

**AM 2002-
Page 2**

1 agree to maintain the ball fields and accessory facilities once built; and the League have priority
2 scheduling of the fields as allowed by municipal codes and regulations.
3

4 Finally, applicable Municipal codes and regulations shall govern site selection, construction,
5 and use of the ball fields under this resolution. This resolution requires the Mayor to prepare and
6 submit to the Assembly such ordinances and resolutions, including appropriations measures,
7 necessary to implement the resolution.
8

9 **Alternatives**

10
11 The Mayor has proposed AO 2002-29 which would place a separate bond proposition in the
12 amount of \$4,500,000 before the voters in the April, 2002 election. If approved, the bonds would be
13 used to purchase several private parcels located on the South side of Lore road east of Sandlewood
14 Place and North of East 79th Avenue offered to the Municipality by J&L Properties. J&L would build
15 out the fields and all necessary improvements, providing the League a "turnkey" facility at no cost
16 to the League by the summer of 2004. Although recommended by the Mayor and preferred by the
17 League, this option has several disadvantages. First, there is some doubt voters will approve this
18 relatively expensive solution. According to Land Design North, "it is questionable whether voters
19 area-wide would support a bond to acquire needed lands in the Abbott Loop area." LDN report, p.
20 6. "A bond in April, according to League official David Manzer, "is a very risky proposition. Last
21 year's Parks bond passed only after a recount and we didn't even know the results until May. This
22 year's Parks bond is the largest in many years and contains many much needed items. Will the
23 voters, in much tougher economic times this year than last year, approve the acquisition of a 2.6
24 million dollar piece of private property for a park. . .?" See, David S. Manzer E-Mail dated December
25 6, 2001.
26

27 Secondly, making an expensive "turnkey" recreational facility available to a private group with
28 no commensurate contribution by that group to its acquisition or construction raises troubling
29 questions over equal treatment to other deserving private recreational groups who have similar
30 facility needs. Finally, outright purchase of private lands for this purpose removes those properties
31 from the tax rolls, thereby reducing the Municipal tax base and further burdening taxpayers who will,
32 of course, have to repay the \$4,500,000 in bonds sold to acquire the site and build the new fields.
33

34 If voters do not approve the \$4,500,000 in bonds proposed by the Mayor, the Mayor would
35 "link" that action to an automatic approval of an amendment to the Bicentennial Park Plan which
36 would allow construction of the four fields in that park. The Mayor's "fallback" position is attractive
37 to some because it ends the controversy surrounding location of the fields and paves the way for
38 more intensive development of Bicentennial Park. On the other hand, the Mayor's
39 "fallback" proposal does not address the considerable costs of building out the new fields in
40 Bicentennial Park. Estimated to cost between \$1.5-2.0M, the new fields and related community park
41 facilities do not appear in currently funded capital or operating budgets. Potentially, only \$600,000
42 is available in "leftover" parks bonds for this purpose, contingent on project design and a legislative
43 finding by the Assembly. Correspondence between Mr. Campbell and Assemblymember Tesche
44 (attached) confirm those facts. Unless the Simonian Little League is prepared to contribute in
45 excess of \$1.0M to build the fields in Bicentennial Park or the Mayor can find additional funding for
46 that purpose, the alternative of simply approving an amendment to the Bicentennial Park Plan is
47 unrealistic and ill-conceived.