1. **Roll Call**

   Park Board members in attendance included, Chris Gabler, Cindy Kist, Peggy Kvam, Nate Pasko (7:25), Marvin Puspoki, Madeline Seveland, and Elise Raarup. Staff members in attendance included Dave Johnson, Mike Pavelka and Perry Vetter.

   Chair Raipur called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes**

   Gabler moved and Puspoki seconded a motion to approve the meeting Minutes of April 8, 2015 as submitted. All voted “Yes”. Motion carried.

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

   None

4. **Business Items**

   **A. Glen Lake Activity Center Feasibility Study Update**

   Mike Pavelka, Facilities Manager, provided an introduction noting that the Glen Lake Activity Center (GLAC), located at 14350 Excelsior Boulevard, was constructed as a fire station in 1964. In the early 1990’s, it was determined that the station was no longer needed to provide affective fire coverage to the city. The decision was made in 1995 to convert the facility to an activity center to provide meeting and storage space to Glen Lake area non-profits and civic organizations. The facility consists of one very limited activity space approximately 40’ x 40’ that can be divided in half to provide two smaller rooms. In addition, the facility houses a Minnetonka Police work office, as well as a HCMC ambulance station. Over the years, community user groups, as well as the city, have used the GLAC for various meetings and small events. The facility now reserves requests for about 1,300 hours of use per year.

   Pavelka reported that in 2014, Recreation Services completed a Programming Space Needs Assessment that indicated current shortages in requested programming space totaling 9,064 hours annually (24.8 hours/day), and are projected to increase to 11,916 hours (32.6 hours/day) by 2020. In April, the city contracted with the architectural firm of Hammel, Green and Abrahamson, Inc. (HGA) to complete a feasibility study to determine if, or the extent to which, a new facility could be constructed at the current location of the GLAC. Funding for this study was recommended by the park board and included in the 2015 Capital Improvements Program by the city council. At the May 13th Park Board tour, Glenn Waguespack of HGA met with those in attendance to review some of the possibilities and challenges in place. Staff has met with HGA since the tour to better define options to present to the park board this evening.
Pavelka closed by noting that the GLAC is currently in need of several significant repairs including a roof replacement. These repairs are being delayed until after the Feasibility Study is completed.

Pavelka introduced Glenn Waguespack of HGA to present three options developed which illustrate the amount of programming that the current GLAC site allows for. Waguespack presented the three options developed which included the following summaries:

**Option 1 (small site)**
- Incorporated the existing facility and skate park area to the east
- Includes a 2 court gymnasium, 1 large multipurpose space and 1 multipurpose/meeting room
- Provides 135 parking spaces (108 for the building & 27 existing baseball field stalls)
- Parking is include in a tuck under parking area
- Includes a run/walk track, entry, lobby, roof terrace and support spaces
- Construction and professional costs are estimated at $18,110,000 in today’s dollars and $21,460,000 in 2018.

**Opportunities Include:**
- No site acquisition & playground stays in existing location
- Building over parking reduces overall footprint
- Green space maximized at the corner
- Future expansion possible (to larger site)

**Challenges Include:**
- Future expansion not possible on small site alone
- Cost premium (about $850,000) for raising the building for tuck under parking
- Skate board park would need to be relocated

**Site Option #2 (Large site)**
- Incorporated the existing facility location, skate park area, and private facility to the east to the east
- Includes a 3 court gymnasium, 1 large and 1 medium multipurpose spaces and 1 multipurpose/meeting room
- Provides 175 parking spaces (145 for the building & 30 baseball field stalls)
- Parking is include in a tuck under parking area
- Includes a larger run/walk track, entry, lobby, roof terrace and support spaces
- Construction and professional costs are estimated at $23,030,000 in today’s dollars and $27,280,000 in 2018.
Opportunities Include:
- Building over parking reduces overall footprint
- Snow removal minimized
- Building entry/drop off and parking are protected from the elements and baseballs hit from the field
- Green space maximized at the corner

Challenges Include:
- Limited expansion of the program
- Cost premium for raising the building for tuck under parking
- Skate board park would need to be relocated
- Requires purchase of private property

Site Option 3 (large site)

- Incorporated the existing facility location, skate park area, and private facility to the east to the east
- Includes a 3 court gymnasium, 1 large and 2 medium multipurpose spaces and 1 multipurpose/meeting room
- Provides 182 parking spaces (152 for the building & 30 baseball field stalls) provided on a two level “parking tray”.
- Parking is include in a tuck under parking area and above ground parking ramp
- Includes a larger run/walk track, entry, lobby, roof terrace and support spaces
- Construction and professional costs are estimated at $25,320,000 in today’s dollars and $29,990,000 in 2018.

Opportunities Include:
- Program needs are maximized
- Building is orientated to connect to the park
- Provides adequate green space at the corner of Woodhill & Excelsior
- Parking tray could be utilized for special events

Challenges:
- Adjacent property would need to be acquired
- Playground and skate park would need to be relocated
- Expansion is limited
- Cost premium for structured parking
- Extensive site work/grading and some tree loss at the parking ramp.
Waguespack asked the board for any questions or comments.

Kvam asked about the approximate building height of the gym area. Waguespack estimated it to be 50’ and noted that it would require a variance. Dave Johnson, Recreation Services Director indicated for comparison reasons that The Glen facility was approximately 80’ in height.

Puspoki asked if the facility might include banquet space. Johnson indicated it would not, noting that the facility is not trying to duplicate spaces already accounted for in the city. Puspoki noted that he really liked option 2 which included three gymnasiums, adding that it seemed to be more economical to go from two to three gyms. He also suggested that there be adequate seating in the gym area and that adequate dividers be included. Johnson noted that while this was all good feedback, the Feasibility Study does not go to that degree of detail. He reminded the board that the primary objective of the Study is to determine what sized facility could be reasonably accommodated at the site.

Kvam concurred with Puspoki, noting that three gyms were preferred.

Gabler noted that he liked option #2 for the cover it provides in the parking area in the event of dangerous weather conditions. He also suggested the possibility of a public / private partnership to help fund the project if approved.

Pasko also indicated that he favored option #2 because it included three gym spaces.

Kist also voiced support for a facility the size of Option #2; adding that she felt the private facility needs to be acquired.

Seveland agreed with the rest of the board, noting that she feels three gyms are needed to meet the current and future demand. She noted that a facility such as this is needed to replace the GLAC; and that such a facility would be a significant community asset.

Hearing no further comments, Pavelka and Waguespack thanked the board for their feedback.

**B. Review of contractual requirements for organizational use of city athletic fields**

Pavelka provided the staff report and indicated that the city of Minnetonka provides designated use of assigned athletic fields to four youth sports organizations including the Glen Lake Mighty Mites and Glen lake Girl’s Athletic League at Glen Lake Park, Minnetonka Big Willow Baseball at Big Willow Park, and the Hopkins Baseball Association at Guilliams Park. Pavelka noted that as detailed in the Comprehensive Athletic Field Use Policy, these organizations are granted the primary use of their assigned fields and pay a pre-determined annual amount for maintenance and services
provided by the city. In exchange, each association has field maintenance responsibilities, and is responsible for the management and operation of the program they represent.

Pavelka explained that many of the volunteers involved with these organizations are parents of participants and as a result change on an annual basis. As a result, Pavelka noted that it is not surprising that new volunteers to the organization are not always aware of the requirements in place for their organization to utilize and maintain the fields their organization has been assigned.

To address the conditions expected by the city, Pavelka reported that staff is preparing an agreement that will include all stipulations put in place by the city. Once completed, he explained that each organization will be required to sign off on the agreement prior to the start of their season.

Pavelka reviewed 18 conditions included in a draft outline that fell under the subheadings of insurance, participation, policies, changes in use, and organizational requirements. Following a review of each item, Pavelka asked for park board member questions and comments.

Raarup asked if the intent of the agreement was to formalize conditions and expectations already in place. Pavelka responded that it was.

Referring to one of the conditions that requires each board to follow Roberts Rules of Order for all board meetings, Seveland asked what the purpose for this condition was. Pavelka explained that Roberts Rules of Order allow for a legitimate format that is open for public response and input. Vetter noted that following Roberts Rules should not be a burden to any organization, it is simply a meeting format.

Referring to a condition in the draft that “participants with special needs will be reasonably accommodated” Gabler asked what was meant by that. Pavelka indicated that to the point that a child can participate without physical limitations, all children should be allowed to participate. He noted that those with more severe disabilities can be accommodated and referred to a program such as Reach for Resources (contracted through the city) or other programs such as the Miracle or Challenger Leagues. Gabler suggested that the wording be amended to read “participants with special needs will be reasonably accommodated when possible.”

Kvam questioned the condition that “No participant will be rejected, asking if non-Minnetonka residents could participate. Pavelka responded that in most cases yes, however eligibility is dictated by each organization. He noted that in most cases, registration is open to all, however some follow school district boundaries.
Hearing no further questions or requests for changes, Pavelka indicated that the draft outline will be forwarded to the City Attorney for the development of a draft agreement; then brought back to the park board for a final review.

5. Park Board Member Reports

Kvam reported that she was stopped by a resident recently who was also a city volunteer and thanked Kvam and the park board for organizing last November’s Volunteer Recognition event.

6. Information Items

Johnson distributed the 2014 Recreation Services Department Annual Report and asked that the park board forward any questions to him.

7. Upcoming Park Board Agenda Items

Johnson reminded the board that there would be no July meeting due to the July 4th holiday.

8. Adjournment

Raarup adjourned the meeting at 8:37 p.m.