

**MINUTES
OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
EDINA PARK BOARD
HELD AT CITY HALL
November 10, 2014
7 p.m.**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Gieseke called the meeting to order at 7:13 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Answering roll call were Members Deeds, Jones, Gieseke, Steel, Jacobson, McCormick.
Member Cella arrived at 8:39 p.m.

Student Members present: Colwell, Chowdhury

Absent: Downing, Greene, Segreto

III. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

Member Jones asked to switch Item C with Item A.

Member Jones made a motion, seconded by Member Steel, to switch Item C with Item A on the agenda.

Ayes: Members Deeds, Jones, Gieseke, Steel, Jacobson, McCormick.
Motion Carried.

Member Steel made a motion, seconded by Member Jones, approving the meeting agenda as amended.

Ayes: Members Deeds, Jones, Gieseke, Steel, Jacobson, McCormick.
Motion Carried.

IV. ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA

Member Jones made a motion, seconded by Member Jacobson, approving the consent agenda as follows:

IV.A. Approval of Minutes – Regular Park Board meeting of Tuesday, Oct. 16, 2014

Ayes: Members Deeds, Jones, Gieseke, Steel, Jacobson, McCormick
Motion Carried.

V. COMMUNITY COMMENT

None

VI. REPORTS/RECOMMENDATIONS

VI.C. Redevelopment Planning for Former Public Works Site Update

Bill Neuendorf, Economic Development Manager, gave the presentation on redevelopment planning for the former Public Works site.

Member Jones asked what the Park Board involvement would be in this process. Mr. Neuendorf stated at this point, it is up to the Park Board. The City Council has directed that a portion of this site be for public use and a portion for private use. He assumed the public portion would be some type of parks and rec facility.

Member Jacobson asked how the Lid project would be part of the Grandview project or would they be separate projects. Mr. Neuendorf stated these would be separate projects. The Lid was a proposal to be innovative on how they integrate transportation and land use. He noted the Lid project, at the earliest, is ten years away.

Member Steel wondered if they could pull data from the needs assessment that would be relevant to that project and cross-tabulate it as far as ages and location of residents. That would help them to see from a parks & recreation standpoint what residents are looking for. Mr. Neuendorf stated they could definitely look into it and indicated that it is an important study with a couple of questions in it that are directly relevant to the site. He stated he was not sure about the statistical significance of this. Member Steel noted it was her understanding that they received so many results that in certain points cross-tabulation is not going to be valuable but for the large majority that data should be very valid.

Member Jones stated one of the specific questions that had to do with Grandview showed that 73 percent of Edina residents support a new indoor community space on that site. She stated this process has been going for a long time and there was a lot of public engagement. She thought a lot of work went into this to create a good framework. She thought that the council and Mr. Neuendorf should understand that the people that worked on that as well as the people that filled out the surveys really want the city to honor their time and work. She thought it seems that every time this process begins again what happened in the past does not matter. She thought the public has spoken and they want a public amenity. She stated that would be her expectation and of the people that participated.

Member Deeds seconded what was said. He stated there is very little public space left and very little developable space in the city. The long-term benefit of investment in amenities to the broader real estate prices in the city will probably benefit more from building the amenities up than from another restaurant, apartments or condominiums. He noted they have very little in the way of park or public space left to make use of and thought if they really thought this through and consider how they compete with other suburbs in the area and what they compete on and if they do not remain a destination suburb for people moving into the Twin Cities, they cannot keep their property values. He thought this needed to be taken seriously and thought about. He thought a long-term benefit to the city, a good public space, probably has higher returns than another shopping center.

Member Steel asked what has resulted with the school district discussions. Mr. Neuendorf stated so far he has met with the Parent Leadership Commission and given them the same invitation for discussion as he gave the Park Board. He talked to the school district on several different occasions. Member Steel wondered where they fit into this puzzle. Mr. Neuendorf thought there was a good relationship between the city and the school district about working together. As they begin the process about this site, he was making the same invitation to all of the different groups to come together and decide how they can work best together and what is the real need of the site and what are they willing to pay for on this site and how can they maximize the efficiency and do it most effectively.

Mr. Neuendorf indicated the school district is looking to redevelop the bus garage in the near future to accommodate new buses that will not fit in the garage. He thought the city and school district were looking at different time frames and he imagined that in the next generation both properties will look differently but they will probably occur one after another.

Member Jones thought she saw a request for three million dollars from Mr. Neuendorf to buy that site in the most recent Capital Improvement Plan. Mr. Neuendorf stated there is a draft Capital Improvement Plan the City Council will look at during their next meeting. He put a placeholder in the plan but it was not to buy the existing site.

Member Jones asked if the City Council has taken any other action with respect to the Public Works site besides passing the framework. Mr. Neuendorf stated there were a lot of different actions taken. He reviewed the actions made by the City Council. He thought when this comes back in the spring for review there will be more options to discuss and choose from.

VI.A. Golf Course Projects Update

Joe Abood, General Manager of Braemer Golf Course, gave a presentation on the golf course update.

Member Deeds asked what the target for completion of the driving range and the redesigned executive course is. Mr. Abood stated the completion should be done by the summer of 2016. Member McCormick asked where the leagues would go that used the Fred Richards Course and did not commit to Braemer Golf Course. Mr. Abood did not provide a specific response but stated that there are several other courses in the area.

Member Jones was wondering what the scope of the task force is. Mr. Abood stated everything that is in the scope of this project is for the betterment of the park as a whole. They are looking at anything that would make this a better amenity for the community. Member Jones indicated she would highly encourage more paths and walking paths. Mr. Abood indicated that is the goal of the task force; they want to bring people into the facility, not just golfers. They want to make it a place in the community that people can feel proud of and visit.

Member Deeds asked if there was any movement on vendors in terms of the restaurant. Mr. Abood stated there is some movement, nothing is finalized and they are still in the contracting phase but it does look promising. Ms. Kattreh hoped to have a lease agreement for City Council approval by next Tuesday.

Member Gieseke stated some of the concerns he heard in closing down the Fred was how they can do right for all of the user groups, in particular the youth, seniors and beginner groups. He wondered what they were envisioning to make sure they accommodate all of the groups that used the Fred. Mr. Abood stated they are trying to engage all of the people that were playing at the Fred and let them know there is availability at Braemar and the programs they are offering are excellent.

Member Steel recommended updating and boosting the website on the Braemar project to which Mr. Abood replied he would get that updated. Member Deeds asked if there was information on the website with regards to Richard Mandell and thought maybe they should show some of the golf courses he has designed in order to generate some excitement for Braemar. Mr. Abood stated they will get that information on the website. Member Steel thought this should also be shared on social media. Member Jones stated she has been hearing really good reviews and welcomed Mr. Abood. Mr. Abood indicated he was very excited to be in the community and felt Braemar has the potential to do extremely well in the future and they are on the right path to doing that.

VI.B. Staff Recommended 2015 – 2019 Capital Improvement Plan

Ms. Kattreh gave a Power Point presentation on the 2015-2019 Capital Improvement Plan.

Member Deeds asked for clarification on the priority listings on the two pages Ms. Kattreh gave the Park Board. Ms. Kattreh stated those were from the Finance Committee. They ranked their list of priorities from 1 to 71. Member Deeds asked what Ms. Kattreh's top priorities were. Ms. Kattreh indicated this was a difficult process for them. They are looking at a park system with some aging infrastructure, park shelter buildings in need of replacement along with playgrounds that are in need of replacement. She indicated she was eager to get through the strategic planning process so they can prioritize and put budgets and years to some of these projects. There is a high focus on the Braemar Park project this year.

Member McCormick asked regarding the golf course piece, the course renovation is a five and she wondered if this was a lower priority. Ms. Kattreh stated they are recommending the course renovation not be done in the next two years. Anything that is ranked one through four is likely to be funded in the next two years of the CIP and they are not going to be ready to do any renovations to Braemer for two years.

Ms. Kattreh reviewed with the Park Board how the CIP plan works.

Member Jacobson asked regarding the Fred, how Ms. Kattreh would foresee the funding for the Fred conversion. Ms. Kattreh indicated that would not likely come out of the CIP but that a conversation will take place once the Master Plan starts next summer. Member Jones asked if the answer would also apply to the Grandview project. Ms. Kattreh indicated that was correct. Member Deeds asked if the dome project was also a separate project. Ms. Kattreh indicated that was a separate bond project.

Member Jones indicated she had a question on the park shelter buildings because she thought they needed improvements. She asked if they agreed to putting on siding and roofs, did that mean they would be removed from the CIP for replacement for an indeterminate number of years. Ms. Kattreh stated that is one part of the CIP that has been a little misleading. When they submitted their CIP projects as far as the shelter buildings she wanted to make sure that the Park Board and City Council understood the financial liability that is outstanding with the shelter buildings knowing they were not likely to get funding within the CIP to replace the buildings because there is not enough funding in the CIP to be able to do that. She noted it was determined by their Facility Manager that the roofs and shelter buildings should not be delayed longer because of their condition. They felt like it was in the city's best interest to spend approximately \$16,000 per shelter building to at least keep them safe and functioning for the next few years. Ms. Kattreh stated she would like to wait to do maintenance on the shelter buildings until they finish the Parks & Recreation Strategic Plan and see how the Park Board and City Council feel about the buildings and then talk about a funding source for these and then prioritize the buildings and maintenance that needs to be done.

Member Gieseke asked what the need is for a new snowmobile and what is it used for now. Ms. Kattreh stated it is actually a show mobile and is like a portable stage. She thought this would be another great discussion for the Park Board and they should decide if the city should invest in a portable stage they can move around to different parks for events and performances or would they be better off investing in amphitheaters in different parks. Member Steel stated the meaningful discussion is the funding sources because she would not be confident in the future if they have unstable funding. She also noted that trails were a big item on the survey and assumed they would have some repairs and wondered how they would fund those. Ms. Kattreh stated there is actually a budget line for trails in the park maintenance budget so they have the ability to maintain their current trails within the park budget.

Member Jones noted the list for playground equipment in the CIP for replacement in 2015 shows some playground equipment being replaced before other playground equipment that was scheduled to be done sooner. Ms. Kattreh thought that would be a great thing to address as part of the strategic plan. Member Gieseke thought they needed to also address equitability of equipment in general in their strategic planning.

Member Jones wondered if they were metering the irrigation they install. Ms. Kattreh indicated she could put together a study on which ones are metered and which ones are not. She thought most of the general park facilities are not metered and more of the enterprise facilities are metered. Member Jones suggested they install metering as they put in new irrigation. Ms. Kattreh agreed.

VI.D. Community Needs Assessment Study

Ms. Kattreh gave a Power Point presentation on the Community Needs Assessment Study.

Member Gieseke asked if they had any idea of how Edina compares to similar cities. Ms. Kattreh stated in the report there are specific benchmarks and Edina is compared to some of the suburbs around Chicago on the north and west side. In a lot of cases they are really close to the higher percentages but have a little work to do in order to improve. Member Steel asked what the next step is in the process. Ms. Kattreh stated they have a lot of the cross tabs available in the report and she thought the next step would be to have a more detailed strategic discussion with the planning consultants as to how to use that cross tab data.

Member Jones wondered what people meant by trails. Ms. Kattreh thought in terms of their survey it was used pretty generically and as they are looking at the strategic plan it will be critical that they look at all types of trails. Generally it was vague in terms of the survey. They did hear about biking, walking and nature trails along with connectivity. Member Jacobson stated as she was reading through the results she realized there was a need to accommodate more walking. Ms. Kattreh agreed.

VI.E. Park System Strategic Plan Update

Ms. Kattreh updated the Park Board on the Parks & Recreation Strategic Plan and went through the schedule.

VII. CORRESPONDENCE AND PETITIONS

VII.A. Council Updates

No discussion.

VII.B. Other Correspondence

No discussion.

VII.C. Veteran’s Memorial Committee, June 20, 2014 Minutes and Aug. 29, 2014 Minutes

Ms. Kattreh stated the construction of the Veteran’s Memorial is well underway and coming along well.

VIII. CHAIR AND BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Member Geiseke stated in regard to the Veteran’s Memorial Committee meeting, there is a note about a potential name change and he wondered what that was in regards to. Ms. Kattreh indicated she has not been involved in that conversation and cannot comment on that.

Member McCormick asked if the work plan was approved. Ms. Kattreh indicated it was not approved yet but would be by the end of the year.

IX. STAFF COMMENTS

Ms. Kattreh went through staff comments and updates with the Park Board.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Gieseke moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:01 p.m.

Ayes: Members Cella, Deeds, Jones, Gieseke, Steel, Jacobson, McCormick

Motion Carried.

Meeting adjourned at 9:01 p.m.