

**MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
PARK BOARD
HELD AT CITY HALL
October 9, 2012
7:00 PM**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Steel called the meeting to order at 7:06 pm

II. WELCOME NEW STUDENT MEMBERS

Chair Steel welcomed new student member Yasmeeen Almog

III. ROLL CALL

Answering roll call were Members Dan Peterson, Deeds, Jones, Gieseke, Steel, Kathryn Peterson, Jacobson, Hulbert, Segreto, Almog, O'Leary
Cathy Cella arrived at 7:55 pm

IV. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

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

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Deeds, Jones, Gieseke, Steel, Kathryn Peterson, Jacobson, Hulbert, Segreto
Motion Carried

V. ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA

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

V.A. Approval of Minutes – Regular Park Board Meeting of Tuesday, September 11, 2012

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Deeds, Jones, Gieseke, Steel, Kathryn Peterson, Jacobson, Hulbert, Segreto
Motion Carried

VI. COMMUNITY COMMENT

None

VII. REPORTS/RECOMMENDATIONS

VII.A. Garden Park Public Hearing Regarding Baseball Field Renovations

John Wright indicated he is not a member of the Edina Baseball Association (EBA) but does have a son who is now 16 and has played baseball. Mr. Wright gave a power point presentation. He informed the Park Board that Garden Park is built on road construction landfill and when there is a moderate rainfall the fields are not good and they would love to renovate the playing surface and solve the drainage and playability issues that are currently there. In addition, they would like to improve the aesthetics of the field as well as have some player improvements. He noted the fields for the younger kids are more than adequate but as they get older it's important for them to have several fields that they can play on that meet the size standard and the amenities standard. He added they have had trouble with the school fields as far as keeping them mowed during the summer and on more than one occasion he has taken his own Toro and mowed the fields but try to do their best with the school fields they are able to use.

Mr. Wright informed the Park Board of a few proposed improvements: dugouts, batting cages and modifications to the fencing. He then went over a quick summary of what has been proposed and put into the grant as part of the Hennepin County Youth Sports Program which includes taking out the infield and replacing it with sand peat material so the infield can drain. Also, put drain tile in the

outfield, re-grade and plant new grass with an irrigation system (the current one has not worked for several years). In addition, the backstop would be heightened and the chain link fence would be raised; he commented that Mr. Keprios suggested black vinyl fencing because it is more aesthetically appealing to the neighborhood. Also a place for pitchers to warm up inside the fence along with dugouts and a shed on one side and possibly a very small concession stand. In addition, put in batting cages, an electronic scoreboard and some bleachers behind the fence. Mr. Wright indicated there is a lot going on at Garden Park every night during the summer and they did stress in the grant what Garden Park is used for and that is for a certain age group for baseball as well as all families that use Garden Park for other sports and in general.

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board that the total estimated cost of construction is \$382,660 and with a \$100,000 from the EBA that leaves them with a total cost of \$282,660 which they submitted the grant for last week. She explained that staff did make a \$100,000 CIP request for this just in case they receive partial grant funding and not the whole \$282,660.

Member Gieseke asked how it can cost \$5,000 for a flagpole to which Ms. Kattreh replied that question did come up amongst their group and is not quite sure other than it is a construction estimate but assumes it must include footings, possible lighting and up to three flagpoles which can cost up to \$1,500 each.

Member Segreto asked how many of their baseball fields have electronic scoreboards, what is the useful life and what maintenance is involved. Ms. Kattreh replied she would need to refer to park maintenance staff for those answers but would expect it to last between 10 and 15 years and added that the four fields at the Courtney ball fields each has an electronic scoreboard. Brad Burley, EBA Board Member, indicated they are pushing 15 to 20 years with the scoreboard on Courtney Field #4.

Member Kathryn Peterson indicated she knows there was a lot of damage done by vehicles this past spring and asked if fences will be constructed in such a way so vehicles cannot get through. Ms. Kattreh replied they are planning to put up a fence that would open up to allow vehicles to have access; however, when the fence is closed neighbors would still have access to the field when it's not being used in a scheduled manner.

Member Jones asked how many games are being played on that field to which Mr. Wright replied approximately 90 to 100 games from May through the end of July and that does not include practices. Member Kathryn Peterson added that the high school starts using it in April for their sophomore and JV games.

Member Jones asked what happens if they don't get the grant money to which Ms. Kattreh responded the first thing they need to determine is if they receive funding through the CIP. If grant funding is not received, we will sit down with the EBA and decide if they still want to make the \$100,000 contribution and then determine how they could prioritize and phase in the improvements.

Member Jones asked if there would be adequate parking to which Ms. Kattreh replied yes, there is plenty of parking for what they have available as far as field space.

Casey Hankinson, 6615 Parkwood Lane, indicated he has played many years of baseball and thinks Garden Park is severely underutilized from a playability standpoint and certainly could use an upgrade. He drives by Garden Park many times and does see water on the fields to the point where other fields become impacted and thinks whatever improvements made to Garden Park are to be applauded. He congratulated EBA on donating \$100,000 towards the project and as a resident he would be thrilled and thinks it would be a real perk to have another fine, outstanding facility in Garden Park.

Brad Burley, 4510 Arden, informed the committee he has been involved in baseball in the community for a very long time and as sports have grown in the community with lacrosse, soccer, softball, etc., the erosion of the baseball fields in the community has impacted their ability to practice. Therefore, when Garden Park is shut down for a period of time there really is nowhere else to go because the fields at Courtney are for games only and there are not a lot of 90' baseball fields to practice on or reschedule games and it's really putting a crunch into the organization.

Jeff May, 5724 Dale Avenue, President of the EBA, thanked Ms. Kattreh and staff for all of the hard work they put into the grant application. He noted that in a number of aspects he thinks it reflects how good of a project it is for the community. It first reflects the cooperation between the EBA and the City coming together with EBA's contribution and the City's help with the grant and in putting together a terrific plan that will really serve the community. He indicated they've had a lot of discussions about field capacity and the growth of athletics in the community and the need to add field capacity in which this a project that will dramatically improve the usability and capacity of Garden Park and hopes the Park Board will support this project.

Keelin Kane, 5533 Warden Avenue., informed the Park Board that she and many other neighbors use the park for things other than sports, they like to walk and enjoy the ambiance of having a park in their neighborhood. She indicated she is all for sports and thinks it's delightful to hear jolly sport behavior and laughing during the summer; however, one concern she has is traffic although it doesn't sound like there will be an increase in traffic. She commented she would like to hear a little more about the terms of a better facility because it may eventually cause people to want more use of the field and night games and she is concerned about the night sky and the lights that may be put up and so forth.

Member Hulbert asked if it is necessary to illuminate the flags if that is what part of the plan is to which Ms. Kattreh replied yes. Member Dan Peterson commented that he thinks the other option is to spend \$150 on a good flag pole that is in a stand and take it out of the storage area for the games and put it back into storage when the game is over.

Member Segreto made a motion, seconded by Member Dan Peterson, that they approve this with the elimination of the flagpole in the project.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Deeds, Jones, Gieseke, Steel, Kathryn Peterson, Jacobson, Hulbert, Segreto
Motion Carried.

VII.B. Walnut Ridge Shelter Building Winter Lights

Holli Hankinson, 6615 Parkwood Lane, informed the Park Board that last year she came up with the idea of wouldn't it be neat if the warming house and adjacent tree at Walnut Ridge Park were professionally lit with white Christmas lights if the neighborhood was willing to pay for them. She pointed out she started a petition and has gathered 21 names of neighbors who are willing to support it and that she tried to contact most of the neighbors that are in direct sight of the lights. She indicated that she has contacted three different vendors that would be professionally lighting them and they came up with the cost of \$1,200. She stated that with Park Board approval she will then try to gather donations from the neighbors. She indicated that the rink is a neighborhood gathering place and so anything to make it a little more festive is what they thought so they are proposing to have the lights lit the end of November until the rinks shut down which she believes is February

Member Segreto commented that she feels a little conflicted with the proposal because there have been discussions about how the City should strive for a certain sense of uniformity in some of the park structures, being the shelter buildings. However, she does like the idea of personalizing park structures to add to the festivities and sees that as important to the feeling you get in the neighborhood. She stated that in looking at where the signatures have been obtained in connection with the petition many of them are not along the perimeter of the park and those are the people she would see as being most affected by the lights.

Chair Steel asked if the donations were collected would this need to be brought back to the Park Board. Ms. Kattreh replied she would ask for approval stating if they receive the donations you would give the approval to do this and would also want the City Council's approval on this item. She noted if Park Board gives approval she would give the neighborhood another month to raise the funds prior to City Council approval. Chair Steel asked if they would be able to have a public hearing or notify the houses in that area to which Ms. Kattreh responded they had not planned on doing a public hearing but if that is the process the Park Board would like to take she would be happy to do it.

Chair Steel asked about the electricity costs to which Ms. Kattreh replied the proposal is for LED lights which are very efficient; however, without the use of LED lights they would not have considered this proposal.

Member Gieseke commented that he loves the lights but if there are some concerns would you be open to having the holiday lights on in December and go two weeks into January or some kind of combination. Ms. Hankinson replied they would consider anything to have the winter lights. She added there are quite a few Jewish people in their community and she has talked to them and gathered their opinion and they are all fine with it, but winter lights is what they are thinking. Mr. Hankinson informed the Park Board that it is probably 75 to 100 yards to the nearest residence and the hockey rink is lit to full exposure. He commented if there was a timer on the lights he thinks there would be very little impact from those actual lights to the residents and added if there was one resident in close proximity and did not like it they would certainly not want to put them up. They really would like to have some holiday cheer around the ice area that everyone uses at night and it's just a way to spruce it up through the winter.

Member Deeds commented this is not a permanent change to the park in any way, shape or form and if the neighborhood supports it and is willing to fund it he can't possibly see the objection to it. He indicated that he does think there needs to be some kind of a process to let the neighborhood know this is going to be happening.

Member Jones asked what the \$1,200 pays for. Ms. Hankinson replied for the first year it would be putting LED lights on three sides of the warming house and one of the adjacent trees, installation, removal, storage and any maintenance throughout the time frame they are lit. Member Jones asked if they are just proposing this for this year to which Ms. Hankinson replied that is something she wanted to ask. If they do get approval do they need to come back every year and go through the same process? Member Jones asked who would be the party that would be donating, is it your neighborhood association? Ms. Hankinson replied the Parkwood Knolls Association she believes is donating \$300 out of the \$1,200 and the rest would come from neighbors door to door. She also informed the Park Board there is a Parkwood Knolls newsletter which goes to the entire neighborhood and she put an article in that newsletter asking if anyone is opposed, has concerns or questions to contact her.

Chair Steel asked Ms. Kattreh what she would recommend going forward if they make a recommendation tonight. Ms. Kattreh replied she thinks it would be a good idea to look at it again before they approve it next year by a neighborhood mailing asking for feedback. Member Hulbert asked if they approve this couldn't they just say if you are doing the same thing next year and as long as the intention doesn't change they could do the same to which Ms. Kattreh replied absolutely.

Member Jones noted that she would request that the City create some donation agreement so that the City would be indemnified from any problems that the contractor might experience or anyone else might experience from this. Ms. Kattreh replied that's true and they could make sure that the potential contractor is licensed, bonded and insured.

Member Hulbert made a motion, seconded by Member Dan Peterson, to approve the request with the stipulation that in subsequent years they notify staff of the intention to do the same and not expand it.

Member Deeds noted that he does think they probably need to put a notification out to the neighborhood in terms of process. Member Hulbert asked how wide they would do it to which Member Deeds replied he would say the neighbors around the perimeter of the park. Member Hulbert commented that Christmas lights are up all season and he doesn't know what the disagreement is going to be to which Member Deeds responded he agrees, he just thinks legally they probably have to. Member Kathryn Peterson stated that the rinks lights are far bigger than the little LEDs.

Ayes: Dan Peterson, Deeds, Jones, Gieseke, Steel, Kathryn Peterson, Jacobson, Hulbert
Nays: Segreto
Motion Carried.

VII.C. 2013-2017 Enterprise Capital Improvement Plans

The Enterprise Managers gave power point presentations explaining their CIP items.

Edina Aquatic Center – Susan Faus – Replace Heaters, Pool Deck Repairs, Bathhouse Roof and Other Improvements, Replace Pool Filters and Main Pool Boiler.

Member Hulbert asked Ms. Faus if they have looked at repairing the posts to which she replied they have but because they are buckling straight down into the concrete it was recommended that they replace the posts at the same time.

Member Deeds asked if the pool itself is still chlorine based or have they gone to a salt base system to which Ms. Faus replied it's chlorine based. He asked if they have considered going to a salt based system to which Ms. Faus replied they have not but it is probably something they will take a look at in the next few years. Member Deeds explained the reason he asks is given the changes that are being made with the filters would it make sense to do something along those lines at the same time. Ms. Faus replied it is certainly something they can look into.

Member Jones asked Ms. Kattreh to explain the new process and what those numbers mean as well as how it is going to function in terms of getting things done during the year. Ms. Kattreh explained they are entering into a two year CIP process and how it works is staff was asked a couple of months ago, as a department, to prioritize all of their capital improvement projects. She noted the Parks Department, including the enterprise facilities, had approximately 78 to 80 capital improvement projects which were ranked in order from 1 to 80. Staff then submitted those with their descriptions to the Finance Department and the City Manager for their review and at that time took all of the projects in addition to all of the departments within the City and gave them priority rankings. They then ranked all of the city's capital improvements projects on a priority scale from 1 to 7 and those items ranked from 1 to 5 are likely to receive funding between now and 2015. Those items ranked 6 or 7 are still ranked as important projects but they don't have the funding in the next two year cycle to be able to fund those. She explained from the proposed CIP that she emailed to the Park Board three weeks ago was the plan staff submitted because she wanted to give everyone an opportunity with plenty of time to be able to review all of those projects. She commented that she realizes it's a lot of information and between then and October 2nd when the City Council and staff had first opportunity to review that priority system was where the draft proposal came into play; therefore, you will see a difference in the two proposals. She indicated that the City Council is very interested in hearing Park Board's input and feedback and just because a project is ranked a 6 or 7 doesn't necessarily mean that it's not going to receive funding because City Council needs to hear if you feel some of those projects are more important. Ms. Kattreh pointed out now having said that there is a finite source of funds to be able to fund these projects which is why they are not all receiving 1 through 5.

Member Dan Gieseke commented the wall of the new Flowrider that faces 66th Street is all grey cement and asked if they've talked about beautifying that up. Ms. Faus replied they have planted some trees and shrubs along that area and they will look at painting it or something to at least change the color.

Braemar Arena – Susie Miller – Wall System Repairs, Replace Zamboni, Make-up Water Tanks, Low E Ceiling Replacement/West Arena, Painting East Arena, Ballet Room Remodel, Low E Ceiling Replace/East Arena and Parking Lot Resurfacing.

Member Kathryn Peterson asked what is going to be painted because she is wondering about the \$25,000 price tag. Ms. Miller replied it is the walls on the backside and because they are concrete block it is more expensive because they need to use higher quality paint so they don't have peeling issues.

Member Kathryn Peterson asked if the price to replace the Zamboni included netting out the trade-in value. Ms. Miller replied no and explained they just replaced one this year and it actually netted out to be approximately \$108,000 with tax after trade-in value which cost a lot less than they expected. She stated that she is new to the business and it's her understanding they can fluctuate in price and other staff felt they should keep it at \$140,000 and hopefully they will have the same success.

Member Jacobson asked in regards to the Low E Ceiling Replacement are there other alternatives besides that fabric because it seems like spraying foam may last longer and be more energy efficient. Ms. Miller replied that this has been determined to be the best. She indicated that recently three of her staff went to a conference where they found this other product where it was framed in rather than the cabling and sounds like it's going to be less expensive. She added that Mankato State University just installed it in their arenas last year and have zero issues, it's super durable and they could not say enough great things about it.

Member Almog commented she was a figure skater for a long time and remembers the "barn" and from her perspective she would support painting it because she remembers practicing in there and it was pretty sketchy. Member O'Leary indicated he was a hockey player and also remembers practicing in the East Arena and never looked forward to those because it seemed darker, not as friendly and practices weren't run as well and there was a weird vibe going on. He also noted that he remembers a painting on the wall of a figure skater. Ms. Miller replied that they will be putting both a hockey player and figure skater on the wall; however, they do want the figure skaters to feel like it's their home because the hockey community has kind of taken over the other two arenas with the number of state championship banners that Edina continues to accumulate. She does agree they need to make it a little more multi-purpose.

Member Dan Peterson asked Ms. Miller if she had any comments on the priority rating system and does she agree with all of them to which she replied they are very happy.

Member Jones stated she knows there are going to be other capital improvements that came with the Hornet's Nest which were not part of last year's CIP and asked Ms. Miller to talk about that. Ms. Miller responded they are part of the bonding so there is going to be a portion of the bonding. Those items are relocating the Zamboni room, which provides for safety. That's moving it from the south end to the north end which provides for safety. The staff are very excited about that. The railing is under construction right now there a little bit of a challenge because of the wall but it will happen. It's just a matter of figuring out some minor details. That's to help accommodate the seating that was taken out for the walkway. The ADA pathway was completed. We shut down for the month of September they had to open it up the last sat in September because hockey tryouts were going on. They achieved the goal and it opened on time and it's beautiful.

Member Gieseke asked what the expected life span is of the more durable ceiling replacement material. Ms. Miller replied she does not know but the person kept saying “lifetime warranty” so she is assuming close to 20 years but will double check on that.

Ms. Kattreh asked Ms. Miller to talk about her great plan for repurposing the office and concession area. Ms. Miller informed the Park Board they have funding from a surplus from 2011 so they are going to remodel the concession stand and administrative area. She explained when they took over the concession stand on July 1st it felt very separate from the administrative area. They could not cross utilize staff. She explained the plan to the Park Board and noted the benefit is they will be able to share staff and therefore may only need to schedule one person in each area. In addition, the new plan is actually a little more welcoming and staff will now be more out in the lobby area. She pointed out that another benefit is they are going to open up some space that could be used for meeting space and possibly put in a sofa and chair and maybe video equipment and books for coaches. She indicated she may actually have somebody that will help with the funding of it. She commented since kids spend so much time at the arena she thought it could also be a place where hockey players and figure skaters can go and hang out with friends, kind of like a second home. She stated the goal is if it’s their second home they will look to them not only for their regular season ice but for offseason training as well.

Chair Steel indicated the East Arena and Ballet Room costs are the same but are different priority levels and wondered if there was some strategy behind that. Ms. Miller replied she wasn’t involved in the prioritizing but thinks the benefit of the Ballet Room is they will be able to generate additional revenue by offering classes as well as renting it out for meeting space. She stated it is functional the way it is right now but would first like to make a statement to the figure skaters and hockey community by brightening up the East Arena and making it a place they want to be.

Braemar Golf Course – Todd Anderson – Driving Range Expansion, Carpeting, Slit Drainage 3 Fairways, Clubhouse Roof Replacement, Cart Path Repair/Expansion, Maintenance Equipment Replacement, Tee Renovation, Clubhouse Remodel.

Member Hulbert stated their packet shows the driving range expansion in 2015 but the presentation showed 2013-2014 and asked if there was a change. Mr. Anderson responded in 2013 they have \$800,000 and in 2014 they have \$200,000. Member Hulbert asked how they will break that up over two years; are you going to keep the range in operation and just do half at a time. Mr. Anderson replied the bulk of the construction will be in 2013 but they are trying to reasonably split out some of the costs that are going to be on the tail end in 2014. Mr. Hulbert asked when they hope to break ground to which Mr. Anderson replied if it’s approved they would be looking at September.

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board that as staff they ranked this very high in their priority but on the draft CIP it’s ranked a 7 so at this point in the process there is currently no funding in the CIP for it. However, they are working with the City Manager and the Finance Department to try to come up with some viable options to get this project taken care of.

Member Cella stated that in her packet she does not see a listing for the clubhouse remodel to which Mr. Anderson replied that was his error, he did not submit a form for that. Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board this is a slightly different funding source, it doesn’t come from the construction fund like the majority of their projects, it comes from the endowment. The way it works is they still need to submit the CIP forms to show that it’s coming out of the endowment. She noted that was the piece they missed and apologized for the error and added this is also a new process for staff so they’ve made a few errors but they are working with the Finance Department to see if they can still make that addition to the CIP for this next year. Member Cella asked what the total cost of the clubhouse is to which Mr. Anderson replied phase I would be \$75,000 and the rest would be tables and chairs for approximately \$30,000 to \$35,000. Member Cella asked is that well within the Memorial Fund to which it was noted yes.

Member O'Leary asked if putting up a big net to block the golf balls from going any further was an option to which Mr. Anderson replied people really don't like netting because anytime you have limited flight or limited club selection it is not optimal and people do not care for it.

Member Dan Peterson asked Mr. Anderson approximately what's the revenue from the driving range this year to which Mr. Anderson responded to date they are at \$287,000. Member Dan Peterson stated that it seems to him that a priority 7 is wrong for something that brings in that kind of revenue. He asked if that million dollars includes the redo of the executive course to make it all par 3 as well as close the two holes to which Mr. Anderson replied yes. Member Dan Peterson asked what the procedure is to see if there is support to change the priority ranking on that item. Ms. Kattreh replied it is a hot topic and they have had a lot of discussion about it at the City Council work session on October 2nd. She stated that as she had mentioned they are working on trying to determine other potential funding sources, even bonding and phasing the project. Ms. Kattreh indicated that it is important for her to mention it is a million dollar project and the overall CIP budget for two years for the entire City is 2.6 million dollars and that's a problem. She commented that it's not that the City doesn't value or see the need for this project, it's purely a matter of money; however, it is very important that the City Council hear your concerns and desires.

Member Jones commented that last year this project was only going to cost about half of that and asked what happened. Mr. Anderson explained that \$550,000 was actually the estimate they had and that the National Golf Foundation's estimate was \$300,000 to \$400,000 with the thinking that part of it could be done in-house which they have found out that is not the case; we really don't have the equipment. The cost estimates came from the golf course architect and he is currently in the process of getting two additional cost estimates so they should have a better feel but again the range is \$799,000 to 1.3 million. Member Jones indicated that she understands they are going to increase the size as well as be able to give the tees a break and asked Mr. Anderson how much revenue he thinks they would be getting if they were to put this in. Mr. Anderson replied no formal estimates have been made but he is guessing on the capacity on the public range during peak times would increase by at least 20% which would be approximately \$75,000 to \$100,000 but more so than the capacity is the improved turf quality because they are losing play to other ranges. He indicated they are a one stop destination and if they have a quality range it would exceed what you would think as far as increased capacity.

Member Jones asked if they will be able to completely redo the golf dome without any capital improvement. Mr. Anderson replied the insurance money will not totally recover the replacement cost but they are hoping to get the dome up and running in March, not the building but the dome itself. He added it's an ongoing battle with the insurance company and there are additional expenses that they never anticipated as far as building codes. Ms. Kattreh added they are still trying to determine the overall cost for the replacement of the golf dome and it is another one of those items that might get added to the CIP at some point in the process before final approval in December.

Member Gieseke asked if there is any capacity to increase fees if they would complete this project as you see surrounding competitive driving ranges to which Mr. Anderson replied definitely. Member Gieseke asked by how much, what percentage. Mr. Anderson responded he thinks they could definitely go up to \$9.00 for a large bucket once they have a better range with better turf. Member Gieseke asked Mr. Anderson if he could imagine a way to phase this in one piece at a time to which Mr. Anderson replied they really haven't had an architect look at that and tell them what they can do.

Chair Steel asked what the limit is on the CIP and how it is determined and if there is a surplus does that affect the current CIP or are there opportunities to push projects forward; how does the City go about that for each of the different areas. Ms. Kattreh replied that some of the surplus does go into the CIP and there are several different sources of funds for the Construction Fund and in the next year they will have approximately 2.6 million dollars from a variety of sources that will make up the capital improvement pool of money. She indicated there is the ability to move projects forwards or backwards

to try to achieve different goals at different times; therefore, if you see projects as a priority in 2013 and they are ranked in 2015 those are comments that the City Council would like to hear.

Chair Steel asked if the items listed for 2015 through 2017 are based on projections. Ms. Kattreh explained they are based on staff recommendations; however, if you see a project in 2015 with a rating of 6 or 7 it likely means it was a project that staff had rated sooner and it was moved up to 2015 for discussion in the next two year CIP cycle. She pointed out you will see a lot of the projects in 2015 through 2017 have a lower ranking because that is when staff felt that they should be replaced. Chair Steel asked if they can expect the funding in 2015 through 2017 to stay the same or you have no idea to which Ms. Kattreh replied they have no idea.

Member Kathryn Peterson indicated there seems to be ample demand for the driving range and it appears there is no increase in the driving range fees; however, it looks like there are other communities that do charge more and that there is a lot of demand regardless of the condition of the driving range. She stated that it seems to her you might be able to increase the fees a little bit and maybe start building a fund to help pay for some of it. Mr. Anderson replied that peak demand times are very interesting in that you could be hitting off of concrete and it really wouldn't matter; however, the rest of the time people are cognizant of the pricing and unless they went to different pricing for peak times and non-peak times they would have a hard time with that. Member Hulbert asked how often people call to ask if they are hitting off of mats or grass to which Mr. Anderson replied all of the time. He noted if they had a greater surface area it would solve a lot of problems and they could raise their price point but it's tough right now especially when they have a new competitor a few miles away with quality turf.

Member Dan Peterson asked is there any support from the Park Board for moving this to a one or two priority. Three Park Board members raised their hands.

Centennial Lakes - Tom Shirley - Replace HVAC Units and Replace Park Sound System

Mr. Shirley informed the Park Board there were a number of other items that were on last year's five year plan that did not make it through this year's process but are putting much more into their operating budget the next few years rather than the CIP.

Member Jones asked if the speakers at the outdoor skating rink work or do they need to be replaced. Mr. Shirley replied those speakers are only used during the winter and a couple of them are getting a little crackly, especially the main ones at the Centrum building. He stated that right now they are all working but they are going to start failing. Unfortunately, when they find out they are not working, it's going to be during the winter and then the problem is getting up the poles to replace them. Member Jones asked if it is possible to separate those speakers from the whole in ground speaker system that is running throughout the park. Mr. Shirley replied yes, they have a number of amplifiers right now and thinks they have approximately a dozen amplifiers that are controlled separately so they can turn those off during the summertime. Member Jones asked about the cost for this project since it is a rated 7 because she is trying to think about when she is at the park where they experience music. She noted she thinks it would be important to maintain the sound system if it's broken in the Centrum and outdoor speakers. She commented for movie night she doesn't know if these are the same speakers, so if they do need to replace those, she would suggest those be a priority within the next five years. She added she is not sure about the in ground speakers. Mr. Shirley replied they have a program where they are replacing them continuously throughout the year and that a lot of them are pretty old. Member Jones asked what it would cost to replace to which Mr. Shirley replied that it depends on the speaker, how they get to it and the quality, but they are approximately a \$1,000 a speaker. Again, the problem is getting up to the speakers because that adds a big cost right there.

Edinborough Park – Susan Faus – Replaster Pool, Security Camera System, Pool and Wall Tile, Lift to Birthday Party Area, Track Floor, Concrete Repairs, Adventure Peak Remodel, North Sidewalk, Track

Air Conditioning, Adventure Peak Wave Slide, Upstairs Restroom Remodel, Park Boiler, Ramp to Track, Provider Larger Locker Rooms and Window Washing.

Member Segreto indicated that for concrete repairs it shows a lump sum of \$153,000 and asked if some of the really bad areas that are safety hazards should be given a higher priority. Ms. Faus replied that they got that number from the City and they recommended replacing the entire area and because of the current damage and where it's leaking they recommend replacing it all at one time. Ms. Kattreh added that the \$153,000 is to primarily replace the main park entrance concrete including the entrance off of the parking lot. She indicated that actually what Member Segreto is proposing they are doing in that they are taking a look at the most serious and potentially dangerous issues that they've attempted to patch that can no longer just be patched.

Member Segreto stated that it's her recollection that Adventure Peak produces quite a bit of revenue from birthday parties and is a very popular destination not only for Edina residents but residents across the Twin Cities. She noted that it concerns her that a number of items related to Adventure Peak are low priorities and it seems to her that all of the Adventure Peak items should be the same priority. She asked if City Council would give a little consideration to increasing their priority if this is a revenue stream for Edinborough. Ms. Faus agreed that Adventure Peak is a primary revenue source for them.

Member Kathryn Peterson asked if they would cement over the existing steps to make the ramp in the same spot to which Ms. Faus replied yes. Member Kathryn Peterson commented that the price tag of \$41,000 seems really high as well as the pool and wall tile costing almost \$190,000 seems like a crazy amount of money to her. She stated that in her own personal experience working on past projects with the City it seems the City gets the worst deal ever of everything and it seems like everything costs twice as much as any of them could go out and find it for. Ms. Kattreh responded that the prices are actually based on architect estimates so that isn't necessarily what they will end up paying because they rely on experts to give them estimates. She explained when it actually comes time to doing the projects they will receive multiple competitive bids for a project like that and would go through a sealed bid process so therefore they would get the best pricing available. Ms. Kattreh pointed out in regards with the ramp to the track they actually don't have enough distance to be able to concrete over those steps or to add any sort of an easy type of a chair access. They will need to build adjacent to those stairs from the windows in the track all the way down the entrance to the concession stand. It would be approximately a 30 foot ramp that would be overhanging in the Great Hall and because of the width of those steps there is just no structural way to do anything within that footprint. She added that amount is in the architects estimate. Member Dan Peterson asked why not just make the steps a ramp to which Ms. Kattreh replied because of the code requirements the ramp would not even fit if you were to go from the track door to the entrance of the concession stand and there is a restroom access right in between so that eliminates that possibility.

Member Jones commented they are building a ramp to the track; however, the track floor has been given a priority 7 and is curious what the track floor looks like and what it needs. Ms. Faus replied they did put that in the initial CIP but it wasn't considered a high priority; however, the condition of the track floor is definitely worn and there are certain areas where it has worn down and could be a potential hazard. Member Jones asked if anything else needs to be done on the track level because it doesn't make logical sense to her if they are going to spend that much money on a ramp to get up there but are not going to improve the surface of the floor so that once you get there it's not safe is inconsistent. Ms. Kattreh pointed out that part of the goal in the renovation of Edinborough is to improve its overall handicap accessibility and that is one area where they are lacking significantly. She thinks that is probably the reason the rating committee ranked that one a little higher. Member Jones asked if you took a wheelchair to the track right now would it be safe to which Ms. Faus replied yes she believes it would be safe.

Member Jones asked regarding the POS (point of sale system) that is scheduled for 2017 she remembers last year talking about having the ability to have one POS for all of the enterprises and wondered where that went. Ms. Kattreh responded they are working in that direction and just installed that POS system at the Aquatic Center and as the POS are in need of replacement they are working towards the same system.

Member Jones asked regarding the security system that is scheduled to go in is that a similar system that is used in the other facilities to which Ms. Kattreh replied yes it's the same system used at City Hall, Public Works and the Aquatic Center.

Chair Steel stated she feels strongly about moving up the priority for the lift to the Birthday Party area and noted it's a higher priority than the ramp to the track but the same amount. She noted that it's hard weighing two different accessibility projects where the ramp to the track is more resident oriented and the lift to the birthday party area serves fewer Edina residents but nonetheless children. She asked Ms. Faus for some insight and felt it should be pushed to 2013. Ms. Faus replied again she was not part of how the projects were prioritized but did note that they currently do have the ability to create another birthday site by putting people into the amphitheater which does have access. Therefore, personally for her the priority would be access to the track.

Member Kathryn Peterson commented that she finds the new process to be somewhat frustrating. It appears to her that it went from staff to the City Council and then Park Board gets to look at it but it seems like a lot of the priorities have already been decided which begs the question what is the Park Board's role except to hear presentations and ask questions which she is not sure changes any outcomes. She indicated that she is a little frustrated as to why they are doing this because to her it would make sense to go from staff to the Park Board to the City Council. Member Segreto stated that she feels the same way. Member Deeds commented that if it's going to go from staff to City Council then don't waste the Park Board's time because that is one hour of his life that he won't get back.

VII.D. 2013 Proposed Fees and Charges

Member Cella asked why the fee went down for photo shoots in the Great Hall and asked if it had to do with fewer trees or something. Ms. Faus replied that was a mistake the fee will remain the same as in 2012.

Member Deeds indicated that the golf fees remained the same as in 2012 and noted given the increasing fuel costs and assorted other things means your cost recovery will go down and you are not keeping up with inflation and asked why no movement. Mr. Anderson replied because last year they raised the fee \$2.00 for 18 holes and \$1.00 for 9 holes in addition to raising the patron card fee by \$5.00 and added they had never done those three things in one year. Member Hulbert asked wasn't it also part of the study to have an every other year review of the rates and try to keep them consistent for a couple of years and not jack them up year after year to which Mr. Anderson replied that is correct.

Member Jacobson asked Ms. Kattreh where they stand regarding the folks who live at Edinborough and the contract they have that is expiring. She asked did they make an agreement to renew or are they willing to pay fees for using the facility. Ms. Kattreh replied they have not heard a final answer from any of their neighbors but are still trying to get a contract signed.

VII.E. Sports Dome Location Recommendation

Member Jacobson gave the Park Board a recap of where the Sports Dome Committee netted out their main recommendation. The Committee felt that doming the soccer field at the Braemar Facility was not enough so they recommended to add on the improvements of Pamela Park fields as kind of a bundled version and believes it did go to City Council. Ms. Kattreh replied that City Council is looking for a recommendation from Park Board tonight.

Member Jacobson explained that one of the main things that the Edina Soccer Club (ESC) is concerned with is if they put a dome over the soccer field at Braemar they are reducing the size of that field; therefore, if it's smaller it's less useable which means that they have really gone down on the number of fields that are of a high quality that can be used for ESC. She noted that is why the recommendation is to add additional field capacity or add on or improve the Pamela Park soccer field in width so that it is a useable field for play.

Member Kathryn Peterson commented that she knows one of the things that has come up is possibly stopping the current practice of resting one of the fields at Lewis Park and asked if that could also be bundled in terms of an approach to satisfy the concerns that ESC has. Ms. Kattreh replied she did have that discussion with ESC and they feel with the additional field at Lewis Park it would be most beneficial in the fall. They do not feel this would be enough of an addition to take the place of what they could potentially be losing at Braemar if they were to lose the width of that field. However, she thinks it is something they should take a hard look at with their maintenance crew and with the recommendation from the Park Board as well it would be helpful to review the use of the Lewis Park fields. Member Kathryn Peterson asked would the new field at Pamela meet the requirements in terms of the field size that is being lost. Ms. Kattreh replied they would be very close, the width of the renovated field at Pamela would be 230 feet and the width of Braemar right now is 240 feet. She pointed out they would also be proposing to add an upgraded field at Pamela because right now that field space is being used as practice space. She explained if they were to upgrade to a sand peat type of a field surface it would definitely be an improved game and practice venue and that is where they would really be getting the net gain in the field with the addition of the renovation of that field and they would also be improving the width of the existing senior field.

Member Jones asked to be brought up to speed and asked if there is an approach the City could take to meet the demands that would satisfy them. Ms. Kattreh explained that prior to the Financial Committee's review of the CIP this year, the renovation of the fields at Pamela Park would accomplish this goal. As the review team took a first look at the CIP and the funding sources available they felt the addition and renovation of the field was not a priority so those fields were moved back and that is where this glitch came into the process. She commented that was the reason in the delay of the last sports dome meeting because she was looking for the results of the initial CIP review to try to alleviate the field problem involving the dome at Braemar.

Chair Steel commented it is her understanding that tonight they are just recommending the location instead of worrying about the funding. Ms. Kattreh replied they would recommend asking the City Council to take the next step in hiring a consultant to then look at the Braemar site and determine the feasibility, the cost and the size of the field that they would be able to put there as well as the dollar numbers needed to move forward.

Member Jacobson informed the Park Board at the end of their last meeting a suggestion talked about off the table was that one of the stipulations that City Council had was that they can't look at any school properties. However, it seemed to them like one of the most economical ways to do this project and leave Braemar alone. If the City were able to partner with the School District and look at putting a dome on Kuhlman it would be much cheaper and they would leave their best field alone. Member Hulbert asked didn't they try that once to which Member Jacobson replied yes.

Member Deeds stated that the current proposal is that the domed Braemar field gets them a dome and they can say they have a dome and other than that it does not seem to him to be a substantial benefit and use of public money. He stated that actually it would probably be a net loss in terms of play time if they simply dome Braemar. He indicated that Kuhlman is the best solution and the idea of doming the large soccer field at Braemar is convenient, it's easy, it will not be cheap and they will lose field space for it. He commented that he doesn't see it as beneficial, he has been on the committee and he has gone through this and at the end of the day it doesn't solve the problem and it will end up costing 1.5 million

to 3 million dollars to do it and he doesn't support it. He added that if the ESC is not going to support it and is not going to step up and commit to the hours on it, it doesn't come anywhere close to penciling out. He pointed out that not only is it an expensive capital improvement but it's a net loss every year in terms of operating costs because they will have a dome up and taking it down and they don't have a commitment on the largest tenant to fill it. He commented that as it stands he doesn't think the project should move forward until some level of understanding is reached. It just doesn't make sense to spend money for consultants right now on Braemar or move this project forward until something gets worked out. Mr. Deeds indicated that they were told by City Council that they cannot consider neighborhoods or school property which meant they had the field at Braemar; they looked at a bunch of other sites that they knew were never going to work but at the end of the day Braemar is a lousy choice, it doesn't solve the problem; all it does is allow Edina to say we have a dome. To him it is a lousy use of public money.

Member Kathryn Peterson indicated the ESC response says with some minor tweaks they are ready to support this and commit to the hours we've discussed. She stated to her minor tweaks doesn't sound like a different location necessarily and therefore thinks the door might be open to having another field, such as Pamela, that might be a replacement for that. She noted that at the same time she would agree that Kuhlman would be the more logical alternative and asked if there was a way to move forward and say "continue to look at both sites and do some cost comparisons" because she thinks it will show up that there are some significant cost savings about one location versus the other.

Member Almog asked why Kuhlman Field was ruled out in the first place. Member Kathryn Peterson replied because at one point in the past there was an active neighborhood group that fought against it, that was quite some years ago and people change but in some people's memory it is still quite vivid. She stated she doesn't know if that group still exists and doesn't know if people have the same passion. Member Cella commented that it was part of a proposal a number of years to dome Kuhlman and there was a very active neighborhood group of people who surround it that didn't want it in their neighborhood.

Member Cella pointed out that another problem with Kuhlman would be parking because they are already at the very line of how many parking spaces they need and that may be an issue. She stated she also has concerns moving forward with Braemar without specifying a size since size seems to be a huge issue and the original recommendation of the consultant was saying it could only fit 200 feet and we are attaching a picture that says 230 feet and the ESC wants 240 feet. Therefore, if they are just throwing that proposal out without making a recommendation on size or even knowing if the architect could get more than 200 feet seems to be a waste of a recommendation.

Member Almog asked what is wrong with Braemar. Member Deeds replied the problem isn't necessarily Braemar because it is a nice field and location; however, the size of the field can be split in half and they can play 8 and 8 so two games can be played at the same time. He pointed out that if they shrink the field to fit the dome they lose that capacity.

Member Deed informed the Park Board they are two to three fields short and if they have to shrink a current field so it can be domed it will actually leave them with a net loss in terms of overall playing time. It doesn't solve the overall problem they are facing which is they don't have enough full size playing fields.

Member Jacobson pointed out another thing with doming Braemar field is you can't play on it all summer and so they are down even one more field so unless they do some kind of improvements to Pamela they wouldn't have a place to play all summer.

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board that for clarification it was not the City Council that decided not to look at school district sites, it was the School District that asked not to use School District sites and they passed the word on through the City Council. Secondly, the Braemar site has not yet been studied so

they don't know how large of a dome could fit on that site. Ms. Kattreh reminded the Park Board that when the consultants did the study that was the size field they recommended based on the use they projected in Edina. She indicated if they were to look at the Braemar site they could certainly ask the consultants to consider two things. First, is there enough width if they cut into the hill on the west side by the Hornet's Nest to expand that field to a domed field of 230 or 240 feet? She stressed that it's important to remember that at this point Braemar has not yet been looked at by a consultant. Secondly, they will want the consultant to look at the size of the dome and figure out how much it's going to cost to operate the dome and with the revenues it could generate would it work.

Chair Steel noted that her sentiment is more along the lines of Member Deeds that we are not solving an issue and this is a lot of money. Member Hulbert stated that he agrees with Member Deeds as well as the last sentence from the Report/Recommendation that states "Staff will continue to pursue land purchases options and field renovations to improve the quality and quantity of field space in Edina".

Chair Steel indicated that they could recommend that they continue to explore those options and should an opportunity arise then they will act on it.

Member Gieseke stated that he would like to revisit Kuhlman Field.

Member Jones commented that she is disappointed in the letter they received from ESC because she doesn't think they realize that without the ESA, EBA, EFA and the community are behind this and are willing to work towards solutions and are saying yes they really want this and they are willing to do what it takes. She pointed out that the EBA just said they are willing to work with getting a grant and they are going to spend association money to make this happen because it will make Edina a better place. She noted that she remembers getting all sorts of letters in the beginning of the process of people who really wanted a dome and she is very disappointed after all of staff's time and consultant money that they are left with a letter that is basically not very helpful and feels if they do try to find a way to make this work maybe the ESC will agree with it. She commented she has been working with this group for a while and to be told this at the last minute is quite disappointing.

Member Gieseke pointed out that in all fairness to the ESC they have been voicing these kinds of objections during the entire process so when this came to fruition these are the results of their last meeting they objected forcefully and forthrightly. He stated they were honest about it and said this is not the solution they were looking for. Member Jacobson commented she thinks they would like to take the letter back if Park Board was willing to say here is a field you can play on but we haven't provided that option. Member Kathryn Peterson asked is that the minor tweak to which Member Jacobson replied yes. Member Deeds stated that it's the stipulations: Field Dimensions, Pamela Lighted Field and Pamela "Net-New". Ms. Kattreh replied that is correct, that is what they were intending and that is what was included in their original CIP. Member Jones stated she would prefer that staff take a look at this before they just say we are not going to go any further. Ms. Kattreh replied that she feels very confident that what they have heard from the ESC is if they were able to dome the existing size field then they would not feel like it was a loss of field space; however, then their concern is where they would play during the construction year. They don't feel like there is any field space in Edina and quite frankly they don't want to go outside of Edina for field space so the issue would be the year of construction.

Chair Steel commented that earlier they were talking about the driving range at the golf course and that is a very clear project with a very clear return on investment with support and is taking quite a bit of time to fund. She stated with this project there are all of these questions and issues and thinks they need to direct their energy a little more strategically.

Member Kathryn Peterson commented that she doesn't read that as being about the dome but reads it as recovering other field space.

Member Segreto made a motion, seconded by Chair Steel, to discontinue evaluating Braemar as a site for the potential domed sports facility and instead remain open to pursue land purchase options and field renovations to improve the quality and quantity of field space in Edina.

Member Kathryn Peterson asked can they make it more inclusive to not eliminate Braemar but to say that we want to look at other things.

Member Jones commented that she believes they did look at purchasing property and found that it was cost prohibitive and found that Braemar was an excellent site given the fact that it already has parking and is not going to bother any neighbors. She noted it is already flat or relatively flat and it probably has synergies with the arena and will hopefully improve the arena facility because of the increased activity. She stated that she thinks it's an excellent site and that there is already a bus from the high school going there. She knows there are other associations in addition to soccer that are very excited and interested in making this happen for Edina and therefore feels that looking at other sites doesn't make sense to her. Of all of the sites that have been looked at this is the best site.

Chair Steel indicated that she sees Member Kathryn Peterson's point about adding the School District and would like to add that as a friendly amendment.

Chair Steel made a friendly amendment, in addition to land purchase and field renovation options looking at school district options.

Member Segreto stated she would like in her motion to say she does not want staff to spend a lot of time in looking for purchase options, they will be open for purchase options and are trying to increase fields in the City. Member Kathryn Peterson replied she also doesn't want to exclude the Braemar site, she understands there are shortcomings there but there are limitations here and to say they have to reasonably work within those limitations. She is okay with the possibility of looking at other sites and she agrees there probably aren't any except for Kuhlman which is only if the City and School District can play nice which seems to be a challenge. She stated that she doesn't want to discard Braemar and based on what the ESC said their acceptance of it can happen there are just other things that have to be packaged with it.

Member Deeds pointed out that Braemar works as part of a package, it does not work on its own. The problem he has is if they move this forward in his estimation the City Council is looking so solve this issue by putting up a dome somewhere so it is off of their plate and they can say they have a dome. Therefore, Pamela fields being tied in, etc., are going to get completely ignored and that is going to make the problem worse and not better and will be spending a significant amount of money on it. It doesn't seem to him like it is a worthwhile investment of public money simply to have a sports dome that bides three months on one field.

Chair Steel stated that she believes the motion was **“not to recommend Braemar Soccer field as the site but for staff to continue to pursue land options and field renovations to improve the quality and quantity of field space in Edina.”** Chair Steel's friendly amendment would be to add school district's as well. Member Segreto accepted.

Member Gieseke noted that he would like to add specifically Kuhlman field, Member Segreto accepted.

Member Jones asked to clarify that the motion states that Braemar is no longer going to be considered. Chair Steel responded it says it does not recommend that Braemar is the site. Member Segreto responded it states “no positive recommendation to direct further interest in that intent”. Member Jones asked Member Segreto if she is saying we reject the committee's . . . Member Segreto responded yes, based on some of the rationale that Member Deeds presented.

Member Gieseke indicated he would like to make a different motion to recommend the study of Braemar because it's a viable option and at the same time they do not recommend moving forward beyond that point until they can couple that dome site if it does happen with other field renovations and acquiring more fields and specifically Kuhlman.

Chair Steel asked Member Segreto if she is comfortable with that, they need to vote or she needs to withdraw the motion. Member Segreto stated that she doesn't want to amend the motion anymore, she feels there is no payback on this dome. Economically she feels as though maybe it's not the right time for Edina to be building the dome and would like to keep her motion the way it is.

Member Cella asked are they voting on, which amendments. Chair Steel replied the motion is "to not recommend the sports dome committee's recommendation of the Braemar Soccer field site and for staff to continue to pursue school district, particular Kuhlman field, land purchase options and field renovations to improve the quality and quantity of field space in Edina".

Ayes: Steel, Hulbert, Dan Peterson, Segreto

Nays: Jones, Cella, Deeds, Gieseke, Jacobson, Kathryn Peterson

Motion Failed

Ms. Kattreh indicated if you look at staff's recommendation based on the recommendation from the committee maybe she didn't word it strongly enough based on the recommendation from the Sports Dome Committee. Perhaps there needs to be a little bit stronger language regarding the Pamela fields. Member Kathryn Peterson suggested using words like "requires" or "necessitates" with respect to the funding of the renovation of the fields at Pamela. Member Deeds stated he thinks their recommendation should include that no further study of Braemar be undertaken until study and approval of the field expansion at Pamela Park be approved by the board. Member Kathryn Peterson asked if they could somehow throw Kuhlman in there. Member Jones asked if they could put not only Pamela but other fields in both the School District and city because the school district has many fields that could be upgraded and they have talked about putting a dome over their field and she is thinking about potentially putting in turf at a field. Member Cella asked if she is talking about the School District paying to turf a field because they would love to be able to turf more fields; however, that is not in their budget. Member Deeds replied he thinks what they are talking about is the city and the school district working and playing well together and figuring out a way to improve fields, such as Creek Valley for example, with the City's help so that they are more playable and consider a dome on Kuhlman.

Member Cella commented she thinks the Kuhlman dome is going to be a complete non-starter with that neighborhood and with the parking and thinks they are going to be distracting themselves from the issue because that whole neighborhood will get whipped into frenzy and you will lose focus on getting a dome done. Member Deeds commented he thinks if you put up a dome it's not like they are going to be drawing crowds like they do for football and it's not going to overrun the parking lot. Member Gieseke indicated that he doesn't understand the parking issue, no activity is going to take place there that is not taking place there right now and parking is fully functional. Member Cella explained that they have state requirements of how many parking spaces they need given the amount of buildings they have, if you are going to add one more activity they are required to count how many activities are potentially in those buildings. Member Gieseke replied he understands that but they are not adding an activity to which Member Cella replied they would be adding people coming to a covered over dome that is currently not used during the winter. Member Gieseke stated that when they do accommodate a football game and they do accommodate other activities there they have no parking problem and there is no incremental addition. Member Cella responded she's assuming they would be using it approximately from November through March and that she doesn't know exactly how they count parking spaces, she just knows they are on the edge of how many parking spaces they have and it's going to be an issue.

Member Deeds made a motion, seconded by Member Dan Peterson, that the continued study of Braemar and the forward motion of the dome should not occur until the issue of expanded playing fields is addressed, solved, and budgeted for.

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

IX. CORRESPONDENCE AND PETITIONS

Ms. Kattreh indicated the correspondence and petitions she received were included in the packet regarding Garden Park and the Walnut Ridge Park lighting issues.

X. CHAIR AND BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

None

XI. STAFF COMMENTS

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board they are hoping to have the golf dome up and operational in February or March 2013. The first bid packages are going out for the fabric and for the turf which are due on October 30th.

Meeting adjourned at 10:07 pm