

**MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
PARK BOARD
HELD AT CITY HALL
APRIL 10, 2012
7:00 PM**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Steel called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm

II. ROLL CALL

Answering roll call were Members Dan Peterson, Cella, Gieseke, Segreto, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Kathryn Peterson, Jones, Weicht, Neville

III. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

Member Dan Peterson made a motion, seconded by Member Hulbert, approving the meeting agenda.

Ayes: Members Dan Peterson, Cella, Gieseke, Segreto, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Kathryn Peterson, Jones

Motion Carried

IV. ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA

Member Dan Peterson made a motion, seconded by Member Gieseke approving the consent agenda as follows:

IV.A. Approval of Minutes – Regular Meeting of Tuesday, March 13, 2012

Ayes: Members Dan Peterson, Cella, Gieseke, Segreto, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Kathryn Peterson, Jones

Motion Carried

V. COMMUNITY COMMENT

None

VI. REPORTS/RECOMMENDATIONS

VI.A. Hornet's Nest Working Group Recommendation

Member Jones thanked the Hornet's Nest Working Group, who all diligently met on Tuesday mornings at 7:30 a.m. to work through the details of this proposal. She explained to the Park Board that as part of the process the group looked not only at the proposal presented to them at their special meeting on January 23rd but they also reviewed the broader needs of Braemar Arena, such as what capital investment would be needed at Braemar to function and to stay competitive and to attract the purchase of off-season ice time and remain a premiere facility. She noted that the group realized that the key to do those things was to offer an indoor training facility at the arena. She stated that with great thanks to staff and Mr. Anderson they were able to get a construction cost range from four contractors as well as letters of interest from several indoor training operators and a retail store. She pointed out that after reviewing the information the Working Group agreed to the scope, scale, location and amenities of the project. She added that for anyone who asks she would gladly provide the meeting minutes and recommendations from their meetings. She noted they carry a lot of information on how they made their decision and as a group how they unanimously endorsed the proposal presented in the Park Board packet.

Mr. Anderson first thanked the members of the Working Group for the time and effort they put into the project. He explained that a little over two years ago a small group of Edina Alumni conceived the Hornet's Nest Project and their goal was simple: to bring Braemar Arena back to the forefront as one of the best facilities in the State of Minnesota. He noted that when Braemar Arena was constructed in 1966 it was a "state of the art" facility. Today the three sheets of ice remain among the very best in the state;

however, over the last 46 years the needs and the demands of both hockey players and figure skaters have evolved. He indicated that many players drive to communities like Woodbury, Wayzata, Eden Prairie and St. Paul to train for their shooting skills, puck handling skills, weight training, etc. He stated that the Hornet's Nest Project will allow boys and girls, hockey players and figure skaters, mites to high school age to receive training both on and off the ice all under one roof.

Mr. Anderson explained that the project as contemplated would be constructed on the north side of the Braemar West arena and would be a two story 26,000 square foot addition that could be accessed either directly from Braemar Arena or from the parking area to the west of Braemar Arena. He pointed out that the lower level would consist of four locker rooms which would house both the men's and women's varsity and junior varsity programs. He added that the design of the facility was engineered to reduce the overall size by approximately 8,000 square feet from the previous presentation. He noted at the request of the Braemar Arena staff a Zamboni room has been added along the side of the central egress corridor adjacent to Braemar West arena.

Mr. Anderson showed renderings of what the locker rooms might look like as well as the training facility and retail store. Mr. Anderson then went through the summary of the project. He noted that they solicited estimates from four different contractors including Kraus Anderson, Copeland Construction, Knudson Construction and RJM Construction. He noted that the average cost of the estimates from these contractors was \$121.00 sq. ft. and so at 26,450 square feet the total cost of the project would be approximately 3.2 million dollars. He pointed out that the estimated cost of 3.2 million less the cost of the Zamboni room, \$200,000, would leave a net cost of approximately 3 million dollars. Mr. Anderson explained that through the 501C3 group "Drive for the Hive", they will solicit 25% of the project costs through private donations and therefore as a result the finance request is for just under 2.5 million dollars. He pointed out that the amortization table shows the debt fully amortizing over a 20 year period.

Mr. Anderson explained to the Park Board that regarding rent they solicited requests for expression of interest ("RFEI") from several third party operators including FIT, Ice Edge, Total Hockey and Velocity. The response to the RFEI's indicated the tenant's willingness to enter into a long-term lease agreement as depicted in the rent role. He noted that they did the same for retail and solicited RFEI's from several retailers including General Sports, Sports World, and Letterman Sports.

Mr. Anderson indicated that the total revenue derived from the project is estimated at a little over \$223,000. In the cash flow projection that revenue will be used to pay both the operating expense and to retire the debt as shown in the lower right hand corner of the "Hornet's Nest Summary" sheet. He pointed out that while this does show a slight negative cash flow in the early years Ms. Miller will be explaining how the presence of the training facility will mitigate that through increased revenues at Braemar.

Member Cella stated that in the cash flow projection it shows rental revenue but also reimbursement revenue and asked Mr. Anderson to explain what the reimbursement revenue is. Mr. Anderson replied that the leases that will be executed by the third party operators of the training facility and the retail are what are known as triple net leases. This means that the retailer and the training facility operator would be responsible for their pro rata share of the operating expenses and any taxes that would be associated with that space and those reimbursements just depict that fact.

Mr. Keprios indicated that as he pointed out in his staff report if this were to go forward staff is of the opinion, and he believes they have the Working Group's endorsement of this, that there are some additional improvements that would be triggered as highly needed if the Hornet's Nest were to go through. He noted that as shown in the Report and Recommendation the relocation of the West Arena Zamboni room would be very important because it has always been a safety hazard and they have been fortunate there have not been any accidents. He stated that area would then be made into a much needed larger lobby area for the lower level of the West Arena. It is estimated to cost approximately \$42,000.

Mr. Keprios explained that if they were to move forward and relocate the Zamboni room and build a Hornet's Nest it would be extremely important for them to have a safe, accessible path for coaches and staff to then access to the player's benches from that lower level without having to walk across the ice on the one end. He noted it would cost approximately \$161,000. Mr. Keprios pointed out that if they do this they will lose some seating and to make up for some of that lost seating he showed where they could create an open railing which would create more seating. He noted they've estimated it would cost approximately \$23,000 to create that standing room only seating. Therefore, relocating of the Zamboni room, renovation of the vacated Zamboni room to create a larger lobby to add the ADA accessible pathway access and to include that upper lobby railing would cost approximately \$429,000. Mr. Keprios stated that isn't to say that Braemar Arena doesn't have more needs beyond that but if the Hornet's Nest were to be built it would trigger those as probably being the highest in priority.

Mr. Keprios stated that staff is recommending Park Board move forward with this project in concept to the City Council with some contingencies; however, not everything is in concrete at this point. He noted that it would be contingent upon 25% of the project (\$752,367.67) be covered through private donations. The recommendation would also be contingent upon getting a commitment from the EHA and Edina Figure Skating Club to commit to a \$20.00 surcharge on a per player basis per year for the life of the bonds and this would be consistent with what was done when they first built the West Arena. The last contingency would be that the City Council and School Board would have to agree on an ice rental surcharge fee needed to cover the operating expenses. He indicated that is not something that staff could just literally impose so don't consider that a given; however, the working group put approximately \$12,000 in their recommendation. Mr. Keprios commented that lastly he thinks it would be fair to propose to the City Council that before they were to embark on something like this they would want ten-year lease agreements from the two vendors that would be leasing the space on the upper level.

Member Dan Peterson asked as part of the \$161,000 for the ADA entrance being proposed is there an ADA approved restroom on the level or is it required under law to be wheelchair accessible. Mr. Keprios responded that it is not an ADA or City Code issue; however, it is a safety factor more than anything. Mr. Keprios stated that even though it is not required, in our view, it would be the right thing to do.

Member Segreto commented the one issue she has is the recommendation does talk about an in perpetuity suggestion that the High School contribute or pay \$12,000 per year and she thinks they have to be really careful about any kind of payment scheme that locks an in perpetuity and would like that to be made part of the record.

Member Kathryn Peterson asked for clarification between the difference of the Hornet's Nest summary around the Zamboni room and what was in Mr. Keprios presentation around Zamboni room, are there two different Zamboni rooms. Mr. Keprios replied no, Mr. Anderson was showing where the Zamboni room would be located and pointed out that the new Zamboni room would be the city's part. Member Kathryn Peterson asked so the costs that are shown for construction would not be duplicated? Mr. Keprios apologized for the confusion because as he read through it a little closer the Zamboni room costs of \$202,821.50 need to be added back into the net construction costs if we are to include relocating the Zamboni room to become part of this project.

Member Cella commented if she could just clarify when Member Segreto was talking about an in perpetuity of payment by the High School she believes what Mr. Keprios was clarifying as part of his remarks that items listed as proposals for fees are just suggestions. This is something that would still need to be worked out with the School Board and City Council to sit down and come to an agreement.

Chair Steel asked if there has been any communications with the Figure Skating Club to which Mr. Anderson replied yes. He pointed out that the difficulty the Figure Skating Club has right now is that

they don't have a training facility and they are losing figure skaters to a facility in St. Paul that does have a specific training facility. He added that he did talk to the Director of the Figure Skating Club and they are in support of this and would like to see a training facility.

Member Kathryn Peterson asked if the liability around the use of the training facility be the responsibility of the vendor or would it fall back on the city because it is a city facility. Mr. Anderson replied that third party operator would be leasing the space and they would have to provide their own insurance so that any injuries that would occur in there would be their insurance and not the city's. Mr. Keprios commented that most likely they would ask them to add the city as an additional insured on the lease.

Chair Steel asked Mr. Keprios that the recommendation before the Park Board is the Working Group's recommendation as well as the these four additional projects with contingencies, correct. Mr. Keprios replied that is correct.

Member Jones made a motion, seconded by Member Hulbert, approving the recommendation Chair Steel stated.

Ayes: Members Dan Peterson, Cella, Gieseke, Segreto, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Kathryn Peterson, Jones

Motion Carried

VI.B. Veteran's Memorial Committee New Member Appointment

Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board that there is currently a vacancy on the Veteran's Memorial Committee due to Member Barb Bender not being able to continue to volunteer due to her new job. She has only been able to attend 2 of the last 13 meetings. He stated that there is a very eager and willing volunteer, Richard Olson, who would be more than happy to fill in as a voting member. He indicated that he has a lot of experience in the fundraising arena and has been giving the committee some wonderful advice along the way. Therefore, he would ask that the Park Board approve Richard Olson as a new member of the Veteran's Memorial Committee.

Member Dan Peterson made a motion, seconded by Member Cella, approving Richard Olson as the new member of the Veteran's Memorial Committee.

Ayes: Members Dan Peterson, Cella, Gieseke, Segreto, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Kathryn Peterson, Jones

Motion Carried

VI.C. Veteran's Memorial Sculptor Contract

Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board that they have a verbal commitment from a donor who wants to currently remain anonymous but has verbally pledged \$100,000. He asked that the Park Board recommend to the City Council to forward with executing the proposed sculptor artist's contract because it takes 9 to 10 months to develop the sculpture. He added that their target date is to have the memorial in the ground by Memorial Day of 2013. He indicated that the Veteran's Committee feels very confident they are going to get enough money through in-kind and cash donations to move forward with this project. Therefore, he wants to be sure that they have the support of the Park Board and City Council before they go ahead and sign the \$83,000 contract; he added that they would not recommend doing this unless they have the money from the donor in the bank.

Member Gieseke asked Mr. Keprios if this is a typical scenario and asked for a little bit of background on the sculptor and asked if he has done other work through the City or locally. Mr. Keprios replied that from what they are told from the Edina Public Art Committee the sculptor bases their price on what the foundry tells them what the expenses are going to be and then they tack their fee on top of that. He informed the Park Board that part of the danger of delaying the decision is that the price might go up and that is out of the control of the sculptor.

Member Cella asked if the contract and terms is a pretty standard sort of terms for buying a sculpture. Mr. Keprios replied yes, there are a couple of artists on the Veteran's Committee that say it is standard; however, he also intends to give the contract to their City Attorney to be sure they are not missing something.

Member Segreto stated that she has represented some artists over the years and she would like to make three contract comments. First, they have an outside date for the delivery of the art piece; not to strap the artist but just a comfortable outside date. Second, it states the venue for disputes is in New York which she thinks should be changed to Minnesota. Third, regarding the copyright in the contract she wants to make sure that they have the right to make images of the sculpture and use it for promotional purposes because she could see this being on their calendar or something else.

Member Segreto commented that she would also like to know how members of the community would feel about the artist taking this sculpture and offering it to another municipality. Mr. Keprios replied that the committee is encouraging the artist to go forward and sell it to one other municipality because it reduces our price tag by \$7,000 and the committee is fine with that.

Member Jones indicated that she has a couple of reservations regarding this. She noted that the contract commits the City of spending \$83,000 for the sculpture to which money has not been budgeted for this expense and if they don't get money from this donor then the \$83,000 would have to be taken from other spending priorities in order to meet the contractual obligations to the sculptor. Secondly, \$83,000 is just the next step in a project that has a total cost of \$400,000 of which none of this has been budgeted by the City. Therefore, if the City takes the first step and is left with an \$83,000 sculpture that needs to be installed and they don't have the funding for the rest of the memorial to put it in there will be a strong impetus to find the money in the City budget to complete the memorial where nothing has been set aside for this large expense. Third, she finds the argument that costs may go up so that we must approve the contract today to be spurious because such an argument could be made for each and every possible expense that the City encounters and spending decisions should not be made based upon fear of what might happen to prices in the future. She noted such decisions should be based upon meeting the strategic needs of the City.

Member Jones stated that while there is a generous potential donor who will support the cost of the sculpture she still doesn't see that there has been a significant actual contribution to this project. She pointed out that in the world of charitable organizations where a project of this kind is dependent upon pledged or actual contributions the organization normally refrains from making a firm contractual financial commitment to start construction until a significant percentage of the total necessary funding has been pledged. She noted that the percentage usually is over 50% and often over 75%. Member Jones commented that as she understands it the actual contributions from pledges to date is not very substantial and if the \$100,000 potential pledge is made firm then the total contribution would be in the range of 25% of the total cost of the project. Therefore, she doesn't think that is enough for them to move forward with committing the City to spending money on the project and for that reason she opposes approving the contract at this time.

Member Segreto asked Member Jones if she would feel more comfortable if the contract was made contingent upon the committee raising the \$83,000 expense that would be this obligation. Member Jones replied that if they could cover the expense and the installation, she doesn't know what installation for a sculpture this size would be, and then she would feel better.

Chair Steel pointed that it looks like the cost for delivery and installation would be \$7,500; however, that does not include the price of the crane. She indicated that in Mr. Keprios recommendation it says "we have asked that the money be deposited into the Community Foundation account now or at least pledged to be placed in the account in the denominations in time to make the payments" she stated that she would

be more comfortable “asking that the money be deposited into the Community Foundation Account now before they go ahead with this contract”.

Member Hulbert stated that he agrees with that. He noted that he thought they were pretty clear when City Council stated and passed that \$30,000 was the extent of the City’s financial obligation. Therefore, going forward with the installation and the purchase before the actual contribution is made would go against what they have done so far and he would feel more comfortable if they had the deposit.

Member Segreto suggested if the contract was made contingent they would have no financial exposure and then they would have the best of both worlds that is having the price of the sculpture locked in and no obligation to pay unless the money was raised and deposited. Member Hulbert noted he would be okay with that. Member Gieseke commented that’s a good suggestion and even better seeing as the other party would agree to it. Member Cella responded that would be the issue why the artist would want to agree to go ahead if he thinks prices are going to go up for his foundry costs and if we have a contingency to get out that if she were his lawyer she would tell him not to sign it. Member Segreto commented that if he is making the same sculpture for another municipality he may be fine with it.

Member Cella indicated that she does resonate to Member Jones comment about the fact that even looking at the \$100,000 donation that is only 25% of the total cost of the \$400,000 for the memorial. She stated that to go ahead with buying hard goods for something when you only have 25% of the total raised with one donation, they don’t know what the other fundraising efforts are going to be like. She commented that she would feel a little bit more comfortable giving the Veteran’s Committee another three or four months to do some serious fundraising so they can come back and say they were able to raise another \$100,000 so that they can see that they are actually making some strides to funding the whole project. She added that if this is going to stall out as Member Jones mentioned then they are going to have a big statue with no place to put it.

Mr. Keprios commented that he cannot say that it’s not going to stall out; however, they did have a meeting today with the owners of a construction company who are interested in an in-kind donation to construct it. Also, the survey work has already been an in-kind donation from a member of the Veteran’s Committee. In addition, a committee member is working to secure an in-kind donation of a lot of the granite work through a connection. Mr. Keprios pointed out that they also have two more meetings set up for next week with some significant possible donors as well as they are meeting with the Noon Edina Rotary Club. He noted things are getting set up and they are moving forward; however, he can’t sit here and guarantee that they are going to raise all of the money. He commented they will have the money to buy the sculpture, that’s a given and the contract will be written that way; however, there is the outside chance that the City will have this beautiful sculpture with nothing to put it on and that would be the risk and worst case scenario to the City.

Member Segreto commented that she just got back from Washington, DC, and she came back very inspired after looking at the Veteran Memorials there and her personal opinion is that she doesn’t feel that this is such a big risk that she is worried about it and she would like to see this go through.

Member Dan Peterson made a motion, seconded by Member Gieseke, to table it for one month and see what the Veteran’s Committee can tell them at that time.

Ayes: Members Dan Peterson, Cella, Gieseke, Segreto, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Kathryn Peterson, Jones

Motion Carried

VI.D. Cost Recovery Targets for Enterprise Facilities – Keeya Steel, Park Board Chairperson

Chair Steel explained to the Park Board that her intent tonight is not to set up cost recovery targets or talk in detail about numbers but rather discuss in general the idea of setting costs recovery targets. She

noted that two City Council members expressed to her that they would like targets set; therefore, she would like to hear from the Park Board what they think as to whether it would be helpful, feasible and would help make their vision easier.

Member Hulbert stated that without having any conversations on the topic he thinks it would be worthwhile to talk about it. He noted that all of the different enterprises are going to have different challenges so they need to treat them all differently.

Member Kathryn Peterson indicated that she thinks it would probably be more helpful in the sense of setting ranges instead of the target being just one number but does think it's worthwhile to talk about. She noted that eventually they would need to get City Council's buy-in to whatever they came back with.

Member Segreto commented that she thinks they've struggled with trying to figure this out and she thinks it would be very helpful to have ranges.

Member Jacobson stated that she thinks as they try to decide things going forward like the sports dome and how much are they willing to pay for a sports dome versus where it is she thinks are the kind of targets that would help them decide that and how big a dome they can build as well as anything that they are going forward with in the future to try to be equitable.

Member Dan Peterson indicated that he is not opposed to talking about targets but they need to also look at the other side of the column which should be to the benefit of the City. He pointed out that he thinks it would behoove the City to lose money if they are going to help seniors or kids who can't afford to do some of the things. He noted that another thing that perplexes him is with all levels of government is why they are talking about getting off the property tax idea of funding and look at a State-wide sales tax because the State raises taxes pretty efficiently and just like the schools get money from the State if Edina has 48,000 citizens they would get so much money back to run their City.

Member Jones indicated that she would like to raise this to the City Council to make sure that they have their support if they were to take a look at this. She stated that she thinks it would be wise to find out from them if they have their support if they start examining this. She suggested if they did this that it be done much later in the year since their agendas are pretty full for the next few months. Member Jones commented that she also agrees with ranges and would love to find out what makes one place an enterprise facility and not another such as the Art Center and Senior Center, what triggers something to be an enterprise facility. She indicated that she knows just a little bit about the comprehensive plan to say that the enterprise facility has their own targets and their own type of goals; however, she would like for them to look at those goals and see where they match up and where they don't in meeting those goals.

Member Gieseke commented that they are asking a very large and important question and he thinks they need to deal with what their mission is and they need to understand more of the scope before they start implementing ranges. He noted that they don't want to handicap what their decision making mission is supposed to be with set ranges that maybe don't correlate to the overall mission; therefore, they need to know more about how things are functioning and those kinds of categories before they can move forward.

Member Kathryn Peterson indicated that actually makes her feel better because when she was talking about the criteria for enterprise facilities she was kind of referencing that she doesn't really understand how the facilities are categorized. Therefore, maybe they need to relook at that as part of this or at least offer their opinion on it.

Member Cella stated that depending on what their mission and function is the enterprise facilities may have completely different target ranges than others and may expect some to be more self-sustaining than others. She noted that at some point they may need to have a workshop to lay it all out on the big graphs in excel and kind of see where everything lines up. By doing that they may have a much better sense of what the enterprise is, what its goal really is, what kind of revenue it is bringing in and then what purpose it is serving and what people in our community it is serving and once this is all laid out they can get a sense of that.

Member Neville stated that he would like to reemphasize the point that Member Dan Peterson made. It's interesting to him that when they approach an enterprise facility that is losing money they talk about this kind of idea of what it's giving back to the community in that it's okay that it's losing money as long as it's giving something back to the community. He commented that what seems to be the difficulty whenever they approach one of these enterprise facilities is quantifying how much it's okay to be losing for what it is giving back to the community and that is always a really difficult thing to put a number on. He asked how much is it worth that all of these kindergartners have a place to go play because of this enterprise facility. Therefore, as they move forward with these differences they need to make a decision on that difference and can we live with that difference because it's giving back to the community. If we can't live with that difference then we need to make some serious decisions about how the revenue is being created and generated in that enterprise facility or else something needs to change. He commented that it's an interesting idea of how do you quantify that and that is something that obviously needs to have more discussion beyond just this meeting.

Chair Steel commented that she would also like to add to those various categories the user fees because even though it is not an enterprise facility there is still a cost recovery target that the City Council has talked about. Chair Steel stated so what she is hearing is that the Park Board wants to look at the value of the public good, cost recovery, targets or ranges and the definition of enterprise. Member Kathryn Peterson stated that as Member Jones pointed out they may want to confirm the understanding with the City Council that that is in fact what they want the Park Board to take on.

Chair Steel made a motion, seconded by Member Jones, that the Park Board asks the City Council for their approval that this Park Board studies the value of the public good, the cost recovery targets and the definition of the enterprise facilities knowing that this would be studied at a much later date given their work load.

Member Segreto asked would it be possible to have the City Council join them in this study, like a joint work group because really the City Council should be involved in the study of the issue. Chair Steel asked Mr. Keprios for his thoughts on that. Mr. Keprios replied at that elected level he thinks it's probably wise that the City Council discuss this as one body in a Joint Work Session with the Park Board. Chair Steel replied that she thinks this recommendation allows for them to decide how they study it.

**Ayes: Members Dan Peterson, Cella, Gieseke, Segreto, Steel, Jacobson, Hulbert, Kathryn Peterson, Jones
Motion Carried.**

VI.E. Self-Assessment Survey – Keeya Steel, park Board Chairperson

Chair Steel informed the Park Board that she will start to compile the surveys and work with Mr. Keprios and Member Segreto to move to the next step. Member Kathryn Peterson asked what the next step is to which Member Segreto replied getting together to talk about it. Chair Steel replied that she thinks what she will do is compile it and then they can look it over and pick a date and go from there.

VI.F. Board and Commission Members Orientation Presentation – Staff

Mr. Keprios showed the Park Board a power point presentation created by Karen Kurt, Assistant City Manager. The presentation is a generic New Board and Commission Member orientation that from here on will be given to new Board and Commission members.

VII. CORRESPONDENCE AND PETITIONS

Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board that he is still receiving emails on the Edinborough Park Study which he will keep updating the master list and send them out occasionally but not every day.

VIII. CHAIR AND BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Member Kathryn Peterson indicated as long as she has lived in Edina there has been a rule that no access is given to the athletic fields before April 15th and asked given the climate changes if any thought has been given to relook at it or add some variability to it based on the turf and that sort of thing. Mr. Keprios replied absolutely he thinks they have to remain flexible and meet the needs and desires of their residents so it is something that they are going to have to revisit on a year by year basis.

Member Segreto stated that she read in the Sun Current that the City Council was moving meetings in connection with other religious holidays other than Christians and the Jewish faith and asked if any of their meetings conflict with these other holidays. Mr. Keprios replied not this year that he is aware of yet.

Member Cella asked Mr. Keprios that when he updates them with the emails from the various citizens if he could somehow at the end of one update but a colored line or colored asterisk so they will know the next time what emails have been added. Mr. Keprios responded that is a good suggestion and they will start doing that.

Member Jones gave the Park Board an update on the Naming and Donations working group. She noted that right now they are in the middle of a public comment period for a Naming Policy and Donation Policy. She indicated that the working group will be meeting on April 23rd to discuss any feedback and asked the Park Board if they had any questions, suggestions or comments about the two policies to give that to the working group as soon as they can. She stated that they have updated the policies since their last meeting and did receive input from Mr. Keprios and Mr. Neal so their comments have been incorporated into the policies.

IX. STAFF COMMENTS

Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board they are moving forward with the installation of the flow rider at the Aquatic Center and they seem to be on schedule. The City Council approved an award of bid to provide the themed structure for the flow rider.

Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board they have been working with consultants on the sports dome site study and have had their first meeting.

Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board that he does plan to have the Edinborough Park issue back on the May Park Board agenda.

Meeting adjourned at 8:33 pm.