Call to Order
President Minogue called the Workshop Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call of Commissioners
Upon roll call those answering present were President Minogue and Commissioners Aubrey, Nephew, Kinzler, Creech and Dallman. Absent: Commissioner Hess

Staff members present were Executive Director Atwell, Executive Assistant Sesto, Superintendent of Recreation Esposito, Superintendent of Parks Scarmardo, Superintendent of Finance & Personnel Woods, Communication & Marketing Supervisor Talenco, Assistant Superintendent of Recreation Defiglia and Recreation Supervisor Kroger. Attorney Adams was also present.

Changes to the Agenda
None

Public Participation
Mr. Patrick Byrne, 257 S. Park Boulevard, explained that he is a regular user of the fitness center at Spring Avenue Recreation Center. He felt it was a great thing to have in the community, convenient to his home, and he and his daughter work out several mornings a week prior to work. If the facility were to go away it would be difficult for him to get to the facility at Ackerman and get home and get to work on time. For someone who has a visual impairment he needs help getting the devices programmed and the staff at SARC has always been very helpful. He trusted that the SARC facility would be retained and thanked the Board for their time.

Mr. Don Stufflebeam, 364 Scott Street, said he would hate to see the SARC fitness center go away. He rides his bike to the facility everyday except Saturday and Sunday. He was aware there was a questionnaire going around about the fitness center and asked who was against it and the reasons. He also asked why they would even question not having the facility.

Ms. Joan Masterson, 197 Bryant, said she has used the SARC fitness center since its inception. She felt it was vital to trying to maintain her health. She asked the Board’s thoughts after having reviewed the recent survey of the fitness center users.

President Minogue explained that users of the fitness center were surveyed and after reviewing the results the Board realized that everyone wants to continue having a fitness center at SARC. As always, the fitness center will be monitored by staff and hopefully they will continue to meet all their expectations.

Ackerman Sports Complex Pay Request #11
Superintendent Scarmardo presented the Ackerman Sports Complex Pay Request #11, in the amount of $720,868.93, and gave a project update. The pay request was for work completed on the project by Cosgrove Construction, Manusos Concrete, Associated Electrical, Thyssen Krupp, Baileys, McHenry County Glass, G. Porter & Co., Ruffalo Painting, M.G. Mechanical Plumbing, Absolute Fire Protection,
Floors, Inc., T.A. Bowman and the professional services of Professional Building Services.

Staff recommended the Board place Pay Request #11 on the October 27, 2009 Regular Meeting consent agenda for formal approval.

Commissioner Kinzler noted on the most recent update from Professional Building Services they had made a comment regarding field identification problems possibly causing a delay.

Superintendent Scarmardo explained there were issues with the railings that were delivered and found to be too short. Since that time new pieces were delivered and have been welded to the railing.

Commissioner Dallman asked how the recent Fall Classic Tournament worked out at Ackerman Park.

Superintendent Scarmardo reported there was a couple of parking issues such as few cars using the church lot on Sunday morning.

Superintendent Esposito reported there were 175 teams that participated in the tournament.

Commissioner Dallman was pleased to hear the construction of the sports facility didn’t cause any undue harm to the soccer tournament because it has been getting bigger every year.

After review and discussion the Board agreed to place formal approval of the Ackerman Sports Complex Pay Request #11 on the October 27, 2009 Regular Meeting consent agenda.

**Bid for Ackerman Sports Complex Fitness Center Flooring**

Superintendent Esposito reported bids for the Ackerman Sports Complex fitness center flooring were opened on Monday, October 5 at 11:00 a.m. Seven bid packets were either mailed out or picked up. Bid specifications requested prices on two specific manufacturers of fitness flooring. Staff recommended choosing Option 1 which was for Mondo flooring with carpeted accent areas where users would stretch prior to using the equipment. At opening one bid was received from Professional Fitness Concepts. Their bid of $67,880.97 was within the budgetary constraints. It will take up to two months for the flooring to be ordered and installed. When completed the equipment will be installed.

Staff recommended the Board place awarding the bid for the Ackerman Sports Complex fitness center flooring to Professional Fitness Concepts, in the amount of $67,880.97, on the October 27, 2009 Regular Meeting consent agenda.

Because only one bid was received Commissioner Dallman asked if the amount bid was a good price.

Superintendent Scarmardo explained that since Mondo flooring is a sole source provider, all installers have to purchase it from Mondo. The only variance in pricing would be installation costs. Many companies won’t bid on a project because the installation cost is too competitive. Staff anticipated the cost of the flooring would be under $70,000. The Park District will be receiving a credit of $25,000 for choosing not to put in vinyl tile.

Commissioner Kinzler asked if it was possible to rebid the project.

Attorney Adams explained that the bid specifications authorize the Board to reject bids and rebid. In this case because they are talking about a product that has one supplier they are probably not likely to receive a
lot more bids. The specifications called for the Mondo product, or an equal to and still only one bid was received. It is a judgement call on whether the Board wanted to reject the bid and rebid the flooring but felt the Board should take into account timing issues and the likelihood of being able to get a better price.

Commissioner Kinzler thought that in the Chicagoland area there would be more than one company who wanted $67,000 worth of business. That would give the Board an idea of whether they are getting a good deal or not.

Discussion ensued after which time the Board agreed to place awarding the bid for the Ackerman Sports Complex fitness center flooring on the October 27, 2009 Regular Meeting consent agenda for approval.

Glenbard School District 87 Proposal for Synthetic Turf at Memorial Park
Director Atwell presented a report answering questions raised by Board members at their September 15 meeting. The questions focused on Park District access to the fields, the hourly rental rate, where synthetic turf could be installed at Park District facilities if funds were available, what relationship the proposal had to do with the Park District offering high school summer sports camps, who would be responsible for maintaining the synthetic turf field and if the School District had asked the Park District to contribute to the cost of lighting Memorial Park.

Discussion ensued on what would be included in the intergovernmental agreement as far as what would happen in the event of the field not being available to the Park District, use of the field beyond the estimated eight year life span of the synthetic turf should the turf last longer than expected, whether the Park District’s football program could use the field, and to not specify that the $20,000 annual payment would be paid by using the fees paid for summer sports camps but from the Recreation Fund.

Attorney Adams explained that no discussion on the terms of the contract had taken place at the legal level. Typically in an arrangement such as this there would be some provision that would provide for some sort of suspension of the fee payment when there is a suspension of the benefits that are to be derived from that payment.

After discussion the Board agreed to place approval to move forward with the proposal by Glenbard School District 87 for the Park District to participate in their project to install synthetic turf on the field in Memorial Park on the October 27, 2009 Regular Meeting consent agenda.

Mr. Brad Steinhilber, 335 Geneva Road, addressed the Board saying he is the travel commissioner for the Park District’s Glen Ellyn Girls Softball Association and had spoken with the varsity softball coach at Glenbard West and Glenbard South. They are for the turf field as long as the infield is kept as a clay infield. Mr. Steinhilber did not feel any money should be given until the plan has been presented. The Park District has already let it be known that they would not be able to give the high school softball team more field time at Ackerman Park.

Mr. Don Pydo, 632 Crescent Boulevard, asked the Board what programs those funds would have supported but now will not be supported.

Attorney Adams commented that it was a rhetorical question because Mr. Pydo was talking about a $20,000 expense on a $5 million a year recreation budget. There is no specific way to answer the question because the funds received from the camps are not specifically allocated to any particular expenditure. They go into a budget and are expended in accordance with the Budget & Appropriation Ordinance.
Mr. Pydo commented that the product proposed for Memorial field has hazardous materials in the product and questioned the aspect of liability. He also asked if the Park District would be aware of how the field is maintained and if it is being done timely and in a proper fashion.

Attorney Adams commented that the Park District Rick Management Agency has been advised of the project that is being used in this particular instance. They are aware of its characteristics and concerns that some people have brought forward. Their own independent assessment of it is that it is not a material or product that the Park District needs to be concerned about from a liability or risk management standpoint. He felt the product would be periodically inspected to make sure that its characteristics are appropriate for use and there are probably specifications from the manufacturer on when and how to inspect the field to insure quality and safety and also to look for trouble spots.

Mr. Pydo asked what the Park District would do if the summer camps had to be discontinued and the Park District was not receiving the $20,000 camp revenue.

President Minogue stated that the payment would still come out of the Recreation Fund.

Mr. John Huston, 588 N. Ellyn Avenue, asked what the aesthetic of the area will be once the turf is installed. It looks like a park now but will it look like that in the future?

Director Atwell felt what Mr. Huston would see is a green turf field where the grass field is now.

Mr. Eric Peterson, 237 Lorraine, commented that he had heard that the field is primarily meant for high school and park district use and asked if there would be public access to the turf. Mr. Peterson also asked if the tennis courts in Memorial Park were going to be repaired.

Commissioner Dallman explained that the courts were no longer owned by the Park District and suggested Mr. Peterson mention his concerns to School District 87.

As far as public access to the field Director Atwell suggested Mr. Peterson ask the School District.

**Anima Singers Rental Request**

Superintendent Esposito presented a report regarding Anima’s request to be considered a resident group and for the Board to consider charging them the rental fees they were charged last year. Approximately two years ago the Board had discussion on getting the group up to being charged the real rate or what a non resident group is charged. The Board’s direction to staff was to increase the fee little by little until they are charged the correct rate. In 2008/2009 they should have been charged $41/hour and were charged $26/hour. For the double room they should have been charged $49/hour but were charged $40/hour. Although their rehearsals began again this year in September they have not signed a contract and have not paid any rental fee.

Ms. Priscilla Smith, Executive Director of Anima, addressed the Board saying they have been in Glen Ellyn since 1964 when the chorus was started and have always maintained their offices in Glen Ellyn. They are currently at 799 Roosevelt Road. As far as they are concerned they are residents of Glen Ellyn because their business resides in Glen Ellyn. They were informed they were considered non residents and would have to pay non resident rates. When they asked why they were told because less than 50% of their customers are Park District residents. They asked that they continue to be considered residents and pay resident rates. If they can’t get the resident rates they will not be able to continue with the Park District for any length of time.
President Minogue commented that she remembered them coming in front of the Board in the past and this is not the first time the Board had discussed this issue. As Superintendent Esposito stated, the Board did talk about how to bring the rental rate up to what it should be. The chorus had that extremely low discounted rate because at one time they were a program of the Glen Ellyn Park District. As far as being a resident, Anima does not own the building at 799 Roosevelt Road so does not pay taxes to the Park District. A resident pays taxes to the Park District.

Commissioner Kinzler felt from a technical point of view they were paying taxes because the owner of the building uses rental income to pay taxes.

When asked if anyone else was interested in renting the space Superintendent Esposito stated no one had approached staff to rent the space. If Anima were to move out staff would use the space for new programs.

Attorney Adams asked if there was a letter sent to Anima in June 2008 informing them of a new arrangement with regard to the rate structure.

Superintendent Esposito explained that staff did sent a letter to Anima in 2008 explaining the rental rate. Anima then signed a contract that reflected the first year of a three year rental schedule.

Attorney Adams felt before the Board could approve a change they would have to look at what actions were taken by the previous Board. If the Board chooses to go in a different direction it should be documented in such a way that it is consistent with or reverses the direction of the earlier Board. He also wanted the opportunity to look at the Board’s policies with regard to resident versus non resident businesses, resident versus non resident membership in organizations that seek to rent Park District facilities. He was aware that the Board on a number of occasions had made policy decisions based on the percentage of resident versus non resident members of the program or activity that seeks to engage with the Park District.

Lengthy discussion followed on whether Anima should be considered a resident group and therefore pay the resident rental rate.

Commissioners Dallman and Creech were in favor of charging Anima the resident rental rate.

President Minogue pointed out that Anima had not paid any rent for the current year.

Commissioner Aubrey commented that the Board holds accountability for the taxpayers. Someone who is a non resident comes to that building and benefits from it without having to pay anything for it. Instead of discussing whether to charge resident or non resident rates he thought the Board should consider if they want to maintain the relationship, can Anima afford it and does the Board still value it as a source of revenue to help pay for a portion of operating MSRC.

Attorney Adams commented that a policy amendment would be required if the Board were to change the fee structure. He felt the Board also had to consider the precedential impact on doing that. Would it set precedent for other groups that may be similarly situated and are not for profits. The may or may not have an office in Glen Ellyn, and they have a resident and non resident component of their participants.He asked that Anima at least make a rental payment based on last year’s rates with the understanding that it may be subject to an adjustment.

The Board agreed to place further discussion on the Anima rental rate on the October 27, 2009 Regular Meeting agenda under Unfinished Business.
Introduction of New Employee
Superintendent Esposito introduced Brenden Berry who was recently hired to fill a Recreation Supervisor vacancy. The major programs Brenden supervises are soccer and girls softball.

The Board welcomed Brenden to the Park District.

Budget Review
Superintendent Woods reported staff was asked to cut expenses by 5% because a static property tax levy is anticipated this year. For the current fiscal year the Park District brought in approximately $150,000 more in tax dollars. Next year with the CPI being .1% staff expects an increase in tax dollars of about $2,500. For any of the operations that are truly taxed based, expenses were cut so that they stay within the money received.

Superintendent Woods presented a Fund Balance Recap report to the Board and pointed out that once again Superintendent Esposito continued to increase the fund balance after all expenses related to recreation are paid. The two major operating funds, Corporate and Recreation, have healthy fund balances.

The Consolidated Budget report presented gave an overview of each budget fund. The funds cannot be intermixed and by State Code and have specific uses. For 2010 it was projected that the Park District would have revenues of $10,911,262 and expenses of $11,057,500. Although that represented a deficit of $146,238, Superintendent Woods explained that while the Park District did sell $4 million in non-referendum bonds in 2009, the Park District receives the revenue in one year but may not expend it all in one year. The Park District has the money although it does not show on the income statement. The Park District is not operating in a deficit and has reserves to pay expenses with the healthy fund balances in the Corporate and Recreation funds.

Attorney Adams explained that there is nothing in the Park District code that mandates a fund balance and there is no firm policy of the District that establishes a percentage of the annual receipts or hard number to establish a fund balance. What the Park District has looked at to determine an appropriate fund balance is in part determined by what the bond rating people feel is a good fund balance to maintain the current bond rating and also good practices.

Superintendent Woods went on to explain that the Fund Summary reports detailed where the revenue in each fund comes from as well as a breakdown of expenses. The tax dollars received are the same as last year. Next month she will present the Tax Levy Ordinance to the Board.

The salaries in the Corporate Fund are a combination of Administration and Parks Department. There is a decrease in the salaries and staff did not anticipate giving out any raises this year. Programs may be paying for more services because the Parks Department can’t afford to pay overtime or time and one half. If the Board did want to consider a merit increase, a 1% increase for full-time staff would be approximately $13,000.

Superintendent Scarmardo reported that the Parks Department would not be hiring as many part-time seasonal staff next year. What affects the budget the most is the winter months for snow plowing and making ice. They try to have staff work straight time but sometimes it is not possible. For the remainder of 2009 overtime has been frozen unless absolutely necessary.

Commissioner Nephew asked if the Parks Department was already having difficulty with the salaries and that was why overtime was frozen.
Superintendent Scarmardo explained that some part-time staff had been laid off. There were a lot of special events this year which required a lot more working hours, work that the Parks Department did not have to do in the past. There are also more setups required for softball, baseball and soccer on weekends. Normally the part-time seasonal staff works from March to November. Seasonal staff is always hired for spring and summer months and let go in the fall.

Superintendent Woods explained that the Recreation Fund increases in revenue and expenses were attributed to the Ackerman Sports Complex. Staff projected to make a net revenue of $102,686 for 2010.

The Police Fund is used for police services only. Some of the fund balance will be used up.

The Paving & Lighting Fund is now a very small fund. Some of the funds had to be allocated to other operating funds.

The IMRF/FICA Fund is the tax levied to cover Social Security and Medicare taxes and the IMRF pension. IMRF will increase from 10 ½% this year to a little over 11 ½% next year. IMRF is for all full-time employees and anyone who works more than 1000 hours in one year.

The Debt Service Fund is not under the tax cap and what is levied is determined on the bond ordinances filed with the County to pay for debt.

The Liability Fund covers tort immunity, property and casualty insurance, unemployment and workers compensation. All Liability Insurance is provided through PDRMA. Superintendent Woods was very confident that there was not a commercial insurance company that could provide the Park District liability and immunity for less than what PDRMA charges. PDRMA also provides risk management services and help assists any employment problem.

The Special Recreation Fund is not under the tax cap. Funds are used to pay for integration costs as well as ADA improvements.

Money levied in the Audit Fund is used exclusively to pay for the external auditor’s costs.

The Working Cash Fund is the Park District’s savings account for emergencies. $200,000 is kept in the fund.

Fund 70, 2006 Capital Projects fund was for the Ackerman project so there is nothing budgeted for 2010.

The Equipment Replacement Fund is used to purchase equipment and vehicles. Funds are transferred into the ERF fund from the Recreation, Capital Projects and Liability Funds and saved for when equipment has to be replaced.

The Fund 91 2007 Capital Project Bond Fund will also be cleared out because of the construction completion at Ackerman.

Fund 94 is the Capital Projects Fund. Expenses for 2010 include payroll, payment to the Village and the construction of a playground at Ackerman Park.

The Cash in Lieu of Land Fund is the money received from developers. The Village is kind enough to enforce the Park District’s ordinance and will not issue building permits until the funds are received from the developers.
Corporate Administration  
Superintendent Woods presented the budget for Corporate Administration saying it reflected a 1% increase in revenue. There were minimal increases in expenses and decreases in many line items. Staff anticipated a 5% increase for employee health insurance.

Commissioner Kinzler commented on the employee’s contribution for health insurance coverage and asked what the average was among park districts.

Superintendent Woods explained that what employee’s pay is on a sliding scale depending on their annual salary. Some park districts don’t have their employees pay anything, some park districts pay only for the employee and the employee has to pay for family coverage and sometimes it is a percentage of the family coverage. Four of the 29 full-time employees make under $30,000 so their wages cannot compare to some other situations where wages are higher and they can afford to pay more of the insurance costs.

Parks  
The only revenue in the budget comes from $4 of the program fee, per each athletic program participant. That money covers some expenses for the Parks Department.

Commissioner Nephew questioned how it was determined that there should be a 18.5% decrease in the building and landscape line item. She felt maintenance of the parks was one of the most obvious things that residents see and asked how that would impact what the parks would look like in 2010.

Superintendent Scarmardo explained that the philosophy has always been to do more with less. When there are no the tax dollars to purchase new equipment or materials they looked at doing more things in-house. If it is an emergency they can’t control it but can on the day-to-day operations and purchases. He was not suggesting that the staff would let things go. Some baseball parents will be helping out at Village Green so not as many staff hours will be spent there on weekends. Another area where he was hoping to cut staff time and cost was striping the soccer fields for practices. In the past the program used cones to delineate the field for practices.

Commissioner Creech commented that she appreciated Superintendent Scarmardo’s can do spirit and being very resourceful with the money but considered his department as one of the most important because even people who don’t actively participate in programs drive by and live near the parks. She would rather see some of the items in the Parks Department budget stay at the same level.

Superintendent Scarmardo commented that he and his staff had several meetings to discuss what they could do to reduce costs so was very comfortable with those cuts. His only concern was the part-time seasonal help.

President Minogue stated that the Board will continue discussion of the budget at their Regular Meeting on October 27, 2009.

Matters from Staff  
Director Atwell reported the Park District received a $400,000 check from IDNR for the Village Green Park project.

Matters from Commissioners  
Commissioner Dallman said he heard great things about the Glen Ellyn Fall Classic soccer tournament.
Commissioner Creech attended the Churchill work day and her daughter loved hauling the buckthorn.

Commissioner Aubrey attended the recent Churchill Park cleanup. He thanked staff for meeting with him to talk about the Ackerman Sports Complex.

Commissioner Nephew asked for an update on the Ackerman facility marketing project.

Superintendent Esposito reported staff was meeting tomorrow with the graphic designer to go over the final design and hoped to have a post card sent out within two weeks. There will also be an ad in the Daily Herald, three pages in the upcoming brochure and a large piece in the Tribune.

**Adjourn to Executive Session**
At 10:00 p.m. Commissioner Dallman moved, seconded by Commissioner Creech, to adjourn to Executive Session under Section 2(c)(1) of the Open Meetings Act, “discussion of the appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance or dismissal of specific employees or legal counsel for the district,” Section 2(c)5 “discussion of the purchase or lease of real property for the use of the district, including discussion of whether a particular parcel should be acquired,” and Section 2(c)6 “setting of a price for the sale or lease of property owned by the district.”

Roll Call: Aye: Commissioners Dallman, Creech, Aubrey, Nephew, Kinzler and President Minogue
Nay: None
Motion Carried

**Reconvene the Workshop Meeting**
The Workshop Meeting reconvened at 11:10 p.m.

**Adjourn**
There being no further business Commissioner Dallman moved, seconded by Commissioner Aubrey, to adjourn the Workshop Meeting. *Motion Carried*

Respectfully submitted,

Jeanine Sesto
Board Secretary