



Agenda Minnetonka Parks & Recreation Board

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

7 p.m.

Minnetonka Community Center – Council Chambers

Parks & Recreation

Board Vision

A city with outstanding parks and recreational opportunities within a valued natural environment.

Board Mission

The mission of the Minnetonka Parks & Recreation Board is to proactively advise the City Council, in ways that will:

- » **Protect & enhance** Minnetonka's natural environment
- » **Promote quality** recreation opportunities and facilities
- » **Provide a forum for** citizens interested in our parks, trails, athletic fields and open space

1. Roll Call

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jack Acomb | <input type="checkbox"/> Peggy Kvam |
| <input type="checkbox"/> James Durbin | <input type="checkbox"/> Chris Gabler |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Chair Nelson Evenrud | <input type="checkbox"/> Madeline Seveland |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cynthia Kist | <input type="checkbox"/> Chris Walick |

2. Approval of Minutes

A) September 6, 2017

3. Citizens wishing to discuss items not on the Agenda

4. Business Items

A) Discuss Public Input Process for Mountain Biking

B) Review the Scenic Heights Elementary and Purgatory Park habitat restoration project

5. Park Board Member Reports

6. Information Items

7. Upcoming Park Board Agenda Items

8. Adjournment

Minutes of the Minnetonka Park Board Meeting of September 6, 2017

1. Roll Call

Park Board members in attendance included Jack Acomb, Nelson Evenrud, Chris Gabler, Cindy Kist, Peggy Kvam, Christopher Walick, James Durbin and Madeline Seveland. Staff members in attendance included, Darin Ellingson, Jo Colleran, Kelly O'Dea, Perry Vetter, Sara Woeste, Mike Pavelka and Kathy Kline.

Chair Evenrud called the meeting to order at 7 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

Gabler moved, Durbin seconded a motion to approve the meeting Minutes of June 7, 2017 as submitted. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

Gabler moved, Seveland seconded a motion to move item 6 before item 3 on the agenda. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

3. Citizens Wishing to Discuss Items Not on the Agenda

Carol Allis, 12201 Minnetonka Blvd., Minnetonka represented Diana Houston, who compiled information regarding mountain biking and submitted packets to the recreation department. Allis asked to verify that the packets were received.

O'Dea informed Allis that city staff received the packets. O'Dea explained that all of the public comments and information received is being compiled and will be presented to the park board at a later date

4. Business Items

A. Review Gray's Bay Marina Slip Fees

Pavelka explained that when the city started the marina in 2003, the park board was originally involved in setting the marina fees and have historically reviewed them. The last time there was an increase was prior to the 2012 season. The slip fee increased \$100, making the season fee \$3900. Since that time there have been no increase in slip fees recommended by the park board.

The main reason for no increase in fees is due to the fact that the marina has been meeting budget expectations annually. One attachment is a comparison of private and municipally operated marinas. Gray's Bay Marina is closer to a private marina because there are amenities that other locations do not have such as: gas operations, attendants on-site and a restroom facility. Private marinas have more amenities such as a mechanic and boat storage. As an enterprise fund, the objective of the marina's business plan is to be able to cover

operational costs and set aside money for large capital expenditures in the future. Surveys have been sent to slip holders in the past and there has been some concerns about raising rates. There used to be a lottery system to get on the waitlist at Gray's Bay Marina. That process changed and now someone can apply to be on the waitlist anytime of the year. Currently, there are 15 people on the waitlist and those have been gathered since the end of 2016. There is some concern that the boat slip market is not as strong as what it used to be prior to 2009. That is one of the reasons the waitlist process changed. The budget escrow continues to be strong and it is ahead of what has been budgeted since the city started operations there. Under the recommendation area, it mentions that privately operated marinas have increased approximately three percent. Municipally operated boat slips have increased almost two percent. In the past, Gray's Bay Marina has been about \$1000 - \$1500 less than a private slip and is in that area right now. At this time, due to the strong position the escrow is in staff is not recommending an increase. Pavelka asked for any questions.

Acomb asked that given the strength of the escrow fund, if there is any discussion of reinvestment of the revenue that is being generated or somehow using the funds that would otherwise be going into escrow for something else or is the plan just to hold onto the money.

Pavelka stated that the DNR owns the property and the agreement with the DNR says that we cannot utilize those funds for anything other than the marina. It can only be utilized at the marina itself and on the grounds. At this point, the money is being held onto but some of the items it is set aside for are big ticket items. In ten or 20 years, the pilings and dock may have to be replaced and those are big ticket items. If that happens, potentially that is a half million dollar project.

Evenrud asked if the park board agrees with the staff recommendation for the slip fees to remain at \$3900 for the 2018 season.

Kvam moved, Seveland seconded a motion to accept the current slip fees to remain as they were last year. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

Vetter thanked O'Dea, Pavelka and their staff for working on this. Vetter stated that when this facility first came onboard with the city back in 2003, it was that partnership between the DNR and the city to offer additional access to Lake Minnetonka. It did not come with any insurance that there would not be a risk in the future. The way staff has managed the escrow account, knowing that this facility does need to be self-sufficient going forward has really put the city in a great strength.

Evenrud commented that this is an area that a lot of cities might shy away from taking on. Others may see it as something that will take a lot of work and staff time.

5. Park Board Member Reports

Kvam is a member of a social media website called nextdoor.com and a number of people brought up an interest in having a sidewalk on Excelsior Boulevard because there are a lot of kids walking on the shoulder to school. There are people from several different neighborhoods showing an interest and want to know how they can express their support to the city to try and make something happen. Who should they contact, should they get a petition or what should their next step would be?

Vetter mentioned that it is a group effort. The city council has determined that they would like a little more aggressive approach to connectivity, especially the example given along Excelsior Boulevard. It is also important to note that it is County Road 3. In Minnetonka, there is an excellent trail system, however we are lacking on those major county thoroughfares. Hennepin County does not have any plans to rebuild a lot of those roads in the next 20 to 25 years so the city council's approach has been to understand that there is a great need and try a go alone approach.

Next year, the city council has authorized a trail on Plymouth Road or County Road 61. That project will take two years, following that Vetter believes that Excelsior Boulevard is the next highest rated trail and is currently in the capital improvements program. When County Road 101 and Shady Oak Road was done in conjunction with the road project it was a lot more affordable for the city to go that cooperative effort. However, waiting 20 - 30 years to develop a trail along some of these busy roads is not realistic, especially when there is activity along them.

Staff has been proposing those trails and the council has been adopting them. Phil Olson, in the engineering department leads the internal trails team and people can be directed to him. When it comes to our bi-modal trail system throughout the city, we have an interdepartmental team of representatives from finance, planning, engineering, public works, recreation and the police department. Being involved in the process and monitoring the process is also very important.

Kvam clarified that the neighborhoods are west of Glen Lake and the top trails on the list are east of Glen Lake. Since the trails are not on the top of the priority list, should we talk to the mayor rather than staff?

Vetter recommended starting with staff and explained that on the website, there is a very detailed analysis of all the segments and how those trails are rated. Segments are rated on a number of criteria about connections, missing links and service centers. There is kind of a defined formula that the park board has looked at for

years. It is also nice to have support for that segment but also want to take the loudest voice out of the equation and ensure that it is done systematically. If it is done by the go alone process along county roads it is going to be very expensive.

Evenrud stated that he lives near Excelsior Boulevard and thinks it would be a great thing and gave a brief history of the area.

Evenrud asked for more reports.

Durbin thanked Vetter for the explanation, but pointed out that fun was left out. Durbin mentioned his appreciation towards the public safety portion of those trails. Trails are not just used for recreation purpose, they are also used as sidewalks. There are many important areas where people are walking on shoulders of roads because there are not any alternatives. Durbin sees that as an accident waiting to happen. Even walking to a small park off of Tonkawood, there is no way to get to it except for walking on the street and that is not right. Trails are expensive to do, so staff's efforts in putting together the matrix and their priorities, is appreciated.

Vetter responded by saying that Minnetonka is at about 50 plus miles of unfunded and unscheduled trail segments. Currently, estimates are well over 60 million dollars so if done by a go alone approach, it will be done in a slow manner. That is why it is important to follow the rating system, how it is prioritized and how segments are put together. Is it for transportation, recreational, to get to a government center, places of worship, schools, etc... they all have their own small percentage of a rating popularity piece of it. Trails are being used year round for transportation and it is important to look at that aspect because it is gaining popularity.

Ellingson stated that the website has been updated in the last couple of days. Listings of priorities and the maps associated with each trail segment is now on the website with links on the trails analysis and projects. On the website information can be found on the trails page under parks and trails.

Evenrud took the time to thank and acknowledge past members. Evenrud stated that he learned a lot from his peers and never got the chance to thank them. Some of the skills learned were how to be comfortable, have fun, take in a lot of information, give good feedback and get feedback from residents.

6. Information Items

A. Mountain Biking:

O'Dea recapped the June 7, 2017 meeting. Since then, staff has continued to hear from residents. Due to the amount of feedback, staff decided to do an internal feasibility study. Staff thought it was very important and wanted to complete a robust study that has more information than some of the studies that were presented at the June 7 meeting. Staff thought it would be beneficial to hire an outside consultant to help; specifically dealing with the public input process.

At the October 4 meeting, the public input process will be discussed and defined. There will likely be a representative from the consulting firm to present options. In addition to the public input process, their assistance will also be needed in other areas. Other locations are being researched, including the 494 corridor. A number of other concerns were expressed, including safety concerns, environmental impact and parking and those are being looked into as well. There is not a set date that this information will be brought back but it will be in the future.

O'Dea reminded people that they can sign up thru eminnetonka.com to receive updates on the mountain biking project page.

Vetter said that at the October 4 meeting, there will be a more defined idea of:

- 1). what the public input process will be
- 2). schedule of meetings
- 3). opportunities for people to get engaged.

Evenrud agreed that in a project to this scope with so many moving pieces and things that are constantly evolving; making it clear as to what the timeline is going to be and what people can expect is a great thing to do.

B. Pickleball:

Ellingson commented that building eight pickleball courts at Lone Lake Park was put into the CIP for 2018. With available park dedication fees from some bigger projects this year, there was a possibility of getting the construction started this fall and finished in the spring so pickleball would be available earlier in 2018. Bids were received on August 3, and based on the estimates from the concept plans last year; \$310,000 was budgeted, which had ten percent contingencies. At that time, that price was thought of as a conservative price. However, that was not the case for the bidding climate for an August bid. Bids came in at \$423,000, being significantly higher than what was budgeted. The bids were rejected and will be re-advertised, most likely in January, which should give a more competitive bidding climate for contractors as they are setting up their workloads for the upcoming year. Hopefully the bids will come in close to what was

budgeted. If the bids are significantly higher; courts may have to be reduced from eight to six to fit the budget.

Evenrud asked the board if there are any questions for Ellingson.

Kvam said that she was biking by Richfield's pickleball courts this weekend and they have eight courts in their facility and it was packed. Due to its popularity, it was really impressive to see.

O'Dea clarified that the hope was to start on the project early, but now this puts the project back on schedule. Woeste and O'Dea met with the pickleball group last week to discuss the process. The group understands the process and are still looking forward to pickleball courts in 2018.

C. Park Ordinance Update

Ellingson explained that the park regulations and park ordinance was discussed this past winter. Park board worked with staff and the city attorney to revise language and make things more current. At the council meeting on April 24, changes were approved with the exception of not changing the language for sledding. There was concern that changing the language to, "it's prohibited excepted for assigned" got too restrictive. After reviewing the language, talking to the city attorney and The League of Minnesota Cities, it was decided that it was not worth changing the language. It still protects the city, so it was recommended to leave the original language.

7. Upcoming Park Board Agenda Items

O'Dea pointed out that there was a typo in the packet under other meetings and activities, the Fire Department and City Open House was listed as October 10, 2018 and it should have been 2017. This event will take place at the Community Center from 5 – 8 p.m.

Something that was not listed in the packet, in the near future, we are hoping to get a presentation from the Minnetonka Historical Society to the park board.

Vetter verified that the Excelsior segments that were discussed under Park Board Member Reports are number six and number seven on the list.

8. Adjournment

Gabler motioned to adjourn, seconded by Kist. Evenrud adjourned the meeting at 7:33 p.m.

**Minnetonka Park Board Item 4A
Meeting of October 4, 2017**

Subject:	Discuss Public Input Process for Mountain Biking
Park Board related goal:	To provide quality athletic and recreational facilities
Park Board related objective:	Renew, expand and maintain a trail system to encourage outdoor recreation and improve the connectivity and walkability of the community
Brief Description:	The park board will review and discuss options for the public input process regarding mountain biking

Background

The city of Minnetonka has engaged with the consulting firm WSB and Associates to assist in the community outreach and engagement for the prospective mountain biking trails project. There has been a large amount of interest and concern over the prospect of developing trails for mountain biking within city parks. Therefore, staff decided to take a step back and engage with the community through a more in-depth, targeted process.

Through discussions with city staff, WSB has compiled three community engagement options for the park board to consider, which are included as an attachment. All options, and the pros and cons of each, are evaluated in the attachment. Each option includes the same number of meetings. Options include:

Option 1 – **Population based outreach.** This option would include targeting interest groups and engaging with them through a focus group. This would ensure all viewpoints are equally heard. One general public meeting would also be held. This is the recommended option.

Option 2 – **General public meetings.** This option would include inviting a broad audience to all meetings to achieve the most overall number of people.

Option 3 – **Neighborhood meetings.** This option would include four geographically based meetings to ensure widespread participation across the city.

All meetings will include a short presentation from staff and consultants about the background of this project, explain what mountain biking is, and what next steps are. However, the primary purpose of the meetings will be to listen to the concerns and answer questions, and collect responses to specific, guided questions in a small group, break-out style.

Staff and consultants are also looking for feedback on the use of online and interactive tools, specifically the city's online engagement tool, Minnetonka Matters, and Mentimeter, an interactive polling tool for meetings. Regardless of the option selected,

the results will be presented to the Park Board at a regular meeting at the conclusion of the public engagement process to determine next steps.

The above options will be presented at the Park Board meeting.

Recommendation

Based on information received from the consultants, staff recommends selecting option one (Population Based Outreach) as the process for public input.

Recommended Park Board Action: Review and discuss the public input process options and provide direction to staff by recommending one of the options.

Attachments

1. Table of engagement options

Option 1: Population-based Engagements (RECOMMENDED OPTION)	Option 2: All General Public Engagements	Option 3: Geography-based Engagements
<u>Four Targeted Meetings:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project advocates • Project opponents • Sub Group – Minnetonka Park Board • General Public 	<u>Four General Meetings:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General public audience invited to each meeting • Engagements held in general/accessible community locations 	<u>Four/Five Targeted Meetings:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invitations based on proximity to proposed trail areas/nodes • Engagements held in locations close to each site
<p>Marketing would be specifically targeted to members of these different groups, to get the “right people” to the “right meeting.”</p>	<p>Marketing would be general invitation based, but still involve some targeted invitations to ensure all voices are heard.</p>	<p>Marketing would be neighborhood-specific (mailings, geographically-oriented).</p>
<u>Recommended Engagement Structure & Techniques:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short Presentation from Staff/consultant (baseline information) • Guided breakout Group discussions and/or Focus Group Agenda • Theme Grouping of Opportunities/Challenges (hands-on) • Reporting back of key themes 	<u>Recommended Engagement Structure & Techniques:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short Presentation from Staff/consultant (baseline information) • Guided breakout Group discussions (recommend World Café style to allow people to interact with across groups) • Theme Grouping of Opportunities/Challenges (hands-on) • Reporting back of key themes 	<u>Recommended Engagement Structure & Techniques:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short Presentation from Staff/consultant (baseline information) • Guided breakout Group discussions • Theme Grouping of Opportunities/Challenges (hands-on) • Reporting back of key themes
<u>Other possible techniques:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Real-time audience polling (i.e. Mentimeter) • Minnetonka Matters 	<u>Other possible techniques:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Real-time audience polling (i.e. Mentimeter) • Minnetonka Matters 	<u>Other possible techniques:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Real-time audience polling (i.e. Mentimeter) • Site visit • Minnetonka Matters

Option 1: Population-based Engagements (RECOMMENDED OPTION)	Option 2: All General Public Engagements	Option 3: Geography-based Engagements
<p><u>Advantages:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures each side is purposefully connected with • Allows a more in-depth conversation to get to the real issues • Provides a better education opportunity 	<p><u>Advantages:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More inclusive (more people) • Can easily and broadly market events 	<p><u>Advantages:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can learn about site specific questions and issues (site analysis) • Possibly hear from new voices
<p><u>Disadvantages:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less opportunity for collaboration among opposing viewpoints • More challenging to “target market” the meetings • Perception of exclusion 	<p><u>Disadvantages:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less substantive conversation (big crowds) • Opportunity to have one side dominate 	<p><u>Disadvantages:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-neighbors may not feel welcomed • Opportunity to have one side dominate • Perception of exclusion (depending on marketing)

**Minnetonka Park Board Item 4B
Meeting of October 4, 2017**

Subject:	Review the Scenic Heights Elementary and Purgatory Park habitat restoration project
Park Board related goal:	To Protect Natural Resources and Open Spaces
Brief Description:	Review the habitat restoration project

Background

In 2016, the Riley-Purgatory-Bluff Creek Watershed District and Scenic Heights Elementary School requested that the city of Minnetonka partner to restore a portion of Purgatory Park in conjunction with the ecological restoration of the Scenic Heights Elementary School Forest.

Scenic Heights Elementary School has been a registered School Forest with the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) since 2006. It is located immediately east of Purgatory Park and north of Purgatory Creek. The portion of Purgatory Park proposed to be restored as part of the School Forest restoration is 1.25 acres.

The Watershed District has a commitment to general improvement of the Purgatory Creek sub-watershed and a commitment to watershed education.

The park board reviewed and approved the project at their September 7, 2016 meeting.

Summary

Since the September 7, 2016 park board meeting, staff has continued to work with the partners on this project.

On August 23, 2017, the partners held an information meeting to inform the neighbors about the substantial change to the forested area, including tree loss. Approximately 160 neighboring residents were notified and about 15 people attended. After a brief presentation, the attendees had questions about the type of habitat restoration, tree loss and protection of wetlands. The project was well received by those in attendance.

Additionally the school district is engaging its school audience at their curriculum night and during school conferences.

The funding for the project has changed slightly with the Watershed and School Districts pursuing and obtaining funding in the amount of \$50,000 through Hennepin County's Opportunity Grant. The School District will contribute in-kind

Item 4B –Review the Scenic Heights Elementary and Purgatory Park habitat restoration project

October 4, 2017

Page 2

site management and maintenance services as well as \$45,000. The Watershed District will contribute the balance of the local match through design and project management services and payment for the water quality improvements.

The city will **not** be responsible for any financial contribution. Project implementation is anticipated to cost \$214,625 with additional costs for design and project management.

The cooperative agreement outlines the responsibilities of each party.

City of Minnetonka responsibilities include:

- Engaging in the project planning and design process to assure that the Purgatory Park restoration goals are clearly understood and realized through the design and implementation of the project;
- Reviewing and providing feedback for pertinent restoration plans, specifications, and project bidding documents;
- Being available for periods of construction and restoration to provide inspection, review and feedback;
- The city will grant Purgatory Park access to the Watershed District and its contractors for the purposes of design, construction, and ongoing monitoring at the site.

Watershed District responsibilities include:

- Serving as the project manager, and working closely with city staff to assure that the project is designed and implemented to achieve mutual goals;
- Serve as the grant recipient for the Opportunity Grant from Hennepin County;
- Contracting with its District Engineer, Barr Engineering Co., to assist in preparation of grant application materials, and upon receiving grant funding, to design the project and provide construction and restoration oversight, utilizing appropriate landscape architects, ecologists, and water resources engineers;
- Contracting with appropriate professional natural resource restoration specialists to inventory existing desirable plant communities, remove invasive species, and implement a multi-year ecosystems restoration project;
- Ensuring that its contractors do not damage park amenities such as trails or benches, if damage occurs the watershed district will repair any damage to the city's specifications;

**Item 4B –Review the Scenic Heights Elementary
and Purgatory Park habitat restoration project**

October 4, 2017

Page 3

- Contributing necessary funds and in-kind services sufficient to meet local match required by the grant, when combined with the in-kind services provided by the school district.

The parties anticipate that the Project will be implemented on the following updated timetable:

- October 2017: Project bidding;
- January – March 2018: Invasive plants cleared;
- Spring 2018: wetland buffer restoration;
- Throughout 2018: plant installation, seeding, and invasive species management;
- 2019-2020: continued establishment and vegetation maintenance.

Discussion Points

- Are there suggested changes to any components of the project that staff should consider?

Recommended Park Board Action: Review the project and provide feedback.

Attachments:

1. Applicable Park Board meeting minutes of September 7, 2016
2. Restoration Plan dated May 2017

Jo Colleran, Natural Resources Division Manager, added that she believes much of the damage in Purgatory Park is a result of BMX features such as ramps and jumps being constructed. She thanked those in attendance for starting this dialog, explaining that a positive solution is beneficial to everyone involved.

Marks mentioned the VANTAGE program, an accelerated program offered by Minnetonka School District for students interested the business world. He suggested that further research related to mountain biking might be provided by these students. Dave Johnson indicated that he has worked with similar groups in the past and would be willing to work with the VANTAGE students if they express an interest.

Marks closed by thanking the Board for their time and attention.

Hearing no further comments, Kvam moved and Gabler seconded a motion to direct staff to conduct further research into the possibility of adding mountain biking trails in the Minnetonka park system, including possible partnerships to design, construct and maintain trails, and report back to the park board prior to discussions on projects to be included in the 2018-2022 Capital Improvements Program. Evenrud, Kist, Gabler, Kvam, Puspoki, Raarup and Seveland voted "Yes", Acomb abstained due to a full board in attendance. Motion carried.

D. Consideration of a partnership to restore habitat on Minnetonka School District and City of Minnetonka property

Colleran introduced Matt Compka from Barr Engineering who provided a presentation explaining the history of property owned by the Minnetonka School District at Scenic Heights Elementary School and used for the schools environmental curriculum. Compka explained that the Riley-Purgatory Creek Watershed District has grant funding available through the DNR's Conservation Partners Legacy Grant Program and that they anticipate applying for a grant of approximately \$315,000 to assist in expenses to provide restoration to the area that is 1.25 acres in size. Compka further explained that the school districts property also abuts city park land at Purgatory Park that would also benefit from the restoration dollars if the grant is successful. He explained that his reason for being in front of the board this evening was to gain the park board's authorization to apply for the grant on behalf of both the School District and City of Minnetonka.

Kist asked if the project would require any additional city funding and/or staff time to administer. Compka responded that no city funding would be required, however staff administrative assistance required by no actual labor.

Raarup asked how the School District benefits from the proposal. Compka responded that a curriculum will be developed to involve and educate students throughout the process. Evenrud asked if additional curriculum options would be

developed. Compka indicated that increased opportunities would become available in the areas of water quality and native species knowledge.

Puspoki indicated that his children have benefitted from the students access to this property in the past and he would welcome the added curriculum.

Kist asked what the timetable for the project would be. Compka responded that, if the grant is successful, work would start this winter after a qualified contractor is selected.

Kvam asked Colleran if there were any potential negatives to the city's involvement in this grant application. Colleran indicated that there were no concerns, adding that the city will need to continue restoration efforts whether the grant is approved or not.

Hearing no further comments, Evenrud moved and Kist seconded a motion to approve the restoration partnership and authorize the park board chair and Recreation Services Director to sign off on the letter of intent. Evenrud, Kist, Gabler, Kvam, Puspoki, Raarup and Seveland voted "Yes", Acomb abstained due to a full board in attendance. Motion carried.

5. ~~Park Board Member Reports~~

~~Kvam reported on the successful Hopkins Royal Triathlon that was held at Shady Oak Beach and the surrounding area on Saturday, September 3, 2016.~~

6. ~~Information Items~~

~~No additional items were discussed in addition to the information included in the meeting packet.~~

7. ~~Upcoming Park Board Agenda Items~~

~~No additional items were discussed in addition to the calendar included in the meeting packet.~~

8. ~~Adjournment~~

~~Raarup adjourned the meeting at 9:25 p.m.~~

**Minnetonka Park Board Item 6
Meeting of October 4, 2017**

Subject:	2017 Summer Recreation Program Registration Summary
Park Board related goal:	N/A
Park Board related objective:	N/A
Brief Description:	Provide the Park Board with the 2017 Summer Recreation Program Registration Summary

	Program	2016 Participation #s	2017 Participation #s
Youth	Aquatics	549	419
	Babysitter Training	36	30
	Baseball Camps	59	-----
	Basketball Camp	56	42
	Cheerleading Camp	0	31
	Golf Lessons	10	-----
	Hop-Kids – Art, Dance, Music, Science	118	154
	Hop-Kids – Sports	172	159
	Horseback Riding Camp	21	27
	Jidana Day Camp	214	217
	Kid's Corner	31	33
	Knee Highs Soccer	88	65
	Martial Arts	55	99
	Playgrounds (ages 6-12)	1159	1098
	Skating Lessons	169	168
	Skyhawks Camps	30	35
	Soccer Camp	26	26
	Soccer League	640	582
	Summer Adventure (ages 4-5)	203	166
Tennis in the Parks	170	192	
Volleyball Camp	12	12	
Teen	Canoeing on the Creek	4	4
	Geocaching	6	-----
	Kayaking the Kinnickinnic	4	5
	Paintball	7	9
	Rec-Tivity	32	-----
	SUP Yoga	4	3
Adult	5-Player Basketball League	11 teams	11 teams
	Badminton Open Gym	1207	1625
	Beach Yoga	-----	55
	Golf Lessons	28	19
	Kickball Leagues	14 teams	10 teams
	Martial Arts	78	93
	Skating Lessons	33	16
	Soccer League	18 teams	16 teams
	Softball Leagues	82 teams	76 teams
	SUP Yoga	14	270
Touch Football League	5 teams	-----	
Senior	Bike Club	114	106
	Classes	929	1165
	Events	862	746
	Golf League	26	36
	Softball League	40	44
	Trips	110	321
	TOTAL	6239	6544

**Minnetonka Park Board Item 6
Meeting of October 4, 2017**

Subject:	McKenzie Park Hockey Rink Update
Park Board related goal:	N/A
Park Board related objective:	N/A
Brief Description:	Provide the Park Board with an update on the McKenzie Park Hockey Rink project.

The hockey boards currently used at McKenzie, Gro Tonka, Meadow, Spring Hill, and Boulder Creek parks are no longer being manufactured. Park maintenance staff typically replaces four - ten damaged panels each year, but those panels are no longer available. Funds were set aside in the 2017 Capital Improvements Program to install a new board system at McKenzie Park. After researching different products, staff selected a system that will utilize fiberglass panels instead of HDPE plastic. The existing board system has been removed and the panels will be saved to be used on the other rinks. In an effort to improve the quality of the ice in the winter, the asphalt surface is being removed and the surface will now be gravel. This will allow the surface to be graded completely flat to provide a uniform ice thickness. The asphalt surface was sloped to allow water to drain off in the summer, which required one end of the rink to be built up with six -ten inches of ice to get four inches of ice on the opposite end. The gravel surface will not affect the use of the space for the summer park program. The new system (boards and fencing) is scheduled to be delivered on October 16, and is scheduled to be completed by the first of November.

**Minnetonka Park Board Item 7
Meeting of October 4, 2017**

Upcoming 6-Month Meeting Schedule				
Day	Date	Meeting Type	Agenda Business Items	Special Notes
Wed	11/1/17	Regular	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint meeting w/city council • Volunteer recognition 	
Wed	12/6/17	Regular	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of 2017 Farmer's Market Operations and staff recommendations for 2018 operations • Consideration of 2018 Park Board Strategic Plan 	
Wed	1/3/18	Regular	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adoption of 2018 Park Board Strategic Plan 	
Wed	2/7/18	Regular	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minnetonka Historical Society presentation regarding Burwell House 	
Wed	3/7/18	Regular	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of projects for the 2019-2023 Capital Improvement Program 	
Wed	4/4/18	Regular	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	

Other meetings and activities to note:

Day	Date	Description	Special Notes
Tues	10/10/17	Fire Dept. & City Open House	5-8 p.m. Community Center

Items to be scheduled:

Mountain biking project updates
Mountain biking feasibility report