

**VILLAGE OF MARSHALL
PARKS COMMITTEE MINUTES
MARCH 10, 2014**

Chairperson Hensler called the Parks Committee meeting to order at 6:00 P.M. Members present: Cripps, Diedrick, Lemke, Stransky and Hensler were present. B. Arnold and S Tweed were absent. Others present: Marshall Fire Department Representatives: William Blaschka, Cory Quinn, Steve Chadwick, Boyd Pierce, Dan Timpel; Maunsha Soccer Club Representatives: Mike Rateike, Scott Weber, John Hendrickson, Jerry Gillis; Others: Jason Dunn, County Board Supervisor Dennis O'Loughlin, Shawn Arnold, John Schuepbach, Recreation Director Matt Hendricks and Sue Peck-Village Administrator.

1. **Marshall Fire Department Fireman's Park discussions.** Bill Blaschka provided a list of maintenance and future repairs that need to be addressed at Fireman's park. Part of their list was projects the department is willing to work on this year and then another list of future projects.

Discussion was also held on management of Fireman's Park. This park is public property which is subsidized by tax dollars and operated by a corporation. When looking at checks and balances on the operations of the park, is this the current management setup the best for the community? It is somewhat of an unusual setup, but has worked in the past.

Recreation Director Hendricks noted the Village updated their Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan in 2013. This is a 5 year plan. Fireman's Park was included in the plan. Outdoor Recreation Plans act as guides for the community. Some of the items looked at are what may be needed or should be added in a park; along with future items that should be looked at when adding or developing a park. It is a guide of recommendations for future operations.

Fireman's Park is a public park, and like other parks it requires maintenance. You can let it go or you make plans for the park. What do we want in it and what should it look like? A plan should be done for the park. Mr. Blaschka said there is only so much space; if they are having their festival they need all the buildings that are there. There needs to be planning for the future of the park. We have a community park and a festival which makes it a joint issue.

The Village is looking to know if the Firemen are 100% committed to this park or 50% committed. The Village would like to see the maintenance agreement rewritten and a park plan completed for the park. We are looking for a unified vision for the park. We know the purpose now, what is the vision for the next 5-10 years from now. What is best for the community?

The Village would like feedback on the following three options:

1. Do the Firemen want to continue on an arrangement similar to what is done now; but more on a 50/50 split basis?
2. Do the Firemen want 100% ownership of the park and would than take over all cost and responsibility in it?
3. Do the Firemen want the Village to take over 100% of the park operations and costs? Would the Firemen look to act more in the capacity of a "Friends of Fireman's Park" group which would change the current operations of the park in this scenario?

There was discussion on how the community pride for the park can be rebuilt. There needs to be a connection back to the park. It was felt one of the first things that need to be done for the park is a park plan. Look at what are the issues, the public's visions of this park, the Fire Department's vision for the park and the Village's vision should be looked at.

The Firemen will discuss the above three options at their next meeting and get back to the Village on the direction they would like to proceed under.

2. Mauneshia United Soccer Club

The purpose of meeting with the soccer club was to discuss the current facility and space needs of the organization and continue a dialogue for the future of the soccer program.

Mr. Hendrickson noted they are affiliated with Madison Area Youth Soccer Association (MAYSA). They currently run an in-house program. They do play games with Sun Prairie groups. They have a spring and fall program. Since their inception they have now operated one spring and one fall program and are currently registering for spring 2014. In the fall their numbers drop and generally that is because of flag football. They are working hard to fill older spots. They coach up to U12 now. As kids get older they hope they stay in the program and move up.

Some challenges they are having is getting volunteers and keeping kids interested. Field coordination can also be challenging. They currently use Riverview Park facility for one U11 and one 12 field; one U10 and two U8 fields. U4 & U5 use a U10 field. U6 & U7 are using Morrison field in Waterloo. This spring they are looking at using the same yardage fields; but are unsure on the number of participants; they may need some green space at Converse. As kids stay in the program and get older the field sizes different for age levels. If the numbers stay where they have been they will be needing two U12 fields (76'x52') and one U13 field. They can only get two U11 fields on Riverview now. They will need a U10 field and a U8/9 field. Possibly a field can be established at Converse; depending on the available green space.

As age groups get older, the sizes of the fields change. (U9/10; U11/12; U13/14) The U13/14 uses a full size field. This could fit in Riverview but that bumps others. Also the goal signs change. Currently there is no real facility for U13 anywhere.

Some discussion was held on soccer facilities offered at Waterloo. At the new trailhead facility there were some plans for a field there, but it was thought this fell through because the grant funds were for actual materials for the facility and couldn't be used for sports fields. They thought it would be a stretch to get a U10 field there. The Morrison field in Waterloo is a full size field. They have noted a decrease in participants from Waterloo. Some of the issues are getting the word out and when a facility isn't very visible people have a tendency to forget.

Youth participation in soccer is an opportunity for fitness. The ultimate goal is to have soccer at U14 on up and have a joint program at the high schools. Neither school district has embraced the program at this time. Their group is somewhat a feeder program for other clubs. Some past participants have chosen other sports or have chosen other clubs that the older age groups.

Mr. Hendricks said the program was first built through the Village of Marshall offering soccer; the role flip flopped in early 2013 and the Soccer club took over operations. Field space continues to be challenge. There was some discussion about the additional land the Village purchased north of

Riverview Drive for potential soccer use. A year or so ago the Village also had a schematic of a complex east of Deerfield Road. The additional land by Riverview was discussed on how it could be used. A bridge would need to be put in over the drainage ditch; even one on the Sleepy Hollow side would be good. A playground near a shelter, parking is very much needed. Most people are parking on Riverview and Sleepy Hollow. A restroom by the shelter would be good. They felt a couple U4 & U5 fields would fit between a parking lot and main field – a 20' x 30' space is needed for them. Is this space ample or is it a band aid for two years? For now it can accommodate U4 to U12. They agree this would only be a temporary fix. The new space is not playable in its current condition. Ideally if they had a facility similar to the Deerfield/Cambridge fields, it would be sufficient. Mr. Hensler would also like to see a commitment from Waterloo.

Mr. Hendricks stated they have tried to work with getting the schools on board. They have been reluctant. Mr. Diedrick with the schools having large complexes they need to be involved. There needs to be an end to the beginning. Basically you need a wide base of participants with the ultimate goal of a high school soccer team. Mr. Hendricks suggested the club speak with other communities that have done it and/or get a copy of the model from someone who did it cooperatively. How did they find/get the players? How did it all happen? How did the facilities come about? Start to fill in the voids.

The Club stated they paid for a portable toilet at Riverview last year. They would like the Village to consider picking up that cost. Mr. Hensler stated the Village Board would need to discuss that.

Mr. Stransky said he understands their issues with the program when their space is split up. He used to play in a similar situation and it gets very confusing for people. If you don't have a facility, people need to connect with a facility through the high schools. Can they run a High School program? If you don't have a facility you don't have a future, without a future you can't make it happen without a facility.

Facility visibility has proven to be an issue. Mr. Hendricks also noted that Riverview Park doesn't have a sign. Green space is always a good investment and it is at a shortage. The club members said they are committed to all age groups. If a facility could be established there may be park grants and foundation dollars that could be applied for. They will continue to maintain fields as they did in 2013. They do need volunteers to help.

3. Dog Park.

The ideal for a dog park was brought up at the last Village Board meeting. The ideal was fairly well received. The parks committee recommended funding the park with an additional \$5.00 in dog license fee per dog. The board discussion was not having a dog license fee increase, but taking the cost out of fund balance. No final action was taken by the board.

The Village Board discussed at length the fact that there was "no official leash law ordinance". They are working to revise this ordinance require dogs off the owner's property to be leashed. They also discussed that if there was a dog park to possibly eliminate dogs from other parks. Mr. Hendricks stated that communities such as McFarland still allow dogs in their parks and they have a dog park. City of Madison let dogs in some parks and not others. City of Sun Prairie allows dogs only in their dog park. There can be various options on allowing dogs in parks: 1) allowed 2) not allowed 3) allow in some and

not in others. Mr. Hensler said the proposed leash law would require dogs to be on a leash (not to exceed 10'). The Village Board will be discussing at their March 11th meeting.

Mr. Diedrick said he likes the flexibility of taking dogs to parks. Mrs. Cripps said she was also in favor of allowing leashed dogs in the parks-if they are walking through. Mr. Lemke and Mr. Stransky concurred. There was discussion that maybe "no dogs allowed during events" and "dogs in parks on leash only".

As far as the dog park, there seemed to be support for the park. Mr. Schuepbach said he would like to see the leash law implemented and have no dog park now. Some support and others didn't support a dog park. There will be maintenance and costs. Mr. Hendricks did note that when they first discussed a dog park they talked about Village owned properties when making the proposal. Mr. Hensler said maybe there is something that could be opened up outside of town.

4. Riley Deppe Park

The Village Board will again discuss on March 11th assuming Riley Deppe Park. The Parks Committee's role was to provide information to those making the decision. Mr. Hendricks shared results from a survey that was sent to 1400 residents in the Village along with social media options. There were 269 responses; 90% of the respondents were from the Village; 10% non-residents. 183 respondents were in favor of the Village assuming the park, 86 respondents were against. Respondents were also given the opportunity to express why they were for or against it. Many that were against it were because of the cost to the taxpayers and those for it saw it as an opportunity.

Mr. Hensler said if we take it over he wants to see it lock, stock and barrel with NO strings attached. The County has agreed to do certain maintenance items in 2014 and will take care of it thru 2014. Mr. O'Loughlin said the County can't take it back as far as he is concerned.

Mr. Blaschka expressed concerns about the projected costs for this park in the Outdoor Recreation plan. Mr. Hendricks said the Outdoor Recreation plan is typically a five year plan, an action plan. He was hesitant to be stuck on the figures. Some, all or none of the items could be done. Some costs can be defrayed with volunteers and outside funding sources. If the park is obtained a park plan should be completed. Dane Count will be doing the following in 2014: New roof on shelter; tare down old restroom that is boarded up, fix drainage in parking lot (no blacktopping will be done), upgrade pier, prune trees, mowed the no mow zone. Mr. Blaschka also noted there are a lot of ash trees in the park. Mr. Hendricks said intensify tree plantings should be considered for Riley Deppe and Fireman's parks.

Mr. Diedrick said if the budget dollars aren't available, that park could be the same in five years as it is today. Certainly if the Village doesn't take control of the park nothing will happen

Mr. O'Loughlin said this discussion has been going on for twenty years. The County knows it is best to have Marshall take care of the park. Mr. Diedrick said the County is spending funds in County Parks that have a regional draw. Riley Deppe doesn't have a regional draw. Mr. Hensler said the tax dollars the County is currently spending won't come back to the Village.

Mr. Blaschka asked about the shoreline around the park. Mr. Hendricks said the shoreline is rock that is sufficient to hold the toe. There is no rock around the island.

5. Recreation Director Report

1. Applied for an environmental grant.
2. Check on cost to get electrical to the shelter at Langer Park - \$12,500. This price seemed like too much just to get power to the building.
3. Mr. Hendricks will be leaving his position with the Village at the end of March.

Having no further business a motion was made by Diedrick and seconded by Cripps to adjourn at 8:45 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Peck
Village Administrator