Minutes of the Minnetonka Park Board
Meeting of March 1, 2017

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 Ann Davy, Darin Ellingson, Dave Johnson, Kelly O'Dea, Perry Vetter and Sara Woeste.

Chair Evenrud called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

Gabler moved and Kvam seconded a motion to approve the meeting Minutes of January 4, 2017 as submitted. Acomb, Evenrud, Gabler, Kist, Kvam and Seveland approved voted “Yes”. Durbin and Walick abstained. Motion carried.

3. Citizens Wishing to Discuss Items Not on the Agenda

None.

4. Business Items

A. Mountain biking project update from Minnetonka High School Vantage Program students

Recreation Services Director, Dave Johnson introduced students from the Minnetonka Vantage program, who presented the board with a project update. The project lead reviewed the Vantage Program along with the attached chart that was put together by staff:
**CITY OF MINNETONKA**

**MOUNTAIN BIKING FEASIBILITY STUDY (DRAFT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBLE CONTACT(S)</th>
<th>TRAIL DESIGN</th>
<th>COST ESTIMATING</th>
<th>PUBLIC INPUT</th>
<th>TRAIL MAINTENANCE / COMMUNITY BENEFIT</th>
<th>NATURAL RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONSULTANT</td>
<td>TRAIL DESIGN</td>
<td>COST ESTIMATING</td>
<td>PUBLIC INPUT</td>
<td>TRAIL MAINTENANCE / COMMUNITY BENEFIT</td>
<td>NATURAL RESOURCES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TASK:**

- **Review work completed to date**
  - Determine cost for construction with inflation factors for years 2018 - 2022
  - Schedule community input meeting
  - Develop recommendations for daily, weekly, monthly and annual maintenance
  - Work with consultant on design of trail route and gain knowledge of trail construction

- **Gain knowledge of city’s NR issues including tree protection and restoration efforts**
  - Hire an arborist to conduct a tree inventory
  - Summarize input received
  - Project staff hours required for annual maintenance
  - Provide restoration components for the survey

- **Work closely with Natural Resources on trail design, provide survey with NR features and NR impacts**
  - Provide a survey with nr features (actual survey vs. Gps points unless sub-foot accurate).
  - Prepare annual budget

- **Understand permitting requirements**
  - Prepare a tree protection and erosion control plan including access and construction limits
  - Develop estimated user numbers
  - Provide analysis of final design work

- **Identify and commit restoration volunteers**
  - Develop cost/benefit formula as compared to other recreational amenities
  - Work with contractor (if trail is constructed)
The vantage students reported progress on their tasks adding some fundraising efforts they had begun to assist with the project. Johnson added the feasibility study could be completed by July 1, 2017. Resident and local trail advocate, Ben Marks noted that the project team has contacted and met with Mountain Biking organizations such as Minnesota Off-Road Cyclists (MORC). The project team noted there are 24 MORC members in the Minnetonka area and are many other groups that are willing to volunteer for trail maintenance. One of the vantage students expressed interest that this project be placed in the Capital Improvement Plan for 2018. Johnson reminded the park board that the April meeting would allow the park board to prioritize projects to recommend for the 2018 - 2022 CIP.

Evenrud asked board members for comments or questions on the presentation. Evenrud asked about signage on the trails. Johnson indicated the project team would not be responsible for the trail sign design, but would work with a consultant on the types and locations of the signs. Johnson will add the signage piece to the above table. Evenrud closed discussion.

Evenrud acknowledged the two new park board members, Christopher Walick and James Durbin, and allowed time for the group to introduce themselves.

**B. Review of the Capital Improvement Program**

Annually, the park board reviews, recommends, the park and trail related items that are included in the Park and Trail Improvement Fund (PTF) portion of the CIP to the city council.

Evenrud introduced Assistant City Manager, Perry Vetter to review the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). Vetter explained the purpose of the CIP as it pertains to the city’s five-year plan to provide and maintain public facilities for the citizens and businesses of Minnetonka, balanced against constraint of available resources. Projects included are ranked to determine their funding priority. Priority rankings include:

1. *Projects necessary for public health and safety, or to meet legal mandates.*
2. *Projects which help maintain or make existing systems more efficient. Cost benefits and coordination with related projects will be considered.*
3. *Projects expanding existing systems, providing new services, or for general community betterment.*

The PTF accounts for just over 4% of the entire 2017 – 2021 CIP (*Figure 1*). While exact percentages change annually, the PTF averages around 5% of capital expenditures with a current high of over 9% of total expenditures in 2019. Undoubtedly, the largest share of CIP expenditures the city has fall within the Water and Sewer System Improvements and Street Improvements categories.
Traditionally, staff has proposed funding for the expansion of trail segments over rehabilitation; and the renewal of parks over the construction of new related amenities. Looking at the previous five years’ worth of projects (2012 – 2016), and the current five years’ worth (2017 – 2021) of projects, the capital investment for new trails (46%) and new park amenities (7%) compared to the rehabilitation of existing infrastructure has been very close to evenly allocated, slightly favoring new construction (53% to 47%) (Figure 2). Investment in trail segments, both new construction and rehabilitation of existing, has been the largest area of focus during this timeframe at 56% of all expenses. Investments in existing park rehabilitation, while less than 25% of investments over this time period is the next largest category of planned CIP projects.

These are allocated amounts out of the PTF and do not include other sources such as the Community Investment Fund, Park Renewal Bonds or external grant/partnership funds. Data compiled from 2012 - 2022 illustrates the allocation of funding in the following categories:

1. New trail construction
2. New park amenity construction
3. Existing trail rehabilitation
4. Existing park rehabilitation
5. Athletic field improvements owned by the city
6. Athletic field improvements not owned by the city
7. Burwell House and park building improvements
8. System Planning Studies
To ensure the long-term viability of the park and trail system, prioritization is crucial to ensure the most essential projects are completed in times of limited funding. And, to allow for expansion of the system to occur when resources and opportunities are made available.

In addition to the three priority rankings established by the city council, staff has established guidelines on prioritizing the scheduled and unscheduled projects included in the PTF in the following order:

1. All park board recommended and city council adopted agreements (city-owned and non-city owned) be funded as agreed upon.
2. Rehabilitation of existing trails in order to maintain a preventative and proactive maintenance system.
3. Park and Trail Investment Plan projects based upon a 30-year asset inventory are completed to prevent deferred, emergency, or corrective repairs. This category would include city athletic fields.
4. Building and structure related projects are completed to protect the investment of each respective facility.
5. Expansion of the trail system by selecting highly rated segments from the Trail Improvement Plan.
6. Planning and system studies that would provide the research and planning materials to benefit the public, staff, park board and city council on matters pertaining to the park, trails, open space and recreational needs of the city.
7. Expansion of the trail system by the construction of miscellaneous trail links not identified through the Trail Improvement Plan, but petitioned to the city.
8. Non city owned athletic field improvements and expansion.
9. Non city owned park and trail amenities petitioned to the park board and city council.

It is staff’s intent that these priorities remain flexible in order to adapt in the event that specific or prospective projects become available. By establishing guidelines, and not a specific policy, there remains the opportunity to take advantage of available grants, external partnerships, or acquisition that otherwise would be limited by a defined policy.
The park board will review and comment on the 2018 - 2022 CIP at the April meeting. There are certain projects whose status is still unknown at this time and require further deliberation and discussion. Those include the mountain biking request and further discussion regarding the 2016 request of Bennett Family Park.

The city council will review in April and tentatively scheduled to adopt in May. Below are some of the key components and historical funding of the proposed CIP.

**Trail Improvement Plan**
One component of the PTF is the backlog of unscheduled and unfunded trail segments. This list encompasses approximately 50 miles of new trail or missing link segments and cost estimates without coinciding with a larger roadway project have exceeded $60 million.

**Park and Trail Investment Plan**
The next major component of the PTF is the park and trail investment plan that looks forward 30 years and projects the lifecycle of existing amenities in the park system. This plan initiated from a previous park board goal to develop a funding mechanism for future capital needs. The plan tracks all infrastructure installed in the park system and projects a future cost and replacement schedule. Those costs are combined and scheduled during the five-year CIP window. It is important to note that some park

---

1 2019 New trail investments total $1,975,000 and unfunded segments estimates total $63,280,000.
renewal projects occurred almost 15 years ago and will be 20 years old at the end of this year’s CIP window.

City Owned Fields
Over the next five years, a variety of improvements are scheduled to city-owned athletic fields. The upgrades include major turf playing surface maintenance and expansion in the number of lighted fields to extend play and safety improvements. These improvements are consistent with the needs of the Athletic Field Needs Study presented to the board in 2012.

Non-city Owned Fields
At the February 3, 2016 park board meeting, Alan Lanners, President of the Bennett Family Park organization presented an informational overview about their organization. A capital funding request was later received which was included as a project, with the request listed as unfunded. The park board visited the park as part of their annual tour last May. In the mid-1990’s, the City and Bennett Family Park established a capital improvement agreement. That five-year agreement totaled approximately $200,000 of infrastructure improvements for fields. As part of that agreement, Recreation Services was given free field use for programming needs outside of the baseball season.
New Projects
At the December 7, 2016 park board meeting, Minnetonka High School students from the Vantage Program presented a concept for the inclusion of designated mountain bike trails to the city’s park and trail system. The board reacted favorably to the concept request and they asked for a CIP page to be allocated to the project for inclusion in the 2018 – 2022 CIP reviewal. To date, that is the only outstanding project request received that does not have at minimum a project page in the 2017 – 2021 CIP and will be updated and brought forward for review.

Evenrud asked for feedback from the board. Kvam questioned if the city was restoring the natural resources on the Cullen-Smith property. Vetter explained that the restoration of that property is funded through operational dollars. Vetter also explained some of the restrictions associated with the Cullen-Smith property. Evenrud suggested that the Cullen-Smith property as a potential stop during the May tour.

Kvam questioned page 5-5 of the CIP. Vetter noted prior funds allocated for investment along the Minnehaha Creek Corridor do not expire and are available when a specific project has been identified. Kvam also questioned the number of practice courts for pickleball on page 5-7 of the CIP. This should read 8 practice courts.

Seveland was happy that 46% of the investment allocation for the Park and Trail Improvement Fund was for new trail construction. Seveland questioned whether school routes or safety played a role in prioritizing new trail construction. Vetter referred to page 5-8 of the CIP showing that 40% is made up of community access. Vetter noted the city has a trails team which has members from all city departments.
Seveland asked for safety information regarding the inflatables for Shady Oak Beach, as seen on page 4-3 of the CIP. Staff noted they would follow up on the safety concerns at the April 5 meeting.

Seveland inquired if the city had specific sites for Park and Open Space Purchase page of the CIP. Vetter explained that the city looks to work with willing sellers. He also noted that even though unfunded, listing the project in the CIP allows specific restrictions of the Community Investment Fund to be met.

Seveland expressed her opinion that $2 million dollars is not enough for the Glen Lake Activity Center facility. She thought more funding was necessary to make the facility look more than a remodeled Fire Station.

Acomb questioned the inflatables on Shady Oak Beach Improvements page. Johnson reminded the park board that the city is unable to rent inflatables, therefore the larger budget number was placed to purchase equipment.

Evenrud commented that he is not an expert and appreciated learning more about the CIP and CIF budgets. He expressed the limited number of north/south trails and thought there might be benefits to partnerships. Vetter informed the board that city staff member, Phil Olson will be at the April meeting to answer questions regarding trails.

C. Review of the City’s Park Regulations

Evenrud introduced Darin Ellingson who provided the park board with a handout titled ‘Description of changes’. Ellingson reviewed the report with the park board highlighting the changes made.

Park board member Seveland inquired if verbiage could be added to clearly state that animals are not allowed on athletic fields. Gabler wanted to verify that owners are responsible to pick up their animal’s feces, which Johnson confirmed was in the document. Kvam questioned whether the term dogs should be used instead of animals on 1135.020,1d. Ellingson mentioned a staff discussion about the use of dogs and preferred it to stay that way. Kvam suggested the addition of the word “motorized” in front of trail bike in 1135.020, 9. Seveland asked if the city has designated signs for sledding. Johnson stated that the city does not sign for specific activities like sledding, tobogganning, or snowboarding hence the change to the regulation. The change would allow those activities in areas where signs are posted. Evenrud asked if 1135.020, 18 (tobacco products) was enforceable. Staff will follow up at the April meeting. Walick asked for the reason why cans are not allowed at the beach. Johnson replied the injury risk with broken cans.

Ellingson concluded the discussion by reviewing the next steps. The Park Regulations will be presented on March 27, 2017 at the city council meeting, and returned to the park board at their April 5, 2017 meeting. The city council will then adopt the regulations.
at the April 24, 2017 meeting. Johnson encouraged one member of the park board to be present at the city council meetings.

5. Park Board Member Reports

Kvam reported signs of spring at Kinsel Park.

Seveland inquired if the Williston Fitness Center could have more recycling bins added.

Noting that it was his last meeting, Evenrud took the opportunity to thank Johnson for his service to the park board. He noted the high level of service to which the department operated and how welcoming Johnson is. Speaking for the entire staff, Vetter echoed that appreciation and thanked Johnson for his leadership. Johnson thanked everyone for the kind words.

6. Information Items

Johnson reviewed the Recreation Services 2017 Summer Brochure. The Recreation Services summer brochure was posted online by February 14, and delivered February 22nd to Hopkins and Minnetonka residents, local libraries, and community education offices. Registration for Hopkins & Minnetonka residents begins at 8 a.m. on Tuesday, March 7. Registration for the second session of swim lessons begins on June 27.

This edition is the largest publication ever and the only one mailed to residents. It includes 72 pages of programming and a variety of community events and family activities including, the Minnetonka Summer Festival, Shady Oak Beach, Music in the Park, Theater in the Park, the Hopkin Raspberry Festival and the Minnetonka Farmers’ Market. The summer brochure features registration for Williston Fitness Center health and fitness and tennis programs, triathlon events, playground programs, day camps, golf, ice-skating lessons, youth and new teen programs, aquatics program, Minnetonka senior services, adult activities and leagues, facility reservations, Inclusion Services, and the beginning of registration for youth fall soccer.

Johnson reviewed the 2016 Annual Report for the Park and Recreation Board. He referred to six significant highlights of the past year:

- Conducted a neighborhood meeting in January to review a resident request for a park in the Robinwood neighborhood. 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.

• Conducted a neighborhood meeting related to the proposed lighting of the Civic Center Park athletic field.

• Conducted a recognition event for volunteers assisting in the areas of parks, programming and natural resources

• Received a request from residents interested in mountain biking and the addition of new trails in the city’s park system.

Johnson asked that any changes go through Kelly O'Dea or Perry Vetter.

Johnson introduced Sara Woeste, Program & Special Events Manager to give an update on the Shady Oak Beach Sign. Woeste thanked Kist and Kvam for participation on the sub-committee. She reported that the 2017 CIP includes funding for the addition of a dynamic monument sign at the entrance to Shady Oak Beach. This sign’s purpose is to welcome park guests and provide important information related to the beach such as, hours, weather related closings, beach sales, etc. Staff met with three members of the Minnetonka and Hopkins park boards to review the concept for the proposed sign. This sub-committee directed staff to move forward with the concept presented. The next step in the process includes taking the concept to the city’s Planning Commission for approval of the needed variances.

Johnson introduced Ann Davy, Program Division Manager who reviewed the Park Board Project Page. Davy stated that at the November 2016 joint meeting of the Park Board and City Council, a request was made by the Council to develop project pages to better inform residents and Council of park board projects and initiatives.

Park board staff have worked closely with the city’s IT staff to develop a project page template. The first page developed features plans for the addition of pickleball courts at Lone Lake Park. The link can be found at:


7. Upcoming Park Board Agenda Items

In addition to the calendar included in the meeting packet, no additional items were discussed.

8. Adjournment
Evenrud adjourned the meeting at 8:13 p.m.