

PARK COMMITTEE
DOG PARK SUBCOMMITTEE
TOWN OF HOLLAND
January 16, 2019 7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:	Chair Kathy Warzynski, Michelle Byom (7:04 p.m.), Daryl Ciokiewicz, Dick Jakes, Barb Larsen
OTHERS:	Clerk Marilyn Pedretti; Karen Eckert, Susan Anderson, Michael Anderson, Rod Van Dunk

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Warzynski called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Notices were properly posted.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Warzynski welcomed new member Daryl Ciokiewicz to the subcommittee.

CITIZENS CONCERNS

Karen Eckert, 122 Lake Street, stated her support for a dog park and asked for clarification on the process and the survey.

DEVELOPMENT OF AN OFF-LEASH DOG PARK

- A. Survey results: Warzynski reviewed the survey results: 55 surveys returned out of approximately 1,560 households, for a 4% return rate. She noted that 62% were not in favor and of the 24 dog owners, 13 would never use a dog park. Rod Van Dunk, W6819 Holter Road, asked why the survey did not indicate that money was available from the powerline. Larsen noted that with only 4% return rate, this survey was skewed and should be considered as a market sampling. She also noted that, if taxpayers were made aware that the funding could be taken from another source than taxes, they may have supported it. Jakes stated that the survey went out with the tax bills and those who felt it was important responded and the subcommittee should take into consideration that 62% said no.
- B. Maintenance costs: Larsen reviewed the information she received from City of La Crosse and City of Onalaska concerning their respective dog parks. Eckert stated the maintenance costs for the City of Onalaska are minimal because all they have is sand and the area is too small for much activity. Ciokiewicz reported that through his business he has been made aware of a survey that indicates 95% of the households are pet owners. He asked if we could survey pet owners in the Village of Holmen and Town of Onalaska to help tell the story. Van Dunk reported on a petition circulated through his store in which 150 Village residents signed for their support of a dog park.
- C. Fencing, benches, receptacles and other features: Warzynski reported on her cost research for amenities and noted this did not include doggie play equipment:
 - \$8,700 fence - 4' black, plain galvanized, extra heavy duty with double gates and access gate for maintenance (not including labor)
 - \$268 picnic table (not including labor and paint)
 - \$135 park bench (not including labor and paint)
 - \$100 receptacles (not including labor and paint)
 - \$100-150 signage similar to City of Onalaska
 - \$15,000 to \$20,000 initial costs (with estimated labor costs)

- D. Liability and WTA input: Warzynski reviewed the two memos in the packet: (1) Wisconsin Towns Association (WTA) indicated the Town would not be liable per state statute; and (2) insurance company reported the Town would be covered under the current policy. Jakes expressed concern that because the Town would have “the deepest pockets” we could still be on the hook for legal costs to fight any litigation. Larsen stated the Town has done their due diligence.
- E. Permits and fees: Warzynski noted that most people from the survey responded that a permit or fee should be required. Discussion followed. Larsen suggested a lock box on site would be beneficial with the limited office hours. It was the consensus to set the permit at \$1 a month or \$12 a year.
- F. Other items: Ciokiewicz asked about a concern in the survey about dogs not being allowed in the Holland Sand Prairie. Clerk Pedretti explained the reason for the ban was to protect the birds and the soil. Byom noted a popular dog walking area by the high school but noted it may be discontinued with the upcoming athletic field construction.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Warzynski opened the floor for recommendations to present to the Park Committee at their February 5th meeting. She also noted that the Town Board will be holding a public meeting to discuss the powerline money on February 20th. Eckert suggested another survey. Jakes noted that the residents have spoken and the subcommittee would be negligent if they did not honor the results. Byom stated the results were just a sampling. Larsen suggested that, with the growth in the three municipalities, a dog park would be well suited.

Motion by Jakes that the Dog Park Subcommittee, based on the information that we have on hand, bring forward to the Park Committee not to pursue an unleashed dog park. Motion died for lack of a second.

Motion by Larsen/Ciokiewicz that we do pursue the dog park proposal based on many of the things we have discussed, the action we have taken and research we have done, with an estimation of \$20,000 for installation, and a fee of \$12 a year or \$1 a day and open to the residents and non-Town residents plus on-going maintenance as needed. **MOTION** carried 3 yeas (Byom, Ciokiewicz, Larsen) and 2 nos (Jakes, Warzynski)

FUTURE AGENDA & NEXT MEETING

Warzynski reported that with the recommendation, she did not foresee any need for further Dog Park Subcommittee meetings. She suggested members attend the February 5th Park Committee meeting and/ or the February 20th Town meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Jakes/Larsen to adjourn. **MOTION** carried unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Marilyn Pedretti, Town Clerk