

SPECIAL BOARD MEETING

A Special Meeting of the Mt. Prospect Park District, Cook County, Illinois, was held on Wednesday, May 14, 2014, at the Central Community Center of said Park District. President Doherty called the meeting to order at 6p.m On roll call, the following officers and commissioners were present:

Timothy Doherty
Steve Kurka
Bill Starr
Bill Klicka
Ray Massie
Susan Walsh

Administrative Staff:

Greg Kuhs, Executive Director
Brett Barcell, Director Of Golf Operations
Teri Wirkus, Executive Professional Compliance Manager

Professionals :

Tom Hoffman, Attorney
Dave Esler, Esler Golf Design
Jeff Zurlinden, Nicholas & Associates
Nick Papanicholas Jr., Nicholas & Associates
Tony Papanicholas, Nicholas & Associates
John Green, Goundwork, LTD
Matt Arado, Daily Herald
Richard Mayer, The Journal

Visitors:

Dale Krafft
Rory Spears
M. Bradtke
Ken Orms
Brad Sheffer
Dave Sheffer
David Perns
Jeff Everett
Jerry Boldt

APPROVED

Louis Goodman
Fred Durler
Leonard Zack
Bob Winkates
Robert Jur
Chas. Wetterling
Thomas Helin
Jim & Mary Jo Polark
Bob Sabaj
Mike Murphy
Klayad White
TJ Nowak
Robert Kawalek
Ed DeVaney
Ernie Lassie
Rich Niebrzydowski
Lois Flanagan
Phyllis Swedberg
J.Thomas Martindale
Tom Braun
Harriet Malinowski
David Brady
Joe Mortell
Gary Grouwinkel
J. DeGroot
Ken Marchini
Dave DiPrima

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Commissioner Starr motioned to approve the agenda; seconded by Commissioner Kurka, and carried by unanimous voice approval.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Review of Phase II Golf Course Renovation- (Discussion Only)

Executive Director, Greg Kuhs explained:

- Nicholas & Associates with Dave Esler, Esler Golf Design will review and answer questions about Phase II bids results.
- Base Bid totals for Phase II of the Golf Renovation Project, (with nine alternatives in the bids) were also included in the board packets.

Nick Papanicholas, Nicholas & Associates reviewed:

- May 1st, 2014; Open Bids for Phase II
- Bids notices were in the papers, specifications were distributed to anyone interested.
- Spoke about base bids, alternate bids and cost of the construction.
- Reviewed: the Bid Package #1: Excavation/Seed & Sod/Irrigation & Demolition
- Bid Package #2: Landscaping
- Bid Package #3: Site Utilities
- Bid Package #4: Asphalt Paths
- Bid Package #5: General Trades

Jeff Zurlinden, Project Manager Nicholas & Associates

- Reviewed: which alternates that Nicholas & Associates recommended MPPD deduct/replace.
- Alternate #2: go with the California Greens.
- Alternate #6: deduct of approximately 60,000 square feet of new cart paths.
- Alternate #7: deduct/ respreads some existing bunker sand.
- Alternate #8: deduct replacing sod being used with a mature blanket.
- Alternate #9: deduct for top soil only for t construction (design issue).
- Alternate #11: deduct for tree clearing for 10” or larger taken out by the park district.
- Alternate #24: demolition of the existing maintenance building (if the maintenance building stays in place)
- Alternate #25: reduce cart paths to 7 feet at turn offs; reduce the width of the cart path.
- Base bids with the alternates comes to \$ 7,418,400; due to the alternates a savings of \$1,214,000. This is currently what Nicholas & Associates is recommending to the Park District.

Commissioner Starr: Alternate #6 vs Alternate #25 is that separate savings.

Nick Papanicholas explained that #6 is a deduction for not installing 60,000 square ft of a new cart paths and Alternate #25 asked for a deduction if cart paths were narrower.

Commissioner Walsh: asked the square footage of cart paths now; what is being added.

Dave Esler explained the information was given previously and doesn't have the figure currently.

Commissioner Walsh: asked if there was deduct for irrigation.

Jeff Zurlinden explained alternate #4 was for different piping but Nicholas & Assoc. is not recommending this alternate. There was a discussion about different types of piping, cost and longevity

Commissioner Walsh: on the asphalt bids the lowest bidder was not accepted.

Jeff Zurlinden explained the lowest bidder did not have a complete bid (didn't complete the alternates) so they recommend going to the next lowest bidder with alternates completed. We

APPROVED

asked the largest bid package #1 apparent low bidder to reduce their base bid by 10% but since they would not do so we did not ask any of the other bidders for reductions in their base bids.

Commissioner Walsh: before the bids went out did we send something out to people beforehand asking for preliminary numbers. Jeff responded that we did send out requests for preliminary numbers to contractors for input on the bids.

Jeff Zurlinden and Commissioner Walsh: discussed why the bids came in higher (approximately \$2 m) than anticipated; a combination of factors - at that time budget numbers were requested from potential bidders, the drawings were not complete so the budget was based off the information contractors had, impact of the bidding market, bonds come into play and the timeframe of the job came into play. Time frame was based on a June 16th start due to the (planting) seed had to be in the ground by October for the course to be open the following year.

Commissioner Massie: weren't the drawings supposed to have been done by November, and why were they so late.

Dave Esler, Esler Golf Design explained that the Board authorized to begin drawings in October.

Commissioner Kurka: asked about prevailing wage.

Jeff Zurlinden explained that the bid includes the prevailing wage rates.

Commissioner Walsh: asked about Phase 1 if it is in or out; why did Phase 1 had to be done; now we don't have a plan for it.

Greg Kuhs: stated at this time Phase 1 is not going to be done.

Jeff Zurlinden: explained when the bids were open on phase 1 it was decided to wait on voting for Phase 1; to see the numbers on Phase 2; asked the bidders to hold their bids for Phase 1;

Commissioner Walsh: asked if anything will be done on the maintenance shed; any code violations.

Greg Kuhs: explained there aren't any code violations currently at the building; if major renovations were done to the building we would have to bring it up the code (example ADA requirements); will maintain the current maintenance building; do repairs if need be; and possibly replace in the future.

President Doherty: asked what was moved from Phase 1 to Phase 2; was this included in the bids.

Jeff Zurlinden: explained slight utility work in the retention area moved to Phase 2.

Commissioner Klicka: asked if the contractors are licenses, union and bonded.

Jeff Zurlinden stated that they were and bonded, etc. for the duration of the project and required to pay prevailing wage.

The following individuals addressed the Board:

Fred Durler

- Glenview Park District Golf Course received a \$2.5m for flood control, wanted to know if MPPD spoke with the Village.

Brett Barcel stated it has been brought up to the Village and the answer was no.

Ken Orms

- Some things in Phase 1 have been moved to Phase II was there a reduced price.

Jeff Zurlinden explained that the bids included the movement of several items to Phase II already.

Bob Kawalek

- Recommendation for the alternates based on attempts for savings or will we be losing quality (example on the California grass).

Dave Esler explained variations between two different grasses, sod and the performances.

Tom Braun

- Lived in Mt. Prospect for 46 years.
- Love the golf course and the plans are well done.
- Is the MPPD being fiscally responsible?
- Can MPPD afford the renovations?
- Two years ago asked how much and the answer was \$5m.
- Do we need cart paths throughout the course?
- Enjoy the course the way it is.
- Know we need a new irrigation system (flooding problems).
- This is a community golf course not a private club.
- Get return on this investment.
- Illinois is in \$50m in debt and it is harder to live here.
- Make sure it is a good program that serves all the community members to play.
- Congestion in the parking lots with the new driving range.

Commissioner Doherty: pointed out: the base bid came in at \$8.6m; construction managers are recommending \$1.2m alternates deduct that takes this down to \$7.4m.

Commissioner Walsh: states that the subtotal is \$8.4; bids are \$7.4 but the rest is \$8.4 and there are additional costs; is there a return on investments report or analysis.

Dave Esler explained: the cost analysis is basically not making improvements; lost revenue and additional maintenance cost (didn't repeat that exercise) fixed data points; losses in revenue over time will be substantial; annual additional expenditures in maintenance for irrigation repair, dealing with areas that flood; the property & irrigation are very old; and revenue stream would be a full size driving range.

Tom Marlak

- Been to many of the Park District Board Meetings.
- Listen to the return on investments for a long time.
- PD as a whole most of the projects don't pay for themselves (dog park, band shell, pool)
- Golf Course has unique entity that generates revenue stream (comes back to the Park District every year)
- Can't do a return on investment for soccer, football fields, and band shells.
- Keep our community up in tune with the other park districts (i.e. AHPD)
- Golfers are unique people; provide a nice place to play.
- Golfers will come back after renovations; spend money (pro shop, etc.); Loyal group of people.
- Do the right thing and give us a good course in a reasonable amount of time.
- Golf Course will be an asset; believes has a revenue stream and pay back.
- Come back next year and have a good place to bring friends, enjoy our community and enjoy golf.

Ed DeVaney

- At every meeting the last three years.
- Whole project: take care of irrigation, flooding control; some bunkers; some of the greens; some of the tees (essential to having a better golf course)
- Wish list - to have 24 stations for driving range
- What you want: what is needed & what is extra (extras are expensive).
- Way out of line in cost; going to explode in your face.
- Go back to what is necessary to fix and help the golf course.
- The course is not big enough to do everything the district wants to do.

Harriet Malinowski

- Cart paths shouldn't be on the property line: place them farther away.
- Place cart paths farther away along with the restrooms.

Jerry Boldt

- Resident for 40 plus years-don't play; paid my (\$480 in 2013) taxes to the MPPD.
- No problem with taxes going to parks for families to enjoy.
- Have a problem with taxes to support a golf course that only 7% of population uses the course.
- Too many foreclosure homes in MP; until those homes occupied and produce taxes;
- \$8m plus expenditure for course is a white elephant; used by only by 7% of population.
- Recommends a referendum in November to allow the tax payers to voice their opinion.

Dave Brady

- Canvass more people to get opinions of the entire community not just the golfers or the Board.
- Driving range only will interest a small percentage of people.
- Larger view and larger vote should have been done.

Fred Durler

- Discussed with Lee Howard concerning the bond debt and alternative revenue source bonds.

Commissioner Walsh: wanted to clarify information about the outstanding debt of the Park District with Lee Howard.

B. Hole by Hole Review of Golf Course Renovation

Dave Esler, Esler Golf Design reviewed Driving Range, Cart Paths and Hole by Hole:

Hole #1 Par 5

- Move hole #1 to accommodate the driving range.
- New tees and put a junior tees later on.
- New fairway, existing fairway to become part of new fairway.
- Fairway will drain naturally by gravity then continue through pipes to Weller Creek.
- Proposed cart paths (may or may not get built).
- Discussion on sharing cart paths between #1 & #9.
- Discussion of the driving range as a teaching facility and if Prospect HS pays rent: they do pay rent to use the facility.

Tom Novak responded Prospect HS is a taxing body; the Prospect HS hasn't been an issue and why make it an issue now.

Hole #2 Par 4

- Pretty much the same as it exists now.
- Talked about the flooding around the green; the area will be lowered/raised with grading to decrease the flooding.
- Size of the piping and runs underground: civil engineers are handling this.
- Certain areas will be groomed and mowed so people will not lose their golf balls.
- Difficult hole with Weller Creek.
- Talked about where the balls will be hit (try to hit over the creek) and keep moving and play the ball.

Dave Esler: remarked that MPPD will have the Best Public Golf Course in the State if allowed to move forward; people will seek out the Mt. Prospect Golf Course to come and play.

Hole #3 Par 4

Special Meeting Minutes – May 14, 2014

APPROVED

- With a small water retention area to hold and slowly release the water to avoid flooding downstream
- Intent that the holes are playable 95% of the time.
- Holes must have some interest for people to come to play: small, charming with character.
- Talked about cart paths (proposed: important when maintenance building was going to be built)

Hole #4 Par 3

- Rebuild exiting tees & grounds.
- Keep water basin.
- Pores type piping with gravity drainage

Hole #5 Par 4

- Infested Ash Bore trees removed & 6-7 Honey Locust will be taken out.
- Cart path discussion
- Eliminate large bunker, short par 4 (shorter hole by 100 yards).
- The hole will be a bit straighter than it is today.
- Discussion about the bunker in the middle of the fairway.

Hole #6 Par 4

- Great hole (makes this hole very handsome); more popular and enjoyable.
- Move tees back a bit to make this a challenge.
- Widen the fairway to the left and right.

Hole #7 Par 3

- The back portion of the green is very steep-reduce the slope, reduce the elevation difference so the front portion of the green comes up and flatter.
- Still have a swale & slope that identifies this hole as challenging.
- New grass will not be an issue because this type of green will survive the winters.

Hole #8 Par 4

- Expand the parkway on left.
- Not sure if the proposed cart path will get built.
- Grass bunkers throughout the golf course
- Restore lost hole location: be able to move the hole and distribute the wear (work on the hole)
- Rebuild the original greens and make them bigger.

Hole #9 Par 4

- Fabulous short Par 4- skewed up the green.
- Add a back tee for the better players.
- Trees (silver maples) should come down and change the population to longer living trees and plant additional trees in the future to provide more protection.
- The green will be bigger.

Hole #10 Par 3

- Entirely a new hole.
- Short game will be dramatically improved.
- Unique hole only approximately 120 yards (everyone could get on the green)
- Detention area for water to go to the creek.
- There was also a discussion about combining greens with a resident. Mr. Esler explained why he designed the hole this way (taking into consideration all the variations that the design team looked at).
- The grove of trees will stay with only a few cut down.

Commissioner Starr

- Interested in the idea to combine 10th & 13th greens; would like Dave to pursue this issue. Dave Esler stated he will look at it.

Hole #11 Par 4

- This is a good big golf hole.
- Limited amount of bunkers.
- Important hole to hang onto the cart path (need path access).

There was a question if the District has a plan about the existing Memorials.

- District will relocate (or plant a new tree) for the existing Memorials.

Hole #12 Par 3

- Brand new hole.
- Great trees (oaks) and a few bad trees (ash) too.
- Grass bunkers & gives the property an aged appearance.
- There are square tees & semi-formal slopes to the bunkers
- Proposed restroom is to the back right (if built) – would be screened by evergreens.
- Dry basins-only receive water when needed in flooding etc.

Hole #13 Par 4

- Great hole with a great challenge.
- Trees make this hole have character & protection.
- Discussed sharing the greens and where the proposed cart path would be.

The topic was brought up that Hole #'s 10-11-12 & 13 are basically new holes to accommodate the driving range.

Dave Esler addressed the cost associated with new holes:

Special Meeting Minutes – May 14, 2014

APPROVED

- Projected revenue for new driving range (conservative) could do about \$100,000 as a bottom line (give or take).
- Add the cost of the driving range about \$400k-500k - this could be paid off in six years.
- After that the district is generating revenue from the property.
- Revenue generating by the driving range will help pay off other parts of the golf course.
- The expanded driving range is a found revenue source.

Hole #14 Par 4

- The hole doesn't change much.
- Drainage pipes installed.
- Discussed the cart paths: location, not using carts if it rains.
- There is no marshy wetland - the area is mowed and maintained.

Hole #15 Par 5

- Largely the same hole that exist.
- Proposed cart path.
- Widen the fairway.
- Filling in the pond just a bit.

Discussion with a resident about option of sharing cart paths on several holes and use the trees to protect the golfers on the carts.

Dave Esler: explained his best estimate on which proposed cart paths might happen and why.

Hole # 16 Par 3

- Existing tees reshaped.
- Cart path remains.
- Interesting and difficult hole.
- One area in play, deliberately collecting water, mobile and gradual basin (playable 90% of the time).

Hole #17 Par 5

- Short par 5 hole.
- Character hole with shaping the shot.
- Fantastic golf hole.
- Take out maybe one or two trees.

Hole #18 Par 4

- Entirely a new hole.
- Existing pond reconfigured to hold more water.
- One bridge will stay and the other will not.
- Shorter bunker.
- Existing pump house will remain.

Practice Area

- Surface area 10-11times larger than previous area.
- Relocate the existing maintenance road.
- Short game area back of the tee.
- Proposed location of the netting.
- Approximately front of back tee to the back of range about 275 yds. (middle tee-300yds.).
- Trees to direct the range balls away from the existing maintenance building
- Back tee stations allows for about 23-30 spots depending on spacing.

Proposed Putting Green

- Discussed the putting green and the parking.
- Trees would give a sense of privacy.

Dave Esler: explained that the bids are firm price based on the bid documents. We also have firm numbers based on unit prices.

There was a question about the number that is presented – could that number change based on final design. Since it is a public bid there is far less opportunity for changes.

Dave Esler explained how the different areas are affected by water collecting at bunkers etc.; with the new design and improvement the bunkers, tees and greens will drain more efficiently.

There was a question about retention ponds and the use of Lake Michigan water.

Dave Esler explained that the proposed irrigation will help to move (flow) off site and also the water that flows between the ponds, capturing water (free water), cleaned with the sediments (water from this footprint is cleaner than previous) and part of the irrigation.

Commissioner Walsh stated that during the bad drought the district didn't use Lake Michigan water; new system will help with cleaner water; not planning on buying water for the new tees.

Dave Esler:

- Christopher Burke Engineering Firm is the engineering company.
- The permits haven't been granted at this time (Burke is expecting comments from the MWRD and Corp of Engineers soon).
- Explained how water will be flowing by gravity from the greens.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Golf Course Status 2014 Season

Greg Kuhs, Executive Director

- This particular item was on the Agenda in case the Board wanted to discuss but would be more appropriate for the May 28th meeting.

There was a question:

APPROVED

- Why in option #3: only replace irrigation & drainage (including bunkers) and building new greens need to be delayed until 2015 to start.

Commissioner Doherty explained:

- Re-engineer, re-design, re-bid and lose the time frame as to when the seed would have to be replaced (by October).
- Permitting process would start over.

Nick Papanicholas:

- Permits would have to be modified and resubmitted.
- New bid package.
- The whole process that was just done past six months (construction documents & bidding) would have to be done over.

Commissioner Doherty:

- Staff has given the Board four options to consider (and the Board has several weeks to consider)

Discussion occurred concerning the scope of what would be involved for Option #3; the Board will take a serious look at all the options.

Commissioner Walsh asked:

- Cost of issuance for the Bonds – should be included in the cost of the project.
- If the project cost over \$8m, where would additional funds come from.

Greg Kuhs explained:

- Borrow additional money, issue additional debt with a bond or debt certificate. Speer Financial would advise what the best vehicle to use for additional \$1m on top of the \$8m. (Speer Financial will be attending the May Board meeting.)

Commissioner Walsh asked:

- Would like the information a week ahead of time. (As Speer Financial stated at previous meeting).
- Would the parameter ordinance be something the Board votes on at the next meeting?

Greg Kuhs explained:

- Depends on where the Board is on the project itself.

Commissioner Walsh stated that everything will be voting on at the next May meeting and wanted the public to know.

Greg Kuhs explained what a parameter Ordinance was:

- It has to do with the timing of the issue the bonds and selling the bonds. There are limits and by adopting this type of Ordinance the Board allows the President and the Executive Director to approve the sale of the bonds as long as the terms fall within certain parameters in terms of the highest/ lowest interest rates range with other variables.

APPROVED

Commissioner Walsh stated this Ordinance wasn't on the last meeting agenda, not in the packet and it could be up to 9%.

Tom Hoffman, Attorney explained:

- The 9% is the maximum interest rate that the District could pay. No relationship to the current market or the expected market within the next 60 days.

Commissioner Walsh would like Speer Financial to give an up to date estimate of interest rates for the \$8m for the May Board meeting. Commissioner Kurka explained the ten year treasury is at 2.65% and has been near that level since July; does agree with Commissioner Walsh that the information should be brought up.

Commissioner Doherty asked:

- Between now and before the meeting have staff & Nicholas & Associate come up with figures if the golf project be postponed till 2015. (Professional fees, lost revenue etc.) if we would go with Option #3.

Discussion occurred concerning the options and what the fees would be (estimates). Commissioner Doherty was talking about fees (lost revenues, paying Nicholas & Assoc. again, etc.).

Discussion occurred concerning the Alternates how they are determined and who makes the decision. Esler Design consultants in conjunction with staff & Nicholas & Associates make the suggestions. (When looking at the lost revenue, also look into the leagues leaving, etc.)

Adoption Items

Ordinance 693- AN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING RULES GOVERNINIG AUDIO OR VIDEO PARTICIPATION AT MEETINGS OF THE BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS OF THE MT. PROSPECT PARK DISTRCT, COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

Greg Kuhs, Executive Director explained:

- Adoption of this Ordinance would allow a Board Member who is out of town (for reasons specified on page 2 under item 4) to participate in Board Meetings by calling in by phone during a Board Meeting.
- There was explanation from the attorney on the reason why we would have these rules in place and how they would be implemented.

MOTION

Commissioner Kurka motioned adopt Ordinance 693- AN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING RULES GOVERNINIG AUDIO OR VIDEO PARTICIPATION AT MEETINGS OF THE BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS OF THE MT. PROSPECT PARK DISTRCT, COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS. Seconded by Commissioner Massie and carried by unanimous voice approval.

MOTION

President Doherty made a motion to suspend the rule to allow Mr. Boldt to allow to speak .

APPROVED

Mr. Boldt stated:

- Email conversations with Commissioner Walsh and Executive Director Greg Kuhs regarding Gregory Park.
- Resident in this area for 40 years & part of the property was sold to the Christian Church.
- Since that time the snow has never been removed from the sidewalk, which is supposedly park district property.
- There is no signage what so ever or never has been stated that this is a MP park.
- The grass is being taken care of but when it snows that should be taken care of also.
- Let us put a sign stated that this is part of the park district park.

Commissioner Walsh remarked:

- Mr. Boldt has written that the park district was mowing at the Christian Church and that there was no indication it was park district property.
- Mr. Boldt suggested that since the district mows the lawn, why not also clear the snow on the sidewalk: and have signage indicating this is a park owned by the park district.
- Should clarify with the baseball teams-they are allowed to park in the parking lot.

Greg Kuhs explained:

- Staff will look into sidewalk snow removal and how we treat other parks used during this time and check the status of signage for the park.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Klicka made the motioned to adjourn; seconded by Commissioner Starr and carried by unanimous voice approval.

Respectfully submitted,

Bill Starr, Secretary