Parks & Recreation Committee
Special Meeting

McHenry Municipal Center
333 S. Green Street
McHenry, IL 60050

August 20, 2018, 5:30 PM
City Hall Classroom

SPECIAL MEETING AGENDA

1. Call to Order

2. Public Comment: Any people wishing to address the Committee will be asked to identify themselves for the record and will be asked but are not required to provide their address. Public comment may be restricted to three-minutes for each individual speaker. Order and decorum shall be maintained at public meetings.

3. Approval of past Parks and Recreation Committee Minutes
   a. August 21, 2017
   b. October 26, 2017
   c. November 16, 2017
   d. April 26, 2018
   e. July 30, 2018

4. Walsh Park Donation Update

5. Petersen Farm Draft Market Study Presentation

6. Department Updates

7. Future Meeting Topics

8. Motion to adjourn the meeting

The City of McHenry is dedicated to providing its citizens, businesses, and visitors with the highest quality of programs and services in a customer-oriented, efficient, and fiscally responsible manner.
AGENDA ITEM 2 – Review and Approval of PRC Minutes

Minutes for the following meetings are all unapproved at this time:

- August 21, 2017
- October 26, 2017
- November 16, 2017
- April 26, 2018
- July 30, 2018

Action
To review and approve the minutes.
PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE
MEETING REPORT
Thursday, August 21, 2017
Municipal Center Council Chambers, 5:30 PM

1. **Call to Order:** Chairperson Schaefer called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm in the McHenry Municipal Center Council Chamber.

2. **Roll Call:** Chairperson Alderman Schafer, Alderman Devine and Alderwoman Condon.

   City Officials in Attendance: Mayor Wayne Jett, Director of Parks & Recreation Hobson, Recreation Center Manager Matt LaPorte, Recreation Supervisor Witt, Athletic & Aquatic Supervisor Thompson, Director of Economic Development Martin, Parks Maintenance Superintendent Gorniak.

   Public Attendance: Mr. Pat Wirtz, McHenry Landmark Commission Chair and Colby-Petersen Farm Foundation member, and Mr. Greg Lofgren, Colby-Petersen Farm Foundation.

3. **Public Comment:** None.

4. **Presentation/Discussion on the Historic Petersen Farm by the Petersen Farm Foundation.**

   Mr. Wirtz and Mr. Lofgren provided the Committee with a history of the farm and the many accomplishments of the Landmark Commission and the Petersen Farm Foundation.

   A booklet containing the history of the Colby family and farm was provided to the Committee. Mr. Wirtz reported resources used to compile the historical information presented today came from Nancy Fike, McHenry’s resident historian. She researched sources such as The McHenry County Yearbook and McHenry County Historical Society, Plaindealer Newspaper, family members, and City of McHenry maps are great resources for information.

   **Robert Petersen Living Trust.** Mr. Greg Lofgren reported he was a member of the McHenry Landmark Commission when the city acquired the Petersen Farm property. At that time, the Commission participated in several meetings with Robert Petersen. A concern expressed by the late Mr. Petersen was that the buildings on the property would be used only as storage for city equipment. Mr. Petersen had a vision of the farm as a museum to showcase local farming history in McHenry and the farming community as it was at that time. When the farm was acquired, the Commission began to hold their meetings in the farmhouse and all Commission papers and artifacts were moved to the farm. Some of the items donated to the city as part of the living trust and vision are included in the booklet with a letter written by Mr. Petersen to Mr. Lofgren about starting a historical society separate from the Landmark Commission. At that time, discussions took place between the City and Landmark Commission about possible uses of the property however nothing was decided.
Mr. Lofgren thanked the Committee for allowing him to speak at today's meeting and said he hopes for information on city's plans for the property.

Mr. Wirtz added that in 2005, a petting zoo, old-time farm demonstration area, reforestation, community garden plots, horse trails, a pioneer farming museum, one-room school house, picnic area and walking paths were mentioned as possible attractions to add to the property.

Discussed ensued on the restoration and preservation efforts completed after the city acquired the property, the recent establishment of the Colby-Petersen Foundation, and potential supporters of future preservation efforts on the property.

Mr. Wirtz relayed to the Committee their short-term plans for the property. Currently, the Landmark Commission annually hosts “A Day at Petersen Farm” event. This is a one-day event. The Landmark Commission partners with the McHenry County Farm Bureau, 4-H, McHenry Garden Club, Friends of the Library, city staff, and local retired farmers.

Mr. Wirtz announced the following ideas/programs/events the Commission/Foundation would like to host:

- One or two times a year similar to the Day at the Farm event such as Fall Pumpkin Fest, Special Farmers Market, a mini-concert for adults to raise funds for the Foundation similar to the Gavers event in Woodstock.

- The Commission would like to open the farmhouse two Sundays per month in July, August and September and during events.

- Workshop area to repair items and include permanent tables, chairs, and shelves for inventory of farm artifacts. Mr. Lofgren added many items at the farm should be catalogued. They videotaped the items about 10-years ago and the items were appraised. He would like to encourage and educate young people to care about the farm.

- Mr. Lofgren asked the city to provide coverage for volunteers working events. Mr. Hobson noted Landmark Commission members are covered under the city's insurance however, a Foundation member is not tied to the city and is not covered under the city’s coverage. Mr. Wirtz stated the Farm Bureau has provided $1-M coverage for the Day at the Farm event.

- Maintenance Safety and Security is a concern of both the Commission and the City. Critter control is needed especially in the horse barn.

- The security code to the homestead should be changed.

- Connection to the police alarm board.
• Lock the gates at all times. Mr. Hobson informed the Committee that with the exception of archery classes and access for the tenant farmer, the gates are locked.

• Last winter, the roof for the unattached garage collapsed. Because the snowplows are stored in the building, Commission members do not have access to the area to remove the debris.

• State Preservationist toured the facility last fall with Sen. Althoff and stated it will be costly to renovate the horse barn. Mr. Hobson stated it would cost approximately $200,000 for the work. Mr. Wirtz reported the Foundation is seeking a donor to fund the renovation. Mr. Lofgren noted they would not seek funding until they know what the city’s plans are for the property.

• Mr. Wirtz requested permanent restrooms. The outhouse is unusable.

• Installation of a simple nature path along the wetlands area and through the woods.

• Permanent signage visible from the road acknowledging when the house is open to the public similar to a museum.

• Organize the dairy expo site as a showcase for the county. Mr. Lofgren has been working on this and stated he would like to get the milk house as it was in the 1940’s.

Chairperson Schafer stated the uses discussed were recommended at least 12 years ago, and asked if the city needs to declare support for a specific project before the Foundation can begin fundraising. Mr. Hobson said the Foundation could fund projects however, they need the city’s permission to begin any project. The city could complete a project and the Foundation would reimburse the city. However, this becomes difficult because the Foundation member are the experts and Parks staff consisting of Matt, Cindy, Nicole, and himself do not have the expertise or the manpower to run the farm. Mr. Hobson reported foundation-stabilization of the house and main barn are a priority.

Mr. Lofgren said they are requesting the city to commit to specific projects and the Foundation and Commission will get started. Mr. Hobson reported in the past, it has been difficult to locate an historical architect to complete these projects. Mr. Wirtz said the Chicago Preservation group could provide this information.

Alderman Condon noted this topic is not new to her either. If the question is would the city like all the projects mentioned completed, the answer is yes. The reality is the cost. It takes experts to restore and preserve the farm. From her standpoint, she looks to the Foundation for the expertise and asked what their top three choice projects to complete would be. Once these are identified, it may be easier to seek funding for specific projects.
Chairperson Schaefer agreed with Alderwoman Condon and suggested the Foundation provide the city with their top three projects they would like to see completed first at the farm. He also suggested an event at the farm in conjunction with the Sunday Family Fest during Fiesta Days. He also suggested an active McHenry Chapter of the 4-H Club or the Boy and Girl Scout would be interested in events at the farm. Mr. Hobson suggested a camp-out event.

Mr. Lofgren asked if the Foundation should bring their top three projects back to the Committee or Council. Chairperson Schaefer suggested submitting the list to Director Hobson. Director Hobson said depending on the project it may go directly to the Council or discussed first with the Committee.

Alderwoman Condon asked staff to review the security system and fire alarm at the farm, if possible change the door code, and obtain a quote for gutters on the horse barn. Director Hobson stated the farm was connected to the city’s fire alarm board however, he was not certain if there is an active security system adding there is money in the CIP for some of these projects, specifically the new roof for the house, batten-boards on the barn and possibly the garage. The question is the horse barn stating he is not sure if the foundation has to be stabilized before any renovations can be completed.

An unidentified member of the public in attendance suggested selling the washer and dryer in the home to help fund the installation of a washroom.

Director Hobson noted facility improvements and prioritized maintenance is most important, as these costs will have to be approved in the city’s Capital Improvements Program. Programming would not be difficult and would be supported by the city.

Mr. Wirtz reported the Colby Barn in Lake County makes approximately $450,000 in revenue each year renting the barn for events. Everyone agreed there is potential for this type of use at the Petersen Farm. The city would look to the Commission for a recommendation if this were the direction they want to go.

Chairperson Schaefer reiterated that that a top three list is submitted to Director Hobson to move forward with budgeting or planning.

The Committee thanked Mr. Lofgren and Mr. Wirtz for their input and they exited the meeting at 6:40 PM.

4. **Sponsorship/Advertisement Program Discussion/Proposal.**

Recreation Center Manager LaPorte stated that in an effort to bring additional revenue to the Recreation Center, city staff recommended increasing the city’s advertising opportunities with banners in some of the city’s athletic fields such as Petersen Park. The Crystal Lake Park District charges $395 and $495 for ad banners at Lippold Park, which generates about $15,000 a year that is used for field maintenance and upgrades. Manager LaPorte asked the Committee if this is something they would like staff to pursue. The city would decide what would be appropriate to advertise and if the city would seek ads from businesses outside the city limits.
Director Hobson suggested not selling ads to businesses located outside the city limits.

Chairperson Schaefer agreed adding it is important that the field does not look too cluttered and the ad signs are appropriate.

Alderwoman Condon was in favor of the idea noting the signs should be made from quality materials, offered to only city businesses, and the number of ads offered should be limited at designated locations. Director Hobson said the ads would be available on a first come, first serve basis.

Chairperson Schaefer suggested polling local businesses to determine their interest in this program.

Alderwoman Condon stated the proposed cost of advertising seemed steep and wondered if the first year could be $200 or $300 as charged for ads in McBark Park. Mayor Jett said the cost of the banner must be considered.

Alderman Devine stated Petersen Park would be a good location. Director Hobson noted he would like to offer ads at Petersen and Knox Parks.

Manager La Porte asked the Committee if they had any interest in staff pursuing this topic further and the consensus was yes.

Chief of Police Jones and Alderman Santi entered the meeting at 6:50 PM.

5. Department Updates.

Riverfront Park Boat Ramp. Construction of the boat ramp has begun. The project was delayed due to spring flooding. As a result, the ramp will most likely not open until 2018.

McHenry Recreation Center. Manager LaPorte announced the Recreation Center was holding a one-day “Solar Eclipse” sale for memberships. So far, 45 new members have enrolled through the sale. Membership is now at 2,031.

Chairperson Schaefer asked if the city offered a rate for the 18-20 age group. Manager LaPorte answered the city offers the standard $18/month for single and $19/family. Marlins Swim Team members are offered a rate of $15/month.

Long-range revenue projects based on annual memberships is expected to exceed $550,000. Advertising has increased and a drone video is being produced. Cosmetically, the center will be upgraded with artwork on the walls.

Fall/Winter Brochure was published. The department has partnered with the Crystal Lake, Barrington and Huntley Park districts to add adult day trips for a reduced cost. Additionally through NISRA, all the superintendents from the 11 partner groups will meet on a quarterly basis to brainstorm programs.
Summer Camp. Total registration increased this year. Approximately 70 children attend the camp each week compared to 40-50 in past years. The Mini-Explorers Camp began this year with 121 children enrolled.

Community Needs Assessment. The Committee directed staff to present the results of the CNA to the Committee prior to a formal presentation to the full Council.

5. **Motion to Adjourn.**

As there were no further comments, Chairperson Schaefer called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Alderman Devine made a motion, seconded by Alderwoman Condon to adjourn the meeting.

Aye: Devine, Condon, Schaefer
Motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 6:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Marci Geraghty, Executive Assist/Deputy Clerk

Reviewed and approved this ___ day of ___________ 2017.

________________________
Alderman Jeffrey Schaefer, Chairperson
PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE
MEETING REPORT
Thursday, October 26, 2017
Municipal Center Council Chambers, 3:00 PM

1. Call to Order: Chairperson Schaefer called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm in the McHenry Municipal Center Council Chamber.

2. Roll Call: Chairperson Alderman Schaefer, Alderman Devine and Alderwoman Condon.

City Staff Attendance: Director of Parks & Recreation Hobson, Recreation Supervisor Witt, Athletic & Aquatic Supervisor Thompson, and Parks Maintenance Superintendent Gorniak.

Public Attendance: Mr. Jeff Andreason representing aQuity, Inc.

3. Public Comment: None.

   It was the consensus of the Committee to approve the July 13, 2017 Parks and Recreation Committee Report.

5. Review of Community Needs Assessment Results. Mr. Andreason from aQuity was introduced to the Committee. aQuity is the firm contracted by the city to conduct the Community Needs Assessment (CNA). Mr. Andreason presented the Committee with the results of the survey and walked the Committee through the Executive Summary.

The survey was conducted for residents within the corporate limits of the city. A total of 407 households responded to the survey. Data collection was performed through most of August and September. Chairperson Schaefer noted some households outside the city limits also received the survey and those were not included in the results. Alderwoman Condon asked if telephone surveys were conducted. Mr. Andreason stated people were given the option to complete the survey online, via mail, or via telephone of which seven households selected. The average length of the survey was 14 minutes. Most importantly, the 407 response were compared to census data by age, race, ethnicity, neighborhood, gender, and children in the household so we know at least demographically, the data is representative of the City of McHenry.

Overall, the results of the survey were positive. The average rating given for the department on a 1-10 scale was 7.3, which is considered very positive and the city department is better known than the McHenry County Conservation District. The average rating for school districts and agencies is about a point lower than the city.

The proportion of negative to positive responses were also reviewed. The city department has a 10:1 ratio of favorable ratings to unfavorable ratings. Approximately 80% of residents rated the department positively and 8% were negative. The longer someone lives in the city the more the department is favored. Questions were also asked
about the share of property taxes that go to the department. Most residents think it about 5% of the share they pay. When they are told it is actually just under 1% they were asked to rate the facilities as a good value. Mr. Andreason noted parks districts usually receive 5-6% share of property taxes.

In the survey, residents were asked to express what they like most about the department and its strengths. The number one response focused around the programs and events offered by the department. A close second was how well the parks are maintained; they are clean and safe. One in five stated the McHenry Recreation Center was clearly a strength.

When asked what they do not like about the department, almost half could not think if anything; either they are not aware or there is absolutely nothing they dislike. Those that did mention something stated issues around the lack of an indoor pool, need to improve existing outdoor pool, better maintenance of specific parks and playground equipment, and regulation prohibiting dogs in city parks.

When asked if they had been to a parks facility in the past 12-months, 84% answered yes. Veterans and Petersen Parks, Fort McHenry and the Recreation Center were visited the most.

When asked how satisfied they are with all the facilities they had visited, overall in terms of safety, maintenance, and staff interaction, the scores of higher for the quality of the park experience than the department overall. Average scores are in the 8’s again on a 0 to 10 scale, with 10 being the highest score. Very few people surveys expressed anything negative on any of those levels.

Chairperson Schaefer asked for the percentages for likes and dislikes of city parks by name from the 84% households reporting. Mr. Andreason presented a pie chart depicting the parks and responses that received 10% and higher. For example, McBark Park came in at 13%. Mr. Andreason stated if someone did give a negative rating to any of these elements, they were asked again in an open-ended question, why they are unhappy with any of the parks facilities. Most often, sources of dissatisfaction were a feeling that some of the places are not well maintained or in need of improvements. This was especially true with the pool, Knox Park. More landscaping was requested for the dog park and Petersen Park, and more parking at the Recreation Center and Veterans Park specifically for outdoor concerts. Of those 16% who said they had not been to any parks or facilities, stated the reason, as they do not have the time or there are no children in the household. For those 16%, there is an impression that what the department offers is geared more towards families or households with younger children and not for adults. Mr. Andreason noted this as a challenge and an opportunity for the city to think about what programs could be offered to include adult households.

Approximately one-third of the households said they have not been to any facilities because they go elsewhere – Health Bridge was often mentioned, facilities in Crystal Lake, private studios, and fitness facilities. Some said they were unaware of what was available in the city. Most of the other facilities mentioned were in the Conversation District or other municipalities.
aQuity wanted to know what outdoor improvements or facilities were of greater interest to people. The survey asked people to select what outdoor improvements or facilities were of greater interest to them and to rate their demand. aQuity tested the list by offering trails, open pool, pool with a water park, playgrounds, etc., and asked which of these does your household have an interest or need. Two-thirds or 66% of the respondents answered trails in their area; 44% expressed interest in an open pool; 39% for an outdoor pool and water park; 33% playgrounds. Those who said they were interested in one of the selections were asked to explain how well the parks department or another source is meeting their demands. None of the outdoor facilities tested represent critical unmet needs. In fact, trails, baseball/sports fields, and playgrounds are sufficiently available. Of the outdoor improvements tested, a majority, 40%, placed a top priority on adding and improving trails followed by outdoor pool-related facilities/amenities at 38%, and playgrounds at 4%, sports fields 3%, and ballfields at less than 1%. Mr. Andreason stated it was clear, an outdoor open pool, water park and splash pad were the top three opportunities based on demand.

Chairperson Schaefer said he receives several requests for more sports fields as there are times when the city has a high demands and not enough fields. Mr. Andreason stated overall only one in five households stated athletic fields as a demand.

Mr. Andreason cautioned the Committee from thinking the city has a high priority to provide trails as this demand will always be high and it is not possible to saturate completely the city with enough trails. Chairperson Schaefer noted the city received the same response for walking trails from the previous needs assessment. Director Hobson noted the previous assessment was performed in 2004 and trails have been added to the city. Mr. Andreason stated with all his clients, if he sees trails coming up as a low priority he does the research over again. This is why we ask how your needs are being met not just by the parks and recreation department but also from all other sources. If the conservation district and city provide ample trails, why the city should be investing in more trails. Director Hobson added when the city proposes new locations for trails, connectivity to other trails is a priority.

At the end of the survey, households were asked for the one thing they would like the Parks and Recreation Department to focus on in terms of improving or expanding. Again, trails was the number one demand and an outdoor water park was a clear second. Mr. Andreason noted it was interesting that earlier in the survey just a general outdoor pool was listed as a demand however as the survey continued, this demand expanded to an outdoor water park with a water park. When you add results for the three outdoor water options—outdoor water park, open pool, and lap pool—comprise 38% of the responses. No included in this was a splash pad because this feature was made more specific to a neighborhood park.

Chairperson Schaefer comments this was interesting as out of the over 400 respondents, there had been 21% who had been to the pool in the last year or 60 respondents. Mr. Andreason noted to keep in mind, 44% or about 180 respondents said they were interested in an outdoor pool but not even half of them had been to the Merkel Aquatic Center.
Many respondents stated they were driving to other facilities out of town to use an outdoor pool because Merkel is too crowded, too old, too simple, etc.

Asking the same questions, almost as many respondents - 49% - said they would use, have a need, or would be interested for a fitness center and almost as many - 43% for an indoor walking track. Only about a third said yes to group exercise, indoor splash park, indoor lap pool and gym courts at 28%. Of those items mentioned as a demand, an indoor open pool emerges as the item that has the highest level of demand and a very low level of supply or need being met. Indoor track is close behind and either splash park or lap lanes followed by gym courts and playgrounds.

Mr. Andreason reported he was surprised gym courts did not rank higher. Alderwoman Condon agreed. Chairperson Schaefer said people might view this as a low need because we have use of other facilities that have courts. A discussion ensued on the limited access the city actually has to gym courts in other facilities.

Chairperson Schaefer said he has heard indoor pools are not used regularly by many people and would be interested to learn just how much they are actually used. For example, the YMCA is probably the closest to McHenry. Director Hobson stated the indoor pool at the high school is only open to the public once a week.

Mr. Andreason reported 44% overall said they were interested in an indoor pool; 74% of the people who wanted an indoor pool were 35 to 54 years old, women with households with children. Mr. Andreason noted a need for an indoor warm-water therapy pool was also expressed among the older aged respondents, which includes another demographic who is interested in an indoor pool.

Mr. Hobson commented on the fact that the assessment is U.S. statistically valid and matched up to census data.

Mr. Andreason reported on the responses received for parks programs and overall 40% of the surveyors said a household member has participated in a department program or event. In the past year most often some type of fitness program such as group training or a class. About half as many mentioned participation in sports. Events came up at about 28% specifically more often was the River Run.

When people were asked to rate satisfaction with programs and events, 53% rated their satisfaction at almost 10. Only 4% were dissatisfied. Again, very strong satisfaction scores for the department. Only 16 people said they were unhappy, mostly because of the lack of water classes and small facilities. The same analysis was conducted for department programs and events. The four programs/events that registered the highest level of interest were fitness, adult programs/classes, special events, and active adult programs for 55+. Mr. Andreason found it interesting that programs for older folks scored at the top; for younger folks were more toward the bottom. When respondents were asked how well things were being provided, we saw the same separation where those that say they are interested in youth programs, summer camps, etc., this scored less than 20% but said these programs are in good supply. Adult programs such as active adult events and fitness programs represent the biggest gaps.
Chairperson Schaefer noted this is most likely the biggest area expanded in the past two years. Director Hobson said this might be due to awareness. When you are a member you see all that the recreation center offers but prior to the center, if there were not enough people preregistered for a class it was cancelled. Now we have a much larger selection of exercise classes but they are geared towards the membership. Chairperson Schaefer asked if we know how many of the respondents are members of the McHenry Recreation Center and Mr. Andreason answered that question was not asked.

In terms of one improvement, residents would like to see, the active adults classes for 55+ came up most often followed by fitness. Between 11-15% mentioned youth programs, special events, or broader health classes and programs. Alderwoman Condon asked if this could possibly be because we are already providing that. Mr. Andreason said this was a question about improving and expanding and it may be that with the fitness center, the city is automatically doing more than it was two years ago however, 19% are saying it is still not enough.

Chairperson Schaefer asked if this has anything to do with the ages of the people who responded. Mr. Andreason said these answers are representative of all adults and households with and without children. By definition, there will be more people without children. The census shows approximately 35% of households have children, which is part of the reason why programs for children did come up as often. Chairperson Schaefer said in our survey 65% were no children households. Mr. Andreason said again, this is an opportunity for the city as the data regarding non-visitors and non-users goes back to the biggest reason given for not utilizing the parks department is no children in the household. This is a communication and information opportunity.

Mr. Andreason reported another open-ended question asked was for people to tell us as far as other adult programming, general programming, and youth programming, what specifically you would like to see. For active adults, it was more fitness or group fitness, aquatics, yoga, exercise programs, and group events. Broader adult groups is almost exclusively about fitness programs.

At the conclusion of the assessment, respondents were asked about the idea of the parks department upgrading and improving the recreation center to include a two-court gym, indoor running track, indoor pool with lap lanes/splash pad, therapy pool, expanded indoor childcare space, and an outdoor pool/aquatic park. Respondents were told the addition of all this would mean for a home valued at $200,000, an additional $150 in property taxes per year and asked if they support or oppose. Clearly, a majority of respondents support the expansion although most of that support is only somewhat. However, the 29% who strongly support the expansion are valuable to the total number of people who oppose it, which is 31% combined.

Alderwoman Condon asked what is typical; the referendum process can be harsh. Looking at the information, these seem like favorable numbers.

Mr. Andreason noted on the plus side, the response is strong in support versus opposed. In addition, when asked why do you support or oppose it, a good number of people said
they support it, not necessarily because they are going to use it but because the community needs it, noting the expansion would be used often and improve property values making McHenry a more desirable place to live and move to. Chairperson Schaefer commented his surprise when he read the analysis adding he was pleased that the question was asked.

Director Hobson said one of the things discussed about the assessment was to be specific regarding the proposed expansion and the cost. The only referendum he experienced through the city was in 2002 and the question asked simply do you want a recreation center or do you not want a recreation center. This may have been too vague of a question to ask, as the voters were not given details on what they were being asked to pay for. He added the city must always clearly inform residents on how much the expansion will cost and what they will get for it.

Alderman Devine asked if the respondents were registered voters and it was noted this is just 25% of a slice of the community. Mr. Andreason noted this support was well distributed through all age groups. This is a survey of residents, and not registered voters or voters who actually vote. It would be a different group depending on the election, primary, consolidated, or general. It is very easy to say yes to this while we do have some detailed information about the cost and amenities. In addition, there is no organized opposition to the expansion in the survey.

Regarding Alderwoman Condon’s question about what is typical, these initial numbers are very good. Mr. Andreason would be more confident if it were 40% in favor. Superintendent Gorniak asked if respondents were broke down by location and Mr. Andreason answered, the households surveyed were evenly distributed throughout the city. However, for some reason when they were testing the outdoor water features, people in the southwest quadrant of the city were more in favor of this feature than the other regions. The Committee and staff discussed reasons for this result speculating more families are concentrated in this region of the city and a few high-income neighborhoods.

Another important result shared by by Mr. Andreason was that 18% or one in five people attached a condition to their support; 7% said if they pay more in property taxes they do not expect to pay fees to use the new facilities; 6% said they support it but do not think the community will support a property tax increase; and 2% said they support it but do not believe all of the features in the proposed expansion can be done for just $150 a year in property taxes.

The opponents gave only one reason for opposition and it was taxes are too high, this is a waste of money, or you should charge only the people who are going to use it. In response to Chairperson Schaefer’s question, Mr. Andreason stated these were typical responses from people opposed to the expansion or who just do not want their property taxes to increase for any reason. Director Hobson stated the process is more difficult because there is no way to change the opinions of people opposed to any tax increase no matter what the reason. If we move forward with the expansion, being able to answer every question is essential. Director Hobson added this connects to the recreation center’s membership structure and has been discussed internally between staff. If we
head down this direction, we need to be able to answer every question throughout the referendum process. For instance, people have expressed the need for an indoor walking track, which is something the city could offer free – no membership required. Staff wants the community walking through the doors of the recreation center and the cost of a walking track is minimal; not like a machine that has to be replaced every five years. When they enter the recreation center to use the free waking track, they will see everything the center offers such as water aerobics classes and the fitness center and it will persuade them to pay for a membership. Offering an ala carte-type membership for us to answer questions specifically about the entire project may ease some concerns and sway people who are undecided about the expansion. We may not be able to change the opinion of those who are opposed the referendum but, there are many groups who are asking for the expansion. Mr. Andreason also noted the city's impressive record of accomplishment. The success of the recreation center and what it has meant in terms of memberships and interest, traffic, and usage demonstrates the city did their homework and delivered something the people of McHenry really wanted. The recreation center is being utilized to the point where now it is meeting only some of their needs and people are now telling you they do not understand why a gym was not included in the original construction. Alderwoman Condon commented the majority of those people might not understand that they did not pay any taxes to construction the recreation center. Mr. Andreason said it does demonstrate the city knows how to deliver what is needed to the community.

Mr. Andreason said as follow up half of the respondents clearly agree the most important item needed was an indoor pool; the other half were almost evenly divided between larger outdoor pool, indoor track, or additional gym space. One in five left the question blank, which is separate from the 11% who are mostly all opponents of any expansion and said none of these items is a priority. An interesting fact is the 11% who are opposed have no children in the household, and are either the newest or the most long-term residents of the city.

In summary, Mr. Andreason reported people were asked where they go for information about programs and activities that the department offers and they answered the printed program guide remains the most used source of information. The website was a close second followed by the city’s website. Other people telephone the city for information. Chairperson Schaefer said he was pleased by these results because for years, the city has looked into alternatives for the printed brochure and this shows that it is being used. Director Hobson stated the only brochure mailed out to all residents is the summer brochure – the fall and winter/spring guides are only sent to users. This may be something for the city to reevaluate as mailing all brochures to all residents may increase awareness of the department and memberships for the center.

Chairperson Schaefer asked Mr. Andreason if he had data on results from past referendum surveys. Mr. Andreason said aQuity has never shown support for a referendum that failed. There have been instances when they did not recommend proceeding with a referendum and the community did it is not known if it would have been successful. Director Hobson asked what is the next step should the city decide to proceed with a referendum. Mr. Andreason said the process to conduct a referendum survey is different than for a needs assessment for example, the survey is only conducted
with registered and likely voters. The voter rolls are obtained and only those people who had voted in two of the last three elections are selected. The focus is more on the referendum question and ideally, it is drafted, as it would appear on the ballot. We are looking for voters to respond to the survey as they would in the voting booth. The survey would also ask why do you support or oppose. Then we would test arguments for both sides for example we would give six reasons to support and six reasons to oppose and ask them to rate the examples. Subsequently, the referendum question would be shown on the survey again to find out the respondent's opinion after they have read the reasons to support and oppose. We would then test who moved their support and if they move we will review which arguments were most effective. We can than profile which argument affected families with no children, with children, seniors, etc. The challenge and the reason why aQuity does not conduct many referendum surveys is because there is now a state law prohibiting public agencies from funding those types of surveys. aQuity is currently conducting a referendum survey for the Fox Valley Park District that is being funded by the parks foundation. A Friends of the Park group or foundation must be available to underwrite the survey. Alderwoman Condon asked which election cycle is more beneficial to place a referendum question. Mr. Andreason said there is a lot of strategy involved and it depends on if there is another referendum on the ballot. If it was between schools and parks, schools usually prevail. aQuity works with consultants but they are not campaign consultants.

Director Hobson asked about the timeframe for the referendum process. Mr. Andreason said a referendum survey takes about the same as a CNA, two or three months. In a voter survey, people are more engaged and responsive to the survey and more interested in expressing their opinion. The survey is first to be done in the process, then a campaign consultant will assist with messaging and getting out the vote efforts using the referendum survey as a target. Director Hobson asked if a campaign consultant can only be used for that reason and the answer was yes. If the survey is conducted through a foundation, it is legal for them to turn over the results to the city.

Director Hobson summarized the next step is to present this same presentation to the full City Council and the Committee agreed. Chairperson Schaefer informed Mr. Andreason that Council members and members of the public will have an opportunity to ask questions at the meeting.

Director Hobson stated he and Chairperson Schaefer had previously discussed adding a link to the 14-minute survey on the city website to publicize the effort and staff will poll the recreation center members. However, it must be recognized that this will not be "clean data," but can be compiled by aQuity over the next few weeks. The information will be made available on the city’s Facebook page and website. Mr. Andreason added when they conducted referendum surveys for the Lake County Forest Preserve, which is a much larger geographic area than McHenry, and only approximately 600 responded to each of the surveys and aQuity was still able to determine the level of support for the question accurately. Comparing that ratio to 400 respondents in a community the size of McHenry, clearly demonstrates you do not need to talk to thousands of people. Mr. Andreason added the city should have confidence in the data.

Alderwoman Condon stated she would recommend aQuity stress this point to the full
Council, as it is important. The demographics fit what is representative of the community including the margin for error.

Chairperson Schaefer asked how many surveys were distributed to city residents and Mr. Andreason answer between 6,000 and 7,000. The percentage of return was a bit lower than average. Chairperson Schaefer advised Mr. Andreason to be prepared to discuss the fact that some of the surveys were sent to homeowners outside the city limits and that this data does not reflect responses from those households.

Chairperson Schaefer asked if the survey indicated McHenry is a park department and not a separate taxing district. Mr. Andreason stated this point was discussed in the focus groups. Director Hobson noted the city is a regional provider for recreation and activities.

Director Hobson reported the CNA would be a discussion item on the November 20 City Council agenda.

There being no further questions for aQuity, Chairperson Schaefer thanked them for the information and Mr. Andreason left the meeting.

After a brief discussion, the Committee agreed to bring the question of a referendum back to the Committee prior to full City Council consideration.

Alderman Devine asked if staff had an idea for which election a referendum question could be on the ballot noting a General Election might be beneficial. Director Hobson said he would target November 2018 for the ballot question.

Regarding the indoor pool proposal, Chairperson Schaefer said he would be interested to know if communities that have added indoor pools to their facilities in the past 10-20 years still receive a good draw. Director Hobson stated this information is based on demographics and that is why offering different elements to the expansion will draw more people to the center.

Supervisor Thompson noted the McHenry County YMCA had planned to install a 50-meter pool, but instead they installed a 25-yard pool, missing a great opportunity. When you go to the YMCA in the evenings, the entire pool is swim lesson and classes. The new pool is swim team competition. When a pool is idle and losing money in the middle of the day, it creates opportunities to partner with schools and offer pre-schools lessons during that time to get people in the doors during slow periods. After work and after hours those pools are filled with people.

5. Department Updates

Director Hobson provide update to the Committee on the following matters:

Boat Ramp: It is substantially completed. A few things still needed outside the original scope of the project is lighting. Approximately 10 lights would be needed – three in the middle of the parking lot, perhaps four on the ramp, and three on the driveway entering
the area. There currently is no electric service in the area. One thing being explored is to address this project as a design build. The project is relatively simple and could be presented to electrical contractors to quote. Director Hobson asked the Committee what thoughts they would have to handling the project in this manner.

Chairperson Schaefer said he agrees and asked if this was something Project Engineer Strange could be involved in and Director Hobson answered he does not handle electrical project.

Superintendent Gorniak stated the companies that he spoke with said they would take an overhead Google image of the area to develop photo metrics. They will tell us how much spread is needed between lights, etc. This is not a big system.

Chairperson Schaefer noted now is the time to perform this project as the parking lot is not paved and there would be no cutting involved. Director Hobson said yes, eventually at some point the lot may be paved, but not at this time. From an engineering standpoint, and how the project has been described, it sounds like an electrical contractor can complete the project. Director Hobson agreed, as this is a relatively simple project – run power and install 10 light poles.

Director Hobson reported this project would be paid using park developer donations. Chairperson Schaefer inquired about the status of that fund and Director Hobson noted the fund is increasing from new development.

The Committee was agreeable to the project.

Fox Ridge Park. In the near future, Director Hobson would recommend the Committee review installing a build a public restroom facility at Fox Ridge Park. This item ranked #2 in our last CNA. Lacrosse games, soccer matches, and four softball fields are often utilized at the same time. Restrooms, concessions, and a maintenance structure would be ideal at this location.

Chairperson Schaefer asked if next year’s CIP is completed. Director Hobson said yes, however he would like the Committee’s input on having staff prepare for this project before the next ball season. Director Hobson will prepare a list for possible CIP projects for the next Committee meeting.

Alderman woman Condon agrees with the proposed project at Fox Ridge Park.

Supervisor Witt determined revenue made from concessions at Petersen Park is approximately $10,000-$12,000 per year. Director Hobson said with the amount of games held at Fox Ridge Park it is conceivable that revenue could equal or surpass Petersen Park.

Chairperson Schaefer asked if the structure could be built in phases, for example restrooms first. Director Hobson said the Althoff Park building is a good model, it is not a full garage and just a maintenance storage shed with a small concession. When it was built sometime around 2000, it cost $96,000. In addition, a sewer line would have to be
installed and most likely from Whitmore; fortunately, all the easements are already in place.

In response to Chairperson Schaefer’s question, Director Hobson stated paving the parking lot at Fox Ridge Park is not on the CIP.

Northern United Soccer Federation. Director Hobson reported the President of the Northern United Soccer Federation, formerly the McHenry Area Soccer Federation, contacted him. This organization has combined with Johnsburg and Richmond and are seeking property to create a home base for the federation somewhere in the area to potentially purchase. Director Hobson asked the Federation why would they buy the land and he told her about the 22-acres off Petersen Park. The Committee recalled that his area was always planned for soccer fields. Two U-10 fields and a couple full sized fields as well as a potential partnership with the Pigtail or MBA to turn field #5 into a four-plex ball field. Director Hobson also said this is a potential area for walking paths. A partnership could be proposed to develop this facility. A discussion ensued on how this plan would affect the residential areas around Petersen Park and the soils at Althoff Park. The Committee agreed to direct Director Hobson to pursue talks with the Northern United Soccer Federation regarding a possible joint venture with the city. Director Hobson said he would like to invited the President of the Federation to a future Committee meeting.

Skate Park Lighting. Director Hobson reported Superintendent Gorniak is in the process of collecting quotes for Skate Park lights. This topic is of interest to Carol Chrisman who has asked about hosting an event to raise funds for park lighting in honor of Ryan Buss who recently passed-away. The conduit and bases are already installed and potentially renaming the park after Ryan. The Committee agreed to Director Hobson’s continued talks with Ms. Chrisman.

Althoff Park
Chairperson Schaefer asked if staff has any ideas to share regarding the use of Althoff Park. Director Hobson reported he had met with someone about electric Drone Parks. In addition, Disc Golf was briefly considered at this location. Superintendent Gorniak reported the washroom building at Althoff Park is frequently vandalized. The washroom building is now boarded up for security and the water to the building is shut-off. Chairperson Schaefer asked if the proposed Lakeland Park Drainage project would affect Althoff Park in terms of water storage. Director Hobson said from a storage point of view, the location is too downstream; storage is needed upstream. Director Hobson noted Althoff Park is an ideal location for a dog park however, as the Committee recalled, the neighborhood was opposed to this use at the park and Mr. Althoff who donated the land was not in favor of using the land for this purpose.

Parks Tour/Next Meeting
The Committee agreed to meet at the Parks and Recreation Center on Thursday, November 16th at 2:00 PM for a parks tour.
Committee/Staff Comments.
Alderwoman Condon thanked Director Hobson for assisting with the use of Veterans Memorial Park for the McHenry County Suicide Prevention Taskforce Memorial. The members of the taskforce were impressed with the park.

Director Hobson reported the city might want to reconsider the date of the Rotary Oktoberfest in Veterans Memorial Park. It rained heavily on the day of the event; for the most part the event was rained out however vendor vehicles were driven through the park creating ruts in the grass. Parks Maintenance had to roll the ground because of this event. Chairperson Schaefer said this would have been a huge event with Modern Day Romeos performing if the weather was better and maybe it should be scheduled in a different location. Director Hobson said the event was not anticipated to be as large as it might have been and he would recommend Petersen Park for future Oktoberfest events.

The Committee discussed the condition of the lights in Veterans Memorial Park. Superintendent Gorniak will contact Temple Display about moving lights that were installed too close to pedestrian traffic.

The Downtown Christmas Walk will be held on Saturday, November 18 and the annual Toys for Tots Parade is at 1:00 PM on November 19.

Motion to Adjourn

As there were no further comments, Chairperson Schaefer called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Alderwoman Condon made a motion, seconded by Alderman Devine to adjourn the meeting. All ayes, motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Marci Geraghty, Executive Assist/Deputy Clerk

Reviewed and approved this ___ day of __________ 2017.

Alderman Jeffery A. Schaefer, Chairperson
1. **Call to Order:** Chairperson Schaefer called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm in the McHenry Municipal Center Conference Room.

2. **Roll Call:** Chairperson Alderman Schaefer, Alderman Devine and Alderwoman Condon.

   City Staff Attendance: Director of Parks & Recreation Hobson, Athletic & Aquatic Supervisor Thompson, and Parks Maintenance Superintendent Gorniak.

3. **Public Comment:** None.

4. **Motion to approve the October 26, 2017 Parks and Recreation Committee meeting report.**
   This matter was tabled to the next meeting.

5. **Department Updates**

   McHenry Zone Skate Park Renaming and Installation of Lights.
   Director Hobson provided the Committee with an update on the McHenry Zone Skate Park and a request to dedicate the park in memory of Ryan Buss was discussed along with the installation of lights in the park.

   It was the consensus of the Committee to present to the full City Council a recommendation to rename the McHenry Zone Skate Park to *Ryan Buss Zone Skate Park*, and to recommend the installation of lights at the facility.

6. **Future Meeting Topics.**
   None.

7. **Driving Tour of Parks and Recreation Facilities and corresponding discussion on Parks and Recreation Department Capital Improvement Projects for Fiscal Year 2018/19.**
   The Committee exited the meeting site at 3636 Municipal Drive at 2:10 PM and began a tour of various Parks and Recreation facilities together in the department van.

8. **Motion to Adjourn**

   As there was no further business to discuss, Chairperson Schaefer called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Alderwoman Condon made a motion, seconded by Alderman Devine to adjourn the meeting. All ayes, motion carried.
The meeting adjourned at 3:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Marci Geraghty, Executive Assist/Deputy Clerk

Reviewed and approved this ____ day of ___________ 2017.

________________________
Alderman Jeffery A. Schaefer, Chairperson
Park and Recreation Committee  
Special Meeting Report  
Thursday, April 26, 2018  
City Hall Classroom

Call to Order: Chairperson Schaefer called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. in the City Hall Classroom.

Roll Call: Deputy City Clerk called the roll: Members present: Chairperson Alderman Schaefer, Alderman Devine and Alderwoman Condon. Others in attendance: Director of Parks & Recreation Hobson, Recreation Center Manager LaPorte, Recreation Supervisor Witt, Athletic & Aquatic Supervisor Thompson.

Public Comment: None

Recreation Center Expansion Proforma Draft Review  
Director Hobson commented on the draft proforma. He noted that the assumptions had been revised since the first draft was reviewed. Director Hobson reported that a representative from the aQity research and marketing firm will be joining the meeting to discuss the assumption changes via a conference call. He proceeded to call the representative (Danielle) from aQity Research. Director Hobson introduced Danielle to those in attendance.

Alderman Schaefer asked Ms. Danielle if she could discuss the methodology used in revising the assumptions. Ms. Danielle commented on the three revenue sources that were used in the proforma. She noted that the revenue sources included membership fees, aquatic program revenues and rentals such as birthday parties. In addition, they researched the market penetration using a 10 minute drive time and a 20 minute drive time. They also compared recreational facilities which offered similar amenities.

The Committee along with the consultants discussed in length the revenues versus expenses with respect to the indoor pool, outdoor family aquatic center, gymnasium and walking track. Danielle reported that the consultants had researched the community’s demographics and the regional draw with respect to the proposed amenities. The Committee Members along with the consultants concluded their discussion regarding the proforma.

Recreation Center Expansion Referendum Ballot Measure Review  
Director Hobson reviewed the proposed referendum ballot measure language. The language will be amended to be more concise and educational. A Motion was made by Alderman Schaefer and seconded by Alderwoman Condon to bring the amended referendum question to the City Council for approval. Vote: 3-ayes by unanimous voice vote. 0-nays, 0-abstained. Motion carried.
Department Updates
Director Hobson provided the Committee Members with an update on the new boat launch. He reported that the lights and pay station will be finished by the end of the week.

There was some discussion with respect to the Peterson Farm. Director Hobson continued on to comment on a large donation recently received from the Buss family. Director Hobson discussed the upcoming Fiesta Days event. He concluded the department update discussion by reporting that the Park & Recreation Center Staff is now handling the majority of the park’s sale transactions including memberships and program registrations.

Adjournment
There being no further public business to discuss, a Motion was made by Alderman Devine and seconded by Alderwoman Condon to adjourn from the public meeting at 5:39 p.m. Roll call:
Vote: 3-ayes by unanimous voice vote. 0-nays, 0-abstained. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Meadows,

Reviewed and approved this ___ day of _________2018.

______________________

Alderman Jeffery A. Schaefer, Chairperson
Park and Recreation Committee
Special Meeting Report
Monday, July 30, 2018
Recreational Center Conference Room
3636 S. Municipal Drive
McHenry, IL 60050

Call to Order: Chairperson Schaefer called the meeting to order at 5:34 p.m. in the Recreational Center’s Conference Room.

Roll Call: Deputy Clerk Meadows called the roll: Members present: Chairman Schaefer, Alderman Devine and Alderwoman Condon. Others in attendance: Director of Parks & Recreation Hobson and Supervisor Gorniak.

Public Comment: None

Walsh Park Proposal
Director Hobson reported that an anonymous donor has come forward with a proposal to redesign Walsh Park. The concept plan included a paver path that would match the Riverwalk design. The path would traverse the park, significantly widening the middle and create the unique setting of an “art park”, which would feature sculptures to be introduced later as well as improved seating prior to the narrowing of the path that connects the parking area located behind the movie theater.

The anonymous donor has partnered with a reputable landscape design firm and would like to construct the improvements utilizing a design/build concept. There are two elements that the City would be responsible for; the difference in standard wage costs and prevailing wage costs and the costs in reconstructing the seawall portion of the project. The estimated exposure for the City with respect to the prevailing wage cost is $12,500. The reconstruction of the seawall is estimated to cost in a range of $35,000-$45,000.

There was some discussion with respect to if a portion of the project area was located within a floodplain and if the Army Corp of Engineers would need to be involved. Director Hobson discussed the original Riverwalk’s concept plan designed by the Hitchcock Design Group which depicted the 100 year floodplain’s location and it did not appear to be located in the immediate proposed project area.

The Committee Members discussed the various options with respect to the proposed park improvements. The discussion included the following considerations:

- Possible amending DC Cobbs’ License agreement
• Donating the park land to the anonymous donor if the donor agreed to allow public access
• Funding the City’s portion of the Improvements with park impact fees

The Committee discussed the appropriate ways in which Developer Donations could be used. Director Hobson noted that park impact fees are not to be used for park maintenance. The intention of the use of park impact fees is for park improvements.

Director Hobson recapped the Committee’s conversation regarding the Walsh Park Resign. He was directed first to ask the donor if he or she would be interested in the City donating the park space. If the donor responds no, then the Committee agreed to bring the proposed Walsh Park redesign concept plan including the City’s portion of the prevailing wage cost and the reconstruction of the seawall not to exceed $60,000 to the full City Council. **A Motion was made by Alderwoman Condon and seconded by Alderman Devine to bring the proposed Walsh Park redesign concept plan including the City’s portion of the prevailing wage cost and the reconstruction of the seawall not to exceed $60,000 contingent upon the donor’s response to the land donation question.** Roll call: Vote: 3-ayes by unanimous voice vote. 0-nays, 0-abstained. Motion carried.

**Department Updates**
Director Hobson asked if the Committee Members would be available to meet on August 20th at 5:30 pm to discuss the Peterson Farm Study. The Committee Members agreed to meet on August 20th at 5:30 pm.

Director Hobson reported that the Boat Launch had 200 paid uses and 40 season passes sold.

Director Hobson commented on Fiesta Days and the Food Truck events. He noted that both events were very successful.

**Future Meeting Topics**
Peterson Farm Study

**Adjournment**
There being no further public business to discuss, **a Motion was made by Alderman Devine and seconded by Alderwoman Condon to adjourn from the public meeting at 6:40 p.m.** Roll call: Vote: 3-ayes by unanimous voice vote. 0-nays, 0-abstained. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Meadows
Reviewed and approved this ___ day of _________ 2018.

__________________________
Alderman Jeffery A. Schaefer, Chairperson
AGENDA ITEM 3 – **Walsh Park Redesign Update**

A donor has come forward with a proposal to redesign Walsh Park. A map of the designs are included. However, the concept would include a paver path that would match the Riverwalk design. The path would traverse the park, significantly widening in the middle and create the unique setting of an “art park”, that would feature a sculpture to be introduced late as well as improved seating before again narrowing and connecting to the parking behind the movie theater.

The design is consistent with the recent plans that were compiled by the Riverwalk Foundation. These have also been attached for review. The donor, who wishes to remain anonymous at this point has partnered with a reputable landscape design firm and would like construct the improvements utilizing a design build concept. In a design build concept a budget is set as are the basic concept for the improvements but full constructions plans are not assembled. In this instance, the city has illustrations of the improvements and we have design cross sections from the Riverwalk. Using this information the entire design can be completed.

There are two elements that need to be addressed that the city would be responsible for; the difference in standard wage costs and prevailing wage costs and the seawall portion of the project, if it is pursued. The estimated exposure for the city in the prevailing wage aspect is $12,500. The secondary project that would be a logical time to couple with this initiative is the replacement of the failing concrete seawall, with steel and to pour a concrete sidewalk behind this. For the approximately 115 feet, the cost estimate including prevailing wage was $53,428.42. This aspect would be completely on the city but also managed as a component of the overall design build. It would consolidate construction, alleviate any concerns of failure in conjunction with the improvements or dredging and finally set the base if others ever desired to install cantilevered composite boat docks/boardwalk. The improvements would be funded through the Parks Developer Donations Fund.

Updated cost estimates have been attached as has an email that the donor is willing take on more to match the city’s exposure in the project.

**Action**

To discuss and offer input to staff on the direction of the proposed development and forward to council if consensus is to require expenditure of city funds in conjunction with the project.
Walsh Park - McHenry River Walk

Nierman Landscape and Design is pleased to present you with this proposal. We, here at NLD, strive to make the landscape experience an enjoyable one. We pride ourselves on meeting and exceeding your expectations. Should you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us at 815-337-8873.

**Phase 1**

**Plantings Phase 1.1**
Install Plant Material around Existing Patio Per plan. Includes prepping the plant bed, includes premium Shredded Bark Mulch.

**Plants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Green Velvet Boxwood - 18&quot;</td>
<td>18&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Henry’s Garnet Sweetspire - 3Gal./18&quot;</td>
<td>3Gal./18&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Walker’s Low Catmint - 1Gal.</td>
<td>1Gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>’Goldmound’ Spirea - 18&quot;</td>
<td>18&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bloomerang Lilac - 3Gal.</td>
<td>3Gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>'Fire Chief' Arborvitae - 5Gal.</td>
<td>5Gal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Materials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Yard</td>
<td>Mulch - Premium Bark Mulch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plantings Phase 1.1 Total: $2,575.00

**Plantings Phase 1.2**
Install plant material, per plan. Includes prepping the plant bed, includes Premium Shredded Bark Mulch. Repair/Install turf, per plan. Grade area, and install new, premium grade turf seed. All disturbed areas will be covered with a DS-75 straw blanket.

**Plants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Summer Beauty Ornamental Onion - 1Gal.</td>
<td>1Gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Autumn Brilliance Serviceberry - 6’</td>
<td>6’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Rosy Returns Daylily - 1Gal.</td>
<td>1Gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>'Liberty' Hosta - 1Gal.</td>
<td>1Gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Endless Summer Hydrangea - 5Gal.</td>
<td>5Gal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Client Initials __________________
18 lilypurf - 1Qt.
7 Walker’s Low Catmint - 1Gal.
7 Nearly Wild Rose - 3Gal.
15 Prairie Blaze Black Eyed Susan - 1Gal.
23 Autumn Fire Sedum - 1Gal.
3 Emerald Arborvita - 6’
3 Autumn Jazz Viburnum - 36”

**Materials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Yard</td>
<td>Mulch - Premium Bark Mulch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lawn - Straw Blanket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 Box</td>
<td>Lawn - Staples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Yard</td>
<td>Soil - Topsoil (pulverized)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 lbs</td>
<td>Lawn - Glamour Seed Mix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Plantings Phase 1 Total: $5,698.00**

**Hardscapes Phase 1**

Install new Brussels Block Brick Paver Patio and Walks in Prairie with concrete banding, per plan. The base will consist of approximately 6” of compacted grade #9 gravel installed in compacted lifts and a 1” layer of sand. The pavers will be installed on top of the sand. The pavers will be compacted again, and polymeric joint sand will be swept into the joints between the pavers. Install decorative gravel between building and parking lot, per plan. Install flagstone to allow for access to the existing drinking fountain.

**Materials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23 Bag</td>
<td>Sand - Polymeric Jointing Sand (Standard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300 SqFt</td>
<td>Paver - Brussels Block 7cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Ton</td>
<td>Gravel - Torpedo Sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Ton</td>
<td>Gravel - Grade #9 Gravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 Ton</td>
<td>Flagstone - Fossil Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ton</td>
<td>Decorative Gravel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hardscapes Phase 1 Total: $54,545.00**
Phase 2

Hardscapes Phase 2
Excavate for new patio per plan. Install a new boulder wall, per plan. Average boulder size will be 8"-24" in size. Heavy Duty Landscape Fabric will be installed behind the boulder wall to help keep the soil in place behind the wall. Install new Rosetta Irregular steps, on a compacted gravel base, per plan. Install new Brussels Block Brick Paver Patio and Walks in Prairie with concrete banding, per plan. The base will consist of approximately 6" of compacted grade #9 gravel installed in compacted lifts and a 1"layer of sand. The pavers will be installed on top of the sand. The pavers will be compacted again, and polymeric joint sand will be swept into the joints between the pavers.

Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Bag</td>
<td>Sand - Polymeric Jointing Sand (Standard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100 SqFt</td>
<td>Paver - Brussels Block 7cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Ton</td>
<td>Gravel - Torpedo Sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Ton</td>
<td>Gravel - Grade #9 Gravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Boulders</td>
<td>- Custom picked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Steps</td>
<td>- Rosetta Irregular Step - 7&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Tons</td>
<td>Boulders - Winonsin Granite 12&quot;-18&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 SqFt</td>
<td>Filter Fabric - 3 x 300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hardscapes Phase 2 Total: $41,380.00

Plantings Phase 2
Install plant material, per plan. Includes prepping the plant bed, includes Premium Shredded Bark Mulch. Repair/Install turf, per plan. Grade area, and install new, premium grade turf seed. All disturbed areas will be covered with a DS-75 straw blanket.

Plants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Red Maple - 2.5&quot;</td>
<td>2.5&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Cheyenne Spirit Coneflower - 1Gal.</td>
<td>1Gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Compact Burning Bush Euonymus - 30&quot;</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Purpleleaf Wintercreeper - 32perFlat</td>
<td>32perFlat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>'Little Grapette' Daylily - 1Gal.</td>
<td>1Gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Annabelle Hydrangea - 5Gal.</td>
<td>5Gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>'Marshall's Delight' Beebalm - 1Gal.</td>
<td>1Gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Northwind Switch Grass - 3Gal.</td>
<td>3Gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Hot Rod Switch Grass - 1Gal.</td>
<td>1Gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>'Forever Pink' Phlox - 1Gal.</td>
<td>1Gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>'Mrs. Moon' Lungwort - 1Gal.</td>
<td>1Gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Drift Rose - 3Gal.</td>
<td>3Gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Little Bluetsm Grass - 1Gal.</td>
<td>1Gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Autumn Joy Sedum - 1Gal.</td>
<td>1Gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Miss Kim Lilac - 30&quot;</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Yard</td>
<td>Mulch - Premium Dark Mulch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lawn - Straw Blanket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 Box</td>
<td>Lawn - Staples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Yard</td>
<td>Soil - Topsoil (pulverized)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 lbs</td>
<td>Lawn - Glamour Seed Mix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Plantings Phase 2 Total: $13,615.00**

NLD Salesperson: ___________________________  Date: ___________________

Tom Nierman

I/we agree to the above contract.

Client Signature: ___________________________  Date: ___________________

Payment Terms:  Due Upon Receipt
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Walsh Park - McHenry River Walk

Nieman Landscape and Design is pleased to present you with this proposal. We, here at NLD, strive to make the landscape experience an enjoyable one. We pride ourselves on meeting and exceeding your expectations. Should you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us at 815-337-8873.

Phase 1

Plantings Phase 1.1
Install Plant Material around Existing Patio Per plan. Includes prepping the plant bed, includes premium Shredded Bark Mulch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plants</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Green Velvet Boxwood - 18&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>18&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Henry's Garnet Sweetspire - 3Gal./18&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>3Gal./18&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Walker's Low Catmint - 1Gal.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1Gal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 'Goldmound' Spirea - 18&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>18&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Bloomerang Lilac - 3Gal.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3Gal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 'Fire Chief' Arborviate - 5Gal.</td>
<td></td>
<td>5Gal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Yard</td>
<td>Mulch - Premium Bark Mulch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plantings Phase 1.1 Total: $2,920.00

Plantings Phase 1.2
Install plant material, per plan. Includes prepping the plant bed, includes Premium Shredded Bark Mulch. Repair/Install turf, per plan. Grade area, and install new, premium grade turf seed. All disturbed areas will be covered with a DS-75 straw blanket.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plants</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 Summer Beauty Ornamental Onion - 1Gal.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1Gal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Autumn Brilliance Serviceberry - 6'</td>
<td></td>
<td>6'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Rosy Returns Daylily - 1Gal.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1Gal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 'Liberty' Hosta - 1Gal.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1Gal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Endless Summer Hydrangea - 5Gal.</td>
<td></td>
<td>5Gal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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18 Lilyturk - 1Qt. 
7 Walker's Low Catmint - 1Gal. 
7 Nearly Wild Rose - 3Gal. 
15 Prairie Blaze Black Eyed Susan - 1Gal. 
23 Autumn Fire Sedum - 1Gal. 
3 Emerald Arborvita - 6' 
3 Autumn Jazz Viburnum - 36" 

**Materials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Yard</td>
<td>Mulch - Premium Bark Mulch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lawn - Straw Blanket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 Box</td>
<td>Lawn - Staples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Yard</td>
<td>Soil - Topsoil (pulverized)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 lbs</td>
<td>Lawn - Glamour Seed Mix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Plantings Phase 1 Total:** $7,115.00

**Hardscapes Phase 1**
Install new Brussels Block Brick Paver Patio and Walks in Prairie with concrete banding, per plan. The base will consist of approximately 6" of compacted grade #9 gravel installed in compacted lifts and a 1" layer of sand. The pavers will be installed on top of the sand. The pavers will be compacted again, and polymeric joint sand will be swept into the joints between the pavers. Install decorative gravel between building and parking lot, per plan. Install flagstone to allow for access to the existing drinking fountain.

**Materials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23 Bag</td>
<td>Sand - Polymeric Jointing Sand (Standard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300 SqFt</td>
<td>Paver - Brussels Block 7cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Ton</td>
<td>Gravel - Torpedo Sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Ton</td>
<td>Gravel - Grade #9 Gravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 Ton</td>
<td>Flagstone - Fossil Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ton</td>
<td>Decorative Gravel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hardscapes Phase 1 Total:** $65,475.00
Phase 2

Hardscapes Phase 2
Excavate for new patio per plan. Install a new boulder wall, per plan. Average boulder size will be 8"-24" in size. Heavy Duty Landscape Fabric will be installed behind the boulder wall to help keep the soil in place behind the wall. Install new Rosetta Irregular steps, on a compacted gravel base, per plan. Install new Brussels Block Brick Paver Patio and Walks in Prairie with concrete banding, per plan. The base will consist of approximately 6" of compacted grade #9 gravel installed in compacted lifts and a 1" layer of sand. The pavers will be installed on top of the sand. The pavers will be compacted again, and polymeric joint sand will be swept into the joints between the pavers.

Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Bag</td>
<td>Sand - Polymeric Jointing Sand (Standard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100 SqFt</td>
<td>Paver - Brussels Block 7cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Ton</td>
<td>Gravel - Grade #9 Gravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Boulders - Custom picked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Steps - Rosetta Irregular Step - 7&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Tons</td>
<td>Boulders - Winsconsin Granite 12&quot;-18&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 SqFt</td>
<td>Filter Fabric - 3 x 300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hardscapes Phase 2 Total: $51,015.00

Plantings Phase 2
Install plant material, per plan. Includes prepping the plant bed, includes Premium Shredded Bark Mulch. Repair/Install turf, per plan. Grade area, and install new, premium grade turf seed. All disturbed areas will be covered with a DS-75 straw blanket.

Plants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Red Maple - 2.5&quot;</td>
<td>2.5&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Cheyenne Spirit Coneflower - 1Gal.</td>
<td>1Gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Compact Burning Bush Euonymus - 30&quot;</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Purpleleaf Wintercreeper - 32perFlat</td>
<td>32perFlat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>'Little Grapette' Daylily - 1Gal.</td>
<td>1Gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Annabelle Hydrangea - 5Gal.</td>
<td>5Gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>'Marshall's Delight' Beebalm - 1Gal.</td>
<td>1Gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Northwind Switch Grass - 3Gal.</td>
<td>3Gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Hot Rod Switch Grass - 1Gal.</td>
<td>1Gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>'Forever Pink' Phlox - 1Gal.</td>
<td>1Gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>'Mrs. Moon' Lungwort - 1Gal.</td>
<td>1Gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Drift Rose - 3Gal.</td>
<td>3Gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Little Bluestem Grass - 1Gal.</td>
<td>1Gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Autumn Joy Sedum - 1Gal.</td>
<td>1Gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Miss Kim Lilac - 30&quot;</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Yard</td>
<td>Mulch - Premium Dark Mulch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lawn - Straw Blanket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 Box</td>
<td>Lawn - Staples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Yard</td>
<td>Soil - Topsoil (pulverized)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 lbs</td>
<td>Lawn - Glamour Seed Mix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plantings Phase 2 Total: $15,990.00

NLD Salesperson: ___________________________ Date: _________________
Tom Nierman

I/we agree to the above contract.
Client Signature: ___________________________ Date: _________________

Payment Terms: Due Upon Receipt

Client Initials ___________________________
Date: 8/13/2018

PROPOSAL SUBMITTED TO:
Name: Kit Carstens /D.C. COBBS/Walsh Art Park
Address: 1204 N. Green St
City: Mchenry, IL 60050
Phone: 630-854-8881

NEW CONSTRUCTION: X    REPAIR/REMEDINATION: Demo 128.7LF/138.7LF New Steel

(1.) DEMO: Breakout & haul away 128.7 LF of existing concrete seawall = $11,500.00.
(2.) DEMO: Remove tree stump on East side of property and haul away=$800.00.
(3.) DEMO: Remove entire sidewalk and center stair case and haul away = $1,500.00.
(4.) Saw cut the East side of existing concrete seawall and install new deadmen for proper concrete wall support and proper steel wall return = $2,500.00.
(5.) Pull lines and begin to install 138.7LF of 12' Long Galvanized steel sheet piling = $25,659.50.
(6.) Install 138.7 LF of 4x4x1/4 inch angle iron or top cap for strength & cosmetic locks.
(7.) Install 6-7 deadmen or tie backs for proper seawall support.
(8.) Install 18- 21 3/4 hot rolled bar for further newly installed seawall support.
(9.) Install backfill (peagravel) behind newly installed seawall for proper water drainage and proper settlement leaving the gravel 8" below new seawall. Last, top off with black dirt or top soil 2" higher then new wall for final settlement= $4,500.00.
(10.) When this project and its payments are met in full 1204 N. Green St. (D.C. Cobbs Walsh Art Park) will receive a 10 year warranty on all of the newly installed seawall.

TOTAL INVESTMENT: $53,428.42

All Material is guaranteed to be as specified, and the above work to be completed in a substantially workmanlike manner in accordance with the terms of this contract for the sum of $53,428.42 with payments to be made as follows: Half down to start the job, half of remaining balance when the wall is in, not including driven to grade, top cap or deadmen, and balance on job completion.

NOTE: This proposal may be withdrawn if not accepted within 5 days.

Acceptance of Proposal: I/We hereby authorize Signature Seawalls & Piers to perform the work described above for the contract price specified above, subject to the terms and conditions, which are made a part of this contract. Any amount unpaid
after thirty days will be subject to a FINANCE CHARGE of 18% interest. This is a monthly percentage rate of 18%. You also agree to pay attorney’s fees, collection fees and costs Signature Seawalls & Piers incurs in attempting to collect any amounts owed. Venue shall be Walworth County WI. Signature Seawalls & Piers will provide all paperwork for permit approval. It is the homeowner’s / commercial properties responsibility to pay for all engineering and permit fees before approval and for work to begin. *Concrete cannot be warranted.*

SIGNATURE: ___________________________ DATE: __________  SIGNATURE: ___________________________ DATE: __________
(SS&P/Manager)                      (Home/Commercial/Owner)
AGENDA ITEM 4 – *Petersen Farm Draft Market Study Presentation*

There long has been a discussion as to what direction to proceed with the Petersen Farmstead. Earlier this year the city engaged Business Districts Inc. to perform a market study of the property and aide in determining its future programming. The outline of the scope is included below and Diane Williams is going to be presenting the draft of the study.

BDI will complete the following tasks in evaluating the Petersen Farm’s (Farm) best markets and opportunities.

*Task 1: Information Review and Reconnaissance.*
BDI will conduct a review of all relevant data regarding the Farm. This would include, but not be limited to:

- The Farm’s available fiscal data and current capital improvements plans from the City’s Parks and Recreation department;
- Any recent area tourism and visitor data, including spending patterns, from Visit McHenry County specific to the City of McHenry and nearby attractions;
- All visitor data or attendance counts for the Farm’s recent activities and promotional events within the last five (5) years;
- Past and current marketing or promotional materials for the Farm describing uses or activities held at the Farm within the last five (5) years;
- Any additional City-wide or Parks and Recreation Department studies describing the Farm’s future role;
- Available background regarding the City’s acquisition of the Farm, including any information from the City’s Landmark Commission or the Farm Foundation, describing the consensus vision for the Farm.

During this information assembly process, BDI will use the Experian national demographic database to compile a statistical portrait of population characteristics and spending power for the McHenry region. This data will include convenience and destination drive times, traffic counts, and regional entertainment-related spending. Regional traffic and tourism generators and any other visitor sources and resources will be identified, as described in the next task.

*Task 2: Farm Visit, Tour, and Interviews.*
With City staff and any invited volunteers, BDI will visit and tour the Farm and conduct up to eight (8) key stakeholder interviews at a nearby location. City personnel will schedule these interviews in advance. During these interviews, BDI will solicit input from the City’s management team (Petersen Park and the Farm), the Farm’s current event and program organizers, Visit McHenry County representatives, The Farm’s current partners, such as the McHenry County Foundation, and local officials. It is assumed that Task 2 work will be conducted concurrent with Task 1.
This interview process have three (3) objectives: to determine key operating strengths and challenges at the Farm; to ascertain market potential according to local constituencies and current partners; and to identify the Farm’s initial market context and attraction power. This market context will also frame the peer site assessment described below.

Task 3: Past Visitor Polling.
Using available past visitor contact information from the Farm Foundation and City staff, BDI will develop and conduct a quick poll of past Farm visitors. This poll will be conducted electronically via Survey Monkey. The poll will consist of five (5) questions developed to assess the current visitor experience at the Farm. BDI will require assistance from the City, its Landmark Commission, the Farm Foundation, and other current partners to circulate the poll via electronic and social media.

Task 4: Initial Study Update and Documentation.
BDI will present preliminary market study results from Tasks 1-3 to City staff, the City’s Landmark Commission, Farm Foundation representatives, other stakeholders, such as Landmarks Illinois, and any invited guests. This progress report will describe the Farm’s markets, potentially viable programs and/or uses, visitor attraction opportunities, and relevant trends with implications for the Farm. These preliminary results will provide the basis for implementation of study recommendations. BDI will provide a memorandum, documenting these preliminary results, not to exceed four (4) pages to the City, the Farm Foundation, and Landmarks Illinois. This memorandum will be submitted in a PDF format.

Task 5: Peer Sites Assessment.
BDI will identify up to five (5) farmsteads or like sites with market characteristics and ownership resembling those of the Farm. This Task will examine how these similar properties fund, program, promote, and manage their site currently. How each site’s vision for the future, including their plans for public engagement, relevant programming, sustaining visitor numbers, and facilities maintenance, will be components of this assessment.

Task 6: Competitive Review.
BDI will identify the local and regional market strengths and challenges for the Farm, its current programs, and likely market position. This will include the implications of each of these strengths and challenges for the Farm’s short-term and long-term future. Relevant trends specific to local historic sites will also be considered as part of this review.

Task 7: Opportunity Analysis.
Applying the market data, trends, and best practices, BDI will analyze the Farm’s best market supported opportunities to develop relevant and compelling programs and to generate supplemental revenues to support these activities. Opportunities will include, but not be limited to, identifying new potential partners, interpretive options, possible uses that may include contractors, tenants, or temporary uses, promotion and special events, operating
efficiencies, possible funding sources, and visitor growth tactics. The market and/or financial rationale will be indicated for each opportunity, providing the City, its landmark Commission.

Task 8: Study Documentation.
BDI will prepare a written report documenting likely markets and recommending future actions. An initial draft will be submitted to the City, the Farm Foundation, and Landmarks Illinois. Any suggested changes will be incorporated into a final report document (in PDF format) to the City and to Landmarks Illinois.
McHenry's Petersen Farm: Markets and Opportunities
Interim Study Update and Documentation
August 2018
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Introduction

The City of McHenry’s Parks and Recreation Department (City) retained Business Districts, Inc. (BDI) in March 2018 to examine Petersen Farm’s markets and best opportunities for the future. This project is preparatory to the development of a Master Plan for Petersen Farm (Farm). The following is an interim report of study results.

Project tasks completed include: review of relevant background data about Petersen Farm’s history and current programming; analysis of Farm-specific market data; interviews with 14 individuals representing multiple Farm stakeholders and partners; and research into site markets and programming at similar sites to Petersen Farm. In addition, preliminary data assessing competitive sites is briefly described. Finally, preliminary recommendations to capitalize on the Farm’s opportunities conclude this interim documentation.

Project work to be completed includes the results of a recent visitor quick poll, currently in process, the final competitive site review, and the final recommendations focused on the Farm’s best market-supported opportunities. These recommendations will emphasize what work can be readily accomplished, given current funding and staffing.

For the City, the Colby-Petersen Farm Foundation (Foundation), and other stakeholders, the consensus goal for the Farm is to have it ‘up, restored and active,’ as stated by one interviewee. Every stakeholder and partner indicated this similar objective, most indicating a willingness to help. Achieving this goal will take time and multiple incremental steps. The final opportunities and recommendations, confirmed at the conclusion of this project, will provide a practical path, or task set, to move the Farm’s programming forward over time to achieve that consensus goal.
Current Markets: Petersen Farm

Key market geographies for the Farm are displayed in Chart 1 below. The center point for each drive time market is Petersen Farm. The Custom Market map, shown in Figure 1, is a visual representation of Chart 2's zip code data.

Chart 1: Market Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>McHenry's Petersen Farm</th>
<th>City of McHenry</th>
<th>10-Minute Drive Time</th>
<th>Custom Market: 2017 Survey Respondents</th>
<th>20-Minute Drive Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>26,903</td>
<td>23,044</td>
<td>98,722</td>
<td>118,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>10,095</td>
<td>8,837</td>
<td>35,994</td>
<td>43,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Family Households</td>
<td>7,571</td>
<td>6,865</td>
<td>28,926</td>
<td>35,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Family Households</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>12,506</td>
<td>10,748</td>
<td>36,283</td>
<td>54,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Bachelor's Degree or Greater</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Income</td>
<td>$85,776</td>
<td>$78,098</td>
<td>$96,524</td>
<td>$92,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$68,223</td>
<td>$64,917</td>
<td>$76,008</td>
<td>$73,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Ethnicity</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not of Hispanic Ethnicity</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© 2014 Expertian, Inc. All Rights Reserved; Alteryx, Inc. © 2014 Easy Analytic Software, Inc. (EAS*) All Rights Reserved, Alteryx, Inc.

Chart 2: 2017 'A Day at Petersen Farm' Visitor Zip Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visitor Zip Codes</th>
<th>City Zip</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHenry</td>
<td>60050</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHenry Township</td>
<td>60051</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wonder Lake</td>
<td>60097</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodstock/Bull Valley</td>
<td>60098</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Lake</td>
<td>60014</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others (1 each)</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Day at the Farm Visitor Data, 2017; BDI.
The four (4) markets displayed above include the City of McHenry; a 10-minute drive time from the
Farm; a custom market based upon 2017 ‘A Day at the Petersen Farm’ (‘A Day at’) visitor responses
about their zip codes, and a 20-minute drive time. A map of the custom market is Family households in
each market are 75% or more of total households. The Latino population exceeds 10% on all markets
with the largest population within a 10-minute drive of the Farm. Chart 3 indicates that the dominant zip
codes for the ‘A Day at’ visitors are 60050 and 60051—from the City of McHenry and McHenry
Township. Given the Farm’s status as a City-owned property, serving City residents will continue to be
important to the Farm’s success. Attracting from these geographies with new programming can
generate much needed affinity for the Farm and potential access to additional resources.

The Farm’s 2017 visitor survey results provided indicative data about how attendees learned about the
‘A Day at’ event. Chart 3 shows how the responding visitors learned about the event:
Chart 3: How Visitors Learned about ‘A Day at Petersen Farm’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Visitors Learned about Day at the Farm</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flyers</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of Mouth</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Day at the Farm Visitor Data, 2017; BDI.

Overall, some type of traditional media was the primary way that attendees learned about the event. These varied media continue to work because the ‘A Day at’ event has experienced over a decade of success. For the future, multi-generational families increasing use technology, particularly mobile phones, to identify entertainment options. Making event information more available on more platforms will be important as the Farm enhances its activities and programs.

In the 2017 survey of ‘A Day at’ visitors, 103 of the 105 survey forms included programming suggestions for the Farm. Those activities receiving 60 or more suggestions are shown in Chart 4.

Chart 4: Suggested Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farm Programming Suggestions (Top 5)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical craft demonstrations</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptions and Reunions</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardening classes</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music festival</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community garden plots</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Day at the Farm Visitor Data, 2017; BDI.

The ideas noted represent typical programs offered at sites with similar characteristics to the Farm. Descriptions of how sites organize and offer these types of programming are noted in the Peer Site Assessments.

Overall, the Farm’s markets are sufficient to support increased visitor numbers and programming. The demographic data, cited above for this report, projects that the City of McHenry’s total population will increase by 8.8% by 2022. To market the Farm to the Custom Market, more activities targeted to families with children and introducing the broader community to this unique local resource must occur.
Interview Summary

As noted in the Introduction, 14 interviews were conducted as part of this initial project research. This summary includes shared observations of multiple interviewees.

Common Interview Themes

- ‘A Day at Petersen Farm’ is regarded by all stakeholders as great event—well organized and well attended. The event’s primary audience, families with young children from McHenry and nearby towns, represents the Farm’s future.
- The ongoing site maintenance at the Farm, particularly for the barn and other outbuildings, needs to be more pro-active. A capital plan or mid-term strategy to stabilize and preserve the Farm buildings needs to be developed, and funding sources identified.
- Too much attention is focused on the farmhouse versus the Farm as a whole. The site’s best opportunities are with the larger site and what can be done there, such as restoring the barn for special events.
- The Landmarks Commission’s role is difficult to distinguish from that of the Foundation, but their defined roles regarding the Farm appear very different.
- The Farm’s base of volunteers and partners needs to grow. This will be critical for future leadership at the Farm, for providing additional resources (people and financial) for the Farm, and for developing the necessary visitor experience to appeal to changing audiences that lack a direct connection to the Farm.
- Petersen Farm cannot operate as a historic site open daily. It should emphasize pre-arranged events or educational partnerships, similar to the successful ‘A Day at Petersen Farm,’ expanded gardens, family events, or school group visits.
- Ensuring that the Farm achieves its maximum potential as a resource and how to get there with limited City resources (staff and dollars) will remain problematic. Inertia about what to do and how to do things at the Farm is another aspect of this issue. Overall, more action and less discussion are needed to assure the Farm’s future.

New and Expanded Partnership Options

- A partnership with McHenry’s school districts should be developed. Programs suggested included the grade school district’s classroom units on local history, nature and conservation, and science, and the high school’s entrepreneurship program. With over 5,000 children in McHenry District 15, this partnership would also target the Farm’s most logical audience. Partnership options also exist with surrounding school districts.
- In addition to local schools, partnerships with local daycare facilities were suggested for future children’s activities or visits.
- McHenry County College’s (MCC) horticulture program is another potential larger partner and source of volunteers. Expanding the related Master Gardener program at the Farm, including a plan for any food grown in garden, is an example. This effort could be part of engaging the
schools or even providing produce for a local food pantry. Local Garden Clubs could be additional partners in these efforts. Also, an emerging opportunity is with McHenry County College’s urban agriculture work on local food systems.

- The Farm need better links to area and regional trails (Prairie Path), County conservation sites, and Moraine Hills State Park.
- Organizations that participate in ‘A Day at Peterson Farm’ could be more involved with the Farm and encouraged to offer more programs. Crafters and collectors were noted in particular.
- The Farm’s oak savanna presents an opportunity to work with the McHenry County Land Conservancy.
- Engaging youth group, including those connected to the Farm (4-H and Scout and Explorer groups), for a wide range of volunteer or service work will build local affinity for the Farm. Given McHenry’s large 4-H participation, the potential exists for increased 4-H and U of I extension programming. Beekeeping and similar low impact programs were noted as possibilities. The McHenry County Farm Bureau and extension office could assist with grants, such as those available from the U. S. Department of Agriculture. Future Farmers of America chapters from nearby school districts may also have a role.
- Funding the Farm’s improvements will require more dollars and people. Additional funding sources, including grants and sponsorships, for specific Farm projects or programs should be pursued. Creative funding options, such as the possible solar farm, should also be considered.

The Farm’s Future

- All major stakeholders, particularly the City and the Foundation, need to revisit their roles and/or missions specific to the Farm. They need to think differently about the site and its opportunities.
- City budget constraints will continue to affect the capital expenditures and programming at the Farm. Identifying people and funding resources must begin to build the site’s capacity for effective programs that create affection for the Farm. This will create an enhanced amenity for McHenry and indirectly impact McHenry’s economic growth and attraction power.
- A Master Plan for the Farm needs completion. But establishing new or expanded partnerships and identifying and developing more resources can start now.
- The Farm embodies the richness of the McHenry area’s agricultural story. Learning what parts of the story will resonate with residents and visitors and how translate the story into unique experience will need to inform any Farm programming or activities.

Peer Site Assessments

After considering 15 total sites, four (4) farm or similar sites were identified as peers for Petersen Farm. This peer research examined how these farm sites were funded, programmed, managed and promoted. Management for each site was interviewed to discuss which programs are attracting the greatest interest and attendance at their facilities and their future plans. One (1) peer site is municipally owned and programmed by the municipal parks department, similar to that of Petersen Farm. Either county or municipal park districts (separate taxing bodies) own the remaining sites. All four (4) facilities are dealing with limited fiscal and staff resources. Each farm site emphasizes their agricultural story, but site interpretation and programming is targeted to the needs of their community and nearby area. Current site operations for each peer site are described below.
These peer assessments will be useful to the City and the Foundation for one primary reason—the scope of their work and their comprehensive approach to programming generates ideas transferable to the Farm. These ideas may require implementation at a simpler or smaller scale, but they serve as examples of the many ways to interpret local farming history. Most of these programs are inexpensive to implement when organized with strong and engaged partners.

*Salomon Farm, Ft. Wayne, IN:* Salomon Farm (SF) shares a similar story with Petersen Farm. It was donated to the City’s Parks department in the late 1990s with certain stipulations regarding its preservation and operation, such as a period of significance identified as the 1920s-1940s. The farmstead is located in a residential area and is the only city park in that sector of Ft. Wayne.

The site’s two largest income sources are event rentals of its 1873 barn and farm camps scheduled for six (6) weeks each summer from 9-4 daily. The barn was improved right after the City’s acquisition of SF for an estimated $500,000. This restoration required that the barn be jacked up for foundation repairs. (Like many historic farm outbuildings, the original foundation was fieldstone.) As part of the restoration, one section of fieldstones was preserved as an educational tool. The barn is not climate controlled and is used from May through October. Barn rentals are $700 per event, and the City permits tents and on-site catering for events for additional fees, primarily permitting. The Farm Camp started with 20 children in the early 2000s and now serves 200. The camp represents about 45% of income generated for SF, costing $90 per child per week. Programming is organized and specific to children ages 4-17. Pre-school and young children participate in gardening and growing exercises. For example, the youngest children plant zinnias and learn about plants. They also learn about the farm animals housed at SF for the summer. Activities advance to beekeeping for ages 12 and above. The high school aged campers are referred to as farmers in training. Volunteer gardeners and these older campers grow the produce and operate SF’s Wednesday farmers market, completely set up by the campers.

SF also hosts one major special event, Harvest Fall Festival. This 2-day event is held each fall and typically attracts about 5,000 total visitors. All of SF’s partners contribute to the festival activities, including farm equipment clubs, demonstrating and operating equipment, and fiber arts demonstrations and vendors. Festival activities generally compare earlier and current agricultural practices. Smaller scale special events, such as school field trips, are scheduled based upon school district interest. Minor events attract anywhere from 50-200 participants.

Though no separate non-profit fundraising entity exists, SF relies heavily on volunteers and partnerships to support their year-round park programming. SF staff refers to them as the ‘lifeblood’ of their site, given the staff responsible for SF also manages four (4) other parks. One Parks staff member works steadily to identify those organizations or groups that may be interested in partnering with SF. Volunteers are often affiliated with many of the partner organizations. Partners are diverse and include:

- Collectors, including regional tractor clubs and antique farm machinery clubs;
• Crafts, including a blacksmith forge, and fiber arts groups, who also sell goods and conduct demonstrations. The collectors and crafters also participate in and volunteer at SF events and offer classes on site;
• Garden clubs and the area’s Master Gardeners who volunteer to support all growing programs, including the camps and farmers market. These same garden volunteers also serve as camp counselors;
• Area Future Farmers of America (FFA) chapters who also serve as volunteers and site interns;
• A local farmer who provides farm animals for the summer, and volunteers care for the animals during their time at SF;
• The City’s youth centers in underserved neighborhoods that enable children to attend farm camp and to provide a farm experience with the assistance of grant funding. SF plans to expand this program and to work with the City’s conservatory staff on an urban gardening program with current and new neighborhood partners;
• A local hospital which has agreed to a partnership organized around healthy eating, and staff intends to pursue a USDA grant for program funding;
• Within the City, Parks department staff relies on their City marketing and public information colleagues to sell sponsorships and provide media support and on the City’s public works crews for ongoing maintenance.

SF staff’s outreach work has helped attract resources to the site. Examples include:
• Private funding for a $50,000 building to (primarily) house the farm camp, allowing the camp program can increase its numbers. This building includes a teaching kitchen (not commercial)\(^1\) for demonstrations by local chefs.
• Purdue University extension has been very supportive, providing important technical expertise in accessing USDA funding for SF’s programs, particularly for farm to school programming.

In contrast to other farms sites, SF does not have a friends group raising money to support programming at their location. Parks staff indicates their primary challenge is continued public education that SF is a City park facility available to all; the perception exists it’s a separate farm operation.

*Fischer Farm, Bensenville, IL: After a 1999-2000 local battle to save Fischer Farm (FF), control of the farm site was assumed by the DuPage County Forest Preserve District (DCFPD). The Bensenville Park District (BPD) currently operates Fischer Farm (FF) as a leasehold from the County; actual site ownership is retained by the DCFPD.\(^2\) BPD is a separate taxing district within DuPage County. All improvements and site-related work require prior approval of the Forest Preserve District. FF is 5 acres and includes the farmstead and schoolhouse, also managed by BPD’s FF staff. One BPD staff member, with a public history background, is responsible for the Farm’s budgets and programs. This same staff member prepared FF’s Master Plan in 2011. The site’s long-term goal is to become a living history farm and an accredited museum. In

\(^1\) SF event caterers with Board of Health approvals can use this kitchen.
\(^2\) DCFPD operates 2 other farm sites, Mayslake and Kline Creek, and the Board decided to approach the BPD to operate and program the site. According to FF staff, their ongoing relationship is strong.
addition to its farming story, FF’s land included an original farm seedbed and Fischer Woods, one of northeast Illinois’ most unique wetland ecosystems.

Farm programming began with one event in 2001, when ongoing building restoration began. FF opened to the public in 2011 and initiated much of its current programming then. Key events include the Easter Egg Hunt, October’s Heritage Day, and Discovery Camp held in the summer. Heritage Day, like ‘A Day at,’ includes a wide range of activities—hayrides, visits with FF’s chickens and sheep, traditional crafts, children’s activities, and food. Attendance was lower in 2017 due to bad weather. Discovery Camp is part of the Park District’s summer camp program. Campers, aged 6-10, care for the chickens and sheep at FF, assist volunteers with outdoor projects, and participate in activities held at several park district facilities. Other programs scheduled at FF include video and photo shoots (professional and family), Civil War Weekend (re-enactment), Hands On Arts, and an annual quilt show.

In marketing to visitors and through partner entities, FF focuses on residents within their district boundaries. FF information is readily available on the BPD website and social media. FF’s unique character is also communicated on the website. Information about all programming is included in the seasonal guide sent to all BPD households. Banners for FF’s major events are displayed in the Village of Bensenville, and flyers are sent to residents in neighboring communities. FF also maintains and communicates regularly with a targeted email list.

FF’s partnerships include:

- DCFPD, providing rangers and other staff to interpret FF and conduct nature hikes;
- Elmhurst History Museum, conducting joint field trips to the Museum, the XXX Schoolhouse, and FF.
- Loyola University Graduate Program in Public History that provided student assistance to structure FF programming and serves as a Master Plan implementation resource.
- Two (2) local school districts, conducting field trip tours and serving as a venue for the 5th grade community service days. On those days, students work with FF and DCFPD staff and volunteers on ecosystem restoration.
- Friends of FF Foundation, formed in September 2017. The Board was formed with a core group of FF volunteers, including individuals with financial and fundraising expertise, the organizer of DCFPD’s Kline Farm program, and an educator. The Board has started to recruit additional Board members from among volunteers and district residents. All bring specific expertise. To date, the Friends have raised nearly $100,000 in donations and sponsorships for programming and for increased building accessibility. The Friends group intends to initiate a capital campaign in 2019.
- Crafters, including quilters and other area clubs that participate in FF special events.

Volunteers remain important to ongoing operations. FF provides an online volunteer application and screens volunteer applications for FF-specific needs. Despite being a separate taxing district, supplemental funds are needed for ongoing maintenance and to support specific programs. The fundraising success of the new Friends group has been important. Funding sources have included:

- Fees from admissions and rentals. Despite the smaller amounts, admission fees represent a regular budget line item. Facilities rental fees for private events, such as weddings and birthday parties
- Illinois Department of Natural Resources grant in 2015. This $108,000 grant was used for facility restoration at FF.
FF staff indicates that their primary issue is getting their work done, including Master Plan implementation. Limitations exist on what can be done by one staff person and committed site volunteers.

_Gale Woods Farm, Minnetrista, MN:_ Gale Woods Farm (GWF) is in its 15th year and is operated by the Three Rivers Park District (TRPD). This separate park district encompasses much of Hennepin County, excluding the Twin Cities. Of the peer sites examined, GWF is the largest at 410 acres and offers the most diverse range of activities. There are no historic buildings at GWF. An interpreted farm site is located elsewhere in Hennepin County (Shakopee). GWF staff describes their work as intentional in presenting a working farm. From staff’s perspective, GWF is a working farm and educates visitors; they do not provide ‘agricultural entertainment.’

Current activities and programs are:

- **Product sales.** Produce grown in the 3-acre garden and fruit produced from GWF’s 60 fruit trees are sold to CSAs³ and donated to a free farmers market in the area. Meat bundles produced from the beef, sheep, hogs, and chickens is sold to local school districts and local restaurants.
- **Cross country runs.** Local high schools use the site’s paths for practice runs.
- **Event space.** GWF has a rental pavilion that typically hosts about 75 weddings annually. Staff noted that bookings have declined in the last two (2) years to about 40 each year.
- **School field trips.** GWF hosts classroom field trips in the spring and the fall.
- **Summer camp.** Camps last ten (10) full weeks each summer. The partnership with local school districts, described below, is crucial to how GWF serves the broader district and at-risk youth.
- **Winter educational sessions.** A series of classes on varied topics, including gardening, environment, culinary, and fiber arts (using wool from GWF), are offered to adult learners, preschools and daycare, and home schooled children.
- **‘Meet the Animals.’** This drop-in program, offered from April through September for 2 ½ hours each Saturday morning, introduces families with younger children to GWF’s animals. Volunteers present slightly different programs each week, reflecting what may have changed at GWF. This program generates 20,000 visits per year.
- **Youth farmer program.** These high school students work the produce garden with GWF’s staff and gardening volunteers. This program, structured for 6-10 at-risk youth, provides workforce skills in horticulture.

³ CSA, or Community Supported Agriculture group.
• New efforts supporting food security. While GWF’s core food-related work indirectly addresses food security issues in their district’s disadvantaged communities, an emerging program is supporting community gardens in local communities.

In all of the various programs, paid staff or volunteers, including the high school students noted, do the labor. Additional corporate contributors, such as Target, have provided volunteers for specific tasks, events, or activities. WRPD actively recruits volunteers, and current volunteers recruit many new volunteers to the district. Overall, annual volunteer hours at GWF average 5,600 hours. In addition to active volunteer outreach, GWF has established some additional partnerships:

• In addition to the school-related programs noted above, GWF also works with individual local schools to support schoolyard gardens and collaborate with teachers on garden education.
• GWF has worked informally with the University of Minnesota’s Sustainable Agriculture program.
• The site has been less successful working with the regional Master Gardener program.
• TRPD has a separate Foundation, a 501(c)(3) public charity, to raise funds to support park district programs. GWF works with the Foundation and school district to provide financial subsidies for registrations and fees to ensure that children through high school age can attend GWF programs. The Foundation also works with GWF staff and neighborhood organizations to conduct outreach for this same program.
• GWF staff is also active with the Vermont-based Farm-Based Education Network, a national network of interpreted and publically held agricultural sites.

The park district tax levy supports GWF’s work and district work needed at all facilities. At GWF, programs typically cover about 50% of their operating costs through sales, fees, or rentals. Fees are typically $5.00 or less for admissions. Other fees are charged for camps and school groups. The site’s two largest events in the spring and the fall are free and sponsored by area farm supply companies.

Kline Creek Farm, West Chicago, IL: Kline Creek Farm (KCF) is a unit of the DuPage County Forest Preserve District, or DCFPD. Located in West Chicago, KCF is part of DCFPD’s larger Timber Ridge Forest Preserve site. The Farm is about 200 acres and includes restored and recreated buildings as part of the farmstead. KCF opened in 1989.

KCF is interpreted as an 1890s farmstead, and programming is structured to support that vision. The Timber Ridge visitor center presents seasonal exhibits about 1890s farming and agricultural practices. The site’s function fits with broader DCFPD objectives for their properties. For KCF, the surrounding area has transformed from farms and cultivation to subdivisions. KCF represents the history of the people who lived in the area and how they farmed. Draft horses, beef cattle, chickens, and sheep are located at the site. The draft horses do much of the larger farm plantings and harvesting. The site also illustrates how and where food originates. Beekeeping and the role of bees are part of how KCF educates about food issues.
KCF’s audience attraction efforts are geared to reach families with younger children, ages 3-11. KCF is generally open five days per week. Mornings typically attract mothers with the youngest children, and activities then include story times and collecting eggs from KCF’s chickens. Older children visit in the afternoon and participate in farm chores or craft-related sessions. KCF’s fastest growing audience is recent immigrants to the area, primarily Eastern European immigrants but including immigrants from all parts of the world. Attendance from West Chicago’s large Latino population is less than expected, and additional outreach is planned to that community. Other major programs and activities include:

- A Day at the Farm. Structured as a school field trip, students learn about and experience farm life during the 1890s.
- Harvest Festivals. KCF holds two (2) annually, but with multiple activities around the corn harvest in the fall and the second in the spring for lambing and sheep shearing.
- Holiday Festivals. Special celebrations, emphasizing family activities, are organized for the winter holidays and for the 4th of July.
- Summer Camp. For 7-12 year olds, this camp allows children to serve as farmhands for a day and learn about farming practices and how farm families lived.
- Private hayrides. These group events (for 15+) are scheduled through DCFPD and tour the KCF and the surrounding Timber Ridge preserve.
- Scouts and Youth Groups. Tailored events and education sessions (active and self-guided) are conducted regularly.
- Farmhouse Tours. These sessions focus on specific topics, such as canning or crafts, versus tours.

KCF’s key partners are:

- College of DuPage (COD). Considered one of their strongest partnerships, KCF staff currently works with 2 COD professors—a biology professor on food-related issues and program development, and an agriculture professor on beekeeping, including joint lectures with KCF staff.
- Local grade schools. KCF provides some in-school programs, in addition to on-site programs for school groups. Current partnership work focuses on science coursework. The recent interest among middle school students is about industrial revolution themes specific to their history curriculum. All of the student programs at KCF are structured to meet school district curricula requirements.
- Local food pantry. Surplus produce grown at the KCF is donated to the local food pantry. Volunteer help, solicited via social media, harvests the produce.
- Similar entities. Through KCF’s involvement in the Midwest Open Air Museums Coordinating Council (MOMCC)\(^4\), the site routinely works with other area open-air museums, including Volkening Heritage Farm (Schaumburg), Primrose Farm (St. Charles) and groups, such the DeKalb Area Agricultural Heritage Association, Inc. This networking serves as a source of ideas for education and activities and identifying operating solutions.

Admission is free, and activity fees are minimal. Current fees include $5 student registration fees. Class fees are $50-$100. KCF had a separate Friends group during the first ten (10) years of operation. Their fund raising efforts are now the responsibility of the DCFPD Friends.

KCF staff indicates that their major challenge is demographics. An aging population combined with smaller households and household numbers requires a focus on both their school programming and on

\(^4\) MOMCC is the Midwest affiliate for the Association for Living History, Farm, and Agricultural Museums, a nationwide organization.
a larger public audience. Visitor interests have also changed. KCF’s farmhouse tour is no longer popular and is conducted less frequently. Volunteers (numbering about 100) are now younger with more frequent turnover, though are generally more engaged based upon their visitor experience.

**Preliminary Competitive Sites Assessment**

According to Visit McHenry County (VMC), area outdoor, agricultural, and conservation sites are important visitor attractions. The agricultural tourism season in the County begins in May, with autumn as the primary season. VMC staff indicates that the winter visitor numbers are beginning to increase. Overall, the economic impact of tourism in the County, according to the Illinois Office of Tourism, is about $300 million in visitor spending.

McHenry’s primary tourism sites are located outside of the City limits. They include Stade’s Farm and Market, the McHenry County Conservation District’s Glacial Park, and Moraine Hills State Park. Other County agricultural sites open to area residents and visitors have specific missions or purposes—educational, experiential, or as private sector businesses.

For the Farm’s future, marketing to area visitors for specific events may serve as one component of overall Farm marketing. VMC is unfamiliar with the Farm and what is offered there. Identifying additional programming will be key to having a ‘product’ available for marketing to a larger audience. Increased site capacity to accommodate larger visitor numbers, whether residents or tourists, will be required to ensure a positive experience.

**Preliminary Opportunities**

The objective at any historic place is to make memories and cultivate a singular experience. For the Farm, this means creating a compelling and appealing farm site. To start, these five (5) initial opportunities represent a ‘back to basics’ start to guaranteeing the Farm’s future by solidifying Farm relationships and focusing on actions that will raise the Farm’s local profile.

1. The Farm’s key stakeholders—the City of McHenry, the Foundation, and the City’s Landmarks Commission—should reconfirm their roles and responsibilities for the Farm’s future. Each entity believes that the Farm is important, but clarity about those roles and responsibilities is needed. Based upon the background review for this project, the documented roles for each entity are:
   a. City’s Parks and Recreation Department: To provide varied recreation programs, well-maintained facilities, and open space designed to effectively provide quality leisure time for all community residents.
   b. Foundation: To preserve and develop an educational facility promoting the City’s agricultural heritage at Petersen Farm, and as a 501(c)(3) public charity, raise funds to support Petersen Farm.
c. City’s Landmarks Commission: To encourage preservation of the City’s historic structures and sites important to McHenry’s heritage and to encourage preservation through ongoing Commission activities. Out of this reconfirmation, each group should understand the limitations and expectations of the others.

2. The City and/or the Foundation should join the Midwest Open Air Museum Coordinating Council and the Farm-Based Education Network to become part of the national network of related sites.

3. The City’s Parks and Recreation Department should contact Loyola University’s graduate level Public History program or University of Illinois-Chicago’s graduate level Planning programs to identify students that may be interested in preparing the Farm’s Master Plan as a Master’s thesis.

4. City and Foundation representatives should meet with their partners at MCC and McHenry County Farm Bureau and 4-H to identity two (2) simple actions requiring minimal expense to expand their existing programs at the Farm. These actions could be structured as pilot programs, if necessary. This same discussion should also encompass potential funding options and volunteer interest.

5. The Foundation should initiate a specific fundraising initiative to rehabilitate one outbuilding at the Farm. For example, many stakeholders cited the barn as a possible special event venue, or another building may represent an easier first project. By accessing known, area fund raising experts or with assistance from the McHenry County Foundation, the Foundation can increase its fundraising confidence and skills. The Foundation, also with City assistance, should consider developing a sponsorship program.

Additional opportunities and recommendations will be included in the final project documentation. After incorporating the results of the remaining project tasks, this initial list of opportunities may be refined or expanded. As appropriate, market and financial reasoning will be added to these opportunities to assist the City as it identifies priorities.