



President Hohnke called the Special Meeting of the Board of Commissioners order at 8:00 A.M. Upon a roll of Commissioners being called, the following were present: Duffy, Hohnke, Mahoney, Kubal. Absent: Coleman. Staff present: Adams, Karesh, Knitter, Larsen, Petit, Rhodes, Ritter.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
Eric Anderson, BMO Financial

MISSION, GOALS & BUDGET WORKSHOP

C.1. FY2011-2015 Preliminary Capital Development Program (CDP) Project Review

Adams presented an overview of projects to be considered for completion in the Five Year Strategic Master Plan. Adams reviewed the primary categories projects are segregated into which consist of New Major Development & Facility Additions greater than one million in estimated costs, New Major Development & Facility Additions less than one million in estimated costs, Major Replacement & Renovation of Existing Parks & Facilities, Environmental Improvement Projects, Neighborhood park Developments, Land Acquisition, and Miscellaneous Capital Projects and Purchases. Adams next summarized the projects within each category. He reviewed in more detail proposed conceptual master plan options for the development of 83rd Street Park that included a soccer field, park shelter, playground swing set, ADA accessible walkways and maintaining open space.

Adams explained a new methodology for Board consideration in which to prioritize the proposed projects. The process assigns a weighted value of sixteen (16) different rating criteria. The criteria include:

- Identified as Identified as High Priority by Staff / Board Directive (10)
- Increases ADA Access to Recreation for Persons w/ Disabilities (9)
- Improves Life Safety, Security & Property Protection (8)
- Increases Public Use, Enjoyment & Recreation Opportunities (7)
- Identified as a Need from Previous Needs Assessments/Surveys (7)
- Previous CDP Plan Recommendation (6)
- Directly Increases Recreational Opportunities for Underserved Populations (5)
- Qualifies as Illinois Stateside Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) Priority (5)
- Provides Cooperative Intergovernmental / Community Benefit Opportunities (4)
- Reduces Overall Maintenance Requirements / Costs (4)
- Environmental / Conservation Enhancement & Creates Outdoor Recreation Opportunities (4)
- Adds to Overall Diversity of Park & Recreation System (3)
- Revenue Generation Potential (3)
- Required to Meet Deficiency w/ NRPA Open Space & Facility Standards (3)
- Benefits Affiliated Special Recreation / Sport Interest User Groups (2)
- Adds to Overall Park Beautification (2)

The second component of the assessment is to identify project readiness and urgency by assigning a class rating as follows: Class #1 (Scheduled for FY2012), Class #2 (2-5 years), and Class #3 (greater than 5 years).

Adams presented a draft assessment of all proposed capital projects based on the new methodology. These projects would be further reviewed for implementation based on available funds. Additional Board discussion ensued regarding Board input of the rating/assessment process.

Adams stated the capital projects proposed for the FY2012 Budget in the CDP and Capital Replacement Project (CRP) Funds. Proposed CDP projects consist of: Town Centre Land Acquisitions debt service payment, Orchard Hill

Park, Phase 6, Athletic Field & Parking Lot Lighting Project, Orchard Hill Park Baseball/Softball Field Core Area Park Shelter/Storage Building, and Miscellaneous capital projects and purchases.

C.2. FY2011-2015 Preliminary Capital Development Program (CDPP Funding Options

Adams deferred to Eric Anderson from BMO Financial to review the District current debt obligations and future debt issuance options for capital projects.

Anderson first reviewed the District's available debt margin from its debt limit authority based on the District's estimated equalized assessed valuation (EAV). He further reviewed the District's current and future non-referendum debt service bonding authority. He added the projected declining EAV will impact the amount of bonding authority the District has since the authority is based on a percentage of EAV.

Anderson continued by reviewing the estimated revenues available for capital projects based on various conservative baseline assumptions related to the Consumer Product Index (CPI), EAV growth, and general fund inflation. He reviewed different models taking into account future anticipated capital project expenditure amounts and potential debt service for the development of an athletic recreation center facility.

He reiterated the volatility currently going on in the market that is affecting CPI, interest rates and the EAV, which all can impact either negatively and positively the ability to maximize its revenue within statutory limits. He stated based on current estimates and assumptions, the District could bond at least five million for a capital project such as the athletic recreation center. However, based on current preliminary estimates based on different facility options and costs, the District would have to consider a referendum to fully fund a capital project of that size. He reviewed the impact to tax payers based on different debt amounts and housing values to give the Board additional perspective.

Anderson reviewed potential solutions to fund a recreation center which included a split funding approach, whereby the District uses a combination of existing debt authority within the current tax base combined with asking the taxpayers to fund the balance through a referendum bond issue. He stated the potential benefit would primarily allow the District to complete the facility project without endangering funding resources generated from in-house revenues needed to maintain and improve current capital assets and other new capital projects.

Adams reviewed various facility cost options based on different facility components. He stated based on the results of the 2009 needs assessment, the top facility spaces that are needed consisted of: Walking/Jogging Track (67%), Weight room/cardiovascular Equipment Area (54%), Aerobic/Fitness/Dance Class Space (47%), Exercise Facility for Adults [Age 50+] (34%), Space for Meetings/Parties/Banquets (27%), Gymnasiums for Basketball (25%). Adams reviewed other additional spaces that should be considered based on the benefits of providing additional recreational opportunities such as an indoor turf field. Additional board discussion ensued regarding the different facility options.

Adams requested Board direction regarding the future athletic recreation center, so that staff can finalize a strategic plan for capital development for Board approval. Adams briefly recapped the history regarding the community's stated needs for additional indoor programming space. He asked if the Board wants to pursue the development of a facility within the next five years and, if so, when does the Board recommend starting the planning process for the facility.

After considerable Board debate and discussion regarding the need for a facility and the timing to consider a referendum, the consensus of the Board in attendance agreed to proceed with the planning for the facility and to consider posing a referendum, if needed, within the next three years.

President Hohnke requested a short recess at 10:00 A.M.

The meeting reconvened at 10:05 A.M.

C.3. Mission Statement & Strategic Goals

Adams presented for the Board's annual review the District's Mission Statement and Strategic Goals, which were reviewed in detail and revised last year. Adams stated staff does not recommend any revisions.

C.4. FY2011-2012 Organizational Chart Review

Adams reviewed the current Organizational Chart revised and approved last year. He stated staff does not recommend any additional changes.

C.5. FY2011-2012 Annual Subgoals and Objectives

Adams presented the FY2011-2012 Annual Subgoals and Objectives proposed by staff for Board review. He added that staff completes annually a comprehensive assessment process of all District provided services in order to identify issues, enhance service and determine unmet needs. The assessment process entails the review of all resources used throughout the year such as program survey results, facility survey results, resident feedback received from neighborhood dialogues, Village Town Meeting, Village Annual Survey, planning focus groups, info@woodridgeparks.org, resident work requests, volunteer meetings, coach dialogues, social networking sites, intergovernmental meetings, as well as staff workshops. The information reviewed is then evaluated and created into subgoals and prioritized within the framework of the strategic goals, which will upon Board approval establish the direction for the year.

Adams requested the Board forward any comments regarding the subgoals to either President Hohnke or himself prior to the next Board meeting, at which time staff will request Board consideration to approve.

C.6. FY2011-2012 Preliminary Budget Review

Adams reviewed in detail the FY2011-2011 budget. He first informed the board of the preliminary FY2010-2011 major accomplishments listing for their review. He next highlighted the changes to the proposed FY2012 Salary Wage Scale noting the seasonal positions hourly wage changes due to minimum wage.

Adams highlighted significant revenue and expense line item changes by fund compared to the current year's budget. After Board discussion of various budget items, Adams stated a final budget will be presented to the Board subsequent to receiving the final tax extension from the County, which is typically received at the end of March.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, a motion to adjourn was requested. MOTION by Duffy, seconded by Kubal to adjourn the meeting at 10:35 A.M. ALL AYES. MOTION CARRIED.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian Coleman, Secretary