



# Agenda Minnetonka Parks & Recreation Board

Wednesday, December 7, 2016

7 p.m.

Minnetonka City Hall – Minnehaha Room

## **P**arks & 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"/> Chris Gabler       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nelson Evenrud | <input type="checkbox"/> Marvin Puspoki     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cynthia Kist   | <input type="checkbox"/> Chair Elise Raarup |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Peggy Kvam     | <input type="checkbox"/> Madeline Seveland  |

#### **2. Approval of Minutes**

A) September 7, 2016

B) November 2, 2016 Joint meeting with the city council

#### **3. Citizens wishing to discuss items not on the Agenda**

#### **4. Business Items**

A) **Presentation of mountain biking plan by Minnetonka High School Vantage program students**

B) **Review of 2016 Farmer's Market Operations and staff recommendations for 2017 operations**

C) **Consideration of 2017 Park Board Strategic Plan**

#### **5. Park Board Member Reports**

#### **6. Information Items**

#### **7. Upcoming Park Board Agenda Items**

#### **8. Adjournment**

**1. Roll Call**

Park Board members in attendance included Jack Acomb, Nelson Evenrud, Chris Gabler, Cindy Kist, Peggy Kvam, Marvin Puspoki, Elise Raarup and Madeline Seveland. Staff members in attendance included Jo Colleran, Ann Davy, Darin Ellingson, Dave Johnson, Kelly O'Dea, Mike Pavelka and Sara Woeste.

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

**2. Approval of Minutes**

Gabler moved and Kist seconded a motion to approve the meeting Minutes of August 3, 2016 as submitted. All voted "Yes". Motion carried.

**3. Citizens Wishing to Discuss Items Not on the Agenda**

None

**4. Business Items**

**A. Consideration of a staff recommendation to add sports lighting to the Civic Center athletic fields**

Sara Woeste, Recreation Services Programming and Special Events Manager, provided the introduction and began by summarizing the neighborhood meeting conducted by the park board at the September 7, 2016 meeting. She noted that no major concerns were expressed by the neighbors however questions related to cost, parking and light spill impacting homes north of the creek were asked. Woeste then summarized lighting cost information provided at the meeting by Craig Gallop of Musco Lighting. She indicated that Gallop reported on two types of lighting were available including metal halide at a cost of \$128,000 and LED lighting at a cost of \$165,000. Woeste noted that if the metal halide option was selected by the board, staff would offset the city's funding amount of \$75,000 with a grant application of \$53,000 from the Hennepin County Youth Sports Grant (HCYSG) program. And if LED lighting was selected, the grant amount would be \$90,000. Woeste closed by noting that LED lighting provides improved spill control and more efficient energy use. Woeste indicated that, if approved, the lights be shut down by 9:45 daily to be consistent with other youth fields in the city.

Woeste requested feedback or questions from the park board members.

Gabler asked if all athletic field lights are shut down on city fields by 9:45 p.m. Dave Johnson, Recreation Services Director, responded that all youth fields are required to be shut down by 9:45 p.m., in part to be consistent with an ordinance

requiring parks be closed at 10 p.m. He noted that the only exception is Big Willow Park, where adult fields are provided and can stay lit as late as 11 p.m.

Puspoki noted that he was not in attendance at the August meeting and asked if a payback period was provided by Musco Lighting for LED lights. Woeste indicated that a payback comparison was not provided, Darin Ellingson, Public Works Streets and Parks Operations Manager, indicated that based on his experience with other applications of LED lighting, the additional cost for LED lighting verses metal halide would be covered over the time of the lights.

Kvam noted that Xcel Energy provides rebates for LED lighting due to their energy efficiency. She added that while Musco indicated that there were no local athletic field installations of LED lighting, she reviewed the Musco Lighting website and noted that they have provided LED lighting for several major projects including the White House and Mount Rushmore.

Raarup asked if the added amount needed for LED lighting would reduce the City's chances for receiving a grant. Johnson responded that based on what he has seen for project matches for past projects, he felt that the added amount for LED lighting would not be a negative factor.

Evenrud voiced support for going with LED lighting, adding that the concerns expressed by one resident residing on the north side of the Minnehaha Creek would be better addressed with LED lighting.

Raarup noted that there were no residents in attendance for this item and asked if there were any additional questions or comments from the board. Hearing none, she entertained a motion.

Gabler moved and Evenrud seconded a motion to recommend the addition of LED lighting to the Civic Center athletic fields; and to apply for a project grant through the Hennepin County Youth Sports Grant Program. Evenrud, Kist, Gabler, Kvam, Puspoki, Raarup and Seveland voted "Yes", Acomb abstained due to a full board in attendance. Motion carried.

Johnson noted that contingent upon successfully applying for and receiving a grant, staff will bring the Comprehensive Athletic Field Use Policy back to the board at a later date for consideration of changes related to the use of lights in Civic Center Park.

## **B. Consideration of Pickleball site concepts**

Woeste provided an introduction to the item and a brief review of the options reviewed at the August park board meeting which included the following:

1. Converting the existing tennis courts at Meadow Park to permanent pickleball courts and increasing the number of courts from four to six. Estimated cost is \$148,000, however there are unknowns, both logistically and financially, related to tree loss and wetland impacts.
2. Lone Lake Park – 8 court option, includes a sun shelter for players waiting at a total cost of \$336,853 (construction and contingency costs). This option would also require the Hillside picnic shelter to be relocated at an additional cost of \$45,000.
3. Lone Lake Park – 6 court option, includes sun shelter for players waiting at a total cost of \$265,342 (construction and contingency costs). This option would also require the Hillside picnic shelter to be relocated at an additional cost of \$45,000.

In addition, Woeste reviewed the research staff had completed related to the number of courts other cities provided at a single location and in general. The information provided by Apple Valley, Bloomington, Chanhassen, Edina, Maple Grove and Richfield indicated varying amounts of courts at single locations ranging from 3 to 8. The number of total courts provided per city also ranged from 5 to 14. Woeste noted that most of the cities polled have multiple locations for pickleball courts, noting that if the park board recommends a new facility at Lone Lake Park, maintaining the multi-purpose courts and/or the courts placed on the tennis courts is an option as well.

Raarup asked whether all of the courts listed on the cities' surveyed are dedicated courts for pickleball. Woeste responded that both dedicated and multi-purpose courts are included in the survey. Raarup asked if it was correct that both pickleball and tennis players do not prefer multi-use courts. Ellingson responded that he did not feel that was the case, he noted that the pickleball courts at Meadow are slightly smaller than regulation, however they are still playable and he has not heard otherwise. Kvam added that the need for a lock box for nets and equipment is the main issue of concern expressed.

Kist asked if staff has a timeline for reconstructing the sub-surface on the Meadow Park courts due to wear and tear. Ellingson responded that the project is not yet scheduled in the CIP, however repainting of the surface is scheduled for 2017. Kist pointed out that resurfacing the Meadow Park courts will need to be done in multiple years and she felt that the Meadow Park option is a more difficult option than either of the Lone Lake Park options.

Kvam asked for a summary of why Meadow Park was initially selected as the location for the existing pickleball courts. Johnson responded saying that Meadow was selected because staff had recommended to the board that a neighborhood park not be designated as the primary pickleball site due to the

lack of infrastructure i.e., parking and restrooms to support heavy use. He went on to say that the only community parks that had tennis were Meadow and Lone Lake. Meadow was selected because there are only two tennis courts, and Lone Lake is considered a primary tennis location due to the availability of 4 courts.

Kvam asked staff if pickleball courts can be converted to other uses should the sport decline in popularity in the future. Ellingson responded that yes, the courts could be converted to a variety of other uses including tennis, basketball or shuffleboard.

Evenrud noted that he was concerned about how the courts could be used if demand declines and appreciated Ellingson's response. He added that he sees the popularity of the sport and the needs for permanent courts in Minnetonka and supports constructing 8 courts at Meadow Park,

Raarup supported Evenrud's comments and asked if the budget can support the construction of eight courts. Ellingson indicated that there is \$310,000 in the CIP budget for 2018, and noted that the cost for the 8 court option is \$336,853. He suggested that either cuts could be made to the plan or the eight court plan could be reduced to six with two courts added at a later time.

Kvam noted that she supported building eight courts now and delaying the addition of the \$30,000 sun shelter to allow for the project to meet the budgeted amount.

Seveland agreed with Kvam, adding that she would be concerned with building six courts then never getting to the point of adding the additional two.

Raarup opened the floor to public comments noting that only one person was in attendance.

David Allan, 16528 Hidden Valley Road, Minnetonka, voiced support for building eight courts at Lone Lake, noting that eight courts would allow for flexibility and availability for players of all ability levels.

Hearing no further comments, Raarup closed the floor to public comments.

Kvam asked if staff had researched courts constructed with the sports court surface. Ellingson indicated he had not. Johnson added that the sport court surface could be explored once a location is recommended and final plans are developed.

Gabler asked about the possibility of a public/private partnership in an effort to save dollars. Johnson responded that these types of partnerships have proven to be successful when the amenity being constructed has a single use or

designated association it is being constructed for such as an ice arena. Johnson explained that public amenities such as pickleball courts are more difficult to form partnerships around.

Hearing no further comments, Gabler moved and Evenrud seconded a motion to recommend to the city council the construction of eight dedicated pickleball courts at Lone Lake Park, eliminating the addition of a sun shelter if the budget does not allow for it. Evenrud, Kist, Gabler, Kvam, Puspoki, Raarup and Seveland voted “Yes”, Acomb abstained due to a full board in attendance. Motion carried.

### **C. Receive a request for the addition of mountain biking trails**

Johnson informed the board that staff had recently been contacted by Ben Marks, a Minnetonka resident with a request for the city to consider the addition of mountain biking trails in the city to help meet the growing demand for such trails. Johnson explained to the board that he has worked with Marks to prepare for addressing the park board with his initial request and introduced Marks to the Board.

Marks informed the Board that he is a 20-year resident of the city who has an active interest in mountain biking recreationally. Marks noted that he had submitted a letter explaining his desire for the city to consider adding mountain biking trails to the Minnetonka park system in the Board’s meeting packet and asked if the Board had any initial questions or specific items for him to address before he introduced other supporters in attendance. Kvam noted that she was a road cyclist and prefers longer trails and routes. She asked if the Minnetonka park system provided the room necessary to build trails long enough to benefit mountain biking. Marks responded that his hope is that a series of shorter trails, hopefully in the range of five miles, could be connected by the city’s existing trail system. Then look at the possibility of expanding that even further in the future if possible. Marks added that the average speed of mountain bikers is 7 MPH, meaning that a five mile trail would provide significant benefit.

Marks indicated that Johnson had provided details related to the discussions the park board and council had related to a request made for mountain biking trails approximately 20 years ago. He noted that this request was denied and felt that the reasons for denial, specifically the cost and method for constructing trails, has evolved to the point where most of these earlier concerns no longer exist.

Hearing no further questions from the Board, Marks introduced others in the room who support the addition of mountain biking trails. Those introduced included:

Jason Stukel, Minnetonka High School mountain biking coach

Logan Cummings, Minnetonka student and mountain biking athlete  
Eleanor Dolan, Minnetonka student and mountain biking athlete  
Tim Vossberg, Chanhassen High School mountain biking coach  
Ben Johnson, Hopkins High School mountain biking coach

Stukel addressed the Board and noted that as a coach, it is difficult to take his athletes to locations outside of the city to practice. He added that the city's off road system does not provide the skill set that mountain bikers need to train appropriately. Stukel indicated that he supports Mark's vision of a series of trails in multiple parks that would be connected by the city's trail system. Puspoki asked how many teams are participating in the sport of high school mountain biking in the metro. Stukel responded that the number was approximately 750 riders statewide. Responding to a question from Puspoki, Stukel informed the board that the Minnetonka School District does not provide funding for the sport. He indicated that each student is responsible for their own gear and also pay a required activity fee. Puspoki asked if the sport was considered a club sport and Stukel responded that it varied, with Minnetonka not being a letter sport but working towards achieving that goal.

Ben Johnson indicated that mountain biking was a letter sport in Hopkins with 32 students on the team.

Vossberg indicated that teams travel as far as Wisconsin to compete, noting that there were no metro area races held last year due to a lack of trails and sites that can accommodate parking and other related needs. Puspoki asked if the proposal coming from interested mountain bikers would accommodate the need for larger events. Stukel responded that it would not be an event site but would be a valuable practice and recreational site.

Seveland asked those in attendance what they were looking for in respect to mountain biking trails. Marks indicated that the desire is for fun trails constructed with a width of 12 to 18 inches in width that utilize the landscape and existing trees and vegetation. He indicated that these trails are typically one-way and multi-purpose meaning walkers and others are permitted to be on them.

Evenrud asked if trails would include features such as ramps. Marks indicated they would not.

Cummings informed the Board that he is a junior at Minnetonka High School and has been involved in the sport since he was a freshman. He noted that he and his friends used Purgatory Park for mountain biking prior to signs be posted prohibiting the activity. He noted that he had previously tried other sports, only to connect with Mountain biking. Cummings reported that ages for the sport range from students in grades 6 thru 12, with several of the team members using the sport of mountain biking to train for other sports.

He closed by saying that the technical ability of the sport can't be learned on the city's general trail system.

Dolan indicated that she was a student at Minnetonka Middle School West and has been involved in the sport of mountain biking for the past five years. She stated that the sport helps reduce stress and allows her to be active instead. Raarup asked Dolan what a typical practice/event schedule was for her during the season. Dolan indicated that it was 2 practices and one event per week.

Gabler cited concern for mountain biking being contained to a single location and asked for confirmation that those in attendance were requesting smaller trails off of the existing trail system maintain year around. Marks confirmed that was the request, noting that the problems at Purgatory Park are an example of how a single location can be too heavily used by a variety of activities.

Kvam asked staff to research the possibilities of working with the city of Hopkins in partnership and/or researching the possibility of utilizing land along the trail that parallels 494 from Minnetonka Boulevard to 394.

Acomb asked for confirmation that the trails being requested would be available for multi-use. Marks indicated that they would.

Raarup asked what other metro area communities are doing to meet the growing demand for mountain biking. Vossberg reported on efforts with the city of Stillwater and Oak Park Heights. Raarup asked how his school (Chanhassen) is addressing the shortage. Vossberg said that he is working with Three Rivers and also the city of Chaska on the possibility of adding trails to an existing 60 acre park. Vossberg also reported that the city of Lakeville recently authorized \$85,000 to build trails.

Vossberg indicated that the cost to build trails is approximately \$20,000 per mile. He indicated that MORC (Minnesota off Road Cycling) is responsible for maintaining most of the mountain biking trails in Minnesota.

Seveland indicated that she was concerned about erosion that would occur with the construction of trails in the natural areas. She asked how steep trails would protect against erosion. Vossberg responded that trails are not constructed vertically for that reason, and are instead constructed to circle hills.

Dave Johnson reported that staff has recently received requests for the consideration of adding a BMX biking course in the city as well. He asked for an explanation of the differences in the sport. Ben Johnson responded that BMX biking is typically of interest to younger riders ages 6 to 15 and conducted on wider oval tracks.

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 trials 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.

## **1. Roll Call**

City Council members in attendance included Mayor Terry Schneider, Patty Acomb, Dick Allendorf, Tim Bergstedt, Tony Wagner and Brad Wiersum. Park Board members in attendance included Board Chair Elise Raarup, Jack Acomb, Geralyn Barone, Nelson Evenrud, Chris Gabler, Cindy Kist, Peggy Kvam, Marvin Puspoki and Madeline Seveland. Staff members in attendance included Jo Colleran, Ann Davy, Darin Ellingson, Corrine Heine, Dave Johnson, Kathy Kline, Kelly O'Dea, Susan Svec and Perry Vetter.

Park Board Chair Raarup called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

## **2. Business Items**

### **A. Report from the Chair**

Chair Raarup provided a summary of 2016 park board activity to date including:

- ✓ Adopted a Strategic Plan in January that includes a mission, vision, four primary goals and related objectives.
- ✓ Approved park and trail projects for the 2017 – 2021 Capital Improvements Program.
- ✓ Conducted a neighborhood meeting in January to review a resident request for a park in the Robinwood neighborhood. The Board approved a concept plan for the park at their March meeting after reviewing the feasibility study and related data. Council approved the park plan for construction in 2018 as part of the CIP adoption.
- ✓ Received natural resource information pertaining to education and outreach efforts, toured the experimental goat grazing project and approved the Scenic Heights Elementary School Forest and Purgatory Park Restoration Partnership.
- ✓ Held a community meeting on the sport of pickleball and included related information in the Minnetonka Memo to obtain resident input. In August, developed a recommendation to add new courts at Lone Lake Park in 2018.
- ✓ Held the 3<sup>rd</sup> annual Volunteer Recognition event to show appreciation for volunteers who donated their time and efforts to the areas of parks, recreation and natural resources management in 2016.
- ✓ Reviewed budgets and operating policies related to Shady Oak Beach and the use of community athletic fields

- ✓ Conducted a neighborhood meeting related to the proposed lighting of the Civic Center Park athletic field. Recommended to the city council that staff submit a grant request to the Hennepin County Youth Sports Program.
- ✓ Received a request from residents interested in mountain biking and the addition of new trails in the city's park system. Directed staff to work with the group to develop conceptual plans.

Raarup asked for any council questions.

Allendorf asked what the current status was in regards to mountain biking requests made through Minnetonka Matters. Colleran noted that staff met with a group of five interested mountain bikers and walked Big Willow and Civic Center Parks to discuss possibilities for shorter mountain biking segments throughout the park system as opposed to one park being dominated by the activity. Colleran indicated that the group will be making a formal presentation to the park board at the December 7 meeting. Johnson added that he has been working with a resident and members of the Minnetonka High School VANTAGE program who are developing a proposal as part of their curriculum. Raarup added that the sport of mountain biking is of interest and available to students in grades 7 – 12, as well as residents of all ages who enjoy the sport.

## **B. Guidelines for public requests**

Raarup noted that over the past year, the park board has experienced an increased number of requests for new park related amenities being brought forward by interested residents. Examples include requests for new “pocket” parks by residents in the Meadow Ridge and Robinwood neighborhoods, requests for permanent pickleball courts from interested pickleball players and resident requests for the addition of mountain biking trails in the city's park system. Raarup explained that for all of these cases, the initial request was made directly to the park board without a formal or informal introduction being made to the council.

Raarup indicated that the park board anticipates that the recent trend of resident requests for new or enhanced recreational amenities will continue, and could even be enhanced due to the Imagine Minnetonka initiative. She suggested that to better prepare for these requests, a process be considered that would address the following goals:

1. Improve council awareness of requests being made
2. Increase community awareness of requests being made
3. Enhance direction from the council to the park board and city staff on an as needed basis

Bergstedt voiced support for a process that would provide upward communication to the city council so that they were aware of project requests and any timetables involved. He added that he did not feel that the project request had to start at the park board level.

Barone added that staff's major concern was related to the possibility of council members receiving calls supporting or opposing a project that they were not aware of.

Wiersum concurred with Bergstedt and Barone, noting that the park board continuing to receive the request is preferred. He asked what is currently required in order for a resident or group to make their initial request. Wiersum suggested that criteria be set by the board, including funding requirements, if any, of the asking party. Wiersum cited the process used for requesting the addition of a street light in the city where 100% of residents need to be supportive of the request. Wiersum also suggested that specialized requests be considered at a higher level if the funding support accompanies the request.

Acomb requested that an online park board update be developed so that the council can review the activities of the board and be kept current.

Mayor Schneider noted that he felt the park board was doing a great job of vetting requests that come to the city. He agreed with Wiersum that criteria be put in place such as project cost and available funding/donations; as well as operations and maintenance costs. Responding to Wiersum's suggestion for a required support level from a neighborhood, he suggested maybe starting at 50% support.

Johnson noted that the park board currently has a document in place titled "Guidelines for Funding Special Projects", that includes criteria needed to bring a project forward. He indicated that the requests being made by the council this evening could be drafted into the existing document.

Seveland suggested that material be developed that assists those coming forward in organizing their grassroots effort.

Barone suggested the addition of an online project page for all park board projects so that residents can access the most recent information. Wiersum voiced support for this approach.

Allendorf noted that attempts to notify residents by mail often create concerns due to people indicating they were not noticed. He realizes the mail notifications are needed, but added that they can be challenging. He supported the efforts of any on-line project updates.

Gabler suggested that the project request application to the park board also be accessible online. Gabler supported Wiersum's suggestion of specialized groups bringing funding to the table.

Raarup thanked those in attendance for their input and indicated that the park board will take the information provided and develop a process for improving communications moving forward.

### **C. Review of 2016 Park Board Strategic Plan**

Raarup noted that the park board's 2016 Strategic Plan was included as an attachment in the meeting packet. She added that the park board will begin the process of developing their 2017 plan in December and asked for any city council input.

Wiersum noted that the Park Board's Strategic Plan is well prepared and succinct. He added that his only request for 2017 was, under the goal "To Renew and Maintain Parks & Trails", objective number 5 should separately deal with recreational verse trails designed for connectivity.

### **4. Adjournment**

Mayor Schneider thanked the park board for their work and dedication over the past year.

Raarup adjourned the meeting at 6:25 p.m.

**Minnetonka Park Board Item 4A  
Meeting of December 7, 2016**

<b>Subject:</b>	Presentation of mountain biking plan by Minnetonka High School Vantage program students
<b>Park Board related goal:</b>	To renew and maintain parks and trails
<b>Park Board related objective:</b>	Renew, expand and maintain a trail system to encourage outdoor recreation and improve the connectivity and walkability of the community
<b>Brief Description:</b>	Students from the Minnetonka School District's VANTAGE program will present a request for consideration of funding in the 2018-2022 Capital Improvements Program for the construction of mountain biking trails in the city's park system

### **Background**

At the September 7, 2016 meeting, the park board heard a request from local mountain biking enthusiasts for the consideration of adding dedicated and maintained mountain biking trails in the city's park system. Those speaking at the meeting included high school athletes and coaches from the Minnetonka and Hopkins School District, interested residents and others involved professionally in construction and maintenance of mountain biking trails.

Following the group's presentation, the park board directed staff to work with those presenting to explore potential partnerships for constructing and maintaining trails in the city's park system. Minnetonka resident Ben Marks offered as a suggestion utilizing students in the Minnetonka School District's VANTAGE program to assist in preparing information to bring back to the park board.

### **Summary**

In October, staff from the Parks and Natural Resources Divisions of the Public Works Department, and staff from the Recreation Services Department, joined Marks, students from the VANTAGE program and a mountain bike trail contractor to tour Big Willow and Civic Center Parks to explore possibilities for the addition of trails. Staff has since been working with Marks and the VANTAGE students to prepare a proposal to bring back to the park board at the December 7, 2016 meeting.

**Recommended Park Board Action:** Receive the presentation prepared by students of the Minnetonka School District's VANTAGE program requesting consideration of funding for mountain biking trails in the 2018 – 2022 Capital Improvements Program. Provide staff direction on how to proceed.

**Minnetonka Park Board Item 4B  
Meeting of December 7, 2016**

<b>Subject:</b>	Review of 2016 Farmers Market Operations and staff recommendations for 2017 operations
<b>Park Board related goal:</b>	To provide quality athletic and recreational facilities and programs
<b>Park Board related objective:</b>	Offer a full range of programs for people of all ages and ability levels
<b>Brief Description:</b>	Park Board will review the 2016 Farmers Market operations and review staff's recommendations for 2017

**Background**

The Minnetonka Farmers Market began in the summer of 2009 and has been managed by the city's Administration Department from 2009 to 2015. Recreation Services took over management of the market starting 2016 and hired a part time Market Manager, Amy Weiss, to help with marketing and operations.

**Summary**

The 2016 Farmers Market season ran for 14 weeks on Tuesday evenings from 3 – 7 p.m., June 28 – September 27. The market was located in the Ice Arena B parking lot on the Civic Center Campus adjacent to the athletic fields. The market included a total of 35 different vendors providing local fresh fruits and vegetables, baked goods, plants, crafts and a variety of other food items.

The 2016 Farmers Market season was successful with a total attendance of 4,225 and a weekly average of 338 attendees. Both vendors and customers of the market were surveyed electronically at the conclusion of the 2016 season. The vendor survey results indicate that 82% of vendors reported that their sales were the same or better than in 2015 and that 85% of the vendors hope to return for the 2017 season. The customer survey results show that the majority of customers attend the market to support local growers as well as for its convenience, selection of products and the community feel.

Amy Weiss will provide a detailed summary of the successes and challenges of the market in 2016 and present staff recommendations for the 2017 market.

**Recommended Park Board Action:** Review the 2016 Farmers Market summary of operations and recommendations for 2017 operations and provide input as needed.



**Minnetonka Park Board Item 4C  
Meeting of December 7, 2016**

<b>Subject:</b>	Consideration of the 2017 Park Board Strategic Plan
<b>Park Board related goal:</b>	Enhance Long-Term Park Board Development
<b>Park Board related objective:</b>	Annually assess the park board strategic plan
<b>Brief Description:</b>	The park board will review park board strategic plan mission, vision, goals and objectives in place for 2016 and implement desired changes for 2017.

### **Background**

In 2001, the park board worked with an independent consultant to establish a process for developing and annually refining a strategic plan. As a result of this endeavor, board members developed goals, objectives and specific action steps designed to meet the board's mission and vision developed earlier in the process.

Attached is the 2016 Park Board Strategic Plan. Updates have been made by staff to reflect requests made by the city council at the November joint meeting, and other date related changes. The park board will review this document and provide direction to staff regarding any desired changes for 2017. Once approved, staff will begin the process of preparing action steps to address the park board's goals and objectives, and will present those at a meeting in early 2017.

### **Discussion Points**

- Does the park board desire any additional changes to the 2017 Mission or Vision statements?
- Does the park board desire any changes to the Strategic Plan's goals and objectives for 2017?

**Recommended Park Board Action:** Review the 2016 strategic plan and provide staff with any desired changes for 2017.

### **Attachments**

1. 2017 Strategic Plan - Draft

**Minnetonka Park & Recreation Board**  
**2017 Strategic Plan - DRAFT**

**Vision for Minnetonka Park and Recreational Facilities**

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

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

- Protect and enhance Minnetonka's natural environment
- Promote quality recreation opportunities and facilities
- Provide a forum for citizen engagement in our parks, trails, athletic facilities, and open space

**Goals and Objectives (order does not reflect priority)**

**To protect natural resources and open space**

- Objective #1: Provide feedback to assist staff in managing the open space process  
Objective #2: Continue to review and comment on the implementation of the natural resources stewardship plan  
Objective #3: Review options to enhance natural resources & open space  
Objective #4: Promote the city's efforts of protecting and enhancing the community's natural resources by creating awareness and supporting educational strategies

**To renew and maintain parks and trails**

- Objective #1: Involve park board member participation in park & trail projects  
Objective #2: As needed, conduct an annual review of park dedication fees  
Objective #3: Identify areas of the city that are deficient of adequate park or trail amenities  
Objective #4: Conduct a comprehensive review of the trail system to identify missing links and required future improvements  
Objective #5: Renew, expand and maintain a trail system to encourage outdoor recreation  
Objective #6: Consider all options (off-road and on-road) to improve the connectivity and walkability of community.

Commented [DJ1]: Request of Council Member Wiersum

**To provide quality athletic and recreational facilities and programs**

- Objective #1: Perform an annual review of the Gray's Bay Marina operations plan  
Objective #2: Anticipate, review and respond to community needs not previously identified  
Objective #3: Annually review policies related to the operation and management of parks to determine if changes are required  
Objective #4: Ensure that park amenities, recreational facilities and programs address future community needs and changing demographics  
Objective #5: Conduct a review of the athletic field fee schedule developed for 2017 and make recommended adjustments for 2018  
Objective #6: Review drafts of the updated Parks, Open Space and Trails (POST) Plan  
Objective #7: Offer a full range of programs for people of all ages and ability levels  
Objective #8: Responsibly maintain our parks, trails and recreational facilities, while fairly balancing user fees with general community support

**Enhance long-term Park Board development**

- Objective #1: Define Capital Improvements Program for 2018-2022 related to parks, trails & open space  
Objective #2: Enhance council relations - keep council members informed of park board projects under consideration  
Objective #3: Develop a process to increase community awareness of park board projects  
Objective #4: Schedule board member involvement in annual park board and city related activities  
Objective #5: Annually assess the park board strategic plan  
Objective #6: Conduct a review of the park board's program for recognizing volunteers who complete pre-approved projects to benefit the park system

Commented [DJ2]: Request from the joint meeting with the city council

**Minnetonka Park Board Item 5  
Meeting of December 7, 2016**

<b>Subject:</b>	Park Board Member Reports
<b>Park Board related goal:</b>	N/A
<b>Park Board related objective:</b>	N/A
<b>Brief Description:</b>	Park Board members will report on any park, recreation or natural resources items that have come to their attention since the last board meeting.

**Minnetonka Park Board Item 6  
Meeting of December 7, 2016**

<b>Subject:</b>	Information Items
<b>Park Board related goal:</b>	N/A
<b>Park Board related objective:</b>	N/A
<b>Brief Description:</b>	The following are informational items and developments that have occurred since the last park board meeting.

**Park Board Special Project Guidelines**

Attached is the park board's Guidelines for Funding Special Projects document that was discussed at the joint meeting with the city council in November. Staff will be including an action step in the 2017 Strategic Plan to consider amending these guidelines for future use.

# Minnetonka Park Board

## Guidelines for Funding Special Projects

The Minnetonka Park Board has developed the following guidelines which will be followed when addressing requests for funding of special projects related to recreation or parks. Examples of special projects include, but are not limited to, facilities such as athletic fields, hockey rinks, and other indoor or outdoor athletic or recreation facilities.

***I. The extent of neighborhood and community interest and benefit derived from the project is justifiable.***

- Does it serve a previously identified community need?
- What is the community or neighborhood demand for the project?
- Is there equity in supporting the project (geographic, gender, school district)?
- What is the impact on the community for not supporting the project?
- What are the benefits derived from the project?
- Would this project be utilized by non-residents and what is that impact?
- Will the facility be programmed? If so, at what cost and by whom?

***II. Proximity of requested project to existing park or other city-owned land is appropriate.***

- Is land acquisition involved or will city-owned property be used?
- Has a specific site been identified?
- Does this project displace a current or future activity?
- What is the impact (traffic, noise, light, etc.) on surrounding properties?

***III. There is an ability for the city and the community to fund the project.***

- Is funding available through the city's Capital Improvement Program?
- What other financial resources are available in the community to fund the project? How secure are they and can the needed funding be sustained?
- What ongoing operating and maintenance costs are involved?
- Will this be revenue-generating project? Who will pay for the expenses?
- What liability issues are involved?

***IV. Other issues***

- What alternatives have been considered?
- How does the project align with the established goals of the Recreation Services Department?
- How accessible is the property to the general public?

*Established: July 1, 1998*

*Amended: November 6, 2013*

**Minnetonka Park Board Item 7  
Meeting of December 7, 2016**

<b>Upcoming 6-Month Meeting Schedule</b>				
<b>Day</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Meeting Type</b>	<b>Agenda Business Items</b>	<b>Special Notes</b>
<b>Wed</b>	1/4/17	Regular	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adoption of 2017 Park Board goals</li> <li>• Discussion of 2017 Park Board objectives and action steps</li> <li>• Election of Chair and Vice-Chair positions</li> </ul>	
<b>Wed</b>	2/1/17	Regular	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of 2018 – 2022 park projects</li> </ul>	
<b>Wed</b>	3/1/17	Regular	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approval of 2018 – 2022 park projects</li> </ul>	
<b>Wed</b>	4/5/16	Regular		
<b>Wed</b>	5/10/16	Tour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual tour of parks and related projects</li> </ul>	
<b>Wed</b>	6/7/16	Regular	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	

**Other meetings and activities to note:**

<b>Day</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Special Notes</b>
<b>Sun</b>	1/22/17	Kid's Fest	Noon – 4:00 p.m., Minnetonka Community Center, Ice Arena and Civic Center grounds

**Items to be scheduled:**

- Meeting with Minnetonka Historical Society regarding Burwell House & Mills Park
- POST Plan update