

**MINUTES
OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
PARK BOARD
HELD AT CITY HALL
JULY 12, 2011
7:00 PM**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Hulbert called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm

II. ROLLCALL

Answering rollcall were Members Deeds, Fronck, Jacobson, Jones, Lough, Meyer, Peterson, Segreto, Steel and Chair Hulbert

III. INTRODUCTION OF NEW BOARD MEMBER

New member Deeds introduced himself to the Park Board and apologized for not being at the previous meetings. He explained when he was appointed he did not realize it would conflict with the night class he was teaching at St. Thomas College.

IV. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

Member Steel asked since there is a new format for the agenda will that be reflective in the upcoming minutes such as "Call to Order". She pointed out that the May Park Board minutes do not reflect a "Call to Order" and that it looks like in other board and commission minutes that item does appear and asked if it was necessary that they have that item; she would like those minutes to reflect that since she chaired the May Park Board meeting she would like for them to reflect that she did call the meeting to order.

Member Steel made a motion seconded by Member Meyer that the May 2011 Park Board Minutes reflect that the meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Steel.

V. ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA

Member Peterson made a motion, seconded by Member Deeds approving the consent agenda.

- **APPROVAL OF MINUTES - Regular Meeting of May 10, 2011 with changes approved by Park Board under Agenda Item IV.**

VI. COMMUNITY COMMENT

Elizabeth Stevens, 3205 West 60th Street, addressed the Park Board regarding the "Nite to Unite" event that will take place on August 2nd. She pointed out that it is basically the same thing as "National Night Out" where neighborhoods get together and have block parties. She stated that some of the people at the dog park thought it might be fun to organize their "Nite to Unite" at the dog park. She indicated that she was hoping she could post a sign at the park that says dog owners we plan to unite on August 2nd along with all of the neighborhood folks. She commented that they would avoid the food part but would say bring your dog, chair and something to drink. She stated that basically she is looking for some sort of

acknowledgement from the park side of things that this is not necessarily a bad idea. Member Segreto replied that she thinks it's a great idea but it should be noted that no alcohol is allowed at the park.

Chair Hulbert commented that it sounds like a great idea but questions if they are organizing some sort of event would that trigger some sort of necessity to rent that park like they have done for other groups. Mr. MacHolda responded that in this case he doesn't think they need to go through the park permit process. He stated that it sounds like they are just trying to get other dog owners together and socialize on a given night.

Ms. Stevens indicated that another opportunity that occurred to her is there may be a chance to raise revenue by selling more dog collars or reminding people to register their dogs. She noted that she could coordinate some sort of table or booth because she thinks there are still a lot of dog owners who don't even know Edina has a dog park. Mr. MacHolda replied that personally he would like to see the selling of collars stay at City Hall versus a satellite site that night. He noted that he is all for the socialization of both dog owners and dogs.

VII. REPORTS/RECOMMENDATIONS

VII.A. CONSULTANT FINALISTS FOR EDINBOROUGH PARK STUDY

Ann Kattreh, Manager of Edinborough Park, informed the Park Board that they received eight good proposals from the RFP that was sent out to hire a consultant. She explained that Mr. Keprios, Ms. Miller and herself narrowed it down to what they felt were the top four. She stated that they are looking for input from the Park Board on the four they selected and noted that they could add more if the Park Board so desires and then they can go ahead and set up interviews. She indicated that she thinks it's a good idea to actually sit down and have an interview process and ask some questions as well as give them the opportunity to ask us some questions and maybe get a little more of a comfort level with the architect and consultant. Ms. Kattreh asked the Park Board to let her know if there are any specific questions they would like to have asked during the interview process. In addition, if anyone would like to sit in on the interviews, to also let her know.

Member Deeds asked is the primary goal of having a consultant to try to revitalize as well as understand potential higher level uses, etc. Ms. Kattreh replied that is partially correct. She explained that Edinborough is operating at about a 75% to 80% cost recovery and explained how a trust fund was originally set up for Edinborough when it was first opened. She noted it was originally intended to financially support the operations indefinitely; however, that will not be the case and explained the reasons why. Ms. Kattreh indicated that the City Council has given them the task to try to come to a break even basis and by hiring a consultant they intend to look at all operations of Edinborough everything from the staffing to the programming to the facility itself to find a way to save costs and generate additional revenue. She added that Edinborough was never designed to be a revenue generating facility.

Member Segreto noted that ATS&R indicated that they have already worked on some of the components of the park and asked which components they have been involved in. Ms. Kattreh replied that is a little misleading because they have not worked on Edinborough Park but rather they have worked at some other parks in Edina.

Member Fronck indicated that it seems part of the recommendation that staff is looking for is to basically grant them the power to select one of the consultants moving forward which he is fine with but wanted to know how staff would arrive at the decision. Ms. Kattreh explained that what they hope to do is bring in anyone from the Park Board that may be interested either in terms of sitting in on the interviews or providing questions for them to ask. Ms. Kattreh commented that she does not know if Mr. Keprios was planning on bringing staff's recommendation to the Park Board prior to the City

Council. She noted they are hoping to have the interviews take place the last week in July or first week in August. She pointed out that the City Manager has asked Mr. Keprios and herself to sit down and explain to him the reasons why they selected who they did and then it would go to City Council for their approval. She stated that they could bring their selection back to the Park Board before they take it to the City Council.

Member Meyer stated his perspective is if it's going to accelerate the process to go straight to the City Council he wouldn't object to that especially if it's going to add several months and delay the opportunity to get the data. He indicated he feels the data is the most important thing and clearly several of the firms are qualified to collect the data.

Member Meyer asked Ms. Kattreh why they didn't go directly to Ballard & King. Ms. Kattreh responded that she felt it is important to bring the architectural component as well because they are hoping for some conceptual drawings on any recommendations that they might have pertaining to changes to the facility and that's not something that Ballard & King would specialize in; therefore, they need the architectural component as well.

Member Jones asked Ms. Kattreh if she has brought in any of the businesses that are adjacent to the park such as Edina Park Plaza and the Residence Inn. Ms. Kattreh replied that although they will be key players she has not at this point because she feels they would be putting the cart before the horse. She indicated that personally she would like to have a little more information to discuss with them as opposed to talking about a variety of concepts that may or may not happen. Ms. Kattreh stated that they are aware they are looking at the facility and that just this past week they started construction on the guest services counter and the concession stand. Member Jones stated that she thought that was put on hold because they were going to be looking at the long-term plan for that. Ms. Kattreh replied that it was discussed to be put on hold but because it was in their capital improvement plan they decided to move forward with it.

Member Peterson asked what they mean by Edinborough "Understanding" that was on the matrix. Ms. Kattreh explained that what they meant by that is did they tailor items in their proposal to Edinborough, did they in fact understand their complex and understand the difficulties in dealing with their complex in regards to items such as neighbors, association fees, different user groups, etc. She stated that they feel the two firms where that was marked was because they felt the proposal they submitted took more time in getting to know their operations a little bit more prior to submitting the proposal and added that those two also spent a considerable amount of time with both Mr. Keprios and herself.

Member Deeds stated that he would be interested in seeing some of the interviews because the proposal really doesn't tell you much and that three of the four proposals are almost the exact same proposal. He indicated that what he is interested in understanding is what they mean by "market research"; is it simply that they are going to tell them how many facilities are within 10 square miles or are they going to be potentially in some way, shape or form gathering real market research which he would be interested in.

Member Fronek made a motion, seconded by Member Segreto to accept the four finalists recommended by staff and to provide Mr. Keprios and Ms. Kattreh the authority to select one candidate after the interview process without Park Board approval so that it can be done by the August Park Board meeting.

Ayes: Deeds, Fronek, Jacobson, Jones, Lough, Meyer, Peterson, Segreto, Steel and Chair Hulbert.
Motion carried.

Chair Hulbert stated that he would like Member Deeds to be on the interview committee to which Member Deeds replied he would be happy to meet with Ms. Kattreh.

VII.B. PARK BOARD BYLAWS

Mr. MacHolda pointed out that as Mr. Keprios states in his report/recommendation the proposed bylaws draft is consistent with current city code and is similar to other board and commission bylaws in general procedurally provides the Park Board the authority to establish its own committees without prior council approval. Member Segreto stated that on page 2, #6 second paragraph it states “to provide for the selection of one or two spokespersons to represent groups of persons with common interests during public meetings” and commented that she thinks that would be really hard to do. Chair Hulbert responded that he thinks in meetings like that people step forward and say they are going to speak for the group and then you can say alright and then that person will be the representative by speaking on behalf of the group. Member Segreto asked Chair Hulbert if he thought pragmatically that is clear enough. Chair Hulbert replied yes and added that he thinks it’s fairly common.

Member Segreto noted that in Article II, Section 3 it states that the Board does not have the authority to introduce contracts or expenditures and asked if they have the authority to solicit contracts or expenditures because she is not quite sure what the word “introduce” really means. She commented that maybe the drafter could take note of the comment and maybe explore or see if it needs to be clarified.

Member Segreto pointed out there is no conflict of interest paragraph in these bylaws and asked if any of the other boards and commissions have a conflict of interest. Lastly, she stated that she thinks it’s important for all of the board members to know what the attendance requirement is.

Member Steel indicated that she has a couple of suggestions as well. She noted that Article III Section II talks about special meetings and thought they may want to include work sessions and define the purpose as an informational meeting where no actions would be taken. She stated this may be a good place to establish that and provide definition in the future to give the Park Board the opportunity to hold those types of meetings.

Member Deeds indicated that where it states “the board does not have the authority to introduce contracts or expenditures” that if you look at the mission it seems to put the board strictly in a review position that they are not in a position to make suggestions either to the council or staff. He stated that he is little leery of that language and would like to see something else. He indicated if that is the language they are going for then they need to be clear that they are strictly here to review whatever it is that the staff brings up and if that coincides with the mission then they need to be clear of that.

Member Deeds stated that he would argue to leave the special meetings as open as possible because that will give them the freedom to call whatever and whenever they deem something necessary, it gives them flexibility.

Member Jones indicated that in regards to Article V, committees and subcommittees she would like to see at least one person from the Park Board be a participant in a committee and ideally be the chair of any committee they form. She stated that she would also like to identify what is expected from these committees such as will minutes be taken, etc. Member Jones stated that she thinks they can write a better mission statement to actually state what they do. She indicated that she would be willing to try to write something up with incorporating what has just been said and other comments the members may come up with. She added if anyone would like to work on it with her that would be great.

Member Peterson stated that the mission statement is straightforward; however, it doesn’t get into something else which he thinks they should and that is healthy lifestyles which he feels the Park Board should be promoting for various age groups. For example, if you were to walk around Bredesen Park 25 times a summer you will be recognized in some way such as with a hat or a badge. He stated that he thinks the better cities get into promoting healthy lifestyles, like Edina is doing with the Farmer’s Market; the better off the population will age.

Chair Hulbert commented that if Member Jones is willing to take this on with some of the ideas that have been mentioned and bring a draft to the next Park Board meeting that would be great. Member Lough asked how they address the issue of standardization with other boards and commissions would Member Jones take that on as well. Member Jones replied that she does have a copy of most of the other boards and commissions by-laws and noted she was surprised how they differ in every way. She indicated that it's not just the functions of the commissions but there are some major differences. She stated that she is not going to try and change all of the bylaws but will talk to the City Manager, Scott Neal and see if he has any ideas. Mr. MacHolda pointed out that Mr. Keprios recommendation does indicate that after further review with the City Manager it appears that each board and commission is unique enough in their own function and mission that it would be difficult to standardize bylaws in every regard. Member Segreto asked who drafted the bylaws to which it was noted Mr. Keprios.

Member Jones asked as far as members of the Park Board does anyone feel strongly that they should be residents of Edina to which the Park Board replied yes.

Member Steel commented that in regards to the suggestion that was previously made regarding absences she believes those are in the City Code. She noted that she thinks the idea with bylaws is not to repeat what is already in City Code and added that what is in the City Code takes power over anything they write in their bylaws. Member Lough suggested that perhaps they reference that specific City Code for attendance.

Member Deeds asked if the current mission is a long standing mission or did Mr. Keprios just write it. Mr. MacHolda replied he believes it is long standing. Member Jones commented that she would be open to a new mission. Member Steel pointed out that Under Section III. "Members" they may want to add residents of Edina" because only under student members does it state "shall be residents of the city . . . ". Chair Hulbert commented that he is pretty sure there is already something in the City Code about residency. Member Jones noted that she will take a look at it and added that she believes one other commission had something where it was stated really clear that City Code takes precedence over anything, even bylaws if there is a conflict so she may add that same wording.

Chair Hulbert made a motion, seconded by Member Deeds to table the bylaws until the August Park Board meeting.

Ayes: Deeds, Fronck, Jacobson, Jones, Lough, Meyer, Peterson, Segreto, Steel and Chair Hulbert.
Motion carried.

VII.C. APPOINT BOARD MEMBER TO HUMAN SERVICES TASK FORCE

Member Segreto volunteered to be the Park Board member on the Human Services Task Force.

VIII. CHAIR AND BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Member Segreto asked where they are with the subcommittees. Member Jones replied that she has spoken to Jennifer Bennerotte, Communications Director, to help publicize the request for people who may be interested in working on the two subcommittees.

Member Deeds indicated that he saw the various e-mails regarding "Cool Planet" and Frisbee golf and asked what happened with that. Mr. MacHolda replied there was some miscommunication but Mr. Thompson did end up going through the permit process and Dick Crockett from the Edina Foundation did bring in a check to the Park and Recreation Department office before the event took place.

Member Jones informed the Park Board that regarding the Bike Edina Task Force they applied for bike racks which she believes they will get money for. She noted they will be able to purchase 40 to 60 bike

racks at no cost to the city except for installation. She added that someone from the Bike Task Force is working with Wayne Houle, City Engineer, as where they will be going. Member Jones informed the Park Board that the Edina Bike Task Force had a very successful "Bike to Work Day" which they do annually and this year 12 people signed up which is more than ever. She also pointed out that there will be a city wide tour of Edina which is going to be run with the Edina Rotary on October 9th and they hope to raise money for food shelves.

Member Jones informed the Park Board that the Energy & Environment Commission has been reviewing the turf management plan to which she has attended several meetings and they will be presenting a new executive summary she believes at their next meeting.

Member Jones informed the Park Board that the public works site group that is looking at the vision for the old public works building is in the stage where they are conducting interviews for who will be working on the proposals.

IX. STAFF COMMENTS

Mr. MacHolda informed the Park Board that the City Council did approve the taping of the Park Board meetings on a quarterly basis so the Park Board meetings will be taped August, November, February and May. All of the other Park Board meetings will be audiotaped.

Mr. MacHolda informed the Park Board that they had a wonderful Fourth of July parade and fireworks display. He noted that he would like to personally thank staff and the parade committee for the wonderful job they did. There is a lot of work that goes into these two events.

Mr. MacHolda informed the Park Board that the new Chowen Park playground design and equipment turned out beautiful and they were open and operational the first part of June. However shortly after they opened the calls started coming about a bug infestation. He indicated that the vendor sent out their expert and determined it is what they call a "wood mite". He noted they then got into the dialog was it a contaminated safety surface which is the stance the city took and the manufacturer took the stance it was pre-existing but either case they had a problem. He noted that after some research they did spray the entire site which they found to be 50% successful. At that time they quarantined the park and came to the conclusion from the city to go to the manufacturer because it needed to be removed so they had all of the wood fiber removed, which was too bad because it's a wonderful safety surface. He explained that for the last three to four weeks he has been chasing the manufacturer and the general contractor to try to go beyond the removal of the safety surface and get an acceptable safety surface in place and reopen the park. He indicated that today they began to put in pea gravel as well as they also gave him a drawing of what it will take to make it accessible. Mr. MacHolda pointed out that when it was originally drawn it had 100% accessibility and now they will meet their minimum ADA requirements which will cost an additional \$11,000 and so after talking to the manufacturer they will first make it playable and then will come back and make it accessible so they should be able to reopen the park tomorrow.

Mr. MacHolda informed the Park Board that on June 1st they had a successful bid opening for the flow rider and it was approved by City Council on June 21st and as of right now he thinks their opening will be May or June of 2012.

Mr. MacHolda informed the Park Board that there has been a proposal for an athletic dome by a small group of residents who are developers. He noted that this group has had a number of meetings with various athletic associations, the school board, city staff and he believes independently with elected officials. He pointed out that the next step in their process will be a work session with City Council a week from today at 5:00 pm. He stated that he knows football and lacrosse have sent out e-mails to their bodies looking to show support to their elected officials and believes there are other groups who are also

interested. Mr. MacHolda noted that he hasn't heard anyone is opposed but that he does think there are other groups that think further study needs to be done. He commented that right now the site they are looking at is Braemar which would take up the athletic field that is currently behind the arenas as well as take up part of the parking lot which is to the north of the west arena; it's a fairly large structure. He added that one of the developers has done this type of project successfully in other cities.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business on the Park Board Agenda, Chair Hulbert declared the meeting adjourned at 8:16 pm.