



## PUBLIC MEETING NO. 3 NOTES

2335 Highway 36 W  
St. Paul, MN 55113

Tel 651-636-4600  
Fax 651-636-1311

[www.bonestroo.com](http://www.bonestroo.com)

### Park District of Oak Park Ridgeland Common Master Plan

**Date/Time:** Saturday, April 12, 2008, 9:30 AM

**Location:** Bye School

**Attendance:** General Public ~100

Park Board Members

Mark Gartland

Marty Bracco

Jessica Bullock

Christine Graves

Park District Citizen Committee Members

Tracy Brooker

Patrick Dahlstrom

Dick McKinlay

Nancy Holmes

Park District Staff

Gary Balling

Mike Grandy

Bill Hamilton

Jenny Berni

Yanie Myvett

Diane Stanke

Bonestroo Team Members

Jim Maland, Bonestroo

Steve Hallberg, Bonestroo

Don McKay, Nagle Hartray

Jill Allread, PCI

Meeting Agenda:

Introductions and Overview

Meeting Expectations

Overview of Process to Date

Master Plan Options

Strolling Community Workshop

Formal Public Input Session (3 minute open mike)

#### *Introductions and Overview*

Gary Balling welcomed the crowd and gave an overview of the process that we have been through to date and what the next steps would be. He will be meeting with the Park Board on Monday, April 21, and the School Board on Tuesday, April 22 and a joint meeting with the Park Board and Park District Citizen Committee on April 28<sup>th</sup> to further discuss the options presented today. Three options will be selected to further pursue the detailed construction costs, operational costs and possible methods of financing. This information will all be available for

a Public Meeting that will be held in June on this year. Adequate notice will be provided to the public when the meeting date is set.

Gary handed the meeting over to Jim Maland, project manager for the consultant from the Bonestroo Team.

#### *Meeting Expectations*

Jim Maland gave a quick summary for today's meeting expectations which included a 1-1/2 to 2 hour commitment, an understanding of the project process, understanding of the five options being presented today and input from the public through an open mike session.

#### *Overview of Process to Date*

A brief review of the project schedule highlighted that the project schedule is 70% complete and the next steps will include developing construction and operational costs, looking at financing mechanisms and developing management alternatives. This information will then be presented to the public at the fourth public meeting in June 2008.

#### *Master Plan Options*

Jim Maland reviewed in detail all six master plan options using a PowerPoint slideshow. The options included an Existing Plan and three Expanding Plans and two Visionary Plans. One of the Expanding Plans was a slight modification of the Expanding Plan Option 2, entitled Expanding Plan 2A, that integrates a dog park into the plan. Handouts of the plans along with the written program statements used in the plan development were provided to those that attended. A few errors in the handout plans were noted which will be fixed before they are posted on the park district web site.

An emphasis of the planning process was to evaluate a variety of building locations throughout the site to identify the resulting constraints and opportunities available to those orientations. Significant impacts were found to both the athletic field and building layouts as a result of the narrowing of the north-south dimension of the property as you move from west to east. As athletic fields move eastward the narrower north-south dimension minimized the feasibility to use north-south oriented field hockey, lacrosse and football fields. The building footprints also became larger in the east-west orientation as buildings were moved easterly resulting in more significant restrictions to the outdoor fields and aquatics components. Parking expansion will most likely include the addition of additional levels to the existing Village of Oak Park public parking ramp on Lake Street. This parking structure is currently two stories and it is understood to be expandable to four stories. With the primary parking facility located at the existing parking ramp near the west end of the site, the most desired building sites will undoubtedly be those closest to the parking ramp if all other factors are considered equal. All outdoor sports fields are currently proposed to be surfaced with artificial turf to maximize playability and minimize maintenance and care of the fields. Each plan develops a "back-of-the-house" service area along the southern side of the building which takes advantage of the void created by the utility easement in that area. Staff Offices are included in all plans to show the potential to relocate the administrative staff from the John L. Hedges Administrative Building on Madison Street to improve operational efficiency.

A variety of outdoor pool arrangements were also presented in the various plans to show the diversity of aquatic options available. The four aquatic plans shown represent four popular but different options which is still a small fraction of the available outdoor aquatic options. The general design categories for the options shown range from: 1) a competitive pool layout; 2) a shallow water leisure pool layout; 3) and combination of shallow water leisure and competitive pool water layout; and 4) a leisure pool with a current channel (water in motion) layout. The final decision on what type of pool to provide at Ridgeland Common will require a better understanding of the capital and operational costs differences of the various pool options as well as a more comprehensive joint evaluation of the combined opportunities that could be provided at the Ridgeland Common and Rehm Pools.

Parking was briefly discussed and the existing parking and potential parking plan numbers were identified. The final parking plan will further be developed as the potential costs to the various parking expansion plans are evaluated in the next steps of the project. A traffic study will also be undertaken by the Park District once the

park board has identified the most desired master plan options that are to be further pursued. The traffic study will evaluate the traffic impacts created by any proposed road closings as well as the increased traffic that may be developed by expanding the facility at Ridgeland Common.

#### *Wrap-up*

Gary Balling wrapped up the presentation by canvassing the audience to determine if any additional time was needed for review of the options prior to the public feedback. It was agreed that the strolling workshop was not necessary at this time and public response could begin immediately. Gary indicated that a questionnaire would be available online at the park districts website for this meeting for those that couldn't stay longer today. The project team would remain available after the public input to further answer any questions.

#### *Strolling Community Workshop*

The strolling workshop was canceled to accelerate the schedule to allow for more timely input from the public as outlined above.

#### *Formal Public Input Session (3 minute open mike)*

Comments from the public from the open mike session are as follows:

##### Traffic concerns on East Avenue

- 100, 200, 300 blocks East Avenue are concerned
- How will traffic on East Avenue be addressed
- Closing of Scoville will cause additional traffic on East Avenue

Like Visionary Plan 1 – It considers a look at life span not just one stage of life

Limited space so be as efficient as possible

- Don't replicate OPRF fields with artificial turf
- Need strong presence of ice to strengthen program
- Need winter recreation opportunities in Oak Park
- Kids could use an indoor pool
- Consider "bubble" over outdoor fields
- Building needs to be close to parking ramp

Want 50 meter swim

- Applaud previous speaker
- Great practice for high school team
- Keep 50 M pool as priority
- No value in 25 meter pool
- Too much shallow water in many of the plans

Friends of OP Dogs

- Dog park is more about dog owners than dogs
- Use park every day

High concentration of condos/apartments in the area - need to take into consideration

Against closing Scoville Avenue

- Should close East Avenue and keep Scoville open
- Move lighted fields
- Will fight all way through courts

Haven't solved the battle for ice time between hockey & figure without two full size rinks

- Need more ice surface

In danger of losing the 50 meter pool

- Good for athletics/fitness
- Life skill. Do forever.
- Age diversity interaction (college/working/senior)
- Can use 50 M pool with splashing water for recreation

How will cost of facility affect real estate taxes

- 50% increase in core shell costs from 2005-2012

- Can still use existing facility so why do we have to entirely rebuild
- There better be transparency in June regarding costs

Concerned about cost

- Get to visionary plan if we can get there
- Exercise partnerships and private dollars

Elmwood Park – YMCA Board Member

- Program in plan for Ridgeland Common is what YMCA is building
- Located 1.4 miles west of City
- No ice or 50 meter pool planned at the new YMCA
- Lobbying for joining/supporting new YMCA

Be mindful of bigger footprint and duplicate space (2 ice rinks and two pools)

- Be conscious of energy costs
- Concerned about operation costs

Reiterate dog park support (adopted dog).

- Social aspect of dog park
- Apartment dwellers like dog park at Ridgeland Common

Facility should consider facilities that can't be duplicated elsewhere such as 50m pool and ice rink

- YMCA is different orientation for water
- Enhance the natural environment
- Green roof/plantings

In favor of visionary plans

- Get as much as we can get
- Commends park district for partnership
- Multiuse and efficiency
- LEED use of green roofs

Likes all plans

- Dog park
- Lap pool needs to be year round
- Ice rink is good
- Probably won't get built because Oak Park has too many complainers - not enough tax dollars

Responding to YMCA Board Member

- New YMCA is not accessible by public transit and further than 1.4 miles
- More importantly Ridgeland Commons is a good facility in Oak Park for all ages

END