

MEETING MINUTES
Public Works Site Small Area Guide Process
Tuesday, June 29, 2010, 7:00 - 9:45 pm
Edina City Hall
Council Chambers

Staff Present:

Cary Teague

CAT Members Present:

Kevin Staunton

Kim Montgomery

Josh Sprague

Andy Brown

Mike Platterer

Chris Rofidal

Gene Persha

Lisa Diehl

Ellen Jones

Greg Domke

Steve Buss

Design Team Members Present:

Mike Fischer

Peter MacDonagh

Peter Sussman

Mike Fischer

Michael Schroeder

Jim Miller

Discussion:

Mr. Fischer said he would lead the discussion this evening and focus on “what worked and what didn’t”.

Ms. Montgomery said in her opinion because of the fast paced time frame the group had “tunnel vision”. Member Montgomery said there wasn’t enough time to really think about it, adding more time may be needed to process the principles to ensure this was really what we wanted to say. Continuing, Member Montgomery said she felt there was a disconnect between what the CAT envisioned and what the Design Team interpreted. Member Montgomery said the Design Team got many things right, however they added some things (that were not intended by the CAT) and missed others. Concluding, Ms. Montgomery said there should be a lag time between the CAT initial definition of principles and the delivery of those principles to the Design Team to ensure that the principles are clear and what the CAT intends.

Ms. Diehl suggested one more meeting.

Mr. Rofidal said the Thursday, Friday and Saturday sessions were very intense. Rofidal asked could this process be more virtual, so those traveling could participate.

Mr. Platterer suggested that a conference call might work, adding he thought numbers in the groups were very good.

Mr. Brown thought maybe more could participate.

Mr. Fischer said a good idea may be to have the process take a couple months – this was compressed into a 21 day period.

Mr. Miller didn't think there was a disconnect. He suggested once the design was done, there could be more meetings, and then bring to different groups.

Mr. Fischer suggested that there is an additional meeting to discuss the concept before the public open house.

Ms. Montgomery said she thought that the drawings and the principles were too vague.

Mr. Sprague said he thought the process was good and by being somewhat vague helped gain consensus. If you want more detailed plans you might not get consensus.

Mr. Platterer suggested that more detail could be provided and made more formal toward the end. You would gain consensus as you move forward.

Ms. Jones asked at what point could it be determined if traffic ideas are even possible.

Mr. Miller thought a facilitator was needed for the design team.

Mr. Domke liked the principles.

Ms. Montgomery said she thought that the principles should be simplified and clarified and the principles didn't fully reflect what was intended.

Mr. Sprague disagreed, he thought they did.

Mr. Rofidal said he thought the principles were good; but how do we develop them further. He pointed out the Council wasn't present to participate. Maybe Jack Broz could have given his presentation earlier.

A lengthy discussion ensued.

Mr. Miller stated that MnDot is due to help Edina – 100 is prime; Edina has been ignored.

Ms. Diehl stated staff help and web site was key.

Mr. Staunton said in the beginning all agreed that letting anyone speak was good. Open door informal meeting worked.

Mr. Platterer stated that visioning is the hardest part. Defining detail can come easier.

The team agreed that future CAT “teams” should be Edina residents.

Discussion took place regarding conflict of interest. Some members expressed concern about members of the Design Team being allowed to bid on any parts of the re-design of the area. Member Fischer disagreed. No conclusion was reached by the CAT on the issue of a potential conflict of interest.

Mr. Persha thought the Design Team members could be from outside of Edina. Jack Broz was the only participant not from Edina. He was a consultant brought in from the outside.

Next Steps - Member Staunton asked “What is the task” Staff is working on the report; what does the group want to do?

A discussion ensued on what to do with the bus garage. Should City be proactive in finding a site? It was acknowledged the need to be partners with the School District.

Further discussion took place as to the next steps going forward with a report. Do we attached this to the Comprehensive Plan and flush out as a small area plan?

Ms. Montgomery suggested that a task force be created to deal with how to deal with the bus garage and to flush out details on transportation.

Other ideas on the next steps included drafting a report; whether to attach as an appendix to the Comprehensive Plan; or recommend further study to the Council.

Discussion took place in regard for the need to get the Council to adopt a resolution to allow application for a grant to study the area further.

Mr. Rofidal moved to have City staff apply for a LCA grant. Mr. Brown seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

It was suggested that the Resolution be placed on the next Council Agenda. Members Montgomery and Schroeder will go to the Council Meeting to represent the group.

The meeting adjourned at 9:45 pm.