

Garden Plots

Community Engagement Meetings

October 29, November 10 & 12, 2008

Below are comments received from the Community Engagement Meeting Comment Forms.

1. Option I:

Redevelop and relocate a portion of the Garden Plots and create a football/soccer/lacrosse field area on a portion of that land. This would add three soccer-sized fields – to be used in the fall for football and in the spring for boys' and girls' lacrosse.

Please provide your comments, questions, preferences related to this option and the preliminary garden plots concepts presented. Comments / Questions / Preferences:

10/29/08

Do not want, need most cost info, need to include more garden plot disadvantages – you need to see school sports schedule.

Against the proposal, prefer Option #3, too costly to drive to Royce Road.

What is the likelihood that the newly proposed garden plot areas will create more theft from gardens? This proposal will quite likely result in increased taxes plus require more traveling (gas expenses), for the typical gardener.

This is expensive and it will inconvenience 1,000 gardeners.

Per the percentages of gardeners north and south of 75th, all gardening could be accommodated.

Do not do!

I am a gardener and current plot site is precious to me in many ways, I see the need for proximate field space to NCHS, I am very concerned that all gardeners who want to be at the west street plots could be accommodated, this would require the southern residents be enticed to move south to garden and others have plots near their homes, it sounds like the plots are currently fully rented, it would be good to explore gardening interest throughout the city, (was anyone turned away?).

\$450,500,000 plus

Parking for athletic fields? Not really in "Naperville" – more Bolingbrook, site quality, many, many deer in area. How will park police patrol this area? 450-500 most expensive, same as #4 with exception of 250,000 gardeners.

No

Increased West Street Traffic, increased pedestrian crossings of West Street, possible conflict with emergency vehicles to Edward and insufficient parking for new fields.

This option is not acceptable.

Leave garden plots (Park District) do not move the plots, use all other property strictly for NCHS, and keep NCHS people (students,...) near NCHS.

I support this option. It seems like a win/win solution, and one that maintains the garden plot community and would actually establish two garden plot "communities". Maintaining needed athletic fields near Naperville Central is vital to maintaining the strength of our "athletic community". We have a strong sports community at Naperville Central and we need to support this.

11/10/08

I think the cemetery board should be approached with the idea of moving future burial plots to other Naperville locations so the remaining undeveloped cemetery land could be sold or contributed for school uses.

People have expressed interest in having a plot at DuPage River Park that would not have considered having one in the present location.

Expensive option – would not want. 248th Street is a crazy suggestion that is barely Naperville.

As a parent of an athlete at NCHS, this option is the only one that is feasible. This causes the least amount of disruption to the student population in terms of safety, cost and impact on the structure of their practice times.

I think this is best option.

I support this option; it appears to meet the interests of the largest number of Naperville residents.

I prefer this option.

Only option that will provide a win/win for everyone. More plots for gardeners – more convenient for many more fields – less displacement for all levels of youth sports.

I do know a lot of neighbors who would love to garden if the plots were south of 75th Street. I prefer this option as a long-term solution.

35% of gardeners are already south of 75th Street. Safety to students: proximity to school, trainers and medical facilities – especially if need to take shelter. Flexibility of fields close by so students can be alternate miss bus. Do consider moving topsoil to both "new" plot areas.

This seems like the most permanent solution and should be the one we pursue.

In the long-term this seems to be the best option overall. It is my understanding that the garden plots would be increased and be dispersed throughout Naperville making it more accessible to more gardeners. This option would be to the greatest benefit and safety of students and athletes.

Your tri-fold brochure speaks for itself. The advantages of option I clearly outweigh the few disadvantages especially when you look at the numerous disadvantages of the other 3 options. Displacing many to please a few does not make sense.

No

This is best option. Doesn't make sense to bus athletes off-site. The gardeners already have to commute to the garden plots so to commute to a different location isn't that great a hardship. The cost is the negative but I think there are hidden costs in the other options. For example, option 2 is cheapest now but doesn't address the need for additional fields in the future.

I like this option because it keeps the teams within walking distance of the school. It also doesn't displace all the garden plots, and I would assume there are some gardeners who may actively prefer to use garden plots that were further south (because they don't live in the central part of town). It is the most costly, however. But seems like a long-term solution.

I like this option because it's better for the teams and I'm sure not all the gardeners live in the middle of town. There must be some gardeners who wouldn't mind going south.

Yes, have to take care of our future – our kids.

Obviously makes the most sense. I understand that some gardeners may be required to move, however, given the distribution of the gardeners throughout the city, it may actually be more convenient to many. Do we know the number of gardeners that currently drive to the plots? What % live in south Naperville.

This is the most beneficial for the most people. It's easier for the gardeners to travel than to bus students. Gives the opportunity to "south siders" to garden. Kids need a campus to call home.

Include a power point slide on how to use the microphone (We want you to be heard. Please use the microphone.) Train staff: 1) to remind speakers to speak into the microphone, and, failing that 2) to offer to hold the microphone appropriately for the speaker. If a speaker is allowed a follow-up response, yet has given up the microphone, please return the microphone to the speaker. And insist they use it or hold it for them.

This is definitely the best option. We need to keep our Naperville central student athletes close to the school for many reasons, cost of transporting, safety of the student, and for their sense of community. The students need to be able to easily attend these games safely and should be close to the school. This is well worth the inconvenience of 100 or so gardeners. After all they can drive to the new plots.

This is the best option. Garden plots should be spread out throughout the city not concentrated in one small area. The student athletes need to practice close to the school due to safety concerns, access to trainers, facilities, teachers, etc.

This is the very best option for our kids. You can plant anywhere, I'm a gardener.

Much more supportive of needs of student athletes. The argument that holds close to NCHS was to allow students to stay after school to meet co/teachers and not miss practice is very compelling.

This is the one and only option that addresses present and future needs for the community.

I whole heartedly support this option. Not all people taking advantage of the garden plots are senior citizens or those who walk to the plots. I think those who have gardened the longest should have "squatters rights" to staying on West Street (or/and seniors, etc.). Additionally, I think it would be a benefit to the

community to develop garden plots at both DuPage and 95th Street. I think even more people from all quadrants of town would benefit from this.

The park district did a great job finding plots around the city for the gardeners. We need to keep the teens near the school. Moving them is a mistake for safety, morale and environmental issues.

It is vital to have high school athletic fields located close to the school. There is too much risk for insufficient response time to care for an injured player and for a traffic school bus accident or by closing a busy street. I am also concerned for the gardeners about possible heavy metal poisoning from lead from the shot that was spread by trapshooters and by fallout from fireworks supplied by the yearly display. Has some testing been conducted as was done for the proposed new plots? How is the integrity of the soil controlled? How do you know what pesticides, weed killer and fertilizers are used?

If you created a price discount for plots or a no charge for a year or 2 plot renters would leave up to more south.

Bus 100 plus football, 100 plus lacrosse players, displace 3,000 plus youth athletes or move 200 garden plots to another location – it is a NO Brainer!

This is the only viable option for our kids. It is also a good compromise for the entire community.

This is the only viable option due to: 1) Safety for students – no training facility; busing; no shelter at other fields. 2) Maximum utilization of land – the plots are only used for 6 months as opposed to 9 months for athletics. 3) Not practical to bus hundreds of athletes 6 days a week, equipment. 4) Not logical to displace the large numbers of athletes as opposed to a few gardeners.

To me only available/reasonable option. Safety should be overriding concern – training, busing, lighting, etc. Gardeners will get more space – not less. The numbers of people benefited far outweigh the number “disadvantaged”.

I think that this one is the best because the gardens can easily be moved with minimal consequences where as if we were to bus students then there would be large gees for all of the transportations and field renovations.

35 percent of Naperville residents don't have children in the school system – we moved here and stayed here because of the schools. Which enriches our community more – great schools with on-site facilities or garden plots. Proximity affects our students, but would not affect most of the gardeners. They drive to garden anyway. This is a no brainer.

Present location allows combining trips to library, hospital (Fitness center) and downtown. Is safe for women who come alone. Pilferage is generally controllable. As community gardens, land is developed to its highest and best use. Community because it cuts across age, gender and race as few other programs (should be high priority of park district). As gardens is in continuous use over half of the year whereas athletic field it would be in actual use only a small fraction of that time. Trying to maintain a garden a great distance from one's home (6 miles to DuPage River Park for me) is just not a practical solution for many reasons (for anyone who has ever done gardening would know).

Please keep the safety of the kids in mind. Please do not bus them.

Although the most expensive, this is the only option that can be a win/win/win for NCHS, gardeners, and youth football in the community with the least safety issues and risk.

This appears to be the best option. It optimizes the benefits athletics provides to students and it still allows for garden plots, albeit with some inconvenience to the gardeners. It also provides field space for a variety of school and community events.

Only a good solution if all current gardeners are not inconvenienced due to distance to their plots. All 587 plots were rented by people who deemed West Street location is acceptable. I fear many will drop out if relocated. 15 miles plus 30 drives will add 4-500 in gas costs from West street gardens to DuPage River location making it not worth the trip to garden.

NO

Allows for a win for the community: additional field space, garden plots in multiple locations to serve different parts of the city. Enriches the general school experience for our kids.

Not a good option.

What are the full costs of this alternative? How much will impact to Royce Road cost? Can't make an informed decision without costs. What about Brush Hills Park?

This option is the only option that makes sense. Whenever change is needed, someone will lose out. The school was unable to relocate – we need to increase the fields around the school. Please do the right thing!

It is simply unfair to make a decision to inconvenience those who have garden plots in favor of students at the high school. It is also wrong to make park district residents in school district 204 pay for moving the garden plots. This is a bad option.

Support option 1 so that students don't have to be moved elsewhere to play sports. Also think putting some garden plots in another part of town serves those who would like to garden on the south side of Naperville.

How many acres are being lost from the practice field across Hillside? How many acres in the north garden plot section are you requesting? Has anyone done an inventory of the fields which are or maybe available? What about identifying quantifying future field needs/requirements.

This needs to be done ASAP. Moving garden plots and making trails is a win, win for everyone. The trails could be developed and later expanded into the Hobson Pond property. Remember, the fields are shared facilities, not just NCHS is using them.

The relocation of garden plots is permanent. The field use for sports (temporary) is seasonal, probably 3 months on average that students would have to be bused. In addition, the extra fields and activity would increase congestion in an area that already suffers from traffic congestion. Spreading out athletic activities into the community would help relieve this congestion. I don't see the relocation of St. Raphael and NYFL football for 3 months a year as a large inconvenience versus the permanent relocation of garden plots. Also, what are the long-term impacts: will the need for more athletic fields continue to grow or will the demand for garden plots in their current location increase during the next 5-10 years as demographics in the community change: While I recognize the short-term demand for more student athletic fields (and the desire of parents not to be inconvenienced by having all extra curricular activities located close to school) I am concerned that this amounts to a tyranny of the majority, a concept our democracy does not support.

No – I want the garden plots to remain undisturbed. I have no strong feeling other than that.

Why wasn't the need for additional field space and the displacing of the garden plots discussed prior to the recently approved NCUSD referendum? I assume because of the fear of lost support in the garden plotters and others.

11/12/08

We are Naperville – support our athletes and the future of the world. Their time is precious. This community and our tax dollars need to finance and support our future leaders. Plus the number of garden plots would increase.

Opposed to moving garden plots. Lacrosse should be treated as a club sport for now. No where is it written in stone that all sports should be offered at all high schools. Really expensive to create new fields – transportation cost is lower. May be athletes parents group could fundraise.

Using this space for athletic fields is the best for the community at large. This one time out lay of money is better than being in debt year after year (tax \$). A garden plot is much easier to relocate and easier for those who use these plots to drive another direction to instead of hundreds of students every day.

The best option - close to the school, no extra transportation needed (big cost, more liability).

This is not a good solution. It is poor public policy to pin two legitimate interests (sports vs. gardening) when additional, less expensive, longer term and reasonable option exist. Do not assume that the success of the current garden plot program will reoccur at a remote site. Vandalism and theft is already a problem – additional sites will only increase this – and DuPage River has a large deer population that will eat the crops. 1) What will the effect be on the garden plot wet lands? 2) Will water run off from the new fields negatively effect remaining plots? 3) Lighting and noise – neighbors won't want it. 4) Will athletes complain about Sportsman's?

Best choice. Save cost to transport students to other off-site location it is more safe for our children, less burden for coaches.

This option opens the possibility of more people able to participate in the garden plots. This would also be the most earth friendly because it doesn't use gasoline for traveling teams and more land is used for gardening.

No. Too expensive.

Seems to be the most logical of the 4.

I believe this is the best option. The garden plots that would be established in other areas would open the program for others.

This appears to be the best option. Aside from the advantages already defined. Moving garden plots to the south would benefit gardeners in the south. Added garden plots services south Naperville. Best solution for school and busing.

I think that this would be the best option. As a student I have seen the many uses for the fields after school and I think it would add stress and problems for the teams to be bused to a different location. Adding fields would also allow the opportunity for the lacrosse teams to practice closer to the school if in the future

they do become an IHSA school sport. There would also be more garden plots and 2 locations. Those might be closer to other gardeners.

It would be nice to have plots available on the south side of town (especially sector G).

Not the most practical solution turning good garden soil into "playing fields" is almost as bad as paving it over and parking on it.

Seems like most practical option!

The fields couldn't be used during school anyway because of the time it takes to walk there.

I think this is the best option – over using Knoch Park or busing teams elsewhere is ridiculous. As a parent of 4 children in the district I have always had to travel a minimum of 30 minutes for their games of soccer and football. Why would you ever think of busing students daily for practices?

Yes

Too costly of taxpayer \$.

I think the concern for fields for lacrosse is high on the list of priorities.

This option is too expensive. This is the wrong time for the park district to try to cut \$250K from other programs or to ask the taxpayers for more money. Pursue cheaper options. The area for the proposed new 144 plots to the west of the current garden plots is not good because it is too wet there. The current plots on the western edge are notoriously wet in the spring. It is impossible to plant there in the spring when it is wet. You will not know it is wet there if you check it in other seasons. Check it in the spring, those plots are mud pits.

No

Location and mass of garden plots is important to prevent stealing produce. If split this increases the chance for problems. There is strength in numbers. Lots of \$. [Link to full 203 funding.](#)

This is the best option, equal compromise on both sides. Gardeners do not just walk from their homes to garden. They have to cart all materials (as pertains to gardeners) to do their hobby. How many people will this really misplace? There are a lot of people who have 2 plots. Do not bus my kids around town for their sports. It takes too long – they will be too hungry. They will miss out on time to do homework. What about economic loss to Ribfest with keeping it as is? Major loss of revenue to Ribfest itself and downtown overflow revenue.

We simply cannot bus athletes off-site. It is an unsafe practice that puts their lives at risk unnecessarily. Since mainly football players are involved who experience the highest percentage of interest of any sport, prompt care is vital particularly if the injury is severe. Bus rides always come with an element of risk. The proposed alternate garden plot site is only 4.8 miles away. Since gardeners already drive to the garden to bring equipment, a slightly longer drive would not be particularly inconvenient, not as inconvenient as busing a few hundred children off site at great expense and peril.

Great option! We can finally open other sport locations and give the students the need to be near the school. The gardens are used when students are in class and doing sports. The athletes would have to get back home early but, we

the bus system for practices they will be lucky to be home by 7:45-8 p.m. NOT ACCEPTABLE, while families that garden will be home early any ways before traffic time. It is already this way.

Are there additional annual costs in moving the plots to DuPage River Park i.e. lease costs from the City. If so, what are they? Will the City provide a long-term lease to the park district for garden plot space or will the gardeners need to be moved again if the City Council wants the land for something.

In this option BOTH parties win. The tradition of the garden plots can be upheld in the original spot with some modification and can be expanded upon. It makes no sense to me to be busing our kids all over Naperville when this option provides what is needed and more for both parties. Since there is not an elimination of garden plots but an INCREASE and the impact to the school as well as many other community sports programs is at stake, I see no other option to be considered.

Please do not take this option. The garden plots are for all members of the community, not just for the athletes.

Since cost has become an issue, the park district has a responsibility to charge the actual cost of plots. Gardeners have to pay their fair share.

This in no way benefits the community as a whole – it is a waste of space when not used for sports for a very little percentage of our population. This option #1 restricts the use by all citizens and only allows high school to use it – that's wrong.

This would be my first option as there is an increase of one practice field and additional garden plots. My concern would still be for any kids practicing at this field when there is severe weather. Any thoughts about including a storm shelter?

Please choose this option? This is a win, win for everyone.

This is my least preferred option due to the disruption (elimination) of garden plots and the overall cost. I currently bike to my garden plot. If I lost my plot at West Street, it would not be feasible to bike and I would very likely discontinue my participation in this program, the only park district program in which I currently participate.

Has the quality of this soil been evaluated for food/plant growth? How many gardeners are convenient to the West Street plots? Have you considered the fact that a large number of gardeners (senior citizens) are in fixed income brackets and incur quite an expense traveling to/from gardens – relocation would increase this expense?

No! The park district needs to serve all the residents. The gardeners deserve to have these plots maintained where they are now. If you need to add some south fine, but don't subtract.

I appreciate tat this addresses the long-term needs of the community. Especially from the standpoint of the garden plots. I would hope that the gardeners would be given demographic preference to site location. However, I would welcome the opportunity to see community garden plots throughout the city.

It seems like this is the best option. A “win” Win”. More plots would be available throughout Naperville. Investing in central long-term by developing the athletic fields at the garden plots.

I feel this is the best option for this community as a whole. The need for playing fields is critical for the high school and youth programs.

Great option – makes the most sense and all parties would benefit. The field space is greatly needed by our kids. More garden plots on the south side of town would benefit more resident.

As a parent, I ferry my children to their extra curricular activities wherever they may be. I do not want to displace the gardeners. In addition, I find the expense of this option and the redevelopment of plots elsewhere least attractive. If the park district wants to provide gardening in other locations agreed but don't displace the existing ones.

Best and safest option for students. As long as funding is available, this is the best option for all. Central gains 1 field overall and only some garden plots are moved. More people use the athletic fields at Central than use the garden plots. This is the best long-term option.

As a taxpayer realizing that lacrosse will be coming – financially it makes sense to spend the \$ up front instead of having the park district spend \$28K and school district spending \$30 plus K per year indefinitely. By the way I do not have a plot nor do I have a child that will be affected by these fields.

With four generations of my family living in this town, I can't emphasis enough how important the school community is/was for my family. Just doesn't make sense to bus athletes away from the school. We can't move the school. Families move here for our schools. Just makes sense to keep our athletes on/near campus. Safety, cost and time.

Most logical solution. Open garden plots to the entire community. Need more field space near the high school. Safety/traffic best served.

I understand having school practices near their school, however, there is Centennial park that can be used instead of using buses. Many, many senior citizens use the garden plots as their livelihood. If you move the plots they will not be able to garden. Hidden costs show me the costs, too expensive to move garden plots.

Internet Form

Definitely the best option. Most cost efficient and serves long-term planning purposes best.

The only logical option is this one. To relocate the garden plots is not unreasonable. The students should be close to their school.

This seems to be the most logical choice. It displaces the least amount of individuals.

2. Option II:

Move teams onto the third football field at Knoch Park, currently used by youth football leagues.

Comments / Questions / Preferences:

10/29/08

Need most cost info, need to see school sports schedule.

No

Best option.

This makes most sense to me, students are not being bussed all over town, no need to move any gardeners, plus: add the planned (option 1) plots to the south side, and transition newer gardeners to the south side with long-term plans of eliminating north side plots.

Okay

The “youth” football player is happy to play anywhere! This would probably also be safer for the kids.

This option would be the most practical as far as cost and making the most use of space – I would prefer this space (Knoch Park) no longer be used for 4th of July and Ribfest.

Please consider moving the teams onto the third football Knoch Park. Also consider building up and building 1 or 2 parking garages to free up some of the flat parking areas. Youth football can play at any field since they come from all over Naperville.

Keep the garden plots as is and option of moving leaves to other areas.

Youth football leagues only use 2 hours of fields on Saturday, you should move teams.

11/10/08

This is the option I prefer. The cost avoidance of \$750K is substantial. This needs to be highly considered.

Keep the students as close as possible to the campus for athletic uses. Garden plots should be located all over Naperville in parks. Soils can be made productive every where in our area.

Youth football transportation is by parents. Easier for those teams to be moved than employing buses for high school kids.

Like this option best! Win/win for all. The purpose of a park is to be used. There are plenty of open space and parks that are not being used. At least Knoch Park is being utilized.

Use the land that you have! Lower cost without (much) displacement.

Relocate the youth teams to another location. West Street is too congested on weekends. Let the high school use Knoch Park. There are plenty of other parks for the youth teams to use.

If option I is not feasible, I would find this option as a reasonable alternative.

I fear this is not a long-term solution. Knoch Park will get over used and another solution in 5 years.

Doesn't deal with field needs for band, sports and other high school use.

This doesn't address the Lacrosse teams both boys and girls.

Does not resolve the issue.

Students would not need to be transported to off-site locations.

I think that we would be saving moving a few hundred garden plots at a cost of moving thousands of youth athletes or possibly shutting down or capping a youth program.

This option's a possibility, certainly the most affordable. The kids would still be within walking distance of the school. I do fear the impact it would have on our youth sports programs in town, however. Youth sports are a huge, important part of growing up. Unfortunately, this option seems like a short-term solution.

I think it would be bad to displace the youth teams, but this would be better than moving the teams.

Not a bad option but doesn't allow for addition of lacrosse or a sanctioned sport. Also worry about safety of fields from increased use.

Keep the garden plots. Children and parents and grandparents should garden together and Naperville should be proud of our commitment.

Doesn't answer the question of where lacrosse will go.

If it is agreed by all that the public comes to Community Engagement Meetings to speak and be heard, please do a better job of making that possible. The speaker's use of the microphone improved greatly when audience members spoke up. Don't put a possibly already contentious audience in the position of helping public speakers (criticizing) they will hear.

Don't like this option. Unfair to the youth programs who will have to move 100's and 100's of kids and the families that watch them every weekend better to move the garden plots.

Concerned about fields being over used. Not sure that would meet space needs consequently there are 3 levels of boys lacrosse (90+ players) and 2 of the games.

This would displace too many youth athletic programs. Also, it does not address the needs of spring sports teams (lacrosse – men's and women's – 200 athletes). This is an interim rather than long-term solution.

Not acceptable, nightly programs, fields.

This option does not address any off-site proposals or future needs.

It could work but it isn't long-term solution.

It maybe helpful for us as gardeners to be aware that you concerns are genuine, but it is unreasonable to expect us to be in a position to critically evaluate these other options (II-IV). We do not have the information needed and many of us are just not expert in such analysis and decision making. One thing is obvious. The appetite for space for competitive sport purposes is insatiable. You would

probably also want to take over the south garden area in a matter of time. Now is the time for you, District 203, to bite the bullet and make provisions for current and future needs instead of leaning on the park district to confiscate the present garden space which has become a valuable community heritage.

A past parent and now a gardener – I would think that those gardeners from the south would want to use the south area. No one wants the area way south and west. I understand parents concerns and I have loved gardening. Couldn't track teams run to another location?

Option 2 is the only option.

This is a stop gap only that probably inconveniences the most families and may limit the number of kids that are able to play youth football.

Still short on field space. Plus it displaces the youth football participants.

I think the youth leagues can find practice fields if they are forced to.

The students will not have to be bused.

Maybe a good option.

This is an acceptable solution.

NCHS needs more field space; Naper Park needs more field space; other athletic organizations who use the fields need more space/fields.

We, the public, were led to believe new synthetic turf at the existing stadium would alleviate all field concerns. If the site planner recognized the need pre-referendum then why wasn't it brought to the publics attention? The sanctioning of lacrosse and football practice are not new revelations or make things justifiable. The school district, just like it's not tolerated within the student body, should not be bullying the garden plotters into moving. Seems as if maybe their homework was not done properly and now the spin is on. The park district has taken enough cheap shots in the past few years and should stand tall on this one. Both of your reputations are tarnished enough aren't they?

11/12/08

This would be my second choice. YFL teams are used to traveling to offsite facilities.

This is better than 1 as you don't have to move garden plots.

Not enough space for the schools needs and those fields are already overly used.

Second best choice – youth impacted negatively.

This seems double. Youth football certainly could be given land at Arrowhead, Wil-O-Way by re school district, since (this is playing near the school) what D-203 seems to want. Question: Why can't district 203 soccer fields be more fully utilized? They are often vacant of activity.

Yes good option. There are plenty of parks with large grass areas in this town that are not being used. Move St. Raphael and youth sports to them because they (we) already drive all over town. Ex: Park on Chicago Avenue by assisted living home. That park is NEVER used. I live there.

We would still need to find space for discus and lacrosse teams leaving them without space. It would be hard to practice on worn-down fields and would require more work.

If this is the “cheapest” solution then consider it. There appears to be other adequate space for the youth football leagues.

I'm for leaving the garden plots as is. The land is conditioned and centrally located. We do so much for the kids in this town which is great, but we also have to take care of our seniors. We already took away the long running Last Fling car show to expand the kids area. Much of the Fling is already geared for kids and not much for seniors. Youth leagues seem to make the most sense to move since they are already traveling to get to a field at Knoch Park.

No

This may increase wear to these fields and cause the fields to close.

This seems to be the better choice at this time. Garden plot is currently the only “green movement”. We need a clearer comparison of all 4 options. The same way so that we can compare it on the same level. The garden plot also acts as a buffer of safety for residence in the Hobson West area. As Edward Hospital acts as a buffer for the neighborhood to Highland #3.

Safety concerns are solved with this option.

Cheapest one.

Not good this misplaces all feeder leagues into our schools and sports programs. That is a major interruption. We are short of fields. These feeder leagues help keep our kids out of trouble.

Move other programs (NYFL, St. Raphael). Offsite – an inconvenience to hundreds of children and families. Field damage also precludes this option.

Please, use our common sense and approve option 1. Thank you.

You are forgetting that while some people live on the south they may drive past the garden plots on their way home to gather produce for dinner. Locating plots in the south will not allow this convenience.

Please stay with option two. It's the best and most favored.

This said – having plots south would be a benefit. Current gardeners should not be forcibly displaced just to put in another athletic field.

This is the most reasonable option.

No – the amount of Naperville citizens this displaces is way too many for the benefit of just the high school teams. The Mitchell property should never have limits on who can use the land – it should be open to all community members, not just the high school. 1,000's of kids and families versus a hundred high school kids.

This option does not allow for future needs of lacrosse teams. It also causes a domino effect of moving all youth football teams around town and may even cause those program to limit youth participation due to lack of space.

This would seem to be the optimal option, as it involves the least disruption to gardeners and district 203. It would seem that space can be found elsewhere

within Naperville, either existing or in undeveloped park district space, for youth football.

There is never a perfect solution. As the least expensive, this is a better answer than I or III in these difficult times.

This would just save other problems at other locations.

This option or option IV is my preferred choices. Develop Royce/Nike fields for use by the leagues.

Over usage of fields is a big safety concern. Most, if not all, school and park fields are used by soccer, baseball, etc. already. I can't see that youth teams could easily be moved elsewhere.

What happens to youth football! Once again let's look at the cost.

Very disruptive. Largest domino effect. Least desirable.

Move the youth football teams to other 203 and 204 schools. How much is St. Raphael's paying the park district to use their land. Too many other options need to be looked at before you make a decision!

Internet Form

No responses.

3. Option III:

Move one or more Naperville Central football teams and other teams off campus to District 203 or Park District sites, and/or to lease space.

Comments / Questions / Preferences:

10/29/08

More cost info.

Since this option does require bussing, why even consider it?

This is a good option, inexpensive

Okay, bus students or make gardeners travel – what is the difference. Move trainer and students or 300 gardeners?

Eventually this will probably be needed as school population increases.

Utilize land that District #203 owns.

Prairie site is first choice, bus students is cheaper than 100 people driving to a remote site. District 203 should fully fund all costs should there be any changes.

You should look into it.

11/10/08

This will have to be an alternative in the future. Even if we (Dist. 203) are allowed to take over part of the garden plots we will still need extra space.

Park district and St. Raphael teams are used to playing at various locations so why not let them play/practice at Will-O-Way. Prairie etc.

Please do NOT bus our athletes.

I am opposed to busing due to time constraints to the students. Leasing land is a short-term solution that can change and leave athletes and the school without land.

This option is not beneficial to the students which should be our most important concern.

Increased cost and safety issues increased lost to athletic fees? They are already very high.

Have 203 use their own land.

I am against moving the high school athletes and adding time to their day.

I don't like the idea of bussing the kids to different areas of town. Aside from the inconvenience of it, it will also mean our kids will be getting home even later from practice (leaving less time for homework).

I don't like the idea of bussing kids to practice. They already get home late. Also, don't like the idea of not being close to school and training facilities, also worried about storms and shelter.

Makes absolutely no sense to bus students on a daily basis. Cost/time prohibitive – inconvenience aside, it's a logistical and practical nightmare.

A student leaves the house at 6:30 a.m. and returns 6:30 p.m. when engaged in sports – this will lengthen the day if bussing to and from is added to practice times. If lease from all Saints – will they eventually want their land back?

And 3 cheers for repeating the question that could not be heard – Brad, good job. And for having the courage to guide people to be mindful of their applause – Alan! Good job!

Ridiculous idea spreading NCHS sports all over town. It's like our kids are homeless and they might as well play club sports then.

A disadvantage not mentioned – is the time factor. Practices would be later or the kids would be getting home too late.

This option seems so contrary to the concept of gardening – it would require unnecessary use of natural resources and will add to air pollution. Kids would spend far too much time out of their already packed days. Also, the various schools already have school and park district sponsored programs as well as YMCA after school care.

Unacceptable!

Our athletes will be the losers in this scenario.

This option wouldn't work.

This can NOT be an option. Unsafe, most risk to kids, time issues for kids, impacts academics.

Not appropriate! You need to keep the students at or near the high school when participating in athletic events.

Why is bussing kids considered unsafe? Contrary to what one man said, bussing is less pollution because the alternative is for 250 individual gardeners to drive separate cars to DuPage River Park location. Even at the estimated

“224,000/gr. to bus, you could do that for 10 years with the \$250,000 to relocate gardens.

Minimize busing.

Some of these parks are 5 minutes away and available.

If busing is a safety concern – why is it being currently used the school district.

Acceptable option.

All Saints academy, nest to Mason Sabeka on Aurora is about as far as the garden plots. You can walk there from Naperville Central. This would be perhaps the lowest cost to the community. We have over 1200 houses for sale, and a tax short fall for Naperville. The school system may want to consider this ¾ million dollar expense cure now – wait until our economy improves is my consideration.

We garden people do not need a picnic shelter! We actually take produce home quickly to refrigerate and as for ourselves we hop into the shower.

11/12/08

Not acceptable. Many gardeners currently travel to the plots and moving a portion of the plots to the south would make their travel easier. Busing many athletes, coaches and trainers and equipment would be an overwhelming endeavor.

This is a good alternative. It's less expensive. Garden plots would not have to be moved. We all survived in an era where you didn't have so many sports offered. The garden plots have been here a long time.

I think transporting students daily to off campus fields is irresponsible. This option makes the students days longer, uses gasoline, creating more pollution, and leaves our athletes in danger if bad weather arises. More athletic trainers will have to be hired to go to each site!

Bad choice.

Nothing wrong with this, but why not do a combination of many youth sports and, in the short-term it would be fair to bus re students. Busing if begun, can simply be stopped. Parking over re garden plots (so to speak) can not be undone.

Look at leased space. Why not look at buying areas around the school – houses that would be torn down.

It would be very hard to bus the students to a different location, this adds time and money. You would also need a trainer there.

Too much liability/cost/time in busing.

Totally opposed to moving kids any more than necessary – safety/traffic, fuel costs, time of transport taking away homework and family time.

No

I am concerned about the safety of the students.

Lease land from All Saints.

No!! Do not move my children, not safe, lawsuit waiting to happen not only to school, to the city and park district as well. If a whole bus gets into trouble, big problems.

Unacceptable.

No The neighborhood parks serve the multitude of Naperville residents, in spring and fall alone, Wil-O-Way offers practice/play space for more than 30-40 kids a night, 5 plus days a week equals over 150 kids per season versus the sports team of only approximately 20-40. Not a fair use of property within the community in mind.

No an option due to the need to bus kids to an offsite practice fields. Problems with busing student-athletes include: 1) what happens to kids who are tutored after school or need treatment in the training room? Do they miss practice because the bus left? 2) It extends the kids practices times by at least an hour. 3) It puts additional responsibilities on coaches who may just decide it's not worth it. That could severely jeopardize the Redhawk programs.

This can work, but not the best solution.

No!! Garden plots are not profitable and are funded by the taxpayers. Leased land is not a permanent solution to Central High School infra structure deficit.

No

After option 1, this is not desired.

Busing students to practice is not a good or safe option. Athletes should practice near the school. There is a problem with students staying after school for help and getting to practice late and students leaving practice early.

Don't want to pay the expense year-in, year-out.

No

Not a good long-term solution.

Locate all open fields to move youth. We are not saying to eliminate but look at Nike Park or near DuPage River.

Ridiculous

Internet Form

No – should not be bused away from school.

4. **Option IV:**
Create athletic fields at DuPage River Park or Nike Park for use by football and lacrosse teams. (Note: DuPage River Park is owned by the City and lease to the Naperville Park District)

Comments / Questions / Preferences:

10/29/08

More cost info, should consider expanding to other areas

This option seems to cause less disruption for everyone concerned; I think it's most feasible.

Not as good as Option 3, but good.

Fields seem more suited for ball playing than gardening.

Probably don't need Nike Park if it is very expensive to upgrade. We need all the garden plots – right where they are!

It is not necessary to go as far as DuPage River Park or Nike Park. With the purchase of the land between the Hobson Ponds there is space for fields over there. Also Gartner Park could provide space. What about the flat land near Rotary Hill?

This may be a good solution.

11/10/08

Not at all desirable.

Do not believe teams should not be moved to DuPage River – especially football.

Please do NOT bus our athletes.

Development of these areas would take too much time and Nike may not even be an option. Parking there is also very bad.

Should not be an option at all.

Increased cost and safety issues increased lost to athletic fees? They are already very high.

Yes, least desirable of option II, III & IV.

I am against moving the high school athletes and adding time to their day.

I don't like the idea of bussing the kids to different areas of town. Aside from the inconvenience of it, it will also mean our kids will be getting home even later from practice (leaving less time for homework).

I don't like the idea of busing kids to practice. They already get home late. Also, don't like the idea of not being close to school and training facilities, also worried about storms and shelter. I feel it's easier for people to garden other places than it is for kids to practice far away.

Makes absolutely no sense to bus students on a daily basis. Cost/time prohibitive – inconvenience aside, it's a logistical and practical nightmare.

This is just dumb! Leasing new land is only a temporary fix.

Ridiculous idea spreading NCHS sports all over town. It's like our kids are homeless and they might as well play club sports then.

These fields are just too far away.

Absolutely not.

Unacceptable.

We become the step child of all Naperville high schools, we will lose participation, put our kids at risk and take away valuable time that they don't have to lose.

This is an option with potential, but the North lacrosse team already practices here as well as many other teams.

This can NOT be an option. Unsafe, most risk to kids, time issues for kids, impacts academics.

Not appropriate! You need to keep the students at or near the high school when participating in athletic events.

It doesn't take any more time for 203 athletes to travel to DuPage River Park than it does for the adults. Whose time is more valuable?

Minimize busing.

Best long-term option.

This is the best long-term solution. The safety of the students is not an issue – it can easily be assured.

11/12/08

No, not acceptable. Many gardeners currently travel to the plots and moving a portion of the plots to the south would make their travel easier. Busing many athletes, coaches and trainers and equipment would be an overwhelming endeavor.

I think transporting students daily to off campus fields is irresponsible. This option makes the students days longer, uses gasoline, creating more pollution, and leaves our athletes in danger if bad weather arises. More athletic trainers will have to be hired to go to each site!

Bad location.

The park district has just purchased acreage at Nike Park, could develop DuPage River and will clearly not leave these areas unused regardless of whether it is Naperville Central playing on these fields or the community using it for park district programs, youth football, or another as of yet unforeseen recreational purposes.

Absolutely bad choice this option put our children at lowest priority, our children are our future their safety is our paramount concern, please veto this option in terms of our children's safety.

As a citizen and parent I find this option the most unacceptable. Naperville has always been praised for its family life and healthy programs for its children. This option seems to contradict this.

Why not, great for youth sports.

No need to spend money to replace plots elsewhere when they are already there. More room for athletic fields in the future at DuPage River Park or Nike Park. Keep the garden plots in a convenient location.

You would need to create new fields that might not be ready in time. Again, the students would have to be bused over to the new fields.

Too much liability/cost/time in busing.

This is by far the best solution. Hopefully you can make it work.

No

This option concerns me from the safety of the students and the additional time it would take.

No – Do not move my children, not safe, lawsuit waiting to happen not only to school, to the city and park district as well. If a whole bus gets into trouble, big problems.

Unacceptable

Yes – You are not uprooting anyone of the hundreds that currently use the properties. Maybe those families that live near there would appreciate their kids practicing closer to home – it's only fair with the current crazy boundaries of the district.

Not an option.

If necessary, who not develop these spaces for youth football?

This option would allow future expansion for school sports – which is quite likely to become an issue in the near future.

This is not the first time students have been transported to other sites because of lack of space or facilities. There is no reason this cannot be done again.

No! Travel \$. Many people impacted versus a few gardeners.

No

Move the league games to other locations and the high school use these fields at Knoch Park.

Again, busing students is not practical.

Don't want to pay the expense year-in, year-out.

No

Too far for me to drive and garden. Safety concerns – kids are safer on the bus then crossing West Street and Hillside.

I don't think busing children in Naperville is such a bad thing. The safety issue is over-blown! We need "balance" in the community not always centered around children.

Ridiculous, there is a safety issue. What if a storm approaches, where are the students/staff to seek cover?

I think this is best option.

Internet Form

No – should not be bused.

5. Participants who completed the comment sheets were asked to indicate which option they supported. Below is a summary of the responses.

Option I:	67	64%
Option II:	21	20%
Option III:	4	4%
Option IV:	<u>12</u>	12%
Total*:	104	

*Note: Options were not selected on all of the comment forms received.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS:

Do not have enough info to choose at this point, except I do not want option 1.

I wish the city would buy Mayneland Farm at Mill and Bauer and continue to farm this fantastic farm property; I would pay extra to farm there.

Bring Mayneland Farm, use for fields and garden plots.

None of the above needs better options.

Option III future intent.

Please check number of driving people to garden plots. If large numbers drive then moving is right direction.

It seems that options 2, 3 and 4 are just band aids – we would be back here in a few years.

Option I without a doubt.

Possibly spread the garden plots throughout the community then move people, could make use of plots.

That property is not being used 12 months out of the year. It sits there not used fall, winter and early spring.

Option 1: Terrible option - a blow to the community and community spirit. Options II, III and IV - need careful analysis by knowledgeable persons.

Meeting was very well run! Those in charge seemed very neutral – good.

Why is it that the money was saved for the football team and not the poms? Better yet wasn't it used for the Writing Center? Why wasn't the cash outlay determined from whom it would come from in advance? Poor planning. My husband and I agree due to security (human and animal) that it is unwise to move the garden plots from their present location. Once again, where are the deer going to be relocated – the herd that ranges from 53rd to 95th street. Either predator will decimate a garden plus many other factors.

As a resident of district 204 I am not for a solution that spends park district dollars solely to satisfy district 203 needs. District 203 has many options 1) moving administration building 2) moving bus lot at North 3) building parking deck at Central 4) lease land 5) bus students. That all would cost it dollars and that is why I think they are pressuring the park district for take over for the garden land. The \$500,000 they are offering would get them off cheaply. This said – having plots south would be a benefit. Current gardeners should not be forcibly displaced just to put in another athletic field.

I believe we need a better, more accurate cost analysis.

What about putting artificial turf on the soccer fields on the corner of West and Oswego?

Make NCUSD figure it out without affecting others along with costing no money like they said they would. P.S. I do not garden!

Don't know until questions are answered!