The April 18, 2007 meeting of the Joint Pewaukee Park/Recreation Board was called to order at 7:00 pm by Bob Rohde. Also present were Brian Dziwulski, Dave Linsmeier, Del Kaatz, Sue Gresham, Alderman Kathleen Novack, Trustee Richard Mann and Kelley Woldanski, Park/Recreation Director. Present in the audience were Adam Dobberstein, Sue & Kevin Tess, Kathleen & Jim Pulaski, Bill Nettesheim, Ronald Frey, Andy Eyrise, Rick Eggert, Josh Towner, Barb Whitcomb, Larry Weidmann, Allison Collins, Allison Little, Tammy Tritz, Dave Swan, Jeff Bake, Mr. Mayo, Wally Fiedorowicz, Aaron Johnson, Mary Wichman, Bobbi Pfeifferle, Laura Dritlein, Joe Johnson, Mark Ignatow, Randy & Lisa Heinritz, Dan Brownell, Gary Majeskie, Roland Perschon, Jean Stapleton, Alderman Hasslinger, Mayor Klein, Monica Kaskey, Matt Stevens, and Dave Burch from Bonestroo, Rosene, Anderlik and Associates.

The first item on the agenda was the approval of the minutes of the April 11, 2007 meeting. This meeting was canceled therefore there were no minutes to approve.

The purpose of this meeting was to review the 3 proposed conceptual park master plans for the Pewaukee Sports Complex. The first fifteen minutes of the meeting were given to allow the audience to walk around and review each of the plans. Afterward, Dave Burch gave his presentation of each park master plan stating what each included and the pros and cons of each of the plans. This information is attached to this document.

After the presentation gave by D. Burch, members of the audience were invited to speak about their concerns and/or likes and dislikes of the plans. Comments included:

- Check the well and septic system to ensure it can handle the proposed amount of traffic.
- Plan #2 has ball fields separated from the neighbors, but they the fields do not need to be all 350’ fences. PYB needs a couple smaller fields. Overall he liked plan #2 the best because of the separation from the different sports it provided.
- What kind of research has been done to determine the number of fields needed? D. Burch replied they used the Park and Open Space Plan as well as talking to user groups and staff. B. Rohde added that an inventory has been performed regarding the number of fields used and how many are actually needed realizing that some fields are at capacity now.
- Regarding lighting of the fields – Village Park would be better refurbished to accommodate the needs of lights rather than putting lights at this park. Also, walking trails on the west side of the complex raises concerns as she lives on the west side of the park and is nervous people will cross the treeline and enter her property. Are there plans to plant more trees or widen/move the trail? She doesn’t want people walking in her yard. Also, with traffic flow – Lindsay Road is already a dangerous road with accidents and thinks that people using the park should be required to turn left out of the park onto Lindsay Road and head out to Hwy 74. She would also like to see larger play areas for children.
- Doesn’t want anyone in the treeline. How will the new park affect their water table? Would like to see tennis courts and volleyball courts. Also has very large concern about traffic on Lindsay Road.
- Concern about a lack of play areas for children. Suggests putting in shelters around the park for people to use. Will this park go in a step at a time? Suggests we start the development small, see what needs arise and then plan further amenities for the park.
- An email was read from one of the Board Members on behalf of Sean Sullivan. It read: My name is Sean Sullivan, I’m a resident in the City of Pewaukee, and have been involved with the
Pewaukee Soccer Club for over 25 years, first as a player, now as a coach and board member. I am also a soccer coach up at Pewaukee High School, Head JV Coach, and Varsity Assistant for the Girls program in the spring and Boys program in the fall. I am also a registered Professional Engineer in the state of Wisconsin, and have a large background in Municipal Engineering, including storm water issues. I have practice tonight, and so if I don't make the meeting, please read this entire e-mail as part of the public comment segment of the meeting. I'm writing this e-mail to comment on the three proposals for the upcoming sports complex located off of Lindsay road. First of all, I would like to congratulate the city for going thru with the purchase of this property. I think that if done correctly, this sports complex could be a fantastic addition to a wonderful community. With that being said, I would like to offer some comments regarding the design and layout of the complex. I honestly feel that the soccer layout in all three plans looks to push us off into a corner of the property, and doesn't account for the large number of teams and game size fields we will be using in the spring, summer and fall. As you and your board hopefully knows by now, the youth Soccer program in Pewaukee is one of the largest if not the largest sports club in the city. The need for practice fields and game fields is of high importance to the club as a whole. When I was a youth in Pewaukee back in the 1980's, we played games at East Park, West Park, and South Park. We were asked to leave "East" park years ago, so that it could be designated a baseball/ softball only facility. Later, South Park developed their baseball/ softball diamonds, so our club does not have games at that location. I've been told that Wagner is also now directing us off the west side of the space, leaving only one regulation sized field at that park. We seem to be losing practice and game facilities, only to see them turned into other sporting venues. I am not apposed to other sports succeeding in Pewaukee; rather I'm looking for equal representation. We need to make sure that not only is field space reserved for the number of teams we have, and will have in the future, but that the sizes of the fields and spacing of the fields is optimized. Having youth fields only a couple feet separated from each other creates mass confusion with official whistles, fan reaction, and flow of the game due to balls from other fields interrupting play. One of the joys of coaching at Ballmer, and Wagner is the size, and condition of the field. For older teams, Ballmer is probably one of the largest soccer fields in the area. With the removal of the soccer fields from Wagner and Ballmer, again, looking at the layouts, the proposal isn't addressing this additional reduction in practice and game space within the city of Pewaukee. I find it odd that while we are being moved from both Ballmer and Wagner, after being kicked out of "East" Nettesheim Park and South Park years ago to make way for baseball and softball diamonds, you are still proposing 4 or more diamonds on the new facility? What I believe the club would like to see on the new site, is a more thought out layout of the soccer aspect of the park. While I applaud the inclusion of Rugby and Lacrosse "overlays" I feel these sports fields should be designated at one of the other parks thru out the city. The overlay concept in my opinion only leads to scheduling conflicts between the two sports. Conflicts we continue to have with baseball having our fields in their outfields at Wagner and Ballmer is a perfect example. While both clubs have worked successfully in the past, it always is a cause of nervousness for both when schedules come out in the spring and fall. Tournaments are another issue that should be looked at when designing the facility. How can the city host future tournaments when space is at such a premium? In summary, I appreciate you giving the public a chance to voice our opinions regarding this exciting chapter in the City of Pewaukee. It is exciting for all sports organizations in the city. I do hope you consider what we are all discussing here tonight and come up with a revised plan, or maybe a city wide land use plan at the parks that creates a facility and Parks department we can all continue to be proud of.

- Another comment was made about concerns about traffic. Perhaps instead of a left hand turn only, a four way stop would be better.
- Can someone expand on the idea of the community center? B. Rohde replied that the community center was considered as a part of future planning – in case we would like something like this in the future. K. Novack stated that the strategic planning committee in the City of Pewaukee performed a survey and many comments were that they would like a community center. Although 20,000 square feet is much larger than what she had in mind.
- Another comment was that they were very excited about the complex. He feels baseball is in desperate need of facilities as it has grown to over 00 participants. Also, the High School will most likely lose the field they currently use and therefore this need could be met with the complex.
Someone commented about the email that was read and agrees that we have fields at other parks so why is there a need for them at the sports complex – baseball fields that is. Why not make it a soccer complex? B. Rohde replied that this park is more than a neighborhood park. It could bring in outside teams for tournaments and baseball is included in that. B. Rohde also stated in regard to the email that was read, Nettesheim Park is the only park that has been deemed to not allow soccer because of the conflict with the Department’s adult softball program that is held there.

Another comment was made that there are over 600 kids in soccer; on game day the number of fields proposed are good however they still need other practice fields. It doesn’t seem like there’s enough immediate play areas for kids. Restrooms – crossing over the drive is extremely dangerous so restrooms should be planned for both sides of the complex. Will there be storage there for groups such as the soccer club to store things?

Another resident asked what about the Sussex/Hamilton school district? Their children can’t use this complex because they are not in Pewaukee? B. Rohde stated that was incorrect. This resident continued to state that they do not receive the Pewaukee newspapers or club advertising and that needs to get out to all. There is a real problem on Lindsay Road – there was a fatal accident recently and he has counted 25 accidents in the last 20 years. The road cannot haul 500+ cars. The park is so far east in the community that people will most likely head back down Lindsay Road to go home rather than using Hwy 74.

Is there a proposed plan for a sidewalk or shoulder? B. Rohde stated at this time there is no plan. Mayor Klein stated once the park master plan is done, road assessments will begin as to what is needed to accommodate the park.

Another resident apologized for missing the first meeting and he’s always for progress. However feels there is no concern for the people who live next to the park. He currently lives next to Balmer Park and people consistently park on his grass. He calls the police and they state there is nothing they can do about it. He then addressed the Mayor and asked they there is not infrastructure put into place – garbage, trenches at Balmer Park, people parking in his yard proves infrastructure is needed at the new park. He feels he has nothing to say about whether or not to do this but all those who benefit from the park do. He wants the Board to give some consideration to those who live near the park – he then stated his house is for sale. The Mayor replied that he shouldn’t state he is not a part of this process – this is a long range plan. This will not happen overnight and we value his input.

How will you monitor the water table level and the potential contamination to neighbors? B. Rohde replied that factor will have to be researched once the master plan is developed so it can be accommodated for if in fact there is an issue.

Will adjacent property owners be compensated for their lost property value? B. Rohde stated that it is not common practice of the City to do that and feels that a park typically increases the value of the surrounding properties.

Have any costs been researched for this park and how will it affect our taxes? B. Rohde replied that no costs have been determined at this stage in the process. They also asked if there was any way to route traffic from Hwy 74. B. Rohde stated that Hwy 74 is a state controlled road as well as there would be concern from the DNR because the east side of the park holds a stream and wetland area.

Not all sports use the park at the same time – therefore do we really need all the suggested parking? Also, because of this too, not all the fields will be used at the same time.

Will everything be done in 5 years? Before it’s decided, further work needs to be done to the road – can that be tied into the road infrastructure?

If you have tournaments, that would cause a lot of noise, lights and traffic. B. Rohde replied that these are controllable as it would need to go through the department first. Same resident stated that issues at Balmer Park don’t even get addressed so how can the department control other groups? The Police Department states they have to write a formal complaint.

A lot of issues would be avoided if all the traffic could exit via Hwy 74 – get a different exit.

What avenues have been exhausted to get an entrance on/off Hwy 74? Halquist Stone re-routed the stream, why can’t we look into it? K. Novack stated it would be cost prohibitive to place an entrance on Hwy 74 even if we could get permission from the state and the DNR. The resident replied it would be well worth the investment.
• Looking at this compared to Wirth Park – this is sports friendly rather than family friendly. If it were more family friendly, you would have less traffic.
• Wirth Park is a hybrid park – not a sports park. Resident raised millions of dollars to get sport fields at Wirth Park.
• Headlights could come right at the houses. D. Burch replied that actually the headlights would focus southeast – away from the houses. Same resident stated the land across the road is probably for sale; another piece of land would give us 3 parks real close. Also, a lot of land south of Balmer Park is available. Lindsay Road needs to be 3-4 lanes wide to handle the park. Berms should be 50 feet high to avoid the neighbors.
• When looking at properties – an industrial park would be a better fit for this complex. If all the Board members had property next to the park, would you want a megaplex next door? It seems wise to plan better than this. Everything is densely placed on the map – put everything along Hwy 74 and Lindsay Road where people don’t live.
• Mayor Klein stated the state will not allow access from Hwy 74. This is the planning function, not the final plan.
• Sports complex should go in an industrial area. Weekends are a time to enjoy rather than listening to all the noise. More thought should be put toward this.
• Mayor Klein replied that Halquist would have loved to quarry this area. This is an industrial area because of the quarry next to it and the major state road.
• One resident commended the Board for its planning efforts. Has there been a decibel level study done regarding noise? Lindsay Road is not safe. This is a bad place for Community Center because it is not in the center of the community. This project gives the feeling of the City Hall expansion. We got land for a reasonable price but with all the things that need to go in it, it’s going to be very expensive. What is going to be the total impact? City Hall went over because people forgot about stuff.
• A resident addressed the Mayor stating that assessing what will need to be done to the road she believes means widening the road and this will decrease property values along Lindsay Road.
• With widening the road, could it be widen out of the land of the park rather than the residents?

There being no further comments from the audience, B. Rohde asked the Joint Board members to give their comments about the park. K. Novack stated to the audience that there is a matrix available as to what amenities exist at all the other parks and tennis courts are currently underutilized. B. Dziwulski stated he would like to see the ball diamonds moved as far east as possible. D. Kaatz stated he would like to see the existing tree line stay to provide a buffer to residents. B. Rohde stated he has no concerns for the baseball players in regard to noise from Hwy 74 so placing the ball diamonds as close as possible to Hwy 74 would be best. D. Burch stated he could calculate the decibel levels for each 100 feet in the park. B. Rohde stated he would like to find out what is better – a mound system or a holding tank. Also he would like to see more of a family area on the west side of the park. D. Linsmeier would like staff to get an answer from the state about an entrance on Hwy 74 including what would be the ramifications or potential costs. B. Dziwulski stated he would like the community center to stay close to the road so users can see it. S. Gresham suggested to hide a storage building and to add gazebos around the park for more people to use. K. Novack stated that plan #2 might be the easiest to work off of out of the three. B. Rohde stated he likes plan #1 better, is not sold on #2 because he likes the open area.

D. Kaatz suggested shrinking the size of the baseball diamonds as full sized diamonds for all the fields is not necessary. D. Linsmeier questioned issues for the youth football program – is there a way to include them as they use the school facilities now. B. Rohde stated restrooms need to be close to playing areas to avoid public urination issues. A resident suggested if the entrance is closer to Hwy 74, then the parking should go closest to Hwy 74 as well. D. Kaatz suggested moving the lighted facilities closest to Halquist quarry however placing an entrance and parking there would move those fields closer to the residents.

M. Kaskey asked to speak and stated she likes plan #1 because it allows for programming space and expansion of green space. She suggests not putting baseball there and keep the green space and see what we need and phase into the process. Three diamonds is a great start. There needs to be good buffer between the residents and the soccer fields because of concerns that were brought up. Also shelters and
restrooms should be intertwined in the soccer fields. Also it is dangerous to not have any shelters because of the extreme weather conditions of Wisconsin. Lastly, storage space is very important and needs to be closer to the facilities.

B. Rohde asked D. Burch how the number of parking spaces was calculated. D. Burch replied that there is a specific calculation based on trends – the trend right now is typically there are two people per car. A resident stated the community center should be closer to green space. Garbage receptacles need to move throughout the park. Another resident stated if the Joint Board is not going to utilize the North Woods League, would the decision apply if their parking lot could be found at Halquist Stone. B. Rohde stated that the North Woods League has not provided any further information about what they would like to do however as it stands it is not a good fit for this park because takes away the freedom to place other amenities at the park because of the needed parking spaces.

B. Rohde asked the Board to give a little further direction to D. Burch to go back with to revise the plan. Overall the Board determined to utilize plan #2 with moving the ball diamonds as far east as possible, to take out one of the five diamonds and add green space.

A resident asked the Board if it was not worth their time to answer her questions regarding a different entrance before moving forward with the master plan. The Board responded that option will be researched. B. Rohde then stated that the timeline is to come back in May with a revised conceptual plan and residents will be informed once again when that meeting will be held.

There being no further business, a motion to adjourn the meeting was made by R. Mann: seconded by B. Dziwulski. Opposed none. The meeting adjourned at 9:53 p.m. The next meeting will be scheduled on May 9, 2007 – time to be determined.

Respectfully submitted,
Kelley Woldanski, CPRP
Pewaukee Park/Recreation Director
CONCEPT 1

PLAN ELEMENTS

1. Thirteen (13) Soccer Fields
   - Full Size Fields – 2
   - U12 Fields – 3
   - U10 Fields – 3
   - U8 Fields – 5

2. Two (2) Rugby/Football Fields

3. Five (5) Lighted Baseball Fields
   - Two (2) 300’ Foul Line Fields
   - Three (3) 350’ Foul Line Fields

4. Four (4) Buildings with Septic System
   - Community Center – 20,000 sf
   - Restrooms/Concessions – 4,000 sf
   - Concessions - 900 sf
   - Storage Building – 2,000 sf

5. Main Entrance with Circle Drive

6. Three (3) Parking Lots, Total Capacity 500 Cars
   - Two (2) Parking Lots, 169 Cars, each
   - One (1) Parking Lot, 162 Cars

7. Play Area/Playground – 2,900 sf

8. Three (3) Environmental/Education Stations


10. Open Play Area

11. Two (2) Stormwater Ponds

12. Tree Line Buffer along Floodplain

13. Berming along Lindsay Road.

PROS

1. Soccer field orientation good for all fields
2. Good distance between soccer fields and Lindsay Road
3. Baseball fields have lighting for night play
4. Concessions/Restrooms for each use
5. Separated parking for each use
6. Adequate buffer between baseball fields and parking
7. Community Center located close to Lindsay Road
8. Large open play or event space area
9. Multi use path does not conflict with motor vehicle traffic
10. Tree line buffer to reduce traffic noise from STH 74

Cons
1. Soccer and baseball uses are not separated
2. Baseball field orientation good for only two fields
3. Lighted fields have poor separation to surrounding residences
4. Overlapping fields reduces proper field orientation (Rugby/Football Field)
5. 30 ft buffer between soccer fields are shared between fields
6. Concessions at baseball area may need separate septic systems
7. No additional overflow parking if necessary
CONCEPT 2

Plan Elements

1. Eleven (11) Soccer Fields
   - Full Size Fields – 4
   - U12 Fields – 1
   - U10 Fields – 2
   - U8 Fields – 4

2. Three (3) Rugby/Football Fields

3. Five (5) Lighted Baseball Fields
   - Five (5) 350' Foul Line Fields

4. Four (4) Buildings with Septic System
   - Community Center – 22,500 sf
   - Two (2) Restrooms/Concessions – 2,530 sf, each
   - Storage Building – 2,000 sf

5. Main Entrance with Circle Drive

6. Three (3) Parking Lots, Total Capacity 395 Cars
   - One (1) Parking Lot, 169 Cars
   - One (1) Parking Lot, 166 Cars
   - One (1) Overflow Parking Lot, 60 Cars

7. Two (2) Play Area/Playground – 2,900 sf, each

8. Three (3) Environmental/Education Stations

9. Multi-Use Asphalt Path – 7,135 lf

10. Two (2) Stormwater Ponds

11. Tree Line Buffer along Floodplain

12. Berming along Lindsay Road.

Pros

1. Soccer and baseball uses are separated
2. Soccer field orientation good for all fields but one
3. Good distance between soccer fields and Lindsay Road
4. Two football fields with good orientation
5. Baseball field orientation good for all but two fields
6. Baseball fields have lighting for night play
7. Lighted fields have separation to surrounding residences
8. Concessions/Restrooms for each use
9. Overflow parking if necessary
10. Community center located close to Lindsay Road
11. Multi use path does not conflict with motor vehicle traffic
12. Tree line buffer to reduce traffic noise from STH 74

**Cons**
1. Overlaying reduces proper field orientation (Rugby Field)
2. 30 ft buffer between soccer fields are shared between fields
3. Little buffer between parking and southern baseball field
4. Concessions at both soccer area and baseball area may need separate septic systems
5. No open space
6. Overflow parking used during baseball games cause a conflict for pedestrians when crossing main entrance drive
7. West parking lot shared between two uses
CONCEPT 3

PLAN ELEMENTS

1. Twelve (12) Soccer Fields
   - Full Size Fields – 2
   - U12 Fields – 2
   - U10 Fields – 2
   - U8 Fields – 6

2. Five (5) Lighted Baseball Fields
   - Four (4) 300’ Foul Line Fields
   - One (1) 350’ Foul Line Field

3. Four (4) Buildings with Septic System
   - Community Center with Outdoor Terrace – 20,000 sf
   - Restrooms/Concessions – 6,300 sf
   - Storage Building – 2,000 sf

4. Main Entrance with Circle Drive

5. Three (3) Parking Lots, Total Capacity 441 Cars
   - One (1) Parking Lot, 169 Cars
   - One (1) Parking Lot, 162 Cars
   - One (1) Overflow Parking Lot, 106 Cars

6. Play Area/Playground – 2,500 sf – 5,000 sf

7. Three (3) Environmental/Education Stations

8. Multi-Use Asphalt Path – 6,643 sf

9. Open Play Area/ Event Space

10. One (1) Stormwater Pond

11. Tree Line Buffer along Floodplain

12. Berming along Lindsay Road.

PROS

1. Soccer field orientation good for all fields
2. Baseball field orientation good for three fields
3. Baseball fields have lighting for night play
4. Concessions/Restrooms for each use
5. Large outdoor terrace at the community center
6. Large play area
7. Adequate buffer between all baseball fields except one and parking
8. Overflow parking available, if needed
9. Large open play or event space area
10. Multi use path does not conflict with motor vehicle traffic
11. Tree line buffer to reduce traffic noise from STH 74

Cons
1. Soccer and baseball uses are not separated
2. Poor distance between soccer fields and Lindsay Road
3. Parking not convenient for soccer fields
4. No football or Rugby fields
5. Lighted fields have poor separation to surrounding residences
6. 30 ft buffer between soccer fields are shared between fields
7. Concession building at baseball area may need separate septic system
8. Community Center may need separate septic system
9. Community Center not located close to Lindsay Road