

Park District of Oak Park

Date: Thursday, May 15, 2008
Project: Taylor Park Site Master Plan, 2nd Community Meeting
Public Meeting Date: Monday, May 5th, 2008 at 7pm
Public Meeting Location: Andersen Center, 824 N. Hayes,

Minutes of meeting

1. Mr. Gary Balling, Executive Director of the Park District of Oak Park opened the meeting. He spoke about the overall planning process and gave background on the work to date. He introduced the members of Altamanu Inc. and Terra Engineering who were to facilitate the meeting, Park District Staff, members of the Park District Board and members of the Park District Citizen Committee who were in attendance
2. Mr. Balling then handed the meeting over to Mr. John Mac Manus and Josephine Bellalta of Altamanu Inc. who facilitated the meeting and Julie Smith of Altamanu Inc. who took notes and also took part in the meeting.
3. Mr. Mac Manus reviewed the information and opinions recorded in Park Surveys that had been returned to date. In general the public do not want to see great change at the park, walking and walking pets was very important and that there was a 50%/50% response to the question of having or not having a dog park in Taylor Park.
4. Then Mr. Mac Manus led the meeting through some of the concepts that received favorable response from the attendees at the last meeting and presented the 4 options (plans) that were developed for this meeting. The plans were divided into areas of the park and were accompanied by photos from the park to assist the audience in visualizing the park and potential changes.
5. The following are the comments recorded as they were made at the meeting and their order has not been revised. Comments in brackets are inserted to assist in clarity.
 - High percentage of people (present) attended the previous meeting
 - Request to take out the pavers at the SW entrance
 - Good to redesign that entryway
 - Good to redesign all entryways
 - Path has a problem with the grading.
 - Standing water and ice most of the winter (near SE corner of tennis and playground)
 - Regrade the main meadow. Remove minor berm that runs the length of the park and traps water
 - Park district snow plows in the front shave off the edge of that hillside.(snow ploughs occasionally cut into soil on either side of the paths)
 - Mike Grandy (Park District) commented that the options on the equipment are very limited and the plows used are narrow as he can get. The sidewalk itself is 60 inches wide (not much room for plough). Sidewalk is hard to see (in snow) the driver has a very challenging time.

- Could the paving conform to the width of the plow, i.e. increase the width of the paving to at least 6'. Any wider and vehicles start to attempt to drive on them. This would give a little give for bikers & strollers. Elevation of pavement up to the grade would help as well.
- Natural areas in the SE corner, 30 people would like to maintain it. How do you protect a natural area when a lot of people in this neighborhood let their dogs loose in the park?
- Water stops drying up around May.
- John showed potential views of a fen at SE corner
- John shows the vicinity where a fen may work nicely. Come in on a bridge across the fen.
- Comments on the Fen, restoring Jens Jensen's park is good, are you talking about an acre and a half?
- John shows the vicinity and circles it out.
- Would it be possible to preserve the sled hill park and have enough room for this?
- Yes the sled hill tops out at the beginning of the old Ridgeland alignment.
- Would it still be useable for the sledding hill for kids?
- Yes you would mow it. That would make it flat again for winter and sledding.
- You wouldn't be getting rid of that sledding hill would you? No it would not affect the sledding.
- In the survey it just said fencing, after seeing the pictures (of fences around the fen and potential prairie) now I would feel more comfortable seeing it since it's not that you are throwing up the chain link.
- I like the native plantings it's certainly in Jensen's theory and philosophy, I think it's adaptable, recreation can happen with the native planting. Your diagrams with the fencing enhance that feeling. I think that could work, yes.
- Question: Could you regrade the bottom of the sled hill so that it could be dryer?
- Answer there is water everywhere in the site, regrading would certainly improve it, and that ridge running parallel to Ridgeland acts like a dam.
- With the right grading it would be a much more usable area where kids could play football?
-Answer:somewhat, it may not be an area suitable for that use
- Native plants with their root system do mop up moisture and it would help with the spongy soil and dirt.
- Problem occurs starting in March when the native plants aren't really waking up yet.
- Question: Regarding the meadow (prairie) idea, is it expected or perhaps desirable for the meadow to attract animal life, we have possums, raccoons, red foxes, to that area, and if so what happens in the winter when it gets mowed, what will happen to those animals. Would the meadow have to get mowed, does it have to get cut each year? If the meadow were configured in such a way where you could sled in the center of it? We could leave a V and mow that and leave habitat on each side.
- When you look at the park, you can see that there are still lots and lots of open grass for human and dog activity on that left side, and as long as it still provides sledding in the winter, it is a beautiful opportunity to provide habitat.
- I love the idea of the plantings and the prairie. I do have a concern for the people who count on using this. I know that has been horrible (wet and mud) with little children down there. That is where the park district classes practice, is there enough room there? Is there room for all of that and the teams are desperate for that space. In fall where people have their practice in that park.
- John takes a show of hands to see who is in favor of the fen. A high number of people are in favor of a fen/sedge meadow in that corner.
- How much money would it cost to build and maintain this new area, \$100,000? While it would look nice, I'm sure my vote would change if it cost \$500,000.
- The theory is that it would be best if you can let it take care of itself.

- A healthy prairie needs a burn occasionally to keep it clear of invasive species.
- If some element or elements were introduced that do require additional effort/labor planting weeding, is there some hope to recruit people from the neighborhood to help?
- Answer is certainly, concern is sometimes the people move.
- Doug Chen: Volunteer on the citizens committee advising the park district in ecological friendliness. He is a steward on a prairie.
 - Every ecosystem in NE Illinois was all maintained by fire, set by lightning or Native Americans. You are basically recreating a native landscape and ecosystem which was originally found in the area. To properly maintain it, you need to burn it, people come in who have training, you come in with special equipment, use permits, have a certified crew, there is a lot of science behind setting a fire in an urban setting. This lets the plants and animals come back as frequently as possible.
 - What is the recovery time? My front yard is all burned, first week of April it was burned, mostly green already (early May). If you burn it, plants green up faster than if you do not. As you are burning, what does that look like? How will it affect people who live around there? There is a prescription with humidity, correct wind conditions and forecast. Burn on a day with light winds and certain stratification. Can burn spring or fall. Prairies typically burn every 1-3 years. You only ever want to burn half at a time, so you don't burn all the insect homes. How long does a typical burn take? You spend way more time doing prep than the actual burn. My 35' frontage lasted 10 minutes. Next time we'll have a cost, and other details to help on decision making.
- Sometimes kids can get destructive, breaking the benches in the picnic areas, there could be damage done in this park (to fences and prairie).
- Give them more natural play with something that can be maintained. Ability to interact with nature in a different way. Some traditional components left, allowance for supervision and enclosure. Run off into a path system and explore.
- What kind of ground cover are you thinking in this natural area? Get the sand out of there is one of the things that people have been saying in the survey. A more resilient surfacing.

Many sites were considered for a new playground and an accompanying rest room shelter

- Is the comfort station up there? (north side)
Mike G -it would be a container or shell that would be built in such a way that it could be dropped off in the early spring and be pulled out in late November, that would get rid of the necessity for expensive plumbing.
- Is it possible to improve the one that is there (South side); we are not expecting that it would go away. If the playground moves north, it is a request that the bathroom would go with it too.
- But the soccer game. 3 year olds aren't going to use porto-potties. Park district also needs space for storage, fridges, emergency phones, equipment etc.
- Down at Diversey harbor there is a trailer, but inside it's a full bathroom, that one is piped in.
- For concerts there is one I have seen, one that rolls in, has tanks, someone hooks up a tanker truck to pipe it (waste) out.
- I'm speaking of a 3 sided shell that would follow the roof lines of the existing restroom building that would follow the same color scheme. Porto Potties would be in it. This what we can afford and maintain, we don't want a large building out there; it would be a small facility.
- Would the washrooms be along Berkshire? Yes.
- One small problem, my kids won't use a porto-potty. No matter how attractive you make it.
- What would happen to the trees in that area?

- Would you like to cut all the trees down like you did in Field?
- 77 trees were planted in Field Park
- Porto Potties are a concern. We have an eight and second grader who won't use those.
- If the goal is to try to serve the needs of kids there, it's not a particular good option.
- Remember we are just running through options, we will study all of them
- What about a composting toilet?
- Mine is more of a safety question and concern. I live on Berkshire, I cannot tell you how many times that I have called the police, and my concern is that a shelter would increase activity in that area.
- (Mike G.) We have hot spots that move around from one site to the next. You get them out of one park and they move to the next.
- Folks on Berkshire might be doing a little more rearing than on the other blocks. We probably have half the block present, believe it's one of the darker streets with a lot of foliage, etc... many interesting things are present on the grass.
- Let's make this positive, turn it into a recommendation not a criticism
- Maybe we can put more street lights in there. Other problem being I don't know if there is enough room unless we have to cut down more trees.

Meeting looks at photographs of open area just to the north of the Picnic Grove

- Think about putting something there that is less attractive to having people come and gather. Stick the dog park there if you are going to have a dog park, those kids aren't going to come to the dog park. We often think of punishing kids. I think they ought to be called in to do community service to correct the wrong they have done in the park.
- The logical place for the play area is where it is now, expanded but where it is.
- I think the dog park will be a problem since it will increase the traffic within the park in general, and the usage by animals both inside and outside the park. I think that having the dog park goes against the type of park it is
- We are looking at more of an open air shelter. This whole zone (north side) becomes picnic and play.
- Does this scheme not have a dog park in it?
No it doesn't.
- Are there any events for which a permit is required for this or any other parks? I am thinking specifically of a large wedding which took place in the park?
They were beyond the scope of what they were permitted to do with the amplified music. We have wedding photos and things that happen of that nature. It was a picnic on steroids.
- If you want to use the picnic grove, do you have to have a license (permit)?
Yes
- What if it's an impromptu picnic? Its first come first served.
- I just want to say I really like the combination of the picnic area and playground, it makes a lot of sense you would keep it all together.
- Are there any sort of viewing areas for the tennis?
- This (the west side of the tennis courts) might be another nice viewing area for the tennis courts, since all the people stand on the parkway for hours.
- The Park District at the moment regularly have vehicles pulled in off of division here (near the comfort station), perhaps we could put more of a drop off and handicapped (accessible path)?
- What about the dog park, do you have to have permits to run the dog park now?
- We didn't have nothing like this (dog park), I'm not going to pay \$39 to run my dog around the park, just (let your dog off lease) pick up your poop.
- As far as comfort stations are concerned, as we get into warmer weather they are opened in the morning, staff comes out at 7/730, then they are closed out. That doesn't mean that bad things don't happen in there.

People don't seem to have a huge amount of respect for the public facilities. During the course of the summer they are cleaned multiple times.

- There was a question on the survey about lights on the soccer/multi purpose field. A single light was suggested for kids practice? How would they be turned on and off? The timers on the tennis courts don't often work.
 - The idea would be that this would be new and would use the latest technology. The sports groups asked if we did do something like that could it be extended to 8pm. If it really did go out at 8pm it would be nice.
 - Leave the washrooms on Division Street; there is enough for people on Berkshire to contend with.
 - Today I literally could not drive down Elmwood, it is so tight right now with the number of people that were there, we literally cannot drive down the streets. There are many reasons why I am anti-dog park, I feel that is one more reason (traffic) that this park is not meant for dog parks.
 - The question I had was related to the shelter, whether some of these conceptual schemes could accommodate that idea.
 - This is a la carte; we can take one idea from a concept (plan) and put it with others.
 - The NE corner doesn't get much attention, it looks like a big piece of land and could be a possible meadow, and not much has been said about that.
 - In each case (scheme) something is going on there.
 - It seems maybe it is a good space for the big meadow, but we could have a lot of trees (that might shade out a meadow)
 - At the meetings that were held, I thought that you can't put anything there because it is so wet there.
 - Part of this process is to create drier useable areas.
 - You mentioned an artificial surface in that vicinity (upper field), it would be a huge drainage issue.
 - It could drain with an aggregate underneath it, there are possibilities that water would drain down the hill
 - Comment about the SE corner. It seems like that is probably the busiest corner and the larger you can make the natural area the better. I would like to see the entrance closed off and move the path (use the Jensen path alignment).
 - Why don't you start a committee with people and toddlers? My kids are in 1st and 2nd grade. They don't want to go to Taylor Park, since stuff is for all little kids. My kids spent all the time on that concrete bunker. What I would love for is that this area is still playable for elementary school kids and middle schoolers. We certainly need spaces for toddlers, but right now Taylor is restricted to that, nothing for an older child to do.
 - I'd like to see separate playgrounds for small kids and big kids, separate play structures.
 - (Mike G) I was around the last time we redesigned this park, the first time through we had the Park Board making major discussion about the size and type of play center we would put in this park, one of the thoughts was if we put in an older children's playground area, we would double our expenses because within a ¼ mile there is double the type of facilities (we could provide) at the school. It has playground equipment for older kids
 - Times have changed since more families have kids spread across in years, and I would like to bring the whole family together so that they can all play close together.
 - We have done that at numerous play center areas, but when you deal with scarce resources and scarce land, that was the choice that was made (only a tot lot)
- .
- I don't have children so don't kill me; I think having the dog park near the problem area (north side) would help with some of the problems (security after dark). I like the idea of the bridge (SE corner) and the path going across the corner (fen) along with the scheme with the dog park.
 - Would there be a spectator area near the fen?

- Yes you could view it almost all around the perimeter
- Did one of the 2 schemes add the Jensen path with the bridge?
- It was Mike's idea for the bridge.
- 3 people speak in favor of the current path (from the SE up the hill). 10 like the combination path, (that is a hybrid of Jensen's path) around 10 like the closed off one (SE corner).
- It seems like you could have the bridge (without a connecting path), it just is something that lets you cross the wetland portion. It could be a folly. You will have to create little islands to keep the trees.
- There is a bus stop there too (SE). You would get a desire line from one corner to the other SE to NW.
- Is there any chance the sledding hill could become a little higher?
- Let's fix the grading problems first and then consider that.
- The bridge expands your natural play area greatly with amphibians.
- I loved the description that you gave of the natural play areas, I think that is outstanding and that would serve the purpose of having things for slightly older children, and encourage imagination.
- Someone spoke about (the book) "The Last Child in the Woods".
- Should we talk about the potential dog park now?
- Buildings would be easier and quicker to discuss.

Potential locations were discussed for a new shelter

- There is a sightline issue with locations of shelters down by the tot lot.
- Design the shelter like the ones in national parks, heavy timber open on 3 or 4 sides, a weathered shelter sort of thing, it would open 3 sides but one side would be closed for possible storage. The ones I recall in the park district were made of massive timbers.
- We have a hexagon at Field Park that is not enclosed on any sides, can't hang off of it or set fire to it.
- On the location where the shelter is right now, is there water and sewer piped in right now?
- There is water over by the location #3 (SW north of tennis courts) and we do have power throughout the site.
- Can you talk to us about the plan at this park and how it was designed to have compression and release? In my mind I'm trying to picture a structure at that end and your eye stops at that view there.
- Jensen treated outdoor spaces in a similar manner to Frank Lloyd Wright's spaces inside a building. He compresses the entry and then you come into a high ceilinged space with windows and full of light. He also layered the plantings and used many flowering trees. We could try to do something similar around the shelter and create a forest edge. If you are in the shelter you would probably have some long views to the field. This location needs some layers of dogwoods and Crabs underneath the large canopies.
- What activity would be taking place in the area to necessitate a shelter?
- The shelter could serve as storage for summer camps
- Would it be unattractive to houses on that side? I think it would be. We would want it to be screened.
- Anyone love any particular ones (potential locations)?
- To me functionally location #3 would work best for the most number of people. If you move picnic area to the other area, then the shelter would function for that as well.
- I think #3 would be my preference, it provides nice service to the tennis courts and the soccer field. Gives protection in rain as well. Place to hustle off too, where you can retreat long enough for parents to get their kids (out of the rain).
- A lot of traffic is there already (along Elmwood); those people are using that area anyway.
- Does the budget preclude more than one structure? Yes...
- I am not in favor of moving the playground, moving the little children closer to the big soccer field would be hazardous; they would run right onto the field. My first choice is #4 to keep and expand what is there.
- No one is in favor of location #1 and #2.
- Room (audience) is split on #3 and #4, (12 for #4).

- You wouldn't be adding to the existing building?
- The existing building is not going anywhere.
- As an architect I would hate to see it altered in anyway. Could you afford to build in the style that would pay due respect to the original building? Build the structure in location 3 which serves the needs that all the other ones don't.
- I don't understand the need for shelter #3, what is the function?, It's to store things. What about the additional barrier of people on Elmwood, you are creating a barrier for those people who live there.
- I have something in favor of location 2, what about people gathering there and calling 911, maybe more traffic nearby so there would be less of a chance of people doing much of that. Also that is a good opportunity to create a real focal point for the corner and it is set back and wouldn't bother anyone's view. #2 and 3 are spread out more.
- Number 3 is plopped down from a design aesthetic. Why not put it over here by the bunker? Location 5.
- Is there water at location 5?
- There is water in the bunker literally speaking, is it piped?
- I was going to suggest that site 3 be moved to the NE corner of the tennis courts, but you cut into the soccer field a bit more. All these locations are trying to avoid something.
- Number 5 is now the most popular. (Close to the existing bunker to the NE of the tennis courts)

Picnic Grove

- The picnic grove today is 1960's minimalist. The Glenwood Children's garden was designed by Jensen. It has a council ring (photo of council ring viewed) It is a Jensen signature piece.
- Berkshire people, would you like that? (council ring at picnic grove) YES, it would be nice
- I just want to say, I think the carrying capacity of this park is reaching its limit, both with traffic, parking, soccer balls going onto Elmwood, dogs off-leash, taking off after each other. The new areas should not be planned activity areas. Enough usage of sports, more areas you can just go and enjoy that are not going to bring a ton of people in there.
- I live on Division, I have kids and dogs, my kids have places to play, I just want a place for my dogs to play (dog park). I understand we are due for 2 (dog parks), this would be closer to me.

Dog park discussed in a location just to the East of the tennis courts.

- It is too close to the playground and tennis. Move the play up there.
- We are hearing mixed comments about doing that.
- I am a frequent user of the one at Ridgeland; I am kitty corner to Taylor. I like location #1 (NE corner) for a couple of reasons, it is separate, much further from both playgrounds and tennis.
- Less likely to hear barking, more likely to be drowned out from the constant crushing (noise) of Ridgeland. People are worried about masses of people, but there are only a half dozen people (with their dogs at a time) who all walk there. We all have cell phones, and would be more than happy to be part of a neighborhood watch; we'd join the 911 chorus. We may be able to support you guys, we are there (dog park) at 6am, it depends on the hours set at the park.
- Dog park people tend to be there at 6am, in winter and summer, that presence of people with dogs tends to minimize ill activity that goes on in the park.
- The dog park has nothing to do with that, I see them too at Taylor Park, several times a week. I often see dogs off-leash, people will break the law. Dog parks and dogs off-leash are not a related item (to a dog park).
- I like location #1 NE corner because it is a wet area, and you would kill 2 birds with one stone by regarding the wet area.
- I think that you will get less dogs off-leash if you do have some sort of dog park. People will bring their dogs to the fence

- People I've talked to who have their dogs off-lease have all been neighbors who could point at their house.
- You did a nice job last time telling us how you would enclose a fence in location 2. What would you be thinking in location #1?
- The idea is that there would be multiple layers of shrubbery. Say you are 5', we could still get up to this level (holds hand to chest) of shrubbery and it would still be safe. More flowering trees around the edge. The central area, the longest, would be for dogs to run and people to throw things. Any fence we would suggest for this space would be as naturalistic as possible.
- We live one block behind Berkshire, we have a dog and we use the property every day for walking. When we walk our dogs there are so many dogs off-leash it makes it really hard to walk our dogs, having a dog area where dogs can come would take care of that problem.
- I've never seen anyone I know in the picnic area. I would consider a smaller picnic area (to provide a dog park), although I appreciate that people from other parts of the town want to have meetings there etc, I think a lot of people would go to their back yard and not use the picnic area, but I would be willing to sacrifice one for the other, I came to support the dog park, it is a great use of the space, I bought the house partly because it was near the park and it would be a lovely thing to have.
- It is about 50/50 in favor and against the dog park
- I like the concept of the NE corner because you are putting use to a place there was no use before, expanding use to all of the residents. I know there is concern about traffic, but a lot of people would probably walk there (to Taylor dog park), the fact that there could be 2 dog parks, one on the south-end and one on the north-end of the town, would mitigate traffic concerns for what people would have to travel
- I'm opposed to the dog park for 2 reasons, first of all, this is a Jens Jensen park, I am not sure it fits in with the scheme. This takes a part of the park and takes it away (fences it) and makes it a single-use area. Oak Park only has about 30% of the park space it should have based on the population, taking away from that and creating a single-use/ the (overall) population is a priority I'm not convinced it is a good idea. The second issue is resources, there's a lot of talk about money and resources, dog parks are expensive to put in. Secondly, there are about 330 permits issued for a park, and 50,000 residents in Oak Park, taking part of the park for 330 permits. Maple Park is getting a brand new beautiful one, do we have the resources to add this one.
- You are trying to spend an inordinate amount of time and space on dog parks, simply catering to one portion of the people.
- Quick question, is there a dog park going in around Ridgeland Common?
It is still one of several locations (being considered); the problem with Ridgeland is that it's even tighter there. What we find is that the community allows 2 dogs in an apartment or condo, 3 dogs in a house. Lots of people have dogs and need space for their pets. Many communities don't allow dogs in parks at all.
- I respect that people have different views, but people say that a dog park is the only single use activity in the park; there are a limited number of people in Oak Park who play tennis. There are skateboard parks, hockey rinks and ice rinks at Ridgeland Common. But those places should be here (in Oak Park) because it makes us a whole community. Allow us the same consideration, that we should have some small portion where we can take them (dogs) to play.
- Ditto! Maybe suggest, Lindberg Park, maybe because it is so big, could we take another look at Lindberg? Why was it dropped?
- Second the Ditto
- Third the Ditto
- Lindberg Park was eliminated from consideration for a dog park during the Dogs in Oak Park planning process.

- The dog park is not necessarily a drain on the total resources here. Those 330 people (who have dog park permits) pay 39 dollars a year for the privilege, for the facility. That could increase. Dog park people pay for the maintenance of the dog park.
- As a user and supporter of the dog park, a lot of people think they need a place for dogs to run, I have made a lot of friends at the dog park, a community of people who share, and this is important thing in the community.
- My reaction to the thought that the space is not being used (NE corner) since it is open (green space), yes places are set aside for certain uses, I'm a dog lover, and there is a place for dogs, we trained our dog to run up and down our back yard. Parks should be primarily for people. I understand there are many people with dogs. The issue with all the dogs running loose in that we can't control the people now letting their dogs run free. A lot of dog owners are not very responsible. The dog park is a source of noise/visual pollution. It's a waste dump, attracting waste around the city.
- More dogs would be in the park as a result of this. Before you go ahead and assume there is a consensus for the dog park, you need to do a more effective job to get a true reading. It is the classic problem with a special interest group is that they will come out to all the meetings, I think you need to do a mailing or something like that to make a more positive effort to contact the residents of this area and get a complete view of who wants to have the park (dog park) set aside.
- I can't imagine a more inclusive process than the one the Park District has gone through, starting with Stevenson, and Andersen and Maple and now Taylor. There are advertisements in the paper, with flyers posted in the village, I can't imagine more inclusive advertising for these kinds of meetings, the fact we are all here is that we are interested in participating. Other people can't make it or aren't interested, whatever your views or any side of the issue you are. In fact we are at a park meeting every other week.
- The cost is actually in installing the park.
- A community survey done in 2004 which provided input in the whole planning process. As part of the preparation for the review, one of the items asked on that survey, "Among 29 facilities, would someone in your house want or use this?" Dog parks was near the top (27% of the households were responding) When asked what are the most important things out of your responses, a dog park was rated 8th.
- I'm anti-dog parks, but I agree, you can send survey's out, as much as I'd love to see a survey or mailing, you get about 5 percent response though and I can't imagine you would get a whole lot more. You need to take the point up with your neighbors.
- 105 people, as of today have responded (on the Park District survey on the web), if its' important to you, go to your neighbors and have them complete it.
- It's a questionnaire in order to get a sense of what people are feeling. We do a community survey that gets broader spectrum of people; we do community meetings and information in the newspaper and try to get many different facets of the population so that we hear what people say.
- Dog Park Plus is a temporary situation.
- We can keep it open a bit longer

Gary Balling Park District

We've heard a lot of different sides of this, thank you for participating for 2.5 hours. The next community meeting is Monday May 19, at 7o'clock here. The design team will further refine (the concepts) into three plans and will bring them back at that time.

Attendees

- Upper NE corner is location if there is to be a dog park.
- I have concerns over synthetic turf, the drainage and turf negates enjoyable walking. People in the neighborhood can't take a walk through there (now). And its (synthetic turf) just not natural.
- It could have injuries and impact on wildlife.

Mr. Balling again thanked the attendees.



END OF MEETING NOTES

This is our understanding of what occurred at the meeting. If you wish to add or change these notes please do not hesitate to contact us at (773) 528.7492 or by Email at John@altamanu.com

Notes recorded by Julie Smith of Altamanu Inc.

Comments added by John Mac Manus of Altamanu Inc. in brackets for clarity.