



Board of Park Commissioners
Regular Meeting
Minutes

Tuesday, August 22, 2017
4:00 – 5:30 p.m.

Council Chambers
401 N. Morton

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Les Coyne at 4:00 p.m.

Board Present: Mr. Les Coyne, Mr. Joe Hoffmann, Ms. Kathleen Mills

Staff Present: Paula McDevitt, Dave Williams, John Turnbull, Becky Higgins, Julie Ramey, Kim Clapp, Leslie Brinson, Steve Cotter, Erik Pearson, Joanna Sparks, Barb Dunbar, Elizabeth Tompkins and Crystal Ritter

A. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A-1. Approval of Minutes of July 25, 2017 Meeting
- A-2. Approval of Claims Submitted July 25, 2017 through August 18, 2017
- A-3. Approval of Non-Reverting Budget Amendments
- A-4. Review of Business Report
- A-5. Approval of Surplus

Mr. Joe Hoffman made a motion to approve the Consent Calendar. Ms. Kathleen Mills seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried.

B. PUBLIC HEARINGS/APPEARANCES

B-1. Public Comment Period – None

B-2. Bravo Award – None

B-3. Parks Partner Award – None

B-4. Staff Introduction-None

C. OTHER BUSINESS

C-1. Review/Approval of Wildlife Services Management Contract for Reduction of Deer at Griffy Lake

Mr. Steve Cotter, Natural Resources Manager, studies indicate the deer population has stripped vegetation in Griffy Lake understory, destroying plant and animal diversity in the heavily browsed areas. The Department wishes to protect native vegetation within Griffy Lake Nature Preserve by reducing the size of the deer herd. The 2014 attempt, was unsuccessful due to the abundance of acorns that winter. BPRD requires the services of a professional consultant in order to perform the removal of up to one hundred (100) deer, in a manner that is approved by the State of Indiana Department of Natural Resources Commission, safe to the community, and in a human way. The goal of the sharpshooting effort is to remove enough deer from the nature preserve to reduce the browse pressure on understory plant species and seedlings trees to the point these species are able to recover, and grow once again at Griffy Lake. The re-establishment and median heights of indicator plant species (including violets, trilliums, baneberry, Jack-in-the pulpit, sweet cicely) will be used to determine success of the deer herd reduction effort. The proposed time frame for the sharpshooting activity is from November 15, 2017 through February, 28, 2018. White Buffalo, Inc., is a leading expert in population control of white-tailed deer in urban areas. This firm was selected based on their familiarity with Midwestern forest ecosystems, their research knowledge and complete understanding of the ecology of white-tailed deer, and their flawless safety record.

The Board inquired; how was the number of deer to remove determined?

Mr. Cotter stated, this number was decided back in 2014, based on discussions with state experts. By reducing the number of deer by 100, they believe this should reduce the browse pressure enough to allow the plant population to recover.

The Board inquired; why was sharpshooting selected instead of a public open hunt as the State Parks do?

Mr. Cotter stated, it was basically to increase safety for the community. Staff believe the sharpshooting professionals would do it more safely, and more humanely than a public hunt.

The Board requested clarification on the following issues raised by the public through e-mails and other communications.

- There has been an argument that there's no crisis at Griffy Lake Preserve, but instead that this is all really about problems on the adjacent I.U. property which has some different characteristics.

Mr. Cotter responded, the Master Plan and the Deer Task Force have both mentioned that there is indeed a problem at the Griffy Nature Preserve. The vegetation studies that we conducted this spring seem to indicate that the plants at Griffy Lake are in worse shape than they are at Morgan Monroe State Forest and Brown County State Park. PBRD has no control over what happens on the Indiana University property but our charge is to protect the biodiversity at Griffy Lake Nature Preserve. That is why we're bringing this issue forward.

- The point has been raised, why not go out and counted the deer first?

Mr. Cotter responded, we would love to know how many deer are out on the nature preserve, but it is not considered to be as important as the effects on the vegetation. Experts in this field that we've spoken with say that counts are not necessary. It's possible that a large number of deer are just visiting the site briefly and doing the damage or it may be a smaller number of deer that are spending more time on the site doing the damage. So the number of deer is not as important as the effects on the vegetation.

- In previous reports, the study that was conducted showed there's clearly a possibility that reducing the number of deer at Griffy would produce a corresponding increase in certain invasive plants. What is the plan or response be if that occur?

Mr. Cotter responded, deer have both a positive and a negative effect on invasive plants. They have been shown to interact with some invasive in helping those invasive plants spread, both through the movement of seeds in their feces, and also in their hooves and on their fur. Probably more importantly the deer prefer certain native plants that would actually compete with the less palatable invasive. In those cases the deer are actually facilitating the spread of invasive plants. I think what the questioner refers to is in the disclosure studies it was shown that the established Asian Bush Honeysuckle did grow at a more rapid pace when it was not exposed to deer pressure. Currently we have our Adopt an Acre program at Griffy Lake, where volunteers are maintaining approximately about 15 to 16 acres. We are looking to expand this program, where basically invasive plants are removed from the plots to encourage the native species to grow. We are going to need to spend more time and money controlling invasive plants at Griffy Lake whether we do a deer cull or not. Invasive plants are spreading at all of our properties, and we're not keeping up as well as we need to protect the biodiversity.

- Is it accurate to describe, the proposal is basically adopting a more active management style at Griffy Lake, as opposed to simply letting things happen in whatever way that they are going to happen. It's not just about the deer but about the invasive plants as well. There's going to be potentially additional things we're going to have to do if we want to try to restore the park.

Mr. Cotter responded, absolutely. Without more active management measures, we are going to be losing biodiversity out there that could be protected with appropriate management

- What happens next, if we go through this cull and for whatever reason it is not successful? What is the next plan?

Mr. Cotter responded, one of the things that we're looking into is that the program through DNR that would potentially allow either contractors or citizens to do archery hunts on urban properties. So we are exploring that possibility. We may need to try and schedule another sharpshooting effort as well, we'll have to wait and see.

- Are the deer too smart for the sharpshooters?

Mr. Cotter responded, we don't think that was the case. This firm has been doing this for many years and they have a lot of successful efforts behind them. We think that they understand the lay of the land and deer behavior very well. They said that the reason the deer didn't come to the bait reliably, was that there were too many acorns for the deer to eat. Deer love acorns, and deer did come to the big bait piles, but not in a predictable fashion which made it unfeasible for White Buffalo to conduct the sharp shoot.

The Board inquired, what was the original size of the preserve we made a committed with the State to protect, and what is the purpose of the preserve?

Mr. Cotter responded, Griffy Lake Preserve started out at 240 acres, and is 250 acres today. Ten (10) acres were added and they have been included to the conservation easement with the Indiana Department of Natural Resources Division of Nature Preserves. The purpose is to preserve biodiversity and to get the park back to a natural state as much as possible. The State is specifically interested in the endangered, threatened and rare plants that occur on the site.

The Board opened the floor to the public for comments and questions.

Michael Enyeart approached the podium. You received an email from me on August 10th that critique the Griffy Nature Preserve deer fiasco, which is enclosed with this document, along with my comments to the County Council two years ago.

I know from research and primary documents related to GNP, that some members of this board have diligently served our community for many years. I respectfully suggest to you today, that no past or future board decision that you will make, will have a greater impact on the ecology, than the decision you make concerning the Environmental Resources Advisory Council (ERAC) recommendation before you today.

It seems obvious that my August 10th letter contradicts the July 14th letter from ERAC. As you would weigh these irreconcilable letters, please remember an old trial lawyers' adage quote: "*When the facts are on your side, pound the facts. When the law is on your side, pound the law. When neither is on your side, pound the table*" end quote. ERAC in chorus with the Indiana University Research and Teaching Preserve (IURTP) is pounding the table, while I have both the facts and policy on my side.

What are the facts? The previous deer cull failed. I publicly predicted that several months in advance based on my observation of unusually low deer census and GNP over the past 30 years I have over nine thousand hours of experience hiking and observing which Griffy Nature Woods.

In this room, about two years ago IDNR Wildlife Manager stated that the negative effect of deer overpopulation becomes problematic when deer census reaches 50 to 70 deer per square mile. The Deer Task Force reported that quote "The work of scientists at the I.U. Research and Teaching Preserve indicates that the deer population at the Griffy Woods is far higher in comparable forests in the region as much as 13 times higher". End quote. When you do that math 13 times 50 deer per square mile times 1.7 square miles we find that the Deer Task Force and IURTP are suggesting that there are over 900 deer at Griffy Nature Preserve. Is that credible?

I reported to you based on an observation during ideal conditions that there were actually 28 deer in GNP that year that census is far below normal.

The Deer Task Force wrote quote "Excessive deer browsing poses the possibility of producing an alternate stable state - a condition in which that force would never return to its natural state, even if browsing pressure were diminished by a permanent reduction of deer densities". End quote. Is that hyperbole credible? In contrast we know that Griffy Woods was destroyed by clearcutting before 1900. And what we see today is the woods slowly recovering in sucessionary phases.

So what's the status quo of Griffy Nature Preserve management and philosophy? In the *Baseline Environmental Survey: Griffy Reservoir, 1982* SPEA's John Thiele reported, that Griffy Nature Preserve operates under the practice of passive management. Thiele wrote quote "As a rule, the less done to the Griffy property the better" end quote. Theo also wrote quote, "Most of the area was timbered and completely treeless at the turn of the century that would have been 1900. This regrowth is a sterling example of what total neglect can do for the return of a natural environment."

Frankly I don't care if you shoot the deer or not. Deer are shot there all the time. But, I warn you again that this deer cull will fail as well, because the low deer densities. And I wonder what nutty excuse will be offered to cover up this second public humiliation.

Perhaps instead of using the "shoot first, provide excuses later" technique, you might count the deer by aerial surveys. Several firms offer this service. Two years ago you were permitted to shoot a 100 deer. That was more than three times the deer that you had in Griffy Nature Preserve. I'll hold my joke's on that for another time and place.

And now let me be very serious. It is far more important to me, and I think to the community, that the request before you to change the policy of Griffy Woods from passive management to active management, is proceeding without any debate or discussion of this huge decision. To me, changing the management philosophy of the woods to active management seems to be a betrayal of trust and precedence.

If you abandon passive management, there will be no end to escalating active management demands on an ad-hoc basis, and no end to community outrage, such as the next deer cull failure.

These woods have been well managed by nature for over a century. As a case in point: I observed that when the deer population was much larger, say in 2010, drought and disease, together with human and coyote predation, collapsed the deer population to a new normal.

Thank you.

Ms. Sandra Shapshay approached the podium. I'm a professor of philosophy at Indiana University and also the director of the political and civic engagement program. And so I will try to be a good role model and be politically and civically engaged.

So why am I here to make public comment? Well I sent you all an e-mail before, and I thank you very much for reading it carefully. Obviously you've asked questions of Steve Cotter that reflected the e-mails that were sent to you, and I appreciate that you took those into serious consideration.

I believe good public policy is a judicious combination of scientific evidence pragmatism and values. And I know that Steve Cotter and the Environmental Resources Advisory Council (ERAC) is urging you to reauthorize a deer kill for this year in Griffy. I urge you to weigh the evidence presented very carefully, and also to consider that the fact that the failed Griffy deer kill constitutes a data point. They argue that, the White Buffalo Company was unable to kill any significant number of deer because of a high acorn yield that year. It's also possible that maybe there aren't very many deer in Griffy Woods. As Michael has just urged you to take into consideration. It's also funny that Professor Hoffman said that perhaps the deer were too smart and they evaded the White Buffalo Company. You know you can give a lot of alternative explanations for the failed Griffy deer kill, but one possible explanation is maybe there just aren't very many deer in Griffy Woods.

The Shelton Study that was the basis for the first Griffy deer kill plan, took it as an assumption that there is an overabundance of deer in Griffy. But that was never a proven fact, it was an assumption of the study. And there was no accurate count done and still hasn't been. There has still been no accurate count done of the deer in Griffy. Mr. Cotter just said that there is no need. It's not necessary to count the deer. We can go simply by effects on plants. However, if public policy of deer management is to be really evidence based, it seems at minimum, we should have a count of the number of deer in Griffy. It doesn't cost very much, \$5000. It's one of the services that White Buffalo provides, and it seems to me that we're in, and sorry to get little philosophical here, but we're in a state of epistemic uncertainty. We have a data point that the last deer Griffy kill attempt failed. We don't know how many deer there are in Griffy. Why not take the time to get more evidence, so that we're actually in a good epistemic position, to have evidence based deer management policy for Griffy? It's not as though other communities don't use aerial deer counts to figure out what the number of deer is in a particular area.

And also I just want to point out in my letter, I cited a study by Cook Patton from 2014 that says that low to moderate deer densities are actually good for forest biodiversity. And so, what is the current deer density in Griffy now? Frankly we don't know. Is it in the low to moderate good zone? Is it high? It's not clear. So instead of re-authorizing a Griffy deer kill for this coming winter. Why don't we take the time to get an aerial count, which could be done this winter? Then we know, okay how many deer are actually living in the Griffy Woods area. Then decide on an evidence based way what's the target number of deer. What's the good number of deer that actually aids forest biodiversity? Then let's try to achieve that, perhaps we're there already, and then there's no need for a deer kill. Perhaps we're out of that range, and a deer kill should be authorized. But right now, I just want to urge you to basically think for yourself.

One last point. You've had experts tell you all sorts of things, but you are the board that is supposed to make this decision, and I urge you to think for yourselves. Weigh the evidence carefully, and make an evidence based public policy decision that balances all the factors that you have before you.

Thank you very much.

Ms. Larime Wilson approached the podium. I've been a resident of Griffy Woods at 2305 North Hadley for 19 years, and I am here because I am concerned about the management of Bloomington Griffy Lake Nature Preserve, its overall well-being, the health of all of its flora and fauna, and in particular the invasive plant proliferation that has proven so far to be beyond the ability of Bloomington Parks and Recreation to eradicate.

Specifically, I oppose this proposal to kill up to 100 deer because any significant reduction in the deer population will exacerbate the invasive plant problem.

In the published Shelton study of 2014, she said that where deer were excluded from browsing, invasive plants grew at a rate 30 times greater than control plots, where the deer were free to browse, and she said in her words, that her enclosure plots “became dominated by invasive shrubs” within seven years. In 2014, I saw the oldest of these plots on tour that was given by Mr. Cotter, and it's literally as she describes it, they are dominated by invasive shrubs.

Additionally, in 2014 when the first proposal was being considered, the public was told that the Parks Department would embark on a vegetative plant study that would be used to show whether the deer in its current number, with a baseline or is reduced number after a deer kill, were having an effect on the vegetation. Even after the first deer kill was called off, Mr. Cotter came and presented a report to this board in the spring of 2015, discussing this continuing study that went on for herbaceous plants in the summer and fall of 2014, 2015, and 2016, and for woody plants in the late summer and fall of those years. He said at the time, that study would indicate whether there was a need to have any continued kind of deer control at Griffy.

Now, after these three or possibly four, not sure whether 2017 data jives up with the old protocol or not. Angie Shelton said at the information panel, that you can't really tell much difference. Further that there's no way to tell any difference in these plant species, based on these years of study that were supposed to show us whether there was a need to reduce the population of deer.

I sent you a letter by email earlier today so I'm going to skip over some of this. But basically this protocol has been replaced with the new one that compares it to two other sites. Even in this new protocol it showed in one date, that the 2017 Griffy species were more numerous in Griffy Lake than they were at these other sites, unless you further reduce that to counting only flowering species and only the height of the species.

Just to sum up, I hope you will review the email that I sent, that also has documentation. We cannot say that Griffy Woods is not hunted the way that Morgan Monroe State Park and Brown County Parks are hunted. Griffy Woods is hunted from its north side of the park, and is east side of the park, by hunters who live in Monroe County and these woods are in Monroe County. There is also evidence of it being hunted from within. I sent you a picture of the poacher stands that we find right in the middle of the park. We also have coyote that have been shown by the Ball State Study to be a significant predator. So I urge you as others have said, the relative cost is small is less than these vegetation studies. Get a thermal imaging study we can know exactly where the deer are, where they come into the park, where they migrate to, and where they exit from.

Thank you.

Mark Haggerty approached the podium. I had to get off work just to come over here. I hate it. I warned the City Council for several years that there were no deer. I went to the Deer Task Force meetings. I try to get those people to go out to Griffy and look for deer, or deer signs. Those of us, who use Griffy every day, for a number of years, every day to be out there, know that there's no deer at Griffy. Virtually no deer in Griffy, not that there aren't some families that come through. There's no deer poop in Griffy, there's no deer tracks in Griffy.

The Parks Department under this last kill plan, set up mobile cameras at these bait sites, where they paid for eight hundred dollars worth of corn. And instead of taking these pictures and taking them as evidence, they proceeded to erase all the footage that showed, no, there's no deer there. There might be a family that comes through every few days. But not even for corn, not even in the middle of winter, are there deer in Griffy. And it's only two hundred and fifty acres. Anybody can go out there when the leaves are down, and when the snow is falling and see for miles. You can take a drone, you can picture the whole thing, take pictures of the shadows. It's easy to count, that there are no deer. But in eight years of study we have no pictures of any deer at Griffy. And the studies that were done, weren't even done at Griffy. Those studies aren't done at Griffy. They are done on the I.U. property next to the golf course, where they have some deer. This is really about the deer on the I.U. golf course. This is not about deer in Griffy. Griffy Woods is a hostile place for deer. It's too vertical. It's hunted by coyotes. The people out there can tell you that there's coyotes hunting deer all the time.

This is, the worst kind of science that this government has used, to prove something that doesn't even exist. These ghost deer at Griffy, that for 10 years now, we don't have a picture of, we don't have tracks of. Yes, I've seen all those deer enclosures. I went with Cotter up through the whole thing, and I traipsed through Griffy, on the streams, and on the paths, and the trails, and I talked to people that come. Have you seen any deer? No, no deer. People that live out there for 30 years, the Puderey's hike out there with their kids, all the time for years. No, no deer. Only I.U. can find deer at Griffy, and only by the worst possible science. Now I'm a science nerd, and I look to analyze things when I see them, and I look for evidence in my life. I know something about science. I continue to study.

This whole thing has been about us being forced to stop talking, not to have a coherent group together to speak to any board, to

always be relegated to public comment, never being able to present our case. I'm tired of dealing with this problem that has already been a massive failure.

But listen, this whole process has been unfair and against the public since the beginning. And this is a continuation. I'm sorry that the City Council shoved this on to you guys. But nonetheless, do it again, and fail again. Try. Why didn't we know about acorns? How are the acorns this year?

Thank you.

Mr. David Slaybaum approached the podium. Three years ago, I approached the Parks and Rec Department and also the City Council about having a venison harvest on city properties, in particular Griffy Lake. By having a harvest and using archers, there's no guns, there's no noise. It's a very effective way to harvest the venison. In the past we've been able to do this in other areas, and for every hundred deer that are harvested, the food banks receive approximately eight thousand pounds of venison to have for a protein source.

I think that if we could sit down and look outside the box, and look at the programs that are there available already. Through the Harvest Hunters and all of these programs, where the people are already volunteered to do this. We could do it, and do it in the areas where we know the deer are at, and then we could get an accurate count of the deer, and of the health of the deer. And at the same time use the venison for its purpose, God-given purpose, of feeding people.

Thank you for your time, and I really think that if you would do the archery part of it you wouldn't have the problems with people here and the guns as well.

Thank you.

The Board inquired, can the deer easily travel from one owner domain to another at Griffy, and is there something eating the understory at Griffy?

Mr. Cotter responded, deer do have a limited range, but they certainly cross the boundaries between the I.U. property and the City property. Yes, something is eating the understory at Griffy.

Mr. Hoffman made the following comments, the question is whether we're going to move from a passive management approach to an active management approach at the Griffy Lake Nature Preserve, and that's a hard call. It will always be a hard call, clearly passive management is the preferred method. I doubt anyone would disagree with that. If we thought that passive management was working well for the ecosystem, understanding of course that the ecosystem has already and irrevocably been altered by humans, it would be preferable to go with the passive management. But there are times when the choice seems to be appropriate and reasonable to go in a more active direction.

A good example is the lake itself, due to human interventions, the lake itself was dying because of infestation of various kinds of invasive water plants. And as a result, we made the decision to be more active in the management of the lake. Drained the lake and killed all the fish, so that we could get rid of those plants that were killing the lake ecosystem and start over again. I think that was the right decision, but it was a hard decision, because it involved going from a passive to a more active management.

I'm sure the people who made the decisions about Brown County State Park, went through similar deliberations in deciding to authorize the annual deer hunts at Brown County. Again, I'm sure everybody would have like Brown County State Park to manage itself in a passive sense, but humans affect deer habitat, deer move because of human development.

In 1980's, when the comments were made that were quoted about the wisdom of passive management style at Griffy, that was probably correct at that time. Bloomington has continued to grow and has continued to take away deer habitat. Now the situation is different. Now we have to think about what to do with the deer at Griffy. Our very knowledgeable, very educated, very smart staff along with our Advisory Board, which we chose to give us precisely this kind of advice, tell us that the deer are in fact, or at least a significant cause of the crisis of the overall ecosystem at Griffy. Griffy isn't there just for the deer, it's there as a total ecosystem.

At the same time we're told by a number of other very smart, knowledgeable, educated people there are not that many deer at Griffy, or maybe virtually none at all. And that if we did a count, we would know that, and be able to prove that. If those people are correct, if there are no deer to find, then basically no deer are going to be killed at Griffy, if another deer cull is authorized. We will spend this money and we'll look foolish, but nothing else will change at Griffy. Then we'll be trying to figure out what's the next move, at that point we'll have to try something else. But even if we did somehow manage to count the deer, I'm not sure how that would solve the quandary that we face, because then we would just end up arguing about how many deer are too many deer. Is it 28, is it 50, is it 100, what's the magic number of deer at Griffy.

At least, the approach that our staff and Advisory Panel have presented to us, is an approach that allows us if in fact there are deer, if in fact deer do get culled. Then the approach that we've been presented is one that will allow us to actually measure what we care about, which is the health of the plants and the overall ecosystem at Griffy.

This is a hard issue, it was hard in 2014 and it's hard again today. Two big differences between now and 2014. One, is we tried in 2014 and the deer cull failed. That is a piece of evidence, and it points one way. The second, we now know much more than we did in 2014, that for whatever reason many plant species at Griffy are not doing well. That's the new evidence that's presented by the reports that we've received this time around. So as I weigh all of that information, I end up coming down to the judgment that it is time again, to try a more active management style at Griffy. The one that our staff and our Advisory Board have advocated. If I'm making the wrong judgment, then we will know soon enough, because once again we will waste the money and no deer will die. But if in fact there are deer at Griffy, then this approach will give us a chance to restore the health of the overall ecosystem.

Ms. Mills commented, I agree with Mr. Hoffman. It's definitely a difficult position and one in which there's feelings sometimes of prioritizing the deer over the rest of the ecosystem and the habitat that is there, and I don't feel like that's the right decision to make.

Mr. Coyne commented, I agree with my colleges. We took on the responsibility for Griffy Lake many years ago, and part of that responsibility was to preserve it.

Ms. Sandra Shapshay approached the podium. I was pretty sure that it was a fait accompli when I came in here, that you would all authorize that deer kill. But I do want to point out though that there is a certain arbitrariness to the contract, the up to 100 deer at Griffy that you noted. I think there's also a certain kind of question about if this one fails as well, then we've wasted three thousand five hundred dollars, maybe we looked foolish, but we'll gain more information. But the question is, how will we gain more information? If the same thing happens we're in the same epistemic situation. Why not pause and get a count and find out? If the kill fails, but there's still evidence that there's some plant problems. If actually if you got a count, then you could understand whether there is causation or mere correlation or what. Because right now, we just don't have a lot of evidence about the deer. I haven't heard a good argument against doing a count.

Mr. Hoffman made a motion to approve the Wildlife Services Management Contract for the Reduction of Deer at Griffy Lake. Ms. Mills seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried.

C-2 Review/Approval of Indiana University Health Bloomington Hospital Stream Mitigation Proposal for Ferguson Dog Park

Mr. Steve Cotter, Natural Resources Manager, to fulfill the stream mitigation requirements made necessary by impacts to the streams on the proposed IU Health Bloomington Hospital Regional Academic Health Center Site, IU Health proposes to enhance the existing swale located on the southern perimeter of the Ferguson Dog Park. This project would create and enhance 1.5 acres of riparian corridor north of the swale, and .75 acres of forested riparian corridor south of the swale. Over 400 trees and 150 shrubs would be planted. IU Health will be responsible for the successful establishment and operation of the mitigation site. Staff recommends the approval of this proposal. If the proposal is approved today, an agreement will be presented to the Board at the September meeting.

Mr. Hoffman made a motion to approve the Indiana University Health Bloomington Hospital Stream Mitigation Proposal for Ferguson Dog Park. Ms. Mills seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried.

C-3. Review/Approval of Resolution 17-05 for Refunding of 2009 Parks Bond

Ms. Paula McDevitt, Administrator staff would like to recommend the approval of Resolution 17-05 for the refunding of the 2009 Parks Bonds. These bonds were used to purchase the Twin Lakes Recreation Center, formerly the Sportsplex located at 7300 West Bloomfield Road. The Department has the opportunity to refinance these bonds through a process called refunding. When a bond is refunded the entity that issued the bonds (in this case the Park Commissioners) issues new bonds, and uses those proceeds from the new bonds (which will have a lower interest rate) to pay off the old bonds. Total expected gross savings would be three hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$350,000).

Mr. Les Coyne, Chair opened the public hearing for Resolution 17-05 for the Refunding of the Park Bonds from 2009. Are there any comments or questions from either my colleagues on the board or those in the audience? Hearing none, the hearing for Resolution 17-05 has been officially closed

Mr. Hoffman made a motion to approve Resolution 17-05 for the Refunding of the 2009 Park Bonds. Ms. Mills seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried.

C-4. Seeking Board Ratification of Solar Installations of 13 Parks Facilities

This item was removed for the agenda.

C-5. Review/Approval of Mid-Service Contract with Steve's Roofing & Sheet Metal

Ms. Barb Dunbar, Operations Office Coordinator, due to age and wear, BPRD wishes to replace the existing roof at the Park Ridge East Shelter House. The Department requires the services of a professional consultant in order to perform the roof replacement services of removing of the existing, installing treated plywood decking and underlayment, and replacing the asphalt shingles with 26 gauge metal roof over entire roof area. A metal roof was selected, as they are nearly maintenance free, withstand higher winds and less likely to collapse due to heavy water and snow loads, resulting in significant cost savings. Work will not begin until after August 23, 2017 and be completed by October 27, 2017.

Mr. Hoffman made a motion to approve the mid-service contract with Steve's Roofing & Sheet Metal for the Park Ridge East Shelter House. Ms. Mills seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried.

C-6 Review/Approval of Summer Star Memorandum of Agreement – Griffy Lake Nature Day

Ms. Elizabeth Tompkins, the purpose of this Agreement is to provide school year, outdoor environmental education programming to fourth graders in the Monroe County Public School (the "Nature Day Project"). The grant covers the cost of supply purchases for activities, bus transportation for students and a portion of Bloomington Parks and Recreation staff costs.

Mr. Hoffman made a motion to approve the Summer Star Memorandum Agreement – Griffy Lake Nature Day. Ms. Mills seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried.

C-7 Review/Approval of Contract with Eco Logic, LLC.

Ms. Joanna Sparks, City Landscaper, BPRD wishes to remove invasive plant species throughout the City of Bloomington. The Department requires the services of a professional consultant in order to perform the eradication of invasive plant species using species-specific herbicides in multiple locations. All applications will be made in accordance with the City of Bloomington Parks and Recreation Integrated Pest Management Plan, approved in December 2016. All work will be completed by December 31, 2017. The removal of these invasive species will open space to create critical pollinator habitat with native plant species.

Mr. Hoffman made a motion to approve the Contract with Eco Logic, LLC to Remove Invasive Plant Species. Ms. Mills seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried.

C-8 Review/Approval of Small Service Agreement with Ronnie G. Pursell

Ms. Joanna Sparks, City Landscaper, in order to preserve monuments, due to age and the settling of the earth, BPRD wishes to repair monuments in the oldest section of Rose Hill and White Oak Cemeteries. The Department is in need of a professional contractor to provide the monument repairs.

Mr. Hoffman made a motion to approve Small Service Agreement with Ronnie G. Pursell to Repair of Monuments in the Cemeteries. Ms. Mills seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried.

C-9 Review/Approval of Consultant Contract Interpretive Ideas

This item was removed from the agenda.

C-10 Review/Approval of Consultant Contract Agreement Rundell Ernstberger Associates

Mr. Dave Williams, Director of Operations, BPRD wishes to acquire a conceptual design to identify and determine potential design improvement to People's Parks. The Department requires the services of a professional consultant in order to perform these design services, project initiation, preliminary concepts, conceptual plan development, conceptual plan review and final deliverables and approval.

Mr. Hoffman made a motion to approve Consultant Contract Agreement with Rundell Ernstberger Associates for Design Services at People's Park. Ms. Mills seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried.

C-11 Review/Approval of Changes in Price Schedule for the Holiday market Arts Fair Booth Spaces

This item was removed from the agenda.

C-12 Review/Approval of Agreement with Fox Construction Company, Inc.

Mr. John Turnbull, Sports Division Director, staff recommends the approval of the contract with Fox Construction Company for much needed renovations of the restrooms at Frank Southern Center and the rehabilitation of the locker rooms at Twin Lakes Recreation Center. Four construction companies submitted bids, with Fox Construction being the lowest at \$26,800 for Frank Southern Ice Arena and \$152,000 for Twin Lakes Recreation Center. These projects are funded by the Parks Bond.

Mr. Hoffman made a motion to approve Agreement with Fox Construction, Company, Inc. for Restroom/Locker Renovations at Frank Southern Ice Arena and Twin Lakes Recreation Center. Ms. Mills seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried.

C-13 Review/Approval of Addendum to Agreement between Bloomington Parks and Recreation and Chef for Hire for Banneker Food Service Program

Mr. Erik Pearson, Program/Facility Coordinator-Banneker Community Center, due to the substantial increase in attendance numbers at the 2017 Banneker Camp summer program, more meals were ordered and served, which resulted in Banneker going past the \$14, 000 previously agreed upon, with Chef for Hire. This addendum wishes to change that \$14,000 to not to exceed \$20,000 in order to accommodate for the added meal cost due to increased attendance during the 2017 program.

Mr. Hoffman made a motion to approve Addendum to Agreement between Bloomington Parks and Restoration and Chef for Hire for the Banneker Food Service Program. Ms. Mills seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried.

C-14 Review/Approval of Mid-Service Contract with Umphress Masonry, Inc.

Ms. Barb Dunbar, Operations Office Coordinator, ongoing repairs are crucial for the preservation and future existence of Rosehill Cemetery wall that was built in 1936. BPRD wishes to make repairs to the South wall of the Rose Hill Cemetery in order to maintain the integrity of the wall. The Department requires the service of a professional consultant to perform tuck-point work and repairs. Work will begin after August 23, 2017 and be completed by September 30, 2017.

Mr. Hoffman made a motion to approve the mid-service contract with Umphress Masonry, Inc. for repairs to the South wall at Rose Hill Cemetery. Ms. Mills seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried.

C-15 Addendum to Agreement with Baker Stone Work from May 2017

Mr. John Turnbull, Sports Division Director, a service contract with Baker Stone Work was approved earlier in 2017 for a total of \$20,400. During repairs, it was discovered an additional emergency exit door, located on court 5, also needed to be replaced. This Addendum, for \$1,600 covers the removal of the old door, the installation of the new door, and will include new crash bar and latch. This project is funded by the Park Bond.

Mr. Hoffman made a motion to approve Addendum to Agreement with Baker Stone Work from May 2017. Ms. Mills seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried.

C-16 Agreement with Kentucky Fairways Zoysia Sod Farm

Mr. John Turnbull, Sports Division Director, due to less required maintenance and care, BPRD wishes to install Meyer Zoysia Grass on 8 holes of the Ridge fairways at Cascades. The Departments requires the professional services of a contractor to produce, deliver and install 37,000 square yard of Meyer Zoysia Grass. The \$183,150 project is funded by the Park Bond.

Mr. Hoffman made a motion to approve Agreement with Kentucky Fairways Zoysia Sod Farm to install Meyer Zoysia Grass at Cascades. Ms. Mills seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried.

D. Reports

D-1. Operations Division – No Report

D-2. Recreation Division – No Report

D-3. Sports Division – No Report

D-4 Administrative Division – No Report

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 5:29 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Kim Clapp,
Secretary Board of Park Commissioners