MINUTES
OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
EDINA PARK BOARD
HELD AT CITY HALL
August 11, 2014
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 Segreto, Jones, Greene, Steel, Gieseke, McCormick, Downing, Jacobson.
Member Cella arrived at 7:46 p.m.
Member Deeds arrived at 7:55 p.m.

III. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

Member Segreto made a motion, seconded by Member Steel, to approve the meeting agenda.
Ayes: Segreto, Jones, Greene, Steel, Gieseke, McCormick, Downing, Jacobson.
Motion carried.

IV. ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA

Member Steel made a motion, seconded by Member Segreto, to approve the consent agenda as follows:
IV.A. Approval of June 10, 2014 Minutes
IV.B. Approval of July 8, 2014 Work Session Minutes
Ayes: Segreto, Jones, Greene, Steel, Gieseke, McCormick, Downing, Jacobson.
Motion carried.

V. COMMUNITY COMMENT

None.

VI. REPORTS/RECOMMENDATIONS

VI.A. Park Master Plan Consultant Interviews

Ms. Kattreh explained each of the consultants present tonight has 20 minutes to present, followed by 10 minutes of questions by the Park Board. A ballot will be taken at the end of the interviews.

Ms. Kattreh introduced the first interviewee, Confluence. Terry Minark, the principal of Confluence introduced himself, and Jeff Bransford, Janna Kieffer, Brian Clark, and Mark Wentzell each introduced themselves and explained the way they would support the master planning process.

Mr. Minark provided a biographical sketch and resume of Confluence. Brian Clark walked the Park Board through the basic process they use in developing master plans, and how to engage the public in the planning process. Jeff Bransford discussed the process can be boiled down to a 3-step process: visioning, analysis, and putting together a roadmap for how to achieve that. He discussed the research that can be done to produce data-driven decisions.

Mr. Minark explained the planning process being with a facility conditions evaluations. Mr. Wentzell discussed the importance of looking at the physical buildings in the park system as well, specifically looking at maintenance issues and long-term viability. Ms. Kieffer discussed the stormwater issues

involved in park master planning. Mr. Minark summarized the process will ultimately create a technical document that is also accessible for implementation, with a goal of sustainability and flexibility.

Member Segreto asked if this team present tonight has worked together previously. Mr. Minark responded affirmatively, noting that this team is working together currently for the City of Minneapolis.

Member Jones asked how many parks and recreation master plans Confluence works on per year. Mr. Minark responded that Pros and Confluence work together on approximately five master plans per year.

Chair Gieseke asked them to describe a project completed within the last three years of which they are particularly proud. Mr. Bransford described a project for Oletha, Kansas, in which Confluence and Pros worked together as a team.

Mr. Minark and Mr. Bransford also discussed the ways in which parks and recreation programming help communities economically.

Member Steel asked about complementing the city's Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Minark stated that integrating into the Comprehensive Plan is a flexible process.

Member McCormick asked how the team would look at repurposing existing fields or facilities. Mr. Minark responded that data would be gathered on the programming of the space; this data is also gathered through interviews from city staff and parks and recreation programmers. An analysis would also be done with regard to user trends. Mr. Bransford added that participation data is gathered, as well as nationally published sporting information.

Ms. Kattreh asked the Confluence team about working with an outside consultant, such as ETC Institute, who is preparing a community survey for the city to help guide this process. Mr. Bransford responded that his firm has worked with Ron Vine of the ETC Institute on at least 200-300 occasions.

Member Jones asked how the team would define "public facility." Mr. Wentzell discussed collaborations between public and private entities, and he cited the new curling center being built in Chaska.

Chair Gieseke thanked the Confluence team for their helpful presentation.

Member Cella arrived at 7:46 p.m.
Member Deeds arrived at 7:55 p.m.

Chair Gieseke invited the next team of candidates to present: Bruce Jacobson (Director of Landscape Architecture at Cuningham Group) and Bob Close (Close Landscape Architecture).

Mr. Close stated the parks assessment will be integrated with the needs assessment currently underway. He discussed the value of designing a park system from tot lots to seniors. He noted that Edina has an iconic value, which should be maintained in part through its park system.

Mr. Jacobson discussed the process of creating a physical plan, management plan, financial plan, communication plan, and implementation plan. He noted the success depends on the collaborative effort.

Member Steel asked about the public engagement process. Mr. Jacobson responded the critical thing is to find out how the public views the system, how they connect with it, what makes the system unique.

Member Jones asked how many city-wide parks master plans they have been involved in within the past year. Mr. Jacobson responded they have not handled any citywide master plans, but have been heavily involved with multiple-neighborhood and new community parks planning. Mr. Close indicated they have focused more on the components of the system rather than the entire system.

Member Jones asked about the work they have done in a city most closely resembling Edina. Mr. Jacobson cited work in Maryland as well as Dakota County and Ramsey. Mr. Jacobson noted he has been involved in the Grandview area, and Mr. Close has been involved in Pentagon Park.

Member Downing asked what would be the biggest challenge for a project of this scale. Mr. Jacobson responded he has toured Edina and noted it is a compact city; the biggest challenge is to reach out to each neighborhood.

Member Steel asked how they see this being integrated into the city's Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Jacobson responded there will be actions that come out of each plan (physical, management, financial, communications, and implementation). As tactics are defined, some will be vetted by the city and some will be adopted as policy or go into financial planning or overall marketing and communications.

Chair Gieseke thanked them for their presentation.

Chair Gieseke welcomed Bob Kost, Greg Kalpino, and Karen Lugar of SEH. The team introduced themselves, noting there are other members of their firm whose resources they will draw upon.

Mr. Kost began his presentation by saying the theme is: approach, concept, and reality. He discussed how to define the vision, a continuum of engagement, developing the concepts, and achieving the reality. The team discussed numerous projects they are working on, including current trends such as vegetable gardens, ice for curling, and employing the work of local sculpture artists.

Member Jones asked how many parks master plans the team has worked on in the last year.
Mr. Kost responded they have worked on about three in the last couple of years. They have worked on the parks aspect of Comprehensive Plans for three cities as well.

Ms. Kattreh asked about working with Ron Vine or ETC Institute.

Mr. Kalpino responded he has worked with Mr. Vine, and he would be a seamless piece of the team.

Member Downing asked about another project where they have had to work with many different types of parks and facilities.

Mr. Kalpino responded Elgin is an example. Mr. Kost noted he has also worked on the Burnsville master parks system, which has a similar mix of parks to Edina and required a multi-level assessment as well.

Member Deeds asked where the strategy piece comes in to help the Park Board 10 years from now.
Ms. Lugar responded there are policies and guiding principles. Mr. Kalpino responded the phasing and implementation strategy will play a role in that – that is the way to bridge time.

Member Deeds asked about the process of creating a set of principles and decision guidelines.

Mr. Kost responded there is a systematic process to this; every community is different, but the methodology is similar. Planning is very systematic and relies on the NRPA's criteria. They use the Envision software that is a sustainability rating software. That is another tool to help figure out the goals. The guiding principles are determined with the Park Board and become the litmus test going forward.

Mr. Kost noted this is a legacy document that is kept and updated, similar to a city's Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Gieseke thanked the team for their presentation.

Member Greene excused himself from the fourth presentation.

Chair Gieseke welcomed the next interviewees.

Ken Grieshaber from SRF Consulting Group introduced himself, along with Joanie Giese, whose focus is stormwater management, and Michael Schroeder, with whom he is currently working on other master planning projects. Mr. Grieshaber and his team highlighted past projects and experiences related to parks master planning (in Eden Prairie), the Plymouth Comp Plan, as well as the North Minneapolis Greenway. They also discussed the important process of stakeholder outreach, as well as the current demographics and trends in Edina. They also offered the service for concept plans for existing parks that may need some redevelopment.

Member Jones asked how many park master plans the team has worked on in the last year. Mr. Grieshaber responded by mentioning several master plans they have recently finished work on or are working on right now.

Member Jones asked about the involvement in Grandview. Mr. Schroeder explained about his significant time investment in his volunteer role in the Grandview process.

Mr. Downing commented that a lot of the plan will be based on input from the public. Mr. Grieshaber explained the task force meetings where the public are invited to attend; he also cited electronic media as well as communication via the city's website.

In response to a question by Member McCormick, Mr. Schroeder explained how park concept planning was done in Roseville.

Ms. Kattreh noted the city has hired Ron Vine of the ETC Institute to complete a community survey, and she inquired how SRF would implement those results. Mr. Schroeder recalled a value-based survey he utilized for the City of Roseville, which allowed them to discern the first steps forward. His team really prefers to start with the idea of what values are important to the community.

Member Deeds asked how SRF can develop a strategic vision that lasts for 15 or 20 years. Mr. Schroeder responded that Edina has long been a community of innovation. He would like this pushed in the Vision Edina process as well as the Comprehensive Plan process. Mr. Grieshaber added that it is important to be good listeners, especially through the first phases of the process.

Mr. Schroeder stated the key is to operationalize the plan on paper and make people responsible for moving things forward.

Member Jacobson asked how to identify what things are missing from the park system. Mr. Schroeder responded part of that is engaging in a dialogue.

Chair Gieseke asked if there is a specific example of successful vision implementation. Mr. Schroeder recalled a what-if process of a road being removed in Golden Valley. He believes that a dialogue around possibilities will get us thinking about a master plan differently.

Chair Gieseke thanked SRF for their presentation.

Member Greene re-joined the meeting.

Chair Gieseke asked the Park Board to discuss thoughts before taking a vote.

Member Downing commented that based on his experience, the process, in the long run, is what drives the entire thing. There are so many elements to making sure this process is done well, he believes it is critical that someone has done this before on this scale.

Member Steel stated the City Council needs to buy into this plan, and this needs to affect the Comprehensive Plan so transportation and park systems are interconnected. Some of the consultants have more experience with the Comprehensive Plan process, and that is what she is looking for. She really enjoyed SEH's presentation.

Member Deeds stated he is concerned with the last two presenters because of their heavy involvement in the City of Edina. This means they come in with a preconceived notion of what the city looks like. In reading through the reports, he does not see a lot of strategy in the sense of thinking about how Edina positions itself competitively against the other community, to maintain its status as the premier suburb in the Twin Cities.

Member Greene commented he believes Confluence is the only group who presented tonight that is capable of handling a project of this scope.

Member Segreto commented she really looks to staff for leadership.

Member Deeds indicated that the consultants are brought in to provide information and viewpoint, and the staff and City Council have to make decisions and show leadership. He believes the consultant should be able to provide vision on how Edina maintains its position. The point of bringing in outside consultants is to help reassess the existing framework.

Member Downing commented that Confluence was the only group who brought all the members of its team along, demonstrated significant experience in master planning in comparable cities, and introduced the concept of return on investment in terms of the park system.

Ms. Kattreh indicated she feels like she is looking at the park system from a blank slate, and she is excited to bring in a consultant to help guide the planning process for the next 10 to 20 years. She has worked with several of the consultants, including the Cuningham Group, Barr Engineering, and SEH. From a staff perspective, she would be happy to work with any of the groups.

Member Cella commented she missed the Confluence presentation, but her primary concern is their extensive experience with similar cities leading to a cookie-cutter plan for Edina. She wants a plan that is really specific to who Edina is and where the city wants to be.

Member Jones commented she believes they have done a great deal of background and talked about Edina specifically.

Member Steel noted Confluence spent a great deal talking about their experience rather than what they can deliver, and she leans more towards what can be delivered.

Member Deeds asked whether there will be trouble with having Pros consultant being based out of Indianapolis.

Member Downing explained he thinks Pros would be responsible for process, and that would be the national element. Confluence, however, seemed to be more in tune with what is happening locally. Making it local and Edina is the responsibility of the Park Board and Edina.

The Park Board discussed the importance of process and vision.

The Park Board took a secret ballot to select the consultant.

Chair Gieseke announced Confluence as the selected consultant, receiving eight votes.

VII. CORRESPONDENCE AND PETITIONS

VII.A. Council Updates

VII.B. Veteran's Memorial Committee (April 18, 2014 Minutes)

No comments were made.

VIII. CHAIR AND BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Chair Gieseke indicated Member Steel is now a candidate for the City Council.

IX. STAFF COMMENTS

Ms. Kattreh reported the Sports Dome project is coming along quite well and is on schedule for an early December opening. She noted Pamela Park is still waiting for Watershed District approval, which should happen any day.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Gieseke made a motion, seconded by Member Downing, to adjourn the meeting at 9:46 p.m.

Ayes: Members Segreto, Jones, Greene, Steel, Gieseke, McCormick, Downing, Jacobson, Deeds, Cella.

Motion Carried.

The meeting adjourned at 9:46 p.m.