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1. Introduction

The Barker Park site was donated to the Springfield Park District by the Paul Barker Trust in 2005. This 26-acre site is adjacent to Franklin Park Estates neighborhood that was developed during the 1970s and 1980s. The University of Illinois is to the south and its campus was developed during the same era. The District selected park planners Massie Massie & Associates (MMA) to develop a Master Plan to convert this agricultural field site into Barker Park.

Development of the Master Plan involved careful analysis of the existing site conditions, discussions with staff of the Park District and the University of Illinois at Springfield, and meetings with neighborhood residents and special interest groups. The Park District’s 2005 Updated Master Plan and City of Springfield’s plans were also incorporated. MMA developed and presented alternative conceptual plans at various meetings. These were revised and refined as planning progressed to ultimately produce the final plan.

This Master Plan, including the plan drawings and this report, provides guidelines for development of Barker Park. Development will probably be done in phases, as funds become available. This plan, therefore, provides recommendations for the phase scheduling and budget guidelines for use by the District.

2. Site Analysis

The site is quite flat. It slopes down at less than 1% from the southwest corner to the northeast corner with a total fall of 5-6 feet. A shallow grass waterway begins in the low northeast corner. A man-made drainageway runs along the site’s west boundary between Glendale Drive and Hazelcrest Road. This drainageway flows into a storm drain near Hazelcrest that is believed to connect to the storm sewer that flows west.

A few volunteer trees are present along the north edge of the site. Several cottonwood trees are growing near the grass waterway at the northeast corner. Along the west and north sides of the site, lawns of some adjacent residents encroach into the park site.

The site was once indigenous tall grass prairie. The west half of the site has a silty-clay-loam soil classified as Sable type, and eastern half is silty-loam known as Ipava. At the northeast corner a clay Tama soil is found. These soils have good fertility but drain slowly. The seasonal water table is high, within 1-3 feet of the surface, and the potential for shrink and swell is high.
Barker Park
Site Analysis
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Springfield, Illinois
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Comparison with other Parks

With its 26-acre area, Barker Park could be classified as a ‘community park’ in the Park District’s inventory of sites. It is similar in size to Douglas and Kennedy parks, and slightly smaller than Rotary and Stuart parks. See appendix for visual overlay of boundary on existing parks.

In contrast to Barker Park, however, Douglas and Rotary parks are on major streets making them easily accessible and therefore appropriate locations for recreational facilities used by citizens throughout the community.

3. Potential Park Uses

During the park planning process many park elements were considered, based on:

1. Existing site conditions.
2. Discussions with Park District trustees and staff.
3. Discussions with staff of the University of Illinois at Springfield
4. Meetings with neighbors and interest groups.
5. Compliance with the Park District’s 2005 updated master plan and Springfield’s plans involving the area.

The following recreational facilities were evaluated to determine if they were suitable for Barker Park.
Recreational Facilities

Open Play Lawns

The flat, open character of this site lends itself to having open play areas within the park. The possibility of developing sports fields was discussed at the public meeting, but the neighborhood sentiment was that, 1) there are many sports fields nearby on the UIS and LLCC campuses, 2) traffic generated by sports fields would be undesirable on residential streets, and 3) passive recreation was more appropriate for this park.

The open lawn areas should be used for informal activities such as kite flying, frisbee throwing, casual sport activities, etc. No fences, goals, lights or equipment are desired. The lawn areas could be various sizes and edged by woodlands, prairies, tree rows, etc. These areas should have adequate slopes for good drainage and should be planted with drought resistant turf grass that resists wear and requires little special maintenance.

Playground

At the public meeting, a neighborhood playground was suggested for the park. A playground in this location should accommodate children of all age levels. Equipment should be fun and interesting for use. The style should be simple and the equipment should be durable. It should be planned according to safety standards and should have types and thicknesses of safety surface appropriate for the equipment. The site should be accessible for all users.

The play area should be located away from roadways for safety. It should be some distance from other activity areas to avoid conflict and interference, but close enough for convenient supervision of children. Shade, drinking water and restrooms should be close by. Open lawn areas adjacent to the playground are desirable so children can alternate play between the playground and lawn activities.
Shelters and Gathering Areas

A small shelter is desirable at this park as a place to rendezvous, for protection from sun and rain, and for special activities such as picnics, parties or day camps. With an attractive architectural form, the shelter can become a focal point in the park. The shelter should be located where it is visible from within the park, thus providing orientation, security and safety for park users. Near the shelter, lights and drinking water are desirable.

Other gathering areas and resting locations should be provided along the trails and in other locations within the park such as near a natural feature or a significant view. Here, individuals or small groups could rest or gather for conversation or instruction. The areas could be furnished with a council ring, sitting wall or a few benches.

Trails and Paths

Many people at the public meeting expressed an interest in having trails within the park that could be used for hiking, bicycling and running. Existing and future sidewalks in the surrounding neighborhoods should connect to the park trails. Additionally, the park trail system could be linked to the nearby community bike/hike trails, thereby allowing park users to access the more extensive community trail system. Community trail users, likewise, could access the park for recreational opportunities, shade, restrooms and water.

Two community trails are near the park site. One is 1/4 mile to the east, adjacent to University Drive. This trail connects the UIS and LLCC campuses. The other is 1/4 mile to the west where bike lanes are designated along the roadsides of the 11th Street extension. This trail runs from UIS to the north, and will eventually be extended to Stevenson Drive and Stanford Avenue. While connections to these trails may be in the distant future, plans should provide for this possibility.
**Pond Fishing**

A small pond on the site for storm water detention could also serve for pond fishing. A dock could be built to make fishing accessible to all. It could also be used by individuals or small groups casually observing wildlife or studying pond ecology.

**Dog Run**

Neighborhood residents mentioned that there is a significant dog population in the area, and dog-walking is a popular outdoor activity. Developing the Barker Park with trails will attract dog walkers. A designated area for a dog run was desired in a location where barking would not disturb neighbors. The neighbors agreed that regulations would be needed for clean-up, lease use, etc. Additionally, nearby shade, benches and drinking water were desired for the walkers and their animals.

**Natural Resource Components**

**Drainageway and Pond**

Because the site is flat and the soils drain slowly, some earth shaping will likely be needed for adequate drainage within the park. Existing drainage concerns were expressed at meetings by residents adjacent to the west side of the park. Some additional runoff is anticipated from the development of adjacent properties in the future, and must also be accommodated.

Active use areas within the park should drain well. Broad raised berms were suggested along some sections of the perimeter to help screen adjacent property and add topographic interest. Additionally, a small pond would add visual interest to the park, provide pond-fishing opportunities, and add diversity to habitats in the park.

Barker Park potentially can be a model of effective and sustainable storm water management. With Lake Springfield only 1/3
mile downstream, collection, filtration and storage of storm water can have an obvious benefit to the city’s public water supply.

**Natural Habitats and Landscape Areas**

Parks typically have trees and shrubs that provide shade, windbreaks and park-like beauty. Planted buffer areas can help separate park activities from surrounding areas. A suggestion at the public meeting was to develop various natural resource areas for environmental education similar to Lincoln Memorial Garden on Lake Springfield.

Developing plants and man-made natural areas at this site will require a long-term commitment. Plants can be installed in phases, however, so the cost and work to establish are manageable.

**Education and Exploration Areas**

Another use for Barker Park introduced at the public meeting was nature education and exploration. People thought nature areas might get considerable use by classes from nearby Hazel Dell Elementary school with its environmentally-oriented classes, UIS and LLCC. The process of converting the current cropland to prairie, wetlands and woodlands could be educational in itself.

Park improvements including pathways, gathering areas and other amenities could serve individuals and groups visiting the park for nature study. Special planting areas, designated wildlife habitats and monitoring stations could be created to make the site an outdoor laboratory and demonstration area of sustainable design. Interpretative signs and special events could assist in disseminating information.
**Access and Utilities**

Three possible locations exist for public access and utility connections into the park. They are Halifax, Hazelcrest and Glendale, all public streets. These streets terminate on the west and north sides of the site.

Several factors must be considered when planning for access to the new park. First, neighbors were vociferous in wanting to avoid substantial increases in traffic through their neighborhood. Second, future residential and campus development of the fields to the east and south is likely. The circulation and parking plan must be able to incorporate these areas in the future. And finally, circulation and parking should not adversely impact the quality and opportunities within the park itself.

Fortunately, all public utilities (water, sewer, electric and gas) are currently available at the west edge of the park site. Only short extensions of utilities in the park will be necessary to provide for park users, maintenance and security needs.

**4. Concept Development**

Concepts for development of Barker Park were created based on the site analysis, input of District staff and suggestions from those attending the initial meeting to organize public input. These concepts were discussed at an open public meeting (minutes in Appendix). The concepts focused on different access and parking scenarios.

Concept A allowed vehicular access from Hazelcrest Road and Glendale Drive. This would allow neighborhood and public access from both the north and west. The shelter and playground would be in a central location. A drainageway, circular open lawn, pond, and buffer areas would compose the north half of the site. A larger open lawn, buffer areas and a space for a new access roadway and parking would be in the southern half.
Concept B allowed vehicular access from Hazelcrest Road and Halifax Drive. This concept shifts all the park use areas south with the drainageway and buffer areas separating them from the adjacent existing neighborhood. The playground and shelter area would be closer to the neighborhood. One open lawn would be surrounded by several different use areas. The rest of the park south of this central lawn would be for open play. Space on the far east side of the site would be reserved for park and access for future neighborhood residents.

Concept C allowed vehicular access from Glendale Drive only. This concept provided vehicular access from only one street, concentrating all traffic to one point. The use areas are arranged much like Concept A with the main activity area centered in the park. The activity area separates two open lawn areas. An area for future access and parking from either the south or east would be reserved in the southeast corner of the park.
5. Master Plan

The Master Plan for Barker Park involves converting the current 26-acre agricultural field into a neighborhood park with generally passive recreational opportunities. About half the park would consist of mowed lawns for open play punctuated with a playground, several shaded picnic areas, and a dog run. The remaining half would be converted to native prairies, wetlands and woodlands. A small pond would retain runoff, provide a water-edge habitat and allow for pond fishing. The restoration areas would provide educational opportunities while adding aesthetic qualities. These areas will also provide a buffer between the park and its surrounding residences and farm fields. The plan takes advantage of the flat, open character of the site. It also considers the opinions and preferences of neighbors in the area.

Future Development

At some point in the future changes will likely occur in the vicinity of the park site. These changes could have a direct impact on the park. The Master Plan, therefore, must take into account such future development.

The area east of the park is currently farm field but will likely be subdivided for residential development. The Master Plan accommodates this possible future development by providing a trail and road access into the park from the east.

Other park improvements including open lawns, the pond and the playground are centrally located in the park for use from both the east and west sides. Additionally, the Master Plan shows a ‘future’ picnic area and shelter near the east side if needed to accommodate an increase in neighborhood park users.

The farm land south of the park is owned by the University of Illinois. The long-range Master Plan for the UIS campus adopted in 2008 shows the area continuing to be used for agriculture.

This area of Springfield is gradually being interconnected with a system of community trails. Two trails are currently near the park site. One is 1/4 mile to the east, adjacent to University Drive, connecting the UIS and LLCC campuses. The other is 1/4 mile to the west where bike lanes are designated along the sides of the 11 Street extension. The park Master Plan shows the possibility of connecting these two bikeways with a 'Potential Bike Trail' through the south side of the park.
Park Access

Public access to the park is through Franklin Park Estates. Existing sidewalks along the three streets intersecting the park - Glendale Drive, Hazelcrest Road and Halifax Drive – are proposed to be extended into the park to become part of the park’s internal trail system. Note that the plan shows only one neighborhood sidewalk at each location being extended.

Vehicular access to the park is to be provided for motorists as well as service, maintenance and emergency vehicles. The park roadway is formed by connecting Hazelcrest Road and Glendale Drive. This alignment provides access from both the north and west sides of Franklin Park Estates and avoids concentrating traffic on one street only. It also allows for emergency access to the park should one street be blocked. Finally, this layout avoids shifting of traffic patterns within the subdivision because it offers no apparent ‘short cuts’ for motoring Franklin Park Estates residents.

Park roads would be designed to encourage motorists to drive slowly and cautiously. The residential streets would taper at the park entrance resulting in a narrower park roadway, approx. 24 feet wide. The two entrance points would be highlighted with park signs and entrance columns to designate the park entrance. Along with the narrower roadway, changes in the pavement or speed bumps might be used to reduce traffic speed.

Proposed along the west side of the park roadway are 20-25 parking spaces. This number is modest and recognizes that most Franklin Park Estates residents will hopefully walk or bicycle to the park. Parking spaces will be needed for users with disabilities, visitors from the community, and Park District maintenance and security vehicles. If and when surrounding land is developed, a similar sized area on the park’s east side is reserved for an additional parking.

Temporary over-flow parking can be provided next to the roadway. This would be used when a special event draws more park visitors than typical. The occurrence of such events will be infrequent, based on neighborhood input. Roadways along these areas should have mountable curbs so motorists can temporarily access the turf parking areas.

Recreation Areas

The central area of the park, making-up about half the site, would be reserved for passive recreational uses in character with a neighborhood park.
Two **Open Play Lawns** would be separated by a drainageway and a grove of trees. A **Playground** is positioned at this intersection, visible and accessible from throughout the park. Trails provide access through the area. A small shelter and picnic area are recommended west of the playground, convenient to the park roadway and parking area.

The **North Lawn** (2.5 acres) opens toward the pond. Its size will accommodate informal games of softball or kickball. The area is especially convenient for open play by people using the picnic area or playground on its south side.

The **South Lawn** (5 acres) is encircled by the main park trail loop. Twice the size of the North Lawn, it will accommodate activities such as Frisbee, kite flying, and informal soccer and football. The lawn is separated from the parking, picnic area and playground on the north by the drainageway, thereby encouraging younger children to stay within the smaller North Lawn.

The **Shelter** is shown with a roof about 40 feet square. This size shelter would accommodate about nine picnic tables, adequate for families, a birthday party, family reunion or neighborhood gatherings. Paved areas outside the shelter would allow for larger group activities if needed. The shelter would be lighted for security and evening use and electrical outlets would be available. A drinking fountain and hydrant would be located nearby for park users and maintenance purposes.

**Restroom Facilities** would be provided by portable toilets on a seasonal basis. They would be located adjacent to the parking area for convenience of both use and maintenance. Permanent facilities could be constructed in the same area if needed in the future.

**General Lighting** is anticipated only in the core area of the playground, shelter and parking area. Lighting here would provide improved safety and security and allow use of the area in early mornings and late afternoons. Cut-off lighting with energy saving lamps and timers are recommended.

A **Second Shelter** and **Picnic Area** is shown east of the playground. This additional facility would most likely be needed if land to the east is subdivided.

A **Fenced Dog Run** is proposed in the southwest area of the site. The run could be sub-divided into separate areas for various dog sizes or behaviors. The area is somewhat isolated in the park, however, easily accessed from the park trail. The area is also buffered from adjacent properties with woodlands and prairies. A small shaded **Picnic Area** is shown nearby for use by dog owners and others.

Near the pond a **Fishing Dock, Council Ring Overlook** and small **Picnic Area** are shown. In these locations individuals and small groups can rest, socialize, view nature or gather for talks.
Trails and Paths

Several types of trails and paths are proposed within the park.

- Residential Sidewalk Extensions (3) entering from local streets would be 5-6 feet wide.
- The Community Bike Trail would traverse the park’s south side, interconnecting existing community trails. This trail would be 10-12 feet wide with an asphalt surface to match the UIS trail.
- A Multi-Purpose Trail loops through the park a distance of 2/5 mile. This trail would be 8 feet wide of concrete or asphalt. The trail interconnects recreational areas and extends along the edges of the lawn areas, prairies, woodlands, and other areas of the park. Two small bridges are provided where the trail crosses the drainageway. A viewing mound on the south provides an elevated view of the park and adjacent areas from the trail.
- Walkways would encircle the pond, playground and shelter(s). These would be 6 feet wide and paved to provide ADA access within the areas.
- Mowed Grass Pathways would provide access to the natural woodland, prairie and wetland areas for educational and management purposes. These would be 6-8 feet wide, the width of a mower-deck, and would be mowed at the same time other turf areas in the park are mowed.

Natural Resource Zones

Three natural resource zones are proposed for the park site. Altogether, they comprise about half the area of the park (13 acres).

Zone 1 – Woodlands (7 acres)

Two broad raised berms along the west edge of the park would be developed using material from the drainage excavation and managed as natural woodlands. Both canopy and understory trees would be planted to develop into dense woodland to buffer and screen residents to the west.
Groves with canopy trees including some evergreen species would be developed west of the Woodlands, and along the north and east property lines. These groves will provide screening for current and future adjacent residences. They will provide habitat for song birds and other wildlife. The area would be planted with shade-tolerant grass and mowed infrequently allowing the grass to grow tall to discourage foot traffic through the area and to contribute to the buffer and wildlife habitat.

**Zone 2 – Prairie/Savanna (3 acres)**

Prairie/savanna areas are proposed along the park’s south and east edges to supplement the woodland buffers. Two small prairie areas would flank the pond. Additionally, a prairie area would extend along the south side of the park, separating the park from adjoining agricultural fields. The south prairie will also form an attractive environment for the multi-purpose bike trail and the hiking trail through the area.

The prairie would have a mix of native grasses and forbs (flowers). In some places trees scattered through the prairie would create a savanna environment. Seed mixes need to be selected for particular areas of the site that are suited to soil moisture and climatic exposure. The prairie areas will be contained by trails and mowed turf, and can be managed by controlled burns and/or annual mowing.

These rich and diverse prairies could be viewed from trails and open areas throughout the park. Unique views of the prairie areas will be available from the Viewing Mound on the south side and from the Stone Council Ring Overlook by the pond created from soils from the pond excavation.
Zone 3 - Wetland Drainageway and Pond (3 acres)

A shallow curving drainageway is proposed through the site to collect runoff. It would begin in the southwest and run northeast, terminating in a pond that also serves as a storm water detention basin. Native wetland grasses, forbes and woody plants would be planted in the drainageway and around the pond. These plants will reduce the rate of water flow, filter impurities and provide wildlife habitat. Along the drainageway, various erosion control methods and sustainable management practices would be employed to demonstrate good stewardship practices.

The pond could be stocked for fishing but may need artificial aeration to control algae growth and aid in diversity and health of fish populations.

The Council Ring Overlook, Fishing Dock and Trail Bridges will provide opportunities for viewing the wetlands and pond.

Summary

Barker Park is planned as a large neighborhood park and resource conservation area with limited recreational facilities. Carefully laid out trails, picnic areas, playing lawns, a pond and a playground will provide the recreational opportunities needed at this park. The park’s distinction will be its landscapes that reflects natural environments once found in the area. It will demonstrate sustainable design and sound environmental stewardship. The park is planned to be an attractive asset to residents of Franklin Park Estates, to the University of Illinois at Springfield, to future residents in the area, and to the Springfield community at large.
6. Appendix and Supplemental Information

Park Size Comparisons

Early in the planning process, exhibits were developed to aid the public in understanding the size and recreational capacity of the newly acquired park area. The boundary of the new 26 acre property, was overlaid on two established parks in the district, Douglas Park and Rotary Park.

Neighborhood Traffic Counts and Analysis

Due to concern about the potential for increased traffic in the subdivision, a general traffic report was prepared by Hanson Professional Services, Inc. The report describes existing traffic patterns within the subdivision and helped indicate where access to the park should be provided.
Barker Park Comparison with Douglas Park (26 Acres)

Springfield Park District
Springfield, Illinois
November, 2008
Barker Park Comparison with Rotary Park (40 Acres)

Springfield Park District
Springfield, Illinois
November, 2008
MEMORANDUM
(Form QAP 17.2.3, Rev. 2)

TO: Massie Massie & Associates
FROM: Matt Heyen – Hanson Professional Services Inc.

SUBJECT: Barker Park Traffic Projections and Parking Estimated Usage

Barker Park is located east of 11th Street and west of West Lake Drive, and southeast of the Franklin Park Estates neighborhood in Springfield, IL. Hanson Professional Services Inc. has reviewed the existing traffic volumes on the surrounding streets, has determined anticipated traffic volumes based on the Barker Park Master Plan (Massie Massie & Associates, February 2009), and has estimated the number of parking spaces that would be required for the estimated park usage. The values listed below are for park usage in Spring, Summer and Fall.

**Trip Generation**
According to the *Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation, 7th Edition*, trip generation values are given for a city park (Section 411). For a weekday estimate of traffic based on the acreage of the park, the average user rate is 1.6 vehicles per acre, based on three studies with an average number of 142 acres and a 50% split of entering and exiting vehicles. Using this rate, Barker Park would generate approximately 42 vehicles per day for an average weekday. Weekend traffic would generally be heavier than weekday traffic and is estimated to increase by 50%, generating approximately 63 vehicles per day for a weekend.

**Parking Generation**
According to the *Institute of Transportation Engineers Parking Generation, 3rd Edition*, parking generation values are given for a city park (Section 411). This resource was used as parks are not specifically listed in City Code Article V. Off-Street Parking and Loading. For a weekend parking generation rate, the peak parking demand was 5.1 parked vehicles per acre for a park with high use facilities such as a softball/baseball field, soccer fields and an administrative building.

Because this park is surrounded by residential and undeveloped land where most local users can be expected to walk/ride bikes to the park, is located in the back of a subdivision and contains mostly passive activities, the peak weekend parking demand generation rate was reduced to 1.5. Using this rate, the peak weekend parking required for this park would be 39 spaces. Currently 25 spaces is shown in the master plan, however the use of mountable curb on the west side of the road would supply the additional 14 spaces needed in peak parking times.

Hanson Professional Services Inc.
Barker Park Development Sequence

Barker Park would probably be developed in phases as funding becomes available. The following phases would provide a logical sequence for the proposed improvements.

Phase 1
- Rough grading
- Create a drainage swale to alleviate existing drainage problems
- Excavate pond
- Create berms along south and west borders of park using soil from pond excavation
- Install drainage culverts across swale and near the pond
- Trench primary water and electrical service
- Install erosion control devices and seed the site

Phase 2
- Plant canopy, understory and evergreen trees
  - Use some fast growing species to provide windbreaks while slower growing, more durable species are developing
- Seed prairies, bioswale, meadows, and open lawn areas
  - Manage prairie and wetland to develop into stable, mature natural areas
- Mow open lawn areas

Park opens for public use

Phase 3
- Construct roads and sidewalks within the park
- Construct pavilion
- Install site elements
  - playground area, stone council ring, fishing dock and fenced dog run
- Install site amenities
  - benches, picnic tables, drinking fountains, security lighting and signs
- Install flower beds and shrub plantings
Barker Park
Neighborhood Meeting Minutes

Date:
January 26, 2009  5:30 pm

Attendance:
See Attached List

Meeting:
Several Franklin Park Estate neighbors were present. The neighborhood does not currently have an association.

Kent Massie provided an overview of the project, displayed park comparisons and gave an analysis of the site conditions. The potential park property was donated to the Springfield Park District three years ago and developing a master plan for the property is the next step in the process.

Mike Stratton stated the District values the residents’ opinions of the proposed development and will try to accommodate the neighbors’ needs and concerns. Gray Noll stated he often weights neighbors concerns and desires higher than the general public's concerns and desires when the final designs are developed for a neighborhood park. Massie presented three park concepts addressing different circulation patterns. Proposed park activities basically remained the same for all concepts.

- Concept A – Vehicular access from Hazelcrest Road and Glendale Drive
- Concept B – Vehicular access from Hazelcrest Road and Halifax Drive
- Concept C – Vehicular access from Hazelcrest Road

All concepts displayed another potential access area from the south or east in the future, should those areas be developed with some land use.

Neighbors commented Concept A was preferred for vehicular circulation because two options for entering/exiting the site are available. In Concept B, Halifax Drive is rarely used and would not provide a good access to the park. Concept C was not preferred due to concentrating all ingress and egress traffic onto Hazelcrest Road. Hazelcrest Road was described as a heavily traveled road and vehicular speed is a concern.

Security at the park was an important topic with the residents. Stratton stated the park would be open during normal park hours from 6am to 10:30pm. There would be no gate at the park entrance to eliminate after hour use. Park District and City police would patrol the park as they do other District facilities.

The residents preferred no lights and restrooms at the site.

The activities within the park were discussed. The residents preferred more family oriented activities. Open lawn areas, trees and passive recreation were preferred. Areas for dogs were viewed as desirable.

Massie Massie & Associates
Land Planning and Landscape Architecture
Possible park activities/improvements
- Open Lawn Areas
- Playground – neighborhood size
- Pavilion
- Dog Run
- Recreation Pond
- Trail loops
- Picnic areas
- Natural areas – prairie restoration

Negative park elements
- Programmed sports fields
- Lighting
- Restrooms
- Facility buildings and maintenance yards

The residents questioned the impact this park development would have on property values and taxes. Stratton explained he does not have any facts to support information about this but from his experience it depends on how the park is developed. Very large active facilities in the park might decrease property values due to increased traffic and activity. More passive uses can increase neighborhood desirability and property values.

Funding and time schedule for construction were discussed. Stratton stated the schedule depended on funding but is anticipating 5-10 years before construction could begin. Stratton stated the park, if developed as a passive park, would probably not have enough points needed to obtain an Open Space and Land Acquisition Development (OSLAD) grant. The Park District issues bonds every two years and this could be a possible source of funding. Other funding options were briefly discussed.

MMA will refine concepts for the park. A public meeting will be scheduled in February. MMA will provide flyers for the neighbors to distribute. Hazel Dell School was proposed as a possible location for the public meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email Address/Mailing Address</th>
<th>Phone #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard A. Lusardi</td>
<td>2205 Croydon Dr</td>
<td>529-1590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2201 Croydon</td>
<td>585-1614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Theilken</td>
<td></td>
<td>529-0340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2109 Croydon</td>
<td>529-1816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Smith</td>
<td>1916 Croydon Dr</td>
<td>525-0018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009 Hazelcrest</td>
<td>525-0008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14009 Hazelcrest</td>
<td>891-4183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Smith</td>
<td>2013 Clovermont Dr.</td>
<td>553-4739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:garyv@nemley.yahoo.com">garyv@nemley.yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon McConnell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ McConnell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton A. Vandewater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Herndon NO!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Funk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delores Kruger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary E. Kerr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen Staeter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Stratton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Massie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Brumleve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Barker Park
Public Meeting Minutes

Date and Time:
February 17, 2009  6:15 pm

Location:
Hazel Dell Elementary School Gymnasium

Attendance:
See Attached List

Meeting:

An introduction, welcoming and comments were made by Mike Stratton, Leslie Sgro and Kent Massie.

Leslie Sgro noted the Springfield Park District (SPD) trustees and staff are here to listen to the public’s ideas and concerns. She stated the SPD values the residents’ opinions of the proposed development and will try to accommodate the neighbors’ needs and concerns. Mike Stratton stated the current board places more emphasis on input from the surrounding residents than they do the general public's when the master plans are developed for a neighborhood park.

Kent Massie provided an overview of the project, described the location of the park, displayed park comparisons and gave an analysis of the site conditions. The potential park property was donated to the SPD three years ago and developing a master plan for the property is the next step in the process.

A participant questioned the process of developing the master plan, stating he was not involved from the beginning. Massie stated there was an initial meeting among a few residents in January. This meeting determined the process for involving the neighborhood, allowing residents to help determine what should be included in the development of the park. Massie emphasized nothing has been decided as to the development or character of the park at this time.

Massie presented various potential park elements that could be included in the design. Proposed park activities basically remained the same for all concepts. Three park concepts addressing different circulation patterns and arrangements of the park elements were displayed as a basis to generate discussion.

- Concept A – Vehicular access from Hazelcrest Road and Glendale Drive
- Concept B – Vehicular access from Hazelcrest Road and Halifax Drive
- Concept C – Vehicular access from Glendale Drive

All concepts displayed the potential for another access from the south or east in the future, should those areas be developed. Massie stated these areas are not owned by the SPD so they have no control for this potential access and no public access from the east or south is currently possible.

Many participants supported the idea of a park but questioned if vehicular access to the park could come from some other point other than through the neighborhood. Massie replied the Franklin Park Estate streets are currently the only access points.
A participant asked which of the concepts displayed would encourage the least amount of traffic through the neighborhood. Massie stated the amount of traffic and parking depends on the activities proposed within the park. At this point there is no idea what activities might generate traffic. However, all traffic to the park site must currently come through Franklin Park Estates because there is no other possible access.

Increased traffic on Hazelcrest Road due to the park development was a major concern among residents. Massie stated the subdivision had originally been platted for more residences which probably would have generated more traffic than this proposed neighborhood park. Some participants clearly stated no through road should be proposed in the park.

It was stated by a participant that organized sports activities, if proposed for the park, likely would attract league use and traffic will increase through the residential neighborhood. Participants said the University of Illinois at Springfield (UIS) currently has many sports fields located nearby that others can use. Stratton stated there is still a need for organized sports activities in this area but, this park might not be the best location for these activities.

Another attendee questioned if the SPD is required to have vehicular access to the park. Massie stated the SPD needs vehicular access for maintenance and security. If vehicular access and parking for users is not provided, people will park along the neighborhood streets and in front of houses in the area. Stratton stated parking within the park is important for the success of the park and the neighborhood.

It was stated many children in the subdivision currently play on the streets. A park development would give these children a place to play safely.

One resident stated he would like to see the park created. He was one of the first homeowners in the subdivision and even at that time the possibility of a park was promised. He first was hoping his children would be able to use the park but now hopes his grandchildren can use the park.

One participant stated his desire to have the park developed into a natural area that could serve as an outdoor education center for Hazel Dell Elementary School. Prairie and woodland areas were proposed in a concept similar to Lincoln Memorial Garden.

Security at the park was an important topic with the audience. One participant stated the secluded location of the site makes it difficult to monitor and drug dealing and other illegal activities could occur. Stratton and McArnerney-Gibbs stated normal park hours are from dawn to 10:30pm. There could be a possibility of changing the hours of this particular park from dawn to dusk like a few other parks in the SPD such as Riverside Park. A gate at the park entrance could be a possibility to eliminate after hour use. Participants mentioned if there was a gate there would be no way for police to patrol the park after hours creating a different safety issue. Park District and City police would patrol the park as they do other District facilities. Stratton stated the SPD is also dependent on neighbors to "watch" the park and report any illegal or controversial activity.

A resident asked if the park would be lighted. Participants agreed lights would be appropriate for security and safety reasons. The level of light should be kept to a minimum as to not affect adjacent property owners. No sports lighting was recommended.
Various activities within the park were discussed. The residents preferred more family-oriented activities. Open play lawns, trees, prairies and passive recreation were discussed.

Potential park activities/improvements discussed include:
- Trail loops for walking/bicycling
- Natural areas – prairie restoration/woodland
- Recreation Pond for fishing
- Picnic areas
- Open Lawn Areas
- Open Pavilion and Council Rings for gatherings
- Playground – neighborhood size

Undesirable park elements or associated activities
- Programmed sports fields, lighted sports areas
- Additional traffic through the neighborhood or through the park
- Illegal activities due to secluded location
- Increase in taxes to build and maintain

A participant questioned the impact this park development would have on property values. Stratton explained it depends again on how the park is developed. A survey conducted in 2005 found that parks near residential developments can increase the property value of your home by as much as 20%. Stratton suggested more passive uses can increase neighborhood desirability and property values. However, very large active facilities in the park might decrease property values due to increased traffic and people.

A resident asked if the parks uses could change in the future causing an increase in activity and potentially a decrease in property values. Massie stated change will most likely occur in any park as social and economic changes in the community naturally occur. Stratton said a large increase in activity or a shift in park use would need to go through public hearings and the current and future Park Board would likely not agree to a shift of uses resulting in a large increase in activity, especially in a neighborhood park.

Another participant was concerned about the possibility of an increase in Park District taxation when this park is developed. Stratton stated a tax increase would only be possible with a referendum voted on by the tax payers of the SPD.

Funding and time schedule for construction were discussed. Stratton stated the schedule depended on funding but is anticipating 3-10 years before construction could begin.

Upon closing the forum, Massie reviewed the planning schedule. MMA will refine concepts for the park. A preliminary master plan will be developed from public comments and SPD staff suggestions and will be presented to the SPD committee in March 2009. Modifications will likely be made and a revised plan will be presented to the SPD board in April 2009. Adoption of the master plan could hopefully occur in May 2009. Additional public reviews and comments can be made at these meetings. Sgro mentioned another public/neighborhood meeting is a possibility if desired.
**Barker Park**
Public Meeting February 17, 2009

**Sign In**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email Address/Mailing Address</th>
<th>Phone #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kay Tev</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tex11@comcast.net">tex11@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>529-4588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Tev</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tex11@comcast.net">tex11@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>529-4588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windia Dulka</td>
<td><a href="mailto:WDULK1@YAHOO.COM">WDULK1@YAHOO.COM</a></td>
<td>572-1260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Ryan</td>
<td></td>
<td>416-0724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audelle Miller</td>
<td>4109, Russell Dr.</td>
<td>585-9426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fran Koveck</td>
<td></td>
<td>524-2270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Carlton</td>
<td>1909, Claremont Dr</td>
<td>529-8228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Hartley</td>
<td>1908, Claremont Dr</td>
<td>528-1028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Caldwell</td>
<td>2217, Trowbridge</td>
<td>529-3135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Zilker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darleen Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hank &amp; Linda Kremer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra &amp; Rickie Douglas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis &amp; Gloria Sweatman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John &amp; Kay Watt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlene Clemons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary &amp; Lynn Werner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Harman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John &amp; Kathy Moser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron &amp; Melba Hackman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Cully</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Voth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Freeman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misty Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Barker Park

**Public Meeting February 17, 2009**

## Sign In

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email Address/Mailing Address</th>
<th>Phone #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roger Ramirez</td>
<td>2033 Stockton Dr</td>
<td>529-2863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray &amp; Kim Gillespie</td>
<td>1908 Halifax</td>
<td>529-0904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan &amp; Cheryl Formea</td>
<td>2004 Barnard</td>
<td>529-8596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVE THEILKIN</td>
<td>2201 CROYDON</td>
<td>585-1614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Crews</td>
<td>2024 Halifax Dr</td>
<td>C85-9505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Bunch</td>
<td>2009 Croydon Dr</td>
<td>585-2088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Alusardi</td>
<td>2205 CROYDON D#</td>
<td>529-1590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARC A. KLEINSCHIRM</td>
<td>2017 Claremont Dr</td>
<td>585-0313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICK &amp; MARVIE RICHARDS</td>
<td>1804 Reading Rd</td>
<td>971-1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary &amp; Steve Romack</td>
<td>3108 Stockton Dr</td>
<td>529-6913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhys Saunders</td>
<td>STR</td>
<td>788-1521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hewitt &amp; Tracy Gage</td>
<td>2016 Croydon</td>
<td>585-0472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCIA WHERRY</td>
<td>4209 DEMING</td>
<td>585-1296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Carlowe</td>
<td>2200 Stockton Dr</td>
<td>529-4240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**NOTE:** The table above contains the names, email addresses/mailing addresses, and phone numbers of attendees at the Barker Park public meeting held on February 17, 2009. The table is well-organized, with each attendee's information clearly listed in separate columns for easy reference.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email Address/Mailing Address</th>
<th>Phone #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leslie R. Cully</td>
<td><a href="mailto:thecullys@sbcglobal.net">thecullys@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>529-4085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon &amp; Russ McConnell</td>
<td><a href="mailto:thanakin@comcast.net">thanakin@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>525-6618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton &amp; Andrea VanDeventer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:clayton@familyvideo.com">clayton@familyvideo.com</a></td>
<td>841-4183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom &amp; Carolee Cruse</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cruse.41@AOL.com">cruse.41@AOL.com</a></td>
<td>529-9298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Meade</td>
<td>4305 Deming Dr</td>
<td>529-9270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT Hafstrom</td>
<td>2010 Mill Rd</td>
<td>529-2605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Barnes</td>
<td>4313 Deming Dr</td>
<td>529-6049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Liebrecht</td>
<td>4205 Deming Dr</td>
<td>529-1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Wheeler</td>
<td>4112 Russo II (mary.wheeler@1)</td>
<td>529-7797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Wheeler</td>
<td>4112 RUSSO I @comcast.net</td>
<td>529-7787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew McKinley</td>
<td>2236 Hazelbell</td>
<td>529-0821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen Strader</td>
<td>2105 Croydon</td>
<td>529-3546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Kerr</td>
<td>2105 Graydon Dr</td>
<td>529-3546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Wardell</td>
<td></td>
<td>652-8767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Shrode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara McAnarney-Gibbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Noll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Stratton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliott McKinley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Massie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Brumleve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Barker Park
2nd Public Meeting Minutes

Date and Time:
March 23, 2009    6:15 pm

Location:
Hazel Dell Elementary School Gymnasium

Attendance:
See Attached List

Meeting:

An introduction, welcoming and comments were made by Leslie Sgro, Bill Logan, and Gray Noll.

Leslie Sgro noted the Springfield Park District (SPD) trustees and staff are here to listen to the public’s ideas and concerns. She stated the SPD values the residents’ opinions of the proposed development and will try to accommodate the neighbors’ needs and concerns.

Mike Stratton, Executive Director of the SPD, reviewed the planning process and schedule.

Kent Massie provided a brief overview of the project and discussed the preliminary master plan that was developed from the comments at the first public meeting. Massie stated about 50% of the park would be developed into natural resource areas leaving about 12-13 acres for recreational use. This recreation area is then more in scale with a neighborhood park than a community park. Natural buffers would surround the perimeter of the park and buffer the activity areas from the surrounding residents. Massie stated the primary recreation elements include open play lawns, a playground, a shelter/pavilion, multi-use pathways, a dog run, and a fishing pond.

A question was asked concerning the decision to connect Hazelcrest Road with Glendale Drive for access to the park. Massie stated this was done for three reasons: 1) it does not concentrate all ingress and egress traffic to one point, 2) the subdivision encloses two sides of the park and it will be convenient for neighbors from any residence in the subdivision to directly access the park, and 3) for emergency vehicle purposes in case one street becomes blocked, access to the park could still be maintained.

Several residents wondered if there would be an opportunity for a multi-purpose gazebo/pavilion that could be used for larger events such as neighborhood gatherings, performances, reunions, etc. Massie stated the shelter currently shown is 30’x30’ and would be large enough for approximately 9 picnic tables. Additional paved areas and turf around the pavilion could be used for larger events.

One participant asked about the proposed dog run and how it will be managed. Massie stated the dog run is a fenced area that is 200-300’ away from residences and well buffered. Stratton stated there is a fine if you do not pick up after your dog according to the SPD’s rules. There would also be waste locations for disposal of the dog waste throughout the park.
A participant asked about maintenance of the park. Massie stated the open play lawns would be mowed regularly and other natural areas would have a maintenance program. Stratton stated the SPD has a maintenance staff that would travel to the park on a set schedule to mow the appropriate areas. No maintenance building would be located on site. Tree watering, trimming, and other maintenance practices would be performed as needed. Stratton stated the SPD also applies pesticides and herbicides when needed but are very cautious about proper application.

A participant questioned if geese would be a problem with the proposed pond. Massie stated often geese are attracted to open pond sites with little vegetation surrounding the pond. The natural edge proposed around this pond and the surrounding natural areas would provide cover for predators that discourages geese. Stratton agreed often geese problems are prevalent on golf courses and other sites where the vegetation is mowed along the water’s edge.

Security of the park was discussed. Stratton stated the SPD police would have jurisdiction over the area and could issue speeding or other tickets if problems arise. The police would also patrol the park on a regular schedule and City police could also assist as they do with other parks.

Park hours and gated entrances were mentioned. Stratton stated normal park hours are from dawn to 10:30pm. There could be a possibility of changing the hours of this particular park from dawn to dusk like a few other parks in the SPD such as Riverside and Carpenter parks. Stratton stated a gate at the park entrance would be difficult since it would require two staff visits per day and annoys some public users.

A resident asked about the surface material of the trails. Massie stated the goal is to have a paved surface and Stratton agreed concrete or asphalt would be preferred. Stratton stated residents at the last meeting expressed concern about children riding bikes in the streets. With a paved sidewalk within the park it would allow those children and adults to ride bikes/walk in a safe environment. Stratton also stated the paths would be 6-8’ wide to allow service and maintenance vehicles access to the park.

A resident asked if the park would be lighted. Massie stated lights would be appropriate for security and safety reasons. The level of light should be kept to a minimum as to not affect adjacent property owners. No roadway or pathway lighting are envisioned at this time for the park.

One participant questioned the depth of the pond. Massie stated the size and depth of the pond is not yet determined and that a hydrology study would make those determinations. Residents stated the water table in the area is very high and standing water is a common problem at the end of Hazelcrest Road. Massie mentioned storm drains currently exist that may be directed into the proposed drainageway. Fountains and recirculation of the pond’s water were discussed and would be considered in the design phase of the park.

Another participant was concerned about the possibility of an increase in Park District taxation when this park is developed. Stratton doubted if a raise in taxes would be necessary due to the construction of the park. He stated the SPD will probably apply for Department of Natural Resources funds and sell bonds to help with the cost of construction. If District taxation is increased it will apply to the entire district not just Franklin Park Estates residents.
One man addressed the group with the idea of moving the park to the southwest corner of Hazel Dell Road and West Lake Shore Drive. He stated a land trade may be possible with the existing park property and the property he is proposing. This location would be convenient for the school children to access the park. He stated the existing park property could be developed into more residential lots.

Participants commented the new location would provide better access but would make the park less of a neighborhood park and more of a community park. Residents also stated concerns that switching the land use from a park to residential lots would increase traffic through the neighborhood. One resident stated when the subdivision was initially platted Hazelcrest Road extended east to connect to West Lake Shore Drive. Some attending did not prefer this additional development.

A participant also stated the relocation of the park for the convenience and proximity near Hazel Dell School may not be a benefit in the long term because the future of the school is uncertain.

One participant stated the design does a good job of accommodating the various user groups including the older residents that would likely use the park.

Massie stated the master plan could be adjusted if, overtime, needs within the community changed.

Funding and time schedule for construction were discussed. Stratton stated the plan will likely be presented to the SPD board in April or May of 2009 for approval. Once approved, the plan will become an addendum to the Park District’s current Master Plan. It will probably be 2-3 years before funding is considered for the park. Some form of construction on the park could begin within 3-5 years with various elements likely being built in phases as funding becomes available.
Barker Park
Public Meeting March 23, 2009

Sign In

Name

Dan Branden
Carolyn Harmon
Mary & Steve Romack
Marc Klingharn
Bob Carlson
Sharon & Russ McConnell
Rita & David Israel
Jane & Paul Ford
Penny Ward
Geoff & Linda Keene
Mary 
Carolyn
Opal Reson
Brandon Alls
Judy Reynolds
Bonnie & Arley Reckenhoff
Dave Barrows - UTS
Ira Boyer (SJ-1)
Paul & M.F.
Marcia Wherry
Charles Holman
William Barnes
Kay & Beul Tey
## Barker Park
### Public Meeting March 23, 2009

### Sign In

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paula Cardosi</td>
<td>2200 Stockton Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Heath</td>
<td>6546 Shady St. SPFLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Robuck</td>
<td>2004 Croydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Kroll</td>
<td>6517 W thumbs化uron (County, Brond 415)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth M. Wheeler</td>
<td>4112 Russell 62703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill A. Curry</td>
<td>2237 Trowbridge St., J C 62703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Wheeler</td>
<td>4112 Russell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Voth</td>
<td>2009 Croydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen Straeter</td>
<td>2105 Croydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Kerr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Bates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hewitt &amp; Tracy Gaje</td>
<td>2106 Croydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy &amp; Lynn Werner</td>
<td>4018 Brookfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Giro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Logan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Fulgenzi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Stration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Massie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Brumley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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