

MINUTES

**PARK ADVISORY COMMISSION**

4:00 p.m. – October 19, 2004

Time: Satarino called the meeting to order at 4:08 p.m.

Place: Council Chamber, Second Floor, 100 North Fifth Avenue, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

---

ROLL CALL

---

Members Present: Berla, Delone, Macomber, Reneaud, Riseng, Rodgers, Satarino

Members Absent: Berauer, Cohen

Ex-Officio Members Present: Johnson

Ex-Officio Members Absent: Aeschbach, Henderson, Woods

Staff Present: Bemish, Borneman, Dehring, Kuras, Miller, St. John

Others Present: Sue Miskel, 507 Heritage Drive, 747-8636  
Patricia Steiner, 502 Heritage Drive, 665-6378  
David Bien, 531 Heritage Drive, 769-4283  
Robert and Jeannette Carr, 542 Heritage Drive, 665-8287  
Glenn Thompson, 100 Longman, 995-2761  
Chip Smith, Johnson Hill/Land Ethics Studio  
Michelle Zurowick, Advantage Research Services, Inc.

---

PUBLIC COMMENTARY

---

None.

---

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

---

Minutes of August 17 and September 21, 2004 – Moved by Reneaud, supported by Macomber, to approve the minutes as presented. Motion was passed by voice vote.

---

LAND ACQUISITION PROCESS

---

Miller said she wanted to discuss a land acquisition process change that involved the City Council and she wanted to describe some of the work she had been doing with the Greenbelt Advisory Commission in terms of the land acquisition process that GAC was doing.

With regard to land acquisition recommendations that would come from PAC, as well as recommendations coming from GAC, she said she met with the Mayor, Council members Johnson and Woods, and the City Administrator about a month ago regarding concerns from some City Council members that, historically, by the time a parcel was presented to City Council, much of the work had been done by PAC and staff with regards to the parcel that might be acquired for parkland acquisition. She said Council had requested that PAC bring a parcel to City Council earlier in the process of review. She said if there were properties that PAC wanted staff to investigate, to get appraised, or to get environmental assessments, staff would first take it to City Council in a closed session to let them know about the property, and explain to them why there was interest in the property so Council can express any concerns it may have at that time and to give its go ahead to follow the process to determine if the property was a viable park purchase. She said this process would be used for both PAC and GAC. She said the intent of this change was to inform City Council at the beginning of the process and allow it to express concerns at the beginning of the process.

Johnson added that this information would be given to Council in a closed session and the point of this was to notify Council that there was the potential of purchasing a property before all of the appraisal work and negotiations were finished.

Satarino understood that a report would be done to describe the situation and it would be presented to City Council. He was originally concerned that Council would pre-select property, but after talking with Council members, he now felt this would not happen. He felt the process had been well explained and thought out.

Berla asked what activities staff could do before and after City Council's input.

Miller replied that the intent was that before money was spent either with staff time being used or an appraisal or environmental assessment being done, to bring any purchase idea to City Council.

Rodgers felt this change would take away some of PAC's freedom to act on potential purchases.

Johnson replied that Council wants to know that money would be spent before it was spent, so perhaps it was to a degree taking away some of PAC's freedom, but it was a degree of freedom that Council felt belongs to Council and not to PAC. He felt it was a legitimate concern and interest to want to know when thousands of dollars were being spent. He did not anticipate that the process would be anything more than a notification of Council. He said if it turned out that PAC's work was being severely impeded, the issue would be re-examined, but felt it needed to be tried since members of Council want to know that money was being committed before it was committed. He said it would primarily be a notification process.

Riseng was willing to try the new process, but felt Council's input would come too early, before any evaluation of property could be done. She felt it would be better to wait for Council's input until after staff and PAC had evaluated a site for acquisition but before appraisals/environmental assessments were done.

Johnson felt she had a good point and felt clarification was needed. His understanding was that Council's input would be asked for at the point when money would need to be spent, and not necessarily when staff was making a preliminary examination.

Miller thought staff going out to look at a site or PAC taking a tour of a site needed to occur before going to Council, but extensive research done by staff or a consultant, or an appraisal or an environmental assessment being done should happen after Council had given its input.

Satarino thought there should be enough information showing PAC's point of view when the report was presented to Council. He asked if the report would be written or verbal.

Miller replied that it would be a verbal report with printed maps done by staff.

Johnson felt the one area of ambiguity that needed to be cleared up was how much staff/PAC time should be spent on a site before presenting it to Council.

Miller said she, Henderson, Borneman would discuss this and recommend something to Council.

Berla asked if a property should be presented to Council the first time PAC hears about it.

Miller thought it was appropriate that a tour of the site by PAC be done first, with the evaluation form filled out, to look at the site and its relationship to other sites PAC was looking at and its relationship to the PROS Plan so, when it did go to Council, PAC could explain why it was looking at the site.

Berla wanted written specifications that outlined the questions PAC needed to answer before PAC presented a site to Council. He asked that this information be presented at next month's PAC meeting. He asked if someone kept track of the cost to purchase a property, other than the actual cost of the land, and if a report could be generated monthly or quarterly regarding these costs.

Miller replied that she would consult with Henderson, Borneman and Johnson and Johnson would consult with the rest of Council and would provide written guidelines regarding what Council wants at the next PAC meeting. She said the cost information was available and she would talk with Henderson regarding producing a cost report for PAC as well.

Borneman said a list of potential acquisitions was created by staff and some are listed in the PROS Plan and he wondered if the list should be given to Council.

Miller thought that was a good idea.

Macomber asked if Council realized that the list of properties was long but the process might take years to purchase a property.

Miller said some were aware and some not. She thought it was part of staff's job to educate Council on the process of land acquisition.

Regarding some of the work Miller had been doing with the Greenbelt Advisory Commission in terms of GAC's land acquisition process, she reported that she had worked with Council member Johnson, Michael Garfield, and Albert Berriz regarding how GAC wanted to proceed with the greenbelt district properties that might be acquired or development rights purchased. She said they have been working on two RFPs, one for an in-house coordinator who would serve as a liaison both to PAC and GAC and to staff to handle all internal processes for acquisitions related to the greenbelt district as well as to staff the PAC land acquisition committee so there would be coordination between what GAC was doing and what PAC was doing. She said that person would also coordinate all the land acquisition that would be done by PAC within the city limits. She said the second RFP would go to bid for a consultant to handle all of the purchases of development rights/conservation easements in the greenbelt district. She said they intended both RFPs to go out at the same time. She said GAC and staff would review and make a recommendation to Council for the consultant for the greenbelt district. She said PAC, GAC, and staff would be involved in the selection and decision making for the in-house coordinator position, because that individual/firm would be working with both commissions.

Berla asked if this would change the relationship PAC had with staff.

Miller replied yes.

Satarino said PAC currently had a consultant, funded from the land acquisition fund.

Miller said the coordinator position would replace any existing consultants, except if an appraisal or environmental assessment were needed. She said RFP's should go out next week. She said a PAC representative would be involved in the selection of the coordinator position.

Macomber asked who would formulate the list of possible City park acquisitions to take to Council.

Miller replied that she and Henderson would present the list to Council, hopefully at its November 8 meeting.

---

#### HERITAGE RIDGE CONDOMINIUM COMMUNITY REQUEST

---

Sue Miskel, lives in a neighborhood of 15 homes, known as Heritage Ridge Condominiums, and she said the neighborhood was concerned about the use of 2.75 acres adjacent to Heritage Ridge and abutting the north side of Ruthven Park. She said the vacant land is zoned R3 and was assessed at \$119,600 in 2004. She said the

vacant land is located in a large area of wetlands and is a part of the Miller Creek watershed. She said it was of special concern to her neighborhood not only because of the wetlands on and near the vacant land, but also because of its adjacent location to Ruthven Park, Gallup Park and the Huron River. She said it was one of only a few acres along Huron Parkway that retained its natural undisturbed view. She said the Heritage Ridge community proposes that the best use of the site was to make it a foot only accessible part of Ruthven Park. She said this would allow people to enjoy the beauty of an expanded Ruthven Park, which was now severely restricted because of its extremely limited access. She said they envisioned a park that was not available to bicycles or cars and would not require a curb cut onto Huron Parkway. She said their proposal was in agreement with the existing Northeast Area Plan, which supports no vehicular access from Huron Parkway onto this vacant site. She said that their proposal was also supported by several planning principles, goals and objectives stated in the Northeast Area Plan, such as (1) that high quality natural systems should be preserved, (2) that fragile lands should be protected, (3) that the scenic integrity of Huron Parkway should be preserved, (4) that linkages be made to existing parks, and (5) that it is important to Ann Arbor to protect woodlands, landmark trees, steep slopes, endangered species habitat, the Huron River, creeks, and natural flora and fauna from the impacts of development. She said their proposal agrees with the Northeast Area Plan. She said a total of \$55,100 in pledges had been made by residents in Heritage Ridge to help the City to defray the cost of purchasing the vacant land for a park. She said these pledges indicate the neighborhood's commitment to preserve and protect high quality natural systems. She summarized adding that she thought that PAC should also continue to work toward connecting the Huron River greenway system to protect the natural systems and to improve public access.

Macomber asked if development of the site was an imminent threat.

Miskel replied that surveys had been done in the past and recently an environmental assessment was done of the site. She thought it might be an indicator of future development to come.

Berla asked if the residents of Geddes Lake and Heritage Ridge use Ruthven Park.

Miskel replied that access to the park was not easy. She said there appeared to be two paths from Huron Parkway and new woodchips have been placed on these paths, but good access does not exist.

Berla asked Borneman to comment on the quality of site, and what could be done so people of Geddes Lake and Heritage Ridge would have a good way into the park.

Borneman replied much of site was an old field with some wetlands that had been filled in, with very steep slopes. He agreed that there was no good access from the north to the park. He said hundreds of feet of boardwalk would be needed because much of the north park of Ruthven Park was so wet that access would be difficult otherwise. He said staff looked at how to provide better access to Ruthven Park, and it was determined that a pathway access could occur about midway between the north and south boundaries of the park along Huron Parkway, because north of midway was too wet. He said the

woodchip paths mentioned by Miskel were located near the intersection of Huron Parkway and Geddes Road.

Enter Riseng.

Johnson asked Miskel if she knew if there was any interest by residents of Geddes Lake to add the vacant parcel to Ruthven Park.

Miskel replied that it was hard to determine their interest as there were 300+ residents. She felt they would support its use as a park instead of the parcel being developed.

Macomber wondered if the land were developable since it appeared to have a large area of wetland.

Miskel replied that the environmental study done showed it had steep slopes and much wetland so development probably would be difficult, but she did not know if it would be impossible. She said the report did not say if it was developable, it just reported the site conditions.

Rodgers asked if there would still be interest by the Heritage Ridge residents in donating funds towards the purchase of the vacant land to add to Ruthven Park if a pathway could not be constructed to allow foot access by residents north of the park.

Miskel said she would have to ask her neighbors. She said, right now, they would like this parcel added to Ruthven Park and a foot pathway created to allow access from the north.

A man in the audience (a neighbor of Miskel) stated that he and his neighbors wanted a walking access to Ruthven Park for Heritage Ridge and Geddes Lake residents. He said there were existing footpaths through the vacant site used by Geddes Lake residents and high schools students to get to Huron Parkway and Huron High School as well as Gallup Park.

Riseng asked if the Heritage Ridge neighbors had talked about where to place appropriate parking when using Ruthven Park.

Miskel replied that parking existed across the street at Gallup Park and the Northeast Area Plan did not want more curb cuts on Huron Parkway and she did not think people would support another curb cut on Geddes Road because it is a very busy road.

Satarino encouraged the Heritage Ridge residents to talk with the Geddes Lake Association representatives.

A woman in the audience asked what was the cost of construction of a boardwalk.

Kuras replied that it was generally about \$200+ per linear foot.

Satarino thanked them for their proposal and said PAC would discuss it in more detail in a closed session and would get back with the neighbors in the future when more information was available to give them.

---

## PROS PLAN TELEPHONE SURVEY PRESENTATION

---

Michelle Zurowick, Project Manager, Advantage Research Services, Inc., one of the consultants that developed the telephone survey, gave a brief overview of the key findings of the telephone survey. She said 600 telephone interviews were held and only City residents over 18 years of age were interviewed. She said a detailed report, questionnaire, and data tabulations were available from Amy Kuras. She said the key findings were adults participated in less structured activities, either done alone or with others. She said their activities centered on health and recreation. She said for children, 5 years old and younger, informal play in public playgrounds was at the top of their list for recreation and they were also involved in swimming, hiking, walking and soccer. She said children's activities, as they get older, become more structured, with a greater commitment to team sports. She said nearly half of the children aged 6-12 participated in soccer on a regular basis, with other popular activities being swimming, basketball and bicycling. She said for the teen population, aged 13-17, swimming and basketball were top activities and some move into more adult-oriented sports, like golf and cross country skiing.

She said Gallup Park was widely used park among residents (47 percent). She said the parks/recreation facilities were used mostly for hiking and walking, as well as all activities mentioned above. She said nearly 50 percent of the residents were highly satisfied with the services provided by Parks and Recreation, which was a significant increase over the 1998 measurement of 30 percent. She said overall satisfaction with Parks and Recreation appears to be related to the kind of activity a person does as those who were highly satisfied were more likely to be using the parks for hiking, walking and skateboarding. She said this suggested that these amenities were sufficient and were enabling people to do that which they love to do in their leisure time. She said those who were neutral to dissatisfied were more likely to be exercising with their dogs, tobogganing, sledding, and ice-skating. She said the addition of a dog park and outdoor ice rink were the first and third most frequently suggested programs they felt should be offered. She said these activities should be evaluated further to access current resources and to determine where improvements might be made. She said satisfaction has increased in each of performance statements that were asked from the 1998 study. While satisfaction in each of these issues remains quite positive, residents are most happy with the safety of play areas and least happy with the opportunities they have to comment on park projects and issues.

With Kuras' help, she said the parks were grouped into categories, and the biggest finding was that river parks and historical/cultural community center parks might be able to serve as a resource for best practices that could be looked at to apply to other park and recreation services and locations. She said river park users had a higher overall satisfaction with park and recreation services and were happier with the adequacy of picnic areas/shelters. She the historical/cultural community park users had higher

satisfaction with safety of play areas, overall services of the employees and staff, and the availability of recreational program offerings. She said residents were satisfied overall with the current level of maintenance of parks, with desired areas of improvement being with general upkeep, more regular maintenance, and grass/tree trimming at the top of list with trash removal, cleaner parks and geese excrement following. She said just over half the residents felt it was important to acquire land along the Huron River for park use. She said residents were least interested in dedicated funding for active recreation, such as soccer and softball fields. She said the future initiatives residents were most interested in were development of bicycle/pedestrian paths to link parks along the Huron River, with a major of the residents rating this as highly important. She said the second most requested improvement was adding more bicycle paths.

She said one in three residents belonged to an athletic/swim club or other recreational facility not run by the City and this increased to one out of two with residents with teenaged children. Since swim facilities and tennis/basket ball courts were provided by these private clubs/facilities, adding these facilities to city parks might increase more resident use of city facilities.

She said the senior center usage has increased since 1998, but the type of senior center desired by the community, it was split with 44 percent preferring smaller neighborhood centers and 43 percent preferring a larger, centrally located facility. She said more in-depth analysis would need to be done to determine what the senior needs/wants were.

She said the brochure used by parks was determined to be a very good tool to inform the public of available parks activities. She said the people surveyed, on average, have lived in the City 19 years, approximately three quarters of the people live in a household with two or more adults, and one in eight is a single parent household. She said the demographics matched closely to the 1998 study.

Berla asked if the demographics of survey were compared to the demographics of the city as a whole. He asked if University students were included in the survey. He asked what time of day the calls were placed and if cell phone numbers were used. He was concerned that the student population may be under-represented in the survey results.

Zurowick replied that the demographics of the survey had not been compared to the demographics of the city as a whole. She said the respondents were not asked if they were students. She said a random digit dial list was used and she was not sure if cell phone numbers were included. She said most survey calls were made in the evening and on weekends.

Rodgers asked if the age of respondent was requested.

Zurowick replied no, they were just asked if they were over 18. She noted that two thirds of the respondents were female, which was common in telephone surveys. She said if equal representation of male and female respondents were wanted, screening for men first would need to occur.

Rodgers asked how many calls were placed to get the 600 responses.

Zurowick did not know, but would find out.

Satarino said this survey was similar to past surveys. He said PAC had talked about setting up a planning session and this survey would give them guidance.

Kuras added that the telephone survey would be one piece of a large amount of public input that was being sought at focus groups and public meetings. She said the next public meeting would be on October 28, from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., at Cobblestone Farm, with small discussion groups rotating to different tables to discuss different topics. She said everyone would have a chance to discuss each of the topics, there would be a guided discussion, and the goal was to prioritize the different things that came up from the first meeting and the feedback that had been received. She encouraged PAC to participate.

Macomber asked how the focus groups results compared with telephone survey results.

Kuras replied that the focus groups had discussed more administrative issues whereas the public input had not mentioned administrative issues at all. She said Chip Smith, Johnson Hill/Land Ethics Studio, one of the consultants for the PROS Plan update, had been leading the focus group meetings.

Smith added that the focus groups that have occurred so far have been with public groups and interest groups, and city staff, boards and commissions. He said the staff focus groups have concentrated on the administrative issues, which did not come up at all in the public sessions. He said the in the public focus group sessions and the vision fair, the athletic fields and sports complex were seen as big issues, whereas in the telephone survey these issues were not as important.

Satarino asked what other focus groups the consultant still had to meet with.

Smith replied that a meeting with the City Administrator, Community Services Area Administrator and Public Services Area Administrator; and the Ann Arbor Public Schools Board still had to occur; and next Monday night there would be a focus group held at the Neutral Zone from 7:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. with teenagers.

DeLone asked for a copy of the telephone survey questionnaire.

Kuras replied that she would get him a copy as he, being a new member, did not already have it.

Macomber asked for a list of all the focus groups that would be involved.

Kuras replied that she would prepare a list of the focus groups and give it to PAC and added that the entire telephone survey questionnaire and the results of the survey, as well as the methodology used for input for the plan's update, would be included in the PROS Plan.

DeLone asked if there was confusion between Parks and Recreation and Recreation and Education; who they are and what they provide.

Smith replied that there was much confusion by the public.

Kuras reported that there was much more work to be done on the update of the PROS Plan. She said once all the public input and focus group input had been gathered, the information would be tallied up. She said the second public meeting would work on prioritizing some of the issues. She said some of the staff and the consultant would be working on the process of re-writing and updating sections of the plan, and writing new sections through November and by early next year the first draft should be ready.

---

#### UPDATE ON REHABILITATION AND DEVELOPMENT MILLAGE

---

Reneaud reported that people at the New Center told her they liked the trail along Bandemer Park. She reported that she received feedback on Virginia Park that the work was finished and they really liked it.

Satarino added that Tom Gantert of the Ann Arbor News wrote an article about how wonderful the trail system was.

---

#### UPDATE ON OLSON PARK

---

Dehring reported on the status of Olson Park. He said it had been an ongoing long process into its second year. He said the overall project involved a lot of site improvements that took a lot longer than anticipated. He said the soccer fields needed reseeding and there had been some problems with establishing the native grasses. He said they were working with the contractor regarding a maintenance program and renovation of what they had put in at the site. He said for most part, the site work was done. He said the city had to grant an easement to DTE to get electricity on the site for lighting. He said they were working with another contractor regarding the shade shelters. He anticipated opening the park soon; at the latest, he would like to open by end of the year. He said the goal with the soccer fields was to get the turf established; with the soonest use anticipated to occur next fall. He said a field lottery would be used to assign use of the fields. He said Terry Rynard would be the person to ask regarding field allocation, especially regarding the new fields.

Berla asked for an update from Terry Rynard regarding field allocations at the next PAC meeting.

Macomber asked why the parking area at Olson Park was gated closed.

Dehring replied that was done because they did not want conflicts with the operation of construction equipment occurring with park users. He said since the contractor was responsible for the maintenance of fields for the first year, they did not want turf areas negatively affected with use occurring too soon. He said the final paving of the parking area would not occur until the next fiscal year when additional funds would be available.

#### UPDATE ON SPORTS FIELD COMPLEX

---

Dehring reported that the City Attorney Office, Airport staff, and Parks staff had been talking about the potential of using the land on Lohr Road south of Ellsworth Road for soccer fields/sports fields. He said the land was owned by the Airport and the FAA regulates how the land may be used. He said the Airport staff/board were in the process of approving its facility master plan, and as part of its plan, this area was being designated as non-aviation; not necessary for runways or the operation of the Airport. He said we must wait until the FAA approves the facilities master plan, then staff could proceed with additional discussions on using the area for soccer fields. He said there were still a lot of steps in the approval process with the FAA before the site could be used.

DeLone asked if athletic fields were a part of the Airport master plan.

Dehring replied that it was not a part of their master plan; the area being considered for recreation use had been identified in their plan as non-aviation land.

Berla asked for the location of the city's tree nursery.

Dehring replied that the tree nursery was located on Ellsworth Road, north and east of area being considered for recreational use. He said the Airport owns the nursery land.

Berla asked for a timeline of the approval process.

Dehring said the Airport master plan must be adopted by FAA, and be approved by the Airport board and City Council, then staff would develop a development plan, which would have to go through another review process with Pittsfield Township, then site conditions would dictate when the ground would be ready to use as fields. He added that Henderson and Miller had been in communication with the Township regarding this site.

---

#### UPDATE ON SWIFT RUN SERVICE CENTER SITE

---

Dehring reported that Pittsfield Township approved the PUD site plan for the west portion of the Swift Run complex. He said through the PUD, the Township had identified specific areas; maintenance area, active and passive recreation area, and composting area. He said approximately 40 acres have been identified to be used as active recreation. He said discussions have occurred regarding using the area south of the maintenance area along Stone School Road for soccer fields. He said the amount of land available for soccer field use was less than envisioned earlier in the process. He said a site plan would be submitted to the Township for its review regarding the recreational design proposed for the soccer fields; but, first, meetings would be held with the public in area regarding what type of active uses they want to occur at the site.

---

CITY COUNCIL ITEMS UPDATE

---

Johnson reported that the 2004 DNR-MNRTF acquisition grant application amendment resolution and the Evergreen purchase were approved on October 18 by City Council.

---

REPORT FROM MANAGER OF PARKS AND RECREATION SERVICES

---

Borneman reported that Beverly Walters, a botanist with NAP for the past ten years, had been invited by the Michigan Department of Natural Resources to serve on the Plant Technical Advisory Committee to help review/update the endangered and threatened species list.

Satarino requested that the development millage projection, which spells out what was earmarked for each upcoming project over the next two years, be included in the next PAC packet.

Dehring said the form would be provided, highlighting those projects still in the process.

Johnson asked if another column showing the funding source could be added to the City Council Parks and Recreation Action Items form they receive with each packet. PAC agreed.

Dehring asked if the old items could be removed from the City Council Parks and Recreation Action Items form. He suggested only showing projects for past three months.

Johnson replied yes, but asked that the funding information be added to the form first, and then the next month the list could be shortened to include recent projects only.

---

REPORT FROM RECREATION ADVISORY COMMISSION

---

Berla reported that the new high school site plan shows only two or three practice fields and a stadium to play sports in on the site. He thought that two or three fields was not enough and would add to problem of there being not enough sports fields already in Ann Arbor. He said RAC was going to talk with the site committee and advocate for more sports fields.

---

REPORT FROM ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION

---

None.

---

REPORT FROM GREENBELT ADVISORY COMMISSION

---

Johnson said the information regarding GAC already had been covered by Miller.

---

PUBLIC COMMENTARY

---

None.

---

COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS

---

Rodgers asked if there were more information on the Fuller Road site. He was also concerned about the First and William site.

Satarino said more information was being sought by the Attorney's Office and Henderson might have more information at the next PAC meeting. He said no new information was available on the First and William site.

Rodgers thought PAC was still uncertain what could be discussed at LAC's closed sessions. He said the last two LAC meetings could not occur for lack of a quorum. He wanted to discuss either how to make sure that does not continue to happen or what members can do outside a LAC meeting.

Satarino thought discussions in a LAC meeting must be about specific sites that could eventually be purchased as a park, but also there must be a quorum.

Berla thought if quorums were hard to achieve, rescheduling the LAC meetings should be considered.

Borneman asked if PAC wanted more clarification about what could be discussed at a closed meeting that did not have the six people required for a quorum. PAC agreed. He said Henderson would follow up with City Attorneys Office.

Riseng reported that the Park Maintenance Task Force had met several times and had been working on a citizen survey addressing maintenance of parks, natural areas, and interest in an adopt-a-park program, and they were getting close to a final survey form. She said she would give PAC a copy of the survey form when it was finished for PAC's input, hopefully before PAC's next meeting.

---

CLOSED SESSION TO DEAL WITH LAND ACQUISITION ISSUES

---

Moved by Berla, supported by Macomber, that PAC hold a closed session to discuss land acquisition issues. Approved by all PAC members.

---

ADJOURNMENT

---

Satarino declared the meeting adjourned at 6:22 p.m.

Jill St. John, Secretary  
10/26/04