Minutes of the
Edina Park Board
March 8, 2011
Edina City Hall, Council Chambers

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bill Lough, Todd Fronek, Ellen Jones, Joseph Hulbert, Louise Segreto, Dan Peterson, Keeya Steel, Randy Meyer, Felix Pronove

MEMBERS ABSENT: David Deeds, Austin Dummer, Jennifer Kenney

STAFF PRESENT: John Keprios, Ed MacHolda, Janet Canton

I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Dan Peterson MOVED TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 11, 2011 PARK BOARD MINUTES. Todd Fronek SECONDED THE MOTION. MINUTES APPROVED.

II. NEW BUSINESS

A. Chowen Park Playground Equipment - Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board that for the Chowen Park playground equipment they used a different process on their approach to the design and selection of playground equipment. He explained that Mr. MacHolda solicited volunteers to serve on a small committee and asked them to come up with a plan they thought might work and then sent out a mailing to 333 households (those within 1,000 feet of the park) and invited them to an Open House. He noted that since the Open House Mr. MacHolda has continued to visit with the neighbors who were actively involved in the process and showed a strong interest in the neighborhood. He stated that they did go through a couple of other revision plans until they found one that equally satisfied their needs and desires. Mr. Keprios pointed out that from a staff's perspective they feel it's their duty to ensure that the final design is within budget, equipment is safe, that it's a really good value for the community, that it meets ADA requirements and that it's properly sized for its surroundings in the park. He indicated that the other step they changed is to bring it to the Park Board for approval. Mr. Keprios commented that for the next project he would like to ask a Park Board member to serve on the neighborhood committee.

Mr. MacHolda stated that Jennifer Corniea and Matt Dubbe were the neighborhood committee members. He noted that at the Open House a resident, Angela Gadtke, informed the committee that she thought the design was missing some toddler elements. He indicated that for the next week Ms. Gadtke, Ms. Corniea, Mr. Dubbe, Game Time representatives as well as himself made a series of revisions and came up with the final plan which everyone endorses.

Mr. MacHolda pointed out that in addition to what is seen on the diagram of the park in terms of playground equipment there are three trees, five benches, two trash receptacles and a pair of soccer goals.

Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board that the selection of the pieces wasn't simply done by what looked to be the most fun but kept in mind the obesity issue and so the equipment is a little more exciting, challenging and physically rewarding for kids.

Ms. Jones asked if the neighborhood had a chance to see the final revised plan after the Open House to which Mr. MacHolda replied no. Mr. MacHolda indicated there were approximately 12 adults and five children at the Open House where there was a large drawing of the proposed plan. He noted there was good dialog and they did start the process of making a couple of revisions. He commented Ms. Gadtke really stepped forth from the community in stating that she felt there was a piece missing for the toddler age group. He noted Ms. Gadtke, Ms. Corniea and Mr. Dubbe early in the process branched to other neighbors that had toddler age children and made revisions so what they have today is a good representation of the neighborhood.

Ms. Segreto commented that she does like the change in process so that it now includes the Open House and added that she thinks it broadens the bases of community consensus. She asked is it clear when the time for public comment is over, so that people feel if they don't get their comment in by a certain time it would not be considered because it's late. Mr. Keprios replied that the letter that was mailed out inviting neighbors to attend the Open House stated:

"If, after reviewing and discussing the plan on Wednesday, February 16th the neighborhood agrees with the neighborhood committee, the proposed plan will be placed on the Park Board's March 8th, 2011 agenda for their approval."

The neighborhood was made aware there would be no follow-up Open House.

Mr. Lough stated that he would like to support this process and all processes that would tend to involve a wider range of the community that the park would have an impact on which has been done in this case. He stated that the only caution he would urge, and it seems to have been done in this case, that you bring the process to a conclusion so that the public feels they have had the chance to make their comments.

Mr. Peterson asked if there is any activity by senior citizens in the neighborhood where there is something in the park for them and secondly what is the life expectancy of the playground equipment. Mr. MacHolda replied that the current playground equipment at Chowen Park was installed in in 1991. He noted that the new equipment should easily last 20 years. As far as the diversity of the neighborhood once the letter went out he did hear from the senior population and when they found out who was involved in the neighborhood committee they were at ease. He pointed out that more trees and benches will be added which will be an enhancement for the older population to come and enjoy and sit and watch.

Mr. Hulbert asked if the soccer area will become a scheduled field to which Mr. MacHolda replied no. Mr. Hulbert asked if there is a plan for the rest of the parks beyond the current CIP as far as the playground equipment. Mr. Keprios replied there has been an ongoing plan that's in written form that shows it as a 15 and a 20 year replacement schedule. However, with the newer equipment with the exception of the wooden

equipment seems to last about 20 years so they are pretty much on a 20 year replacement schedule. Mr. Hulbert commented that he also likes the addition of the trees in there for the next generation.

Ms. Angela Gadtke, 5825 Drew Ave., stated she would like to commend the process and commend Mr. MacHolda for his work. She noted she was very vocal at the Open House in trying to get more activities and equipment for the younger children and Mr. MacHolda was very open to suggestions. She indicated that she thinks they came to a consensus of a plan that really represents the young families in their neighborhood as well as the families of children that are a little bit older.

Mr. Meyer asked what is the warranty of the equipment which John Elder, the representative from Minnesota Wisconsin Playground, replied that the warranty on the product is 100 years on locks and uprights, 15 years on rotationally molded plastics and one year on the moving parts. Mr. Meyer asked Mr. Elder if he ever gets any objections to the one year on moving parts to which Mr. Elder replied no because if something is going to happen it's going to happen within the first year. Mr. Elder explained to the Park Board the difference between an engineered wood fiber and a wood chip. With a wood chip you are at the mercy of whatever the person operating the chipper decides to throw in that day: leaves, branches, bark, limbs, etc. He indicated that engineered wood fiber is the shredded core of a hard wood tree and the benefit to that is it knits together to make more of a static surface which complies with the ADA and provides a predictable impact safety surface. He added that it also allows for use of wheelchairs and walkers whether it's for someone who has ADA challenges or someone who is elderly with a grandchild. Mr. Meyer asked how often the wood fibers are topped off to which Mr. Elder replied there will be a top off every five to seven years.

Mr. Hulbert asked is there anything in this facility that is directed towards children with developmental disabilities or special needs. Mr. Elder replied a lot of the rope based activities are quite often used for kids who have some of the ADA challenges as well as some of the cognitive disorders. He noted there are ground level events for children who have mobile disabilities such as steering wheels and the like. He pointed out that the tire swing is something that is strongly pursued for ADA purposes and is quite often used for children with mobility issues because of the larger area that you are able to place the child onto. He indicated that for the swings they did two belt swings and two enclosed tot seats and the purpose behind that was because of the larger number of smaller children in that area. Mr. Elder commented that the toddler rocker as well as the see saw are also ADA compliant as ground level events. He noted these are some of the things that are of the new age playgrounds where it's using different muscles and different motor skills which is especially helpful for kids whether it's autism or the spectrum disorders or any of the physical disabilities.

Mr. Hulbert asked what about for children with disabilities that might like to swing but can't stay in a loop belt or won't fit into the enclosed tot seat. Mr. Elder replied right now there is nothing; however, it is equipped so that they are able to put in an adaptive seat. Mr. MacHolda stated that there was one on the original drawing but one of the parents who attended the Open House was concerned about the weight of that bucket. This person felt if a toddler wasn't paying attention it could really hurt a small

child; therefore after the Open House they went to the two belt two bucket swings. Mr. Elder pointed out that there is a nature discovery table underneath one of the decks where kids are actually able to position themselves and it has a very tactile sensation because that is something that is especially attractive and calming for children with any of the sensory disorders.

Mr. Hulbert commented that as a parent of child with special needs he thinks this is something that needs to be considered and if anybody has talked to anybody in that neighborhood that might be a user of that park their thoughts should be taken into consideration if they haven't been brought to the table. Mr. Elder replied absolutely and that is one of the things you will notice with their plan. They always meet the ADA requirements but usually they exceed it and added that when he puts a playground together he tries to keep those sorts of things in mind. Mr. Hulbert asked with this equipment for the swings if they wanted to add one of these two years down the road could they put that on that playground equipment to which Mr. Elder replied absolutely. Mr. MacHolda commented that they can easily swap out one of the belt buckets for the ADA swing.

Mr. Fronek asked Mr. Elder if his company provides both the equipment and the installation to which Mr. Elder replied yes. Mr. Fronek asked if they are going to be within budget to which Mr. Elder replied the way the equipment is priced they will be within budget which does include installation.

Joseph Hulbert MOVED TO APPROVE THE PROPOSAL AS OUTLINED WITH THE CAVEAT OF HAVING ONE OF THE BELT SWINGS CHANGED OUT FOR AN ADA TOT SEAT. Louise Segreto SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B. On-Camera Meetings vs. Off-Camera Meetings – Mr. Hulbert indicated that he has received feedback from some members who feel an off-camera environment may be more conducive to dialog because they are able to sit around a table and look at one another. He stated that it may be a little more productive in the case of certain topics to have off-camera meetings and added that it would not require as much expense.

Mr. Lough stated there are at least two broad areas in his mind where off-camera situations would facilitate their coming to eventual agreement about issues which may be more nettlesome. He indicated that he also thinks when they sit in an on-camera session there are different levels of understanding as to what the issue is and sometimes they are expected to act on something in a fairly short order manner. Therefore, he thinks one of the benefits of work sessions, which may be off-camera, is that they can absorb research and ask questions about the research as well as ask for follow-up research. He noted then they can get themselves to a level where they feel comfortable and understand what's going on and what they are being asked to decide upon. Mr. Lough stated that he would rather see more on-camera time used by the individual members to state what they think about their understanding of the issue and their opinion about what actions should be taken. He commented that also during work sessions they are able to sit in a more collegial environment and spend time not only collecting data but exchanging opinions. He stated that he's not saying they wouldn't do that in an on-camera session

but he thinks it would allow them to form points of view around certain issues and to express those points of view with some degree of confidence and it doesn't take anyone by surprise per se and they are encouraged much more to do that.

Ms. Jones indicated that she was thinking in terms of the questions that were on the letter that Scott Neal, City Manager, had sent out. The first question was "Do you believe that filming your Commission meeting, and subsequently rebroadcasting the filmed meeting on cable television, would change the manner in which commissioners or guests behave or participate in your Commission meetings?" She stated in response to the question she does actually get a little self-conscious and does think it can affect a free flow of opinions and attitudes; however, when it comes down to it she doesn't think it has a totally negative effect. She commented that when she wants to look into what's been going on in the city she looks through the minutes and feels as long as there are good minutes they don't need to be filmed. She also pointed out in this day and age when they have to watch every penny and the fact people are getting paid to film the meetings makes her hesitant about spending taxpayer money on that. She stated she would be interested whether or not the community feels that this is a service they want their tax money spent on. Ms. Jones stated that another question that was asked was "In what areas do you think it would be very important to have those filmed". She stated her feeling is that any kind of public comment period would be important to be filmed.

Ms. Segreto stated she does agree with everything Mr. Lough and Ms. Jones said. She then asked Mr. Keprios if they were to take some of their meetings and convert them into work sessions that would not be televised is there a requisite number of public meetings that the Park Board must have to satisfy the ordinance requirements. Mr. Keprios replied no but did clarify that the Park Board could still have a meeting, not necessarily a work session, that's not on camera. He stated that he doesn't want to confuse work sessions versus meetings off-camera. He noted that work sessions really are a singular agenda topic item that is one issue that they are going to work on. He stated that meetings are when they actually intend to take action as well as take public comment but it doesn't have to be on-camera so there is a difference between an off-camera meeting and a work session.

Ms. Segreto asked Mr. Keprios if the City is receiving any public input as a result of the meetings being televised. Mr. Keprios replied that to his surprise there are quite a few people that do watch it and from his own experience people do tell him that they've watched the Park Board meeting on TV. Ms. Segreto indicated that if the Park Board is taking a vote on something then she thinks it should be televised. If they are not taking a vote and it's truly a work session then they could cut back on the number of meetings that are televised. Mr. Keprios pointed out that the question for the Park Board is how important is it so they can watch it at home on TV versus reading the minutes. He noted that the action can take place whether the Park Board is on camera or not. He stated that if the people want to be actively involved in their government then they need to be here. That is something you should consider as you are thinking about camera versus no camera, or perhaps there are only certain types of issues that require an on-camera meeting as is the case in at least one other community he is aware of.

Mr. Fronek indicated that he would like to echo all of the statements previously made. He noted that he does think being on-camera does affect the manner that he conducts himself and he thinks it's sub-conscious. He stated when you're on TV and you're sitting up high he does think the manner he is conducting himself is different. He noted that whether it's an off-camera meeting or work session scenario they are at a round table, it's easier to have a discussion. He indicated that maybe Park Board members need to take on a little more burden or as Mr. Lough has eluded to a little bit more research and understanding of the issues that are presented before them. He stated they should have some sort of dialog among Park Board members and staff in a less formal environment so that when they are on-camera the facts are all out and everyone understands their opinion. Therefore, he thinks as a Park Board that first they will be more informed and second they will be able to discuss different factors with the people in the community.

Mr. Hulbert indicated that when they had their work session last July he thought it was very productive and people were chiming in whenever they wanted and didn't have to worry about interrupting or touching their microphones. He stated that he thinks they could have more of them and if it ever evolved into something where they wanted to make a formal motion they would then bring it to the Park Board meeting. Mr. Hulbert suggested that maybe they look at forming smaller subgroups and try to tackle more things at the same time and then come back and report back to the Park Board like what Ms. Jones did with the CAT committee.

Ms. Steel noted that the two issues that come to her mind are transparency and accessibility and Edina has done a good job televising the Park Board meetings as well showing it online. She stated that she does receive e-mails from people saying that they have watched the Park Board meetings either on TV or online so there are viewers out there. She indicated that to take that away from viewers in the age of twitter and social media she thinks it would really be a step backwards for Edina and she couldn't do that to their community members. She noted that people are not always able to attend their meetings for many different reasons so they also need to consider that. Ms. Steel commented that as far as work sessions they have a lot of issues that they need to work on and a lot of questions so she would like to have more work sessions where they are able to divulge into these issues and have that dialog because she thinks they are very productive. She stated if they are taking action on something that needs to be televised and they need to be up front with the community.

Mr. Meyer gave a little perspective from his involvement with the School Board. He noted that about three years ago they went to approximately every other meeting being a workshop as opposed to a formal meeting and thinks that structure has worked well for them. He noted that they have a lot of ideas and interest in things they want to pursue but unless staff comes to the Park Board with proposal X they really don't have a way of articulating it in a general sense and feels that is what workshops are for. He stated that he agrees with Ms. Steel and at School Board workshops they rarely pass an item, unless it is time sensitive, it goes back to the regular meeting as part of the minutes. Mr. Meyer indicated that he disagrees with what said earlier about workshops having one agenda item. He commented that he thinks you can come into a workshop and say okay, we are

going spend 20 minutes on item A, 20 minutes on item B, and 20 minutes on item C; it doesn't need to be a single focus. He noted that they may want to think about some kind of regular schedule to start with to get into this type of process. Mr. Meyer indicated that he thinks if they are going to pass a motion it should be in front of the cameras at a televised meeting.

Mr. Peterson stated that he agrees with Mr. Meyer and in response to Mr. Neal's third question, "Do you believe that filming and rebroadcasting your Commission meetings is an important tool in communicating your Commission's activities and discussions with the public?" that he does. He indicated that he thinks there is a lot of interest and that television has become the equivalent of a New England town hall meeting except you don't have to go to City Hall you can watch it at home. He stated that he does like the idea that if there are no action items maybe they could get longer briefings from staff and a longer questioning period of understanding what the issues are.

Mr. Pronove stated that in general he agrees with what has been said so far, but it seems to him that when they do have some basic questions they faint away from the camera. He indicated that at their last work session when one of the focuses was the golf course there were definitely more questions brought up. He noted that he felt a little more confident coming in knowing a little more about the golf course and knowing a little bit more about the concerns. He stated that he tends to shy away sometimes from basic questions he might need answered because other people might find it irrelevant. Therefore he thinks work sessions are a nice spot to get things out of the way but when they are on-camera they should definitely focus more on the more important kind of questions that they can't answer themselves because they need help from the community or even experts. He stated that he feels work sessions help for more basic questions and the more important and in-depth questions should definitely be brought up on-camera.

Mr. Lough stated that after listening to everyone's point of view it seems they spend a lot of time asking questions of staff and having communication back and forth between member and staff. He indicated that he thinks if they had more work sessions then maybe they would become more comfortable looking at each other, asking questions of each other and even be willing to express, to some degree, disagreement when it's appropriate. He noted that he's not saying disagreement is wrong, it's a matter of feeling more comfortable with one another to do it and perhaps that comfort would help them arrive at better decisions as a Park Board. He stated that he would like to be able to exchange their views and get into some of these issues in a little more comfortable and direct way. He indicated that he thinks the public would benefit from this because he thinks it's more likely at that point that they would then exchange views on-camera and it would be much more forthcoming about what they are thinking, what point of view they are taking and what perspective they are taking on a particular issue as they try to arrive at the correct decision for the community.

C. Recap of February 1, 2011 Work Session with City Council (action plan)

1. Veteran's Memorial Future Maintenance Expenses – Mr. Hulbert reminded the Park Board that at the work session it seemed the maintenance expenses for the future

veteran's memorial was a concern for some people. He indicated that they want to know what would be the city's burden for maintaining it. Mr. Keprios replied the discussion of future maintenance expenses will form its own calendar based on the design process and they won't know that until they have a design and it's been approved. He stated at that point the discussion will be who is going to cover the cost for the maintenance. He noted that he also thought what he heard at the joint work session was that they also need to come forward with what is the value of the land where it's going to be placed and the cost of any proposed restroom facility improvements if that becomes an added feature to the park. Therefore, they need to decide should that be the burden of the Veteran's Memorial Committee even though the restrooms currently serve the whole park, so they will need to have a discussion regarding that issue.

Mr. Hulbert asked Mr. Keprios if the committee said something about having an Open House. Mr. Keprios replied that the City Council made it real clear they would like an Open House that we will host as well as hold a public hearing at the City Council level. He stated that the question for the Park Board is do you also want to have a public hearing at a Park Board meeting or just rely on input from the community beyond an Open House. He indicated that he is envisioning that once they have a design to bring before the community and answer their questions if the Park Board still feels a need to have a public hearing at a Park Board meeting, we can certainly put it on the agenda at that point. He noted what he heard from City Council is they want there to be an Open House and they definitely want to have a public hearing and specifically want to make sure they are aware of what the maintenance expenses are and what the burden on the tax payer is going to be.

Mr. Hulbert asked if they have solicited design companies or architectural firms to submit proposals. Mr. Keprios replied that the City Council approved the contract with SEH Architects, and so far they have had one meeting with the Committee. The meeting was more of a fact finding, where does the committee want to go, what elements are they sure about, etc. He noted that there is still a long ways to go before a design will come to the Park Board. Mr. Keprios commented that he was going to ask the Park Board next month to see if they would like to have a liaison serve on the Veteran's Memorial Committee. He noted that he hasn't had a chance to discuss this with the chairman so he would like to give him the courtesy of a phone call first; however, please start to think about it and they can discuss it at next month's meeting.

Mr. Meyer asked what sort of meeting schedule the committee is on to which Mr. Keprios replied the main committee typically meets the third Friday of each month at 7:30 am in the Mayor's Conference Room. He indicated that recently the Chairman sent him an e-mail asking if this would be an appropriate time to step up the number of meetings in the short term; however, he thinks there are enough sub committees that should be doing a lot of the work outside the main body that they should be able to keep meeting once a month and added that the architect also seemed to think that was appropriate.

2. Facility User Fee Per-Participant – Mr. Hulbert asked Mr. Keprios is there or is there not going to be a study taken to determine activity by activity what the cost is for soccer versus softball versus hockey, etc. Mr. Keprios replied he is trying to recall if that was a

request of the City Council to get into that level of detail because it's not going to be an exact science if that's the mission they are being sent off to do. He noted that staff can certainly take a shot at it but if this is going to be a priority item they will not be able to have all four items on the same agenda because there wouldn't be enough time to get all of the information to the Park Board. He pointed out that the participant fee is going to come down to is philosophically does the Park Board feel it should be covering the expense for the majority of a particular sport or should they be subsidized like it is now. He stated that the per-participant fee will likely go up next year but it becomes a matter of how much. Mr. Keprios indicated that he thinks the Park Board may need some more background information in order to make an informed decision. In addition, they will also need to inform the athletic groups that this is under consideration.

Mr. Meyer indicated that he didn't think the goal was necessarily to up the fees or fix it but rather what would be helpful initially is to be able to understand where their costs are and get a handle on how the expenses work. He noted that he thinks once they have that information they can start to think about what their long-term objective is and then they can see where they are subsidizing programs in some places, which may be just fine, but be able to make it a choice versus a random act. He indicated that from his perspective the most helpful thing as a board member would be to understand the overall dynamics of how it's currently structured, he's not so worried about getting down to the last nickel, it's more conceptually how are these costs rolling out and then have a discussion around it. He stated that he doesn't want to surprise the athletic associations and up all of their fees but, more importantly, at least understand does it make sense when they look at it.

Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board that he can certainly take a shot at it if the desire is to try to break it down sport by sport. He noted they are not budgeted that way and he would have to take their best estimate because they have a field budget and an outdoor rink budget and how much of that is specifically expense just for a hockey rink is something they can take a shot at and then take the raw data as best they can and go from there.

Mr. Meyer stated that he thinks before staff goes through a ton of work maybe the Park Board should discuss the process first so that Mr. Keprios is clear on whether we are giving direction or asking questions that make sense. We need to be clear about what it is we are asking for so that Mr. Keprios is not putting in a ton of work without being really sure about what it is we are trying to accomplish.

Mr. Fronek indicated that maybe it would help to see how the budget breaks out and see what is spent on fields and then try to formulate how many kids are in field sports and get a rough idea of where they are subsidizing. He noted that to Mr. Meyer's point maybe get a little bit more tangible idea of where the expenses are so they can begin to drill down and not put a ton of burden on staff. Mr. Keprios replied that he would be happy to start with the budget and show on the big picture of what they have so that it's clear data to then break it down per sport and then have a discussion.

Mr. Hulbert stated that he thinks this is something that would be good to discuss at a work session and talk about the data and work through the topic and later bring it to a

Park Board meeting to take action. Mr. Fronek indicated that he also thinks that would be an opportunity to discuss philosophy and express opinions so they can start to back up the process. He commented that if he remembers correctly this started out as a good idea to start charging these people a dollar amount and then it's increased incrementally; however, that philosophical viewpoint hasn't been reevaluated.

3. Future of Edinborough Park and Centennial Lakes Park – Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board that this issue was requested by staff to be put on the Park Board/City Council joint work session agenda. He explained that Edinborough Park/Centennial Lakes started out with a trust fund that had approximately nine million dollars and in less than five years it will be down to zero. He noted they will be out of money because there is a subsidy every year and to cover the subsidy it comes out of the trust fund, it's like a train running out of track. He stated that they need to find a way to do one or more of three things: bring in more revenue, cut expenses or find another source of subsidized funding. He noted that from staff's view the last thing they want to see happen is to have it become another Town Square like St. Paul where it's sold and becomes private property. He stated that maybe there are a lot of other ideas of what Edinborough could be or should be. He noted that one of the things he heard would be to hire a professional consultant and added that he has already been hearing input from some City Council members as well as residents. Mr. Keprios stated that he would like to hear more input and said he can put together all of the data regarding their numbers of visits, how many are residents, etc. He pointed out that they are trying to do a little better job of breaking out where the maintenance and operating expenses are within the park itself as well as what are the options, how would it affect current contracts and agreements that are in place with those that own property around the area. He stated that it's a very large issue that is going to need attention soon and it's something that's on their radar screen as a high priority and would like the Park Board's input into the process. Mr. Fronek asked if Edinborough Park is a separate entity from Centennial Lakes Park as far as the trust fund is concerned to which Mr. Keprios replied they are of the same trust fund so they are considered one and the same.

Mr. Meyer indicated that he would say this is probably their highest priority as far as understanding. He noted this would be a good workshop item to find out the history, where they are now and what the current time line is for the decision process. He commented that he thinks they could go from there because he doesn't know the history to understand possible solutions or the perspective on it so he feels that should be the first step.

Mr. Peterson questioned how many people even know about the facility. He stated that a lot of municipalities collect e-mail addresses of citizens and maybe they could start to do that in Edina. He noted there are a lot of ways to put a coupon on an e-mail. He also suggested that possibly they think about having the City of Edina or Park and Recreation Department have a table at the Farmer's Market at Centennial Lakes and feature what's available and maybe members of the Park Board could volunteer to be there for a couple of hours. This is one way people will know the incredible facilities that the Edina park system has to offer.

4. Naming of Parks and Facilities Policy – Mr. Hulbert indicated that maybe they should try to schedule a joint work session with the City Council to discuss Edinborough Park and Centennial Lakes. He noted he would also like to have a work session to discuss facility user fees and pick up where they left off at last year's July work session regarding the naming policy and donations or maybe divide up into smaller work groups.

Ms. Steel indicated that she likes the idea of dividing things up and she does understand the urgency of some of it but they do need to be sensitive to staff time and asked Mr. Keprios how he thinks it could be best managed. Mr. Keprios replied that it's going to require that staff do quite a bit of research regarding Edinborough and Centennial Lakes which they are currently working on. He stated that he thinks it's premature for him to make promises of his staff without asking them just how long it's going to take them before they are prepared to give Park Board all of the facts and information needed to come up with a plan but thinks they should be able to get it done within a couple of months.

Mr. Keprios stated that they will not be able to cover everything in one work session. He explained just for clarification the donation policy and the naming policy are totally separate but are certainly good topics. He stated that he would like the opportunity to do a little more research and thinks a two month period to pull the data together will give him plenty of time.

Mr. Fronek noted that he thinks it probably makes sense to have the Edinborough/Centennial Lakes work session first and then decide what they want to do in terms of any sort of sub-committee or group that's going to be formed. He stated that he thinks Edinborough/Centennial Lakes should be the top priority and the rest of them seem less of a priority and once they figure that out they can move forward.

Mr. Lough asked since the facility user fee background materials can be prepared more quickly than Edinborough/Centennial Lakes perhaps the Park Board could get started on the user fees. He noted he would classify that as the second highest priority. Mr. Keprios replied that if that's the agreement of the Park Board then staff will do their very best to have it in front of you within two months.

Mr. Meyer suggested having a May workshop with the majority of the time being spent on Edinborough/Centennial Lakes. He noted if that timeline works then they could spend 30 minutes looking at the facility user fee in the big framework, not the details. Maybe just try to understand how the budget flows and then let Mr. Keprios know what they are looking for specifically. He commented that way Mr. Keprios isn't spending a lot more time than what is required up front. Mr. Keprios replied that, if they need to, he thinks they could put the facility user fee on next month's agenda.

Ms. Steel commented that she thinks the idea is just to get some background information so that they are able to develop some of their questions and decide what their priority questions are. She asked when the Park Board approves the fees and charges to which Mr. Keprios replied in September.

Mr. Hulbert indicated so it may be possible to have a May work session and do a brief educational overview on facility user fees and Edinborough/Centennial Lakes and added that at some point in the upcoming year he would like to pick up where they left off last July with the naming of parks and facilities.

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. Braemar Golf Course Clubhouse Consultant - Mr. Keprios reminded the Park Board that the direction he received from the City Council at the work session was to start over with a more formal request for proposal process approach to hiring a consultant. He noted he was asked to submit it to everyone who has shown an interest in it to date and to further analyze if there are any other consultants out there that they should consider.

Mr. Keprios put together a draft of request for proposal which gives potential consultants about a three week window to respond to it. He pointed out that it states the Park Board reserves the right to choose whatever consultant they feel has the best value to the community and not necessarily who is the lowest bid. It also states anyone who has expressed an interest who wants to submit a proposal is by law legally rightful to do so. Mr. Keprios asked the Park Board if they would like to have a couple of Park Board members volunteer to work with staff once the proposals are submitted to go over them.

Ms. Segreto stated that she thinks it would be a good idea to have several Park Board members to help staff weigh through the proposals. Mr. Fronek noted that he agrees and he would be happy to serve in that capacity. Mr. Hulbert asked Mr. Keprios if this is something they should do after a work session. Mr. Keprios replied that the proposal deadline is March 29th and explained that he would like to call a meeting to distribute the proposals to the volunteers so that a recommendation could be made at the next Park Board meeting. Mr. Hulbert and Ms. Segreto both stated they would like to volunteer. Mr. Lough noted that he is not volunteering but asked if the RFPs could be e-mailed to the other Park Board members as well so they could read them to which Mr. Keprios replied he would be happy to do that.

Ms. Jones stated that she would like to add a couple of questions to the RFP because she wants it to be made really clear what it is they are trying to answer. Ms. Jones read her questions. "How do we change the Edina Golf enterprise from a money losing enterprise to one that makes enough money to reinvest in its own facilities"? If this is possible, how long would it take?" "What do we need to do to make it happen"? "If it is not possible, what are our options, for example on-going taxpayer's subsidy, privatization, partial sale of property, or whatever"? "The long range vision for the Edina golf enterprise is to make it one of the best if not the best public course in the market; is this possible given the objectives stated above"? "What are some long range plan options to make this happen"? Ms. Jones stated that these are broad questions without getting into details because she wants to make sure these questions are answered.

Ms. Jones stated that in the scope of the study she would also like to add staff and compensation as separate line item. She would like to ask the question "Are the right people in the right positions for success". She commented that these are some of the things that she would like to add.

She indicated that she would also like to add to one of the sections on the back some kind of full disclosure because the Park Board did talk about the need to make sure that we are aware if there is any relationship with the city. Therefore, she would like to include statement "The City of Edina is interested in hiring a consultant who is independent, unbiased and without a conflict of interest. Please explain any relationships that the owners or principals or team members may have with the Edina Golf Enterprises, City of Edina". She would like something like that added so they are told up front.

Mr. Keprios asked Ms. Jones for clarification on what it is she is asking the consultant to do with her question "Are the right people in the right positions". Ms. Jones replied she wants them to use their best judgment to evaluate whether or not they have the right people in the right positions because she would think they are working with many different kinds of golf enterprises and they will know whether or not we have the right management team, have the right people with experience in the pro shop with accounting principles. She stated we need to know if we have the capability of making this a successful enterprise. She commented that it's a tough question but she would like an unbiased person to come in and take a look at it because if they are looking at the whole enterprise she thinks that should be looked at as well. Mr. Keprios stated that he would take issue with the question for a document that becomes published and says that someone is not qualified to be in the position that they are currently working. He indicated that is more of a management and personnel issue and not for a consultant to address, they deal with those things at a management level and not in the eyes of the public. Mr. Keprios pointed out that the other piece is he gets a little concerned with his own proposal in that it may be asking for more than they are going to be able to afford.

Ms. Jones indicated that she can appreciate sensitivity but she is looking at the big picture and would like to hear from the rest of the Park Board their opinions if this is a question on the table for a consultant to give. Mr. Keprios replied that he totally agrees that the consultant will likely study and answer the question; "Do we have the right number of staff and the right number of positions for the certain tasks that need to be done"; however, getting into qualifications and do they have the right personality for the job or whatever that is not something they should be asking a consultant to do.

Mr. Lough asked Ms. Jones if the Park Board could have a copy of what she has just suggested distributed by e-mail and then he would invite the Park Board to get back to Mr. Keprios with comments about what has been written. He stated that it articulates what they are trying to do, maybe it's not appropriate that the consultant upon further reflection comment on all of this but he thinks that it has to be taken under advisement.

Mr. Meyer indicated that if the Park Board feels strongly do we have the right people in the right positions with the right skills then maybe they could filter that in a way that it goes to Mr. Keprios or Mr. Neal. He stated that if they are paying for that information and it's being gathered then they are making a mistake if they are not sharing

that with the administration of the city. He commented that he doesn't need to know it and he doesn't think anyone on the Park Board needs to know it but if it's being collected it should be shared. Mr. Keprios responded that he believes that any information gathered is public information and wants to make sure that they don't mix personnel issues versus filling positions, such as, do we have the right number of positions for the tasks at hand and not get into personality and qualifications type of thing.

Mr. Hulbert noted he thinks these are tough questions but are good questions and he thinks they are not necessarily totally unfair questions for taxpayers in Edina who the golf course belongs to and they may want to know some of those answers. He stated that he is curious to hear what he Park Board members think of Ms. Jones questions. He indicated they are being asked to approve an RFP based on the criteria and asked if they still want to do that or do they want to deliberate it for a month and think about it. Ms. Segreto stated that she would like another month to look at what Ms. Jones has put together and think about it.

Mr. Fronek indicated in his view he would defer more to staff's judgment with the understanding that the Park Board and City Council as an advisory role they have to empower staff to allow them to operate facilities. He stated that right now they are at the point where the golf course isn't making money, and Ms. Jones first question was eloquently put "can this enterprise make money and are the right structures in place for this to make money". He stated that as an appointed member of the Park Board he is uncomfortable getting into employment decisions with regards to the enterprise facilities.

Mr. Keprios indicated that maybe instead of detailing what is in the scope of the study maybe you determine the questions and the consultant could say yes they can do it or these are things that would need to be studied to get you your answers. He noted that he thinks it would be worthy to wait another month.

Mr. Lough asked Mr. Keprios if he could take a crack at rewording the RFP and take into account some of the questions that Ms. Jones has asked. Mr. Keprios replied absolutely and encouraged the Park Board members, after reviewing Ms. Jones questions in writing, to let him know if they have any additional questions because maybe there are other questions that they haven't thought of tonight and then he will come back at the next meeting with a rewritten RFP for Park Board's consideration.

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Raymond O'Connell, 4612 Valley View Road, informed the Park Board there are two osprey boxes at Braemar Park; one has been in use since 2009 and has had two fledgings so far, 2009 and 2010. He noted that the reason he is here is because there is a pole on park property west of the ice sheets inside the fence of the lower lot at Braemar. He noted that it's a good pole, 45 feet long, and noted that Mr. Anderson and Mr. Swenson would like to get that up and there is a great spot for it practically in the middle of the course. However, where it's located is heritage grass which cannot be disturbed and there is signage there that states that. He stated that in the next couple of weeks, hopefully when the snow melts, he would like to get that pole transported, which everything can be done in house with a front loader, and put it in place. He noted that he

doesn't want to go over Vince Cockriel, Park Superintendent, but he wanted to be sure that the Park Board knew about it. He explained that the design for the osprey boxes is to bring more notoriety to the parks and it is working, people like to watch them.

VI. UPDATES FROM STAFF

Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board there isn't a lot to update on because he has been out of the office the last three weeks because of an illness but has slowly been working on getting back to full-time. He noted that he wanted to remind the Park Board that he will not be at the July Park Board meeting because he will be having a knee replacement and will be out of commission for the month. He noted that may be a good time to have a work session and Mr. MacHolda would be in attendance.

VII. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

John Keprios opened up the floor for nominations for Chair of the Park Board. Louise Segreto MOVED TO NOMINATE JOSEPH HULBERT. RANDY MEYER MOVED TO CLOSE NOMINATIONS. TODD FRONEK SECONDED THE MOTION. Mr. Keprios announced that Joseph Hulbert has been voted as Chair of the Park Board and congratulated him.

John Keprios opened up the floor for nominations for Vice-Chair of the Park Board. JOSEPH HULBERT MOVED TO NOMINATE KEEYA STEEL. TODD FRONEK MOVED TO CLOSE NOMINATIONS. DAN PETERSON SECONDED THE MOTION. Mr. Keprios announced that Keeya Steel has been voted as Vice-Chair of the Park Board.

VIII. PARK BOARD COMMENTS

Joseph Hulbert stated that Janet Canton does an incredible job with her minutes because it's almost as though you write down what I'm trying to say rather than how I speak it, you do a wonderful job, thank you.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:00 PM