



ADA Transition Plan

Sycamore Park District

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 3

All Site Conclusions and Recommendations from Recreation Access Consultants 6

Assumptions for Plan of Action 20

Framework of Plan 21

Review of Plan: Public Input 21

Timeline for Plan 22

Budget and Cash Flow for Plan 23

Appendices:

- Cover Letter from Recreation Accessibility Consultants, LLC
- Site-by-Site Details from Audit



Introduction

In 2011, Sycamore Park District (SPD) retained the professional consulting firm of Recreation Access Consultants (RAC) to conduct a complete audit of its facilities to provide the district with a useable list of needs to make SPD's services accessible. The final results of those audits were presented to the Board and Staff in May 2011. At that time, the district was in transition, itself, from one Executive Director to another, and was left to have its incoming Executive Director to develop the final transition plan for the district. Upon arriving at SPD, the Executive Director began that work, and the final result is this Transition Plan.

Authority

Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 USC 12131) prohibits the more than 86,000 units of local government such as the Sycamore Park District, from discrimination on the basis of disability in the delivery of programs and services. The definition of programs and services is broad and includes public parks and recreation operations, such as the many unique opportunities made available for the enjoyment of your registrants by the District.

The Department of Justice issued an implementing regulation for title II, effective on January 26, 1992. That regulation is integral to this audit and can be found at 28 CFR Part 35. That was amended with a regulation published September 14, 2010 in the Federal Register.

Title II requirements that come into play at the District include:

- section 35.105 self-evaluation
- the section 35.133 maintenance requirement
- the section 35.150 program access test regarding existing sites, and
- the section 35.163 requirements regarding building signage.

Additionally, Illinois Accessibility Code requirements where they are more stringent than the ADA requirements have been factored into this report.

Final and Enforceable Regulations...and Final Guidelines

Regarding recreation facility design, two sets of federal guidelines were applied to the Sycamore Park District access audit. One is the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines, or ADAAG. Published by the US Department of Justice (DOJ) on July 26, 1991 as Appendix A to 28 CFR Part 36, this final and enforceable regulation is now known as the 1991 Standards. It adequately addresses entries, showers, curb cuts, doors, service counters, ramps, decks, and other typical building elements.

On September 14, 2010 the DOJ published the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. As these Standards were already available as a final guideline, and were used as a guide in the access audit. It addresses many recreation environments.

The 2010 Standards were developed by the US Access Board and include requirements for playgrounds, fishing areas, boating areas, swimming pools, fitness centers, golf courses, and sports courts and fields. The Access Board, a federal agency, develops all access guidelines.

Approach and Analysis

Section 35.150 of the DOJ regulation implementing the ADA makes it clear that not necessarily every facility or site of the same type must be made accessible. This plan interprets this DOJ requirement to mean that with redundant sites, such as playgrounds, the District has some flexibility in determining which site it will make accessible. However, for unique sites, such as the Sycamore Golf Course, the District has virtually no choice with regard to which site it will make accessible, as there is only one such site. Where we know the District plans work at certain sites, we have tried to incorporate that as well. Lastly, **if we take no action in this plan to make certain facilities accessible because others will be [or already are], we must remember that when we do complete renovation of a previously inaccessible site, it must be made accessible. An example of this is the WPA Main Shelter.**

An additional issue is whether a building has been altered since 1992 (or 1985 under Illinois law), and if a recreation site such as a playground has been altered or built new since 2000. If so, there is little flexibility in how access requirements are applied to that site.

Settlement agreements by federal agencies (Justice, Interior, and Education) have adhered to what are now the 2010 Standards. While these are effective for new construction on March 15, 2012, the 2010 Standards are to be used in evaluating recreation sites now in existence.

Audit/Transition Plan Format

The audit included an examination of 22 facilities or parks. Each facility or park has its own section in Recreation Access Consultant's (RAC's) final report to the park district, and staff has reviewed these to make its final recommendations. Our Conclusion section 23 is found, appropriately, at the end of the site reports.

Title II Program Access

As mentioned above, the title II program access test in 35.150(b) gives the District great flexibility in making existing facilities and sites ***that have similar features*** accessible. For example, 16 playgrounds were counted. Not all of those playgrounds must be accessible.

The program access test imposes a burden on the District to make the “program of playgrounds” accessible with relatively similar ease to all District residents.

Our goal was then to have at least 1 of every 3 playgrounds or tot lots accessible, or able to be made accessible. Here is a summary of the results.

There are 16 playgrounds for children. We believe 6 are accessible. In addition, we believe 2 more could be made accessible with relative ease. The District could leave the remaining 8 sites “as is” and inaccessible. This ***exceeds*** the ratio we recommend of 1 of every 3 similar sites.

We applied this concept to ball fields, athletic fields, basketball courts, fishing and shelters. For these environments we treated the District as a whole. Our recommendations, we believe, make the “programs” at playgrounds, ball fields, athletic fields, basketball, fishing, and shelters accessible to residents.

Conclusion

The final reports by our consultant, RAC, identify, we believe, every access deficit at the sites, as required by section 35.105 of title II. We have, in our approach to program access, made recommendations so that not every access deficit needs to be corrected. **Their recommendations are flexible enough that later modifications, should your own plans change, can easily occur. Staff has exercised this flexibility in putting together its final recommendations.**

RAC noted in their report that “the Sycamore Park District has shown a commitment to access for people with disabilities.”

All Site Conclusions and Recommendations from RAC

Background

There are 705 access deficits identified in the 22 site reports. That is what title II of the ADA regulation requires. For every problem, a solution must be identified.

RAC made the following findings, from which staff have made a modified recommendation for a Transition Plan at the end of this report:

As discussed in the prior section, the District does ***not necessarily have to make every site accessible***. It ***does*** have to make every program it conducts within its sites accessible.

We have attempted to identify some broad solutions, such as the refreshing of all accessible parking, as a way to address issues identified in the 22 site reports, and as a way for the District to better manage compliance. This approach also gives the District flexibility within its compliance efforts to move resources so that they are applied with optimal impact.

This is process is also about accountability. The adjustments to door closers, eliminating changes in level, and other recommended actions are ineffective if not maintained over time by District employees. We recommend the following to facilitate review:

In coming up with this Transition Plan, staff have:

- 1. Read the final report cover letter.*** It describes the concepts and requirements invoked throughout the RAC Audit.
- 2. Read this Conclusion section of the RAC Audit.*** This is a big picture review of the issues and solutions recommend.
- 3. Read the 22 site reports.*** Including the report for each site, the photo gallery, and the checklists.
- 4. Applied our knowledge of the sites and staffs' expertise.*** In doing this we see more logical groupings of work. We know Sycamore Park District sites better than RAC does. We have blended in what we know with what was recommended in RAC's report. There is always another way to solve an access problem...perhaps you'll be the one to see that solution.

Common Issues

In the evaluation, some common issues arose. These included the way maintenance affects accessibility to playground surfaces used. The common issues are also "big picture" items for the District and incorporate many of the specific site recommendations.

Maintenance

The District uses a conscientious staff to maintain its facilities and sites. However, over time, every facility and site yields to wear and tear. The recommendations below describe ways in which attention to maintenance can specifically address some access deficits.

1. **Provide training** to maintenance staff regarding the features of an accessible route and how to ensure that it remains unobstructed and that park amenities (such as garbage cans or signs) are placed adjacent to the accessible route.
2. **Provide training** to recreation staff regarding the features of an accessible route and how to ensure that it remains unobstructed.
3. **Purchase some new tools.** The District should have enough battery-powered digital levels, and tools to measure pounds of force for doors, to equip some staff for occasional spot-checks. A great website for gauges is:

<http://www.technologylk.com/crl-door-pressure-gauge-lk-HMC035.htm?src=froogle>.

Changes in Level and Gaps

The routes and sidewalks that make up the District's network of accessible routes are in fair condition. Wear and tear, settling, weather, and other factors combine to cause changes in level and gaps along portions of those accessible routes, making that portion noncompliant and a barrier to many customers with physical and sensory disabilities.

Removing changes in level and gaps has a significant universal design benefit too, as more people with all types of conditions can more easily use District routes...staff pushing carts of supplies, parents with kids in strollers, and people using an assistive device such as a wheelchair, Segway, or walker.

4. **Eliminate changes in level** in 2012 or 2013. Using the rationale that the most severe changes in level are the greatest barriers to access, make changes in level of greater than .75" the highest priority. Make changes in level of between .5" and .75" the second priority. Make beveling of changes in level of .25" to .5" the third priority.
5. **Add** change in level of more than .25", and gap checks of greater than .5", **to park maintenance safety checklists** in 2011 if not sooner. This will help identify and correct these problems before they expand. Make pre-measured shims and distribute to employees for their use and ease of measurement.
6. **Add inspections for gaps** of greater than .5" **to park maintenance safetychecklists**. Identify and fill these gaps before they expand. **In the alternative, consider a resurfacing of segments of asphalt route** which have deteriorated.

7. **Adopt** a policy about the use of other Electronic Personal Assistive Mobility Devices (EPAMDs) in District facilities and at District sites, and promote that policy to the general public. Every day, more people with limited physical mobility start to use a Segway or similar machines.

Obstructed Accessible Routes

Employees **may** see an accessible route as an empty 36" wide space in which a potted plant or garbage can is a perfect fit. However, that blocks or obstructs the accessible route

8. **Provide training to park maintenance, recreation, and administration staffs** regarding maintenance of accessible routes in parks and in recreation facilities.

Employee Work Areas

The District employs well-qualified and skilled people on a full time basis, making parks and recreation services available to Sycamore Park District residents. It also employs many more on a part-time or seasonal basis.

The District likely already has employees with disabilities and in the future, will have **more** employees with disabilities, in all categories...full time, seasonal, and regular part time.

It is important to address access to work areas, and both the title II regulation and the work of the Access Board do so. In section 203.9 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design, the treatment of employee areas is made clear.

Generally, a person with a disability should be able to **approach**, **enter**, and **exit** the work area. This is addressed by requirements for accessible routes and accessible means of egress. Other factors are door width, and threshold changes in level.

Excluded from this exception are several types of common spaces in employee areas. Spaces such as the ones below must meet the access guidelines as they are excluded from the definition of employee-only areas:

- corridors
- toilet rooms
- kitchenettes for employee dining use, and
- break rooms

In short, the key issues are the accessible route, changes in level, doors and entries, and maneuvering space once within the work area. This approach is effective so long as when the District hires an employee with disabilities, or a current employee acquires a disability, it will remove architectural barriers in work areas or make other accommodations.

The two recommendations below are particularly important in some of the older infrastructure sites owned by the District such as the Community Center.

9. **Address accessibility in the District personnel policies**, and note that, upon request by an employee, the District will make reasonable accommodations, which **may** include the removal of architectural barriers in work spaces.
10. **Require new construction, and alterations or additions** that include employee work areas to be designed and constructed so they are compliant with the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design and the Illinois Accessibility Code.

Accessible Parking

The District maintains approximately 258 standard parking spaces at facilities, and 16 more that are designated as accessible stalls. Illinois requirements here are more stringent than federal requirements. In correcting or refreshing its accessible stalls, the District should address all of them at once to eliminate inconsistencies and come into compliance.

11. **Create a parking stall template.** A suggested template is below.

Parking Stall Dimensions

Stalls must be a minimum of 8' wide. An adjacent access aisle must also be a minimum of 8' wide. An acceptable **alternative** design is an 11' stall with an adjacent 5' access aisle.

The access aisle must be diagonally striped with high quality yellow paint.

Signs must be mounted on posts not farther than 5' from the head of the stall. The collection of signs must include the US Department of Transportation R7-8 standard sign (the blue icon in a wheelchair). Below that must be the fine sign. The statewide fine is \$250. Unless the City of Sycamore has adopted a higher fine by ordinance, the sign must note the \$250 fine.

Federal settlement agreements in Illinois require a third sign, on at least one stall, that says VAN ACCESSIBLE. The Illinois Accessibility Code does not include this requirement but we believe it is required.

This belief was reinforced recently by a US Department of Justice settlement with St. Clair County in Illinois, where the settlement required the addition of "van accessible" signs.

Finally, the bottom edge of the lowest sign is a minimum of 48" above the finished grade. We recommend 60" so it cannot be obstructed by a parked auto.

We suggest that the signpost be located at the head of the accessible stall and that the curb cut and detectable warning run the distance of the access aisle.

Perhaps the most common error we see in accessible parking stalls and access aisles is the slope. The Illinois Accessibility Code limits the slope to not more than 2% in any direction. This is a challenging requirement that can take considerable effort to meet.

Connection to the Accessible Route

The access aisles should connect to an accessible route. The maximum running slope for the accessible route is 5%, and to account for heaving and settling, we recommend 4%.

The maximum cross slope is 2%. Do be certain to use compliant detectable warnings, which are now in a template with a colored background and raised, truncated domes.

Passenger Loading Zone

The loading zone must have an access aisle adjacent and parallel to the vehicle pull-up space. The loading zone access aisle must be 60" wide and 20' long.

Confirm this template with the City of Sycamore, and the Illinois Attorney General's Office, to ensure that stalls will be compliant.

12. In 2012, 2013, or 2014 ***implement a plan to correct or refresh every accessible stall*** at every District facility. Incorporate this task into other plans that require parking lot restriping or resurfacing. Certainly in 2011 as lots are resurfaced or restriped, use this template as well.

Running Slope and Cross Slope

We often saw running slopes steeper than permitted. At some sites this was a minimal issue, but at other sites it was a significant variance. This condition naturally occurs when concrete settles, or when connections between new and old routes are off by fractions of an inch. Cross slope is equally important, as it serves drainage as well as access purposes.

13. ***Adopt a policy*** that in new construction and alterations the ramp slope shall not exceed 1:13, or 7.7%, as opposed to 1:12, or 8.33%. This allows room for error in the field. It also makes ramps easier to use for everyone, not just people with disabilities. This universal design approach is also a risk management tool.
14. ***Adopt a policy*** that in new construction or alterations the cross slope shall be an integral part of the project and shall not exceed 2% or 1:50.

Detectable Warnings

The US Access Board suspended the detectable warning requirement in the late 90's, for a period of several years. It was restored in 2002 though, and is now included in the 2010 Standards. It is typical to see noncompliant detectable warnings in every community.

The detectable warnings at curbs **that are not compliant** are often a cross-cut of concrete, or a grid laid on wet concrete to create a diamond-shaped indentation. Over time these should be replaced.

15. As with parking, **develop a template for detectable warnings**. Confirm the template with the City of Sycamore and the Illinois Attorney General's Office.
16. In the same year that parking is refreshed, **implement a plan to correct or refresh every detectable warning** at every curb or crossing at District facilities. If necessary, phase this out over a two or three year period.

Door Opening Force Requirements

In District buildings and facilities, there are approximately 121 doors. Many have closer mechanisms. Some of these need adjustment to bring the pounds of force (lbf) necessary into compliance (5 lbf for interior doors and 8.5 lbf for exterior doors). However some of the closers are just old. The wear and tear of 20 or more years erodes the closer effectiveness.

17. **Evaluate and determine the age of door closers.**
18. **Add door closer maintenance checks** to safety checklists for employees and for closers with 10 years of service or less, aggressively maintain them for effectiveness.
19. **Purchase and install new door closers** for all exterior doors (with closers 20 years old or more) and 50% of interior doors in 2012 or as soon as is possible.
20. **Purchase and install** new door closers for all remaining interior doors (with closers 20 years old or more) in 2013 or as soon as is possible.

Signage

District signs can serve several valuable purposes. First, signs assist "way-finding" in buildings, such as at the Community Center. Second, signs identify important permanent elements of facilities, such as restrooms. Third, signs facilitate access by people with vision and physical limitations. Aside from consistent use of the District logo, we did not note a signage template.

The Access Board requires different treatment for 2 types of signs. Signs for permanent spaces, such as a bathroom, must be in both Grade 2 Braille and raised lettering.

For directional or informational signage though, only raised lettering is required. Be certain to incorporate these approaches into signs in buildings and sites operated by the District.

21. **Develop a sign template** in 2011 that describes where and in what facilities signs will be used. The template could include:
 - size of sign

- mounting height
- mounting location
- size of characters
- space between characters
- contrast between characters and background
- icons or symbols used in the signs, and
- District information in the signs (name of facility? phone number? main office number?).

22. **Implement signage template and correct or refresh** District facility and site signage in 2012 or 2013.

Bathrooms

Bathrooms are an essential part of a visit to a Sycamore Park District facility. Exercise, food and beverage, social activities, and more all rely on one of the oldest designs known to us. Making those facilities accessible is tremendously important.

Additionally, **portable toilets** placed temporarily at sports fields and event venues **must** be accessible and **must be served by an accessible route**.

23. **Develop a bathroom template in 2011.** Confirm it with the City of Sycamore and the Illinois Attorney General. Be sure to include temporary facilities such as portable toilets in the template.

The template should address the toilet itself, grab bars, items in the stall such as toilet paper and hooks, the stall itself, operating mechanisms, mirrors, sinks, hand towels, hand dryers, and more.

24. **Include bathroom renovations** at facilities in the District's Capital Acquisition and Replacement Plan.

25. **Consider the use of automatic flush controls.** These have environmental benefits and are also a great way to eliminate some accessibility problems.

26. **In the interim, implement non-structural modifications recommended in each section of this report,** such as lowering mirrors, remounting grab bars, changing the height of toilets and urinals, installing compliant stall hardware, and so forth.

These less costly changes on a site-by-site basis will serve your customers well until resources are available to renovate restrooms on a comprehensive scale.

27. **Make one portable toilet,** if one is provided at a site, accessible. This includes a portable toilet placed at a picnic shelter or adjacent to sports fields.

These must be accessible and must be served by ***an accessible route***. ***The District has some sites with portable toilets and this is critical to address. Follow our single-user toilet specifications in our site checklists.***

Lockers and Locker Rooms

Research shows that people with disabilities will refrain from using public facilities if they fear that sites are not accessible or they'll be embarrassed in their attempt to use sites.

We all know the benefits of recreation participation. If a person with a physical disability comes to the Sycamore Pool to swim, there are no designated accessible lockers.

28. ***Implement the locker room changes recommended*** at the Sycamore Pool.
29. ***Promote availability of accessible locker rooms once completed***. Announce these changes to the community and see more participation by people with disabilities.

Alarms

In existing facilities where an aural or audible fire alarm system is provided, a visual alarm is not required unless the building was constructed after January 26, 1992 or has been upgraded since that same date.

If an alarm in an existing facility is audible only, it need not be modified to include a visual alarm unless it is replaced or upgraded in the future.

30. ***Determine in 2011*** if systems have been upgraded or replaced since 1992.
31. ***Develop a plan in 2011*** for the installation of aural and visual alarms in renovations.
32. ***Retrofit construction that has occurred since 1992*** to include aural and visual alarms by the end of 2014.

Brochures

The park grid in the District brochures is an important tool for Park District residents and can now be used to communicate about accessibility. Revise it to incorporate the access work District staff completes and indicate in your grid where, for example, the accessible picnic areas are, or where the accessible playgrounds are.

33. ***Update parks and facilities grid*** to reflect decisions made by the District regarding our recommendations, and note which sites are accessible or will be made accessible.

Website

The title II regulation requires that all types of public communication used by the District be available to people with disabilities. Many people with vision impairments use websites every day with the aid of technical equipment.

The District should evaluate its website and make necessary changes so that the website can be read by that type of equipment.

A link at the US Department of Justice website offers guidance on this. The District IT staff should become familiar with this issue. Go to <http://www.ada.gov/websites2.htm>

34. **Evaluate the District website** and make changes so that the information on the site is accessible to people with disabilities.

Swimming

The **minimum required** of the District by title II of the ADA is that the “program” of swimming be accessible to residents. This is measured by the “program access test” described in section 35.150 of the title II regulation (see 28 CFR Part 35).

The District has one outdoor pool at Community Park. We believe that because it is the only district pool, it must be made accessible.

35. **Make Sycamore Pool accessible**, by implementing all of the recommendations in that site report.

Maintenance Facility

In another site report we address the Maintenance Facility. As discussed earlier, the District can apply a different standard to spaces used only as employee work areas.

Park maintenance supervisory staff should receive an orientation in regard to the application of the **approach, enter, and exit** strategy so that they understand the reason for the various requirements.

36. **Train maintenance staff supervisors** in accessibility concepts that are applicable to the maintenance building.
37. **Implement recommendations regarding parking, accessible route, changes in level, gaps, doors, and alarm systems** at the Maintenance Campus.

Playgrounds

The **minimum required** of the District by title II of the ADA is that the “program” of playgrounds be accessible to residents. This is measured by the “program access test” described in section 35.150 of the title II regulation (see 28 CFR Part 35).

For similar multiple sites, no guidance is given as to how many existing playgrounds should be made accessible. Again, a good practice is to treat this as a planning exercise and aim for 1 of 3 playgrounds being made accessible.

Our evaluation included 16 different playgrounds for children aged 2 to 5 and 5 to 12. Of these, six are accessible, and two more could be made accessible with minor corrections.

The Program Access Chart, along with the Sycamore Playground Map at the end of this section, illustrates the areas where work is recommended so that every resident of Sycamore is close to an accessible playground. [[Sycamore Playground Map](#)]

38. **Make corrections** cited in these reports so the playgrounds at the site below remains accessible:

- **Boynton Park**
- **Kiwanis Prairie (2 to 5)**
- **Leon Larson Park**
- **Sycamore Lake Rotary Park (2 to 5)**
- **Sycamore Lake Rotary Park (5 to 12)**
- **Wetzel Park**

39. **Make corrections** cited in these reports so the playgrounds at the site below **becomes** accessible:

- **Founders Park**
- **Kiwanis Prairie Park (5 to 12)**

40. **Leave as is** the other playgrounds at the park named below, and if future alterations or renovations occur at those sites, make them accessible.

- **Brothers Park**
- **Charley Laing Memorial Park**
- **Elmer and Stanley Larson Park**
- **Kiwanis East Park**
- **Old Mill Park**
- **Sycamore Community Park (play area one)**
- **Sycamore Community Park (play area two)**
- **Sycamore Park Sports Complex**

41. **Advertise the accessible playgrounds** in the District website and publications.

Baseball Fields

The ***minimum required*** of the District by title II of the ADA is that the “program” of baseball be accessible to residents. This is measured by the “program access test” found in section 35.150 of the title II regulation (see 28 CFR Part 35).

For similar multiple sites, no guidance is given as to how many existing baseball fields should be accessible. We recommend that a minimum of one field of every three be accessible. We saw 6 sites with 20 total ball fields. Of these, no fields are accessible. We are recommending access be created to 3 of the 12 fields at the Sycamore Park Sports Complex and one of the four ball fields at Sycamore Community Park.

The Program Access Chart at the end of this section, along with the Sycamore Baseball Map, illustrates the areas where work is recommended so that every resident of the Park District is close to an accessible baseball field. [[Sycamore Baseball Map](#)]

42. ***Make corrections*** cited in these reports so baseball fields at the sites below ***become*** accessible:

- ***Sycamore Park Sports Complex (3 of 12)***
- ***Sycamore Community Park(1 of 4)***

43. ***Leave as is*** the fields at the following sites:

- ***Brothers Park***
- ***Kiwanis East Park***
- ***Kiwanis Prairie Park***
- ***Sycamore Park Sports Complex (9 of 12)***
- ***Sycamore Community Park(3 of 4)***
- ***Wetzel Park***

44. ***Advertise the accessible baseball fields*** in the District website and publications.

Basketball Courts

The ***minimum required*** of the District by title II of the ADA is that the “program” of basketball be accessible to residents. This is measured by the “program access test” described in section 35.150 of the title II regulation (see 28 CFR Part 35).

For similar multiple sites, no guidance is given as to how many existing basketball courts should be accessible. Because of the nature of basketball surfaces, a hard court, access is easier. The District has 4 sites with courts.

Of those, 3 of the 4 are accessible, and we recommend no new access.

The Program Access Chart at the end of this section, along with the Sycamore Basketball Map, illustrates the areas where work is recommended so that every resident of the District is close to an accessible basketball court. [[Sycamore Basketball Map](#)]

45. ***Make the corrections*** needed to maintain accessible basketball courts as specified in the reports for the site below:
- ***Brothers Park***
 - ***Kiwanis Prairie Park***
 - ***Wetzel Park***
46. ***Leave as is*** the basketball court at the sites below:
- ***Sycamore Community Park***
47. ***Advertise the accessible basketball courts*** in the District website and publications.

Athletic Fields

The ***minimum required*** of the District by title II of the ADA is that the “program” of athletic fields be accessible to residents. This is measured by the “program access test” found in section 35.150 of the title II regulation (see 28 CFR Part 35).

For similar multiple sites, no guidance is given as to how many existing athletic fields should be accessible. We recommend that a minimum of one field of every three be accessible.

There are 2 sites with 11 total athletic fields and none are accessible. We recommend access to two of the fields at the Sycamore Park Sports Complex.

The Program Access Chart at the end of this section, along with the Sycamore Athletic Field Map, illustrates the areas where work is recommended so that every resident of the Park District is close to an accessible athletic field. [[Sycamore Athletic Field Map](#)]

48. ***Make the corrections*** cited in the reports so that the athletic fields at the sites ***become*** accessible:
- ***Sycamore Park Sports Complex (2 of 10)***
49. ***Leave as is*** the athletic fields at the following site:
- ***Kiwanis Prairie Park***
 - ***Sycamore Park Sports Complex (8 of 10)***
50. ***Advertise the accessible athletic fields*** in the District website and publications.

Picnic Shelters/Gazebos

The **minimum required** of the District by title II of the ADA is that the “program” of picnic shelters be accessible to residents. This is measured by the “program access test” described in section 35.150 of the title II regulation (see 28 CFR Part 35).

For similar multiple sites, no guidance is given as to how many existing picnic shelters should be accessible. ***Of the 9 sites with existing picnic shelters, 13 are accessible. We recommend no new access and that the remaining 3 be left as is and inaccessible.***

The Program Access Chart at the end of this section, with the Sycamore Picnic Shelters Map, illustrates the areas where work is recommended so that every resident of the District is close to an accessible picnic shelter. [[Sycamore Picnic Shelter Map](#)]

51. ***Maintain the accessible*** picnic shelters at the sites named below:

- ***Brothers Park***
- ***Charley Laing Park***
- ***Founders Park***
- ***Leon Larson Park***
- ***Old Mill Park***
- ***Sycamore Community Park (1 of 2). Currently Accessible: Main South Shelter***
- ***Sycamore Lake Rotary Park (3 of 3)***
- ***Sycamore Park Sports Complex (3 of 5). Currently Accessible: Good Tymes, Lions Shelter, Shelter NE of Good Tymes***
- ***Wetzel Park***

52. ***Leave as is*** the picnic areas at the sites below:

- ***Sycamore Community Park (1 of 2). Currently Inaccessible: WPA Main***
- ***Sycamore Park Sports Complex (2 of 5). Currently Inaccessible: Shelter Between Fields 9 & 12, and Shelter East of Sports Concession***

53. ***Advertise the accessible picnic shelters*** in the District website and publications.

Other Activities

In Sycamore, bags and tennis are also popular. The District maintains both tennis court locations so they are accessible, and one of the two bags courts is accessible. However, the parking and access paths are below standard and should be upgraded. These are good examples of exceeding the minimum in some cases, but not the “entire” facility.

Costs by Phases

RAC feels the District can integrate the recommendations in our transition grid with your own planning and budget documents. We have tried to balance the projected resources needed in each phase for compliance.

Our Phase One costs are projected at \$112,015.

Our Phase Two costs are projected at \$170,258.25.

Our Phase Three costs are projected at \$107,274.75.

The overall total cost of the work we project is \$389,548.

We believe that over time, the value of the projections for phases two and three will rise. These figures are projections only and will likely change due to supply and demand.

It should be noted that these estimates do not, in some cases, include labor costs, and in other cases the costs of having an engineer or architect create bid specifications and bid documents to get the work completed.

Public Feedback

An integral part of the self-evaluation of sites and facilities, and the development of a transition plan, is the involvement of the public. A public forum should be scheduled after the District has had some time to digest this report. We would be glad to work with the District on this project at no charge, and we would be glad to return to assist in this process.

Conclusion

The District has a variety of recreation facilities and sites. The skilled staff operates facilities and sites the community wants and enjoys. This report identifies some issues that are typical of a mature recreation infrastructure.

The Board of Commissioners should review this report and determine to what extent it will act on our recommendations and the recommendations to be received from staff.

While no one can say with certainty how long the District should feel comfortable in stretching these projects, we'd suggest it be not more than a 3 year range after the effective date of the 2010 Standards...that means March 15, 2015.

Be certain to understand that you could be forced to accelerate your pace.

Your strategy should address the common issues identified in this report. The District should be commended for undertaking this task. Although the access audit and transition plan are both mandated tasks, many of your neighbors have not completed these steps.

Assumptions for Plan of Action

Based upon the details of RAC's audit, we have room to work with in terms of how to progress with honoring the intent of bringing our recreation services into compliance. This document intends to lay out how Sycamore Park District plans to approach this transition. We hope to accomplish the majority of the items in the three years recommended by RAC, with a few exceptions due to plans that are being discussed related to a few of our facilities. Specifically, these are the Swimming Pool and the Community Center.

The Board of Commissioners, with input from the public, is beginning a long-range planning process which will address the future of the Community Center and the Swimming Pool. The Community Center is not owned by the park district, so we must work with our landlord to plan for the work to be done in that facility. Furthermore, the district must decide if it is in its best interest to stay in that building. Therefore, to expend funds in that space before deciding its fate seems unreasonable at this time. Additionally, the Swimming Pool's future is in doubt. Many of its mechanical systems are reaching the end of their effective life, and the type of facility is no longer that which draws a large number of users to the facility. The long-range planning process will determine its future. Hereto, the district must decide if it is in its best interest to stay in that building. Therefore, to expend funds in that space before deciding its fate seems unreasonable, as well.

Therefore, staff has reviewed all of the proposed items outlined by RAC and pulled out the items which are related to the community and pool.

Other Assumptions Made in this Process Include:

- A. Work may be done more efficiently, effectively, and inexpensively by grouping it into similar categories (i.e., electrical, plumbing, carpentry, etc.) and bidding it out in larger quantities/groupings.
- B. There is not sufficient, in-house staff time to do this work.
- C. Costs will inflate each year, so the sooner we get the work done the better.
- D. Training of Staff is not included in the costs provided by RAC.
- E. Costs of Equipment for maintaining facilities to standard are not included in the RAC estimates.
- F. No funds were dedicated or estimated for updating website to accessible standards. We will put that in the operating budget.

Framework for Plan

In order to reasonably address the expectation of the law and the audit, staff has developed a five year plan for accomplishing the items specified in RAC's audit of our facilities/services. In rough form it will address issues as follows:

Year 5: Community Center Items

Year 4: Swimming Pool Items

Year 3: Parks and Facility Work

Year 2: Parks and Facility Work

Year 1: Parks and Facility Work

Furthermore, the work in Years 1, 2, and 3 will be accomplished in common groupings, and bid with like work. That work will be formulated into logical groupings by an architecture/engineering firm hired by SPD to develop the bid specifications and bid documents, and to supervise the work as it is completed. Those logical groupings include:

Plumbing

Carpentry

Concrete and Paving

Specialty Work (Fire Suppression, Alarms, etc.)

Review of Plan

After initial approval by the Board of Commissioners, the park district then conducted a public review of the plan which included:

- A. A Public Hearing on the Plan held on August 20, 2012.
- B. Review of the Transition Plan by Administrative Staff of Kish Health Systems.
- C. Review of the Transition Plan by Opportunity House Staff.
- D. Review of the Transition Plan by Kishwaukee Special Recreation Staff.
- E. Review of the Transition Plan by Sycamore Public Schools Administrative Staff.
- F. Review of the Transition Plan by City of Sycamore Administrative Staff.

Timeline for Plan

June 2012	Board Has First Review of Plan Board Approves Electronic Personal Assistive Mobility Devices Ordinance
July 2012	Board Reaches Consensus on Plan Plan Distributed for Review and Comment by Agencies Serving Special Populations
August 2012	Required Public Hearing for ADA Transition Plan Comments Returned by Agencies Serving Special Populations
September 2012	Board Reviews/Approves ADA Transition Plan with Changes Plan is Posted on the SPD Website
October 2012	Professional Services are Retained to Develop Bid Specifications And Bid Documents Staff Attend Training on ADA Inspections
November 2012	Staff Finalizes Parking Stall and Sign Templates
December 2012	Staff Audits all Buildings for Date of Construction and Most Recent Renovation Staff Updates Brochure Grid of Parks and Facilities
January 2013	First Work is Put out to Bid Work Begins on Updating Website to Meet Accessibility Requirements
March 2013	Board Approves Bids Superintendent of Parks and Facilities Initiates: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. A staff surveillance program for access issues b. An annual audit of facilities for access issues
April 2013	Executive Director Institutes a Documentation Program for Actions Taken
Spring 2013	Work Begins – Year One
Spring 2014	Work Begins—Year Two
Spring 2015	Work Begins – Year Three
Spring 2016	Work Begins – Year Four
Spring 2017	Work Begins – Year Five

Budget and Cash Flow for Plan

<u>WORK DEFINED</u>	<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>	<u>YEAR 3</u>	<u>YEAR 4</u>	<u>YEAR 5</u>
All Pool Work				\$57,123	
All Community Center Work					\$67,918
District Work: Plumbing and Carpentry	\$93,680				
District Work: Concrete & Paving		\$168,989			
District Work: Specialty Work			\$16,299		
Equipment & Training	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$2,500		
Professional Fees/Contingency 18%	\$16,860	\$30,400	\$2,950	\$0	\$0
TOTAL	\$113,040	\$201,889	\$21,749	\$57,123	\$67,918
Special Recreation Starting Funds	\$116,445	\$101,405	-\$2,484	\$73,767	\$114,644
Additional Funds	\$98,000	\$98,000	\$98,000	\$98,000	\$98,000
Running Balance	\$101,405	-\$2,484	\$73,767	\$114,644	\$144,726