

**MINUTES
OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
EDINA PARK BOARD
HELD AT CITY HALL
April 14, 2015
7 p.m.**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Gieseke called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Answering roll call were Members Cella, Good, Strother, Jones, Gieseke, Segreto and Jacobson

Member McCormick arrived at 7:11 p.m.

Member Greene arrived at 7:29 p.m.

Student Members: Chowdhury and Colwell

Absent was Member Steel

III. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

Member Segreto made a motion, seconded by Member Good, approving the meeting agenda.

Ayes: Segreto, Strother, Gieseke, Good, Cella, Jacobson, Jones.

Motion carried.

IV. ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA

IV.A. Approval of Minutes – Regular Park Board Meeting of Tuesday, March 10, 2015

Member Segreto made a motion, seconded by Chair Gieseke, to make a change to the minutes on page four, third paragraph change “Member Segreto thought there would be an...” to “Member Segreto asked if there would be an ongoing management contract”.

Ayes: Segreto, Cella, Gieseke, Good, Jacobson, Jones, Strother.

Motion carried.

Member Strother made a motion, seconded by Member Jones, to adopt the Minutes of the March 10, 2015 Park Board minutes with the changes requested.

Ayes: Segreto, Cella, Gieseke, Good, Jacobson, Jones, Strother.

Motion carried.

V. COMMUNITY COMMENT

None

VI. REPORTS/RECOMMENDATIONS

VI.A. Donations, Sponsorships and Advertising Policy

Ms. Kattreh went through the Donations, Sponsorships and Advertising Policy with the Park Board.

VI.B. Centennial Lakes Park Sculpture Donation

Tom Shirley, General Manager of Centennial Lakes Park, informed the Park Board of the donation.

Nick Legeros showed his sculptures and gave the history to the Park Board.

Member Segreto thanked Mr. Legeros and was pleased to see there were pedestals on the sculptures. She wondered if Mr. Legeros wanted the sculptures all together. Mr. Legeros replied they are spread apart in the park and the two children are actually on real stones and added they want these sculptures to be indestructible. He stated in regard to pedestals, every artist has to consider what type of pedestal the sculptures are going to be on, depending on the size. Member Segreto thought at some point they need some curatorial review so they do not end up having a sculpture park that looks like a hodgepodge. Michael Frey, General Manager of the Edina Art Center, stated Member Segreto brought up a good point and that they have been working on that because there is no uniformity to the pedestals in the parks.

Member Segreto stated she was at an arboretum and all of the sculptures were so close together that it looked discordant and she would hate to have the Edina parks look like that. Mr. Frey agreed and commented spacing is an issue so they need to be mindful of that as well.

Chair Gieseke asked if there is a security guideline, has there been any theft of sculptures in Edina and how are they fastened down. Mr. Frey stated there has been theft and damage done to sculptures.

Member Strother asked about unintentional damage and asked if they were made to be touched and climbed on. Mr. Legeros stated he has done many pieces and these are durable enough to be climbed upon. He noted the measures they go to in order to protect the sculptures from damage. Chair Gieseke stated he would like to expand on that and wondered if safety to children has been considered as well. Mr. Legeros replied he hopes people will interact with the sculptures and he tries to design the sculptures so there are not any sharp areas or places on the sculptures that will hurt people. Mr. Frey stated it is a primary concern of the Edina Art Center.

Member Good asked if these were considered unrestricted donations or will there be restrictions to the donations to which Ms. Kattreh replied they will be considered a restricted donation.

Dick Crockett, Executive Director of the Edina Community Foundation, stated he was especially pleased to have this proposal come before the Park Board and City Council because it is within their mission to bring people together to serve, strengthen and celebrate the community and this is what it is all about.

Member Jones thought the sculptures were lovely and really appreciated the opportunity to see them. She commented she was curious about the process because she knows they do not get sculptures frequently to look at because they are not involved in that and wondered if this was going to be a new process where they will start seeing donations. Ms. Kattreh thought that was a good question and stated it was a decision by staff to bring this forward to the Park Board because in this case they are changing the use of a part of the park. This part of the park was not originally designed or intended to be sculpture pads and staff felt it was very important they were not making the decision to change this use of the park. She noted staff wants the Park Board to be able to weigh in on it along with the City Council in making the final decision on the acceptance of the sculptures.

Barbara La Valleur, Public Art Edina working group member, stated they had a presentation by Mr. Legeros and the Arts and Culture Commission endorsed this and felt it was a very fine and high quality display of sculptures. She stated she was personally thrilled with the sculptures.

Member Cella asked for information on how that part of the park is now being used and what putting the sculptures there would curtail or change so it can actually be discussed. Mr. Shirley responded right now the northeast part of the park is a natural grass area with a passive use of the park. He did not think the sculptures will change the use of that area of the park and will add to that passive use that is there and feels it would be a great addition to that area. Ms. La Valleur stated she has been with public

art for years and the original intent for Centennial Lakes Park was to place public art in different areas, which are shown on the map.

Member Segreto asked if anyone else is seeing these sculptures in the light of being a memorial because she struggles a little bit with that. Chair Gieseke stated it concerns him as well and also brought that up and wondered if they want three sculptures with the same theme. Member Segreto stated that is why she was thinking about spacing them apart so that it would not appear to be such a memorial. She thought they also need to be thoughtful about portraying their community and would hope the images would show the growing diversity of the community. Mr. Legeros pointed out the girl is of Korean descent and there was never really a desire to make this a memorial. This was supposed to honor the people and history of the airline so he tried not to focus on things that would typically go into a memorial.

Chair Gieseke stated he wanted to get an idea of the percentage of artwork that will be in the park. Mr. Shirley replied there has been talk in the past and there has always been some thought about artwork throughout the park in different areas, but we have not identified those areas. Ms. La Valleur stated a lot of it comes down to funding and someone having an idea of a sculpture. She thought this process would probably take 20 years before they would see four or five sculptures in Centennial Lakes Park.

Ms. Kattreh stated she did not think it would be difficult to find a dozen different nice places in the original part of the park for public art.

Member Strother stated what is important to her is if they are putting sculptures into an already established park that the park not turn into a museum and that it is allowed to be interactive, which is what these sculptures are going to be.

Member Jones stated that she would like to recognize that when someone is donating something as a memorial and is willing to fund art, she appreciates that it is not a representation of the person and does not feel like a memorial at all.

Mr. Crockett stated he just wanted to make the point that over the period of 10 years, this has amounted to a pretty significant investment for the city and added they have acquired approximately \$250,000 in sculptures.

VI.C. Park System Strategic Planning – Draft Report

Terry Minarik from Confluence went through the Strategic Plan Draft with the Park Board.

Member Jones asked Mr. Minarik if he was going to be defining the difference of what makes a community park versus a neighborhood park. Mr. Minarik responded this is an executive summary within the body of the park classification and in a later chapter it defines a community park, a neighborhood park, an enterprise facility, etc. He noted there is also an in-depth definition of each of those parks in the system and a summary of what amenities they have.

Member Jones asked if the Park Board will be seeing this again to which Mr. Minarik indicated they will. Mr. Minarik explained they are moving forward to present the next draft through a City Council work session. He asked if the committee would like to meet prior to that for an overview before this is actually presented to the council.

Member Good asked in regards to the use of the classifications, did the team find the classification process useful in helping them to determine or discern things or are they just classifications. Mr.

Minarik responded it is very useful especially when they begin to break it down; it helps them to identify how much of the city is actually covered by the park system.

Member Cella stated regarding the acknowledgements, the Park Board is going to have to decide if it is going to be the Park Board members who were present when they started or when they end or will they include everyone because it is not going to be the same list. She also pointed out that Member Jones name is missing. Ms. Kattreh stated to be honest she did not review the list and she would be interested in how the Park Board felt about it. Member Good wondered why they had to have an acknowledgement page. Member Segreto indicated she felt the same way. Ms. Kattreh indicated she thought it was standard in every strategic plan she has seen; however, she is open to doing it either way. Chair Gieseke commented that it gives some accountability as to who was there during the process. Mr. Minarik pointed out that some communities are very adamant about having it. Chair Gieseke stated in his opinion they should include everyone from start to finish to which Ms. Kattreh agreed.

Mr. Minarik reviewed the park system with the board.

Member Jones was not sure if they settled on if they provide a wide variety of high quality and innovative parks and recreation programs and facilities. She wondered if they were going to keep the wording as high quality. Mr. Minarik thought they talked about excellence as noted.

Mr. Minarik continued with his presentation.

Member McCormick stated there is a lot of activity that happens in the back half of 2015 and she wondered how that gets approved and what the process looks like. Ms. Kattreh indicated they need to talk a lot about that time frame because she felt it was very aggressive.

Member McCormick asked when this will go to the City Council to which Mr. Minarik replied the City Council will see it on May 6. Member McCormick thought that would give them enough time to work through this.

Mr. Minarik continued reviewing the Strategic Plan with the board.

Member McCormick asked if they have any trend information to which Mr. Minarik indicated they did.

Member McCormick stated on page 44, the chart shows cross country skiing is down by nine percent. Mr. Minarik stated it is down nine percent nationally but up for Minnesota in general. Member McCormick thought they might want to make note of this so it is more specific.

Member Jacobson asked if there was a place where they recommend what kind of new things Edina should be looking to add to the parks they do not already have. Mr. Minarik stated some of the recommendations coming forward come from the demographic and trend findings. He pointed out this is through the Level of Service section, where they talk about where Edina fits in.

Member Cella stated she would like to see the whole trending section reformatted so they can look specifically at more state and local trends. Mr. Minarik responded they could definitely do that.

Member Segreto asked if there was any part of this plan that Ms. Kattreh would like the Park Board to focus more on in terms of helping get staff a tool that would be useful to use. Ms. Kattreh stated that is a great question. She wants to make sure that when they get to the recommendations at the end that it has everything they want to see addressed in the parks system and that it is spelled out clearly in the report. The most important part of the plan to focus attention on is the Implementation Plan. Member Segreto stated she felt overwhelmed commenting on the whole document in general and decided to

focus in on the portions of the plan that are important to her such as 4.1, 4.2, and the natural areas, assuming the rest of the Park Board members are looking at the rest of the plan that is important to them. She asked if it would make sense that they break the plan apart so that they know the whole plan is getting attention rather than just a part of it because the document is overwhelming.

Mr. Minarik stated he did not expect them to come back with all of their comments at this meeting. They knew it would take the board some time to review it and they would love it if the board looked at the recommendations and implementation process. Member McCormick thought that is a really good idea to break this down and have different board members look at different sections of the plan. Ms. Kattreh thought that was a great idea too.

Member Good stated this is a great body of work but what he saw as he looked at comments was strategy. When he looks at strategy, it is about making choices and to some degree when he read the plan there is a list of everything. Without yet any guidance for them as a board, how do they say no to things and feel it is the right thing to do because they have made a decision that this is what they want to build. He felt it was missing some direction around what the strategic themes are.

Mr. Minarik stated if they could begin to list those things that would be helpful and have all of the goals have priorities. Member Good stated if it's a needs to be done, that is a red flag and needs to be addressed but there are 14 different goals with items under them and he sensed it is a list of things they want to get accomplished but no direct path.

Member Jacobson stated one thing she was trying to do was put on her tactical hat and use this as a document that would push her forward to have some kind of direction. Mr. Minarik thought there is currently a replacement plan within the system for some things that are out there. He stated this is a big checklist for them too.

Member Jacobson thought there were some key things they were hoping to get such as a replacement plan in place and some kind of way to try to figure out if there is equity in the different parks.

Mr. Minarik stated they have had discussions about making a plan for the park buildings, repairs and replacements and they are trying to figure out how to recommend a plan moving forward.

Member Jacobson asked if they also go as high a level as helping the board figure out if they want mini or mega parks and how do they choose those parks. Mr. Minarik stated the other thing they found too was that they have general open space and they need to determine what to do with that space.

Member Jacobson asked what in the plan guides them to make the discussions that the city needs them to make to which Mr. Minarik replied they are going to make those recommendations to the board.

Mr. Minarik continued with his presentation.

Member Jones stated when they are looking at the benchmark figures she thought it would be useful to see national trends. Mr. Minarik responded he will try to think of how they can incorporate that into the plan.

Member Jones asked if there is a map of where there are playgrounds. Mr. Minarik recalled there is one but was not sure if it was in the document. Member McCormick stated she thought it would be helpful to have that in the document with the demographic information. Member Jones asked if they could include school playgrounds and Member Jacobson asked if school locations could also be included.

Mr. Minarik continued with the review of the Strategic Plan.

Member McCormick asked if they could show on the plan where the trails currently exist and where trails are proposed to which Mr. Minarik responded they could show that. Member McCormick stated if they have data that shows where they are missing trails that would be helpful. Mr. Minarik stated they could change the color to show the different types of trails. Ms. Kattreh thought that might be helpful and they could show in a different color what is a designated trail and what is a sidewalk or on-street shared bike trail.

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board that she recently had a really good meeting with Ms. Faus, Mr. Minarik and Mark Nolan from the Engineering Department. She indicated that conversation alone sparked so many ideas and so many comments. She noted it is really going to help them move forward with the Engineering Department as they are preparing sidewalk and road construction plans as well as figuring out the timing and how some of the sidewalk and trails can be incorporated into this larger plan.

Member Good asked what is the rank priority based on to which Mr. Minarik replied it is based on the level of service analysis and the benchmarking.

Member Cella asked Mr. Minarik to tell them a little about the Senior Center because that comes up really high. She indicated she did not see any verbiage what is needed beyond what they already have. Mr. Minarik stated what came up was through the focus groups, people came forward and said the Senior Center was not necessarily used the way it could be used because the space is actually bigger than what they are using it for. He stated another thing that came up was the fact that the name of the Senior Center should be changed to a more community center or multi-generational facility. The board discussed how they can improve the programming for the Senior Center.

Mr. Minarik continued with the presentation.

Member Good thought in the program area of the report they could have some real support in having a fit to mission so they know why they are developing the program. Mr. Minarik stated one of the things they talked about is the city is more in the job of introducing things to people then once they become proficient in them then they go to the specialists. Member Good stated there seems to be a thread going through here about wanting the city to stay involved and help to manage the other programs. Mr. Minarik agreed.

Member Jones asked if there was a way to find out if the people using the facilities are residents. Mr. Minarik thought it can be tracked by registration. Ms. Kattreh indicated it could. Member Jones asked if that could be put into the report to which Mr. Minarik thought it could. Ms. Kattreh noted 95% of the program users are residents.

Member Jacobson stated as she looked at the list of operational costs and funding opportunities, one thing she did not see on the list is facility rentals and they have talked in the past about being able to rent out rooms in the Senior Center or wherever there is room. Mr. Minarik asked if this is something they currently take advantage of. Ms. Kattreh indicated it was and is a big revenue source for them.

Member Good stated he read both the vision and mission statement and they seemed similar to him. He wondered what their vision is as a group. Mr. Minarik stated this is a placeholder and they are working on the vision statement, and it will be added to the document.

Chair Gieseke asked how they can make sure this is implementable and actionable. Ms. Kattreh explained they want to make sure the implementation pages are clear and accurate and follow the direction that staff, Park Board, and City Council see for the city. She wants this to be a document that informs but also drives the work that the Park Board and staff have going forward for the next 10 years.

Mr. Minarik thought that the thing they can do is clarify the priorities and strategies that are most achievable and show early success.

Student Member Chowdhury stated this might be redundant but this document has gone through many surveys in terms of what specific demographic is more inclined to do a specific activity and he thought this was important in considering when they take action to renovate something that they are not doing it without recognizing if people will use it and not just renovate it to use up funds.

Student Member Colwell stated he liked Member Good's comment regarding the vision and the discrepancy between the vision and the mission statement. The mission statement should be more of a description of what they do as a community and a Park Board whereas the vision is what they hope to achieve from what they do as a community.

Staff reviewed with the Park Board the timeline for the Park System Strategic Planning.

Member Segreto indicated she would look at sections 4.1 and 4.2. Member Jones stated she would look at section 4.3. Member Strother indicated she would look at section 4.5 and Member McCormick indicated she would look at section 4.6.

VII. CORRESPONDENCE AND PETITIONS

VII.A. Council Updates

No discussion.

VII.B. Veteran's Memorial Committee

No discussion.

VIII. CHAIR AND BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Member Gieseke stated later in the summer they would like to have an offsite retreat type of meeting to discuss items and get to know each other better.

Member Greene stated the Edina Soccer Club is going to donate a \$50,000 floor that will go inside the new outdoor hockey rink during the summer months and will be utilized to play futsal, which is a form of soccer. It will allow for outdoor use of futsal and they will be able to get 5,000 hours of kids playing in a covered area.

IX. STAFF COMMENTS

Ms. Kattreh went through her list of staff comments.

Ms. Susan Faus gave an update on the Veteran's Memorial Project.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Gieseke made a motion, seconded by Member Greene, to adjourn the meeting at 9:14 p.m.

Ayes: Members Cella, Jones, Gieseke, Jacobson, McCormick, Segreto, Greene, Good, Strother
Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 9:14 p.m.