrace, IL 60181
630.376.1911
www.IIpra.org

MIKE SELEP, CPRP
Interim CEO and
Professional Services Director

BARRY FRANKS
Finance Director

DINA KARTCH
Education and Conference Director

HEATHER WEISHAAR
Communications and Projects Director

Illinois Parks and Recreation (ISSN 0019-2155) is published bimonthly at 211 E. Monroe Street, Springfield, Illinois, by the Illinois Association of Park Districts and the Illinois Park and Recreation Association. Annual subscription rates: \$6 for IAPD/IPRA members; \$25 for non-members; \$30 foreign; \$20 educational institutions. Single copies: \$2 members; \$5 nonmembers. Periodicals postage paid at Springfield, Illinois and additional post offices. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to Illinois Parks & Recreation, 211 E. Monroe Street, Springfield, IL 62701-1186. Opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily express the official views of the IAPD/IPRA. Likewise, the publication of any advertisement is not to be construed as an endorsement of the product or services offered. Members of the IAPD and the IPRA and other interested persons are encouraged to submit articles and illustrative photos for possible publication in the magazine. Send for manuscript guidelines and deadline dates: Editor, Illinois Parks & Recreation, 211 E. Monroe Street, Springfield, IL 62701-1186, 217.523.4554, rwhelpley@ILparks.org, www.Ilparks.org. By submitting articles for publication, authors are assigning the copyright to the Illinois Association of Park Districts.

Copyright® by the Illinois Association of Park Districts and the Illinois Park and Recreation Association. All rights reserved. Reprints of articles in whole or in part without prior written permission are prohibited.





Dr. Ted Flickinger
IAPD President and Chief
Executive Officer

Boardmanship

The Chain of Command

For a smooth board/executive relationship and a healthy work environment, each party must respect the chain of command.

The first time a board member tries to manage the day-to-day operations of the agency, she is wrong. The first time the executive tries to set policy, he is wrong. Each must understand and honor this relationship if they want to remain compatible and functional.

The director is the CEO, and in that position she leads the entire management team. The board is the governance team with the president serving as the facilitator. Together the governance and management teams form the organization's leadership. Personnel decisions belong to the executive. Board members that want to hire staff need to back off.

What Does it Take?

Other than making policy, hiring the executive and reviewing the executive's work, long-range planning is one of the most important functions of a board member's governance role. In order to be effective, board members need to make a commitment to the agency's mission, and they must be willing to give the time necessary to be good board members.

But great board members do more than attend meetings. In addition to thorough preparation for meetings, they also actively participate in those meetings and, along with the executive, assess how best to use their skills to perform their roles as board members.

In order to have a functional agency, there must be respect of board colleagues, the executive and staff. To foster and exemplify this respect, you need to know your role and expectations as a board member and be able to be a good listener and supporter of the staff and fellow board members.

Dream Big, Think and Plan According to Financial Resources

It is great to have big dreams because big dreams often lead to major accomplishments. However, especially in this day and age, board members and the executive need to ask, "How are we going to pay for all of this?"

So before completing the strategic plan, review your available financial resources. The executive should report the revenue outlook for the agency and forecast future revenue. Write a plan that fits your budget. It's much easier for the executive and the staff to accomplish the goals when they are financially feasible. The opposite is very frustrating.

Unanimous Consent

In parliamentary procedure "unanimous consent" means that no board member objects. Unanimous consent, oftentimes referred to as general consent, allows the board to move more quickly through agenda

Big dreams often lead to major accomplishments. However, especially in this day and age, board members and the executive need to ask, "How are we going to pay for all of this?"



items so that it can devote more time to discussions or controversial issues and debate on other subjects. Boards can also adopt reports and motions, approve minutes and end debate this way. However, unanimous consent cannot be used in all situations. Check with your attorney.

Underperforming Board Members

On numerous occasions I have written my recommendations on how to work with "problem" board members and I have stated that you need to have a policy regarding attendance, behavior and code of ethics (see for example my columns in the March/April 2006, the May/June 2007, and the March/April 2008 issues of *Illinois Parks & Recreation*, available on the Web by searching the Illinois Periodicals Online Web site at

Together the governance and management teams form the organization's leadership.

www.lib.niu.edu). You need to deal with areas such as the board member who tries to manipulate others, board members who arrive late and leave early from board meetings, or board members who show up at the office to evaluate staff, correct employees or reassign duties.

In addition to the recommendations I have made in the past, I think when two board members are having a problem, the board president should encourage them to express their concerns about each other's board performance directly to one another. If that doesn't work, or if all board members are concerned, then it is the president's role to address that concern with the problem board member. The board president should represent the board and remind any and all problem board members that their behavior is in question and that it violates the board's code of ethics, which should be a part of the agency's board manual.

If a problem board member doesn't want the personal discussion, or doesn't want to admit that his or her behavior is in conflict with the board's code of ethics, then before you would censure a board member in a public meeting, you would place on the agenda of the upcoming board meeting and item reading: "Evaluation of Individual Board Member's Performance." At that time the matter would be discussed by the full board in an attempt to clarify the behavior, determine what is appropriate, explain what is inappropriate and discuss possible solutions or alternate approaches that will have a positive impact on the board's effectiveness.

IAPD Goes Online for Board Training

After 45 years of working with agency boards, I can tell you untrained or inconsistently trained board members, even those most enthused about an agency's mission, can unwittingly be detrimental to the agency's operation. That's why we have chosen to offer the nation's first standardized online training curriculum for park, recreation and conservation board members. This evolving online training series is designed to develop board skills in the following areas:

1. Strategic planning.
2. Conducting effective board meetings.
3. Measuring the effectiveness of the board and the agency.
4. Financial procedures and responsibilities (more than reading a spreadsheet).
5. The relationship between the board and the executive.
6. Relations between the board and the staff.
7. Parliamentary procedures.
8. Passing referenda.
9. Advocacy within the community and with elected officials
10. The public/private sector partnerships that benefit the park, recreation and conservation agency.

This online curriculum is the natural outgrowth of the more than 80 years of service that the Illinois Association of Park Districts has provided to our member agencies. Through its workshops, seminars, annual conferences, reference books and training manuals, the Illinois Association of Park Districts has earned the reputation as the leading educator for park and recreation executives and board members.

We have distilled the information from our publications and course offerings to develop this curriculum. Our goal is to make this material available on the Web site to anyone, anywhere at any time. As a board member, you volunteer much of your time to your community. That's why we turn to the Web as a means to offer you a valuable board training experience at the time and place that's most convenient for you. We hope that this added convenience is one more way to say thank you to you board members, who not only care to serve your communities, but who also care to educate yourselves to be the best board members you can be.

Watch the IAPD E-News and *Illinois Parks & Recreation* magazine for the "Go Live" Announcement Later this Year!

IAPD Calendar

July 23

Legislative Golf Outing

White Pines Golf Club
Bensenville Park District

August 10

IAPD Golf Tour – Event 3

Nettle Creek Golf Course
Morris

August 22

Park District Conservation Day

State Fairgrounds, Springfield

September 11

IAPD Awards Gala

Chevy Chase Country Club
Wheeling Park District

September 22

IAPD Golf Tour – Event 4

Aldeen Golf Course
Rockford Park District

October 13-16

NRPA Congress

Salt Lake City, Utah

November 5

Legal Symposium

Hamburger University
Oak Brook

January 28-30, 2010

Soaring to New Heights Conference

Hilton, Chicago

EYE ON THE PROFESSION

A CLOSER LOOK AT TRENDS AND ISSUES IN THE PARK AND RECREATION PROFESSION



Mike Selep, CPRP
IPRA Professional Services
Director and Iterim CEO

If You Build It, They Will Come...

It's true that if you build a facility a surge of new people will use your services. However, it takes a truly coordinated effort throughout a park and recreation agency to continually attract individuals once that new facility smell wears off.

As I talk with friends, family and recreation professionals across the country, one topic of conversation always comes up. Citizens in Illinois are fortunate that they have dedicated financial resources toward parks and recreation and the construction of a true variety of recreation facilities. The consumption of recreation services in Illinois continually grows. Agencies are encountering an increased demand for services from a variety of segments of the population. But, as financial resources become increasingly challenging to obtain, it becomes important to continue making changes and improvements to existing programs and facilities rather than simply building new ones.

When 'Old' is the New 'New'

As with any seasonally sensitive capital asset, maintaining a swimming pool is an expensive (and somewhat risky) proposition for a park and recreation agency. Even if fees are charged to maintain a facility, poor weather or an unexpected maintenance issue may cause an agency to experience a loss of revenue for a period of time. Whatever profit was in the budget can easily be washed down the drain.

Even so, community members will respond in interest surveys that they want a pool. But then, interest surveys are sometimes as abstract as wish lists sent to Santa, and when faced with a referendum that would seek a tax increase to finance an aquatic facility, a number of communities have voted "no."

A case in point is a 2006 measure that would have financed a new \$5.2 million facility for the Palos Heights Parks and Recreation Department. The referendum did receive community support, but not enough to pass. At that time, the city's old pool, originally constructed in 1972, was in need of mechanical and structural repairs. It was also operating at an \$80,000 a year deficit. No wonder officials were considering shutting it down in favor of a new facility.

According to Michael Leonard, director of the department, the referendum turned out to be a time when the public started to speak, and it was time for him and the city council to listen. "The community didn't vote 'no' to aquatics," said Leonard. "They did not want to see their traditional pool demolished. When the pool was built, it was *the place* in the community to be. Many people that grew up in Palos Heights have moved back and started families. They wanted to keep their community pool."

A community grass roots organization called Save the Pool was formed. This group brought the issue of keeping the pool open in front of city council members. Leonard developed a plan to renovate the pool in stages over the next three to five years. Small improvements would be made in the meantime, based on feedback gathered from community members. The pool's operating schedule was changed to decrease staffing costs, and a new municipal partnership program was formed to provide hybrid pricing for several communities that did not have a pool, so that individuals from those communities could swim at the Palos Heights pool at a rate between resident and non-resident rates. The city council approved Leonard's plan.

If you Keep it Open... Will they still come?

There isn't a new facility smell at the Palos Heights pool (it would be hard to smell over the fresh scent of chlorine in the air anyway). But improvements have re-invigorated the facility. Physical updates include replacing the old deck chairs and adding a drop slide. But operational updates, such as the addition of creative programming and such events as Wacky Wednesdays and Friday Cookouts have also brought more people to the pool. Attendance has increased, and, as a result, the pool operated at a lower loss, \$35,000 in 2008, which included \$40,000 in capital expenses.

The timeline for making the major repairs has been fast-forwarded as Palos Heights received an Open Space Lands Acquisition and Development (OSLAD) grant to help fund the \$900,000 pool renovation project. These changes will provide for a new mechanical system and water heater that will decrease the amount of energy needed, thus

As financial resources become increasingly challenging to obtain, it becomes important to continue making changes and improvements to existing programs and facilities rather than simply building new ones.



reducing operating expenses. A new pool shell will be installed and ADA accessibility enhancements will be made to provide increased opportunities for all community members to be an active part of the Palos Heights pool.

Build New or Fix up Old, But Always Maintain the Fun

It's true that a significant amount of financial resources are devoted toward recreation in Illinois and that new facilities are fantastic additions to a community because they meet new needs and have that new facility smell. What's also true is that recreation has a tradition within a community. While we recognize and implement the newest and greatest trends in our facilities and program offerings, it also often pays to acknowledge the traditions and values of the community.

Congratulations to Palos Heights. Save the Pool gathered support to continue a community tradition for this and future generations. A lower cost alternative was developed in the process. I wonder what Save the Pool members are doing this summer. Perhaps they can figure out how to keep that wild kid from doing cannon balls near the grumpy people who are sitting in lounge chairs near the edge of the pool, but don't want to get wet.

I hope not.

That is my favorite part about going to the pool, and, as we all know, splashing onlookers is completely fair as long as you yell out a warning: "CANNON BALL!"



Peter M. Murphy
IAPD General Counsel

Even in a Tight Economy Voters Favor Investing in Preservation

At the end of its spring session, the Illinois General Assembly worked quickly to approve a number of initiatives on the IAPD Legislative Platform. These include **House Bill 2295**, which provides that a person is not eligible to serve as park commissioner if that person is in arrears in the payment of a tax or other indebtedness due to the park district or has been convicted in any court located in the United States of any infamous crime, bribery, perjury or other felony. Also passing the General Assembly was **House Bill 242**, which adds the consumer price index to the debt service extension base of Illinois park districts, forest preserves and conservation districts and **House Bill 4151**, which provides that the principal on bonds issued by a park district shall be payable no later than 25 years from their date of issue. All three bills were sent to the governor in mid-June.

Capital Budget Proposal

In addition, for the first time since 1999, a capital budget has been proposed. It can be found in the following pieces of legislation:

- **House Bill 255** – Provides the revenue stream for projects through legalized video gaming; authorization for the private management of the Illinois State Lottery; increased taxes on liquor, candy and beauty products, and increased vehicle fees.
- **House Bill 312** - Amends the State Finance Act and makes appropriations and re-appropriations for specified purposes.
- **House Bill 313** - Contains fiscal year 2010 appropriations and includes member initiative projects. The bill, totaling more than 900 pages, includes a variety of important park and recreation projects.
- **House Bill 2400** – Provides that money in the Capital Projects Fund shall be set aside and used for the purpose of paying and discharging annually the principal and interest on bonded indebtedness then due and payable.
- **House Bill 2424** – is the Budget Implementation (Capital) Act that also creates the Park and Recreational Facilities Construction Act.

These capital bills seek to provide important monies for park and recreation projects and include \$150 million for park development that would be administered through the Illinois Department of Natural Resources.

At press time, these bills, except for **House Bill 313**, had been sent to the governor.

Follow the Action on the Web

You can follow the progress of any of the measures that affect park, recreation, conservation and special recreation agencies in Illinois by going to the IAPD Web site at www.ILparks.org. At the home page, scroll over the Public Policy button on the left hand side of the page. From the flyout box that appears when you do this, choose from among the “2009 Priority Bills – House,” “2009 Priority Bills – Senate,” or “Complete Bill Review” options.

Capital bills seek to provide important monies for park and recreation projects and include \$150 million for park development that would be administered through the Illinois Department of Natural Resources.



Survey Shows Illinois Voters Support Investments in Land and Water Preservation

The research firm of Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin & Associates recently surveyed Illinois voters to assess their attitudes towards the concept of making a significant state capital investments in land and water conservation. Overall, the survey results show that while voters are highly concerned about the condition of Illinois' economy, they are strongly supportive of making substantial investments in land and water conservation. More than three-quarters would like to see state spending for land and water conservation kept the same or increased, and 71 percent backed dedicated funding in the amount of \$700 million from the state's capital budget to land and water conservation programs. As impressive as the overall level of support for this concept is the degree to

Voters see dedicating a small portion of the state's capital budget as a highly reasonable action and believe that it is an important investment, even when state revenues are down.

which it cuts across demographic subgroups of the Illinois electorate. The idea is supported by:

- 70 percent of women and 72 percent of men;
- 78 percent of Democrats, 58 percent of Republicans and 69 percent of independents;
- 72 percent of voters under age 50 and 70 percent of voters age 50 and over;
- 70 percent of whites and 77 percent of voters of color; and
- 75 percent of Chicago residents, 76 percent of those in the Cook County suburbs, 70 percent of voters in the collar counties, 71 percent of those in the northern part of the downstate region and 63 percent of those in southern Illinois.

Not surprisingly, support was even higher for a smaller level of investment, with four in five (79 percent) supporting a more modest dedication of \$350 million (or 1.3 percent) of the proposed \$26 billion Illinois capital investment budget for land and water conservation.

The survey suggests that economic concerns do not deter voter support for investments in conservation because voters see no conflict between the issues. Specifically:

- 73 percent agree that “Even though state revenues are down, the Illinois state budget should include funding for land and water conservation;” and
- 83 percent agree that “We can protect land and water and have a strong economy at the same time, without having to choose one over the other.”

Furthermore, voters see continued funding for land conservation as vital to the state economy. More than seven in ten found the fact that fishing, hunting and wildlife-associated recreation generate \$4 billion in economic activity annually and more than 30,000 jobs in Illinois convincing reasons to support the General Assembly dedicating \$700 million of the Illinois capital investment budget to land and water conservation.

Voters are more inclined to back candidates for the General Assembly who support investments in conservation.

Overall, the survey results show that voters see dedicating a small portion of the state’s capital budget as a highly reasonable action and believe that it is an important investment, even when state revenues are down. Ultimately, Illinois voters are highly confident that the state can enjoy a strong economy and still protect its vital land and water resources.

This survey reflects the strong voter support seen for open space and park and recreation opportunities as evidenced by local park district and forest preserve referenda.

Read the Entire Survey Results

Access the Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin & Associates survey on the IAPD Web site at www.ILparks.org. At the home page, scroll over the Public Policy button on the left hand side. From the flyout box that appears when you do this, chose to go to the “IAPD Advocacy Center.” At the Advocacy Center, you will see an item titled “Illinois Voters Strongly Support Land Protection,” which links you to the survey results.



ILLINOIS PARK DISTRICTS

Local Government Meeting People's Needs

Illinois park districts:

- Offer affordable recreational opportunities to their communities
- Protect open space
- Actively promote wellness in their communities
- Partner effectively with businesses and other local governments
- Increase property values
- Serve people with disabilities

Source: Illinois Park Districts: Citizen Perspectives, a report of the University of Illinois Office of Recreation and Park Resources, Department of Recreation, Sport and Tourism, March 2007.


IAPD
Illinois Association of Park Districts
www.ILparks.org



architecture
for
the recreation community

WILLIAMS ARCHITECTS

630 221 1512
630 221 1220
www.williams-architects.com
450 E. Gunderen Dr., Carol Stream, IL 60188



Parks Day

Raises Awareness at the Illinois State Capitol

More than 50 Illinois park districts, forest preserves, conservation, recreation and special recreation agencies participated in IAPD's Parks Day at the Illinois State Capitol on May 5.

Agencies created inviting – often interactive – displays in the State Capitol rotunda to showcase their outstanding facilities and programs and provide examples of how critical funds from such initiatives as the Open Space Lands Acquisition and Development program (OSLAD) and the Natural Areas Acquisition Fund (NAAF) have been used to benefit the citizens they serve.

Many agency representatives met with their legislators during Parks Day to personally escort them through the exhibit area and to thank them for their continued support.

“Parks Day at the Capitol is an opportunity for agencies to educate legislators, legislative staff, government employees and State Capitol visitors about the outstanding parks and recreation programs available in Illinois,” said Dr. Ted Flickinger, IAPD president and chief executive officer. “The programs and services offered by these agencies address important issues like childhood obesity, youth at risk and preservation of open spaces and natural resources.”

Representatives from Illinois park, recreation and conservation agencies gave their legislators a card containing a few of IAPD's 2009 Priority Bills.

2009 Parks Day at the Illinois State Capitol participants

Addison Park District
Alsip Park District (2)
Buffalo Grove Park District
Carol Stream Park District (1)
Cary Park District
Champaign Park District
Chicago Park District
Chicago Wilderness
Decatur Park District
Des Plaines Park District
Elmhurst Park District
Forest Preserve District of Cook County (3)
Forest Preserve District of Will County
Foss Park District
Park District of Franklin Park
Freeport Park District (5)
Glenview Park District (4)
Gurnee Park District
Hanover Park Park District
Hoffman Estates Park District
Illinois Association of Conservation & Forest Preserve Districts
Illinois Association of Park Districts
Itasca Park District
Joliet Park District
Lan-Oak Park District
Lockport Township Park District
Lombard Park District
Manhattan Park District
Naperville Park District (6)
New Lenox Community Park District
Oak Lawn Park District
Pleasant Dale Park District
Recreation Access
Rockford Park District
Village of Romeoville Parks and Recreation Department
Schaumburg Park District
Skokie Park District
South Suburban Parks and Recreation Professional Association
Special Recreation Association Network of Illinois (SRANI)
Springfield Park District
Vernon Hills Park District
Waukegan Park District
Wheaton Park District
Wheeling Park District



To See More Photos of this Event...

Go to IAPD's web site at www.ilparks.org, click on “Resources” on the left side of IAPD's Home Page and select “Photo Gallery” to view pictures from Parks Day and the Legislative Reception.

become part
of the
winning team.

Vermont Systems has been producing high-quality Recreation and Parks software and providing world class support for over 23 years. Our ongoing commitment to our customers drives us to offer reliable and comprehensive solutions to meet their needs. Our entire team carries this torch year after year.

Join the Vermont Systems Team and
bring home
GOLD!



RecTrac™

Recreation Tracking Software

Activity Registrations	Locker Reservations
Facility Reservations	Trip Management
Pass Management	Court Reservations
League Scheduling	Golf Point of Sale
Point of Sale/Inventory	Personal Trainer
Equipment/Site Rentals	Incident Reporting

GolfTrac™

Golf Course Point of Sale Software

Point of Sale/Inventory	Tee-Times
Memberships	Touch Screen
Photo ID Cards	Gift Cards
Handicaps	Food & Beverage
Weather Reporting	Credit Book

WebTrac™

Integrated Internet Software

Activity Registrations	Site Reservations
Facility Reservations	Locker Reservations
Pass Registrations	Trip Reservations
League Registrations	Court Reservations
Equipment/Site Rentals	Trainer Reservations
Tee Times	Venue Ticket Sales

MainTrac™

Maintenance Tracking Software

Resource Tracking	Equipment/Vehicles
Work Orders	Materials Inventory
Facility Maintenance	Personnel Scheduling
Preventive Maintenance	Inspections/Results
Task Tracking	Planning/Budgeting

eRecTrac™

Internet RecTrac Integration

Use eRecTrac for web-based employee access to your RecTrac database. eRecTrac represents our ongoing commitment to provide multiple user interfaces to access the RecTrac database.

FinTrac™

Financial Tracking Software

General Ledger	Purchase Orders
Accounts Payable	Time Management
Payroll	TMS Interfaces

TracPlug-ins™

TeleTrac	POS Hardware
ID Card	PDATrac
Biometric ID	Access Control
Credit/Debit Card	LiveVault Backup
Electronic Checks	Positive Access
Gift Card	Remote Lighting

Vermont
VS Systems
Recreation & Parks Software



University of Illinois students and local youth clear the way for fresh mulch.

by Bruce Wicks, Joseph Altshuler, Mari Gordon,
Dee Kaiser and Wendy Kniepp



A Partnership for Park Revitalization:

East St. Louis and the University of Illinois

Thanks to a committed park district and the help of the University of Illinois, citizens of one of the most economically disadvantaged regions of the state are once again enjoying positive recreational opportunities in their neighborhood.

In 1988, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign made a commitment to the city of East St. Louis by founding the East St. Louis Action Research Project (ESLARP). This organization has established or worked with many community partners in East St. Louis, such as neighborhood organizations and churches, in order to offer assistance with different projects. One of those projects is the revitalization of a neighborhood playground. That sounds like a small step, perhaps. But a convincing argument can be made that for a city burdened by structural problems, park and recreation opportunities are more central to the quality of life for local residents than in more advantaged communities where residents can choose to pay for their recreational pursuits.

East St. Louis Action Research Project and Community-based Learning

An Action Research Model is at the heart of everything the East St. Louis Action Research Project does. The tenets of this bottom-up planning model are that marginalized groups are a priority, that we respect local residents as true partners, that residents know best what the problems are and thus also know the solutions and that something actually gets accomplished. Within this framework, ESLARP uses a combination of students, faculty, staff and resources to help its partners through capacity building and technical assistance.

There have been many different ways classes have engaged with East St. Louis. Faculty members from across the University of Illinois campus have adopted different approaches to their teaching from lecture/discussion to studios.



Left: Bench dedicated to Marie Drake. Right: Marie Drake and University of Illinois students dismantle the old playground sign in order to take it to the university for repairs.

The class that has helped the park district is an Action Research Seminar and was begun in January 2007 to: 1) create a comprehensive park plan based upon community priorities, 2) implement specific parts of that plan and 3) work to keep the plan current by continuing to seek input from the community. Past experience told us that such a project could not be completed in a semester and to accomplish what residents want and help build capacity to sustain any improvements would take far longer than one semester. Thus, we developed this plan:

- **Semester 1 (Spring 2007).** Park assessments. Intercept surveying of park users. In-depth interviews with long-term residents.
- **Semester 2 (Fall of 2007).** Door-to-door neighborhood surveying to assess community needs. Conduct citywide planning summit.
- **Semesters 3 and 4 (Spring of 2008 and Fall of 2008).** Implementation of summit priorities.
- **Semester 5 (Spring of 2009).** Continue implementation and reconnect with residents to assess priorities and adjust as needed.

The Action Research Seminar team has varied in size from six to 18, and its members have represented such disciplines as: architecture; recreation, sport and tourism; aerospace engineering; business; urban planning and geology. Unlike most courses, students are permitted to repeat this class, as the content changes every semester. Some have taken it three times as they continue to learn new skills and have expressed a genuine desire to help make a difference and see the project through.

The Adopt-A-Park Project

During the listening phase of the project in the fall of 2007, we learned from the Planning Summit that residents were well aware of the financial constraints under which their park district was operating. A suggestion was made, and confirmed by those in attendance, that the

parks should be “adopted” in some way by neighborhood organizations. In consultation with Park District Executive Director Irma Golliday, the Action Research Seminar team chose to focus on this, as it was both “doable” and closely aligned with our goal of building sustainable local capacity.

The University of Illinois began its involvement with the Illinois Avenue Playground in 1993, when architecture students planned and implemented a design for the plot of abandoned land. Students collected information from residents young and old in order to best fit their plans to the needs and desires of the community. In addition to design, students were also involved in site and material acquisition and playground construction. In 1998, students returned to clean and update the park during an Alternative Spring Break trip. Their return to the Illinois Avenue Playground reinforced ESLARP’s continuing commitment to the community.

Even before UIUC students developed the Illinois Avenue Playground, several elderly residents had taken it upon themselves to maintain the plot as a safe place for children to play, and the formal creation of a playground sparked significant community enthusiasm. Despite early excitement surrounding the playground, much of the local leadership disappeared throughout the years that followed. Though the park remained serviceable, it was certainly neglected. A decade later, the park was no longer the positive community space that its developers had envisioned.

In spring 2008, the Action Research Seminar team began to brainstorm about how to make the adoption of Illinois Ave. Playground a reality. The decision to return to Illinois Avenue was made for several reasons. First, the university was involved with the playground’s early years, and ESLARP is committed to continuing its work with neighborhood groups. Second, the park’s small size made it a good prototype site for the Adopt-a-Park program. Though much of the original local leadership had left the area, one resident named Marie Drake had continually cared for the playground. With the help of Marie Drake, who is now 87 years old, we hoped to revitalize the park through reestablishing local leadership and enthusiasm.

Surveying residents in the area began the process of launching an Adopt-a-Park program at the Illinois Avenue Playground. Team members went door-to-door and asked people about their impressions of the park, their current use of the park and their visions for the park. We spoke with a range of people, including young children, young adults, parents, and grandparents. Concurrently, community leaders were brought into the process, including the park district executive director, a pastor from a nearby church and Mrs. Drake. Mrs. Drake’s home is across the street from the Illinois Avenue Playground, and she has acted as the park’s guardian and caretaker for many years. Her enthusiasm has been critical throughout this project and served as an inspiration for residents as well as students and faculty.

From our surveys and meetings came the idea to host a community event that would bring people together at the Illinois Avenue Playground. Residents with whom we spoke emphasized that one thing always draws people in – food. Taking their advice, we planned a kickoff cookout with a few goals in mind. At the most basic level, we hoped that the event would serve as a reminder to residents that the Illinois Avenue Playground was still an important part of their neighborhood. We also anticipated that the cookout would be a model for positive use of the space and would establish excitement about maintaining and updating the area.

In order to show how a little volunteer effort could go a long way, we planned park beautification opportunities at the cookout. In preparation, the Illinois Avenue Playground sign that had been erected in 1993 was removed and repainted, to be re-installed during the event, and team members worked hard to secure donations of landscaping materials and plants. Throughout the kickoff cookout, community members and University of Illinois students painted posts and benches, planted flowers and added fresh woodchips to the park. It was important for the Action Research team to continue collecting resident input, and feedback was sought from adult participants. Children also had the opportunity share their visions for the playground by drawing what changes they would like see in the park. Of course, the barbeque aroma helped to bring more and more residents to the park as the day went on. In addition to a large number of residents, local media, the mayor of East St. Louis and several other local officials joined the event. The combination of food, publicity, park beautification, community excitement and positive energy made the event a success.

By publicizing the work being done at the Illinois Avenue Playground, the East St. Louis Park District made this project more visible in the community and marketed the beginnings of an Adopt-a-Park program. In response to this request, the Alpha Phi Alpha fraternity voted to adopt the Illinois Avenue Playground because a fraternity member who had recently passed away had lived in the neighborhood, and the adoption of this park was a tribute to him. The Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity board, under the leadership of President Mike Boyd, passed the resolution to work with the East St. Louis Park District and adopt the Illinois Avenue Playground in April 2008. The adoption was featured in the *Monitor*, a local newspaper, courtesy of Reggie Riddle, a member of the fraternity and photographer for the paper. The Alphas pledged to keep up with park maintenance and coordinate beautification projects throughout the year. This adoption by the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity was endorsed by the board of park commissioners and will allow the district to redirect scarce resources elsewhere, knowing this park is being maintained.

Next Steps

When the opportunity was presented to residents to participate in cleaning up the park, many were excited to get involved. The positive energy from the kickoff cookout gave residents a sense of ownership and reminded them that they have a stake in the community. Marie Drake's leadership and dedication has also inspired many. She is a great asset to the Illinois Avenue Playground and the East St. Louis community as a

whole. Her example reinforces the notion that developing and supporting community-based leadership is a key to successful park adoption programs.

The changes made at the Illinois Avenue Playground made a great impact on the community. The residents of the neighborhood appreciate the beautification and visual improvement of their park.

Beyond the adoption of the Illinois Avenue Playground, efforts must continue to communicate with local leaders about their roles in improving this and other East St. Louis parks. Volunteer activities between the park district, the Alpha Phi Alpha fraternity and students from the University of Illinois need to be coordinated to achieve the greatest results.

Others have recognized the success at the Illinois Avenue Playground as an example of what neighborhood organizing and volunteer work can achieve. Friends and Families for Virginia Park, a new organization in East St. Louis's Alta Sita neighborhood, has been created to make Virginia Park a center piece for that area. With help from the park district and the university, the friends group was instrumental in securing a grant from KaBOOM!, a national non-profit that empowers communities to build playgrounds. And a second KaBOOM! playground grant has been secured for nearby Lincoln Park.

The revitalization of East St. Louis parks is providing the community a renewed sense of pride, as well as improved opportunities for quality recreation experiences. However, we know our work is not done and have on the agenda the following goals:

- Create a resource packet for prospective organizations that includes sample agreement documents and work schedules.
- Design a volunteer management plan for the park district with particular attention to volunteer recognition.
- Promote the program in as many ways possible.
- Provide follow through support for organizations adopting parks.

Through this partnership, the East St. Louis Park District and the University of Illinois are able to provide great experiences for the students while accomplishing goals of the park district.

Bruce Wicks, PhD is an associate professor in the University of Illinois Department of Recreation, Sport and Tourism.

Joseph Altshuler, Mari Gordon, Dee Kaiser and Wendy Kniepp are University of Illinois students who were deeply involved with the East St. Louis Action Research Project.





Building a Capital Improvement Plan to Last

Do you know which of your park sites is in most dire need of repair? The answer is probably yes. Do you know how all of your other parks rank in terms of their need for improvements, the funds available, time since last improvements, timeline for future work and community desires for those sites? Is the answer still yes?

For the Park District of Oak Park, the answer was that we had all those pieces of information somewhere, but not at our fingertips. This made decision-making and accountability difficult, particularly in the wake of a successful referendum that raised money to renew our parks.

As a new commissioner, I was unfamiliar with the district's infrastructure needs and relied mostly on my anecdotal observations that this building needed ADA accessibility upgrades or that field drained poorly. I had to vote on a 5-year capital spending plan within the first nine months of my term. The plan was a spreadsheet, listing spending allocations for each park site and anticipated funding streams. But to make a sound judgment, I felt I needed a document that laid out the rationale for the expenditures, explained how we determined what the needs of all the parks were and listed the long-term funding sources. So I decided to create that document.

In fact, it was not so much a writing project as a collating project. The district had begun a major reassessment of its operations and infrastructure in 2001, after years of the status quo. A comprehensive

needs assessment had proceeded in several stages, with extensive citizen input at each stage and multiple reports had been produced.

An Infrastructure Committee of citizen volunteers had spent fourteen months cataloging the state of the district's major capital assets and made a number of recommendations, foremost of which was that a major master planning effort was needed in order to ensure that limited financial resources were used effectively. As part of that effort, the district conducted a community attitude and interest survey to learn how current district programs and facilities were meeting the needs of our residents. One of the most important findings for the subsequent capital improvement plan was the response to a question that asked how residents would allocate \$100 in new tax funding among seven types of parks, recreation, historic and special facilities. The responses showed that a balanced approach was preferred: with \$29 out of every \$100 going to the improvement and maintenance of existing parks, playgrounds and outdoor swimming pools. Fifteen dollars each were allocated for land acquisition and improvements and construction of new game fields; \$12 for renovation of the neighborhood centers; \$10 for improvements to historic properties; and \$8 for renovation of our flagship recreation facility, which includes an ice arena and outdoor pool. This critical information told us that the community did not want us to go out and spend the whole \$100 on the ice arena or on historic properties. The community wanted a balanced approach to capital improvements throughout the district.

What is a Capital Improvement Plan and Why do you Need One?

A capital improvement plan is a framework for prioritizing capital needs, identifying funding sources and establishing a timeline for expenditures. Recognize that these are three sequential steps. The needs assessment must come first, then the financing plan, then the timeline for construction or purchase.

The needs assessment comes first because it is much easier to convince voters and other funders to contribute money if you can show them that you know what the needs are and have a thoughtful plan for fulfilling them. But more than that, keeping current on a comprehensive needs assessment is simply good stewardship of public assets. We owe it to taxpayers and users to keep up-to-date on the status of our infrastructure and know what has to be fixed next.

So how do you know what needs to get fixed next? You establish criteria for prioritization. Some criteria are obvious: life safety repairs come before beautification and roofing comes before painting. You could also consider how long it has been since a given asset was last improved. But beyond the obvious, your criteria come from the mission, vision and goals of your district, which ultimately come from the residents. That is why citizen input at multiple stages of the capital improvement planning process is necessary, and why recording the planning process in a central document accessible to the public is so critical.

The capital improvement plan should be designed to provide information to assist staff and elected officials in making decisions. By putting all the information in one document and posting it on the agency's Web site, a capital improvement plan also provides transparency and accountability to users and taxpayers. Accountability is something fundamental to our work as a unit of local government, and it is something that we owe to our taxpayers, users, partners, affiliates, and donors. It is simply our duty in a democracy to provide an accounting to our constituents for the decisions made and actions taken using their dollars. Furthermore it builds trust, a valued commodity in local governments.

There are additional upsides to a well-constructed capital improvement plan. It allows for better coordination with other agencies for planned or desired activities. For example, if your park district and municipality both have capital improvement plans, you may be able to coordinate timing on adjacent projects, such as water main replacements and field grading improvements. It is better to plan together than to tear up the same turf twice. A capital improvement plan also creates the basis for a historical record of intentions and actual projects. This will help guide future park boards as they continue to maintain and improve your parks.

Pulling it all Together

Putting together a capital improvement plan from scratch takes a lot of effort. When I identified the need for such a document, our executive director agreed and asked, "Can you work on it?"

This was a great act of faith on his part, and was only possible because the board and staff had achieved a relationship of mutual trust and support that had been nurtured through several years of deliberate, open and respectful recruitment of citizen volunteers and advisory committees.

I began searching for the puzzle pieces that could be assembled into our capital improvement plan. I found out that we had a spreadsheet with cost allocations, a number of reports from citizen committees that had surveyed our historic properties and overall park infrastructure and even historical descriptions of our parks that had been written by out-of-work librarians during the 1930s as part of a Works Progress Administration project. I put these together as best I could and then set up meetings with staff, interviewing them to fill in the gaps. The final structure provided background about the district and its extensive needs assessment process, summary data on capital revenues and expenditures and detailed information about individual park projects.

The result turned a two-page spreadsheet into a 73-page document with a thorough history of needs assessment, narrative descriptions of capital expenditure allocations and resources and descriptions of each site owned by the district, complete with photos and acquisition dates.

There are still pieces missing. One of the biggest is establishing a solid process for estimating and tracking the effect of capital projects on our operating budget. During the master planning process for each individual site, the district asks the public and planners to brainstorm first and estimate costs later. That way we can generate creative ideas freely rather than snuffing them out prematurely with dollar



Oak Park's Andersen Park and Center Left: Before, Right: After

constraints. This works for capital plans because often we can split projects into phases and spread the costs over time as dollars become available. But operating costs should be considered up front. Some projects will save operating dollars by rationalizing staff allocations, conserving energy or expanding partnership opportunities. They can also easily add operating costs, however, so operating impact should always be considered up front in the capital planning process. It is also vital to track data on operating expenses before and after capital improvements, in order to verify the accuracy of the estimates and to

demonstrate to the public how, hopefully, the capital expenditures are generating operational savings or service improvements over time. The Park District of Oak Park's capital improvement plan estimates "low, medium, and high" savings or added costs attributable to capital projects, but we have more work to do on tracking our operating costs and integrating these numbers into the capital planning process.

Maintaining your Capital Improvement Plan

Don't build it if you can't maintain it! That refrain is repeated by many a wise park director and park board, and it applies to capital assets as well as to the capital improvement plan itself. Your document should be designed in such a way that it is easy for staff to update on an annual or biannual basis. It should be structured so that future iterations will relate to past data and allow for trend analysis. It needs to be institutionalized so that it will persist despite staff and board turnover, and updates and public hearings should be on the district's annual or biannual calendar.

Putting it to Work

We began using our capital improvement plan immediately. It is a decision-useful document, a communications device, a brief history, a showcase and a plan. In a very active and vocal community like Oak Park, it has proven to be an excellent tool for balancing the public's desires with the district's resources. A memorable endorsement came by way of an editorial by a local newspaper:

Is good government possible? Can elected officials ever simply be straightforward? We offer two examples that give us hope: The park district's capital improvement plan: You can like the plan, hate the plan or quibble about the choice of building materials or the placement of a sand volleyball pit. But when it comes to the Park District of Oak Park, you cannot say that officials didn't tell you what was coming.... Now the board has put forward its five-year capital improvement plan for the next phases of park rehab. This plan is in keeping with the board's promise to taxpayers. It is ambitious, it is specific, and it is spelled out in black-and-white....We have concerns here about costs and overreaching in financial hard times. But we appreciate the financial guidepost the district has provided us.

— *Wednesday Journal*, October 15, 2008, p. 24.

Lise Valentine is a commissioner at the Park District of Oak Park.

WebXtra:

Download and Read the Oak Park Capital Improvement Plan

From the Park District of Oak Park Web Site (www.oakparkparks.com) ...

Scroll over the "About Us" button on the bottom of the home page. Click on the "PD Finances" option, where you will be taken to a page that will allow you to choose to view the 2008-2013 Capital Improvement Plan among other documents. (Or type this URL into your Web browser

<http://www.oakparkparks.com/AboutUs/CurrentFinances/PDOP%20CIP2009-2013%20Accepted.pdf>).

From the IAPD Web site (www.ilparks.org) ...

Roll to the "Publications" tab on the left side of the home page. Click on the "Illinois Parks and Recreation Magazine" option to take you to the magazine page. You'll find links to all Web Xtras on the bottom of the page.

From the IPRA Web site (www.IPRAonline.com) ...

Check out www.IPRAonline.com/resources/publications

<h1>MIDWEST AQUATIC SPECIALIST</h1>	
 <p>Burbach Aquatics, Inc. Architects & Engineers <i>Your Quality Choice for Aquatic Design!</i></p>	
<p>INDOOR & OUTDOOR RECREATIONAL AQUATIC CENTERS</p> <p>WWW.BURBACHAQUATICS.COM baae@centurytel.net</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *TECHNICAL EVALUATIONS *FEASIBILITY *MARKETING STUDIES *CAPITAL CAMPAIGNS *REFERENDUM SUPPORT *IN-HOUSE DESIGN *IN-HOUSE SPECIFICATIONS *CONSTRUCTION - *ADMINISTRATION *EXPERT WITNESSING *FOR FAILED FACILITIES 	



Governor Addresses 31st Annual IAPD Legislative Conference

At the IAPD Legislative Conference Governor Pat Quinn announced \$21 million in grant awards for park agencies.

Governor Pat Quinn and Illinois Department of Natural Resources Director Marc Miller were on hand May 6 to discuss plans for revitalizing the state's effort to preserve natural areas with the 375 delegates attending IAPD's Legislative Conference in Springfield.

"Our goal is to leave no child inside. We want to take on nature deficit disorder," said the governor. Toward that end, the governor said that he is working to restore the Illinois Department of Natural Resources to its former stature. For too long, he said, the department has been taking unfair cuts. He also announced the latest round of Open Space Lands Acquisition and Development (OSLAD) grants totaling more than \$21 million to for 59 park development and land acquisition projects.

Senator Don Harmon of Oak Park and Representative Skip Saviano of Elmwood Park gave conference delegates an understanding of the legislative process and tips for establishing long-lasting and beneficial working relationships with members of the General Assembly.

Break-out sessions on developing advocacy skills, records retention and a review of park and recreation-related bills before the state legislature served as preparation for individual lobbying efforts, some of which were begun at the Legislative Reception, held the evening before the Legislative Conference at Springfield's Illini Country Club. That event offered park and recreation professionals and board members a chance to visit with state legislators in a relaxed setting.



Senator Don Harmon of Oak Park and Representative Skip Saviano of Elmwood Park speak about the legislative process



Hoffman Estates Park District Commissioner Scott Triphahn with his State Representative Fred Crespo.



The break out session on developing advocacy skills featured a series of round table discussions.



Illinois Department of Natural Resources Director Marc Miller listens to a presentation on the issues affecting the state's park, recreation, conservation and special recreation agencies.



Deputy Executive Director Andrew Kimmel of the Lake County Forest Preserve District meets Representative Mike Bost of Carbondale at the IAPD Legislative Reception on May 5.



Representative Charles E. Jefferson of Rockford and Illinois Department of Natural Resources Director Marc Miller at the IAPD Legislative Reception.



Ancel Glink understands the value of teamwork.

**Ancel
Glink**

DIAMOND BUSH
DI CIANNI
& KRAFTHEFER

Think Ancel Glink

Ancel Glink. No law firm knows park district law like we do — we wrote the book. Progressive in our thinking, zealous in our client advocacy, and relentless in our commitment to Illinois park districts, only a firm like Ancel Glink could know this much about park district law. So whatever your needs are, **think Ancel Glink!** Visit www.ancelglink.com to download pamphlets on labor law, tort immunity and other subjects from the Ancel Glink Library. Please contact Rob Bush, Scott Puma, Derke Price, or Bob Porter at 312-782-7606 to find out how Ancel Glink may be of service to you.

Serving Illinois with offices in Chicago, Vernon Hills, Naperville, Crystal Lake and Bloomington | 312 782-7606 | www.ancelglink.com

The Economics of Fun



Comprehensive Park & Recreation Master Plans • Park Master Planning • Grant Writing
Creative Play Environments & Outdoor Education Areas • Athletic Field Design & Engineering
Community Needs Assessments • Building Feasibility Studies • Environmental Design & Green Engineering
Splash Pad Design • Ecological Planning & Green Park Design

1754 E. Washington Street • Suite 120 • Naperville, IL 60563 • P 330.577.0445 • F 330.577.0477 www.design-perspectives.net

PEOPLE & PLACES



Peter Murphy to Serve as Next President/Chief Executive Officer of the Illinois Association of Park Districts

IAPD General Counsel **Peter Murphy** has been selected to serve as the association's next president and chief executive officer.

Murphy joined the Illinois Association of Park Districts in 1980. As president and CEO, he will be responsible for managing the association's operations and personnel; monitoring state and federal legislative initiatives; working with the IAPD board of trustees to develop strategic plans and goals; establishing

corporate and nonprofit partnerships; overseeing finances; serving as the association's spokesperson; and directing programs and services including research, board member training, publications, education, public awareness and marketing.

Murphy received his B.S. degree from the University of Michigan and his J.D. from the New England School of Law in Boston. He has more than 31 years of experience with state and local government.

As general counsel, he monitors all bills and initiates legislation pertaining to park districts, forest preserves, conservation, recreation and special recreation agencies on the statewide and national level. He has worked to pass more than 90 percent of the IAPD's legislative agenda during his 29 years at the association.

He currently manages the association's legal and legislative programs, acts as legal counsel to the membership, provides

grassroots advocacy training, provides testimony on behalf of the association to House and Senate committees, serves on the board of the Illinois Parks Association Risk Services (IPARKS), represents the association on Partners for Parks and Wildlife and is the liaison to the IAPD/IPRA Joint Legislative Committee, which establishes the association's yearly platform and coordinates initiatives to promote positive legislation for parks, recreation and conservation.

He is a Certified Association Executive (CAE) from the American Society of Association Executives (ASAE). He was elected president of the Illinois Society of Association Executives (ISAE) in 1993 and has served on various committees since 1988, serving as chairman of the ISAE Legislative and Non-dues Revenue Committees and on the ASAE Legal Section Council Board.

He has been a member of the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) since 1980 and has been a member of their National Issues Action Committee and has served as chairman of the American Park and Recreation Society's Legislative Committee.

Murphy is also a member of the American Academy for Park and Recreation Administration. He serves as general counsel and board secretary for the Illinois Conservation Park and Recreation Administration and is a member of the International Federation of Parks and Recreation Administration. He is Chairman of the American Public Excess Entity Pool (APEEP).

Murphy has been involved in many community and civic organizations including six years of service as a cubmaster, a youth baseball coach for 14 years, past president of the Springfield Southwest Baseball Association, a board member on the Springfield Parks Foundation and is serving his sixteenth consecutive term as president of the Thomas Rees Carillon Society. He has served as an alderman for the City of Leland Grove for four consecutive terms.

IN MEMORIAM

Michael T. Williams, Architect

Michael T. Williams, founding partner of the Carol Stream architectural firm of Williams Architects and Williams Construction Management, died on May 28. He was 68 years old.

Williams grew up in Oak Park, where he was influenced by the work of Frank Lloyd Wright. He earned a bachelor of architecture degree from the University of Illinois and a master of architecture degree from the University of Pennsylvania.

He established the architectural firm of Williams-Pollock and Associates, and after several years then founded Williams Architects in 1994.

Williams Architects and Williams Construction Management served more than 160 park agencies and nonprofit and private recreation facilities in Illinois and elsewhere. Among the firm's many projects were the Rice Community Center and Pool in Wheaton, the

Bartlett Community Center, the Glenview Park Center, the award-winning Centre of Elgin, Lisle's Sea Lion Pool, Woodridge's Cypress Cove Water Park, the Downers Grove Recreation and Fitness Center, the Wheaton Park District's Park Services Center and Barrington's Citizens Park.

Among his many public service activities, Williams was a member of the Friends of West Chicago Parks Foundation and a member of the Lisle Park District Partners for Parks. He was a trustee for the Bartlett Parks Foundation.

In March, in recognition of his commitment to creating accessible recreation spaces, he was inducted into the Western DuPage Special Recreation Association Foundation's Hall of Fame.

He is survived by his wife, Jan, six children and several grandchildren.

Memorials can be made to the Western DuPage Special Recreation Association Foundation, 116 N. Schmale Rd., Carol Stream, Illinois 60188.



Twelve Illinois Agencies Are Among the 24 Finalists for the 2009 National Gold Medal Awards

Twelve Illinois parks and recreation agencies are vying for one of the six gold medals awarded annually to the nation's top agencies.

In May, the American Academy for Park and Recreation Administration (AAPRA), in partnership with the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA), announced the 24 finalists for its six 2009 National Gold Medal

Awards for Excellence in Park and Recreation Management.

The Gold Medal Award honors communities throughout the United States that demonstrate excellence in long-range planning, resource management, volunteerism, environmental stewardship, program development, professional development and agency recognition. Each agency is judged on its ability to address the needs of those it serves through the collective energies of citizens, staff and elected officials.

A panel of five parks and recreation professionals reviews and judges all application materials. Judges are chosen for their experience and knowledge in parks and recreation on both local and national levels.

Winners in each of the six categories will be announced during NRPA's Annual Congress and Exposition in Salt Lake City, Utah, October 13 to 16, 2009.

Categories are based on the population an agency serves. Illinois has nominations in four categories (missing the statewide category and the category for serving populations of more than 250,000).

Illinois nominations by category are:

Class II (population 100,001 – 250,000)

**The Fox Valley Park District, Illinois
The Pleasure Driveway and
Park District of Peoria**

Class III (population 50,001 – 100,000)


**The Arlington Heights Park District
The Glenview Park District
The Hoffman Estates Park District**

Class IV (population 25,001 – 50,000)

**The Bartlett Park District
The Buffalo Grove Park District
The Downers Grove Park District
The Lombard Park District**

Class V (population less than 25,000)

**The Batavia Park District
The Itasca Park District
The Vernon Hills Park District**



Dr. Bruce Larson receives a 40-year public service anniversary award at the 2007 IAPD "Best of the Best" gala.

Urbana Commissioner Retires from the Board after 42 years of Service

On May 31, the Urbana Park District hosted a farewell reception in honor of **Dr. Bruce Larson**, who recently left the agency's park board after serving for 42 years. He began his board tenure in 1967 and served as president for 33 years, from 1970 to 2003.

He was instrumental in district's development of Meadowbrook Park, Busey Woods and Wheatfield Park, as well as the 1979 opening of the Anita Purves Nature Center.

Larson was also a strong supporter of – and significant contributor to – the work of the Illinois Association of Park Districts. He was on the IAPD board from 1976 to 1979 and again from 1990 to 1996, serving as president during his final year on the board. He was a major force behind the re-write of the association's by-laws in 1978 and held a seat on (and often the chairmanship of) nearly every IAPD committee, including the Board Development, Membership, Nominating, Constitutional By-Laws, Joint Distinguished Park and Recreation Agency, Coordinating, Research Advisory and Joint Legislative Committees.

In 1992, he earned the association's top honor, the Commissioner of the Year Award.

Larson is a University of Illinois emeritus professor of biochemistry and nutritional sciences. This spring, he chose not to run for an eighth term on the park board. He is the longest serving commissioner in the district's history, surpassing the 40 years served by J.C. Blair, who was on the original park board and was its first president in 1907. Blair was also the first president of the Illinois Association of Park Districts from 1928 to 1929.



Quincy Executive Director Retires after 35 Years with the District

Quincy Park District Executive **Mike Parks** retired on June 30. Parks started as a maintenance worker for the district in 1974. He was director of parks for 19 years before becoming the district's sixth executive director in May 2003. He leaves the district, which is made up of 28 parks on 1,000 acres and employs 28 full-time staff, with more than \$3 million in its reserve fund.

At press time, the district was working with the IAPD Executive Search Program to find Parks' successor. In the mean time, **Ed Seger**, the district's director of parks, is slated to serve as interim executive director.



Sheavoun Lambillotte (front row, left) is Geneva's new executive director. Traci Wicks (front row center) is the district's marketing and public relations supervisor. Mickey Boyle, (front row, light blue shirt) is the district's aquatics and adult programs coordinator. Jay Kelly, (back row, center) is the district's superintendent of recreation, and David Shindley, (back row, right) is the assistant facility manager/athletic supervisor.

Geneva Promotes Rec Superintendent to Executive Director, Hires new Staff

The Geneva Park District Board has named **Sheavoun Lambillotte** as the new executive director for the Geneva Park District. Sheavoun was the district's superintendent of recreation for the past ten years.

Board President, **Chuck Emma**, stated that "she has the vision, expertise, and commitment that the board was looking for to carry on the tradition of excellence that has been established within the district."

She assumed her duties on July 1, following the retirement of longtime director, **Stephen Persinger**.

Jay Kelly is the new superintendent of recreation for the Geneva Park District. As superintendent, he oversees all aspects of the recreation department, including all facilities and recreational programs. He comes from the Homewood-Flossmoor Park District and has been in the field for 13 years. He has a bachelor's degree in recreation administration from the University of St. Francis.

Traci Wicks is the district's new marketing and public relations supervisor. She oversees the district's Web site, the creation of all marketing materials and press releases and the design and production of the district's seasonal brochures. Previously, Wicks was the marketing coordinator at the Addison Park District and has been in the field for five years. She has a bachelor of arts degree in communication, with an emphasis in advertising and minors in both marketing and graphic design.

Mickey Boyle is the new recreation and aquatics coordinator. His responsibilities include overseeing the operations of the Sunset Aquatic Facility, adult programming, active older adult programming, adventure recreation programming and several park district special events. Mickey comes to Geneva with a B.S. in recreation, park, and tourism administration from Western Illinois University and six seasons of aquatic experience.

David Shindley has joined the district as its new assistant manager and recreation supervisor at the Stephen D. Persinger Recreation Center. He helps oversee the day-to-day operations of the facility, the birthday party program and all the recreation activities at the new building. Shindley previously worked for the Chillicothe and Peoria Park Districts in central Illinois. He has a bachelor's degree from Illinois State University and has been working in the parks and recreation field in some capacity for eight years.

Geneva Park District Director Retires After 30 Years of Service

Stephen D. Persinger retired June 30 from the Geneva Park District. Persinger served as the district's executive director for thirty years. He was in the field of Parks and Recreation for 36 years.

With Persinger's guidance, the park district expanded its green space to more than 700 acres. Over the years, he was responsible for the development of bike and pedestrian trails, playgrounds and parks, athletic fields, an outdoor aquatic center and water sprayground, a community center, a recreation center, two fitness centers and a skate park. The district has 40,000 program participants and offers such programs as preschool, a before- and after-school program, arts and crafts, trips, special events, athletics, dance, martial arts, gymnastics, tumbling, camps, as well as toddler, youth and adult programs.

Persinger is most proud of the acquisition, restoration and development of the Geneva Park District's Peck Farm Park. The 400-acre park features acres of natural prairie, pedestrian trails and athletic fields, as well as an observation silo, a restored barn, a history museum, a butterfly house and a newly constructed recreation center.

During his career, Persinger won the 1999 Illinois Park and Recreation Association Fellow Award, the 2005 National Recreation and Parks Association Citizen Branch Award for Professional Excellence and the 2008 Illinois Park and Recreation Association Robert Artz Award.

He is a past chairman of the Illinois Park and Recreation Association board.



Stephen D. Persinger at the sign dedication of the Stephen D. Persinger Recreation Center in October, 2008.



Ralph J. Volpe

Highland Park Bids Farewell to Old Director and Welcomes a Successor

The Park District of Highland Park executive director **Ralph J. Volpe** recently retired after more than 30 years of professional experience in the field of parks and recreation. Volpe received a bachelor's and master's degree in parks and recreation administration from Western Illinois University.

Volpe started as a graduate intern at the Park District of Highland Park and worked for the district as a Youth Conservation Corps (YCC) Director and a winter sports facility manager before going to the Glencoe Park District. Volpe returned to Highland Park two years later as the assistant superintendent of parks and worked his way up the ranks as superintendent of parks and director of parks and planning. He then assumed the responsibilities of the executive director in 2001.

Volpe has been highly involved in the field of parks and recreation throughout his tenure. He is a Certified Park and Recreation Professional and has been involved in a variety of leadership roles for the National Recreation and Park Association, the Illinois Park and Recreation Association and a variety of other park and recreation organizations.

Liza McElroy became the district's new executive director on May 18. McElroy had been the director of the Winnetka Park District since 2001, where she managed numerous projects, including strategic planning, obtaining grants and the renovation and construction of several parks and facilities.



Liza McElroy



Winnetka Park District Hires New Horticulturist

Amanda Braus recently joined the Winnetka Park District as the agency's horticulturist and Certified Arborist. Braus helps the district's bio-diversity efforts by creating and maintaining more natural areas, eliminating evasive species in parks and designing interesting plant groupings. Braus's past environmental experience has been with Greencorps, Wildlife Management, V3 Corporation and the Naperville Park District. Her extensive background includes landscaping; identifying native and invasive plants; prairie, forest and wetland restoration; and prescribed burns. Braus is a graduate of Roosevelt University with a B.S. in environmental science.



Chuck Trongnetpanya



Jennifer Rooks-Lopez

Northbrook Hires IT Director and Project Manager

The Northbrook Park District recently added two management positions: an information technology director and a project manager.

Chuck Trongnetpanya is the IT director. Previously, he served as director of technology for the Naperville Park District and IT manager for the Elk Grove Park District. Trongnetpanya graduated from DeVry University with a bachelor's degree in telecommunications management. He is working toward an MBA at the Keller Graduate School of Management.

Landscape architect **Jennifer Rooks-Lopez** is the district's new project manager/planner. She prepares landscape plans and construction documents, assists in site planning for recreation projects and oversees contractors. This summer, she is working on master plans to update three of the district's parks.

Before coming to Northbrook, Rooks-Lopez worked as a project manager for Wood and Associates Inc. of Atlanta, Hitchcock Design Group of Naperville and the Brickman Group of Long Grove. She graduated from the University of Georgia with a bachelor's degree in landscape architecture. She is LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) certified.



Kay Wojcik poses with the sign for the conservation area dedicated in her honor.

Schaumburg Dedicates Kay Wojcik Conservation Area

Because longtime state legislator **Kate Wojcik** was such a strong supporter of the Schaumburg Park District for many years, district officials thought it fitting to dedicate to her honor the conservation area that backed up to her Schaumburg home.

Oak Hollow Conservation Area was officially dedicated as Kay Wojcik Conservation Area at Oak Hollow in a ceremony May 23.

"It's our pleasure to dedicate this park for all your work for park districts and service to special recreation," Schaumburg Park District Board President **George Longmeyer** told Wojcik at the ceremony, which featured remarks from Longmeyer, district Executive Director **Jean Schlinkmann** and IAPD President and CEO **Ted Flickinger**.

Wojcik served as a representative and senator in the Illinois legislature for more than 20 years. In her time in office she repeatedly supported efforts to bring state funding to the district.

In the mid-1980s Wojcik helped secure \$250,000 to build the Meineke gymnasium. In 1993, the initial softball field and parking lot at Olympic Park was built with \$750,000 of Build Illinois funds. In addition, the park district has received \$1.95 million in Open Space Lands Acquisition and Development grants with her help. An enthusiastic supporter of fundraising and nature conservation events, Wojcik has also been a personal contributor to park district preschools and Safety Park, and she served as a trustee for the Schaumburg Park Foundation. In 2001, IAPD honored Wojcik as the Legislator of the Year.



Olympic gold medalist Scott Hamilton with Northbrook's Laila Schlesinger.

Skating Institute Names Northbrook Skating Coordinator Director of the Year

Northbrook Park District Skating Coordinator **Laila Schlesinger** received the Skating Director of the Year Award from the Ice Skating Institute (ISI) at its conference in Orlando.

"The award was a complete surprise and truly an honor," says Schlesinger, who received the award from Olympic figure skating gold medalist Scott Hamilton. Chosen for her demonstrated leadership, Schlesinger was praised for energizing and enlarging the skating program at the Northbrook Park District. Schlesinger has worked at the Northbrook Park District since 1981, starting as a part-time skating instructor. "I hope that my passion for the sport will continue to inspire more children and adults to participate," she adds.

In another skating honor, the Northbrook Sports Center won the bid to host the 2010 ISI International Artistic Challenge in December 2010, which will draw skaters from all over the world.

Haylie's Certified Playground Mulch



RAINBOW FARMES

25715 S. Ridgeland Avenue . Monee, IL 60449
Ph: 708.534.1070 * Fax: 708.534.1138

email: RainbowFarms@nettech.com

W.B.E. CERTIFIED

Make your Nominations for the IAPD's "Best of the Best" Awards

The 2009 IAPD "Best of the Best" Awards Gala is coming to Wheeling Park District's Chevy Chase Country Club the evening of Friday, September 11.

Through August 3, nominations will be accepted for Board Member Service Anniversary Awards, Agency Anniversary Awards, Illinois Parks' Top Journalist Award, Best Friend of Illinois Parks - Business Category, Intergovernmental Cooperation Award, Partnership Award, Good Sportsmanship Award, Outstanding Citizen Volunteer of the Year Award and, new this year, the Best Green Practices Award for an agency that incorporates environmentally-friendly business practices and policies. Also added this year is an Arts in the Parks Award presented by the IAPD and the Illinois Arts Alliance to an agency that supports the arts or fosters partnerships with artists and arts organizations to enhance the quality of life for citizens in the communities it serves.

Nomination booklets with award descriptions and nomination forms will be mailed soon.

Submit nominations online or download a nomination booklet at www.ILparks.org. Select "Calendar of Events" along the left side and scroll down to September.

All supporting materials for nominations (narratives of contributions, newspaper clippings, etc.) must be submitted by e-mail to bjhill@ILparks.org.

Reservations to attend this year's awards gala will be accepted beginning July 31.



Former IAPD Board Member One of Three New Members of the Rockford Park District Foundation Board



Harris Agnew at the 2006 IAPD/IPRA Annual Conference.

After serving two consecutive terms as a Rockford Park District commissioner and four years as a member of the IAPD Board of Trustees, **Harris Agnew** joins the Rockford Park District Foundation Board of Directors. Agnew is a retired 17th Circuit Judge. He served many years as the board liaison with the foundation. In 2001, he received the IAPD Michael Cassidy Award for Community Service.

Other new members on the foundation board are **Rob Funderburg**, chairman of Alpine Bank, and **Pat Agnew**, attorney and founder of Agnew Law Office.

IPRA Announces Deadline For 2009 Awards Nominations

Nominations for IPRA individual, agency, programs, parks and community service awards are being accepted now through October 30, 2009.

Do you know of an individual who deserves recognition? IPRA has worked to make nominating someone for an award easier than ever. Just send the awards committee your nominee's name and the awards committee will do the rest. Complete and easy directions are on the IPRA Web site. All the details are at www.ILipra.org/awards.

Winning an individual or agency award at the Soaring to New Heights Conference is a testament to the dedication and long hours put in to make a community a better place to live and play. Why not make sure that a deserving agency, professional or volunteer gets the chance to be recognized?



Volunteers Needed for Park District Conservation Day at the Illinois State Fair - Saturday, August 22

The Illinois Association of Park Districts is seeking volunteers to assist with Park District Conservation Day at the Illinois State Fair, one of the largest, outdoor public awareness events for park districts, forest preserves, conservation, recreation and special recreation agencies.

Volunteers receive free parking and free admission to the Illinois State Fair on Saturday, August 22nd. If you are interested in volunteering, register online or download a registration form at www.ILparks.org. Click on "Calendar of Events" on the left, scroll down to August and click on "Park District Conservation Day."

Director of Fundraising Joins Forest Preserve District

Kathi Wagner has joined the staff of the Forest Preserve District of DuPage County in the position of director of fundraising and development.

Wagner comes to the district with nearly two decades of experience in nonprofit development, most recently as executive director of the Illinois branch of the International Dyslexia Association. Her career history demonstrates a track record of increasing charitable income through corporate and foundation grants, special-event fundraisers and direct mail solicitations. She has previously served on the board of directors of the Chicago chapter of the Association of Fundraising Professionals.

Wagner earned a bachelor's degree in communications from Ohio University.



Homewood-Flossmoor Goes Green as a Matter of Policy

On Tuesday, April 21 – the night before Earth Day – the **Homewood-Flossmoor Park District Board of Park Commissioners** unanimously approved a request to add an environmental policy to the district's policy and procedures manual, which is a guideline for all park district actions.

One of the district's goals for the fiscal year was to develop an official "green" policy that would include a list of suggested actions and best practices to guide the district. Several staff members formed an Environmental Committee that, after more than three months of study, formulated such green policy goals as purchasing and using environmentally safe products; reducing, reusing, recycling; conserving natural resources; preserving natural ecosystems; and actively promoting public education of environmental issues.

The district has already taken the environment into consideration by purchasing a hybrid vehicle and choosing a print vendor that prints on 100 percent post-consumer paper stock for its quarterly program guides.

"Staff has done a great job of embracing the green initiative and producing a useful, working document for today and the future," said **Debbie Kopas**, executive director for the park district.

The policy can also be viewed online at www.hfparks.com.



South Suburban Park & Recreation Professional Association Honors Retiring IAPD Director

Midlothian Park District Director of Parks and Recreation **Evelyn Gleason**, CPRP, presents IAPD President and CEO **Dr. Ted Flickinger** with a gift signed by members of the South Suburban Park & Recreation Professional Association. The association commemorated the long and fruitful working relationship that it has enjoyed with Dr. Flickinger, as the IAPD and the South Suburban association have worked together over the years to lobby for legislation beneficial to the field. The South Suburban Park & Recreation Professional Association made the presentation to Dr. Flickinger at a dinner held in conjunction with the IAPD Legislative Conference in Springfield in April. At the January, 2009 IAPD/IPRA annual conference, Flickinger announced his retirement as of January 2010.

Normal hires Aquatics and Special Events Supervisor

Joel Dickerson joined the Normal Parks and Recreation Department this March as the new aquatics and special events supervisor. He is in charge of the summer staff and is involved in the renovation of the Fairview Family Aquatic Center slide project.

Dickerson graduated from Illinois State University with a degree in recreation management. He was previously employed with the Sterling Park District as its aquatics manager.



Recreation Administration

George Williams College of Aurora University

M.S. Graduate Degree Program Specializations

- Administration of Leisure Services
- Outdoor Pursuits Administration

www.aurora.edu/recadmin

B.S. Undergraduate Degree Program Specializations

- Commercial and Public Recreation Management
- Outdoor Leadership
- Professional Golf Management

www.aurora.edu/recreation

What sets us apart?

- National recognition
- Innovative curriculum
- Outstanding, accessible faculty
- 95% placement rate
- Extensive alumni network
- Convenient location

Financial aid and graduate assistantships are available for qualified students.

For more information, contact:

Dr. Rita Yerkes, Dean

Call: 262-245-8572

E-mail: recadmin@aurora.edu



GEORGE WILLIAMS COLLEGE
AURORA UNIVERSITY

350 Lombard Street, P.O. Box 210, Williams Bay, WI 53197-0210

Give Us Your Best Shot!

Enter by October 1, 2009.

Show off your agency and its visual images with "Give Us Your Best Shot," a photo contest sponsored by the Illinois Association of Park Districts and the Illinois Park and Recreation Association. Photos submitted may be used in future editions of *Illinois Parks & Recreation* magazine, on the cover of the *IAPD/IPRA Membership Directory and Buyers' Guide*, or in other IAPD/IPRA projects.

Enter as many times as you like in four categories: **recreation, sports, wildlife** and **nature/landscapes**. All entries must feature Illinois scenes. For complete guidelines and an entry form, go to www.ILparks.org and highlight "Publications" on the navigation bar on the left, then choose "Illinois Parks and Recreation Magazine." Scroll down the page.

Great fields. Great plays. Great memories.

Improving Places
Improving Lives



Minnetonka • Plymouth • Chicago
St. Paul • Rockville • St. Cloud

800-880-4700
www.bonestroo.com

 **Bonestroo**
Engineering • Planning • Construction

A MOON JUMP 4U PARTY RENTAL
Kathleen Rhea
5109 West Lake Street
Melrose Park, IL 60160
630-833-4386 PH
708-450-4381 FX
amoonjump4u@gmail.com
www.amoonjump4u.com

AECOM
James Ash
111 NE Jefferson
Peoria, IL 61602
309-495-6564 PH
309-676-5445 FX
jim.ash@aecom.com
www.aecom.com

AMERESCO, INC.
Louis Maltezos
1900 Spring Rd., Suite 400
Oak Brook, IL 60523-1834
630-203-2600 PH
630-954-5977 FX
lmaltezos@ameresco.com

ANCEL, GLINK, DIAMOND, BUSH, DICIANNI & KRAFTHOFER, P.C.
Robert Bush
140 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, IL 60603
312-782-7606 PH
312-782-0943 FX
rbush@ancelglink.com
www.ancelglink.com

AQUA PURE ENTERPRISES
Thomas Todner
1404 Joliet Rd., Suite A
Romeoville, IL 60406
630-771-1310 PH
630-771-1301 FX
mail@aquapure-IL.com
www.aquapure-IL.com

AT ASSOCIATES, INC.
Jerry Aulisio
7 N. Wisner
Park Ridge, IL 60068
847-692-7515 PH
847-692-7516 FX

BONESTROO
William Dinchak
1860 Winchester Rd.
Libertyville, IL 60048
847-816-1631 PH
817-816-3762 FX
bdinchak@bonestroo.com
www.bonestroo.com

BROOKS, ADAMS AND TARULIS
Steve Adams or Rick Tarulis
101 N. Washington St.
Naperville, IL 60540-4511
630-355-2101 PH
630-355-7843 FX
info@napervillelaw.com
www.napervillelaw.com

BSN SPORTS/COLLEGIATE PACIFIC
1901 Dilplmat Dr.
Farmers Branch, TX 75234
800-527-7510 PH
800-899-0149 FX
www.bsncp.com

BURBACH AQUATICS, INC.
David Burbach
P.O. Box 721
Platteville, IL 53818
608-348-3262 PH
608-348-4970 FX
baae@centurytel.net
www.burbachaquatics.com

BURNHAM AND FLOWER AGENCY
Eddie Wood
2000 W. Pioneer Parkway, Suite 25
Peoria, IL 61615
800-692-9522 PH
309-692-9602 FX
ewood@bfgroup.com

BURNIDGE CASSELL ASSOCIATES
Daniel Atilano
25 S. Grove Ave., Suite 500
Elgin, IL 60120-6400
847-695-5840 PH
847-695-6579 FX
d.atilano@bca-arch.com
www.bca-arch.com

CABRERA CAPITAL MARKETS, LLC
Brian King
10 S. LaSalle St., Suite 1050
Chicago, IL 60603
312-236-8888 PH
217-523-4273 FX
bking@cabreracapital.com
www.cabreracapital.com

CALL ONE
Bob Chatz
123 N. Wacker Dr., Suite 700
Chicago, IL 60606-1796
312-681-8300 PH
312-681-8301 FX
chatz@callone.net
www.callone.net

CDS OFFICE TECHNOLOGIES
Bob Allen
612 S. Dirksen Parkway
Springfield, IL 62703
217-528-8936 PH
217-753-5523 FX
ballen@cdsot.com
www.cdsot.com

CEDAR FOREST PRODUCTS CO.
Matt Lilly
1008 S. Division Ave.
Polo, IL 61064
800-552-9495 PH
815-946-2479 FX
salescfp@cedarforestproducts.com
www.cedarforestproducts.com

CENTRAL SOD FARMS
Paul Carlson
25605 W. 111th St.
Plainfield, IL 60565
630-904-1017 PH
630-904-0327 Fx
pablo559@aol.com
www.centraisod.com

CHAPMAN AND CUTLER
Lynda Given
111 W. Monroe St.
Chicago, IL 60603-4080
312-845-3000 PH
312-701-2361 FX
given@chapman.com
www.chapman.com

CHASE BANK
Sudeepa Chakrabarti
100 E Higgins Rd. FL 2N
Elk Grove Village, IL 60007
847-228-2713 PH
866-779-0192 FX
sudeepa.x.chakrabarti@chase.com
www.chase.com

CIVILTECH ENGINEERING, INC.
Michael Folkening
30 N. LaSalle St., Suite 2624
Chicago, IL 60602
312-726-5910 PH
312-726-5911 FX
mfolkening@civiltechinc.com
www.civiltechinc.com

CORPORATE CONSTRUCTION SERVICES
Kelly Groth
1323 Butterfield Rd., Suite 110
Downers Grove, IL 60515
630-271-0500 PH
630-271-0505 FX
ccs@corporateconstructionservices.com
www.corporateconstructionservices.com

CORPORATION FOR OPENLANDS
Gerald Adelmann
25 e. Washington Street, Suite 1650
Chicago, IL 60602
312-427-4256 PH
312-427-6251 FX

COWHEY GUDMUNDSON LEDER, LTD.
Matt Bardol
300 Park Blvd., Suite 205
Itasca, IL 60143
630-250-9595 PH
630-250-9644 FX
matt.bardol@cgl-ltd.com
www.CGL-Ltd.com

DIRECT FITNESS SOLUTIONS
Rudy Pottorff
600 Tower Road
Mundelein, IL 60060
847-680-9300 PH
847-680-8906 FX
rpottorff@directfitnesssolutions.com
www.directfitnesssolutions.com

E. COONEY ASSOCIATES, INC.
Ed Cooney PhD., P.E.
359 Webster Ave.
Elmhurst, IL 60126
630-834-0754 PH
630-834-1528 FX
ed@ecooney.com
www.ecooney.com

EHLERS & ASSOCIATES INC.
Steve Larson
550 Warrenville Rd. Suite 220
Lisle, IL 60532-4311
630-271-3330 PH
630-271-3369 FX
slarson@ehlers-inc.com
www.ehlers-inc.com

ELGIN SWEEPING SERVICES, INC.
Christopher Cacciatore
1015 W. Pershing Rd.
Chicago, IL 60609
773-254-7100 PH
773-254-3555 FX
jcosta@elginsweeping.com
www.elginsweeping.com

ENGINEERED PLASTIC SYSTEMS, LLC
Tiffany Bachmann
885 Church Rd.
Elgin, IL 60123
847-289-8383 PH
847-289-8382 FX
tiffany@epsplasticlumber.com
www.epsplasticlumber.com

FARNSWORTH GROUP, INC.
Christine Klein
7707 N. Knoxville Ave., Suite 200
Peoria, IL 61614
309-689-9888 PH
309-689-9820 FX
dadams@f-w.com
www.f-w.com

FGM ARCHITECTS
John Dzarowski
1211 W. 22nd St.
Oak Brook, IL 60523
630-574-8300 PH
630-574-9292 FX
johnd@fgmarchitects.com
www.fgmarchitects.com

FRIEDMAN & HOLTZ PC.
Charlene Holtz
150 S. Wacker Dr., Suite 2600
Chicago, IL 60606-4202
312-857-4000 PH
312-857-1880 FX
www.friedmanholtz.com

GENERAL SPORTS VENUE
Phillip Primato
11550 Common Oaks Drive, Suite 206
Raleigh, NC 27614
919-488-5812 PH
919-488-5801 FX
pprimato@gsvenue.com
www.generalsportsvenue.com

GEWALT-HAMILTON ASSOC., INC.
Robert Hamilton
850 Forest Edge Dr.
Vernon Hills, IL 60061-3105
847-478-9700 PH
847-478-9701 FX
info@gha.engineers.com
www.gha-engineers.com

GOVERNMENTAL ACCOUNTING, INC.
James Howard, CPA
1835 Tweed Road
Inverness, IL 60067
847-991-3909 PH
847-991-3138 FX
mrjrhoward@hotmail.com
www.gaicpas.com

GREEN ASSOCIATES, INC.
George Reigle
111 Deerlake Rd., #135
Deerfield, IL 60015
847-317-0852 PH
847-317-0899 FX
greig@greenassociates.com
www.greenassociates.com

GREEN CAN PRODUCTS LLC
Jennifer Willis
2112 W. Galena Blvd, Suite 8 #430
Aurora, IL 60506
630-673-7816
630-466-7216
jennifer@freegreencan.com
www.freegreencan.com

HALOGEN SUPPLY COMPANY, INC.
Rich Hellgeth
4653 W. Lawrence Ave.
Chicago, IL 60630-2532
773-286-6300 PH
773-286-1024 FX
rhellgeth@halogensupply.com
www.halogensupply.com

HARRIS N.A. PUBLIC FINANCE
Eric Anderson
1399 East State Street, 2nd Floor
Geneva, IL 60134
630-845-2735 PH
217-523-4273 FX

HDC ENGINEERING LLC
Merle Ingersoll, Jr.
210 W. Springfield Ave., Suite 300
Champaign, IL 61824-0140
217-352-6976 PH
217-356-0570 FX
merlei@hdc-eng.com
www.hdc-eng.com

HERVAS, CONDON & BERSANI, P.C.
Michael Bersani
333 Pierce Rd., Suite 195
Itasca, IL 60143
630-773-4774 PH
630-773-4851 FX
mbersani@hcbattorneys.com
www.hcbattorneys.com

HITCHCOCK DESIGN GROUP
Bill Inman
221 W. Jefferson Ave.
Naperville, IL 60540-5397
630-961-1787 PH
630-961-9925 FX
binman@hitchcockdesigngroup.com
www.hitchcockdesigngroup.com

HODGES, LOIZZI, EISENHAMMER, RODICK & KOHN
Robert Kohn
3030 W. Salt Creek Ln., Ste. 202
Arlington Heights, IL 60005-5002
847-670-9000 PH
847-670-7334 FX
info@hlerk.com
www.hlerk.com

HOMER INDUSTRIES, LLC
Todd Hahn
14000 S. Archer Ave.
Lockport, IL 60441
815-838-0863 PH
815-838-0863 FX
todd@homerinc.com
www.homerindustries.com

HUTCHINSON, SHOCKEY, ERLEY & CO.
Bob Bergland
222 W. Adams
Chicago, IL 60521
312-443-1566 PH
312-443-1082 FX
rberglund@hsemuni.com
www.hsemuni.com

ILLINOIS BUS SALES
Rob
1216 Rand Rd.
Des Plaines, IL 60016-3403
847-297-3177 PH
847-296-3155 FX
rob@bestbussales.com
www.bestbussales.com



IAPD ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

INTERACT BUSINESS PRODUCTS

Chris Voloch
65 Hansen Ct., Suite 106
Wood Dale, IL 60191
630-694-0011 PH
630-238-3199 FX
cvoloch@interactbp.com
www.interactbp.com

J.E.M. MORRIS CONSTRUCTION, INC.

Jean Ellen Morris
49 W 102 US Route 30
Big Rock, IL 60511
630-556-3730 PH
630-556-3730 FX

JJR, LLC

Paul Wiese
35 E. Wacker Dr., Suite 2200
Chicago, IL 60601
312-641-6756 PH
312-641-0668 FX
paul.wiese@jjr-us.com
www.jjr-us.com

JOHN DEERE COMPANY

Mark Allegar
11145 Thompson Ave
Lenexa, KS 66219
630-258-0384 PH
800-850-2698 FX
allgaiermarkc@johndeere.com
www.johndeere.com

KI FURNITURE

Jim Heyden
5400 Newport Drive, Suite 18
Rolling Meadows, IL 60008
847-368-1248 PH
847-368-1249 FX
jim.heyden@ki.com
www.ki.com

KUBIESA, SPIROFF, GOSSELAR, ACKER & DEBLASIO, P.C.

Kenneth Kubiesa
105 South York Street, Suite 250
Elmhurst, IL 60126
630-516-1800 PH
630-516-1808 FX
kubiesa@ksgalaw.com
www.ksgalaw.com

LAMP INCORPORATED

Ian Lamp
P. O. Box 865
Elgin, IL 60121-0865
847-741-7220 PH
847-741-9677 FX
ilamp@lampinc.net
www.lampinc.net

LANDSCAPE CONCEPTS MANAGEMENT

George Markoutsas
31745 N. Alleghany Road
Grayslake, IL 60030
847-223-3800 PH
847-223-0169 FX
gmarkoutsas@landscapeconcepts.com
www.landscapeconcepts.com

LEOPARDO COMPANIES, INC.

Michael Behm
5200 Prairie Stone Parkway
Hoffman Estates, IL 60192
847-783-3000 PH
847-783-3001 FX
www.leopardo.com

LET'S GO PLAY, INC.

Mark Fiore
P.O. Box 785
Tinley Park, IL 60477
708-802-9750 PH
708-802-9760 FX
mark@letsgoplayinc.com
www.letsgoplayinc.com

LINCOLN EQUIPMENT, INC.

Kathie Luecker
2051 Commerce Avenue
Concord, CA 94520
800-223-5450 PH
925-798-3602 FX
kluecker@lincolnaquatics.com
www.lincolnaquatics.com

MAYTRONICS US INC.

4357 Park Drive, Suite J
Norcross, GA 30093
888-365-7446 PH
770-613-5099 FX
info@maytronicsus.com
www.maytronicsus.com

MB FINANCIAL BANK

6111 N. River Rd.
Rosemont, IL 60018
847-653-1971 PH
847-653-0432 FX
dbrockway@mbfinancial.com
www.mbfinancial.com

MCGINTY BROS., INC.

Brian McGinty
3744 E. Cuba Rd.
Long Grove, IL 60047
847-438-5161 PH
847-438-1883 FX
brian@mcgintybros.com
www.mcgintybros.com

MESIROW FINANCIAL, INC.

Walter Stock
350 N. Clark St.
Chicago, IL 60610
312-595-6362 PH
312-595-6988 FX
wstock@mesirofinancial.com
www.mesirofinancial.com

MIDWEST SALES COMPANY

Jill Peterson
2122 E. 12th St., Suite 326
Davenport, IA 52803
563-322-5501 PH
563-336-4017 FX
sales@midwestplaygrounds.com
www.midwestplaygrounds.com

MOBILEAR INC.

Sue Zurales
4699 Auvergne Ave #11
Lisle, IL 60532
630-241-0990 PH
630-241-0993 FX
szurales@mobileartesting.com
www.mobileartesting.com

MONDO USA INC.

Hermione Joachim
1100 E. Hector St., Suite 160
Conshohocken, PA 19428
610-834-3835 PH
610-834-3837 FX
hjoachim@mondousa.com
www.mondousa.com

MUSCO SPORTS LIGHTING

Gail Cressley
100 1st Ave. West
Oskaloosa, IA 52577
641-673-0411 PH
641-673-4852 FX
gail.cressley@musco.com
www.musco.com

NICERINK

James Stoller
PO Box 310
Genoa City, WI 53128
888-642-3746 PH
262-279-6744 FX
info@nicerink.com
www.nicerink.com

OTTOSEN BRITZ KELLY COOPER & GILBERT, LTD.

Shawn Flaherty
1804 N. Naper Blvd., Suite 350
Naperville, IL 60563
630-682-0085 PH
630-682-0788 FX
sflaherty@obkcg.com
www.obkcg.com

PALATINE OIL COMPANY

Keith Copersmet
PO Box 985
Palatine, IL 60078
847-358-3600 PH
847-358-5904 FX
info@palatineoil.com
www.palatineoil.com

PERENNIAL PARK PRODUCTS

Tiffany Bachmann
885 Church Rd.
Elgin, IL 60123
847-289-8383 PH
847-289-8382 FX
tiffany@epsplasticlumb.com

PERSONALIZED AWARDS

Daniel Eastman
6020 W. Donges Bay Road
Mequon, WI 53092
800-726-0425 PH
262-242-8925 FX
info@LifeShouldBeRewarding.com
www.lifeshouldberewarding.com

PFM ASSET MANAGEMENT LLC

William Sullivan
222 N. LaSalle, Suite 910
Chicago, IL 60601
312-977-1570 PH
312-977-1575 FX
jessend@pfm.com
www.pfm.com

PHN ARCHITECTS

Karen Lellios
199 Town Square, Suite D
Wheaton, IL 60189
630-665-8400 PH
630-665-8450 FX
karen.l@phnarchitects.com
www.phnarchitects.com

PINNACLE SERVICES, INC

Aron Jordan
1337 Industrial Dr.
Itasca, IL 60143
630-773-8660 PH
630-773-8586 FX
ajordan@pinnacle-services-inc.net
www.pinnacle-services-inc.net

PIZZO & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Kim Martin
10729 Pine Rd.
Leland, IL 60531
815-495-2300 PH
815-498-4406 FX
info@pizzo.info
http://pizzo.info/

PROFESSIONAL FITNESS CONCEPTS, INC.

Brian Fonseca
521 Vera Court
Joliet, IL 60436
815-741-5328 PH
815-741-5352 FX
brian@pfc-fitness.com
www.pfc-fitness-equipment.com

RAIN BIRD

Paul Sowacke
2226 Maple Rd.
Homewood, IL 60430-1106
708-925-4400 PH
708-486-7070 FX
psowacke@rainbird.com
www.rainbird.com

RATIO ARCHITECTS

Brian DeMuyneck
10 E. Chester St.
Champaign, IL 61820
217-352-7696 PH
217-352-7831 FX
www.ratioarchitects.com

RENAISSANCE COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS, INC.

Michael Shares
3509 Martens St.
Franklin Park, IL 60131
847-671-1340 PH
847-671-9340 FX
mike.shares@rc-systems.com
www.rc-systems.com

RILEY CONSTRUCTION CO., INC.

Geoff Deigan
5614 52nd Street
Kenosha, WI 53144
262-658-4381 PH
262-658-0312 FX
www.rileycon.com

ROBERT W. BAIRD & COMPANY

Bill Hepworth or Gwen Arndt
2435 Dean St., BLDG 2-B
St. Charles, IL 60175-4827
630-584-4994 PH
630-584-4474 FX
whepworth@rbaird.com
www.rbaird.com

SAFARI LAND

Giovanna D'Alessandro
701 W. North Ave.
Villa Park, IL 60181
630-530-4649 PH
630-530-7539 FX
safari_land@yahoo.com
www.safarilandfun.com

SEC GROUP, INC.

Dave Reitz
420 N. Front St, Ste. 100
McHenry, IL 60050
815-385-1778 PH
815-385-1781 FX
www.secgroupinc.com

SEVEN UTILITY MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS

Dale Snyder
7704 Oakridge Rd.
North Little Rock, AR 72116
501-835-3142 PH
866-546-8561 FX
dsnyder@sevenutility.com
www.sevenutility.com

SIKICH GROUP, LLC

Fred Lantz
998 Corporate Blvd.
Aurora, IL 60504-9999
630-566-8400
630-566-8401
fredl@sikich.com
www.sikich.com

SPEAR CORPORATION

Sam Blake
P.O. Box 3
Roachdale, IN 46172
800-642-6640 PH
765-522-1702 FX
sblake@spearcorp.com
www.spearcorp.com

SPEER FINANCIAL, INC.

David Phillips
One North LaSalle, Suite 4100
Chicago, IL 60602
312-780-2280 PH
312-346-8833 FX
dphillips@speerfinancial.com
www.speerfinancial.com

SRBL ARCHITECTS

Carol Sente
1161-A Lake Cook Rd.
Deerfield, IL 60015
847-272-9500 PH
847-272-9510 FX
carols@srblarchitects.com
www.srblarchitects.com

TEAM REIL INC.

John Cederlund
17421 Marengo Rd.
Union, IL 60180
888-438-7345 PH
815-923-2204 FX
john@getreil.com
www.getreil.com

THE TRUST FOR PUBLIC LAND

Beth White
53 W. Jackson Blvd., Suite 815
Chicago, IL 60604
312-427-1979 PH
312-408-1733 FX
beth.white@tpl.org
www.tpl.org

WILLIAMS ASSOCIATES ARCHITECTS, LTD.


Michael Williams
450 E. Gundersen Dr.
Carol Stream, IL 60188
630-221-1212 PH
630-221-1220 FX
williams@williams-architects.com

WRD ENVIRONMENTAL

Geoff Deigan
445 N. Sacramento Blvd
Chicago, IL 60612
773-722-9870 PH
773-722-9875 FX
gdeigan@wrdenvironmental.com
www.wrdenvironmental.com

W-T ENGINEERING, INC.

Scott Triphahn
2675 Pratum Ave.
Hoffman Estates, IL 60192-3703
224-293-6333 PH
224-293-6444 FX
scott.triphahn@wtengineering.com
www.wtengineering.com



When investing, think of us as the rope.

Wise investing is like a long, difficult climb. It requires patience, skill, and – above all – constant attention to safety. At IPDLAF+, our professional team bases its investment philosophy on one bedrock ideal: preservation of principal. That means our members seek to avoid the missteps that can lead to financial catastrophe. Call IPDLAF+ today at (800) 731-6830 or visit our web site at www.IPDLAF.org. We'll tell you more about how our focus on safety can help you reach your investment goals.



Illinois Park District Liquid Asset Fund Plus (800) 731-6830 • www.ipdlaf.org

Don Jessen, Senior Marketing Representative, 630-361-2313

Bob Leli, Senior Managing Consultant, 312-977-1570, ext 223

Sponsored by:
Illinois Association of Park Districts
Illinois Park & Recreation Association

*This information does not represent an offer to sell or a solicitation of an offer to buy or sell any fund or other security. Investors should consider the Fund's investment objectives, risks, charges and expenses before investing in the Fund. This and other information about the Fund is available in the Fund's current Information Statement, which should be read carefully before investing. A copy of the Fund's Information Statement may be obtained by calling 1-800-731-6830 or is available on the Fund's website at www.ipdlaf.org. While the Fund seeks to maintain a stable net asset value of \$1.00 per share, it is possible to lose money investing in the Fund. An investment in the Fund is not insured or guaranteed by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or any other governmental agency. Shares of the Fund are distributed by **PFM Fund Distributors, Inc.**, member Financial Industry Regulatory Authority (FINRA) (www.finra.org). PFM Fund Distributors, Inc. is a wholly owned subsidiary of PFM Asset Management LLC.*

It's about
giving them
a
SAFE place
to make
MEMORIES



Safe places can include more than just a serene meadow or a leisurely stroll in the park!

Illinois Parks Association Risk Services (IPARKS) is a unique property and casualty coverage program that is specifically tailored for Illinois Park Districts. IPARKS stands far above traditional insurers in its ability to offer coverage for the widest variety of recreational programming and facilities.

Program Benefits:

- Endorsed and supported by the Illinois Association of Park Districts (IAPD)
- Stable and consistent pricing
- Loss control services and resource library
- Rated AAA by Demotech, Inc.
- Available through your local independent agent

For more information about what IPARKS can do for your agency, contact your IPARKS Representative at **1-800-692-9522.**

Call Today!



***ILLINOIS PARKS ASSOCIATION
RISK SERVICES***

Burnham & Flower
2000 W. Pioneer Pkwy., Suite 25
Peoria, IL 61615
(800) 692-9522
www.iparks.org

Park districts: reduce crime, lower healthcare costs, build self-esteem, boost local economies, increase property values, promote healthy lifestyles, strengthen neighborhoods, provide jobs, attract new business, lengthen lives, provide nature education, increase accessibility, protect the environment, preserve land, bring happiness, reduce stress, control weight, conquer boredom, offer safe play areas, believe fun is essential, build family unity, increase tourism, diminish gangs, promote cultural diversity... the benefits are endless.



Park District of Oak Park Capital Improvement Plan 2009 -2013

Accepted Thursday, September 18, 2008

Our Mission: In partnership with the community, we provide quality parks and recreation experiences for the residents of Oak Park.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION: THE PARK DISTRICT OF OAK PARK	3
COMMISSIONERS AND LEADERSHIP STAFF	3
DISTRICT FACTS	5
PURPOSE OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN	5
BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS GENERAL PRACTICES	5
MISSION, VISION, AND VALUES	6
PARKS AND FACILITIES	7
HISTORY OF NEEDS ASSESSMENT	10
2002 INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE REPORT	10
2002 PLEASANT HOME HISTORIC STRUCTURE REPORT	10
2004 COMPREHENSIVE MASTER PLAN	11
2005 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN AND REFERENDUM	13
SITE MASTER PLANS	14
2006 TRANSFER OF VILLAGE PROPERTY	14
2006 RECREATION CENTER HISTORICAL STEWARDSHIP COMMITTEE REPORT	15
2007 RIDGELAND COMMON EXISTING CONDITIONS REPORT	15
THE 2009-2013 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	16
ONGOING CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN	16
DEFINITION OF CAPITAL EXPENDITURE	16
SELECTION AND ALLOCATION OF CAPITAL PROJECTS	16
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUNDING SOURCES	16
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT EXPENDITURES BY TYPE	19
HISTORIC AND PLANNED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT EXPENDITURES BY LOCATION	23
ANDERSEN PARK AND CENTER	24
AUSTIN GARDENS	25
BARRIE PARK	26
CARROLL PARK	27
CHENEY MANSION	28
DOLE CENTER	29
EUCLID SQUARE PARK	30
FIELD PARK	31
FOX PARK	32
HEDGES ADMINISTRATION CENTER AND GYMNASTICS CENTER -- 218 MADISON	33
LINDBERG PARK	34
LONGFELLOW PARK	35
MAPLE PARK	37
MILLS PARK AND PLEASANT HOME ("JOHN FARSON HOUSE")	38
OAK PARK CONSERVATORY	39
RANDOLPH TOT LOT	40
REHM PARK AND POOL	41
SCOVILLE PARK	44
STEVENSON PARK AND CENTER, 49 LAKE	45
TAYLOR PARK	46
WENONAH TOT LOT	47
NON SITE-SPECIFIC IMPROVEMENTS AND LEMOYNE PARKWAY	48
APPENDICES	50
APPENDIX A: 2002 INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE REPORT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	50
APPENDIX B: 2004 PARK DISTRICT CITIZEN COMMITTEE MEMO TO VILLAGE AND PARK DISTRICT	53
APPENDIX C: LEISURE VISION 2004 COMMUNITY SURVEY EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	56
APPENDIX D: UPDATED PLANNING GUIDELINES	70
APPENDIX E: VEHICLE REPLACEMENT SCHEDULE	71
APPENDIX F: SCHEDULE OF SITE MASTER PLANS AND IMPROVEMENTS	72
APPENDIX G: DEBT SERVICE SCHEDULE FOR DEBT CERTIFICATES	73


INTRODUCTION: THE PARK DISTRICT OF OAK PARK

COMMISSIONERS AND LEADERSHIP STAFF




Marty Bracco
 Jessica Bullock
 Mark Gartland
 Christine Graves
 Lise Valentine

Park District of Oak Park Organizational Chart





Park District of Oak Park Recreation Department Organizational Chart



JHAC = John Hedges Administration Center
 RC = Ridgeland Common
 SUPT = Superintendent
 ASST = Assistant
 MGR = Manager
 REC = Recreation
 OPGC = Oak Park Gymnastics Center

July 2008

DISTRICT FACTS

2008 Population Estimate: 50,200

Total acres: 82.5

Sites Operated: 22

Flagship Recreational Facility: 1

Core Centers: 4

Neighborhood Centers: 3

Outdoor Pools: 2

Historic Buildings and Parks: 4

Notable features: conservatory, seasonal ice arena, skate park, gymnastics center, tennis courts, basketball courts, soccer fields, baseball diamonds, playgrounds, splash pads, bocce court, sand volleyball court, temporary dog park, sled hills

2006 Equalized Assessed Value: \$1,461,989,313

2006 Property Tax Rate: 4.35%

2008 Budget: \$13,329,592

2008 Full-time Budgeted Positions: 50

2009-2013 Capital Improvement Plan: \$28,018,966

PURPOSE OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

The Park District of Oak Park's 2009-2013 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) is a five-year projection of planned physical improvements to District parks and facilities. The CIP provides a "blueprint" for revenue projections and spending priorities. No actual expenditures are made until they are included in the annual budget and reviewed and approved by the Board of Commissioners.

Continued investment in our parks and facilities is critical to the District's mission of, in partnership with the community, providing quality parks and recreation experiences for the residents of Oak Park. Developing a long-range vision for park and recreation programs and services in our community has allowed the Park District of Oak Park to continue to provide the many individual, community, economic and environmental benefits that enhance the quality of life and make our community a great place to work and play.

BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS GENERAL PRACTICES

Board Authority Pursuant to State Law: The Board functions under the authority of the Illinois Park District Code, 70 ILCS 1205/1-1 *et seq.* and within the framework of applicable State of Illinois and federal laws.

Actions Taken in Representative Capacity: Board Members, collectively and individually, act as representatives of the residents of the District in maintaining and promoting the District's parks, other facilities and programs. Through careful evaluation of needs, resources and other factors, Board Members make decisions that they determine best serve the community as a whole.

Park District of Oak Park



Our Mission

In partnership with the community, we provide quality parks and recreation experiences for the residents of Oak Park.

Our Vision

Oak Park's parks system provides open space and recreation opportunities for all Oak Park residents and we will work persistently to ensure the availability of these quality parks, recreation programs and facilities for generations to come. We strive to provide an excellent parks and recreation system that is deeply integrated into the distinctive Oak Park living experience. We envision the recognition of our parks system by Oak Park residents as a major contributor to the enhanced quality of life that exists in the Village. We value and respect our history, our civic involvement and the Oak Park tradition of innovation and we will strongly consider these factors as we plan for the future.

We believe that citizen participation and access to their parks and recreation programs is paramount. The parks system will conduct the public's business in an open, communicative and self-evaluative fashion. We will reach out to populations that are underserved and we will continually seek feedback and take corrective measures as we strive for excellence.

We believe the key to achieving and maintaining an excellent parks and recreation system lies in creating partnerships with other community agencies to provide services in a seamless fashion. These critical partnerships are both within and external to Oak Park's boundaries. The organization providing the program or service is secondary to the quality and the diversity of the offerings. We promise, in collaboration with our partners to balance development and maintenance of quality parks and facilities with the preservation of open space. In addition, we pledge to offer innovative, high quality programs that provide significant benefits to participants, residents, the environment, the local economy and our overall community.

Our Values

In striving for excellence, we are committed to ...

Effective

Communication: We will demonstrate attentiveness to our customers' needs by routinely soliciting public input and feedback and welcoming ideas and input. Our processes and procedures will facilitate and reflect open and effective communication.

Inclusion: We will recognize and appreciate our community's diverse population and we will strive to provide parks and recreation opportunities to all, regardless of economic means or physical ability.

Funding: We will aggressively pursue economic sustainability and stability through sound fiscal management and efficient use of resources.

Partnerships:

We pledge to work effectively with others, establishing and strengthening bonds with governmental entities as well as other community organizations and user groups for the betterment of the community.

Customer Service & Professional

Conduct: We will demonstrate the highest standards of ethical conduct, treating everyone with courtesy and respect and recognizing diverse opinions and needs. We will actively listen and respond to requests in a prompt and respectful manner.

Planning:

We will design long-term strategies and set measurable goals while proactively seeking positive solutions to problems and challenges.

Evaluation: We will maintain an on-going process of evaluating our performance and effectiveness and we will measure the success of implemented policies and strategies.


Safety: We will actively implement sound safety practices in our facilities and in all aspects of our work, ensuring a safe environment for users and employees of the parks system.

We will value every citizen contact and pursue each as an opportunity to demonstrate these highly regarded values.

MISSION, VISION, AND VALUES

approved November 2004

PARKS AND FACILITIES





Facilities & Area Map: Legend

Parks & Facilities

- 1. Andersen Center/Park**
824 N. Hayes at Division, 3 blocks west of Austin Blvd.
(708) 383-6904
- 2. Austin Gardens**
1100 Ontario St., 3 blocks west of Oak Park Ave.,
1 block north of Lake Street
- 3. Barrie Center**
1011 Lombard, 4 blocks west of Austin Blvd. directly
south of I-290 Expressway
(708) 383-6905
- 4. Barrie Park**
127 Garfield St., 3 blocks west of Austin Blvd.
directly south of I-290 Expwy
- 5. Carroll Center/Park**
1125 S. Kenilworth at Fillmore, 2 blocks west of Oak
Park Ave., 1 block north of Roosevelt Rd.
(708) 383-6906
- 6. Elizabeth F. Cheney Mansion**
220 N. Euclid, 1 block east of Oak Park Ave., 2 blocks
north of Lake St.
(708) 383-2612
- 7. Conservatory & Conservatory
Center**
Named by the National Park Service to the National Register
of Historic Places
615 Garfield St. at East Ave. directly south of I-290
Expressway
(708) 386-4700
- 8. Dole Center**
255 Augusta & Cuyler, 2 blocks east of Ridgeland Ave.,
2 blocks north of Chicago Ave.
(708) 848-7050
- 9. Euclid Square**
705 W. Fillmore, 1 block east of Oak Park Ave.,
1 block north of Roosevelt Rd.
- 10. Field Center/Park**
935 Woodbine at Division, 4 blocks east of Harlem Ave.
(708) 383-6907
- 11. Fox Center/Park**
640 S. Oak Park Ave. at Jackson St., 2 blocks south of
Madison St.
(708) 383-6908
- 16. Gymnastics Center**
218 Madison St., 3 blocks west of Austin Blvd.
(708) 383-0218

12. Lindberg Park

On Greenfield between Marion & Woodbine,
1 block east of Harlem Ave., 1 block south of North Ave.

- 13. Longfellow Center /Park**
610 S. Ridgeland Ave. at Jackson Blvd., 2 blocks south
of Madison St.
(708) 383-6909
- 14. Maple Park**
1105 S. Maple on Harlem Ave., 1/2 block north of
Roosevelt Rd.
- 15. Mills Park/Pleasant Home**
217 S. Home, 3 blocks east of Harlem Ave.,
3 blocks north of Madison St.
- 16. John L. Hedges Administrative
Center**
218 Madison St., 3 blocks west of Austin Blvd.
(708) 383-0002
- 15. Pleasant Home**
Designated a National Historic Landmark
217 S. Home, 3 blocks east of Harlem Ave., 3 blocks
north of Madison St.
(708) 383-2654
- 17. Randolph Tot Lot**
Grove & Randolph
- 18. Rehm Pool and Park**
515 Garfield at East Ave., directly south of I-290
Expressway
(708) 848-9661
- 19. Ridgeland Common
Pool, Park, & Ice Rink**
415 Lake St. at Ridgeland
(708) 848-9661
- 20. Scoville Park**
800 W. Lake St. at Oak Park Ave.
Named by the National Park Service to the National Register
of Historic Places
- 21. Stevenson Center /Park,
Active Sport Area (ASA) & 49 Lake
Teen Center**
49 Lake St., 3 blocks west of Austin Blvd.
(708) 383-6910
- 22. Taylor Park**
400 W. Division at Ridgeland
- 23. Tennis & Fitness Centre**
301 Lake Street, half block east of Ridgeland
(708) 386-2175
- 24. Wenonah Tot Lot**
Wenonah & Harrison

Schools

- A. Ascension School**
601 Van Buren St., 3 blocks east of Oak Park Ave.,
1 block south of Jackson
- B. Beye School**
230 N. Cuyler
1 block east of Ridgeland Ave.,
3 blocks south of Chicago Ave.
- C. Gwendolyn Brooks Middle
School**
916 Washington Blvd., 2 blocks west of Oak Park Ave
- D. Hatch School**
1000 N. Ridgeland Ave. 2 blocks south of North Ave.
- E. Holmes School**
508 N. Kenilworth Ave., 2 blocks west of Oak Park Ave.
at Chicago Ave.
- F. Irving School**
1125 S. Cuyler Ave.
1 block east of Ridgeland Ave.,
2 blocks north of Roosevelt Rd.
- G. Lincoln School**
1111 S. Grove Ave., 1 block west of Oak Park Ave.,
2 blocks north of Roosevelt Rd.
- H. Longfellow School**
715 Highland Ave., 2 blocks east of Ridgeland Ave. at
Jackson Blvd.
- J. Mann School**
921 N. Kenilworth Ave. 2 blocks west of Oak Park Ave.
at Division St.
- K. Oak Park & River Forest High
School**
201 N. Scoville Ave., 1 block north of Lake St., 2 blocks
west of Ridgeland Ave.
- L. Percy Julian Middle School**
416 S. Ridgeland Ave., 1 block north of Madison St.
- M. Whittier School**
715 N. Harvey Ave., 2 blocks east of Ridgeland Ave.,
2 blocks north of Chicago Ave.
- N. Fenwick High School**
505 W. Washington Blvd, between East and
Scoville on Washington



	Administration Center	Andersen Park & Center	Austin Gardens	Barrie Park & Center	Carroll Park & Center	Cheney Mansion	Conservatory	Dole Center	Euclid Square	Field Park & Center	Fox Park & Center	Gymnastics Center	Lindberg Park	Longfellow Park & Center	Maple Park	Hills Park & Pleasant Home	Randolph-Grove Tot Lot	Rehm Park & Pool	Ridgeland Common	Scoville Park	Stevenson Park & Center	Taylor Park	Wenonah-Harrison Tot Lot	
Acres	.26	1.3	3.64	4.22	2.48	2.20	0.80		2.81	3.39	1.54	.08	13.9	2.62	6.98	4.43	.16	6.51	6.06	3.98	3.3	11.75	.12	
Fields & Courts																								
All-purpose Field	1	1	1	1	1				1	2	1	2	2	1	2			1	1	1	1	1	1	
Baseball/Softball Field			60'	60'				60'	60'(2)	60'	60'	90'(2)	60'	60'	60'(2)				60'(2)	60'				
Basketball Court - full			½(2)								½			full								½(3)		
Bocce Ball									1															
Soccer Field			1																			1		
Tennis Court			2					4					3	3	4			3		3		6		
Volleyball Court (sand)													2											
Special Site Features																								
Ceramic/Art Studio								1																
Dance Studio								1																
Gymnastics Center											1													
Ice Rink - indoor																		1						
Ice Rink - outdoor														1				1				1		
Indoor Playground																								
Mind/Body Studio																								
Nature Area/Floral Display			1		1		1						1			1					1			
Neighborhood Center		1	1	1					1	1	1			1							1			
Parking Lot																		1	1					
Picnic Area																						1		
Program Registration		1																			1			
Public Restrooms																								
Renal/Banquet Facilities																								
Skateboard Park																								
Sled Hill																						1		
Splash Pad/Water Feature		1								1	1			1										
Swimming Pool																						1	1	



Wheelchair accessible

HISTORY OF NEEDS ASSESSMENT

In 2001, the Park District of Oak Park began a major reassessment of its operations and infrastructure, following several years of maintaining the status quo. Assessment of the District's capital needs has occurred in several stages with extensive citizen input at each stage. Major reports described below include the 2002 Infrastructure Committee Report, 2002 Pleasant Home Historic Structure Report, 2004 Comprehensive Master Plan, 2005 Capital Improvement Plan, 2005 – 2010 Site Master Plans, 2006 Recreational Center Historical Stewardship Committee Report, and 2007 Ridgeland Common Existing Conditions Report.

2002 Infrastructure Committee Report

The Board of Park Commissioners initiated the Parks Infrastructure Committee in 2001 to inventory and assess the condition of the Park District's infrastructure and to make recommendations on immediate and long-range capital planning. After 14 months of observation and analysis, the citizen committee composed of volunteers from the local community, submitted a report that included three major findings and four primary recommendations.

Findings:

1. The lack of financial resources has created a serious deferred maintenance problem. Building systems are continuing to deteriorate, grounds are not properly maintained, vehicles are not being replaced, and computer systems are not upgraded to take advantage of new technology.
2. Relationships between the Park District, Village, and school districts are critical.
3. Existing financial resources are not nearly enough to pay for all the needed improvements. The Park District currently does not have the funds necessary to address life safety work items.

Recommendations

1. A major planning effort, to include a Comprehensive Plan, Site Master Plans, and a Capital Improvement Program needs to be made to ensure that limited financial resources are used effectively. As a community, some major decisions need to be made about the future of the Community Centers and large special facilities like Cheney Mansion and Pleasant Home.
2. It is estimated that the 10-year capital improvement plan will cost over \$13 million. The Park District should prepare financial plans that include cost recovery policies, financial models, life cycle costs, and a reserve study.
3. The Park District should appoint a Citizen Advisory Committee to develop a comprehensive plan for the Park District for the future.
4. A focus on good design and preserving the Jens Jensen designs is essential to the quality of life in Oak Park.

2002 Pleasant Home Historic Structure Report

The historic John Farson House, designed by architect George W. Maher in 1897 and known as "Pleasant Home," together with its estate, now known as Mills Park, has been owned by the Park District of Oak Park since 1939. In 1990, the Park District created the Pleasant Home Foundation, a non-profit organization that is dedicated to restoring, preserving, and operating this 30-room architectural landmark as an historic house museum.

Although general maintenance of the home and grounds was kept up, little true restoration was done between 1939 and 1990. Major projects included rebuilding two front porch plaster medallions, recreation of one of Maher's urns, remodeling of the restrooms, replacement of some windows, removal and replacement of front walkway and steps, and on-going exterior painting and roof repair.

Recognizing the need for a restoration plan, Pleasant Home Foundation commissioned a comprehensive report on the home in 2001, conducted by a team of architects and engineers. This **Historic Structure Report** documented the historic and architectural significance of the house; assessed the existing conditions; and made prioritized recommendations for repair and restoration. The scope of the report included the interior and exterior of the home and perimeter fencing but did not include restoration of furnishings, stained glass or landscaping of the original estate. The final report recommended a prioritized, phased maintenance approach and estimated that complete restoration of the home would cost \$4.69 million (2002 value of construction costs).

There are two phased categories for capital improvements at Pleasant Home are Life Safety & Maintenance and Restoration. Life Safety & Maintenance is the work required to stabilize the building and ensure the safety of the occupants and visitors to the home, and includes critical roofing, tuck-pointing, and fire suppression. Restoration, to a target date of 1910, is the work that would return the home to its original features and is divided into two phases. Phase I restoration includes critical roof repairs and new support systems (e.g., mechanical, electrical, HVAC). Phase II restoration includes rejuvenation of the key spaces that are used for tours and events. The Historic Structure Report gave each work item a priority rating of 1 through 51 with "outer shell" items such as roofs given high priority.

To date, restoration and repair has included rebuilding the entire roof structure and most gutter systems; restoration of the library and great hall fireplace; restoration of the front fence entry; addition of accessible lift at the west elevation; repair of the living room fireplace, front door, sun porch door and threshold; and boiler room mold abatement.

In 2007, the Foundation and Park District commissioned a full appraisal of the collections, furnishings and decorative elements of the home. The appraisal, presented in two volumes, is based on current market valuations and emphasizes the importance of the home, its history and collections. This guide, along with the Historic Structure Report, will help guide the Park District and the Foundation in grant seeking, restoration and long-term operation of the home.

2004 Comprehensive Master Plan

Following the Parks Infrastructure Committee report, the Park District, in partnership with the Village of Oak Park and the newly organized Park District Citizen Committee, engaged in a comprehensive planning process involving hired consultants. The Comprehensive Master Plan was completed in October 2004.


The Comprehensive Plan included a **benchmarking survey** administered by Leisure Vision, Inc. to thirteen park and recreation agencies identified by the Park District Citizen Committee. Benchmark agencies were chosen based on their demographic and geographic similarity to Oak Park. The purpose of the benchmarking survey was to better understand how the Park District of Oak Park compared to other park and recreation agencies on a wide range of issues affecting the Comprehensive Master Plan. Issues covered in the survey included types, numbers,

and areas of parks and open space available; types, numbers, and miles of trails available; types and numbers of indoor and outdoor recreation facilities; and budgets, staffing, and other basic information. The results of the survey revealed that:

Approximately 67% of the benchmark communities had long-range capital improvement plans with an average length of 5 years and average annual capital spending of \$1.39 million. The Park District of Oak Park did not have a capital improvement plan at that time. The Park District of Oak Park ranked 8th out of 13 park systems in total operating budget and 9th out of 11 systems in tax revenues. Oak Park had more community centers than the average benchmark community but less community/specialty centers. Oak Park had smaller facilities, less program space, smaller parks, and less acreage than the benchmark communities. The average community had 7.5 acres per 1,000 population while Oak Park had 1.64 acres and the national guideline is 10 acres. Oak Park had significantly fewer miles of trails than the benchmark communities.

The consultants and the Citizen Committee found that it was challenging to compare the parks and recreation facilities of the benchmark communities to Oak Park particularly because of Oak Park’s very limited amount of open space. Therefore, rather than relying on the pure benchmark data to develop guidelines for the Park District of Oak Park, the Citizen Committee used the benchmark information as one of several sources from which to create a set of guidelines specific to Oak Park. Other sources included their knowledge of the practical physical constraints of Oak Park and the results of an Oak Park community attitude and interest survey.

The **community attitude and interest survey** was developed by Leisure Vision with direction from the Citizen Committee and additional volunteers with expertise in market surveys. The survey was mailed to a random sample of 3,367 Oak Park households in January 2004 with the goal of obtaining 800 completed questionnaires. In fact 824 were returned, and the sample yielded a precision of +/-3.4% with a 95% confidence level. The survey asked residents to share their attitudes, utilization patterns, and desires for parks and recreation facilities and services, and was to serve as a foundation for setting priorities for the Comprehensive Master Plan. One of the most important findings related to the Capital Improvement Plan was the response to a question that asked how residents would allocate \$100 in new tax funding among seven types of parks, recreation, historic, and special facilities in the Oak Park community.



The responses indicated that a *balanced approach* was preferred, with \$29 out of every \$100 going to the improvement/maintenance of existing parks, playgrounds, and outdoor swimming pools. Fifteen dollars each were allocated for land acquisition and improvements/construction of new game fields, \$12 for renovation of the neighborhood centers, \$10 for improvements to historic properties, and \$8 for renovation of Ridgeland Common ice arena.

The Park District Citizen Committee then developed specific **planning guidelines** for the number and size of parks and facilities based on the benchmarking survey and the community attitude and interest survey. The guidelines identified areas in which the Park District had a surplus or a deficit of parks or facilities and were meant to assist in park planning but not to be treated as an absolute blueprint. The updated guidelines are included in [Appendix D](#).

Using these tools and insight from the Comprehensive Master Plan process, the consultants made the following recommendations regarding capital improvement priorities:

The Park District of Oak Park should address areas of high citizen need in the capital improvement plan. Areas of high priority identified in the community survey included paved walking/biking trails, small neighborhood parks, outdoor swimming pools, and playgrounds.

The Park District of Oak Park should address deficiencies in the numbers and quality of athletic fields in the capital improvement plan. The benchmarking survey found that Oak Park had a serious athletic field deficit compared to its peer communities.

The Park District of Oak Park needs to upgrade park maintenance.

Improving Ridgeland Common is an area of high community importance.

The Capital Improvement Plan needs to be well balanced.

The Park District should recognize that funding improvements to parks and recreation facilities is of importance to Oak Park residents.

2005 Capital Improvement Plan and Referendum

In 2005, the Park District prepared a six-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) that was based on the 2004 Comprehensive Master Plan. The CIP included a schedule of funding sources and expenses for site master plans for parks and facilities, improvements based on those plans, improvements to community centers, property acquisition reserves, historic property improvements, conservatory improvements, security and ADA improvements, general property repair, energy conservation improvements, technology improvements, tree maintenance and acquisition, sign replacement, vehicle replacement, and site furnishings. The variety in expenditures reflects the balanced approach voiced by citizens in the community survey (see page 13).

On April 5, 2005, the voters of Oak Park passed a referendum authorizing the Park District to collect an additional 25 cents per \$100 of equalized assessed valuation of property for the Corporate Fund beginning in the fall of 2006. The Park District's pre-referendum tax rate was 0.197 and the projected tax rate increase at the time of referendum was 0.447. The actual tax rate in the first year of the increase was 0.397, with an estimated tax increase of \$206.08 on a \$400,000 home. The additional tax revenue has been used to implement the Capital Improvement Plan and to replace an annual \$1.6 million transfer from the Village of Oak Park following the transfer of Village property to the Park District (see page 14). It has also been essential in providing the matching funds required for state grants.

Site Master Plans

As part of the 2004 Comprehensive Master Plan, a schedule was developed for creating long term master plans at each major park or facility.

The purpose of the site master plans is to:

1. promote community involvement in park renewal;
2. allow phasing of improvements;
3. provide a basis for scheduling improvements; and
4. fulfill grant funding requirements.

The process for each site plan includes substantial public input. Focus groups are convened with user groups and staff to provide the planners with feedback on current uses and future needs. Two to four community meetings are then held to gather input from the general public and gather feedback on draft site plans. Public comment is invited through feedback forms and is also taken at Board meetings. Each site plan proposal is then reviewed and accepted by the Board of Commissioners. In 2008, the District also began holding additional pre-construction community meetings to review how construction will proceed. Site plans are intended for use as long-term visions for future improvements with the understanding that funding for the improvements will become available over time. Schedules, meeting announcements, meeting notes, and draft plans are all posted to the Park District web site, www.oakparkparks.com, and public meeting attendees are invited to join an e-mail list to receive updates on the process.

Since the referendum passed, Site Master Plans have been completed for nine parks and facilities and nine more plans will be developed through 2010 as follows (see also [Appendix F](#)):

2005: Andersen Park, Austin Gardens, Carroll Park

2006: Dogs in the Parks, Field Park, Fox Park, Longfellow Park, 218 Madison (Gymnastics, Administration, Maintenance)

2007: Maple Park, Ridgeland Common Existing Condition Study, Ridgeland Common Facility and Site Plan (2007-2008)

2008: Taylor Park, Mills Park, Oak Park Conservatory, Rehm Park

2009: Cheney Mansion, Euclid Square Park, Randolph Tot Lot

2010: Lindberg Park, Scoville Park

On September 16, 2006, a milestone in the referendum process was reached when the Park District formally cut the ribbon to open the Phase I master plan improvements to Andersen Park, the first park renovation following the referendum.

2006 Transfer of Village Property

An historic event took place on April 6, 2006 when the Village of Oak Park transferred ownership of five recreation centers to the Park District. Previously the Village owned the facilities and the Park District operated them. Ninety-nine year leases were executed for Barrie Center and Stevenson Park because those facilities have Village potable water underground storage reservoirs. Wenonah Tot Lot, Randolph Tot Lot and an adjacent Village-owned parcel were also conveyed to the Park District at this time. The Park District conveyed parkways on Kenilworth, Le Moyne, and Randolph to the Village, as well as the land under the Rehm Park fire station. These transfers were a major recommendation of the Infrastructure Committee and the Park District Citizen Committee, and have allowed the Park District to implement the Capital Improvement Plan in a streamlined fashion without the distraction of property ownership disputes.

2006 Recreation Center Historical Stewardship Committee Report

During the master planning process at Anderson, Carroll and Field Parks, group of citizen volunteers were asked by the Park District Board of Commissioners to investigate the historical and architectural issues pertaining to the three remaining John S. Van Bergen designed recreation center buildings. The committee solicited input from various experts informed about historic preservation and recreation center development, architects, historians, and park district staff. The committee developed consensus around the following four general findings:

1. The three Van Bergen designed recreation centers are historically significant in that they represent Oak Park's participation in what was known as the "playground" or "structured play" movements of the early 20th century.
2. John S. Van Bergen is an architect of local, regional, and national stature and significance. The three centers are unique among his designs because they are public, recreational facilities open to all citizens.
3. The recreational needs and practices of the Oak Park community have changed substantially since the time of the creation of these three centers, and are likely to continue to change and evolve in the future. They no longer work well for many of the flexible, active, large group, and multi-space activities that are in demand in the 21st century.
4. The "story" of these three recreation centers—especially their role in the development of Oak Park, the emergence of a Prairie School of architecture, and the creation of community through play-oriented recreation—should be clearly articulated to Oak Park residents. This could be achieved by preserving and/or restoring various artifacts or structures in a variety of ways.

The Committee made specific recommendations related to each center but these did not include the costs to implement the recommendations. Overall, the Committee found that the Andersen Center was in the best shape and had the most potential for renovation. Field Center was found to be the least suited to current and future community recreational needs, and the committee supported the idea of eventually removing the center and relocating its functions to a new addition to the adjacent Mann School. Carroll Center was found to be in better condition and with greater architectural integrity than Field Center, but with the same lack of fit with modern recreational programming.

2007 Ridgeland Common Existing Conditions Report

In 2007, the Park District commissioned a comprehensive study of existing conditions at Ridgeland Common, the Park District's "flagship" recreation center built in 1962. The scope of work included a comprehensive physical evaluation and analysis of the building systems related to safety, security, and code compliance including an assessment of (but not limited to) the current conditions of all of the mechanical, structural, architectural, and civil/yard piping systems. The process included focus group meetings, special user group meetings, and two community meetings. The Final Report, completed by Thompson Dyke Associates, concluded that Ridgeland Common is physically and functionally obsolete, requiring extensive renovation within 5 years that would cost over \$9 million, and no longer meets the community's modern space programming needs.

THE 2009-2013 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Ongoing Capital Improvement Plan

The 2009-2013 CIP is an update of the original 2005-2010 CIP. It is the goal of the Park District to update the CIP every two years and integrate the CIP into the annual budget process. The public has ongoing opportunities for input on capital improvements through the site master plan processes for specific parks. The public is also invited to provide comment at the beginning of every Board meeting and at the annual Public Hearing held before the budget is approved or by contacting staff and Board members. This CIP is made available on the Park District web site, www.oakparkparks.com, along with other planning, budgeting, and capital improvement information.

Definition of Capital Expenditure

Capital expenditures are generally for projects that have a monetary value of at least \$5,000, have a useful life of at least three years, and result in the creation or renovation of a fixed asset that benefits the entire community. Examples of capital projects include construction, remodeling, or purchase of parks, park fixtures, buildings, and vehicles, as well as related planning and engineering costs.

Appropriations for capital improvement items lapse at the end of the fiscal year but are re-budgeted and re-appropriated as needed until the project is completed or changed. The operating and maintenance costs for capital assets, once complete, are funded through the operating budget.

Selection and Allocation of Capital projects

Most capital projects are developed through an extensive site planning process with input from many stakeholders including the community, user groups, other government entities and partners, staff, and the Board of Commissioners. Smaller or emergency capital projects may be submitted by Park District department staff for review and consideration by the Executive Director and Board of Commissioners. Staff and Board meetings are held to discuss these smaller projects, and the projects are prioritized based on the District's mission, vision and values, CIP, department goals, and available funding. When requests exceed available funding in a given year, adjustments are made to scope and scheduling, or additional funding is sought. The effect of capital improvements on operating expenses is always an important consideration.

Capital Improvement Funding Sources

There are four primary sources of capital improvement revenue. The Park District strives to maximize these local revenues by actively and aggressively seeking matching grants from the Illinois Department of Natural Resources and private foundations. The District also uses its debt capacity to issue general obligations bonds for capital projects. Please refer to the table on page 18 for specific amounts by year.

Property Tax

About half of the property tax revenue generated from the 2005 referendum increase of 25 cents per \$100 in equalized assessed valuation has been allocated for funding the CIP. The total anticipated property tax revenue available for capital improvements is \$1.9 million in 2008 and totals \$10.6 million from 2009-2013. Annual increases in Property Tax revenue have been projected to equal the maximum increase allowed by the Property Tax Extension Limitation Act, which is set at the lesser of the prior year CPI-U or 5%. The projected increases are as follows:

2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
4.1%	4.8%	3.0%	3.0%	2.5%

Grants

The major source of grant funding is Open Space Lands Acquisition and Development grants from the Illinois Department of Natural Resources. These grants are available for the purpose of acquiring, developing, and/or rehabilitating lands for public outdoor recreation purposes and require a matching contribution from the Park District. The District has identified projects for OSLAD grant submittal for each year of the CIP. The revenue has not been included unless the grant has already been announced by the Governor of Illinois.

The District received a \$399,000 OSLAD grant for Field Park improvements in 2007 (payable 2008) and received a \$400,000 OSLAD grant for Longfellow Park in 2008. Other grants in 2008 include special recreation access grants for Longfellow Park: \$109,000 from the Kellogg Foundation “Access to Recreation” program, \$235,000 from Good Heart Work Smart, and \$1,000 from CVS. Grant revenues total \$755,000 in 2008. The District also plans to pursue Community Block Grant Development funding in 2008.

Debt Issues


General Obligation Bonds are secured by the full faith and credit of the Park District and a pledge of the District’s taxing power. The legal debt limit for non-referendum bonds was set at the amount of debt service outstanding in 1994 which for the District is approximately \$219,000 in annual debt service. The debt service is paid from a dedicated property tax levy. Two-year General Obligation bonds with a value of \$400,000 are expected to be issued biennially to fund urban forestry management, vehicle replacement, and technology upgrades. The district also has the ability to issue debt certificates which are not subject to the non-referendum limit because they are not secured by the full faith and credit of the District. The debt service for debt certificates is paid by available revenue in the Capital Projects Fund.

\$515,000 in debt certificates were issued by the District in 2007 for improvements to Cheney Mansion and \$15,165,000 of debt certificates are anticipated to be issued between 2009 and 2013 to fund the acquisition and development of a new space for the gymnastics program and the Buildings and Grounds Department and to partially fund improvements to Ridgeland Common.

Operating Budget Transfer

Additional operating revenues generated mainly by non-tax sources are transferred to the capital improvement fund to accelerate the pace of capital improvements. In 2008, \$242,043 is budgeted to be transferred from operations and \$1.4 Million between 2009 and 2013

The following charts illustrate the total sources of funding for 2008 and for all years 2009-2013.



In 2008, property tax revenue will provide 57.6% of all capital improvement revenue. Over the course of five years, the debt issues are expected to provide over 56.2% of total revenue as the amount of debt issued during this period is significantly increased.

The following table shows revenues by source and by year from 2005-2013. Notable past funding sources included transfers from the Village of Oak Park used to fund operations and maintenance at the previously Village-owned community centers. The 2005 referendum was intended in part to phase-out this transfer. A specific portion of the property tax is earmarked for special recreation purposes, per state statute (70 ILCS 1205/5-8). Some revenues from this fund were contributed to capital projects that improve ADA accessibility in 2007.


Revenue	Actual		Budget 2008	Projected					
	2005	2006		2007	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Property Tax		\$ 1,750,000	\$1,588,000	\$1,900,000	\$ 1,980,000	\$ 2,075,040	\$ 2,137,291	\$ 2,201,410	\$ 2,256,445
Village Transfer		844,000	1,732,613						
Handicap Fund contribution			65,000						
Grants			25,965	755,500	676,000	400,000			
GO Bonds				400,000		400,000		400,000	
Cheney Debt issue			515,000						
B&G Debt Issue					2,165,000				
Gymnastics Debt Issue					3,000,000				
Ridgeland Debt Issue							10,000,000		
Operations		478,201	689,487	242,043	270,000	275,000	325,000	325,000	325,000
Total Funds Available for Capital	\$ -	\$ 3,072,201	\$4,616,065	\$3,297,543	\$ 8,091,000	\$ 3,150,040	\$ 12,462,291	\$ 2,926,410	\$ 2,581,445

Capital Improvement Expenditures by Type


Expenditure amounts are best regarded as spending allocations. Some allocations represent best estimates of what a specific item, such as a replacement fire alarm system, will cost. Such cost estimates are made based on estimates provided by Gilmore Franzen Architects, Inc. as part of the 2004 Comprehensive Master Plan, as well as Park District experience over the last few years of making capital improvements. However, most allocations represent how many dollars may and should be spent on a given improvement or location. For example, the expenditure allocation for improvements to a community center necessarily limits the type and extent of improvements that can be made. As discussed on page 13, the allocations reflect a balanced approach to District-wide improvements.

The following charts illustrate the total sources of expenses for 2008 and for the 5 years of the CIP, 2009-2013. The Master Plan Improvements constitute 55.3% of 2008 expenditures and 57.7% of total expenditures through 2013.

**Park District of Oak Park Capital Improvement Plan
Expenditure Allocations by Type: 2008**



**Park District of Oak Park Capital Improvement Plan
Expenditure Allocations by Type: 2009-2013**



There are seven major expense categories included in the CIP that the District uses to identify the type of project that is being planned. Please refer to [page 23](#) for specific amounts by year and location.

Park Planning

The park planning expenditures include the costs for landscape, architectural, and engineering plans and community surveys required for the development of Site Master Plans. The planning process is used to solicit community input and create consensus for future improvements to District properties. See [Appendix F](#) for a schedule of master plan development.

Master Plan Improvements

This is the construction of improvements that are recommended in the site master plans. Most master plan improvements are divided into several phases that may take ten or more years to fully implement. In 2008, \$2.7 million is allocated for construction of site master plan improvements to complete Phase I of improvements at Austin Garden and Field Park and begin Phase I improvements at Fox and Longfellow Parks. Between 2009 and 2013 \$21.3 Million is allocated for master plan improvements.

Building Repairs and Improvements

This includes improvements to buildings and indoor facilities such as the community centers and technology improvements that are not outlined in a site master plan. The improvements include reconfiguration of programming spaces, adding storage spaces, heating and cooling upgrades, creation of amenities such as observation areas and facility attendant kiosks, and efficient office spaces for staff. Primary 2008 expenditures include fire alarm system replacements at various centers, \$25,000 of improvements at each of the three non-core centers, a security system at Dole center, new boilers at two centers and \$100,000 each for improvements at Pleasant Home and Ridgeland Common. During the five years of the CIP \$1.6 Million is allocated for this category

Park Improvements and Property Repair

This includes improvements and repairs to the portion of park sites that are not normally associated with a building and are not outlined in a site master plan. Examples of improvements include parking lots, pools, playgrounds comfort stations bike racks, and forestry management. 2008 allocations include restoration of the Scoville Park war memorial, the first year of a multi-year program replacing trash cans in the parks, the first year of the urban forestry management program, continued improvements at Stevenson Park and the park sign program. \$1.1 Million is allocated to be spent on Park Improvements from 2009 – 2013.

Property Acquisition Reserve

This is a reserve fund for land acquisition related costs (such as appraisals, environmental testing and closing costs), which was found to be one of the community's priorities in the community attitude and interest survey (see page 12).

In 2007, two homeowners adjacent to Carroll Park offered their properties for sale to the District, and the District was able to arrange purchase of them through an agreement with the Trust for Public Lands.

Vehicle and Equipment Replacement

This category includes replacement of District vans and trucks as well as the Zamboni, water trailer, wood chipper, outdoor stage, and other mobile equipment. 2008 purchases will include replacement of two pickup trucks and a ball field groomer, as well as annual lease payments on various vehicles such as a Zamboni, lift truck, and passenger vans.

Debt Service

Debt service is the annual payment for principle and interest for debt issued to fund large projects with long useful lives. The Debt service payments included in the CIP are funded with current tax proceeds and as such do not cause taxes to increase when debt is issued, but do cause the amount of funds available for current projects to be reduced. Currently the full amount of debt service is for the debt issued in conjunction with the repair and restoration project at Cheney Mansion. Additional debt is anticipated to be issued during the period of this CIP for partially funding the replacement of Ridgeland Common and addressing facility needs for Gymnastics and Buildings and Grounds. The CIP outlines a \$10 million debt issue for Ridge Common, \$3, million for Gymnastics and \$2.165 million for Buildings and Grounds, all of which could be issued without going to referendum. The full debt service schedule is included in [Appendix G](#)

The following table shows expenditures by type and by year from 2005-2013.

Expense	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	9 Year Total
Park Planning	\$ 42,930	152,584	117,870	261,200	67,000	51,000	-	-	40,000	732,583
Master Plan Improvements		380,581	\$1,804,811	\$2,863,821	\$ 1,253,550	\$ 1,995,000	\$ 4,900,000	\$ 7,075,000	\$ 1,450,000	21,722,763
Building Improvements		517,157	2,104,154	694,491	1,170,500	30,000	520,000	110,000	120,000	5,266,301
Park Improvements		225,155	287,430	154,325	270,000	365,000	332,500	177,500	177,500	1,989,410
Property Acquisition & Development			76,380	683,296	5,165,000	-	-	100,000	100,000	6,124,676
Vehicle & Equip Replacement	-	40,674	52,741	130,274	132,062	110,894	142,388	144,000	125,800	878,833
Debt Service			32,215	65,807	262,648	465,148	468,350	772,375	987,249	3,053,792
Total Capital Expense	\$ 42,930	\$ 1,316,151	\$4,475,600	\$4,853,213	\$ 8,320,760	\$ 3,017,041	\$ 6,363,238	\$ 8,378,875	\$ 3,000,549	\$ 39,768,358

HISTORIC AND PLANNED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT EXPENDITURES BY LOCATION

This section describes the planned capital improvements by location. **Estimated annual operating costs and savings fall into three categories: low/small (\$0 to \$999), medium (\$1,000 to \$9,999), and high (\$10,000 and above).** Savings may be used to reduce expenditures or may be reallocated for other productive uses.

The following table shows expenditures by location and by year from 2005-2013

Summary	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	9 Year Total
Andersen Park & Center	16,177	415,902	-	47,500	-	-	-	-	150,000	629,579
Austin Garden Park		1,448	270,284	59,716	18,550	-	-	-	-	349,998
Barrie Park & Center		28,026	178,483	15,000	-	-	150,000	-	-	371,509
Carroll Park & Center	26,753	26,022	418,753	40,000	-	-	-	-	600,000	1,111,528
Cheney Mansion and Grounds		61,688	639,975	-	22,000	-	50,000	100,000	-	873,663
Dole Center		1,200	-	35,000	-	-	-	-	-	36,200
Euclid Square Park		-	4,000	-	25,000	380,000	-	-	-	409,000
Field Park & Center		54,771	1,082,576	186,724	-	-	-	-	-	1,324,071
Fox Park & Center		45,664	222,454	889,987	-	-	-	-	-	1,158,104
John Hedges Administration Center		40,128	34,197	471,563	5,165,000	-	-	-	-	5,710,888
Lindberg Park		-	-	-	-	21,000	-	-	450,000	471,000
Longfellow Park & Center		53,517	273,295	1,437,408	-	-	-	-	-	1,764,220
Maple Park		-	38,931	-	1,035,000	-	-	-	-	1,073,931
Mills Park & Pleasant Home		-	7,500	135,000	-	300,000	600,000	-	-	1,042,500
Oak Park Conservatory		122,848	312,713	80,815	300,000	-	350,000	-	-	1,166,376
Randolph Tot Lot		-	-	-	20,000	200,000	-	-	-	220,000
Rehm Park and Pool		13,877	-	58,100	290,000	265,000	150,000	250,000	250,000	1,276,977
Ridgeland Common Park & Facility		166,504	158,143	305,100	-	500,000	4,000,000	6,000,000	-	11,129,747
Scoville Park		-	10,000	-	163,000	30,000	-	725,000	-	928,000
Stevenson Park & Center		35,958	570,184	74,947	572,000	-	-	-	-	1,253,089
Taylor Park		3,101	19,109	37,100	-	650,000	-	-	-	709,310
Wenonah Tot Lot		-	-	-	200,000	-	-	-	-	200,000
Multiple Sites or Non- Site Specific		245,495	235,003	979,255	510,210	671,041	1,063,238	1,303,875	1,550,549	6,558,667
Total Capital Expense	42,930	1,316,151	4,475,600	4,853,213	8,320,760	3,017,041	6,363,238	8,378,875	3,000,549	39,768,358

Andersen Park and Center

1.3 acres at Hayes & Division

History

Acquired in 1916, the park is named after children’s author Hans Christian Andersen and includes a center originally designed by John S. Van Bergen. The center has been significantly modified over the years. The play equipment was previously renovated in 1985. This small neighborhood park currently has a multi-purpose field, playground, and splash pad.



Past Improvements

The site master plan for Andersen Park was completed in January 2006 and the Phase I improvements were completed in September 2006. Improvements included a splash pad, roll hill, water fountain, walkways, new playground equipment, swings, security lighting, replacement fencing, woven willow dome, interpretive signage, plantings, and decorative paved seating areas. In 2006 Andersen Center improvements were also made, including roof repair, and lock and door replacement.

Future Improvements

An upgrade of the local fire alarm system is scheduled for 2008. This will replace the circa 1965 system and allow for constant monitoring. Replacement park benches were ordered in 2007 and will be installed in 2008. The \$25,000 allocation for Center improvements in 2008 will be used to make the restrooms accessible when no staff is present, possibly address small-scale maintenance needs (e.g., painting, tuck pointing, tile replacement), replace or upgrade amenities for programs, and possibly update office and common spaces. Phase II site master plan improvements have been scheduled for 2013 and will make improvements to the north side of the park including walkway enhancements, replacement fencing, plantings, signage, and a raised berm for watching games in the multipurpose field.

Estimated Operating Costs

Additional annual costs for splash pad water, additional security lighting electricity, renewing play area woodchips, and the fire alarm upgrade are each expected to be low, although combined they will create a medium increase in cost.

Benefits

Capital improvements to Andersen Park have enhanced the play environment, improved safety, and improved the aesthetic value of the park. 2008 improvements are expected to further improve safety and make interior spaces more comfortable for users and staff.

Andersen	N	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	CIP Total
Fire Alarm System					15,000						-
Site Master Plan		16,177	4,994								-
Master Plan Improvements			379,133							150,000	150,000
Center Improvements			31,775	790	25,000						-
Replace park furniture					7,500						-
		16,177	415,902	790	47,500					150,000	150,000

Austin Gardens

3.64 acres at Ontario & Forest

History

Henry W. Austin, Jr. donated the land for Austin Gardens to the Park District in 1947 on the condition that it remain a public park bearing the Austin family name. The District officially received ownership of the property upon the death of Mrs. Austin in 1954. The park includes a wildflower woodland habitat first planted in 1970 by members of the League of Women Voters, as well as hundreds of trees. Since 1975, Austin Gardens has been used as a performance space by the Oak Park Festival Theatre. A Trust for Austin Gardens currently valued at \$485,000 is held by the Oak Park River Forest Community Foundation and proceeds can be used for extraordinary maintenance and recreation activities.



Past Improvements

The site master plan for Austin Gardens was completed in 2005 and funded through the Austin Gardens Trust. Construction of Phase I improvements began in October 2007 and included path improvements, new benches, new plantings, trash receptacles, fencing, electrical upgrades, lighting, and an irrigation system for the wildflower area.

Future Improvements

Additional security lighting improvements are scheduled for 2009 as part of the site master plan.

Estimated Operating Costs

The irrigation system is expected to produce small annual savings because staff will no longer need to water the wildflower garden manually.

Benefits

Lighting improvements are expected to make operations safer and more efficient for park district and theatre staff. Irrigation will allow for an expanded wildflower collection and path improvements will improve the walking experience for park users.

Austin Gardens	C	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	CIP Total
Master Plan Improvements			1,448	270,284	59,716	18,550					18,550
			1,448	270,284	59,716	18,550					18,550

Barrie Park

4.22 acres at Lombard & Garfield

History

The 0.9 acre site at the southwest corner of Lombard and Garfield was acquired in 1932 and named for the children’s author James Barrie. It includes a center originally designed by Arthur B. Maiworm. The adjacent 3.3 acre park was acquired in 1965 and had been the site of a manufactured gas plant from 1893-1931. Soil contamination was discovered in 1999, and remediation was undertaken through a coordinated effort by the Park District, Village of Oak Park, ComEd, and NiCor. Cleanup and restoration took place from 2001-2005. Barrie Center is located on top of a Village underground potable water tank. Current features include a multi-purpose field, a soccer field, baseball field, two half basketball courts, two tennis courts, two playgrounds, a multi-use sport court, and a sled hill with a storage area for utilities and maintenance equipment built into the base. Barrie Park athletic fields are irrigated.



Past Improvements

Improvements to Barrie Park done through the remediation project included new ball fields, landscaping, sled hill, tot lot, lighting improvements, a multi-use sport court, and patio. In 2006, improvements to Barrie Center included roof repair, lock and door replacement, and creation of storage spaces to secure equipment. 2007 Center improvements completed in March 2008 included making the restrooms ADA accessible and creating both interior and exterior access, upgrading restroom fixtures, upgrading ventilation systems creating a customer service kiosk, replacing railings, improving common areas, and reorganizing office workspace.

Future Improvements

An upgrade of the local fire alarm system is scheduled for 2008. This will replace the circa 1965 system and allow for constant monitoring. \$150,000 has been allocated in 2011 to improve site drainage and turf quality.

Estimated Operating Costs

Restroom improvements are expected to produce a medium annual reduction in staffing costs since they will be accessible when no staff is present. Storage improvements are expected to produce medium savings by reducing asset loss through better inventory control. The fire alarm upgrade is expected to add a small annual charge for monitoring.

Benefits

Recent improvements have made Barrie Center accessible to people with disabilities, improved security, made interior spaces comfortable for users and staff, and created a more customer-friendly environment. A full time program supervisor is now located at this facility as part of the District’s effort to enhance program offerings and improve customer service.

Barrie	S	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	CIP Total
Fire Alarm System					15,000						-
Field Improvements								150,000			150,000
Center Improvements			28,026	178,483							-
			28,026	178,483	15,000			150,000			150,000

Carroll Park

2.48 acres at Kenilworth & Fillmore

History

Acquired in 1916, the park is named after children's author Lewis Carroll and includes a center originally designed by John S. Van Bergen. The center has been significantly modified over the years. The northern part of Kenilworth Street was vacated by the Village in 1960 to expand the park and connect it to the Lincoln School grounds, creating roughly five acres of total open space. Current features include a baseball diamond, two playgrounds, and a multi-use field.



Past Improvements

The site master plan for Carroll Park was completed in December 2005 with the cooperation of Elementary School District 97 and the Phase I improvements were completed in September 2007.

Improvements included extensive new playground equipment, a water fountain, walkways, plantings, and additional security lighting. In coordination with the Village of Oak Park, the Kenilworth cul-de-sac was rotated 90 degrees to the southwest to gain more play space. In 2007 Carroll Center improvements were also made including roof repair, and lock and door replacement.

Future Improvements

An upgrade of the local fire alarm system is scheduled for 2008. This will replace the circa 1965 system and allow for constant monitoring. The \$25,000 allocation for Center improvements in 2008 will be used to make the restrooms accessible when no staff is present, possibly address small-scale maintenance needs (e.g., painting, tuck pointing, tile replacement), replace or upgrade amenities for programs, and possibly update office and common spaces. Phase II site master plan improvements have been scheduled for 2013 and will focus on improving the playing fields and relocating the 3-5 year old playground.

Estimated Operating Costs

The electricity cost of additional security lights is expected to be offset by their greater efficiency compared to the lights they replaced. The modern play equipment is expected to produce small annual savings in parts and labor costs of retrofitting replacement parts for the former (obsolete) equipment. The fire alarm upgrade is expected to add a small annual charge for monitoring.

Benefits

Capital improvements to Carroll Park have greatly enhanced the play environment, improved safety, and improved the aesthetic value of the park. Scheduled improvements are expected to further improve safety and make interior spaces more comfortable for users and staff.

Carroll	S	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	CIP Total
Site Master Plan		26,753	6,424	1,000							-
Master Plan Improvements OSLAD app				417,753						600,000	600,000
Center Improvements			19,598	-	25,000						-
Replace Fire alarm system					15,000						-
		26,753	26,022	418,753	40,000					600,000	600,000

Cheney Mansion

2.20 acres at Euclid & Ontario

History

Cheney Mansion was designed in 1913 by Charles E. White, Jr. for the Sharpe family. It has six bedrooms, seven bathrooms, many reception rooms, a ballroom, coach house and greenhouse on two acres of landscaped grounds. It was purchased in 1922 by Andrew and Mary Dole and inherited by their niece, Elizabeth Cheney, who deeded it to the Park District in 1975. The Park District took ownership of the property in 1985. It was designated an Oak Park Landmark by the Village of Oak Park in 2004. Cheney Mansion is currently used for Park District programs such as cooking classes, and as a rental facility for the public. The mission of Cheney Mansion is to provide a unique venue for recreation programs, special activities and community events for the enjoyment of Oak Park residents and is a distinctive locale for private meetings and celebrations.



Past Improvements

The boiler and external walkway pavers were replaced in 2006. Major renovations were made in 2007 in preparation for the 2007 Oak Park River Forest Infant Welfare Society’s Designer Showcase House (it had also been the Showcase House in 1986). Improvements included roof and gutter replacement, tuck pointing of chimney and exterior elevations; repair of the exterior stucco; and exterior painting. Interior renovations include a remodeled kitchen, replacement kitchen hood vent, fire alarm upgrade, and interior finishes to all rooms. A new wooden fence was erected on the east end of the site and the wrought iron fence surrounding the Mansion was repaired and restored. Improvements were made to the coach house to make it a better rental property and lead paint was removed from the fire escape staircase.

Future Improvements

Master Plan improvements are scheduled to begin in the late fall of 2011 and conclude in 2012. Developing a permanent solution to providing access to the main level of the building is the main priority. Repairs of the greenhouse will also be needed in the next five years.

Estimated Operating Costs

The new boiler is expected to recover its cost within 4-5 years.

Benefits

The envelope of the building was secured for many years to come, restoring the integrity of this historic property and ensuring that it continues to be a desirable elegant rental facility as well as a beautiful location for community events. The safety and security of users and staff were improved by many projects including the fire alarm upgrade, lead abatement, kitchen hood vent, and roof repair.

Cheney Mansion	C	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	CIP Total
Site Master Plan						22,000					22,000
Master Plan Improvements								50,000	100,000		150,000
Facility Repairs			49,688	633,200							-
Paver Replacement			12,000								-
			61,688	633,200		22,000		50,000	100,000		172,000

Dole Center

Village-owned building at Augusta & Cuyler

History

Dole Learning Center was built in 1926 and donated to the Village of Oak Park in 1939 by Andrew and Mary Dole, who also owned Cheney Mansion. The Village used it as a library branch for several decades and added recreational programming in the late 1970s. Dole Center underwent a major renovation in 2002 which made the building ADA accessible. In addition to the Village, the Oak Park Library and Park District occupy parts of Dole Center through an intergovernmental agreement and all three entities contribute to a sinking fund for the utility costs, janitorial services and maintenance of the building.



Past Improvements

In 2006 a partition was built on the third floor to create a sound barrier between two dance studios. In 2008 \$35,000 is allocated for the installation of security cameras.

Future Improvements

No further improvements are scheduled at this time.

Estimated Operating Costs

Monitoring the security cameras is expected to create a small annual cost.

Benefits

The third floor sound barrier created a better environment for users of both dance studios, and the security cameras are expected to improve security in the facility.

Dole	C	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	CIP Total
Leasehold Improvements			1,200		35,000						-
			1,200		35,000						-

Euclid Square Park

2.81 acres at Fillmore & Euclid

History

Acquired in 1929, the park was originally called New South Park, or Park #9, but was subsequently named after the adjacent street. It includes a baseball diamond, four tennis courts, a tot lot, soccer field, and drinking fountain.

Past Improvements

The tennis courts were last replaced in 1979 and last resealed in 2004. The playground equipment was last replaced in 1998.



Future Improvements

The site master plan process for Euclid Square is scheduled to begin in 2009, with master plan improvements beginning in 2010. The park is in visible need of walkway repair, drainage improvement, and replacement of the tennis courts and play equipment.

Estimated Operating Costs

There are no estimated changes to operating costs at this time.

Benefits

Capital improvements to Euclid Square will enhance the play environment, improve safety, and improve the aesthetic value of the park.

Euclid Square	S	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	CIP Total
Site Master Plan				4,000		25,000					25,000
Master Plan Improvements						-	380,000				380,000
				4,000		25,000	380,000				405,000

Field Park

3.39 acres at Division & Woodbine

History

Acquired in 1916, the park is named after children’s author Eugene Field and includes a center originally designed by John S. Van Bergen. The center has been significantly modified over the years. Woodbine Avenue between Berkshire and Division was vacated by the Village in 1960 to expand the park and connect it to the Mann School grounds, creating roughly five acres of total open space. Current features include a playground, two baseball diamonds, and a multi-use field.



Past Improvements

The site master plan for Field Park was completed in May 2006 with the cooperation of School District 97. Phase I improvements were begun in August 2007 and completed in April 2008. A \$399,000 Illinois Department of Natural Resources Open Space Land Acquisition and Development Grant partially funded the Phase I improvements, which included new playground equipment, a bocce court, splash pad, shelter, new pathways, renovated and expanded baseball and soccer fields, a new vehicular drop off near the Center, installation of an irrigation trunk, new benches, new drinking fountains, and the addition of many new trees. Phase I construction was complicated by the discovery of remnants of the vacated street and foundations of homes under the park. In 2007 Field Center improvements including roof repair, and lock and door replacement.

Future Improvements

The \$25,000 allocation for Center improvements in 2008 will be used to make the restrooms accessible when no staff is present, possibly address small-scale maintenance needs (e.g., painting, tuck pointing, tile replacement), replace or upgrade amenities for programs, and possibly update office and common spaces. Phase II site master plan improvements have not been scheduled yet but may include relocating the parking lot to the intersection of Division and Kenilworth and building a new recreation center attached to the school.

Estimated Operating Costs

The electricity cost of additional security lights is expected to be offset by their greater efficiency compared to the lights they replaced. The modern play equipment is expected to produce small annual savings in parts and labor costs of retrofitting replacement parts for the former (obsolete) equipment. Additional annual costs for splash pad and irrigation water will be medium. The poured-in-place playground surface will require less maintenance than the previous surface and produce a medium amount of annual savings.

Benefits

Capital improvements to Field Park have greatly enhanced the play environment, improved safety, made the athletic fields more useable, and improved the aesthetic value of the park. The poured-in-place playground surface has made the playground ADA accessible. Scheduled improvements are expected to further improve safety and make interior spaces more comfortable for users and staff.

Field	N	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	CIP Total
Site Master Plan			31,433								-
Master Plan Improvements				1,082,576	161,724						-
Center Improvements			23,339		25,000						-
			54,771	1,082,576	186,724						-

Fox Park

1.54 acres at Oak Park & Jackson

History

Acquired in 1922, the park is named after William H. Fox, who served on the Park Board of Commissioners from 1919-1925. It includes a recreation center built in 1966. Current features include a playground, baseball field, and multi-use field.

Past Improvements

The site master plan for Fox Park was completed in January 2007. Center improvements completed in March 2008 included making the restrooms ADA accessible and creating both interior and exterior access, upgrading restroom fixtures, upgrading ventilation systems, replacing railings, remodeling the kitchen and activity space, adding storage space, creating a customer service kiosk, improving common areas, and reorganizing office workspace.



Future Improvements

Phase I master plan improvements to the north end of the park will include new creative play areas, a restored spray feature, new swings, a ramp to gain access to the restrooms, a new north entranceway, a walkway all the way around the center, and a renovated entryway plaza on the south side of the center. The “sunken area” will be brought up to grade in order to accommodate these features and create accessibility. Other improvements include landscaping, bike racks, and lighting. The 1965-generation Fox Center boiler will also be replaced at an estimated cost of \$18,000. Phase II site master plan improvements have not been scheduled yet but will to improve the southern part of the park. Other identified future needs for Fox Center include replacement windows and the addition of a dance floor suitable for lessons.

Estimated Operating Costs

The new boiler is expected to pay for itself in utility savings within 4-5 years. Heating costs are expected to decline due to better heat distribution achieved with the new control mechanisms and produce medium savings. The electricity cost of additional security lights is expected to be offset by their greater efficiency compared to the lights they replaced. The poured-in-place playground surface will require less maintenance than the previous surface and produce a medium amount of annual savings.

Benefits

Capital improvements to Fox Park will greatly enhance the creative play environment, improve safety, make the athletic fields more useable, and improve the aesthetic value of the park. 2007 Center improvements also improved ADA accessibility, created a more customer-friendly environment, provided functional and secure office areas, and allowed for the location of full-time program supervisor in the Center, which will improve security and customer service. The additional storage areas also streamline transitions between programs.

Fox	S	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	CIP Total
Boiler					18,000						-
Site Master Plan			11,429	6,634							-
Master Plan Improvements					789,079						-
Center improvements			29,999	215,820	82,908						-
Replace Lighting in Main room			4,236								-
			45,664	222,454	889,987						-

Hedges Administration Center and Gymnastics Center -- 218 Madison

0.34 acres (22,180 sq. ft.) at Madison & Harvey

History

Acquired in 1986 for \$145,000, 218 Madison was built in the 1930s and formerly housed an automobile dealership. In 2001 The building which houses administrative offices, program registration and buildings and grounds headquarters (including vehicle storage) and the District’s Gymnastics Center was named after John L. Hedges, former Executive Director for twenty years.



Past Improvements

Renovations made in 2001 reorganized office workspaces. Remodeling in 2005 converted storage space into offices and streamlined the customer service and registration area. In 2006, lighting fixtures were converted to energy-saving models. A Facility Improvement Study conducted in 2006 focused on improvements to the existing facilities on a short-term (1 to 3 years) basis with an emphasis on the Buildings and Grounds and Gymnastics Center. Factors considered included public and staff access, storage, staff work stations, staging and common areas. The long term Space Program evaluated the disparate functions now housed at 218 Madison and determined specific space needs for each of these functions. The Study identified needed structural repairs such as replacement of roof trusses, reconstruction of the basement ceiling, masonry repair, ventilation system replacement, and roofing replacement.

Future Improvements

Short-term improvements scheduled for 2008 have been delayed until the long-term solutions to address the space needs of the Gymnastics Program, which has sufficient demand to double in size, and the space needs for buildings and grounds operations are determined. All three functions currently housed in 218 Madison also suffer from a lack of parking. The District is actively pursuing relocating either or both the Gymnastics and Buildings & Grounds functions and has allocated a total of \$5,165,000 in 2009 for this purpose.

Estimated Operating Costs

The energy-efficient lighting is expected to produce small annual savings in electricity costs.

Benefits

Recent improvements at 218 Madison have created a more customer-friendly registration area, rationalized staff workspaces, and introduced workflow efficiencies. Long-term improvements will greatly improve the gymnastics program by reducing waiting lists, creating new and diverse programs, allowing the District to host competitive meets and improving viewing areas. Long-term improvements to the buildings and grounds area will improve operations by allowing more efficient access to equipment and centralize equipment storage.

Hedges Admin Center	S	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	CIP Total
Replace F40 Bulbs w/ T-12 Bulbs			11,898								-
Site Master Plan			25,990								-
Install 2 flagpoles on front of 218			2,240		5,760						-
B&G Facility Relocation						2,165,000					2,165,000
Gymnastic Center Relocation or Renovation						3,000,000					3,000,000
Master Plan Improvements				34,197	465,803						-
			40,128	34,197	471,563	5,165,000					5,165,000

Lindberg Park

13.9 acres at Marion & Le Moyne

History

Acquired in 1925, this park was originally called “Green Fields” but was subsequently named after Gustav A. Lindberg, the first Superintendent of Parks of the Park District of Oak Park. The land had previously been used as a refuse dump. In 1972 the Oak Park River Forest Community Foundation established the Presidential Walk in Lindberg Park with the planting of 17 sugar maples, one for each of the 17 former Village of Oak Park Presidents. This tradition continues with a new tree planted as each village president ends their term in office. The park now features baseball diamonds, multi-use fields, tennis courts, and a native prairie plant garden. Lindberg Park athletic fields are irrigated.



Past Improvements

In the late 1990’s, the gardens were restored to their original layout which was designed in the 1930’s by Mr. Lindberg. This project was a joint effort between the Garden Club of Oak Park and River Forest and the Park District of Oak Park with funding from the Illinois Department of Natural Resources. The original design had included water gardens and roses transplanted from gardens dismantled after Chicago’s Century of Progress World’s Fair in 1934. Other improvements completed in 2000 included remodeling the comfort station and concession stand, resurfacing the tennis courts, installing irrigation under the fields, and replacing 120 trees.

Future Improvements

A site master plan for Lindberg is scheduled for 2010. Identifiable needs include adding paths on the north and east sides to complete a walking path around the park, replacing backstops and fencing, improving security lighting, renewing the comfort station, improving field drainage, and adding “health-walk” medallions around the park.

Estimated Operating Costs

There are no identified changes to operating costs at this time.

Benefits

Capital improvements will improve safety, make the athletic fields more useable, improve the circulation through the park and improve the aesthetic value of the park.

Lindberg Park	N	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	CIP Total
Master Plan							21,000				21,000
Master Plan Improvements										450,000	450,000
							21,000			450,000	471,000

Longfellow Park

2.62 acres at Ridgeland & Jackson

History

Acquired in 1920, the park was named after the American poet, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. The recreation center was built in 1966 in the same style as Fox Center. Current features include a playground, baseball diamond, full-court basketball and tennis courts

Past Improvements

The site master plan for Longfellow Park was completed in February 2007. 2007 Center improvements completed in March 2008 included making the restrooms ADA accessible and creating both interior and exterior access, upgrading restroom fixtures, upgrading ventilation systems, replacing railings, creating a viewing area for the upper level program room, remodeling the program storage spaces, creating a customer service kiosk, improving common areas, and reorganizing office workspace.



Future Improvements

Park master plan improvements will be constructed in 2008 and will include new accessible creative art/music play areas, a restored and enhanced spray area, new swings, a ramp to gain access to the restrooms, a new north entranceway and art walk, a walkway around the center, and a renovated entryway plaza on the south side of the center. The “sunken area” north of the center will be filled in and a full-sized basketball court with spectator area will be installed. The play areas are being relocated from the northwest corner of the park to a more central location allowing for parental monitoring of both the playground and the ball field. Sand volleyball courts currently in the center of the park will be relocated elsewhere in the District. Other improvements include a new water fountain, landscaping, bike racks, and lighting. A hard-surface interior pathway system will be added to allow park patrons to traverse the park from north to south. At the south end of the park, the ballfield/soccer field area will be redeveloped and a brick plaza with seating and bike racks will be added in the southeast corner.

A significant percentage of this project is being funded through grant funds, allowing planned improvements to be made in a single phase. The Park District received a \$235,000 grant from the Good Heart Work Smart Foundation of which \$200,000 will be used towards the installation cost of the Longfellow Center elevator and lobby area and the balance was used to plan more accessible features for the playground areas. The Park District, in partnership with the Oak Park River Forest Community Foundation, secured a \$220,000 Access to Recreation grant sponsored by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. Over \$100,000 of these grant monies will be used for the Longfellow Park site master plan improvements. The Park District also received a \$400,000 Illinois Department of Natural Resources Grant for Longfellow Park.

In 2008 replacement of the Center’s air conditioning system will also be completed.

Longfellow Park – Continued

2.62 acres at Ridgeland & Jackson

Estimated Operating Costs

The new air conditioning system is estimated to produce small annual savings in electricity costs, and a small decline in heating costs is expected due to better heat distribution achieved with the new control mechanisms. The electricity cost of additional security lights is expected to be offset by their greater efficiency compared to the lights they replaced.

Benefits

2007 Center improvements improved ADA accessibility, created a more customer-friendly environment, provided functional and secure office areas, and allowed for the location of full-time program supervisor and a regular part-time program coordinator in the Center, which will improve security and customer service. 2008 capital improvements will greatly enhance the creative play environment, improve safety, make the athletic fields more useable, and improve the aesthetic value of the park. Filling in the “sunken area”, installing an elevator, building ramps, and using a poured-in-place playground surface will vastly improve ADA accessibility.

Longfellow	S	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	CIP Total
Replace Air Conditioning system			4,278		15,000						-
Replace Lighting in Main room			4,236								-
Site Master Plan			20,192	3,826							-
Master Plan Improvements					987,500						-
OSLAD GRANT					400,000						-
Center Improvements			24,812	266,303	39,908						-
			53,517	270,129	1,442,408						-

Maple Park

6.98 acres at Harlem & Lexington

History

Acquired in 1921, the linear park was formerly railroad property. It was originally called Park #6, or Perennial Gardens for the formal plantings installed there but was later renamed for the adjacent Maple street. A comfort station was built in the center of the park around 1960, renovations in the early 1980s added new landscaping and curving walkways, and the playground equipment was replaced in 1998. Current features include a playground, two baseball diamonds, two multi-purpose fields, and three tennis courts.



Past Improvements

The tennis courts were resurfaced in 2002. Ballfield backstops were renovated and safety cages were added in 2005 when the infields were realigned. Many trees have been replaced in Maple Park in recent years. The site master plan was completed in November 2007.

Future Improvements

Master plan improvements scheduled to begin in 2009 will depend on award of an Illinois Department of Natural Resources Open Space Lands Acquisition and Development grant. Phase I improvements will include removal of the three tennis courts in the center of the park and installation of two new lighted courts on the south end. The vacated land in the center will be landscaped as an open meadow, and a new continuous pathway will be created along the east side of the park to connect the north and south ends of the park. An off leash dog area will also be installed. Later phases have not yet been scheduled, but are anticipated to include refurbishing the two ball diamonds, a continuous path along the west side of the park, climbing boulders between the two ball diamonds, relocating the playground to the central-east side of the park and fencing along Harlem to protect against errant vehicles. The comfort station will be renovated at the same time.

Estimated Operating Costs

Additional staffing and maintenance needed for the dog park will be covered by dog park permit fees. The electricity cost of additional security lights is expected to be offset by their greater efficiency compared to the lights they replaced. The new walkways will create a small additional cost for snow shoveling.

Benefits

Removing the physical barrier of the tennis courts from the center and creating a continuous chain of meadows will greatly improve the aesthetic value of the park. Improvements will also enhance the play environment, improve safety, provide a dog recreation area, provide a complete walking path circuit, and make the athletic fields more useable.

Maple Park	S	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	CIP Total
Site Master Plan				38,931							-
Master Plan Improvements OSLAD app						985,000					985,000
Master Plan Improvements Dog Park						50,000					50,000

Mills Park and Pleasant Home (“John Farson House”)

4.43 acres at Pleasant & Home

History

Acquired in 1939, the historic John Farson House, known as “Pleasant Home”, is a National Historic Landmark and was designed in 1897 by architect George W. Maher. Outbuildings on the attendant grounds were subsequently razed and Mills Park has been maintained as open space for many years. Pleasant Home was used for decades as a community center and is now also rented out to the public for events. The Pleasant Home Foundation offices are located in the home, as are the offices and museum of the Historical Society of Oak Park and River Forest, which has been located in the home since the 1960s. The organizations provide daily tours (free on Fridays) and educational programming for the community.



Past Improvements

Major projects from 1939 to 1990 included rebuilding of two front porch plaster medallions, recreation of one of Maher’s urns, remodeling of the restrooms, replacement of some windows, removal and replacement of front walkway and steps, and on-going exterior painting and roof repair. As described on page 10, a comprehensive existing conditions report on the home was conducted in 2002, and subsequent restoration and repair has included rebuilding the entire roof structure and most gutter systems; restoration of the library and great hall fireplace; restoration of the front fence entry; addition of an accessible lift at the west elevation; repair of the living room fireplace, front door, sun porch door and threshold; and boiler room mold abatement.

Future Improvements

A site master plan for Mills Park will begin in late 2008. Identifiable needs include renovation of all fencing, a fully ADA-accessible route through the park, regrading, and sidewalk improvements. In 2008, \$100,000 is allocated for Life Safety needs identified in the 2002 report. The Pleasant Home Foundation actively pursues grants and may also make additional improvements with their own funds not listed here. Major fence repairs are scheduled for 2010 and master plan improvements are scheduled for 2011.

Estimated Operating Costs

Improvements to Mills Park are not expected to have an effect on operating costs. Installation of a climate control system is expected to yield a medium increase in utility costs.

Benefits

Capital improvements to Mills Park will improve ADA accessibility and the aesthetic value of the park. Improvements to Pleasant Home will maintain the integrity of this historic structure and its collection of original Maher designed furniture and art glass.

Mills Park and Pleasant Home	C	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	CIP Total
Site Master Plan				7,500	35,000						-
Master Plan Improvements OSLAD app								600,000			600,000
PHF HSR Life Safety & Maintenance					100,000						-
Repair wrought iron fence					-		300,000				300,000

Oak Park Conservatory

0.80 acres at Garfield & East

History

The Conservatory began as a community effort in 1914 to provide a place to house exotic plants that residents collected during their travels abroad. The present Edwardian-style glass structure, built in 1929, houses a botanical collection of more than 3,000 plants, some of which date back to the Conservatory's founding. Over the years the building fell into neglect. In 1970, the Friends of the Oak Park Conservatory (FOPCON) was formed and led a drive to preserve this unique resource. In June of 2000 the Conservatory Center was opened to provide expanded space and facilities for educational programming, operations and public events. In 2004, the Oak Park Conservatory was designated an Oak Park Landmark, and was added to the National Register of Historic Places in 2005.



Past Improvements

In 2002, a major lead abatement project was completed in the Fern Room with the assistance of grants from the FOPCON and the Illinois Department of Natural Resources Museum Grant Program. In 2006 and 2007, lead abatement was accomplished in the Desert Room and the East Growing House. Additional upgrades were made to the East Growing House to improve growing conditions. These included upgraded mechanical vent controls, a modern heating system, a retractable shade device, environmental controls and new rolling benches for more efficient use of growing space. FOPCON provided \$12,000 in grant funds towards the cost of the shade device. Glazing work in the historical entrance was also completed. A back-up generator was installed in 2007. Exterior doors were replaced in March 2008.

Future Improvements

A site master plan for the Conservatory site will be completed in 2008. Lead abatement of the West Growing House is scheduled for 2009, and lead abatement of the Tropical House is scheduled for 2011.

Estimated Operating Costs

The mechanical shade device installed in the East Growing House will save staff time required to manually paint the glass and remove the paint each year. Other improvements to the East House will result in energy efficiencies that will yield medium reductions in utility costs.

Benefits

The back-up generator will protect the plants from a catastrophic freeze should the power fail in the winter. Accessibility to the Fern Room was improved with the creation of an ADA-accessible path. Other planned improvements will ensure the environmental and structural integrity of the building, and improve staff/volunteer workspaces and efficiency.

OP Conservatory	S	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	CIP Total
Site Master Plan					15,000						-
Master Plan Improvements								100,000			100,000
Lead Abatement Cactus House			122,848	17,152							-
Lead Abatement Tropical House								250,000			250,000
Lead Abatement West Growing						300,000					300,000
Lead Abatement East Growing				249,185	65,815						-
Install a bi-fuel back-up generator					-						-

Randolph Tot Lot

0.16 acres at Randolph & Grove

History

The parcel occupied by Randolph Tot Lot and the adjacent open parcel to the east at Randolph and Oak Park Avenue were acquired by Village of Oak Park in 1924 and conveyed to the Park District by quit-claim deed in 2006. This land and other similar strips along Randolph were set aside for rail stations along the “Dummy line railroad” into Chicago that was never developed. It is a small neighborhood playground for children under 8 years old with play equipment, a sand feature, berm, and water fountain.



Past Improvements

The playground equipment was last replaced in 1991. No major improvements other than sign replacement have been made in recent years.

Future Improvements

A site master plan for Randolph Tot Lot is scheduled for 2009, with \$200,000 allocated for master plan improvements in 2010. Identifiable needs include replacement of play equipment, benches, and trash receptacles. There may also be an opportunity to link the Tot Lot to the adjacent District-owned parcel east of the playground.

Estimated Operating Costs

There are no anticipated changes to operating costs at this time.

Benefits

Improvements to Randolph Tot Lot will improve the play experience, comfort of users, and aesthetic value of the park.

Randolph Tot Lot	S	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	CIP Total
Site Master Plan						20,000					20,000
Master Plan Improvements							200,000				200,000

Rehm Park and Pool

6.51 acres at Garfield & East

History

Acquired in 1913, Rehm Park was originally called “South Park” but was subsequently renamed after Colonel Arthur D. Rehm, a member of the Park District’s first Board of Commissioners and its second Board President. The original park was designed by Jens Jensen, although little of Jensen’s design remains. The play train has been at Rehm playground since at least 1960. An outdoor pool was constructed in 1966 and quickly became a regional destination. While remediation was taking place at Barrie Park in 2001, Rehm hosted the “Temporary Barrie Center” double-wide trailer north of the diving well. Current features include a playground, tennis courts, a multi-purpose field, parking lot, and pool



Past Improvements

Playground equipment was replaced in 2002; as part of the Barrie remediation agreement with ComEd. Pool repairs undertaken in 1996 included renovation of all decks and piping, creation of a zero-edge entry, addition of a wading pool and sand play, and improvements to concessions. Additional pool repairs in 1999-2000 included replacement of the sand filter equipment and lockers. Minor gutter repair was undertaken in 2006.

Future Improvements

A site master plan for Rehm Park will be completed in 2008. The circular stairs to the platform diving boards will be replaced in 2009. The pool filter system is scheduled for replacement in 2009 at a cost of \$250,000. Master plan improvements are anticipated to begin in 2010. Replacement of the entire pool and bath house is planned to be started in 2016.

Estimated Operating Costs

Upgrading the pool filters to more efficient models would produce small savings in utility and staff costs.

Benefits

Capital improvements to Rehm Park and Pool will improve the comfort and safety of patrons, streamline staff coverage, and improve the aesthetic value of the park. Replacing the pool filter will improve the water clarity in the pools.

Rehm Park	S	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	CIP Total
Site Master Plan					33,100						-
Master Plan Improvements							265,000	150,000			415,000
Facility Repairs					15,000						-
Return Gutters			13,877								-
Platform Tower Stair Replacement (EST)						40,000					40,000
Replace existing door hardware & locks					10,000						-
Pool and Bath House Reserve (2016 Replacement)									250,000	250,000	500,000
Replace Filter System						250,000					250,000

Ridgeland Common, Pool, and Hruby Ice Arena

6.06 acres at Ridgeland & Lake

History

Acquired in 1912 from Charles B. Scoville, the site was known as the “Old Cricket Grounds”. In 1914, the site was doubled with the acquisition of a former public service company storage yard to the west between Elmwood and Scoville. Ridgeland Common was named for the adjacent street and was designed by Jens Jensen, although little of Jensen’s design remains. In 1923, toboggan slides and a skating pond were built. In 1929, a memorial to the Spanish American War was erected at the behest of veterans and in 1936 comfort stations were built. The pool, building, and outdoor ice rink were constructed in 1962, with the pool soon used as a cooling tower for the ice rink making these two features necessarily operate in opposite seasons. A roof was built over the ice rink in 1965, and the District’s first lighted baseball fields were installed to the west of the rink. Two basketball courts, a handball court, and sled hill were also built along the railroad tracks at this time. In 1982, the rink was fully enclosed and heated, the front entrance was moved to its current location, and the pool filters were replaced. In 1985 the original ice refrigeration system was replaced. Major pool renovations were completed in 1996, including deck and pipe replacement, zero edge entry to the wading pool, and spray feature addition. During construction, an evaporative condenser was used for one ice rink season and still remains on the upper deck. In 2000, ADA accessible bathrooms were built, office spaces were reconfigured, and hockey locker rooms were added to reduce wear and tear on the other locker rooms. The main pool pump was replaced in 2002 and the motor was rebuilt. In 2007 the ice arena was renamed after Paul Hruby, long-time hockey coach and mentor to many Oak Park skaters. The multi-purpose Comstock Room is named after Fred L. Comstock, a Park Commissioner in the 1930s. Ridgeland Common is the Park District’s flagship facility, and its athletic fields are irrigated.



Past Improvements

In 2006, a temporary dog park was created beside the train tracks adjacent to the sled hill, and the parking lot and staging area west of Hruby Ice Arena were resurfaced. In 2007, improvements to the flooring, air conditioning, storage, and paint in the Comstock Room were completed. The indoor soccer artificial turf used on the rink in the summer was also replaced in 2007. In 2007, an Existing Conditions Study was completed, including a comprehensive physical evaluation of the site and analysis of all mechanical, structural, architectural, and civil/yard piping systems. The Study concluded that Ridgeland Common is physically and functionally obsolete, requiring extensive renovation within 5 years that would cost over \$9 million, and no longer meets the community’s modern space programming needs. In late 2007, several of the ice rink’s 242 cooling pipes failed and were repaired at a cost of nearly \$70,000, delaying the opening of the rink. Imminent failure of more rink and pool components is expected, and \$100,000 is allocated in 2008 for their repair or replacement.

Ridgeland Common, Pool, and Hruby Ice Arena - Continued

6.06 acres at Ridgeland & Lake

Future Improvements

A site master plan for Ridgeland Common completed in 2008 established consensus on some of the features that will be included in the redesigned Ridgeland Common Park such as moving the building to the west side of the park and including a permanent dog park. The plan also left the District with many unanswered questions due to the projected cost of renovation. The lowest projected cost was \$38 million, which is not obtainable without a voter supported referendum. In this CIP, the District has allocated \$10.5 million in non-referendum funds for the improvements at Ridgeland Common. Additional work is needed to develop a more specific plan that will allow the District to more accurately predict the final cost to renovate the site. Whatever the final outcome partnership with the Village of Oak Park, High School District 200, and interested users such as Fenwick High School, TOPS and Millennium swim teams, OPRF Huskies Hockey Club, Dominican University, and Concordia University and the Residents of Oak Park will be vital for the success of the project.

Estimated Operating Costs

Any improvements to Ridgeland Common will substantially reduce operating costs because the aged facility is expensive to maintain. Reconfiguring certain spaces could also save staffing costs by allowing one staff person to perform multiple functions.

Benefits

Capital improvements to Ridgeland Common will greatly improve the comfort and safety of patrons, streamline staff coverage, and improve the aesthetic value of the facility. Major renovation or replacement will significantly impact the number and type of recreation opportunities the Park District can offer to Oak Park residents.

Ridgeland Common	C	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	CIP Total
Site Master Plan / Feasibility Study					123,000						-
Existing Conditions Report				48,079							-
Master Plan Improvements							500,000	4,000,000	6,000,000		10,500,000
Facility Repairs			13,124	47,164	100,000						-
Parking Lot Repair			153,380								-
Astroturf Replacement				62,900	37,100						-
Replace all Door hardware and Locks					10,000						-
Fence Replacement					35,000						-

Scoville Park

3.98 acres at Oak Park & Lake

History

Acquired in 1913, Scoville Park was named after Charles B. Scoville, the previous owner of the land and an advocate for the creation of the Park District. It was the first park built after the creation of the Park District in 1912, and served as a village green, with the installation of a “Liberty” flag pole in 1915, a World War I monument dedicated by the Vice President of the United States in 1925, and bronze marker noting the location of the home of Joseph Kettlestrings, the first white settler in Oak Park in 1927. Scoville Park was originally designed by Jens Jensen and is one of the parks that retains the most of Jensen’s design. The southeast corner features a replica of a fountain originally designed by sculptor Richard Bock and architect Frank Lloyd Wright. The play equipment was last replaced in 1991. In partnership with the Village of Oak Park and the Library, Grove Avenue was vacated in 2001 and a new plaza was constructed adjacent to the park. Scoville Park was added to the National Register of Historic Places in 2002. Current features include a playground, three tennis courts, and an open space used for summer concerts and events.



Past Improvements

A bust of Percy Julian, a world-renowned chemist, humanitarian, and Oak Park resident, was installed in 2003 to celebrate his life and contributions. The tennis courts were last resurfaced in 2005, and new benches were installed in 2007.

Future Improvements

The war memorial is scheduled to be restored in 2008 at an expected cost of \$150,000. A site master plan for Scoville Park will be undertaken in 2010. Identifiable needs include renovating the southeastern entry plaza, improving the planters, evaluating the possibility of a permanent stage, and replacing the playground equipment.

Estimated Operating Costs

There are no anticipated changes to operating costs at this time.

Benefits

Capital improvements to Scoville Park will improve the play experience, aesthetic value of the park and the comfort and safety of patrons. Repairs to the monument will preserve its structural integrity for years to come.

Scoville Park	C	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	CIP Total
Site Master Plan							30,000				30,000
Master Plan Improvements OSLAD app									600,000		600,000
Benches				10,000							-
Comfort Station Renewal						13,000					13,000
Monument Improvements						150,000					150,000
Playground Replacement									125,000		125,000

Stevenson Park and Center, 49 Lake

3.30 acres at Ridgeland & Humphrey

History

Stevenson Park was acquired by the Village of Oak Park in 1916 and named after the author Robert Louis Stevenson. The Park District entered into a 99-year lease agreement with the Village in 2006 because the park contains two underground water reservoirs. The center was built in 1965. The second water reservoir was installed in the eastern part of the park in 2002. Other current features include a baseball diamond and multi-purpose field.



Past Improvements

The play centers were relocated and renovated, and fencing, lighting, and landscaping were renovated in 2003. A skate park and three half basketball courts, were built on top of the new reservoir in 2004. Improvements to the ballfield were made in 2007 and include improved drainage and new walkways leading to the field for improved ADA accessibility. Stevenson Center was renovated in 2007 to replace electrical and plumbing systems, replace restroom fixtures, replace lower level windows, provide functional and secure staff office areas and improve the overall condition of this recreation center. A teen center, opened in the lower level of the center in early 2008, and \$25,000 was allocated for equipment startup costs.

Future Improvements

In 2008 the District applied for a CDBG 50% matching grant to install an elevator to provide access to the upper level room in the center. The boiler is also scheduled to be replaced in 2008.

Estimated Operating Costs

The new boiler is expected to pay for itself in utility savings within 4-5 years. Heating costs are expected to see medium declines due to better heat distribution achieved with the new control mechanisms and energy efficient windows on the lower level.

Benefits

Recent improvements have improved security, improved energy efficiency, made interior spaces for comfortable for users and staff, and created a more customer-friendly environment. Two full-time program supervisors are now located at this facility as part of the District’s effort to enhance program offerings and improve customer service. The new teen center provides a safe, supervised place for Oak Park teenagers to gather for programming and drop-in times.

Stevenson	C	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	CIP Total
Center improvements			30,267	342,606							-
Field Improvements			-	222,078	23,122						-
ASA Improvements			1,675	5,500	16,825						-
Replace existing benches					10,000						-
Teen Center					25,000						-
CDBG Elevator Project						552,000					552,000
Replace water fountain on Water Dept						5,000					5,000
Replace Lighting in Main room			4,016								-
Replace boiler					-						-

Taylor Park

11.75 acres at Ridgeland & Division

History

Acquired in 1914, Taylor Park was originally called “North Park” but was subsequently named after the first President of the Park Board of Commissioners, Henry A. Taylor. Taylor Park was designed by Jens Jensen and still retains much of Jensen’s original design. The park sits on the edge of a moraine from the remains of what was once Lake Chicago. The park currently features six lighted tennis courts, a heavily-used soccer field, playground, comfort station, and is the only park site where group picnics and grilling is permitted. Taylor Park was identified as a potential site for a dog park during the 2006 Dog Park Site Master Plan process. Taylor Park is irrigated.



Past Improvements

The comfort station windows were replaced in 2007.

Future Improvements

The site master plan process will be completed in late summer, 2008. Construction of site master plan improvements is scheduled to begin in 2010, and the District will seek an OSLAD grant for this park.

Estimated Operating Costs

There are no anticipated changes to operating costs at this time.

Benefits

Capital improvements to Taylor Park are expected to improve the usability of the active areas, enhance the aesthetic value of the park, and improve drainage.

Taylor Park	N	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	CIP Total
Site Master Plan				7,900	37,100						-
Comfort Station Renewal			3,101	11,209							-
Master Plan Improvements OSLAD app							650,000				650,000
0							-				-

Wenonah Tot Lot

0.12 acres at Harrison & Wenonah

History

This playground was acquired in 1962 and is named for the adjacent street. It is a small neighborhood playground for children under 8 years old with play equipment, a sand feature, and water fountain.

Past Improvements

The playground equipment was last replaced in 1991. No major improvements other than sign replacement have been made in recent years.

Future Improvements

Planning for Wenonah Tot Lot is scheduled for 2009 and will be done in conjunction with the Randolph Tot Lot Site Plan. In 2010, \$200,000 allocated for construction of master plan improvements. Identifiable needs include replacement of play equipment, benches, and trash receptacles.



Estimated Operating Costs

There are no anticipated changes to operating costs at this time.

Benefits

Improvements to Wenonah Tot Lot will improve the play experience, comfort of users, and aesthetic value of the park.

Wenonah Tot Lot	S	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	CIP Total	Total
Site Master Plan										-	-
Master Plan Improvements							200,000			200,000	200,000
							200,000			200,000	200,000

Non Site-Specific Improvements and LeMoyne Parkway

In 2006, the Park District transferred ownership of LeMoyne Parkway to the Village of Oak Park as part of the transfer agreement (see page 14). In 2007, the District spent \$20,000 on improvements to the timber landscaping and earth form that were needed at the time of the transfer. The District has no further capital improvement obligations for any lands transferred to the Village, which included Randolph and Kenilworth parkways.

The Park District also plans for a number of non site-specific capital expenditures. Between 2008 and 2012, \$95,000 will be allocated for urban forestry management per the District's Tree Policy codified in 2008. District vehicles are replaced according to the schedule included in [Appendix E](#). The schedule reflects the useful life of each vehicle and a replacement plan that designed to minimize excessive maintenance costs by replacing vehicles in a timely manner.

In 2008, the \$65,807 in debt service is for the 2007 Cheney Mansion debt certificate. Debt service payments of \$3.0 Million are projected from 2009- 2013. A projected debt service schedule is included in the CIP in [Appendix G](#).

In 2006, \$36,000 was spent on site surveys of ten Park District sites in anticipation of the site master planning processes. Eighteen thousand dollars is allocated for a Community Wide Survey in 2008 that would assess residents' current Park District programming needs and desires.

The Dog Park Master Plan was completed along with the construction of a temporary dog park at Ridgeland Common in 2006 in response to enforcement of strict off-leash regulations by the Cook County Department of Animal Control

Several thousand dollars are allocated each year between 2009-2013 to replace trash receptacles throughout the District, and in 2008 a comprehensive sign replacement program was completed to replace badly worn and deteriorated signage. In 2006, nearly \$20,000 was spent to replace old tables and chairs at the centers.

Significant investments in technology upgrades began in 2006 and will continue every year to bring the District up to the contemporary standards of efficient business practices and customer service. These include computer hardware and software upgrades that streamline staff workflow, improve bookkeeping, and enhance customer service. In 2006, \$88,583 was spent to purchase two servers and financial software as well as recreation programming and registration software. In 2011, the District plans to again upgrade servers and software, as the expected useful life of these items is approximately five years.

In response to the community attitude and interest survey (see page 12), the District has also allocated funds for land acquisition, in 2007 the District made a down payment of \$76,380 for the first of two properties which are adjacent to Carroll Park. An additional \$683,296 was used in 2008 to complete the purchases. The homeowners of each property individually approached the District in 2007 and worked with the Trust for Public Lands to allow the District time to apply for an OSLAD grant and help offset the purchase price.

Non-Site Specific	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	CIP Total
Urban Forestry Management				25,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	225,000
Vehicle & Equip Replacement		40,674	52,741	130,274	132,062	110,894	142,388	144,000	125,800	655,144
Debt Service			32,215	65,807	262,648	465,148	468,350	772,375	987,249	2,955,770
Site Surveys		36,000								-
Community Wide Survey				18,000					40,000	40,000
Dog Park MASTER PLAN		16,123								-
Dog Park Improvements		12,953			-					-
LeMoyne Parkway Contribution to VOP			20,000							-
Trash Receptacles				20,000	30,000	15,000	7,500	7,500	7,500	67,500
Site Signage Program		31,270	29,852	16,879		5,000	5,000			10,000
Replace Tables and Chairs at Centers		19,894								-
Technology Improvements		88,583	23,815	20,000	20,500	30,000	70,000	10,000	20,000	150,500
Building Repair						-	100,000	100,000	100,000	300,000
Center Window Replacement					20,000		100,000			120,000
Budgeted During Annual Budget Process							125,000	125,000	125,000	375,000
Reserved for Property Acquisition			76,380	683,296				100,000	100,000	200,000

APPENDICES

Appendix A: 2002 Infrastructure Committee Report Executive Summary

SUMMARY

In September 2001, the Board of Park Commissioners created the Parks Infrastructure Committee to inventory and assess the condition of the park infrastructure and make recommendations on immediate and long-range capital planning. This report is the work of a volunteer citizens committee that has a wide background of skills, but shares a common interest in making park facilities better. We prepared this proposed Capital Improvement Program, a Supplementary Report with Needs Assessment Forms, and a compact disk with about 200 photographs of Park District facilities and grounds.

INVENTORY

The Park District operates 26 facilities that occupy 83.4 acres in the Village. There are:

- 7 Community Centers owned by the Village of Oak Park, but operated and maintained by the Park District
- 3 parkways (Kenilworth, LeMoyne, and Randolph)
- 2 tot lots (Randolph and Wenonah)
- 8 special facilities (Austin Gardens, Cheney Mansion, Conservatory, Hedges Administrative Center, Pleasant Home, Rehm Pool, Ridgeland Common, and Scoville Park)
- Neighborhood parks
- 46 pieces of equipment in the vehicle fleet
- 33 computers with related equipment

PRIORITIES

We established three priorities for the Needs Assessment: (1) Life Safety, (2) Regulatory Compliance, and (3) Facility Renewal. The needs are extensive and the Park District does not have the financial resources to meet all the needs.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP)

The recommended 10-year Capital Improvement Program is estimated to cost about \$13.6 million in 2002 dollars.

There are seven ways to finance the necessary improvements:

1. Implement a Capital Improvement Program surcharge on all program fees. A 10 percent surcharge will raise about \$200,000 each year and a 5 percent surcharge will raise about \$100,000 per year. We recommend this approach to help pay for a Comprehensive Plan and some of the Site Master Plans.
2. Issue non-referendum debt service deferred bonds to be paid from the debt service limit tax levy beginning in 2008.
3. Refinance existing debt to take advantage of lower interest rates.

4. Hold a referendum to increase the corporate tax levy rate of \$0.25 with the public understanding that a portion of the tax levy be dedicated for capital improvements and the remaining be used for daily operations. This is the best way to pay for major capital improvement projects. The next election is April 2003, but we do not believe that the Park District can be ready for a referendum in such a short period of time. The earliest election for a Park District referendum is 2004 in either the April or November election.
5. Hold a referendum to increase the debt service levy to pay for specific projects.
6. Seek federal and state grants to help pay for infrastructure improvements.
7. Create a Capital Contribution Campaign

PARK DISTRICT FINANCES

Park District finances are in poor shape. The fund balance is 10 percent when 25 percent is the goal. The fund balance percentage declined from 1996 to 2000 and had a small increase in 2001. The fund balance was 25 percent or more in just one of the last ten years. The Park District has three outstanding bonds that are not callable. The major revenue sources for the Park District are Charges for Services (35 percent), Taxes (30 percent), and the Village of Oak Park Transfer (22 percent). Salaries and wages plus fringe benefits account for almost half of all expenses. Comparisons of the Park District of Oak Park with other park districts in the region generally show Oak Park ranking near the low end.

MAJOR FINDINGS

Maintenance Findings

1. Deferred maintenance is a serious problem.
2. The Park District must spend significantly more on maintenance.
3. There is not enough maintenance storage space.

Administrative Findings

4. The relationship between the Park District and the Village of Oak Park is critical.
5. The relationship between the Park District and the two school districts is critical.
6. There is no Capital Improvement Program now other than what other entities (ComEd and Nicor for Barrie Park and the Village of Oak Park for Stevenson) are providing.
7. The computer systems are not providing good information to the Park District managers and Board.

Financial Findings

8. Fund balances are too low.
9. The Park District of Oak Park spends less per capita than many other park districts in the region.

MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

Planning Recommendations

1. Develop a Comprehensive Plan that includes a Vision Statement. The Neighborhood-Based Community Recreation Center Philosophy should be reexamined.
2. Adopt a Capital Improvement Program.
3. Prepare Site Master Plans for every facility to ensure that limited funds are spent wisely.
4. Organize an Oak Park dialogue on the future of the Community Centers.

Financial Recommendations

5. Raise an estimated \$13.6 million over a 10-year period to fix and maintain existing facilities and pay for the planning costs for a Comprehensive Plan and Site Master Plans.
6. Do not build or expand facilities unless there are funds to maintain them.
7. Develop Cost Recovery Policies and Financial Models.
8. Consider life cycle costs.
9. Prepare a Reserve Study.

Maintenance Recommendations

10. Develop replacement programs for benches, signs, vehicles, computer systems, and other technology.
11. Develop a tree inventory and pruning and replacement policies.
12. Develop scheduled and standardized maintenance programs.
13. Purchase replacement vehicles based on age, mileage (or hours), and vehicle maintenance costs.

Administrative Recommendations

14. Appoint a Parks Citizens Advisory Committee.
15. Encourage neighborhood adoption of parks and public gardening initiatives.
16. Look for joint development opportunities.
17. Upgrade Park District technology.

Design Recommendations

18. Good design makes a difference in the quality of life in the Village.
19. Preserve the Jens Jensen designs.
20. Prepare a Phasing Plan.
21. Look for opportunities to add open space.

CONCLUSION

We conclude that there is a compelling need to improve our park facilities. Unfortunately, the Park District does not have the financial resources at present to fix life safety items, let alone regulatory compliance and facility renewal items.

There is a great deal of work to be done. We are optimistic that we can improve our parks. If we build on the strengths of the Park District staff and use our community resources, we can do what needs to be done.

Appendix B: 2004 Park District Citizen Committee Memo to Village and Park District

Memo

To: Park District Village President and Board of Trustees, Village of Oak Park
President and Park Board Members, Park District of Oak Park

From: Park District Citizen Committee

Date: 11/4/2004

Re: Park District of Oak Park Comprehensive Master Plan

PURPOSE

To provide background information, a summary, and issues related to the Park District of Oak Park Comprehensive Plan.

BACKGROUND

- 1) **Parks Infrastructure Committee Report, November 2002.** The Board of Park Commissioners initiated the Parks Infrastructure Committee to inventory and assess the condition of the Park District's infrastructure and make recommendations on immediate and long-range capital planning. After 14 months of observation and analysis, the citizen commission, composed of volunteers from the local community, recommended a Capital Improvement Plan.
 - a) The Commission reached three major findings:
 - i) The lack of financial resources has created a serious deferred maintenance problem. Building systems are continuing to deteriorate, grounds are not properly maintained, vehicles are not being replaced, and computer systems are not upgraded to take advantage of new technology.
 - ii) Relationships between the Park District, Village, and school districts are critical.
 - iii) Existing financial resources are not nearly enough to pay for all the needed improvements. The Park District currently does not have the funds necessary to address life safety work items.
 - b) Four major recommendations were highlighted in the Commission's final report:
 - i) A major planning effort, to include a Comprehensive Plan, Site Master Plans, and a Capital Improvement Program needs to be made to ensure that limited financial resources are used effectively. As a community, some major decisions need to be made about the future of the Community Centers and large special facilities like Cheney Mansion and Pleasant Home.
 - ii) It is estimated that the 10-year capital improvement plan will cost over \$13 million. The Park District should prepare financial plans that include cost recovery policies, financial models, life cycle costs, and a reserve study.
 - iii) The Park District should appoint a Citizens Advisory Committee to develop a comprehensive plan for the Park District for the future.
 - iv) A focus on good design and preserving the Jens Jensen designs is essential to the quality of life in Oak Park.
- 2) **Comprehensive Plan Process.**
 - a) **Leisure Vision, Inc. was selected as the vendor to develop the Comprehensive Plan to the Park District and District of Oak Park on or about Leisure Vision's credentials included:**
 - b) **Project Scope.** Work projects for the Comprehensive Planning process included:
 - i) **Parks and Recreation Facilities Inventory.** A review of existing park sites for strengths, weaknesses and opportunities, a review and consideration of land resources, and an identification of possible future park redevelopment and land acquisition opportunities.
 - ii) **Community Needs Assessment Survey.** A Community Attitude and Interest Survey was developed by the Park District Citizens Commission in conjunction with Leisure Vision, and conducted during the months of January and February, 2004. The focus of the survey was to survey existing attitudes, utilization rates, perceived needs, and to establish priorities for the future development of parks and recreation facilities, programs and services within the community.
 - iii) **Benchmarking Comparison.** A Benchmarking Survey of comparable communities to compare Oak Park's operating revenues, numbers, sizes and types of parks and (was sent to 22 benchmark communities. Leisure Vision received responses from 13 communities. The range of questions included the number and types of parks and trails, number and types of indoor/outdoor facilities, partnerships, and operating and capital budgets.
 - iv) **Review of Neighborhood Based Community Centers.** A comprehensive review was conducted on the neighborhood-based community center model as related to effectiveness and efficiency of meeting community needs.
 - v) **Benchmarking Comparison of Similar Communities (Governance).** An identification of governance structures and best practices for similar communities was developed.
- 3) **Park District Citizen (PDCC) Committee.**
 - a) **September 9, 2003 Park District Citizen Committee (PDCC) Orientation Meeting.** The responsibilities of the PDCC were identified as: attendance at public forums and the Strategic Directions Workshop, providing input into the development of the Community Survey, assisting staff in identifying benchmark organizations for operational and governance purposes, providing input into development of benchmarking survey, reviewing draft report with staff and consultants, attending public meetings to present draft report, attending the Consensus Workshop, and assisting with the development of a Unifying Vision.
 - b) **Initial Information Gathering.**

- i) **Leisure Vision Information Gathering Visit, September 9-11.** Leisure Vision interviewed community and business leaders, held focus groups made of special interest and user groups, and community public forums.
 - ii) **Strategic Directions Workshop, October 9, 2003.** The working meeting highlighted the public input sessions and affirmed key issues to be addressed in the Comprehensive Plan. The meeting included the Park District of Oak Park Board of Park Commissioners, the Village of Oak Park Board of Trustees, and the Park District Citizen Committee. Key issues that were identified included: funding, governance, historic properties, maintenance of facilities, neighborhood centers, partnerships, service needs and priorities, and the need for a unified approach/intent.
 - iii) **Park Tour, October 22, 2003.** A tour of the park facilities was conducted for the members of the Park District Citizen Committee.
- c) **Park District Citizen Committee.**
- i) **Benchmarking.**
 - (1) **Process.** The role of the Subcommittee was to assist Leisure Vision in developing a list of benchmark communities as part of the Comprehensive Plan. The Subcommittee included Gail Moran, Jessica Bullock, Doug Varn, and Gary Balling. Rick Kuner served as a technical advisor. Originally, 67 potential benchmark communities were identified. The Benchmarking Subcommittee developed a list of criteria to evaluate the communities. The first criterion established was that the communities be located in the Midwest. The Subcommittee decided on five variables to use in the benchmark comparison. These variables included: population, percent renters, percent non-white, median household income, and miles to the nearest large city. All data came from the U.S. Census for 2000, with the exception of miles to the nearest large city which was compiled by Gail Moran. The standard deviation and range for each variable was compiled. The communities were then sorted by each variable. A list including the number of times that a community appeared more than ten away from Oak Park (either higher or lower) was then developed. Communities that appeared three or more times on the list were deleted. The final list included the following 17 communities: Berwyn, IL; Cleveland Heights, OH; Evanston, IL; Shaker Heights, IL; Skokie, IL, Brooklyn Park, MN; Cicero, IL; Des Plaines, IL; Forest Park, IL; Hoffman Estates, IL; Kettering, OH; Mt. Prospect, IL; Palatine, IL; Royal Oak, MI; University City, MO; Wauwatosa, WI; and Westmont, IL. Leisure Vision added five additional communities to the Benchmarking Subcommittee's list. These communities were added because of Leisure Vision's experience with these communities. A Benchmarking Survey, five pages in length and containing 21 questions, was then sent out to the 22 communities. Leisure Vision received responses from 13 communities. The range of questions included the number and types of parks and trails, number and types of indoor/outdoor facilities, partnerships, and operating and capital budgets.
 - (2) **Results.** Approximately 67% of the benchmark communities have long-range capital improvement plans. The average length of the program was 5 years. The average annual spending on capital was \$1,390,000. The Park District of Oak Park currently does not have a long-range capital improvement plan. Oak Park ranks 8th out of the 13 park systems in operating budget. In other words, Oak Park is at the lower end of the benchmarking communities in terms of its operating budget. Oak Park ranks 9th out of 11 systems in tax revenues. In other words, Oak Park is close to the bottom of the benchmarking communities in terms of its revenues. Oak Park has more community centers than the average benchmark community. However, the benchmark communities have more community/specialty centers. In addition, Oak Park's community centers/field houses are smaller and have less program space than the benchmark communities. Oak Park has smaller parks and less acreage than the benchmark communities. The average community had 7.5 acres per 1,000 population. Oak Park has 2.92 acres per 1,000 population. There were also significantly fewer miles of trails in Oak Park, as compared to the benchmark communities. The Benchmark findings validate the need for a capital improvement plan. The survey also highlights the need to increase the operating budget and revenue sources for the Park District of Oak Park. The number/size of indoor and outdoor facilities should also be taken into account when developing a proposed action plan for the Park District.
 - ii) **Indoor Spaces.**
 - iii) **Governance.**

DISCUSSION

- 1) **Governance & Best Practices.** The Park District Citizen Committee has concluded that the existing arrangement by which the Park District of Oak Park and the Village of Oak Park have shared roles in the management of the neighborhood community centers and the programs associated with each, is inefficient and can lead to conflicting policies and positions. Likewise, the PDCC concluded that the needs of the Oak Park community can best be met through a governance structure that aligns in a single organization the community-wide parks and recreation mission with all of the responsibilities, resources, and accountability. It is the strong sense of the Park District Citizen Committee that the Park District model could do it best. Active citizen involvement is one of the defining characteristics of Oak Park and access to decision-makers is highly valued and expected. Under the Park District model, the Board of Park Commissioners is directly accountable to the citizens and has a single focus: parks and recreation. This singular focus ensures that parks and recreation issues will always be the first priority. This further encourages citizen involvement and leadership, since there is direct access to decision-makers. While consolidation as a department of the Village could work, it necessarily involves additional organizational layers between citizens and decision-makers, and the competing priorities of other Village functions.
- 2) **Capital Plan.**
 - a) **Need for a Plan.** Approximately 67% of the benchmark communities have long-range capital improvement plans. The average length of the program is 5 years. The average annual spending on capital is \$1,390,000. The Park District of Oak Park currently does not have a long-range capital improvement plan. The Benchmark findings validate the need for a capital improvement plan. The Benchmarking Survey also highlights the need to increase the operating budget and revenue

sources for the Park District of Oak Park. The number/size of indoor and outdoor facilities should also be taken into account when developing a proposed action plan for the Park District.

b) Interior Space Needs Identified.

i) **Community/Specialty Centers.** Oak Park has more community centers than the average benchmark community. However, the benchmark communities have more community/specialty centers. In addition, Oak Park's community centers/field houses are smaller and have less program space than the benchmark communities. Approximately 41% of the Community Survey respondents indicated that they did not use the neighborhood centers. In addition, 36% only used them for the restrooms/drinking fountains. Forty-eight percent of Community Survey respondents indicated being either very supportive or somewhat supportive of converting some of the seven neighborhood centers into specialty centers. Forty-two percent of respondents indicated being either very supportive or somewhat supportive of cutting back on operating hours at the centers.

ii) **Potential Improvements to Indoor Spaces.**

(1) **Existing Indoor Spaces.**

(a) **Aerobics/Fitness Spaces.** Indoor exercise and fitness facilities were identified as a need by 54% of the Community Survey respondents. The highest percentage of respondent households, at 48%, indicated that it would use expanded aerobic/fitness space.

(b) **Ridgeland Commons.** One of the highest very supportive ratings for investing tax dollars for improvements in the Community Survey was \$800,000 to improve Ridgeland Commons (42%). The Indoor Spaces Subcommittee conducted an evaluation of Ridgeland Common, in conjunction with Leisure Vision/Ballard*King. The Subcommittee's perspective is that Ridgeland Common is in need of major repairs.

(2) **New Indoor Spaces.** An indoor running/walking track (54%) is the potential indoor programming space that the highest percentage of respondent households would use if developed.

c) Outdoor Spaces/Standards.

i) **Overall Park Acreage/Identified Needs.** Oak Park has smaller parks and less acreage than the benchmark communities. The average community had 7.5 acres per 1,000 population. Oak Park has 2.92 acres per 1,000 population. The need for small neighborhood parks received the highest level of response at 75% of Community Survey respondents. Respondents also indicated that they would allocate \$29 out of every \$100 to the improvements/maintenance of existing parks, playgrounds, and outdoor swimming pools.

ii) **Trails.** There were significantly fewer miles of trails in Oak Park, as compared to the benchmark communities. In addition, paving walking/biking trails were identified as some of the highest ranking facilities by need, at 62% of Community Survey respondents.

iii) **Improvements to Pools.** Outdoor swimming pools/water parks were identified as a need by 61% of Community Survey respondents. One of the specific improvements that received the highest very supportive ratings for investing tax dollars was \$225,000 to improve Rehm Pool (41%).

3) Financial Comparison (per 1,000 population).

a) **Operating Budget.** Oak Park ranks 8th out of the 13 benchmark communities in operating budget.

b) **Revenues.** Oak Park ranks 9th out of 11 of the benchmark park systems in tax revenues.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) **Establish a Park District Model of Governance.** It is the recommendation of the Park District Citizen Committee that the Park District of Oak Park and the Village of Oak Park, independent of any other recommendations in, or actions resulting from the Comprehensive Master Plan, begin immediately to implement the consolidation of all parks and recreation policies, programs, assets, funding, and responsibilities under the Park District of Oak Park. Implementing this governance structure with a sense of urgency is the most effective way to address the historical deficiencies in the parks and recreation delivery model and position the Oak Park community to expeditiously meet current and future needs. A governance structure that aligns in a single organization the community-wide parks and recreation mission with all of the responsibilities, resources, and accountability. It is the strong sense of the Park District Citizen Committee that the Park District model is the best option.
- 2) **Transfer Ownership of the Community Centers with Associated Funding.** This would involve, among other actions, the transfer of ownership of the neighborhood community centers (Andersen, Barrie, Carroll, Field, Fox, Longfellow, Stevenson, and Dole) with the associated funding from the Village to the Park District. This should be done in such a way as to make the Park District financially whole, relative to the neighborhood community centers, and have a zero-net-sum impact on the collective tax burden of the community. This should also include transfer of the parkways from the Park District to the Village under the same terms and conditions.
- 3) **Establish Sustainable Funding Mechanisms.** Recognizing the previously identified historical funding deficit under which the Park District operates, it is also the recommendation of the Park District Citizen Committee that the Board of Park Commissioners begin immediately, independent of any other recommendations in, or actions resulting from the Comprehensive Master Plan, to assess and pursue any and all appropriate funding mechanisms in support of the "sustainability" standard identified in the "best practices" evaluation.
- 4) **Strengthen Partnerships.** An equally important element in addressing sustainability for meeting current and future needs, and a "best practices" standard, is an emphasis on partnerships to create maximum community benefit from collective assets. Since it is in the best interest of the community, with potentially the least impact on the taxpayers, the Park District Citizen Committee strongly encourages the Park District to aggressively pursue partnerships with other community organizations (the Village of Oak Park, District #97, District #200, the Township of Oak Park, the Oak Park Library, the YMCA, etc.) in providing facilities and programs.

Appendix C: Leisure Vision 2004 Community Survey Executive Summary

STRATEGIC WORK PRODUCT #1: MASTER PLAN WORKSHOP KEY ISSUES

To understand issues of strategic importance to the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, between September 9 and September 11, members of the Leisure Vision Consulting Team conducted 33 separate stakeholder interviews and 6 focus groups involving elected and appointed leaders with the Village of Oak Park, Park District of Oak Park, business and non-profit sector leaders, and representatives of the Park District Citizen Committee.

On October 9, 2003 a Parks and Recreation Master Plan Workshop was held with elected and administrative officials with the Village of Oak Park, the Park District of Oak Park, and members of the Park District Citizen Committee to 1) discuss what was heard in the stakeholder interviews and focus groups and 2) agree on key issues impacting the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

Each participant at the Workshop was provided a listing of nine (9) potential key issues impacting the Parks and Recreation Master Plan. Each participant was asked to place a #1 next to the issue they felt was the most important, a #2 next to the issue they felt was second most important, and a #3 next to the issue they felt was third most important.

As a result of that Master Planning Workshop, the following were identified as the Key Issues impacting the Parks and Recreation Master Plan and drivers of the process.

1. Funding Improvements to the Parks and Recreation System – developing a sustainable funding plan for the parks and recreation system was a major theme mentioned in many stakeholder and focus group meetings and was clearly the key issue for participants at the Workshop.
2. Understanding Community Needs, Priorities and Financial Support for Parks and Recreation Facilities, and Services – building a system around a clear understanding of community priorities for outdoor and indoor facilities and services was the 2nd highest ranked key issue by participants at the Workshop as well as support for tax and non-tax funding sources.
3. Governance for the Parks and Recreation System – developing a new model or improving on the current model for governing the park system was another issue that was mentioned in many stakeholder and focus group meetings. Many participants did not feel that the current model was working. This was the clear #3 highest ranked key issue for participants at the Workshop.
4. Unified Intent – To create Oak Park's most prosperous future, the Village should become a model for cooperation among government providers, thinking first and foremost what is in the best interest of the Oak Park community. This was the #4 highest ranked key issue for participants at the Workshop.

STRATEGIC WORK PRODUCT #2: COMMUNITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY

The Village of Oak Park and the Park District of Oak Park conducted a Community Attitude and Interest Survey during January and February of 2004 to help establish priorities for the future development of parks and recreation facilities, programs and services within the community. The survey was designed to obtain statistically valid results from households throughout the Park District of Oak Park. The survey was administered by a combination of mail and phone.

The goal was to obtain at least 800 completed surveys. This goal was accomplished, with 824 surveys being completed. The results of the random sample of 824 households have a 95% level of confidence with a precision of at least +/-3.4%.

The following are major findings from the needs assessment survey:

- **Parks in Oak Park are highly used.** Eighty-three percent (83%) of respondent households have visited Park District of Oak Park parks during the past year. This percentage usage is higher than the average of park systems across the country and in Illinois.
- **Less than 25% of visitors to parks rate physical conditions as excellent.** Twenty-four percent (24%) of respondent households rated the physical condition of all the Park District of Oak Park parks they have visited as excellent (24%) and an additional (53%) rated the physical condition as good. The ratings of excellent are lower than the average ratings from park systems across the country and in Illinois.
- **Small neighborhood parks, paved walking and biking trails, and outdoor swimming pools are the most important recreational facilities to respondents based on a sum of their top 4 choices.** Twenty-nine (29) parks and recreational facilities were evaluated as to their importance to community residents.

Other facilities in the top 7 included: playgrounds, natural areas/nature trails, indoor exercise and fitness facilities, and the Oak Park Conservatory. This listing contains facilities that are currently in the park system and some facilities that are either not currently in the park system or are currently in a limited supply.

- **Nearly 50% of respondent households have participated in Park District programs.** Forty-five percent (45%) of respondent households have participated in Park District of Oak Park programs during the past year. This percentage usage is higher than the average of park systems across the country and in Illinois. It is, however, lower than other top Park systems in Illinois including Elk Grove, Deerfield and others.
- **The Park District of Oak Park (59%) is by a wide margin the organization used by the highest percentage of respondent households.** There are three other organizations used by over 20% of respondent households, including: Cook County Forest Preserves (24%); private clubs (24%); and churches/synagogues/mosques (22%).
- **\$800,000 to improve Ridgeland Common (48%) is the improvement that the highest percentage of respondents selected as one of the four they are most willing to fund with their tax dollars.** \$225,000 to improve Rehm Pool (43%) is the other improvement that over 40% of respondents selected as one of the four they would be most willing to fund with their tax dollars. 38% of respondents selected \$500,000 to improve the Oak Park Conservatory as one of their top 4 selections.
- **Restrooms/drinking fountains (36%) is the activity for which the highest percentage of respondents use the seven neighborhood centers.** There are two other activities for which over 15% of respondents use the neighborhood centers, including: youth sports programs (23%); and classes (17%). It should also be noted that 41% of respondents indicated that their household does not use any of the seven neighborhood centers.

- **Aerobics/fitness spaces (48%) is the existing indoor programming space that the highest percentage of respondent households would use if expanded.** Thirty-one percent (31%) of respondent households indicated they would use an expanded indoor ice-rink.
- **An indoor running/walking track (54%) is the potential indoor programming space that the highest percentage of respondent households would use if developed.** There are two other potential indoor programming spaces that over 40% of respondent households would use if developed: warm water family aquatic center (45%); and weight room/cardiovascular equipment area (45%).
- **Forty-eight percent (48%) of respondents indicated being either very supportive (22%) or somewhat supportive (26%) of converting some of the seven neighborhood centers into specialty centers.** Fifteen percent (15%) of respondents are not supportive, and 33% are not sure. The remaining 4% did not provide a response.
- **Seventy percent (70%) of respondents indicated being either very supportive (44%) or somewhat supportive (26%) of the Village of Oak Park, the Park District of Oak Park, and the two local school districts continuing to partner in the acquisition of land and the development and operations of future parks, recreation, aquatics and sports facilities.**
- **Twenty-eight percent (28%) of respondents indicated they would pay at least \$20 per month in additional property taxes to fund the most important types of parks, recreation, and aquatic facilities to their household.** This group includes 16% who would pay \$20-\$29, 8% who would pay \$40, and 4% who would pay \$30-\$39. In addition, 22% would pay \$10-\$19, and 21% would pay \$1-\$9.
- **25% of respondents indicated they would vote in favor of a bond referendum to fund the types of parks, aquatic, historic, and recreation facilities most important to them and their household.** In addition, 24% of respondents indicated they might vote in favor. 18% of respondents indicated they would vote against the bond referendum, and the remaining 33% indicated they were not sure how they would vote.

STRATEGIC WORK PRODUCT #3: PARK DISTRICT FINANCING

Financial Sustainability was identified as the #1 Key Issue facing the Park System. As part of the Master Planning process, the Consultant Team conducted an extensive review of the Park District of Oak Park's financial records regarding operations, capital and debt financing. The Consultant Team is particularly appreciative of the efforts shown by Kent Newton, Supt of Business Operations for the Park District of Oak Park in providing these records.

The following are major findings:

- **The Park District of Oak Park has placed increased emphasis on financial record keeping.** The Consultant Team was impressed with the comprehensiveness of financial records being kept for the Park District. Park District administrative staff have a good understanding of the types of records which a Park system needs to maintain, and how to use the information. In some cases these records are still works in progress.
- **Over the past few years, the Park District has implemented a new Comprehensive Fee policy.** This policy provides clearer guidelines in determining pricing for programs and activities. Not having a fee policy hampered the Park District's ability to make informed decisions regarding programming costs, the portions of programming costs to be covered by fees, and what percent of

indirect charges (if any) should be covered through fees. Some additional work on the fee policy may be required to make it even more effective.

- **The Park District’s fund balances have decreased substantially over the past 10 years.** This finding was initially pointed out in the Infrastructure Committee’s report. The Year 2002 and Year 2003 fund balances for the Park District both for the Operating Fund and for Total Funds are the lowest in the past 10 years. The Year 2003 fund balances did show an increase over 2002 for both the Total Fund and Operating Fund.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Total Fund Balance</u>	<u>Operating Fund Total</u>
1994	\$1,432,038	\$820,730
1995	\$2,022,890	\$1,122,382
1996	\$3,588,607	\$1,724,685
1997	\$2,321,266	\$1,690,262
1998	\$3,552,079	\$1,081,952
1999	\$2,576,227	\$711,450
2000	\$1,235,054	\$609,803
2001	\$951,445	\$711,956
2002	\$571,989	\$503,139
2003	\$623,363	\$525,737

Source: Park District of Oak Park and Leisure Vision

- **Over the past 10 years the fund balance in Revenue Facilities has decreased over \$750,000.** Revenue Facilities is one of 10 Funds listed under “Operating Funds”. As indicated in the chart on the following page, in 1994 the Revenue Facilities Fund had a balance of -\$59,143. **In 2003 the Revenue Facilities Fund had a balance of -\$822,848.**

Collectively, the other 9 Funds listed under “Operating Funds” have shown an increase in their fund balances of over \$450,000 since 1994.

A principal reason for the reduced fund balance in Revenue Facilities is the 1996 Alternative Revenue Bond issue not meeting its revenue goals. This \$2 million bond issue was issued to fund improvements to Rehm Pool and additionally for improvements at the Ridgeland Commons Pool. The Bonds were issued based on a 3 to 2 vote of the Park Board. Bond costs were supposed to be paid through increases in pool revenues. However, pool revenues have not increased sufficiently to cover bond payments, necessitating paying parts of these bonds from other sources, including taxes.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Revenue Facilities</u>
1994	-\$59,143
1995	\$55,217
1996	\$43,059
1997	-\$28,327
1998	-\$53,472
1999	-\$237,447
2000	-\$349,615
2001	-\$459,885
2002	-\$657,832
2003	-\$822,848

Source: Park District of Oak Park

- **Over the past 10 years, funding for operations has increased at a consistent pace.** Expenditures for the operating budget have increased 46% comparing year 2003 to year 1992. Operating expenditures were \$1,984,286 higher in 2003 than in 1992. Of this total, payroll expenses were \$943,978 higher in 2003 than in 1992.

During this same period of time, debt expenses have remained fairly constant. Debt expenses were \$72,839 higher in 2003 than in 1992. Expenditures for Debt has increased 14% comparing year 2003 to year 1992.

During this same period of time, capital expenses increased rapidly until year 2000 and have declined even more rapidly since then. Capital expenses were \$49,495 lower in 2003 than in 1992. Expenditures for Capital expenses has decreased 34% comparing year 2003 to year 1992.

- **Over the past 10 years, revenues from Park District taxes and Park District fees and rental revenues, have increased at a faster pace than revenues from Village transfers.** From 1992 to 2003 revenues from taxes collected for the Park District have increased 65.53% and revenues from fees and rental revenues have increased 60.16%. During that same time revenues from Village Transfer have increased 25.95%. It should be noted that fees from Village Transfer are tied into a formula negotiated between the Park District and Village. The Park District has not requested an increase in that formula during this period.
- **The Park District’s deferred capital maintenance issues are a result of years of under-funding.** It is clear that the Park District has for at least the past 10 years severely under funded its capital maintenance needs. No comprehensive maintenance plan was ever developed until the work of the Infrastructure Committee. Projects were initiated, but they were done on an individual basis, with little regard to how the project fit into the overall priorities for the Park system.

Importantly, this under-funding of capital projects existed for both Park District owned and operated facilities and Village owned facilities that the Park District managed through the Inter-governmental agreement. As a condition of that agreement, the Park District has responsibility for maintaining the 7 community centers.

- **The Park District needs to reallocate its operating resources based on identified community needs.** The Park District is spending a disproportionate amount of its tax revenues and Village transfer revenues on the 7 community center operations. This does not allow sufficient revenues to be allocated to other operations and capital areas of high community importance. This is detailed further in the section “*Strategic Work Product #6: Governance*”, which begins on page 16 of this executive summary.

The chart below shows tax support for various major service areas in the Park District. Tax support for the community centers is derived from Park District taxes and revenues from the Village Transfer. The total tax support for the community centers is nearly \$500,000 more than for parks and sports programs combined. 30% of household respondents to the community survey rated small neighborhood parks as one of the 4 most important parks and recreation facilities to their households as compared to 9% for community centers. The amount of tax support for the community centers is more than is received for the Conservatory, Dole Center, swimming pools, Ridgeland Commons Ice Arena, the 2 historic properties, and the Gymnastics Center combined.

Park District of Oak Park

<u>MAJOR SERVICE AREA</u>	<u>Total Tax Support</u>	<u>Percent Tax Support of Service</u>	<u>Percent Relationship of Tax Support To Community Centers</u>
Community Centers	\$1,326,795	37.27%	
Parks (Open space and sports)	\$842,859	23.68%	64%
Conservatory	\$341,724	9.60%	26%
Dole Center	\$251,838	7.07%	19%
Swimming Pools	\$298,661	8.39%	23%
Ice/Arena	\$166,227	4.67%	13%
Historic Properties	\$117,030	3.29%	9%
Adult Recreation	\$95,665	2.69%	7%
Early Childhood and Summer Camps	\$63,411	1.78%	5%
Gymnastics Center	\$55,693	1.56%	4%
Total	\$3,559,903	100.00%	

Source: Park District of Oak Park and Leisure Vision

STRATEGIC WORK PRODUCT #4: BENCHMARKING STUDY OF COMPARABLE COMMUNITIES

Leisure Vision administered a comparative analysis Benchmarking Survey for the Village of Oak Park and the Park District of Oak Park to other park and recreation agencies as part of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

The purpose of the Benchmarking Survey was to better understand how the Park District of Oak Park compared to other park and recreation agencies for a wide range of issues impacting the Parks and Recreation Master Plan. Issues covered on the survey included: types, numbers, and acres of parks and open space available; types, numbers and miles of trails available; types and numbers of outdoor recreation facilities; types and numbers of indoor recreation facilities; revenues from taxes, fees and charges; staffing costs; cooperative use agreements; capital budgets, etc.

The Park District Citizen Committee coordinated the identification of communities to participate in the Benchmarking Survey. The initial universe of communities for participation in the Benchmarking Survey came from input received in the Stakeholder Interviews. Twenty-two (22) agencies received Benchmarking Surveys and thirteen (13) agencies returned their surveys. The contracted goal was to have at least 10 agencies participate in the survey.

The following are major findings:

■ **Parks and Open Space Areas**

The Park District of Oak Park has 27 park sites and 83.34 total acres of parkland, with the average park size being 3.09 acres. Nearly half of their park sites are neighborhood parks (12 parks), and over 75% of their acres of parkland are made up of community parks (38.69 acres) and neighborhood parks (28.96 acres). Oak Park has 1.59 acres of parkland @ 1,000 population.

The average benchmarked agency has 35.7 park sites and 398.25 total acres of parkland, with the average park size being 11.16 acres. Over half of their park sites are neighborhood parks (22 parks),

and approximately two-thirds of their acres of parkland are made up of neighborhood parks (134.99 acres) and community parks (127.96 acres). The average benchmarked agency has 7.27 acres of parkland @ 1,000 population.

■ **Outdoor Recreation Facilities**

The Park District of Oak Park has a total of 89 outdoor recreation facilities and 1.694 outdoor recreation facilities @ 1,000 population. Over half of their outdoor facilities are made up of tennis courts (27 facilities) and playgrounds (21 facilities).

The average benchmarked agency has a total of 125.5 facilities and 2.290 outdoor recreation facilities @ 1,000 population. The outdoor recreation facilities that the average benchmarked agency has the most of include: playgrounds (25.5 facilities), tennis courts (18.5 facilities), and park shelters/picnic areas (13 facilities).

■ **Indoor Recreation Facilities**

The Park District of Oak Park maintains a total of 13 indoor recreation facilities and .248 indoor recreation facilities @ 1,000 population, while the average benchmarked agency has a total of 10.1 indoor recreation facilities and .184 indoor recreation facilities @ 1,000 population. Oak Park has more horticultural centers, historic facilities/museums, ice-arenas, and gymnastics centers @ 1,000 population than the average benchmarked agency. Oak Park has less indoor tennis centers, soccer centers, teen centers, fitness centers, and senior centers @ 1,000 population than the average benchmarked agency.

■ **Indoor Community/Recreation Centers and Field Houses (Spaces and Sizes)**

The Park District of Oak Park has a total of 14 different types of spaces within its indoor community centers (field houses) and .267 spaces within its indoor community centers (field houses) @ 1,000 population. Of these spaces, the vast majority are meeting rooms. The average benchmarked agency has a total of 15.7 spaces within its indoor community/recreation centers and field houses and .288 spaces @ 1,000 population.

The largest community center or field house in Oak Park is 6,410 square feet, and the smallest is 4,456 square feet. The largest community center or field house of the average benchmarked community is 67,111 square feet, and the smallest is 12,192 square feet.

■ **Annual Revenues from Taxes and Fees/Charges**

Annual tax revenues for the Park District of Oak Park in 2003 (including the Village transfer) were \$3,582,000 or \$68,197 @ 1,000 population. Annual tax revenues were \$42,981 @ each acre of parkland in Oak Park. Annual tax revenues in the average benchmarked agency in 2003 were \$4,333,815 or \$88,252 @ 1,000 population. Annual tax revenues were \$31,862 @ each acre of parkland in the average benchmarked agency.

Annual fees and charges revenues for the Park District of Oak Park in 2003 were \$3,178,670 or \$60,518 @ 1,000 population. Annual fees and charges revenues were \$38,141 @ each acre of parkland in Oak Park.

Annual fees and charges revenues in the average benchmarked agency in 2003 were \$3,590,832 or \$65,241 @ 1,000 population. Annual fees and charges revenues were \$16,467 @ each acre of parkland in the average benchmarked agency.

■ **Annual Staffing Costs**

Staffing costs are \$74,708 @ 1,000 population and \$47,084 @ each acre of parkland for the Park District of Oak Park.

Staffing costs for the average benchmarked community were \$70,040 @ 1,000 population and \$17,423 @ each acre of parkland.

Cooperative Use Agreements

The Park District of Oak Park has 12 partnerships out of a total of 15 potential partnership opportunities that organizations can partner with local schools, other local units of government and non-profits in the development, use, and funding of parks and recreation facilities. The average benchmarked community has 7.5 partnerships. The Park District of Oak Park is the only agency that does not have written partnership(s) with local schools.

■ **Capital Budget**

Revenue bonds are Oak Park's highest source of revenue for parks and recreation capital projects. General obligation funds are their 2nd highest source of revenue for capital projects, and property taxes are their 3rd highest source of revenue.

Seventy-seven percent (77%) of benchmarked agencies listed general obligation funds as one of their top three sources of revenue for parks and recreation capital projects. There are three other sources of revenue that over 30% of benchmarked agencies listed as one of their top three sources of revenue for parks and recreation capital projects: land and water conservation fund (46%); property taxes (46%); and community development block grants (31%).

The Park District of Oak Park does not have a long-range capital improvement program. A majority of benchmarked agencies do have a long-range capital improvement program, with the average length being 5 years. The average benchmarked community (with a long-range capital improvement program) invests \$21,074 @ 1,000 population in their program.

STRATEGIC WORK PRODUCT #5: NEIGHBORHOOD COMMUNITY CENTERS

A major focus of the Master Plan process was a review of the 7 neighborhood community centers. This review was primarily conducted by Jeff King, President of Ballard*King & Associates. Ballard*King & Associates has completed over 250 studies across the country regarding indoor recreation and community facilities.


The process for conducting this work included a full range of qualitative and quantitative research including stakeholder interviews, focus groups, a review of questions on the citizen survey related to the 7 community centers, results from the benchmarking survey of comparative communities, and an extensive review of the financial records for the Park District of Oak Park.

Mr. King additionally conducted site inspections of Park District facilities including Anderson, Barrie, Carroll, Fox, Stevenson, Field and Longfellow recreation centers; Austin Gardens, Euclid Square, Maple Park, Randolph and Wenonah Tot Lots, Taylor Park and Mills Park, Chaney Mansion, Pleasant Home, Conservatory, Dole Center, Gymnastic Center, Rehm Pool and Ridgeland Commons. In addition, alternative service providers in the Village of Oak Park were also visited including the Oak Park Athletic Club, Oak Park YMCA and Temple Fitness.

Mr. King additionally conducted an on-site visit and met with the Directors for each of the community centers as well as management staff.

The following are major findings:

- **9% of household respondents indicated that the community centers are among the 4 most important parks and recreation facilities to their households.** Out of 29 parks and recreation facilities, the 7 community centers came in 16th place in importance.
- **The 7 community centers serve both neighborhood and Village-wide users.** The centers are all open to users throughout the Village. A majority of those who use the community centers use more than one center. While the center staff believes that the vast majority of their participants come from the neighborhoods around the centers, they do not take registration on site to validate this. When mapping out the geographical area for each center it is clear that there is significant overlap in the southern portion of the Village.
- **Restrooms/drinking fountains (36%) is the activity for which the highest percentage of respondents use the seven neighborhood centers.** There are two other activities for which over 15% of respondents use the neighborhood centers, including: youth sports programs (23%); and classes (17%). It should also be noted that 41% of respondents indicated that their household does not use any of the seven neighborhood centers.



- **The current model of service is failing for numerous reasons including:**
 1. **Duplication of services.** Many of the programs at each community center are the same. To a certain degree the community centers are competing with themselves for program participants. Program occupancy rates for the community centers range from 17% to 85% of capacity. This duplication of programs inhibits efficiency and restricts the ability to reach full potential in revenues.
 2. **Staff costs are the single biggest cost at each center.** Each of the seven community centers has a full-time director assigned to the building and various part-time instructors and supervisors to assist with monitoring and programming the building in the evening and weekends. Personnel costs are ranging from 77.8% to 88.3% of the community center budgets. The mean percentage is 84%. Typically personnel cost in a community center range from 60-75% of the total facility budget.
 3. **Administrative overhead.** The administrative overhead costs for operating the centers appear high. Analysis of the 2003 budget reveals that 37% of the total community center budget is associated with administrative costs as the table below illustrates. There does not appear to be a method in place to accurately identify and distribute administrative cost on a Park District wide basis.

Category	2003 Budget
Direct Cost	\$669,881
Administrative Cost	\$375,032
Total Community Center Costs	\$1,013,546
Percent of Administrative Cost	37%

- **There is not an established need to continue to operate 7 community centers.** The financial reality facing the Park District and the relatively small market niche that the community centers serve raises questions on continuing to operate the centers as status quo. The community survey conducted clearly indicates that the community focus has changed. When factoring the financial position of the community centers, use patterns and survey results, a major structure change is needed in delivering community center services.

Options:

The Consultant Team has developed several alternative options for the Village of Oak Park and the Park District of Oak Park. These options range from continuing to operate all 7 community centers with a more efficient administrative structure to converting some of the centers to other uses, etc. Three of these options are provided below.

- **Consolidate Community Center Management.** This option links one of the smaller community centers with a larger center for management. By transferring 3 of the smaller community center management responsibilities to the larger centers this will save between \$124,000 and \$167,000 per year in management salaries and fringe benefits with no drop in services. The Consultant Team recommends that the annual savings from these actions fund some of the capital needs for the Park District.
- **Converting One or More of the Community Centers to a Not-For-Profit (NFP).** This option involves transferring management responsibility for one or more of the community centers to a Not-For-Profit organization. This option will have the same impact as closing one of the centers from a financial perspective. The estimated saving by converting one of the community centers to a NFP

will range between \$76,000 and \$110,000 per year for one center to \$153,000 - \$206,000 per year for two centers depending which center(s) is converted. This option will have an impact on the existing Oak Park programs for indoor activities including pre-school, after school and sports programs at those sites that are converted to non-profit usage. However these same programs are operated at other centers, there is often excess capacity and a majority of participants use more than one center currently. All outdoor programs could remain intact and any NFP use of the park facilities adjacent to the community centers would be handled through central reservations based on availability.

- **Convert to Specialty Facilities and Not-For Profit Management.** This option involves transferring management responsibility for two of the centers to a Not-For-Profit Organization. In addition, this option includes converting one or two of the existing centers into specialty centers. One of the specialty centers should be a fitness center including a cardiovascular workout area and equipment, exercise machines, aerobic/dance room, spinning room and locker rooms. Fitness needs in the community are under-served and there was a great deal of support through the survey process to provide a fitness component. 48% of the survey household respondents indicated that would use an aerobics/fitness space. Fitness is one component that will drive membership and revenue for the Park District.

The estimated saving by converting one of the community centers to a NFP will range between \$76,000 and \$110,000 per year for one center to \$153,000 - \$206,000 per year for two centers depending which center(s) is converted.

- **The Consultant Team does not recommend developing a large centralized recreation center in Oak Park at this time.** A large recreation center could certainly contain the types of programming spaces that are lacking in the 7 community centers and that residents of the community indicated are most important to them. A large recreation center would also cost less money to operate than the existing centers. However, we do not believe that the Park District and Village are in the financial position to pay for the capital costs of such a facility, particularly given the deferred maintenance needs of the existing system.

Perhaps just as important is the fact that the Park District lacks an adequate space to construct a large recreation center. Any recreation center construction would drastically reduce the amount of green space in the existing park system. Buying a property large enough for a large recreation center would add significantly to the cost of constructing a new facility.

One option that merits consideration is the possibility of expanding and renovating Ridgeland Commons. The ice arena is short (185 feet) by industry standards and the building infrastructure and equipment is in need of major repair. There is a possibility to complete the necessary repairs and upgrades to Ridgeland Commons while at the same time expanding the facility to incorporate other program areas (fitness area, gym, weight room, classrooms, etc). There may also be a possibility of enclosing the pool to incorporate a swimming component into the expansion plans.

STRATEGIC WORK PRODUCT # 6: GOVERNANCE

A significant aspect of the Master Planning process was to evaluate and discuss the appropriate system of governance to effectuate the desired future of the community for its parks and recreation system.

The Consultant Team developed four alternative models of governance specific to Oak Park. The proposed models were reviewed by the Park District Citizen Committee and the sub-committee on Governance.

These alternative models were as follows:

Model 1: Enhanced Partnering Status Quo

Description: This Model would result in a park system that is still managed by the Park District of Oak Park in partnership with the Village and two School Districts with enhanced partnering relationships.

Under this Model:

The Park District of Oak Park would remain in existence

The Village of Oak Park would continue to own the Community Centers

The Village of Oak Park would continue providing funding to the Park District under an improved contract

The Park District of Oak Park would continue to have available its current tax and non-tax funding sources

The Park District of Oak Park would continue to partner with the Village and School Districts under improved partnering agreements.

Citizens of Oak Park would directly elect Park Board members

Model 2: Independent Park District-Ownership of Community Centers and Grounds, With Enhanced Partnering Relationships with Community Providers

Description: This Model would result in the Village of Oak Park transferring ownership of the Community Centers and grounds to the Park District of Oak Park and work to increase partnering efforts with other community providers.

Under this Model:

The Park District of Oak Park would remain in existence

The Village of Oak Park would transfer ownership of the community centers and grounds to the Park District of Oak Park

The Village of Oak Park would discontinue providing funding to the Park District for operations of the Community Centers and the contract would be dissolved

The Park District of Oak Park in partnership with other community providers would develop new models for leveraging public, non-profit, and private sector resources.

The Park District of Oak Park would continue to have available its current tax and non-tax funding sources

Citizens of Oak Park would directly elect Park Board members

Model 3: Independent Park District-Ownership and Operations of Community Centers and Grounds by Village, With Partnering Relationships with Community Providers

Description: This Model would result in the Village of Oak Park and Park District of Oak Park allowing the contractual agreement to expire without being renewed, and transfer operations of the Community Centers to the Village of Oak Park, while leaving the remainder of the Park District of Oak Park intact.

Under this Model:

The Park District of Oak Park would remain in existence

The Village of Oak Park and Park District of Oak Park would discontinue their contractual relationship involving the Community Centers

The Village of Oak Park would discontinue providing funding to the Park District for operations of the Community Centers

The Village of Oak Park would take over operations of the Community Centers, either for their current usage or different usage

The Village of Oak Park and the Park District of Oak Park in partnership with other community providers would develop new models for leveraging public, non-profit, and private sector resources.

The Park District of Oak Park would continue to have available its current tax and non-tax funding sources, with the exception of the tax revenues and fee revenues from the Community Centers

Citizens of Oak Park would directly elect Park Board members

Model 4: Village Operated Parks and Recreation System

Description: This Model would result in the Park District of Oak Park being disbanded and total operations of Parks and Recreation being transferred under Village management.

Under this Model:

The Park District of Oak Park would cease to exist

The Village of Oak Park and Park District of Oak Park would discontinue their contractual relationship involving the Community Centers

The Village of Oak Park would take over all operations of the Park system including the Community Centers

The Village of Oak Park may provide funding of the Community Centers through dollars allocated for parks and recreation

The Village of Oak Park in partnership with other community providers would develop new models for leveraging public, non-profit, and private sector resources.

The taxing authority for parks and recreation that only exists through a Park District would discontinue

Citizens of Oak Park would cease to elect Park Board members

Following review and understanding of the alternative models, the Consultant team proposed using “Measures of Excellence in a Park System” as developed by the Trust for Public Lands. These measures were supplemented with additional evaluative factors for measuring the effectiveness of a governance system that the consultant team had experience with in other communities that we’ve served.

The sub-committee on governance thoroughly discussed the proposed 15 factors for evaluating governance models and recommended that the consultant team use the following nine (which incorporated all 15 elements proposed, but grouped some together under a broader category) to test the alternative governance models:

1. VISION

The ability to provide a clear sense of purpose to the community about the parks and recreation system and goals

2. PLANNING & COMMUNITY INPUT

The ability to effectively plan and involve the community in parks and recreation issues.

3. SUFFICIENT ASSETS

The ability to provide the specific assets of land, staff, and equipment to meet the parks and recreation systems' goals.

4. SERVICE DELIVERY

The systems' responsibility to deliver quality services of the highest priority to the citizens. Quality services are defined as including the following evaluative factors: a) equitable access, b) user satisfaction c) safety and d) professional staff.

5. CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT

The ability to attract citizen input and leadership into the park and recreation system.

6. COMMUNITY BENEFITS

The ability to provide benefits beyond the borders of the parks, i.e. improving home and property values.

7. PARTNERING

The ability to effectively leverage other community assets.

8. SUSTAINABILITY

The ability to raise sufficient resources to meet the goals of the parks and recreation system.

9. ACCESS TO DECISION MAKERS

The ability for community members to meet, visit and influence decision makers regarding parks and recreation issues facing the individual and/or the community.

Each of the above nine evaluative factors was then assigned a weight of importance. On a 1 to 5 scale of importance, with 5 being most important and 1 least, the evaluative factors of *VISION*, *PLANNING & COMMUNITY INPUT*, *SERVICE DELIVERY*, *CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT*, AND *SUSTAINABILITY* were assigned weights of 5. *SUFFICIENT ASSETS*, *PARTNERING* and *ACCESS TO DECISION MAKERS* were assigned a weighting value of 4 and *COMMUNITY BENEFITS* was assigned a weight of 3.

The consultant team is now in the process of more thoroughly evaluating and analyzing two of the four governance models. We believe that both the Independent Park District (model 2) and Village Parks & Recreation System (model 4) can be appropriate structures for an effective future of the Oak Park's parks system. Strong cases can be made for both. Following further review of the assessment of community needs, the benchmarking of comparable communities and most importantly, the analysis of the financial sustainability of the parks system, we will be prepared to offer our final recommendation of a governance structure by the end of September, in advance of the Consensus Workshop.

We have also been drafting a recommended Vision, Values and Mission Statement for the future parks and recreation system. The work on this important aspect of the planning process will accommodate our final recommendation on governance.

Appendix D: Updated Planning Guidelines

The updated planning guidelines will be added when they are finalized.

Appendix E: Vehicle Replacement Schedule

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
1989 Zamboni	X									X	
1985 Zamboni								X			
1987 Ford E350 Van (Cons)				X						X	
2005 Dodge Sprinter (B&G)	X										X
1995 Dodge 3500 pass van				X							
2002 Ford 21 pass van								X			
2009 Ford E350 Van (B&G)					X						
1989 Chevy 3500 1ton 4wd					X						
1994 Ford F350XL Club cab					X						
2006 Ford Ranger 4x4 (REV FAC)			X					X			
1996 Dodge Dakota 4wd				X					X		
1997 Ford F250				X							
1998 Ford 1-ton				X							
1998 Dodge Dakota 4wd				X					X		
1999 Ford Ranger 4wd					X					X	
1999 GMC trash packer										X	
2004 Ford Ranger 4wd						X					X
2005 Ford F250										X	
2006 Ford Ranger 4x4		X					X				
Lift Truck				X							
1992 John Deere 2155											
1997 John Deere 540											
2001 John Deere 5210											
2007 Ball Field Groomer			X						X		
1986 Vermeer Chipper								X			
1982 Stadiums unlimited stage							X				
2005 Water trailer											
1975 Ideal Stage Trailer											
1984 Honda Water Cart								X			

Appendix F: Schedule of Site Master Plans and Improvements

<u>Master Plan Development</u>	<u>Capital Improvement Projects</u>
<i>includes site name, planning firm name, and date accepted by Park Board</i>	<i>includes site name consultant for non master planed improvements and construction firm name</i>
2005 Andersen Park : Planning Resources Inc., January 12, 2006 Austin Gardens : CYLA Design Associates Inc., April 21, 2005 Carroll Park : Altamanu Inc., December 15, 2005	
2006 Dogs in the Parks : Altamanu Inc., May 18, 2006 Field Park : Altamanu Inc., May 18, 2006 Fox Park : Planning Resources Inc., January 18, 2007 Longfellow Park : Planning Resources Inc., February 15, 2007 218 Madison (Gymnastics, Administration, Maintenance) : Williams Architects, October 19, 2006	Andersen Park : Kovilic Construction
2007 Maple Park : Altamanu Inc., November 15, 2007 Ridgeland Common Existing Condition Study : Thompson Dyke & Associates, June 21, 2007 Ridgeland Common Facility & Site Plan : Bonestroo Sports	Austin Gardens Carroll Park Kovilic Construction Cheney Mansion Garapolo Maynard, Core Recreation Centers Garapolo Maynard, CMM Field Park Kovilic Construction Oak Park Conservatory Garapolo Maynard, Hummart Stevenson Park Terra Engineering, Century Construction
2008 Taylor Park : Altamanu Inc. Mills Park : Altamanu Inc. Rehm Park/Oak Park Conservatory : Land Design Collaborative	Administrative Center Fox Park Longfellow Park Scoville Park War Memorial
2009 Cheney Mansion Euclid Square Park Randolph Tot Lot & Wenonah Tot Lot	Maple Park
2010 Lindberg Park Scoville Park	Euclid Square Park Mills Park Oak Park Conservatory Randolph Tot Lot Rehm Park Rehm Pool Ridgeland Common Taylor Park Wenonah Tot Lot

Plan Development web pages on the Park District web site are linked to the park names above for Parks with completed Site Master Plans.

Appendix G: Debt Service Schedule for Debt Certificates

Year	Ridgeland				Rehm Pool \$6,000,000	Total Debt Service	Total Funds For Capital	Funds Available for Projects
	Cheney \$515,000	B&G \$2,165,000	Gymnastics \$3,000,000	Common \$10,000,000				
2007	\$ 22,810					\$ 22,810	\$ 4,101,065	\$ 4,078,255
2008	65,842					65,842	3,297,543	3,231,701
2009	66,088	196,560				262,648	2,627,900	2,365,252
2010	66,343	196,932	201,873			465,148	2,722,839	2,257,691
2011	67,430	197,485	203,435			468,350	2,435,024	1,966,674
2012	67,466	197,988	205,344	301,578		772,375	2,899,075	2,126,700
2013	67,354	198,402	207,300	514,193		987,249	2,554,052	1,566,803
2014	68,205	198,370	209,276	517,138		992,988	2,999,133	2,006,145
2015	67,918	198,364	210,725	520,802		997,809	2,645,116	1,647,307
2016	68,550	197,903	212,415	523,230	259,292	1,261,389	3,142,018	1,880,629
2017		202,259	223,569	587,300	258,000	1,271,128	2,789,858	1,518,731
2018		201,058	234,225	572,503	260,400	1,268,185	3,238,656	1,970,471
2019		199,424	399,118	563,956	262,200	1,424,698	2,888,429	1,463,731
2020		202,400	411,088	560,500	264,600	1,438,588	3,339,197	1,900,609
2021		199,860	411,600	566,032	367,000	1,544,492	2,890,981	1,346,489
2022		202,025	411,302	640,150	369,320	1,622,797	3,343,801	1,721,004
2023		198,664	415,185	670,584	380,775	1,665,208	2,997,677	1,332,469
2024			413,012	889,102	391,510	1,693,624	3,452,630	1,759,006
2025				1,252,016	351,516	1,603,532	3,108,683	1,505,151
2026				1,307,089	348,064	1,655,153	3,565,857	1,910,704
2027				1,292,430	344,572	1,637,002	3,224,174	1,587,172
2028				1,295,985	341,040	1,637,025	3,683,657	2,046,632
2029				1,306,808	337,468	1,644,276	3,344,330	1,700,054
2030				1,309,403	508,856	1,818,259	3,806,217	1,987,958
2031				1,318,716	522,049	1,840,765	3,469,341	1,628,576
2032				-	1,158,962	1,158,962	3,933,728	2,774,766
2033				-	1,165,205	1,165,205	3,599,403	2,434,198
2034				-	1,368,708	1,368,708	4,066,391	2,697,683
2035					1,325,088	1,325,088	3,734,719	2,409,631
	\$ 628,007	\$ 2,987,692	\$ 4,369,466	\$ 16,509,514	\$ 10,584,624	\$ 35,079,302	\$ 93,901,493	\$ 58,822,191