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
   - Nelson Evenrud
   - Cynthia Kist
   - Peggy Kvam
   - Chris Gabler
   - Nate Pasko
   - Marvin Puspoki
   - Elise Raarup
   - Madeline Seveland

2. Approval of Minutes
   A) March 4, 2015

3. Citizens wishing to discuss items not on the Agenda

4. Business Items
   A) Review of 2014/2015 Outdoor Ice Rink Operations
   B) Consideration of the 2016 – 2020 Capital Improvement Projects related to Parks, Trails and Open Space

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, Nelson Evenrud, Chris Gabler, Cindy Kist, Peggy Kvam, Nate Pasko, and Elise Raarup. Staff members in attendance included Ann Davy, Jo Colleran, Darin Ellingson, Dave Johnson, Becca Sytsma and Perry Vetter.

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

2. **Approval of Minutes**

Evenrud moved and Kvam seconded a motion to approve the meeting Minutes of February 4, 2015 as submitted. All voted “Yes”. Motion carried.

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

Jim Calkins, Minnetonka resident and former park board member, presented to the board as the President of the Minnesota Shade Tree Advisory Committee (MnSTAC). Calkins distributed both the 2014 and 2015 MnSTAC annual reports.

Calkins commended the city of Minnetonka for the excellent job with respect to tree protection and he went on to explain that there is always room for improvement and requested of the park board to be cognizant of the impact on trees for any future projects in which they provide input. As an example, Calkins noted that tree diversity is very important to prevent massive losses from disease and other environmental factors. He added that it is recommended that no more than 10% of a city’s tree inventory be of any one species; and noted that Minnetonka’s policy is no more than 25%.

Calkins related statistics from the US Forest Service that indicate that tree loss is occurring at a growing rate. He mentioned the city of Minneapolis has an aggressive tree planting program yet they still estimate a net loss of 15,000 trees annually.

Calkins noted that statistics show that several areas improve when the urban forest health is good, including storm water management, air quality, a person’s general health, decreased crime rates, and increased property values. He noted that the protection of mature trees is of most importance.

Calkins closed by noting that he is active in promoting legislation this session that would benefit the Minnesota Community Forest Partnership Act; which if successful, would provide grant funding to cities for tree preservation. Calkins thanked the board for their time and dedication to the city.
4. Business Items

A. Neighborhood meeting – request for a new park in the Meadow Ridge Neighborhood.

Dave Johnson, Recreation Services Director, addressed this item and indicated that city staff were approached by a resident last fall who was interested in developing a small neighborhood park on city owned property located at the end of the cul-de-sac on Meadow Ridge. Johnson indicted that he suggested to the resident that a petition be circulated that would indicate the level of support the general neighborhood park had for adding a new park.

Johnson went on to explain that the petition was submitted to the city at the February 4, 2015 park board meeting; and at that time the board directed staff to schedule a neighborhood meeting on March 4, 2015 to collect input from any residents who had an interest in the proposal. Johnson explained that approximately 115 notices were mailed, and added that he had two notices returned as undeliverable.

Darin Ellingson, Parks and Streets Superintendent, provided additional background including a map that displayed the 23 Neighborhood Park Service Areas (NPSA) in the city. He explained that the 23 areas are divided by physical barriers (typically roads) that make traveling from one area to another difficult for primarily safety reasons. Ellingson provided an additional map that displayed coverage areas of each Mini Park (1/4 mile radius), Neighborhood Park (1/2 mile radius) and Community Park (3 mile radius). He showed how, based on this information, NPSA 14 was deficient of adequate park coverage.

Ellingson indicated the size of the proposed property for the new park was 1.73 acres in size. He provided a matrix of the seven existing mini parks in the city that included overall acreage and the amenities each one included. Primary features included benches, picnic tables, garbage cans and small play equipment structures. Ellingson provided a map that indicated two potential sites for a park to be located, indicated as Area A (on the property’s northwest side) and area B (on the property’s southeast side adjacent to the regional trail). The map also indicated where a designated wetland was approximately located.

Perry Vetter, Assistant City Manager, informed the board that the park board will be reviewing projects to be included in the 2016 – 2020 CIP at the April 8, 2015 meeting. He indicated that staff is looking for direction on whether or not to include a page for the request being considered during the upcoming neighborhood meeting this evening. Vetter noted that any recommendations of the park board will be forwarded to the city council for consideration. Vetter added that, if recommended by the park board, this project would most likely be included in the year 2017 or later.
due to available funding. Lastly, Vetter indicated that if or when the project is considered, the master planning process would take place at that time.

Vetter asked for any questions from the park board.

Kvam indicated that she felt that the NPSA and park coverage maps presented by Ellingson were somewhat misleading because they did not show school facilities and Bennett Family Park as providing park-like amenities. Vetter noted that school facilities were not under the control of the city and had conflicting uses that at times may restrict use by the general public. He also pointed out that the NPSA map separated areas by major barriers such as roadways, noting that area schools and Bennett Family Park also had barrier restrictions.

Evenrud noted that a portion of the lot under consideration for the addition of a park was designated as a wetland. He asked what the park board and interested residents needed to know about any challenges this wetland might present. Ellingson noted that essentially the city can’t do anything to an area designated as a wetland, and added that depending on the quality of the wetland, a buffering distance would also be required. Vetter noted that the existing trail connection from the property to the Regional Trail was in place prior to existing wetland regulations being put in place.

Gabler asked about the amount of grading that staff estimated would be needed on the two designated locations. Ellingson responded that the amount of grading was unknown at this time, however he felt that the extent of grading on Area B would be less than what would be required on Area A.

Raarup asked if staff had any other examples of parks off of a cul-de-sac. Vetter responded that not off of a cul-de-sac; however there are several parks that are in areas of the city that are difficult to find. Vetter explained the process for developers to pay either a park dedication fee, or in lieu of a fee, opt to donate land. He noted that several years ago most developers opted for the land donation and the quality of the land made available was not the best. Raarup asked if the site was accessible for maintenance vehicles. Ellingson indicated that access by smaller vehicles would not be an issue.

Hearing no further questions, Chair Raarup opened the floor for resident comments. She asked that each speaker provide their name and address for the record.

Jim Alsdurf, 4024 County Road 101, questioned why the public was not invited to the initial meeting on February 4, 2014 when the initial request was submitted. Johnson responded that the park board officially received the petition and asked staff to schedule a neighborhood meeting to invite resident feedback after hearing the extent of the request.
Phylis Alsdurf, 4024 County Road 101, noted that she loves Minnetonka and does what she can to take care of it. She appreciates the natural qualities and habitat that the property in question provides the neighborhood and is strongly opposed to any development of a park on this property. She questioned the map previously provided and indicated that she felt park coverage was more available than the maps presented indicated. She asked that the park board not consider the same old – same old as far as parks in the city provide.

Gothriel La Fleur, 17720 Meadow Ridge, noted that he was there with his wife Deb Renshaw and had previously sent a letter to staff outlining their concerns. Mr. La Fleur indicated that he and his wife were not anti-kids. He expressed concern that they were not contacted about this request prior to the neighborhood meeting. He noted that the lot was constructed on a dumpsite from when the neighborhood was developed and cautioned that materials dumped could cause problems. He also expressed concerns related to grading, utility access and low power lines currently near the lot. La Fleur closed by noting that the cul-de-sac currently attracts several cars that park there for access to the trail.

Jay Diebold, 17605 Susan Drive, commented that he and his wife live in a great neighborhood and that some of the new families to the neighborhood have brought the park concerns to the attention of the city; adding that two of the supporters are moving out of the neighborhood and will not experience any benefit if the park were to be developed. He stated concerns related to the impact on trees and wildlife; and indicated that he feels there is currently reasonable access to parks in the area. He questioned what the cost would be to the city and taxpayers.

Margo Pfleidener, 17719 Meadow Ridge, commented that it was good to hear that her neighbors appreciate the trees and voiced concerns about the bird habitat that would be lost along with visual screening. She noted drainage concerns that would impact her adjacent property. She commented that the use of play equipment is limited because children grow out of it; and suggested that those who want it buy it and place it in their yard. She hoped that the DNR would be consulted if the project moves forward. She also expressed concern that the park map presented by staff was not inclusive of schools. She closed by voicing concerns about dogs in the neighborhood and the impact a park and visitors would have on them.

Dan Deitering, 4209 Powderhorn Circle, stated that he does not care where a park goes, but felt that one was needed to serve the neighborhood.

Julie Knapp, 17817 Susan Lane, stated that she does not care where a park goes, but felt that one was needed to serve the neighborhood. She added that currently it is very difficult and time consuming to get to the nearest park.

John Wolff, 3867 Susan Lane, commented that it is a long ways to go to any of the nearest parks for children, adding that by bike it can take an hour round trip and
usually requires a car. He noted that while Bennett Family Park is relatively close, it is a private park and is athletic field orientated. He indicated that he respects the neighborhood impact and suggested that there might be an opportunity to develop a non-traditional natural park. He added that if something is built, users should be encouraged to bike and walk to the park. He said that a park is needed to bring children together.

Heather McCollor, 17735 Meadow Ridge, noted she came late and did not see any plans, however parks can be made without major disruption. She felt that those in support are not looking for a large park, but something smaller with minimal disruption. She noted that her kids are now at the age where they use the trail more than a park. She closed by noting that Minnetonka Middle School East might be close but does not provide any play equipment.

Michelle Mueller, 3975 Hunters Hill Way, noted that the neighborhood has several new families and there is not a park to serve them without having to pack up and drive. She noted that there is a need for a park, but maybe not at this location. She stated that a park is needed to provide a neighborhood “feel”.

Raarup, responding to an earlier resident comment, asked staff if parking in the cul-de-sac was regulated in any way. Ellingson responded that unless otherwise posted, parking is allowed with the exception of between the hours of 2 a.m. and 6 a.m.

Kvam asked John Wolf to provide more information on his suggestion of a natural park. He noted that play equipment could be non-traditional and built into the landscape. The goal would be to preserve trees and the landscape.

Vetter responded to several questions that had been brought up. Regarding how the park would be funded, Vetter indicated that no assessment would be made, and that any improvements would be funded through the general tax levy. Regarding what is being proposed, Vetter indicated that “nothing” was being proposed, the first step in the process is to gain neighborhood input. Lastly, Vetter responded to an earlier request to define what a mini-park was and referred to information presented in Ellingson’s presentation.

Deborah Renshaw, 17720 Meadow Ridge, asked for figures on what the park may cost, noting that the park board directed staff to develop cost estimates at the February meeting. Johnson clarified that the direction provided was for staff to develop amenity costs based on previous installations of equipment in other parks. Ellingson noted that a ½ basketball court was in the range of $15,000 - $20,000, play structures between $15,000 and $50,000 and a swing set $2,000 - $3,000.

Phylis Alsdurf, 4024 County Road 101, asked why previous decisions were made without neighborhood input. Johnson noted that no previous decisions were made other than for the park board to hear the initial request, receive the petition, and schedule this neighborhood meeting to obtain neighborhood input.
Julie Knapp, 17817 Susan Lane, suggested keeping anything developed simple.

Margo Pfleidener, 17719 Meadow Ridge, asked if there was a cost in defining the wetland delineation. Ellingson indicated that there would be, however it is relatively small.

John Wolff, 3867 Susan Lane, asked what process developers have to go through to provide park land for new developments. He cited the development nearby that was constructed on the former Meadow woods Golf Course. Vetter explained the park dedication process that requires developers to provide either property or funding to compensate for park needs. Vetter noted that for several years developers chose providing land and often times it was land that was less desirable.

Margo Pfleidener, 17719 Meadow Ridge, questioned if newer residents to the neighborhood really knew where area parks were.

Heather McCollor, 17735 Meadow Ridge, stated that she was a long-time resident and was aware of where the parks are located.

Johnson asked Becca Sytsma, Recreation Services intern, to report on any comments received by residents not in attendance. Sytsma reported that only one resident who sent a response was not in attendance this evening and that was Shirley Bartee, 3968 Hunters Hill Way, who indicated the she supported the park request but would be unable to attend the meeting.

Hearing no further requests for input, Raarup closed the neighborhood meeting.

Kist asked staff to remind her what the actual petition requested. Johnson read the actual petition which read “We, citizens of Minnetonka, petition the city to build a public park at the end of the cul-de-sac of Meadow Ridge. We feel that this park would be an added value to our neighborhood by encouraging play and exercise for children of all ages, as well as foster a greater sense of community for the area”. Kist noted that she did not see or support a typical park being constructed at the site.

Kvam noted that she visited the site and also other Mini-Parks in the community and saw several contrasts to other park properties. Most notably, she indicated that Elmwood and Mini-Tonka were constructed on flat parcel where the property is question is slopped and would require significant grading. She added that she did not want to see extensive grading or tree loss on the site. Kvam indicated that she would not support a traditional park on this location.

Gabler indicated that 101 and the ability to safely cross it was a concern to him, adding that he feels there is a significant need for a park in this area but was not convinced that the property in question was the best location. He added that he was supportive of the neighbors who live in the area.
Raarup asked staff if it was safe to assume that there are no other possible locations for a park in the area. Vetter responded by saying that if there are any possibilities, they most likely would have the same challenges mentioned this evening.

Evenrude questioned the construction materials on site and concerns about water quality. He asked staff if it was possible that a new park might actually improve the water quality after the site had been cleaned up. Jo Colleran, Natural Resources Division Manager, could not say that water quality could be improved.

Kvam mentioned that there is currently a basketball hoop placed in the cul-de-sac so there seemed to be no need for a half-court basketball court. Staff noted that the hoop Kvam mentioned is on public right of way which could be a concern, and is also not in the best of condition.

Raarup indicated that the park board’s challenge is to balance the needs of those who are longtime residents of the neighborhood, and those who are new to the area. Johnson indicated that the park board essentially had three options for coming to a resolution:

1. Reject the request
2. Approve the request or
3. Delay the decision and ask staff for more information prior to making a decision.

Gabler moved and Kvam seconded a motion stating that the park board does not support the proposed site for the addition of a neighborhood park and directs staff to explore other possible options to provide a park to service the Neighborhood Park Service Area 14 neighborhood and report back to the board. Gabler, Kist and Kvam voted “Yes”, Raarup, Evenrud and Pasko voted “No”. Motion failed.

Evenrude and Raarup indicated that they could not support the motion because it took this property off of the table for future consideration.

Kvam moved and Kist seconded a motion stating that the park board does not support the proposed site for the addition of a neighborhood park at this time and directs staff to explore additional possible options to provide a park to service the Neighborhood Park Service Area 14 neighborhood and report back to the board. All voted “Yes”. Motion carried.

Pasko commented that he feels keeping this property as an option was something he could support.

The park board adjourned for a 10 minute break.
B. Natural Resources Division’s Annual Report and Education and Outreach Plan

Jo Colleran, Natural Resources Division Manager, presented the park board with the division’s 2014 accomplishments in the areas of Water Resource Protection, Development Review, Development Inspection and Compliance, Forestry Activities, Habitat Restoration Activities, and Educational Activities.

Highlights included:

**Water Resource Protection**

- Natural resources and engineering staff collaborated to write the city’s 2014 Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit and identified and tracked the information required to complete the 2014 annual report.
- Wetland related technical assistance was provided on 191 occasions to landowners and developers.
- Staff processed 18 Wetland Conservation Act applications and took enforcement on one violation relating to wetland fill.
- Volunteers monitored and assessed the health of five wetlands in the city as part of the Wetland Health Evaluation Program (WHEP). Volunteers have collected data from 27 wetlands in Minnetonka since 2002 and educate the public about the importance of wetlands.
- Fourth and fifth graders in the six elementary schools were educated on storm water impacts and water resource protection.
- Fifteen acres of conservation easements were acquired for the protection of wetlands, wetland buffers, and trees. A long-term stewardship plan was also adopted for Tonka on the Creek as well as an “Urban Ecology” plan for the Legacy Oaks development.
- Staff drafted “housekeeping” updates to clarify the wetland and tree ordinances. Additionally, updates were drafted for the grading ordinance and ordinance regulating discharges to the city’s storm sewer system in order to comply with Minnesota Pollution Control Agency’s MS4 permitting requirements.

**Development Inspection and Compliance**

- Staff reviewed 310 building and grading permits in 2014 including two subdivisions with new infrastructure and released escrow deposits on 59 sites.
- Staff, in conjunction with the engineering department, inspected storm water best management practices (BMPs) that were required to be installed at 24 new home sites. The sites used combinations of different practices including...
15 infiltration basins, 7 sites with compost amendments, 3 wetland buffers, and 1 underground infiltration system.

- Staff inspected 5 sites for reported illicit discharges and sent 10 letters to property owners regarding wetland dumping.

Forestry Activities

- The city’s annual tree sale distributed 1,177 trees to 617 households. Fifteen different tree species were sold to residents at close to wholesale cost. The sale is designed to aid in reforestation and increase tree diversity in advance of emerald ash borer’s arrival.
- In November staff presented a forest health update to the park board in order to brief them on the city’s emerald ash borer management plan and the ongoing initiatives to manage Dutch elm disease, oak wilt and to promote tree species diversity.
- The Tree City USA designation was again received in 2015 for the city’s commitment to trees in 2014. The National Arbor Day Foundation first designated the city of Minnetonka as a Tree City USA in 1994. In order to be eligible for the designation, a city must annually meet four minimum standards which include: having a forestry department or tree volunteer board, having at least one community tree ordinance, having a community forestry program with an annual budget of at least $2.00 per capita, and pronouncing an Arbor Day Proclamation. In 2014, the city spent approximately $19.00 per capita on all forestry-related activities including habitat restoration.
- A private property tree inventory was conducted in partnership with Tree Trust. Community volunteers and seasonal tree inspector staff were trained on specific protocols and inventoried approximately 2,300 trees in several neighborhoods in order to gather a statistically valid sample. There were 182.5 volunteer hours matched with 89 staff hours, for a value of $8,600, not including staff time. The project will advance the city’s emerald ash borer preparedness.
- Approximately 253 of the 491 city outlots have been inspected as part of the ash reduction program. Currently there are approximately 266 ash trees on city outlots that will need to be removed. Right-of-way ash trees are removed on a case-by-case basis when found to be an imminent safety risk to the road, or in poor condition and the homeowner agrees to the removal.
- The number of tree inspection requests and sites where tree work occurs throughout the year are tracked using Cityworks, a GIS based program.
- A 200 year old bur oak adjacent to the amphitheater on the Civic Center Campus succumbed to wind damage in 2014. Instead of immediately removing this significant park amenity staff evaluated its risk and consulted
with the state’s leading expert. As a result mitigation strategies have been implemented in order to save this tree.

- Staff continued to mentor Green Corps member Monica Sweeney and ensure her project objectives were met and brought to completion by the end of her service in August 2014.

Habitat Restoration Activities

- Over 310 acres of public land in parks and natural areas continued to be under restoration with the goal of bringing back diverse, healthy ecosystems and habitats. Staff utilizes contractors, ICW crews and volunteers to accomplish this work.
- Management areas in 16 parks were documented in the city’s GIS map system. Over one hundred management areas were identified for; the type of restoration (active, partial or intermittent), special protection and biological control locations. A subset of these areas were selected and letter-graded for the control of buckthorn, garlic mustard and problem weeds which totaled 271 grades.
- Coordination of volunteers continues to be one of the top restoration activities from April to October. Special attention was given to groups that expressed interest in helping once per year or multiple times per year. In 2014 Master Naturalists were trained to “adopt” a portion of Minnetonka Mills Park and work independently on restoration activities in this area. Whole Foods employees volunteered twice for a second year in 2014 and expressed interest to adopt a portion of the park as well.
- Staff, contractors and volunteers planted 148 wildflowers and grasses (32 species) at Headwaters Park. Tree removal and multiple weed control visits were required for site preparation.

Education Activities

- Natural Resource staff held the fifth Minnetonka Native Plant Market & Eco Fun Fest which hosted 5 native plant vendors. Approximately 500 people attended. Activities at the event included the Zoomobile, a children’s tree climbing area, reptiles and amphibians, a “Creepy Crawlies” display, a puppet show and exhibitors providing natural resource based information.
- The city partnered with the Blue Thumb organization for the seventh year to help promote a consistent message about native plants, rain gardens, and shoreline stabilization.
The Arbor Day celebrations included the Tree Sale Pick Up on Arbor Day, and a tree planting held at Spring Hill Park on May 22nd. Ten trees were planted by 23 fourth grade students from Gatewood Elementary School.

Staff continued the educational component of the EAB Management Plan by offering an interactive EAB Field Day at Gro Tonka Park in August. Approximately 20 residents visited four stations in order to learn how to identify ash trees, treatment options, replanting options, and how to properly plant and care for new trees.

An EAB booth with a retractable banner was presented at the city’s open house, and the Native Plant Market and Eco Fun Fest. For the second year, a staff member donned an EAB costume for the city’s open house in order to increase awareness.

Staff collaborated with the city of Chanhassen and three professional green businesses to create a new state-wide buckthorn workshop for cities and residents which was held on February 19, 2014 at the Chanhassen Recreation Center. Seventy people attended the seminar, representing 25 cities and 3 counties.

Staff was invited by Cargill to host a habitat restoration display at their “Earth Day Showcase” for employees on April 10, 2014. The showcase was held at their Minnetonka campus in the morning and their Hopkins campus in the afternoon.

In closing, Colleran reviewed the calendar of information to be included in the 2015 editions of the Minnetonka Memo. In addition, she reviewed 21 featured topics included in the Eco Series of Walks and Talks scheduled from January 21 to October 8, 2015. Lastly, Colleran reviewed the 2015 Billboard schedule of notices to be included during each month of the year.

Raarup asked for more information on the outreach education program to the 4th and 5th graders that she has seen in her children’s school. Colleran noted that for the water quality education, she has hired a consultant for student presentations. She indicated that the division’s goal is try to develop a pet waste education presentation this year.

Raarup thanked Colleran for the information included in her annual report.

C. Review of 2015 Park Board Action Steps

Johnson reminded the board of the February 4, 2015 meeting, when the park board reviewed their 2015 strategic plan including the mission, vision, goals and
objectives. Based on the plan adopted by the park board, Johnson noted that staff has developed a draft plan of action steps to be accomplished in 2015 and explained that these action steps will serve as the working document to guide and schedule park board discussions throughout the year.

Johnson reviewed the Action Steps document by goal. One substantive addition was made to goal # 3 (To provide quality athletic and recreational facilities and programs) with the addition of an action step to “consider the addition of splash pad features in designated Community Parks”.

5. Park Board Member Reports

None.

6. Information Items

Colleran noted that the first pet waste campaign event will take place on March 14.

Ellingson reported that the 2014 outdoor skating rink season was extended a week before closing with the recent snow fall.

7. Upcoming Park Board Agenda Items

Johnson reviewed the park board’s 6-month schedule noting that the April 1, 2015 meeting has been changed to April 8, 2015, as requested by the board.

8. Adjournment

Raarup adjourned the meeting at 9:58 p.m.
Minnetonka Park Board Item 4A
Meeting of April 8, 2015

Subject: Review of 2014/2015 Outdoor Ice Rink Operations

Park Board related goal: To provide quality athletic and recreational facility and programs

Park Board related objective: Annually review policies related to the operation and management of parks to determine if changes are required

Brief Description: Staff will report on the results of outdoor ice rink hockey rink scheduling; and present a proposal for changes to the outdoor ice rinks warming houses for the future.

Background

The city of Minnetonka provides maintained ice rinks and warming houses at eight park locations, including but not limited to, Boulder Creek, Covington, Gro Tonka, McKenzie, Meadow, and Spring Hill; as well as the use of two Hopkins School District locations at Gatewood and Glen Lake Elementary Schools. The city also has one unstaffed location at Knollway Park. Outdoor ice rinks with warming house attendants are scheduled to operate for a 10-week period from mid-December to mid-February, contingent upon weather conditions.

Ice Rink Attendance

Listed below are the attendance reports for all Minnetonka warming house locations during the 2013 - 2015 season. Historically, Gatewood and Covington Park typically have had the lowest attendance. The 2014/15 season opened on Saturday, January 3, two weeks later than the anticipated December 20, 2014 date. Favorable weather and good ice conditions on most of the rinks allowed staff to extend the season to Sunday, February 22 (one week).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>2015 (50 days)</th>
<th>2014 (48 days)</th>
<th>2013 (55 days)</th>
<th>Daily Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meadow</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>1043</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gro Tonka</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>1254</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Lake (School District Site)</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKenzie</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Hill</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder Creek</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatewood (School District Site)</td>
<td>121*</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Gatewood was only open for 24 days in 2015 as a result of the ice on the rinks deteriorating faster with a dirt subsurface and Public Works was not able to keep it maintained with the weather conditions.
Hours of Operation

Attached are the Minnetonka warming house hours of operation. Staff has received comments from the public regarding extending hours on Friday and Saturday evenings to remain open until 10 p.m. Staff is recommending extending the closing time at all locations on Friday nights to 10 p.m., and extending Saturday hours to 10 p.m. only at Glen Lake School, and Meadow, Glen Lake, Gro-Tonka and McKenzie parks.

Operational Challenges

The warming house season is always contingent upon weather and ice conditions. Duties and responsibilities include installing and maintaining ice conditions, snow removal, and the temporary closing of rinks due to challenging weather conditions.

Unique to the Gatewood warming house are several challenges that include:

- The need to rent a trailer to be used as a warming house
- The lack of ADA compliance with stairs that lead into the trailer
- Utilities to the trailer are not user-friendly for seasonal staff or public works.
- Hockey rink lights that require power any time the trailer is in operation.

Due to historically low attendance, staff recommends that the park board consider excluding the Gatewood warming house for a two-year trial period while continuing to maintain ice at this location. If the park board agrees, staff recommends that a neighborhood meeting be scheduled to receive resident input prior to deciding on any recommendations to the city council. A final decision on the 2016 operating budget is required by October 1, 2015.

Discussion Points

- Does the park board agree with staff’s recommendation to extend operating hours on Friday and Saturday evenings as noted under Hours of Operation?
- Does the park board agree with staff’s recommendation to consider excluding the Gatewood warming house for a two-year trial period?
- Does the park board have any additional desired changes to outdoor ice rink operations?

Recommended Park Board Action: Review the 2015 operational report and provide direction or recommendations for the 2015/2016 season.

Attachments

1. 2014/15 Minnetonka Rink Hours
### 2014/2015 Minnetonka Rink Hours

* Hours for Boulder Creek, Covington, Gatewood and Spring Hill  
** Hours for Glen Lake, Gro Tonka, McKenzie and Meadow

#### December

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Closed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Closed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Closed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Closed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Closed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 5 p.m.</td>
<td>12 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>12 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>12 – 5 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>Closed</strong></td>
<td>12 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>12 – 9 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>12 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>12 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>12 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>12 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>12 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>Closed</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### January

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Closed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Closed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Closed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Closed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Closed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Closed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Closed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Closed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Closed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 5 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>Closed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 5 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 5 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>Closed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 5 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### February

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>Closed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 5 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 – 9 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 5 p.m.</td>
<td>12 – 9 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Background

Annually, the park board is asked to review and recommend the park and trail related items that are included in the Park and Trail Improvement Fund (PTF) portion of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) to the city council. The CIP is 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.*

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, current 2015 projects and the upcoming five year proposed projects, the capital investment for new trails (35%) and new park amenities (9%) compared to the rehabilitation of existing infrastructure has been very close to evenly allocated, slightly favoring new construction. Investment in trail segments, both new construction and rehabilitation of existing has been the largest area of focus during this timeframe at 68% of all expenses. 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 2010 to 2020 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

### Subject:

| Consideration of the 2016 – 2020 Capital Improvement Projects related to Parks, Trails and Open Space |
| Park Board related goal: | Enhance long-term Park Board development |
| Park Board related objective: | Define CIP Projects for 2016-2020 |
| Brief Description: | Review and discuss the proposed 2016-2020 Park and Trail Improvement Fund Projects |
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 must be done to ensure that the most essential projects are completed in times of limited funding, yet allowing the opportunity for expansion of the system to occur when resources and opportunity are 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 2016-2020 CIP is being proposed for review by the park board and upon park board approval, the recommendations will be included in the draft CIP that the city council will review tentatively in May and ultimately adopt approximately June. Below are some of the key components of the proposed CIP.

New Construction

Trail Improvement Plan
One of the major components 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 have exceeded $10 million.

### Guidelines for Trail Link Prioritization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Difficulty, 10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effectiveness, 20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Use, 30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Access, 40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to prioritize these segments guidelines were developed and weighted ratings were established. A ranking of 0 to 10 was given to each segment. This rating was originally based on certain segments being built during a street improvement project or road reconstruction. Timing of that trail project would then be dictated by the road construction schedules of the city, county or state. While this coordinated approach is
obviously the most cost-effective, some high priority trails have been unnecessarily delayed. For example, the cost of constructing an Essex Road trail segment in advance of road reconstruction could increase costs by a million dollars, but other high priority trail segments might be advanced at more reasonable costs. Other factors influencing timing was if an area was under planned or future redevelopment. These mitigating circumstances often artificially caused certain segments to have lower scores, despite higher public demand.

Based on the discussion during the 2012 joint park board and city council meeting, staff has revised the feasibility guidelines to include more focus on the vision and value the trail network brings to the system.

Staff has proposed a five-year trail investment plan that would construct approximately 3 additional segments totaling 2.8 miles that provide access to the park system and comprehensive guide plan village centers, and support the complete street concept of incorporating pedestrian/bicycle traffic into road reconstruction. The city council has authorized alternate ways of funding the investment plan of unscheduled and/or unfunded trail segments. Those alternatives are the continued utilization of the PTF, the Community Investment Fund and other alternate sources such as grant and match funding by others. As part of the park board’s strategic plan, staff has included funding to improve the trail signage and wayfinding aspect of the trail system to address the need to improve awareness of the entire park system.
**Oakhaven Park Phase II**

Oakhaven Park was designed in two phases to develop a park on a parcel previously owned by the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MNDOT). Because MNDOT was not using the parcel for its intended purpose (HWY 494 Drainage) they reconveyed the parcel to the city at no cost for park and open space use. The first phase was constructed during the spring of 2008 and consisted of playground equipment, half-court basketball, limited seating and access paths. The park is functioning well and feedback received from those that petitioned for the park has been positive. Phase II will consist of a shelter/shade structure, additional seating and landscaping. Phase II funding was reallocated from the Park Dedication Fund as a portion of the responsible budget fix identified by the city council during 2009. Phase II is listed as funded for 2016.

**Purgatory Park Improvements**

During the 2013 joint meeting with the city council and park board, the public input process to identify improvements to the Penaz property and site upgrades was discussed. This process will begin prior to the allocated funding set aside in 2017 and will include a variety of input options. This development scenario will also include the disposal of city owned property in the area. A PTF project to upgrade the foundation of the barn and make structural improvements will occur in 2015.

**Existing Rehabilitation**

**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 was established as a result of a previous park board goal to develop a funding mechanism for future capital needs to avoid a referendum in the future. This schedule tracks all infrastructure installed in the park system and projects a future cost and replacement schedule. Those costs are then combined and scheduled during the five year CIP window. It is important to note that some park renewal projects were constructed almost 13 years ago and will be 18 years old at the end of this year’s CIP window.
Trail Rehabilitation
Part of the investment program is the rehabilitation of existing trails sections. This schedule is based upon a post inspection rating scale modeled to mirror the street rehabilitation schedule and indicate high, medium and low priority segments of the system. Staff anticipates that high priority segments would be contracted out for improvements while a majority of the medium and low priority will be done internally utilizing city staff as they are available. Staff will also be evaluating for surface treatments such as crack filling, sealing and other pavement management similar to street maintenance.

Athletic Field Improvements

City Owned Fields
A variety of improvements are scheduled over the next five years to city owned athletic fields. These upgrades include major turf playing surface maintenance, expansion in the number of light fields to extend play and safety improvements to Big Willow Park. These improvements were discussed as part of the Athletic Field Needs Study and agenda items presented to the board in 2012. In 2016 staff will review the opportunity to add lighting to the Civic Center soccer fields. A newly identified project includes the upgrading of Big Willow Park baseball field into a multipurpose turf field with other community minded enhancements. Funding is included in 2016 for a planning study. This project is being proposed as unfunded in the CIF and would rely on matching grants. A detailed project page is included in the packet.
Building Maintenance

Burwell House/City Housing
These maintenance projects are necessary to protect the investment of the city’s infrastructure. Staff is currently reviewing a roof repair/replacement study and has included funded amount for necessary improvements and replacement of the HVAC system in 2016, new irrigation in 2017 and to replace the building automation in 2018. Staff continually pursues external grants to assist in covering costs related to this historic structure.

Discussion Points

Staff recommends that the park board establish a clearly, prioritized list of capital projects to be used by the city council in finalizing its CIP tax levies. As the council considers different levels of funding, project priorities will have been established under different funding scenarios.

- Does the park board agree with the prioritization ranking proposed by staff?
- Does the park board wish to add any projects to the proposed CIP (unfunded)?
- If funding is not available for the proposed projects, in what order should the projects be delayed or moved to unfunded?
- Does the park board wish to delete any projects in the proposed CIP?

Recommended Park Board Action: Review and discuss the proposed 2016 - 2020 CIP, establish a prioritization list of recommended projects and upon approval recommend to the city council.
Attachments

1. 2016-2020 Proposed CIP Park and Trail Improvement Fund
**Project Category:** Recreational Facilities

**Project Title:** Shady Oak Beach Improvements

**Total Estimated Cost:** $83,700 (city cost)  
$125,000 (total cost)

**Funding Priority:**

**Account Number:**

---

**Description:**

Shady Oak Beach is jointly operated by the cities of Hopkins and Minnetonka. The facility is open from June – August each summer with the revenues generated from season pass sales and daily admissions. The facility was most recently renovated in 1998.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail Fund</td>
<td>$26,700</td>
<td>$33,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$23,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hopkins</td>
<td>$13,300</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Justification:**

The joint agreement between the city of Minnetonka and city of Hopkins provides for the sharing of the operating and capital expenses of Shady Oak Beach. These expenses are split 67% city of Minnetonka and 33% city of Hopkins.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**

2016: Landscape improvements ($15,000), patio tables and chairs ($25,000)  
2017: Entrance monument sign ($50,000)  
2019: Replacement of lifeguard building cabinets ($5,000), windows/screens ($10,000), exterior and interior lighting ($15,000), irrigation improvements ($5,000)

---

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**

These improvements are in keeping with the efforts to maintain a quality facility.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**

Preventative maintenance costs tend to rise as equipment ages. A consistent replacement schedule of older equipment will allow operating costs to be maintained. This capital project will not have an effect on the facility’s annual operating costs or revenues long-term.
Description:
This program funds asset-related costs associated with the arrival of the Emerald ash borer (EAB) insect.

Justification:
The emerald ash borer is an insect now present in the metropolitan area that will eventually kill all native ash trees. As a result, the city is pro-actively designing a management program that deals with the anticipated costs of the infestation. These costs include tree removal, stump grinding, reforestation and chemical treatments.

Scheduling and Project Status:
In 2014, the city initiated a program that will begin to deal with the anticipated effects of infestation. Additional staff will be hired to assist with the development of work plans for both public and private trees. 2015 will be the first full year of the program, and the annual amounts indicated for the remaining years through 2020 are projected costs assuming infestation has not yet been detected.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This program is being coordinated with other forestry programs.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
The costs above reflect only the capital budget portion of the program. The program will also increase operating costs of the city. The first full year of operating costs for the program are estimated to be approximately $200,000 annually beginning 2015.
**Project Category:** Parks, Trails and Open Space  
**Project Title:** Park and Open Space Purchase  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $600,000 - Unfunded  
**Funding Priority:** 4  
**Account Number:** NA

**Description:**
The city’s open space preservation implementation strategy calls for the preservation of open space that meets certain criteria. In addition, the Park Board has identified certain parcels that would expand existing park la

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Investment Fund – Unfunded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:**
The Minnetonka Park Board developed a property acquisition list that identifies desirable parcels for purchase by the City. The list is updated on a regular basis and includes properties within the Minnehaha Creek Preserve and properties that are adjacent to existing City park land to serve in expanding the City’s parks. This funding provides resources to purchase land identified by the Park Board.

In addition, in 2001 Minnetonka voters approved a $15,000,000 bond referendum for parks renewal and open space preservation. About half of these funds were used for open space preservation.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**
As parcels from the prioritization list become available, they will be acquired or preserved by other means (e.g., conservation easements) based on funding availability and City Council approval. Parcels classified as urgent and high priority for open space preservation will be actively pursued.

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**
This project is consistent with the Council Policy on an Open Space Preservation Program and the Management of Natural Resources.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**
Costs related to additional land stewardship are expected to increase dependent upon the size and environmental features of parcels acquired.
Project Category: Parks, Trails & Open Space
Project Title: Athletic Field Improvements
Total Estimated Cost: $705,000 Total Cost
City Cost $490,000
Grant Funding $75,000
Unfunded $140,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: 4701.XXXX.S16207

Justification:
With a lack of available city property for athletic field expansion, lighting of existing fields, along with partnerships with local school districts, provides the best opportunities to expand access to community fields. This program also funds major upgrades to dedicated city owned athletic fields to maintain acceptable playing standards.

Scheduling and Project Status:
2016: $75,000 is allocated to light the existing Civic Center fields. An additional $75,000 would be funded from a Hennepin County Youth Sports Grant. $20,000 is allocated for field renovations at city owned athletic fields.
2017: $85,000 is allocated for Phase II safety improvements (spectator and bleacher protection) at Big Willow Park.
2018: $20,000 is allocated for field improvements at city owned athletic fields. $140,000 is included as an unfunded request for the lighting of the two existing fields at Lone Lake Park.
2019: $200,000 is allocated to replace the lighting on the softball fields at Big Willow Park.
2020: $20,000 is allocated for field improvements at city owned athletic fields.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
The city of Minnetonka has a history of partnerships with the Minnetonka and Hopkins School Districts to provide quality community facilities, most notably, the Lindbergh Center, Arts Center on 7 and athletic improvements at Hopkins West Junior High.

1998: The city provided $100,000 for the redevelopment of fields at Hopkins West Junior High with the Hopkins School District.
2008 – 2010: The city provided $250,000 towards the $3.5 Million construction of Minnetonka School Districts Veterans Field (baseball/football fields).
2009: The city provided $95,000 towards the $1.2 Million construction of Legacy Fields (four youth softball fields) with Minnetonka School District.
2010: The city provided $50,000 towards a $250,000 upgrade of an existing multi-purpose field at Bennett Family Park.
2014: $20,000 is allocated for field renovations at city owned athletic fields and $65,000 for Phase I safety improvements (foul ball netting) at Big Willow Park.
2015: $25,000 is allocated for improvements to youth baseball and softball fields through a matching $25,000 partnership with the Hopkins School District. The district will also be applying for an additional $50,000 to come from a Hennepin County Youth Sports Grant.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Under the terms of the partnership agreements in place for previous improvements completed on school district property, the school districts are responsible for all operational and capital replacement costs. Increased energy costs due to field lighting will be recouped through field use fees.

Description:
The park board’s 2012 update of the city’s Athletic Field Needs Study continues to indicate a moderate need for increased game quality athletic fields for the sports of soccer, lacrosse and football; and increased access to quality practice fields for youth softball and baseball through partnerships.
**Project Category:** Parks, Trails & Open Space  
**Project Title:** Burwell House  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $250,000  
**Funding Priority:** 1  
**Account Number:** 4732.XXXX.S16202

### Description:
This project provides for maintenance and improvements to the Burwell House.

### Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail Improvement Fund - Maintenance Expenditures</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Justification:
Major maintenance projects are necessary at the Burwell House and other properties to keep the city’s investment in good repair.

### Scheduling and Project Status:
Painting of the Burwell House and a roofing replacement study was completed in 2012. Staff will pursue grant opportunities to assist with the 2016 roofing project and HVAC improvements that will be needed in the future. In 2017 irrigation for the gardens and lawn are planned. The large investment in plants ($40-$50,000) warrants this investment. In 2018 the city-wide building automation software that controls the HVAC system will be upgraded. The allocated portions covering the Burwell House are listed with the Building Automation project.

### Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
These projects are necessary to ensure these facilities and houses meet the standards for public health and protect the investment of the city for the long term.

### Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
None.
**Project Category:** Parks, Trails & Open Space  
**Project Title:** Upper Minnehaha Creek Corridor  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $400,000  
**Funding Priority:** 3  
**Account Number:** 4200.XXXX.S15208  

**Source of Project Funding**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Investment Fund</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:**
A creek visioning plan developed in 2006 focused on the integration of the creek's environmental, recreational, historic and economic resources. Conceptual ideas were generated for the corridor and discussed by the city council.

Over the last several years, the city has partnered with the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District (MCWD), Three Rivers Park District, Hennepin County, Minneapolis Park Board and the cities of Hopkins, Edina and St. Louis Park, to discuss creek projects of joint interest.

In 2010, the city and MCWD formed a steering committee to explore the potential for a joint facility to include public amenities and the district's headquarters on city-owned property. Discussions ended in 2012 when the study determined it was not feasible.

Other projects included improvements to the canoe landings along the creek and development of the Minnetonka Mills Park (west of the Burwell House). Constructed in 2011 and 2012, the park project includes trails and boardwalks, bridges across the creek, park entrance features, and a botanical garden west of the historic house site and along the creek.

Potential future projects include:
- land acquisition in the corridor
- construction of additional trails and boardwalks throughout the corridor
- I494/Minnetonka Boulevard gateway improvements
- addition of a community play lot in the recreation core

**Scheduling and Project Status:**
The required public hearings on use of the Community Investment Fund for creek corridor projects were held in 2009, and the city council subsequently approved these expenditures. In addition to the funds above, $200,000 for the remainder of this project is budgeted in 2015.

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**
The visioning plan complements the city's Parks, Open Space and Trails (POST) plan, Natural Resources Restoration and Management Plan, Comprehensive Guide Plan and City Council Policy on Open Space Preservation and Management of Natural Resources.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**
Costs related to additional land stewardship are expected to increase dependent upon the size and environmental features of parcels acquired. Operating expenses associated with an expanded trail and park use have been incorporated into annual operating budgets and the 30-year improvement schedule.
Project Category: Parks, Trails and Open Space
Project Title: Park Investment Plan
Total Estimated Cost: $575,000
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: 4701.62XX-63XX.S16203

Source of Project Funding | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Park and Trail Improvement Fund | $55,000 | $70,000 | $175,000 | $125,000 | $150,000

Justification:
An implementation schedule was created for the park and trail system on a 30 year basis. Improvements will be made upon final evaluation of the listed amenity in order to maintain the park and trail infrastructure. As we move toward 2018, five playgrounds replaced as part of park renewal will reach 15 years old.

Scheduling and Project Status:
Staff has created a 30-year schedule guideline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2016 | Arbor Gazebo Painting – Linner, Covington
Hard Court Resurface – Linner, Covington
Site Amenities
Dock and Boardwalk Decking select replacement/refurbishment |
| 2017 | Arbor Gazebo Painting – Meadow, Gro Tonka, Woodgate
Hard Court Resurface – Glen Moor, Knollway
Site Amenities |
| 2018 | Playground equipment and surfacing replacement – Meadow and Pioneer |
| 2019 | Playground equipment and safety surfacing replacement – Ford and Mini-Tonka |
| 2020 | Playground equipment and safety surfacing replacement – Linner and Sunrise Ridge. |
| 2021-2023 – Future $300,000 | Playground Equipment Replacement – Orchard, Covington, Glen-Moor, Gro-Tonka, McKenzie and Woodgate Parks
Tot Lot Safety Surface Improvements |

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
The Park Board has adopted a goal of renewing and maintaining the parks and trails. This plan will meet the objective to implement the long-term capital funding plan for ensuring the long-term vitality of parks. This project is in keeping with the City’s policy of maintaining its infrastructure in a quality condition.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
This rehabilitation will not increase annual maintenance costs.
Description: In 2007, the Park Board and City Council approved a master plan for Oakhaven Park at 13608 Spring Lake Road (former MNDOT parcel) for the development of a neighborhood park. The initial development of the park was funded in 2008. Phase II funds will be used to construct the remaining amenities approved at the park.

Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail Improvement Fund</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
The Park Board and Council approved the master plan for Oakhaven Park in 2007. The initial phase funded the park development and playground structure. Additional funding is necessary to implement the remaining phase.

Scheduling and Project Status:
Oakhaven Park construction in 2008 included a hard-court with a basketball hoop, a playground structure with equipment for the 2-5 age group and 5-12 age group and swings. Phase II construction would include horseshoes, a picnic shelter with seating, additional walks, landscaping and additional vegetative buffers.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
The development of Oakhaven Park allowed for better access to a Neighborhood Park Service Area that had been deficient of park access.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Annual operating costs have been included since the 2008 budget. Staff will inventory new amenities upon construction and include them in the 30-year improvement schedule.
Project Category: Parks, Trails and Open Space
Project Title: Trail Improvement Plan
Total Estimated Cost: $2,045,000 Total Cost
$ 645,000 City Cost
$1,400,000 Unfunded
Funding Priority: 3
Account Number: 4701.XXXX.S16206

Description:
The Trail Improvement Plan is a multi-year plan created to maintain and enhance the City’s trail and sidewalk system within the city. New trails and walks added to the system provide connections between existing trails, parks, schools and village center points of interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail Improvement Fund (PTF)</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin County Funds (HC)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Investment Fund (Unfunded)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Trail Funding</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Length in Miles</th>
<th>Estimated City Cost</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Center east to McGinty Rd – Boardwalk</td>
<td>PTF</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth Rd – Wayzata Blvd to Sherwood Pl</td>
<td>PTF</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail wayfinding and navigation signage</td>
<td>PTF</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail wayfinding and navigation signage</td>
<td>PTF</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smetana Rd - Westbrooke Way to Sanibel Dr</td>
<td>PTF</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheduled/Unfunded Segments</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Length in Miles</th>
<th>Estimated City Cost</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parkers Lake Rd - Twelve Oaks Center Dr to Plymouth city limits (coordinate w/ future road reconstruction)</td>
<td>PTF</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 60 – CR5 to CR3 (with Three Rivers/HC)</td>
<td>CIF</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 60 – CR62 to CR3 (with Three Rivers/HC)</td>
<td>CIF</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
There is strong community support for the Minnetonka Trail System as evidenced by the heavy use of the completed trail segments and inquiries received about opportunities for extensions. When completed, these trails and walkways will connect five community parks, adjacent communities, and allow users to travel throughout the city on trails physically separated from motorized vehicles.

Scheduling and Project Status:
The Opus Area Improvements page additionally designates $520,000 from the Community Investment Fund to construct trail connections to the new Light Rail Transit platform in 2019.

Staff conducted an educational and community dialogue for missing trail links to assist the Park Board and City Council in recommending projects to be constructed. The avenues for information were the Minnetonka Memo, Summer Festival and Open House.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This is an integral part of the Parks, Open Space and Trail System and the Comprehensive Guide Plans to construct the Minnetonka Trail for walkers, joggers and bicyclists.

The vision for trail segments uses a feasibility score made up of Community Access (40%), Nature of Use (30%), Cost Effectiveness (20%) and Degree of Construction Difficulty (10%).

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Maintenance costs will increase by approximately $1,500/mile.
**Project Category:** Parks, Trails and Open Space - Unfunded

**Project Title:** Trail Segments - Unscheduled

**Total Estimated Cost:** $11,235,000

**Funding Priority:** 3

**Account Number:** N/A

**Source of Project Funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail Improvement Fund – Unfunded</td>
<td>$11,235,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:**
There is strong community support for the Minnetonka Trail System as evidenced by the heavy use of the completed trail segments and inquiries received about opportunities for extensions.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**
These projects are currently unscheduled. Some trail segments may qualify for funding from outside sources. Staff conducted an educational and community dialogue for missing trail links to assist the Park Board and City Council in recommending projects to be constructed. The avenues for information were the Minnetonka Memo, Summer Festival and Open House.

**Description:**
This project involves the construction of the trails described in the table on the following page.

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**
This is an integral part of the Parks, Open Space and Trail System and Comprehensive Guide Plans to construct the Minnetonka Trail System for walkers, joggers, and bicyclists. When completed, these trails and walkways will connect five community parks, adjacent communities, and allow users to travel throughout the City on trails and walkways physically separated from motorized vehicles.

Trails are evaluated by using a feasibility score made up of Community Access (20%), Cost Effectiveness (20%), Degree of Difficulty (15%) and Nature of Use (10%).

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**
Although this project is currently unfunded, proposed funding source and timetable data are provided. Maintenance costs will increase by approximately $1,500/mile.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Segment Description</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Est Cost w/ road reconstruct*</th>
<th>Feasibility (10=High 1=Low)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CR 3 - Glen View to Caribou (IHM)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CR 3 - Pioneer to Nelson/CR 61</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vine Hill Rd - Delton Ave to Covington Rd</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Minnehaha Creek Trail - Headwaters to Jidana Park</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TH 7 - Cattle Pass to CR 101 on north side</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pioneer Rd - Carlton Rd to CR 61</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CR 5 - CR 101 west to Deephaven city limits</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Delton Ave - Vine Hill Rd to Old Excelsior Blvd</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$234,000</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rowland Rd - CR 60 to SWLRT Trail</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ridgedale Dr - White Birch Rd to Target</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$126,000</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>McGinty Rd E - CR 5 to Surry La</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$99,000</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>CR 5 - The Marsh to Fairchild Lane</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>CR 73 - Cedar Lake Rd to Wayzata Blvd</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Woodland Rd - Townline Rd to Hwy 7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>CR 16 - CR 101 to Crosby Rd (partly in Wayzata)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sheridan Hills Rd - Linner Park to Portico</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>CR 16 - Crosby Rd to existing trail on west side of I-494</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Stone Rd/Meeting St - RR tracks to Linner Rd</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$162,000</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>CR 73 - CR 5 to Minnetonka Mills Rd</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$154,500</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Vine Hill Rd - Delton Ave to Covington Rd</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>CR 5 - Fairchild Ave to Woodlawn Ave</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>$114,000</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Pioneer Rd- CR 3 to Merilee Dr</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$181,000</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Merilee Dr - Pioneer Tr to Minnesota River Bluffs LRT</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Ford Park to Lindbergh Dr</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$78,000</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Old Excelsior Blvd - Vine Hill Rd to CR 101 (north side of Hwy 7)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Hillside La - CR 73 to Tanglen School</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>$213,000</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>CR 3 - Woodland Rd to Clear Springs Rd/101 Library</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Berkshire Dr/Junction Rd - CR 60 to CR 3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Minnetonka Mills Rd - CR 61 to CR 73</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>$108,000</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>CR 61 - CR 5 to Hwy 7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Hilloway Park to YMCA La</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>NTC - Maywood La from I-494 crossing to CR 3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Clear Spring Rd - connect trail to Hwy 7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Orchard Rd/Huntingdon Dr - CR 60 to CR 61</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$126,000</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Knollway Park to CR 60</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$97,500</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Knollway Park to Wayzata Blvd/Horn Dr</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Tonkawood Road - CR 5 to Hwy 7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>NTC - Meeting St to existing trail on west side of I-494</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Williston Rd - CR 5 to Hwy 7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Stone Rd - Saddlebrooke Cir to Sheffield Cur</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Cottage Grove Ave - Groveland Park to Grays Bay Blvd</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>CR 61 - CR 5 to Hilloway Rd</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Sunset Dr and Marion Lane West segments</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$19,500</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>CR 73 to Ford Road on Runnymead La</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Fairchild Ave - CR 5 to Grays Bay Blvd</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>East side of I-494 - CR 5 to Wentworth Tr</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$82,500</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Lake St Ext - CR 60 to CR 61</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Victoria Evergreen to McKenzie Park</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>58th St W - Mahoney Ave into Purgatory Park</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Lake St Ext - Williston Rd to Spring Lake Rd</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$118,000</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>North Lone Lake Park - along RR tracks to Dominick Rd</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$116,000</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Fairview Ave/Lake St Ext - CR 3 to CR 61</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$156,000</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Rowland Rd/Bren Rd - Lone Lake Park to Opus trail system</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Cedar Lake Rd - Big Willow to CR 73</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>$108,000</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Oberlin Park along Park Ave to Ridgemount Ave</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Ridgedale Connections</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Covington Park east side connection to CR 101</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>$213,000</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Woodland Rd to Williston Rd - Through Woodgate Park</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Highwood Dr - Williston Rd to Tonkawood Rd</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Holiday Rd/Seymore Rd - Woodland Rd to Spring Hill Park</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Westmill Rd - Spring Hill Park to Clear Spring Dr</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$106,000</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Orchard Rd/Westmark Dr - Minnetonka Dr</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Stodola Rd - Purgatory Park to Scenic Heights Dr</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$151,000</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Covington Rd - Vine Hill Rd to Mahoney Ave</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$117,000</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>CR 3 - Glen Oak St to Woodland Rd</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Woodridge Rd - CR 3 to Gaywood Dr</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>$108,000</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Wayzata Blvd - Claredon Dr to Wayzata city limits</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>South St - Mayview Rd to CR 60</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$99,000</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Kinsel Rd/Mayview Rd - CR 3 to Glen Moor Park</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Meadow Park to Ridgedale</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Old Bren Rd - Bren Rd to Clarion Cir trailhead</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$82,000</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>CR 101 Underpass structure at Purgatory Creek</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>The Strand - Lake Minnetonka LRT to CR 5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Hilloway Park to CR 73 on Park Ridge Dr</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Oak Ridge Rd - CR 5 to Hopkins city limits</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Essex Rd - Ridgedale Dr to Oakland Rd</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carlson Parkway to Linner Park</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Cost:** $11,235,000
## Project Category:
Parks, Trails and Open Spaces

## Project Title:
Trail Rehabilitation

## Total Estimated Cost:
$250,000

## Funding Priority:
1

## Account Number:
4764.6560.S16204

## Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail Improvement Fund</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Description:
Rebuilding and resurfacing existing Minnetonka Trail System and neighborhood trail connections. Replace and expand trail signage and maps.

## Justification:
There is strong community support for the Minnetonka Trail System as evidenced by the heavy use of the completed trail segments. Some of the trail sections are approaching 20 years old and have reached a condition beyond what regular maintenance can address.

## Scheduling and Project Status:
This project is to replace and rebuild existing trail segments. A rating system will be used to determine which segments will be addressed each year. Signage on the trail system will be continually updated and revised maps will be produced.

- 2016 – Dominick to Shady Oak Beach/Beachside II
- 2017 – Pavement Management Updates - crack filling, culvert inspection/replacement and asphalt surface sealing
- 2018 – Pedestrian Ramps and ADA Upgrades
- 2019 – Ridgedale Area Sidewalks
- 2020 – Stone Road – Wellington to Oakland Rd.

## Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This is an integral part of the plan to maintain the Trail System for walkers, joggers and bicyclists. The trails and walkways connect five community parks, adjacent communities and allow users to travel throughout the city on trails separated from motorized vehicles.

## Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Maintenance costs have already been taken into consideration for existing trails.
Project Category: Parks, Trails and Open Space
Project Title: Trail Connections - Miscellaneous
Total Estimated Cost: $125,000
Funding Priority: 3
Account Number: 4750.XXX.S16201

Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail Improvement Fund</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description:
Funding is allocated annually as a resource for responding to unanticipated opportunities and challenges that arise throughout the year in the development of the city’s trail system.

Justification:
It is common for unanticipated opportunities to occasionally arise for the development of new trails or “missing links” when commercial or residential redevelopments are proposed. Additionally, residents or neighborhoods sometimes petition the city to add a safe connection to the Minnetonka Trail System or other community amenities. This item will provide the resources for a timely response to each situation and to accommodate unforeseen challenges in the construction of trails scheduled under the adopted improvement plan.

Scheduling and Project Status:
Individual projects are scheduled in response to unanticipated opportunities and challenges that arise throughout a given year related to improvement of the city’s trail system.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
Decisions regarding the use of this funding will be based upon a set of criteria to be developed by staff during 2011. The criteria will likely include the level of participation by other parties such as the donation of rights-of-way by private commercial or residential property owners, as well support from other government entities and acceptable design standards for construction.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Maintenance of additional trails increases operating costs by approximately $1,500 per mile.
**Project Category:** Parks, Trails & Open Space

**Project Title:** Purgatory Park Improvements

**Total Estimated Cost:** $250,000

**Funding Priority:** 3

**Account Number:** 4701.XXXX.S17210

---

### Description:

In January of 2013 staff completed the purchase of the Penaz property adjacent to Purgatory Park. This project includes the rehabilitation and incorporation of the barn as a park amenity for the 158 acre Community Preserve.

---

### Recommended and Scheduled for Five Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail Improvement Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Justification:

The park board and city council toured 17301 Excelsior Boulevard, a single family residence with a barn in 2012. The property was then acquired for Open Space and Park purposes in 2013. A structural review of the barn has been completed and renovation scenarios for a variety of recreational uses were discussed during the 2014 joint City Council and Park Board meeting. Those discussions will help formulate a public input process to be conducted in 2017. In addition to the open space value early ideas for the site are passive uses, such as picnics and outdoor programmed recreational space.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**

In 2015 funding will be used to correct structural deficiencies in the barn and secure the location. The parcel will be used primarily as open space until 2017 when funds to renovate the structures are allocated.

---

### Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:

These improvements are in keeping with efforts to provide and maintain quality recreational amenities and to respond to needs not previously identified. This 1.23 acre highly visible property is adjacent to and would function as part of Purgatory Park, a 158 acre Community Preserve. Staff has presented options to the City Council, which include selling surplus property adjacent to the park to further fund these improvements.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**

Annual operating costs will be known when a final programming concept is approved. During the interim the parcel will be maintained as part of Purgatory Park.
**Project Category:** Parks, Trails & Open Space  
**Project Title:** Big Willow Park Enhancements  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $2,275,000 Total Cost  
$75,000 City Cost  
$600,000 Grant-Unfunded  
$1,600,000 Unfunded  
**Funding Priority:** 2  
**Account Number:** NA  

**Source of Project Funding**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail Fund</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Investment Fund – Unfunded</td>
<td></td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin County Grant – Unfunded</td>
<td></td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:**  
The existing baseball field at Big Willow Park has served as the premier community baseball field in the area since the 1980’s. Maintaining this field at a high level requires that the field be “rested” annually from September – April. Adding artificial turf would allow for extended fall use to meet the needs of youth soccer, a need identified in the 2012 Athletic Field Needs Study Update and better position the city for future programming needs. In addition, the new surface creates the ability to maintain refrigerated ice from late fall to early spring.

**Scheduling and Project Status:**  
2016: Feasibility study and pre-engineering  
2017: Replace current playing surface with new drainage system and artificial turf  
2019: Construct public areas including bleachers, concessions and warming house/community room space; and purchase ice rink dasher boards, refrigeration equipment and resurfacing equipment.

**Justification:**  
The existing baseball field at Big Willow Park has served as the premier community baseball field in the area since the 1980’s. Maintaining this field at a high level requires that the field be “rested” annually from September – April. Adding artificial turf would allow for extended fall use to meet the needs of youth soccer, a need identified in the 2012 Athletic Field Needs Study Update and better position the city for future programming needs. In addition, the new surface creates the ability to maintain refrigerated ice from late fall to early spring.

**Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:**  
The ability to extend the use of the field for fall soccer and potentially April baseball helps to address needs addressed in the 2012 Athletic Field Needs Study.

**Effect on Annual Operations Costs:**  
Cost savings for maintaining the surface, including mowing, dragging, and striping the baseball field would save an estimated $6,000 annually. In addition field rentals for extended baseball and soccer use would generate an estimated $3,000 annually.

The annual operating budget would be increased an estimated $20,000 annually for maintenance and supervision of the ice skating rink, with revenues of $5,000-7,000 anticipated to offset the maintenance costs.

The addition of a community skating rink may reduce the need for the eight neighborhood rinks currently being maintained, resulting in budget savings for both staffing and maintenance.
Project Category: Parks, Trails & Open Space

Project Title: Ridgedale Area Park Improvements

Total Estimated Cost: $500,000 Unfunded

Funding Priority: 3

Account Number:

Recommended and Scheduled for Five Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail Improvement Fund – Unfunded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description:
In October 2012, the city completed the Ridgedale Village Center study. The study identified two park improvements: improvements to Crane Lake open space, and a new park, public square, and green space on the south side of the mall.

Justification:
The Ridgedale area is a major commercial and economic center in Minnetonka. The city’s comprehensive plan anticipates significant private development to occur in the Ridgedale area. In anticipation of development, the city completed a village center study for the Ridgedale area in 2012.

The elements of the vision plan include transforming the retail center into a mixed use community and enhancing the district’s natural features. Developing a park area on the south side of the mall would be a community gathering space which would be surrounded by an expansion to the mall and high density housing on the south side of Ridgedale Drive. Additional improvements are identified on the properties on the east side of Ridgedale Drive to enhance the natural area and open space surrounding Crane Lake.

Scheduling and Project Status:
Currently, the land on the south side of the mall is privately owned and the city owns the existing open space property on the southeast corner of Ridgedale Drive and Wayzata Blvd. An off-leash dog area, previously approved adjacent to Crane Lake, would be reconsidered as part of an overall review of park amenities in the area. Park improvements are anticipated to be constructed in conjunction with the improvements to Ridgedale Drive and the mall property.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
The project is consistent with the city’s 2030 Comprehensive Plan and the Ridgedale Village Center study.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Annual operating costs will be known when a final programming concept is approved.
Minnetonka Park Board Item 6  
Meeting of April 8, 2015

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

**Park Board Action Step Document**

Attached is the updated 2015 Park Board Action Step document with revisions made by the board at the March 4, 2015 meeting.

**Seasonal Facility Openings**

Gray’s Bay Marina is scheduled to open for gas dock services and public launching on April 15.

The Shady Oak Beach play area is now open for the spring season, and will remain open until set up for beach operations start in late May.

**Attachment**

1. Minnetonka Park & Recreation Board Goals & Objectives – 2015 Action Steps (Final)
GOAL #1: TO PROTECT NATURAL RESOURCES AND OPEN SPACE

Objective #1
Provide feedback to assist staff in managing the open space process
Action Steps:

1. Receive updates as the city acquires property and as privately owned parcels are developed using conservation development techniques
2. Review stewardship plans for acquired open space properties

Objective #2
Continue to review and comment on the implementation of the natural resources stewardship plan
Action Steps:

1. Continue to review restoration and management activities in community parks as outlined in the 20 Year Restoration Plan for Minnetonka Parks
2. Receive periodic updates on the progress of the natural resource stewardship program
3. Tour selected restoration and management areas within the park system
4. Review natural resources informal educational opportunities in the field for park and trail users

Objective #3
Review options to enhance natural resources & open space
Action Steps:

1. Review and comment on a volunteer program to foster stewardship practices within the city’s parks and public lands. This program may include components such as plant rescues, loosestrife control, control of buckthorn and garlic mustard and adopt a storm drain
2. Receive information about park designated water quality improvement projects
3. Review any interpretive signage developed by staff to highlight natural areas within the trail system
4. Receive information and updates regarding the park system’s forest health

Objective #4
Promote the city’s efforts of protecting and enhancing the community’s natural resources by creating awareness and supporting educational strategies
Action Steps:

1. Review and comment on the natural resource division’s 2015 outreach and education plan
2. Review the natural resource division’s Annual Report
3. Implement a pet waste pick up campaign plan
**Goal #2: TO RENEW AND MAINTAIN PARKS AND TRAILS**

**Objective #1**  
Involve park board member participation in park & trail projects  
**Action Steps:**

1. Park board members will be part of neighborhood meetings and recommendation discussions

**Objective #2**  
As needed conduct an annual review of park dedication fees  
**Action Steps:**

1. Conduct a survey of comparable cities to review park dedication fees

**Objective #3**  
Identify areas of the city that are deficient of adequate park or trail amenities  
**Action Steps:**

1. Include study areas as part of POST Plan

**Objective #4**  
Conduct a comprehensive review of the trail system to identify missing links and required future improvements  
**Action Steps:**

1. Conduct an annual review of the Trail Improvement Plan
2. Develop a rehabilitation program and schedule to protect the long term investment of the trail system
3. Conduct a review of park and trail way finding and signage practices to determine if changes are needed

**Objective #5**  
Renew, expand and maintain a trail system to encourage outdoor recreation, and improve the connectivity and walkability of community.  
**Action Steps:**

1. Identify a vision for future trail links and the intrinsic value they bring to the city
2. Involve regional agencies as partners to expand opportunities
Goal #3: TO PROVIDE QUALITY ATHLETIC AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES AND PROGRAMS

Objective #1
Perform an annual review of the Gray’s Bay Marina operations plan
Action Steps:

1. Conduct an annual review of the Marina Operations and Business plans; and develop recommended changes as desired

Objective #2
Anticipate, review and respond to community needs not previously identified.
Action Steps:

1. Host a neighborhood input meeting to determine if a new park is feasible for the NPSA 14 neighborhood and recommend next steps

Objective #3
Annually review policies related to the operation and management of parks to determine if changes are required
Action Steps:

1. Conduct a review of the Comprehensive Athletic Field Use Policy
2. Develop changes to the existing summer playground program registration criteria that allow for expanded opportunities for residents to participate
3. Review and consider previous considerations for park regulation changes related to off-leash usage
4. Develop an agreement for youth sports associations who receive designated priority field space on city athletic fields
5. Review the 2015 Shady Oak Beach weather related closing policy and make changes as needed for 2016

Objective #4
Ensure that park amenities, recreational facilities and programs address future community needs and changing demographics
Action Steps:

1. Provide quarterly reports of programs and services provided by the Joint Recreation Division
2. Develop recommendations for use of park properties acquired by the city
3. Review the results of the feasibility study for the proposed new Glen Lake Activity Center and provide input on desired amenities
4. Conduct a review of outdoor ice rink operations and recommend to the city council any desired changes for the 2015/2016 skating season
5. Consider the addition of splash pad features in designated community parks
Objective #5
Conduct a review of the athletic field fee schedule developed for 2015 and make recommended adjustments for 2016

Action Steps:

1. Review 2015 field use fee outcomes to determine if adjustments are needed for 2016

Objective #6
Review drafts of the updated POST Plan

Action Steps:

1. Provide input on the Organizational, Analysis and Implementation and the Technological Enhancement phases of the POST Plan

Objective #7
Offer a full range of programs for people of all ages and ability levels.

Action Steps:

1. Utilize program evaluations as a source for data collection
2. Conduct seasonal reviews of programs and services offered and provide direction to staff on any desired changes

Objective #8
Responsibly maintain our parks, trails and recreational facilities, while fairly balancing user fees with general community support.

Action Steps:

1. Conduct a survey of comparable facilities in neighboring cities to ensure that rates are within desired ranges
Goal #4: ENHANCE LONG-TERM PARK BOARD DEVELOPMENT

Objective #1
Define CIP program for 2016-2020 related to parks, trails & open space
Action Steps:

1. Review all CIP projects related to parks, trails and open space and recommend funding status
2. Recommend park, trails and open space CIP budget for city council consideration

Objective #2
Enhance Council relations - serve as a voice to the council
Action Steps:

1. Have a minimum of one park board member in attendance for all council reviews of park board recommendations
2. Conduct a joint meeting of the park board and city council
3. Provide park board input regarding park related issues reviewed by other city boards or commissions, including creating a sense of place within the community

Objective #3
Increase community awareness of park board initiatives
Action Steps:

1. Publish an article related to park board activities in the Minnetonka MEMO at least two times in 2015

Objective #4
Schedule board member involvement in annual park board and city related activities.
Action Steps:

1. Provide park board representation at various city events including the State of the City address, Kids’ Fest, Summer Festival, annual open house, and an environmental event
2. Schedule an annual park board tour of parks and trails
3. Schedule a park board/staff canoe trip down Minnehaha Creek
4. Review park board member park assignment schedule and make changes as needed

Objective #5
Annually assess the park board strategic plan
Action Steps:

1. Adopt the park board's 2015 strategic plan
2. Prepare action steps to address the park board’s 2015 strategic plan and provide periodic progress updates
Objective #6
Conduct a review of the park board’s program for recognizing volunteers who complete pre-approved projects to benefit the park system

Action Steps:

1. *Make adjustments as desired from the 2014 volunteer recognition event and schedule a date for the 2015 event*
### Upcoming 6-Month Meeting Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting Type</th>
<th>Agenda Business Items</th>
<th>Special Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>5/13/15</td>
<td>Tour</td>
<td>• Annual tour of parks</td>
<td>5:15 p.m. start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>6/3/15</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>• Review of youth sports organization agreement for use of athletic fields</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>7/1/15</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>• No Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>8/5/15</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>• Volunteer event planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>9/2/15</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>• Summer recreation program participation report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>10/7/15</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>• Shady Oak Beach operations review (including closing policy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other meetings and activities to note:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Special Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>6/3/15</td>
<td>Native Plant Market &amp; Eco Fun Fest</td>
<td>City Hall parking lot:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>6/5/15</td>
<td>Shady Oak Beach Opening Day</td>
<td><strong>Season Hours:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10am – 9pm thru August 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10am – 8pm August 2 - 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>6/27/15</td>
<td>Minnetonka Summer Festival / Burwell Festival</td>
<td>Burwell Festival: 10 a.m. – 4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer Festival Run: 8 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer Festival Event: 4 – 10:45 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>