

**Burr Ridge Park District
Regular Meeting
December 13, 2021**

REGULAR MEETING

The regular meeting of the Burr Ridge Park District was called to order at the Burr Ridge Community Center at 6:30 pm by President Quigley.

Present: Caplis, Lawrence, Malloy, Paulius, Quigley
Also present: Jim Pacanowski, Director
Jamie Janusz, Superintendent of Finance
Lavonne Campbell, Superintendent of Recreation
Members of the Public

Approve December 13, 2021 Agenda

Item VIA, Unfinished Business, Discuss Harvester Park Tennis Court Resurfacing Project, is being moved to after Item IV, Correspondence, and Item VIIB, New Business, BRWB Little League Request to Assume Control of BRPD TBall Program is being moved to after Item VIA in order to accommodate members of the public in attendance.

Approve , November 8, 2021 Regular Meeting Minutes

Malloy moved, seconded by Caplis and approved by roll call vote to Approve the November 8, 2021 Regular Meeting Minutes.

Ayes: Caplis, Malloy, Paulius, Quigley Nays: None Abstain: Lawrence

Approve , November 8, 2021 Executive Session Meeting Minutes

Malloy moved, seconded by Caplis with a request to correct a typographical error for the word "Scoop", and approved by roll call vote to Approve the November 8, 2021 Executive Session Meeting Minutes.

Ayes: Caplis, Malloy, Paulius, Quigley Nays: None Abstain: Lawrence

OPEN FORUM

No Open Forum

CORRESPONDENCE

Nothing further added to the written report.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Discuss Harvester Park Tennis Court Resurfacing Project

Quigley informed the public in attendance that the Board would be happy to entertain any new comments on the subject of the Tennis Court Resurfacing Project.

Gerald Sendra, 219 Cascade Drive, Indian Head Park, stated that at the last meeting some members of the public in attendance asked park district staff to contact the US Tennis Association and Pickle Ball Association to see how the pickle ball courts can safely be installed in the area currently available at Harvester. Was this followed up on?

Pacanowski replied that this information was sought and provided to the Board in their packet.

Joe Petrich, 8700 Wedgewood Drive, Burr Ridge, is interested in finding out what the US Pickle Ball Association stated regarding a retrofit project rather than a brand new facility.

Bill Voigt, 166 Foxborough, Burr Ridge, had 3 suggestions for the Board: 1 - in regard to due diligence, over the decades of his experience in sales process in the 6 and 7 figures of sales, one thing that is in common in every single project of the size of the pickle ball project is that once a decision is close to being made, contact would be made to people who have been through the same experience to see how it has worked for them. The response of the Burr Ridge Park District has been that it is not important what has worked at another location, projects will be done in a way that is best for the Burr Ridge Park District. Mr. Voigt personally feels a good way to move forward would be to contact people who have 2 lighted courts, 4 lighted courts, 3 lighted courts and to see what kind of play they get on those courts. Clarendon Hills has 2 lighted pickle ball courts, LaGrange Park has 3, Lombard has 2, Homer Glen has 2 - all lighted. Compare the play levels of 2 courts vs 4 courts. Western Springs can help the park district understand the difference of play levels between 2 and 4 courts. Naperville has 4 lighted courts. If investing hundreds of thousands dollars, it's a good idea to reach out and see the level of play on 2 and 4 courts. 2 - If a decision is made to go to 2 courts Mr. Voigt would recommend an announcement that the pickle ball courts are a family and small group pickle ball facility because if not, 40 people will show up and not be able to play 3 - if a decision is made for 2 pickle ball courts, take a look at the drawing for 4 and don't place the 2 courts in the middle, put the 2 courts where it would be placed if there were 4 courts, because in the future if you would like to add 2 more courts it then won't be too expensive to add 2 more courts.

Quigley closed the open forum on the topic.

Quigley asked if Pacanowski was hoping for a decision on the topic at tonight's meeting. Pacanowski responded that it would be helpful to have a decision as it would be helpful to get going on the project after the holidays. There would not be a lot of active work prior to the January meeting so a decision no later than January would be best in order

to get out to bid by late February early March in order to get work started in the early summer.

Quigley thanked Jim for all the information he collected.

Lawrence asked if one of the variables on the 4 court option is that there is not a firm determination of the subterranean without engineering done.

Pacanowski responded that the power lines will be between 5 and 6 feet.

Lawrence asked if 6 feet would be a rabbits foot and 5 feet would be a problem.

Pacanowski responded that at 6 feet you have met minimal standard for spacing and at 5 feet you are a foot under that recommended spacing.

Caplis asked Pacanowski to relay to the members of the public what was found from the USAPA and the Tennis Association.

Pacanowski responded that the USAPA rulebook states 30 x 60 is the minimum size recommended per pickle ball court. 34 x 64 is preferred, but the minimum is 30 x 60. A 5 foot overplay on the side, 20' court, 5' overlay width wise at 60 feet, 8' of back play. Minimum recommended per rulebook and other sites also recommend that number. No other information regarding retrofit or sharing overplay areas is available. There is no written allowance that says you can take a 30 x 60 and another 30 x 60 and overlap in the middle for a smaller footprint for the 2 courts. It is not addressed at all. The USTA does not have specific court sites, however, it is common information and the recommended sideline buffer is 12 feet, rear buffer 21 feet. Tennis court standard recommended sidelines of 12 feet, 10 feet is acceptable if there is space limitation. No recommendation of sharing overlays. From a risk management perspective if it is not stating it is allowed, you don't assume it is allowed. Does this information mean that there are no facilities that are less than this recommended minimum? - no. But those are the minimum recommended standards.

Caplis asked if there is any information regarding retrofit courts.

Pacanowski responded that there is absolutely no information regarding retrofit courts available. There is no guidance and facilities are making decisions based on space and what they are comfortable with, not going by the recommended spacing. There are no written accommodations within the standard that give authorization to build less than the minimum recommended standard.

Caplis asked if the fence were taken down in the east can 4 courts be put in.

Pacanowski responded that the minimum standards would be met. You do need to put a divider fence to separate the 2 activities. With the east fence down, the dimensions would either be right on the dot or a little under 1 foot or less from the minimum.

Caplis asked how tall would the fence be.

Pacanowski responded that a 4 to 5 foot fence would be placed on the end of the 10 foot tennis court.

Malloy asked if it was resurfaced, repainted, and 2 courts put in, and then 2-3 years later additional money became available from a donation or other sources and the park

district wanted to add 2 more courts by extending the area, would it be difficult to do that if there were funds available.

Pacanowski responded that it would be possible but not optimal. The 2 pickle ball courts would have to be located as close to the tennis court as spacing allows so that when expanding and adding the 2 additional courts, the existing 2 courts are already in the work area and will not have to be adjusted.

Malloy asked if the entire area would then have to be resurfaced again.

Pacanowski responded that it would depend on when the addition of the 2 courts was done. However, if done within a reasonable amount of time, blending of the surface area should work out and the seam would almost be on the sideline area.

Caplis asked if the 4 courts would have 10 feet between courts.

Pacanowski responded that they would unless it is less than a 6 foot expansion.

Caplis asked for verification that if there were 2 courts added it would add about 40% more to the budget, and an additional 2 more courts will add another 40% for a total of 80% over budget.

Pacanowski responded that if there are 2 pickle ball courts put in and not have to perform a court expansion, the budget will be close to what was being planned for the tennis court resurfacing anyway, with just a few extra dollars because of nets. An expansion for 4 courts could run \$65-80,000 over just 2 courts. There is no guessing what would happen with a fence expense. An expense for fencing will be minimized by removing and replacing the short fence.. There will be 1 foot short of minimum standards and also short minimum standards on rear play.

Lawrence asked for rough numbers for additional courts.

Pacanowski responded that loose estimated numbers are for 2 pickle ball and 1 tennis court \$140-150,000 and 4 pickle ball and 1 tennis court \$210-220,000.

Lawrence asked the projected life span on the courts.

Pacanowski responded 15-25 years.

Caplis stated that a court expansion is anywhere from \$60-100,000 and revenue is down 75% due to COVID. Caplis stated that while providing 4 pickle ball courts would be an option, Harvester Park is a park and not a pickle ball facility and is not intended to be a pickle ball facility or a tennis facility. If there are 4 courts, there may be neighbors complaining about the noise.

Malloy asked if you installed the 2 courts and funds came along sooner than 15-20 years can you add the 2 additional courts.

Pacanowski responded that a 2 court project can be done in a manner which creates an opportunity to go in the direction of a 4 court without a lot of wasted work. There would be some retrofit work but there would be things for placement in the construction in order to accommodate for that in mind for the future.

Malloy asked if we install 4 courts, do we have parking available.

Pacanowski responded that parking is knocking on the door with problems. Nobody likes to go to the west parking lot. Things back up into Chestnut Hills. There is not an abundance of parking and there are times capacity is taxed.

Malloy is in favor of install 2 courts in a position where 2 more courts can be added in the future.

Caplis stated that it would be easier to start from scratch as opposed to added courts in the near future.

Lawrence commented that if there are 2 courts put in and people don't use the courts as stated in comments from the public, there will never seem to be a demand to justify adding 2 more courts since it will not be used enough.

Malloy asked if enough funds are available now.

Pacanowski stated that funds are available from the refinance, however, plans and projections were to stretch the funds for 8-10 years in order to take care of capital. If it is used for the pickle ball courts that will shorten the time available to use the funds for the plan and may then need to refinance.

Caplis stated that money is available in reserves however after 2 years of COVID revenues have been down 75%.

Caplis anticipates that that the 2 courts will be used by families and people coming to Little League games, etc.

Pacanowski stated that in the previous meetings, a public comment regarding noise was made that the pickle ball groups tend to be loud and that it is fortunate that there are no houses around the park. There are houses close to the planned pickle ball court. If the board is possibly moving forward with a 4 court plan, a letter should go out to the Chestnut Hills neighborhood to at least make them aware of the possibility of a 4 court pickle ball plan, since there is very little that can be done to abate the noise coming out of the area. This letter would be no different from what has always been done on past projects such as the development of the wetlands. The plan would at least require notification to Chestnut Hills as there is an active neighborhood around the park.

Mally asked if the courts have to be installed this year?

Pacanowski responded that the current quality of play is compromised with the court being in the condition that it is and is subpar and below our quality of standard. It could be delayed another year but it is getting farther away from our quality of standards.

Quigley summarized that the Board is heading towards a decision of 2 courts.

Quigley stated that the Board is directing Pacanowski to look at 2 pickle ball courts and keep 1 tennis court.

Pacanowski stated that the next time it will be officially discussed is next fiscal year and formally voted on in the budget process in April. It can go out to bid in March in advance of the budget approval as a detailed summary would be given at the February meeting.

Lawrence asked if a bid can be sought for both a 2 court and 4 court installation. Pacanowski stated that there can be a 2 prong bid with one for resurfacing and another alternate bid. It would add cost for design and for design documents but the engineering and topography remain required regardless. It is not standard procedure but is something that can be done. The bid must be constructed properly so that the park district is not bound to take one or the other.

Pacanowski stated that the Board should entertain an invitation for surrounding neighbors to meet and talk prior to going out to bid. Pacanowski recommended a letter to neighbors in January for a February meeting for feedback prior to the bid going out. Lawrence stated that it would be prudent to send a letter to neighbors to get feedback and listen to them as the Board is listening to members of the public right now. If neighbors come in 4 to 1 against 4 pickle ball courts it would sway a decision.

NEW BUSINESS

BRWB Little League Request to Assume Control of BRPD TBall Program

Robert Gallegos, 16W254 W 91st Street, Burr Ridge, President of BRWB Little League, formally requested the Board to release TBall and allow it to officially be underneath the Little League program. TBall would then serve as a feeder system, it would become a training program which would then allow participants in TBall to participate in Little League festivities. Mr. Gallegos stated there has been great attendance since re-launching Little League under new administration,. Little League will provide more guidance and standardized coaches training and unlimited amount of background checks for coaches. Expanded boundaries will take over the south section of Darien, which will also add more participants and teams. There will still be a payment to the park district for fields for TBall which will still produce revenue for the park district.. In the past, it was the responsibility of Little League to ready the fields. Little League no longer wishes to bear that responsibility and will now pay the park district to ready the fields. The goal will be to take the child from TBall all the way to 14-15 years old. This agreement would be mutually beneficial to get more tournaments. Little League also has plans to set up concessions and to purchase better scoreboards which will in turn draw more interest and teams to use the fields.

Caplis thanked Mr. Gallegos for taking on the responsibilities for Little League and asked if Little League needs the revenue from TBall.

Mr. Gallegos responded that it is not due to a need for revenue as it only draws approximately \$1,000. The reason is for the synergy and because it also creates a vested interest from parents coming in with children at a young age.

Caplis asked if other parks allow Little League to run TBall.

Pacanowski stated that it is run both ways.

Malloy asked if TBall uses the same field as other baseball programs.

Mr. Gallegos stated that TBall plays at Palisades (Fara Family Park), however, Little League is attempting to get more time on the Harvester fields.

Pacanowski added that there are already plans on adding more field time at Harvester for TBall. As far as getting reimbursed for resources, resources may not be available. It is currently difficult to get staff and we may not be in a position to get the staff to get the field striped and lined and prepared as often as desired.

Mr. Gallegos stated that Little League wants to pay the park district to do that.

Pacanowski responded that the park district may not be able to secure staff to do that. It will be difficult to guarantee staff available to do that. It could not be guaranteed as currently there is a shortage of staff to run the programs we currently have.

Mr. Gallagos stated that a high school student could perform the task.

Pacanowski responded that we are having difficulty staffing right now in this environment and therefore can't guarantee that staff will be in place for all the programs in the summer. BRWLL made similar comments last season, was asked to furnish any names for us to pursue hiring and no names were offered.

Malloy asked if Andy's has the ability to do that.

Pacanowski responded that would not be possible and it would cost \$42 per hour labor hours.

Pacanowski expressed concern with the current makeup of administration on the Board changing in a couple of years to a Board less enthusiastic about running T-Ball.

Caplis responded that if the program is not being run properly, the TBall program can be taken back under park district control.

Paulius asked if not controlling TBall would hurt current staff.

Pacanowski stated that some of the reasons why the park district was able to provide Little League assistance is previous staff was looking for hours. In this environment, there is no guarantee staff wise, and there is not even a vehicle at this point in time.

Mr. Gallegos stated that TBall is less maintenance, and while it is preferred that the park district ready the field, Little League will perform the striping if the park district does not have the staff.

Caplis asked if this transfer of TBall affects Mark.

Pacanowski responded that this is not a major part of his job, however, the makeup of his job has a lot of pieces in it and this is a piece of his job.

Caplis stated that he would coordinate this program.

Pacanowski stated that if you are turning this program over to Little League, there is no coordination other than readying the fields and maintaining the schedule.

Malloy asked if readying the fields are any different whether the program is run by the park district or Little League.

Pacanowski responded that currently there is difficulty with hiring staff and full timers are covering for positions that we don't have staff hired for. In late spring/early summer if this continues to be an issue it will become a decision as to being able to take care of park district programs or not. We will try to work with BRWLL to meet their request, but there are no guarantees at the present time.

Rich Styczynski, 8218 Garfield Avenue, Burr Ridge, stated that if there is a TBall program integrated in Little League all the way to the 14-15 yr olds, there is a large

group of parent volunteers available to help who then become invested in the Little League program.

Caplis asked if Little League has any travel teams.

Mr. Styczynski stated that there are no travel teams.

Mr. Gallegos added that there was a big loss in Little League because of travel teams coming into play and Little League is currently in the process of growing the league back.

Caplis stated that as a community, Little League's success benefits us. The park district should do everything they can to help them succeed. While it is not desirable to give away programs Little League is trying to get kids and parents at an early age. Caplis is in favor of Little League taking control of TBall and the park district can take it back if it doesn't work out.

Lawrence agreed and stated it is the culture to invest to support the community.

Quigley asked how this will affect staff here as it was clearly a staff member's job.

Pacanowski stated that this would be a discussion for executive session.

Quigley asked if transferring control will impact operations.

Pacanowski stated that the biggest impact will be the slow rebirth of programs and activities due to ongoing pandemic conditions and getting back into the mainstream of services.

Quigley asked how the park district will know whether or not the transfer of control is successful.

Pacanowski replied that knowledge will be gained by how many kids are enrolled, sight observations, and trust judgment based on experience. Parents won't be polled, however the park district always perform vetting ensuring credible people are using our fields.

Quigley asked if it will be transparent that the park district or Little League is running the program.

Pacanowski stated that assuming the program is run with same quality, it will probably not be transparent.

Caplis asked how individuals will sign up for TBall through Little League.

Mr. Gallegos stated that he would request that a link be placed on the BRPD website to sign up through Little League.

Paulius asked if any in house baseball will conflict with the Little League baseball schedule.

Pacanowski replied that it will not.

Malloy asked if the concession stand will belong to Little League.

Mr. Gallegos stated that Little League is applying for a permit to sell hot dogs, tacos, etc., and will also sell during tournaments. This revenue will also benefit the park district.

It was unanimously agreed to allow Little League to take control of TBall.

Pacanowski will have Mark Pasqualini reach out to Little League.

REPORTS

Director of Parks & Recreation

Nothing further added to the written report.

Superintendent of Finance

Nothing further added to the written report.

Recreation Division

Nothing further added to the written report.

NEW BUSINESS

Active Adult Co Op Program Update

Pacanowski provided the board with a formalized document prepared by Willowbrook attorneys that held a few minor changes. If there is consensus that the document is approved, Pacanowski requests authority to obtain signature in order to deliver it in preparation for their board meeting which is next Monday as this will be the closest date to the transition of Carrie Navins.

Caplis asked for verification of Part 6 of the agreement which states club programs. Campbell responded that this is referring to cards, mahjong.

Caplis asked if revenue from the Rocky Mountain Trip will be going to Willowbrook. Campbell responded that it will.

Caplis stated that the work was done by BRPD for this trip.

Pacanowski stated that the Willowbrook stipend paid yearly went towards that trip.

Campbell added that any trip or function after January will go to Willowbrook. A detailed budget was created and it balances out with a clean cutoff in January.

Adopt 2021 Levy Ordinance

Lawrence moved, seconded by Caplis and approved by roll call vote to Adopt 2021 Levy Ordinance.

Ayes: Caplis, Lawrence, Malloy, Paulius, Quigley Nays: None Abstain: None

APPROVAL OF BILLS

Malloy asked for verification of Alpine bill for \$3,250.
Campbell responded that this is for the senior social at Alpine Banquets

Quigley asked for verification of computer service for \$7,295.
Janusz responded that this is for annual maintenance for the accounting system.

Caplis asked what happened to the frame for the truck.
Pacanowski responded that it was just due to age of the truck.

Caplis asked for verification of the \$409.00 Kiwanis bill for lights.
Campbell stated that this bill is reimbursed by Kiwanis.

Caplis asked if the Storytime Train bill is for metra transportation.
Campbell responded that it is.

Caplis asked for verification of the steppers bill.
Pacanowski responded that this is for paving stone steppers for McGirr bench area, with
1/2 skid returned

Caplis asked for verification of the ice rink bill for \$1,100
Pacanoiwski responded that it is for machine prep and transport, bang boards, ground
preparation.
Lawrence moved, seconded by Caplis and approved by roll call vote to Approve
December bills.

Ayes: Caplis, Lawrence, Malloy, Paulius, Quigley Nays: None Abstain: None

ADJOURNMENT TO EXECUTIVE SESSION

Caplis moved to Adjourn to Executive Session, Pursuant to 5 ILCS 120/2(C)1 for the
Discussion of personnel Matters Involving Specific Employees of the Park District,
seconded by Malloy, and unanimously approved at 8:05 pm.

ADJOURNMENT

Malloy moved seconded by Lawrence and unanimously approved to Adjourn the
Regular Meeting at 8:36 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Sherry Stednitz
Recording Secretary