



14600 Minnetonka Blvd. • Minnetonka, MN 55345
(952) 939-8200 • Fax (952) 939-8244
eminnetonka.com

Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee

Agenda

December 13, 2007

5:30 PM

Boards and Commissions Room

Note: A light supper will be available at 5:15 PM.

1. Welcome – Mayor Callison (5 minutes)
2. Accept November 28th, 2007 Meeting Summary – Mayor Callison (5 minutes)
Handout: Summary of Minutes (in packet)
3. Feedback from November 28th, 2007 Steering Committee Meeting – Ann Perry (5 minutes)
Handout: Summary of Issue and Priorities Exercises from November 28th Meeting –
- (in packet)
 - a.) Land Use and Development
 - b.) Transportation
4. Continuation of Issues and Priorities Exercise – Ann Perry (3/4 hours)
Handout: Issues and Priorities Exercise – (questions in packet)
 - a.) City Services and Partnerships
 - b.) City Facilities
5. Review and Confirmation of Issues/Priorities – Ann Perry (1 hour)
Handout: Memo (in packet)

- a.) Composite Issues/Priorities Matrix (in packet)
- b.) Staff Services Committee Summary of Issues (in packet)
- c.) Park Board Summary of Issues (in packet)

6. Steering Committee Discussion and Feedback (5 minutes)

7. Adjournment

Next Meeting Dates: City Council and Boards and Commissions Work Session –
Wednesday, January 16th, 2008 at 6:30 PM
Steering Committee Meeting – January 23, 2008 at 5:30 PM

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE
MEETING SUMMARY
November 28, 2007
5:30 p.m.—8:00 p.m.
Boards & Commissions Room**

Steering Committee:	Jan Callison Jim Couling Terri Yearwood Bob Walker Chris Meehan	Sue Sjeklocha David Nichols John Cheleen Janet Dupre
---------------------	---	---

Project Manager: Ann Perry, Resource Strategies Corporation

City Staff:	Geralyn Barone Elise Durbin Josh Metzer	Julie Wischnack Susan Thomas Jeff Thomson	Ron Rankin Stephanie Scott-Sims
-------------	---	---	------------------------------------

1. Welcome.

Mayor Callison welcomed the group.

2. Accept October 15 Meeting Summary.

The committee accepted the meeting summary.

3. Feedback from October 15 Steering Committee Meeting.

Perry reviewed the comments and summarized themes from the issues and priorities exercise discussed on October 15 for the housing, natural resources, and parks/open space/trails topics. Walker suggested not only looking at Minnetonka, but also the edges.

Perry described how the issues and priorities exercise will form the policies. She said the three groups identifying issues are the public, city organizations, and focus groups. Perry said the staff service committee will form draft policies which will then be sent to the steering committee.

4. Review of November 8 Public Open House Discussion.

Perry said approximately 43 people attended the November 8 open house and she summarized the comments.

Couling suggested at the next open house that people are asked how many years they have lived in the city. Sjeklocha suggested that tradeoff questions, like questions in the community survey, be asked.

There was discussion on how to get more input and awareness about the comprehensive plan update. Suggestions included Kidsfest, Neighborhood Watch Groups, and other neighborhood events.

5. Update on Topical Focus Group Meetings.

Rankin said there have been four focus groups to date—housing, senior housing, senior services, and families/schools/social services, and focus groups are planned for business and young families. He summarized comments received from the focus groups.

Sjeklocha suggested another focus group could be held with citizens who have interacted recently with either the city council or one of the city's boards and commissions. Yearwood agreed that getting all of the focus group participants together as a large group is a good idea.

6. Continuation of Issues and Priorities Exercise.

The steering committee broke into groups for continuation of the issues and priorities exercise.

7. Adjournment.

The next meeting was announced as December 13. The meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

**ISSUES AND PRIORITIES EXERCISE
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 28, 2007**

1. Land Use and Development

a. What land use characteristics define Minnetonka and should we seek to alter these characteristics in the next 10 years?

Characteristics

- Single-family homes with large lots
- Low density residential
- Water features such as Minnehaha Creek, Lake Minnetonka, and others
- Neighborhoods
- Pockets of dense businesses
- Areas of commercial—commercial land uses are in certain areas of the city and not spread throughout
- Feeling of open space
- Trees/woods
- “Village” nodes
- Not industrial

Should we seek to alter?

- Continue to protect water features
- Will have to “nibble” at change (single-family homes on large lots)
- Cannot change the primary characteristics of the entire city, but can change certain areas
- Economy has to drive changes
- Have to be realistic on what can be done
- Build on the “village” nodes/create other nodes (Baker/Excelsior & 7/101)
- More density in commercial/office areas (e.g. Opus, Ridgedale) to offset low density areas
 - If LRT goes through Opus it will allow for more density and a place to live/work
 - Glen Lake—is a walkable area
 - Highway 7/101
- More control on the edges—blending
- Want values of homes to increase
- Commercial development should blend better with neighborhoods/natural features
- Tweak zoning to allow mixed uses—especially in walkable nodes
- More connectivity and less separation

b. What should be the role of existing neighborhoods and business areas to accommodate higher densities in housing and additional employment opportunities?

- Education to both businesses and neighborhoods
- Integrated system
- Incentives
- Willing to think “outside the box”

c. What land use intensities do we want to encourage in Minnetonka over the next 10 years?

- Medium density
- High density in certain areas
 - Opus
 - 7/101
 - Ridgedale
 - Minnetonka Boulevard/101
 - Near transportation
- More businesses
 - Service industry that does not create pollution
 - Small and medium sized businesses
- Mixed use
- Light Rail—tie into density areas
- Green corridor of businesses (e.g. Denver)
 - Green technology/businesses/bioscience
 - Opus is a good area
- Areas around the edges of Minnetonka Boulevard/County Road 101

d. What role should “green” technologies play in city review of private developments?

- Already seeing some of it--market will demand that there is more green technology
- City should not force it through
- People are not used to green technology yet
- Perhaps the city is a facilitator like the special assessments that the city does for the fire sprinkler retrofit
- Lot sizes—an asset and a liability
- Tax incentives
- City owned facilities should set an example
- Give incentives for green technology businesses to locate here
- A city staff member should be LEED certified
- Ordinances
 - Performance zoning—greater density if meet certain green standards
- Sustainable stormwater technology
- City should be an advocate for green technology

e. Are there new land uses or types of development that should be pursued over the next 10 years?

- Cooperatives and senior cooperatives
- Neighborhood-scale retail
- Medium sized businesses
- Mixed use
- Small lot housing
- Use more overlay districts
- Need a “Cheers” like place for people to congregate
- More restaurants

2. Transportation

a. After construction, what impact will LRT have on land uses and services in Minnetonka?

- Mixed-use
- Higher density/more intense uses
- New “village” node
- More intense housing such as apartments/condominiums—need to make some of these affordable
- Build on connectivity
- Bus connectivity to LRT
- Make sure there is the right zoning or overlay district
- Support services
- Coffee shops/restaurants
- Offices
- Hotels
- Entertainment
- Police station

b. What are the transportation conditions or services that will affect residents and businesses in Minnetonka over the next 20 years?

- Gas prices
- Congestion
- Global warming
- Personal Rapid Transit (PRT)
- Village centers
 - Scooters
 - Bike share
- Cars will be smaller
- Automated parking ramps
- Recharging stations
- State funding/gas tax issues
- Transportation for seniors

c. Are there additional transportation services that we need to provide to serve existing and future populations and businesses in and outside of the city?

- Do more targeting for bus service
 - Such as to employment/businesses
- Park and Ride
- More walkability
- Transit services need to be dependable, reliable, senior friendly and affordable
- Collaborate and share services
 - Example: school buses are not used all day long
- Feeder bus lines (in conjunction with LRT)
- Looping bus system
- Intra-city (connections to neighborhood villages/nodes)
- Dial-a-Ride
- Bikes
 - Bike lanes
 - Bicycle parking/storage
- Trail/sidewalk connections
- Emerging modes
 - PRT
 - Segways

Exercise to Frame Issues for Policy Development

1. City Facilities

Discussion Questions:

- a. Should we plan for more intense development knowing that additional sanitary sewer and water facilities might be needed?
- b. Do we need to consider new options to accommodate new stormwater management requirements?
- c. How “green” do we want to go over the next 10 years?

2. City Services and Partnerships

Discussion Questions:

- a. What is the role of city government in 2017?
- b. What type of new services or expanded services will the city need to provide in the future?
- c. What type of public involvement and public interaction will the city need to prepare for in 2017?
- d. Are there other groups and agencies that the city will need to partner with to meet the needs of the future population groups in Minnetonka?

Comprehensive Guide Plan Steering Committee Item # 5 Meeting of December 13, 2007

Brief Description: Review and Confirmation of Issues/Priorities

Background

The purpose of the review and confirmation of the issues and priorities is to establish and “frame” items for the development of policies for the comprehensive plan. This step in the comprehensive planning process is extremely important because the identification of the issues/priorities provide the basis for city policy direction to guide future city actions. The policies, in turn, will assist in the designation of future land uses, the implementation strategies of the comprehensive plan and future service delivery planning activities.

The issues/priorities were developed from:

- responses of the steering and staff services committees to the issue exercises,
- input from various community groups (50th Anniversary committee, the Park Board, etc.)
- public input in response to information provided at the October City wide open house, the 11/7 comprehensive plan open house, city events and website feedback, and
- comments of the topical (senior housing, senior services, housing and families/schools/social services, to date) focus groups.

Additional issues/priorities to be gathered from other focus groups in December/January and the geographic focus groups and targeted open house areas will be presented to the steering committee at meetings in January and February.

The attached matrix is a listing of all the issues and priorities that have been gathered, to date, by various community groups in the city, as noted in the matrix legend. Several issues/priorities contradict each other, especially in the areas of residential density and overall development intensity, affordable housing and the level of natural resource protection.

The list may seem somewhat overwhelming; the comments represent all of the viewpoints received to date rather than a summary or ranking of input received by the city. The task of the steering committee will be to confirm, add to, modify or delete the items listed in the matrix. An exercise will be used at the December 13th meeting to assist the steering committee in screening the issues/ priorities.

After the steering committee has completed this work, staff will submit policies to the steering committee that address the issues/priorities for steering committee review. Please note that the staff services committee has also reviewed most of the issues/

priorities and has started the process to develop draft policies for review and revision by the steering committee.

A work session has been scheduled with the city council and other city boards and commissions for January 16th. The purpose of the meeting is to review the progress of the steering committee's work, the public input that has been received to date and to comment on the steering committee recommendations for the issues/priorities to be addressed in the comprehensive plan policies.

Discussion Points

- Are all issues listed in the matrix?
- Does the steering committee wish to investigate other topic areas that are not listed in the matrix?

Summary

The identification of issues/priorities marks the beginning of the work to develop the 2030 comprehensive plan. The issues/priorities have been developed based upon the earlier background information that the steering committee reviewed over the summer and fall months, and public input. A summary of the process to identify issues/priorities will be included as a section of the comprehensive plan document.

Originated by:

Ann Perry, Resource Strategies Corporation (RSC)

Summary of Issues and Priorities

Legend:

P:	Public (50 th Anniversary Committee, 4/30/07 Open House, Burwell Ice cream Social, 10/9/07 City-wide Open House, web-site feedback)	BC:	Park Board and EDA
SC:	Steering Committee	G-FG:	Geographic Focus Area Groups
SS:	Staff Services Committee	T-FG:	Topical Focus Area Groups
		CP/OH:	11/8/07 Comprehensive Plan Open House

A. Overall City Image and Services	Organization
Maintain low density residential character	SC, CP-OH
Maintain the look and feel of Minnetonka while still keeping it in good condition, without destroying it with new development	P
Limit the amount and intensity of development to avoid impacts of higher density living, traffic, retail, etc.	P, CP-OH
Keep the beauty of the city, less commercial development, fewer high rise apartments	P
All development activities should take place with the premise to stabilize residential neighborhoods.	P
Maintain remaining agricultural/open private land uses	P
Discourage additional new development	P, CP-OH
Maintain feeling of open space	SC
Promote "village" nodes (i.e. Baker/Excelsior & 7/101) and create other nodes	SC
The primary characteristics of the entire city should be maintained with changed land uses/density in certain areas	SC
Continue to focus on public safety, natural resources, green space and transportation.	P, SS, CP-OH

B. Attract, Support and Retain Residents	Organization
Change focus from seniors to families with services for young families i.e. family-friendly uses and city facilities	SS, CP-OH
Provide additional services to seniors to allow them to stay in home and city.	T-FG, CP-OH
Market the city as a family friendly place	SS
Plan for youth activities	CP-OH
Need good schools, accessibility to services, transportation choices and an age balanced community	T-FG, SS
The city should be competitive in retaining/attracting families	T-FG, P
Place importance on existing neighborhoods	SC, CP-OH

C. Housing	Organization
Maintain a diversity of housing types in the city.	T-FG, SC, SS
Need to recognize and retain a balance of housing price to maintain a healthy and	T-FG, SC, CP-OH

economically diverse community.	
The McMansion policy is important to maintain housing character in neighborhoods.	T-FG, SC, CP-OH
Housing needs to be dispersed and integrated in the greater community to avoid segregation of seniors and “boomers”.	T-FG
Existing housing types and values need to be protected.	T-FG,SC, SS, CP-OH

Lifecycle

Protect homes affordable to young families (i.e. starter homes)	P, SC, CP-OH
Develop or redevelop non-residential properties for residential homes	P
Encourage housing strategies to attract young families	T-FG,SC
Senior housing needs to be located near services	T-FG,CP-OH
Different types of housing (one-level townhomes, co-ops, independent living without services, continuum of care) are needed for empty nesters and the various senior age groups in the city	T-FG,P, SC, CP-OH
Need more single family homes for families, avoid high density	CP-OH

Affordability

The market should dictate the supply, type and cost of new housing	SC, CP-OH
The price of land in the city impacts the ability for affordable and mid-priced housing	T-FG,SC
Develop more affordable housing, including single family homes in the community, for young families, seniors, employees of Minnetonka businesses, etc.	T-FG, P, SC, SS, CP-OH
The city has a sufficient supply of affordable housing for our market area	P, CP-OH
Reduce lot sizes to encourage affordability	P, CP-OH
Mid-price and affordable housing is important to balance schools; kids need to be mixed and balanced as well	T-FG,SC
The city needs to provide education on the definition and benefits of affordable housing.	SC
Affordable housing should be dispersed throughout the city rather than concentrated	T-FG,SC
Middle income housing needs to be maintained in the City	T-FG, SC, CP-OH
Incentives for affordable housing are needed (i.e. density bonuses, other funding, property taxes) etc.	T-FG,SC
Due to the difficulty in affecting the private market place, the city should be considered a move-up community	SC
Encourage rental housing with affordable rental rates	T-FG,SC

Maintenance

Discourage demolition of older and smaller existing homes	P
Work with senior with deferred maintenance	T-FG
A point of sale inspection is needed to preserve affordable housing and maintain the quality of the housing stock	SC

D. Land Use and Development	Organization
Will have to “nibble” at change (single-family homes on large lots)	SC
Land use and design controls are needed on the edges of commercial areas to allow sensitive blending with neighborhoods and natural features.	SC
The city should encourage the increase of home values over time	SC
Make sure that city zoning ordinance allows a mix of uses—especially in walkable nodes	SC
Connectivity and walk ability between areas of the city is needed to lessen separation	SC, CP-OH
Consider transportation in new and planned developments	CP-OH
More mixed-use areas (new development or redevelopment) and overlay areas should be encouraged	T-FG, SC,CP-OH

Residential Neighborhoods and Land Uses

Maintain existing neighborhoods of single-family homes on ½ acre lots	T-FG, SC, P, SS
Smaller lots for housing should be provided in the city.	SC, CP-OH
Encourage subdivision of larger lots to accommodate new housing	P
Control the size of residential homes	T-FG,P
Develop strategies to keep quiet neighborhoods quiet	P
Balance residential density to offset open space preservation	P
More residential density in appropriate areas to offset low density areas.	SC
Look at providing residential land uses near schools	SS
Medium density and higher density residential should be encouraged in certain areas	SC
Allow higher density to accommodate future residential needs	T-FG, P, CP-OH
Limit the amount of high density residential land uses	P, CP-OH
Allow higher density residential land uses around community and neighborhood shopping areas	P
Higher density residential needs to be integrated as part of the larger area, in terms of design, connectiveness to transportation, open space, natural resources and other land uses.	T-FG, SC
Higher density residential should be encourage in the Opus, 7/101, Ridgedale, Minnetonka Boulevard/101 areas where transit and walk ability is available	SC
If higher residential density is allowed, the city needs to educate businesses and neighborhoods for the need	SC
The city should consider incentives for high density residential development	T-FG,SC
Higher density residential developers should be encouraged to think “outside the box”	SC
Allow higher density where traffic can handle it	CP-OH
Promote neighborhood identity.	CP-OH

Business Land Uses

Limit the growth of retail areas	P
Discourage “big box” development and provide commercial areas where small business and shops may locate	P
Locations for non-traditional development are needed i.e. services for home based businesses, etc.	P
Additional family oriented restaurants are needed	P, CP-OH

More retail stores dealing with athletic equipment are needed	P
Areas for businesses should be encouraged to accommodate "clean" service industries and small/medium sized businesses	SC, P
Areas should be planned for mixed uses	T-FG, SC, CP-OH
Consideration should be given to "green" business corridors (similar to Denver), such as Opus, where "green" technology/businesses/bioscience.	SC, P
Additional area for small businesses, inc. medical facilities for sr's., should be considered around village nodes, i.e. Mtka. Blvd./CR 101	T-FG,SC
Neighborhood-scale retail uses should be provided.	SC, P, CP-OH
The business areas should be able to accommodate uses where people can congregate and socialize	SC
Need to recognize and support pockets of dense business development	SC
Make sure areas of commercial land uses are in designated areas and not spread throughout	SC
May need to change role of city to attract businesses i.e. business retention and recruitment programs, incentives, etc.	SS
Businesses desire more density, visibility, easy access, affordable housing for employees, transportation, provide services convenient for employees.	SS
No more business "magnet" areas	CP-OH

Development Aesthetics

Existing neighborhoods should be buffered from highway and non-residential land uses with trees and boulevards.	CP-OH
Brick is a nice building material and already existing on old buildings.	CP-OH
Design guidelines are needed for businesses to encourage cohesive design and identity. It looks more organized and like a small town.	CP-OH
Promote outdoor art in the city	CP-OH

E. Redevelopment

Organization

Use redevelopment strategies to build affordable housing	T-FG,SC
Positive incentives (density bonuses, tax incentives) are needed for housing redevelopment	T-FG,SC
The city needs a redevelopment vision with as much specificity in terms of city desires.	SC
Housing redevelopment activities should be pursued along transit corridors	T-FG,SC
Focus redevelopment on new housing products.	SC
The city should actively promote redevelopment	P

F. Corridors/Focus Areas (Additional Comments to Be Added)

Organization

<u>I-394</u>	
The I-394 corridor should be the "showcase" business corridor	SC
Ridgedale should be more accessible and safer for pedestrians	CP-OH
<u>Minnehaha Creek</u>	
The creek corridor should be a high priority for continued enhancement	P, CP-OH
Canoe rentals are needed	P, SC

Prevent residential development and preserve areas along Minnehaha Creek	CP-OH
<u>TH 7</u>	
A visual "image" should be developed and promoted for TH 7	P
Development on the NW corner of TH 7/I-494	P
CR 101 should extend under TH 7	CP-OH
Guidelines are needed to lend a more cohesive appearance to the businesses along Highway 7.	CP-OH
<u>Opus</u>	
Opus is an area appropriate for tall buildings	P
Structured parking should be encouraged within Opus	P
<u>Glen Lake</u>	
Lower density in the Glen Lake area	CP-OH
No more development in Glen Lake	CP-OH
Other Focus Areas (Shady Oak Road, Mtka. Blvd./CR 101	

G. Natural Resources and Environment

Organization

Natural Resource Programs

The preservation and enhancement of natural resources is strongly valued.	SC
Continue to encourage natural resource preservation with new developments.	SC, CP-OH
Priority should be on preservation of natural resources and landscape guidance with new development.	SC
Need a reasonable balance between natural resources and residential living environments. How much should the city protect?	SC, SS
Balance open space with private property rights	P
The half-acre lot size serves to preserve natural resources although generally, does not support mid-priced and affordable single family homes.	SC
Lessen requirements for natural resource protection to obtain more affordable residential land development	SC
City is leader in protection and ordinances need continual review to ensure high standards of protection.	SC, SS, CP-OH
Create incentives and programs for residents to maintain natural resources	SC, SS
Expand natural resource preservation enforcement activities	P, SS

Woods and Vegetation

Maintain woods and trees	P, CP-OH
Continue to develop education, programs and strategies to eliminate invasive plants/species and provide guidance on landscape practices.	SC, SS, CP-OH

Water Resource Protection

Need to preserve water features such as Minnehaha Creek, Lake Minnetonka, and other water and wetland features	SC, CP-OH
Protection of water quality is important and programs are needed to avoid non-point pollution (water from streets, weed killers/green lawns, etc.)	SC, CP-OH
Emphasis should be placed on clean lake water (i.e. Wing Lake and Spring Lake)	P, CP-OH
Increase density to protect wetlands, etc.	P

The city should use greater protection efforts to restore water quality	SC
Sustainable stormwater technology should be required for all development	SC, CP-OH
Preserve aquifers	CP-OH
Allow individual homeowners to alter wetlands on their own property	CP-OH

Green Technologies and Energy Conservation

Use green technologies	P, CP-OH
The market place should regulate the use of “green” technology rather than the city.	SC
City role should be as an advocate/facilitator in the education, use and incentives for the use of “green” technology	SC, SS
City should set an example for use/demonstration of “green” technology in the maintenance and construction of city facilities	SC, SS
City ordinances should allow and offer incentives if certain “green” standards are utilized	SC, SS
Need to determine if “upfront” costs justify the long-term investment?	SS
Is the community committed to being “green” and how much are they willing to pay for it?	SS
Tax credit for some green building techniques	SS
The city should explore the use of wind energy	P
Require energy conservation in all developments and city activities	SC

H. Transportation

Organization

Develop and widen roads	P
Improve roads even though people complain, when funding is available	P
Keep bike trails from becoming LRT routes	P
Increase number of sidewalks and bike lanes and facilities (parking/storage), especially along major routes, and look at walk ability as part of the transportation system	T-FG,P, SC, SS, CP-OH
More sidewalks needed near Elementary schools.	CP-OH
Widen the County Rd 73 in Minnetonka and Plymouth as a unified project	P
Consider the impacts of gas prices, congestion, global warming, cultural changes etc. in planning the city’s transportation system.	SC, CP-OH
Encourage the use of alternatives and emerging modes of transportation (personal rapid transit, scooters, Segways, bike shares, recharging stations, automated parking ramps in planning the transportation system and constructing new facilities.	SC
Consider changing parking requirements for the use of smaller cars.	SC
Plan the transportation system to support village centers	T-FG,SC
Plan for more senior transportation needs that are dependable and affordable and consider driving habits in roadway design and enforcement activities.	T-FG,SC, SS, CP-OH
Additional bus service/facilities are needed especially for employment/business areas, to “loop” through the city, serve seniors and connect to village nodes.	T-FG,P, SC, SS, CP-OH
Dial-a-Ride and Metro Mobility services need to be improved	T-FG, SC, CP-OH
Make sure there are trail/sidewalk connections from neighborhoods to the transportation system.	T-FG,SC, P, SS
Additional MnPass lanes may be required	SS
Regional traffic on local roads are problems for public safety/works services	SS
Should consider local roadway impacts due to increased traffic and congestion	SS

I. Planning for LRT	Organization
Use transportation corridors for LRT	P
Promote and be a leader with LRT	P, CP-OH
LRT should "tie" areas of higher residential density and intensity	SC
Plan for new land uses and intensities along LRT routes	P
Increase residential density (apartments/condominiums) along LRT corridors	P
Need for a "village" node around the LRT station - mixed-use, higher density residential and more intense business development where LRT is available	SC, SS
Should plan for affordable housing near LRT routes.	SC, SS
Make sure there is connectivity (i.e. busses, park/ride) to LRT	SC
Change zoning to encourage "transit oriented development" and land uses (i.e. support uses, retail, office, hotels and entertainment) at LRT stations.	SC, SS
Consider the need for public safety, school and other services needs to be included in consideration of LRT and LRT station areas	SC, SS
Plan for a younger age group (pre-family, singles, young adults) around LRT stations and services and land uses that support that lifestyle (rest., nightlife, etc.)	SS
Need to manage other transportation systems near LRT - parking ramps and intersections	SS
Need for new police/fire and increase in services (i.e. rescue, LRT violations, etc.)	SS

J. Parks and Open Space	Organization
Continue to maintain and develop parks/trails	P, CP-OH
The number of parks is sufficient, but the demographics are changing so there may be a need for a different type of community park, such as playfields, dog parks, etc. and services	SC, P, B&C
Accessible, smaller parks (neighborhood size) are needed in certain areas, including mixed use areas.	SC
Additional active park facilities (indoor and outdoor) within underutilized parks should be planned in the city to meet seniors, families with children and other age group needs.	SC, SS, B&C
Generally, no new parks are needed although some areas are underserved	SC, B&C
Park, trail, open space renewal and maintenance activities should be continued on a regular basis.	SC, P
The city should acquire additional open space under public ownership or control	SC
Park improvements are needed to address climate change impacts (e.g., with warm weather lasting well into the fall, consider lighting outdoor tennis and basketball courts for early evening use).	B&C, SS
The trail system needs to be expanded to meet the growing senior needs	SC, P
Linkages are needed between parks, facilities and trails as well as to neighborhoods, commercial areas and LRT.	SC, B&C
Acquisition of corridors to link the parks and schools.	CP-OH
Promote recreational activities at schools and publicize community use of city facilities	SC, SS
Need to create recreation linkages and cooperation with others (businesses/health insurance) but recognize the difference between private and public facilities.	SC, SS
More community space such as parks, gathering spaces should be provided in east Minnetonka	P
Provide community gathering center like in Golden Valley	P
Need to rethink community centers and recreation facilities for seniors and "boomers"	T-FG
Need for new Williston center to accommodate family orientation, programs for changing	SS, B&C

demographics, families, adult programs	
Need to balance activities for younger families/older families and young adults i.e. play areas, nature center, trails for year-round use, working w/schools to use resources	SS, B&C
Addition of events that contribute to a sense of community (e.g., festivals, cultural events).	B&C

K. City Services and Partnerships

Organization

Maintain strong police and fire department	P
Land use choices and burdens should be considered in light of impacts and management of city service delivery.	SC, SS
Need for partnership with Metro Transit with LRT and transit	SS
Need for partnership with other cities for recreation/services/infrastructure and other programs	SS
Need for partnership and collaborations with schools and non-profits for programs, inc. seniors and immigrants, and sharing of facilities	T-FG,SC, SS, B&C
Increase on services due to computer and internet technology	T-FG,SS
Need to respond to increase demands as a result of aging population, i.e. ambulance service, etc.	T-FG,SS
Change of service delivery and new partnerships due to fuel prices, national/regional water shortages and technology changes, etc.	SS
Need to promote partnerships with federal and regional agencies due to information demands and reallocation of services	SS

L. Communication and Public Involvement

Organization

Use of technology to increase public interaction and disseminate timely information	SS
City involvement in collaborative activities	T-FG,P
Need to encourage seniors in city, school, non-profit services	T-FG
Need for greater responsiveness due to technological changes	SS
Broaden services to accommodate changes in population - immigrants and cultural	T-FG, SS
More educational services to residents	SS

Staff Services Committee Responses

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
General		
1. What brought you to work for Minnetonka and why have you continued to work for the city?		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Culture • Opportunities • Reputation • Always new challenges - never boring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar to Group 1 • Challenging opportunity • Good intern program • Courted by City Manager • Rewarding • Sophisticated population • Want to expand experience with wetlands • Close to home • City's culture remains challenging and evolves enough to keep us going • People • Professional work environment • Values natural resources - put our money where our values lie 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job opening • Location • Position/job responsibilities • Work environment • Resources/technology available • Work/life balance • Shared values
2. Are there sufficient services and community assets to make you want to stay employed in Minnetonka for the next 10 years?		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transportation will be a problem 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes - at the council's will • If the community continues to value the reason we are here, then yes, but with the understanding that could change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes - job growth, receptive to change, training opportunities, EIA employee programs, innovation
3. What can we do from a city perspective to influence the demographics in the community? If yes, what role should the city have to influence demographics?		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More diverse housing stock • Maintaining housing stock 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes - services we provide: businesses, housing available transit/transportation, actively recruit businesses, business retention program, role of EDA may/should change to actively recruit developers for projects, tax incentives, educating citizens/ preparing citizens for changes in density to strengthen "buy in" prior to development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technology/services • Housing choices • Affordable housing has a negative connotation - should consider word choice or inform people exactly what "affordable housing" is • Retail/commercial
4. If current trends continue, what implications do you see for the city in the next 10 years?		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Empty mansions or converted to ADUs, mother-in-law suites, or other residential uses 	

- Grow technology model e.g. green roofs, solar energy, wind, etc.
- Transportation - mass transit, local service

5. What assets and services are important for Minnetonka to retain and/or promote families in the community?

- Recreation
- Schools
- Non-profits
- Change focus to families vs. seniors - attract water park and entertainment for young families, incorporating family-friendly businesses and city facilities
- Develop affordable housing to allow families to live here
- Market MTKA as a family friendly place
- Study market value around schools
- More active recreation - less passive
- More pedestrian friendly and bike friendly (not just trails, but sidewalks and neighborhoods)

6. What type of community do you think residents and businesses want to be in the future?

Residents

- large lots/low density

- Businesses: more density, visibility, easy access

Residents

- public safety,
- natural resources and green space,
- low density, no change in the neighborhood "my neighborhood is established"
- Businesses: survey them annually, affordable housing for employees, transportation needs, provide services convenient for employees

Residents

- Good schools!
- Location of services
- Transportation choices
- Parks and recreation
- Age balanced community
- Neighborhood feel
- Businesses: accessibility to transportation, airport

7. How "green" do we want to go over the next 10 years?

- Real green but realistically will be tough - could use ordinances and incentives for residents

- Depends - can upfront cost justify the long-term investment?
- How committed is the community to being green - are they willing to pay for it?
- Tax credit for some green building techniques

- People will go as "green" as they want to go
- Depends on cost
- Would benefit city infrastructure
- Citizens should be given a choice - should not be mandatory or forced upon them

City Services and Partnerships

1. How will the role of city government change in 2017?

- More information available to residents
- More mandates from state/federal government for: land use, water conservation, green technologies
- Less discretion for environmental and land use
- More competition from private organizations esp. w/recreation
- Play a larger role in encouraging alternative transportation
- Regulations will increase
- More demands for services
- Higher expectations - sophistication and complexity
- Shift in how services provided i.e. flex hours
- More government and higher expectations
- Facilitate information exchange
- Need to know more to accommodate demands

2. What type of services will the city need to provide in 2017?

- More services to combat cyber crime
- Ambulance services
- Management of Wi-Fi services
- Change of services due to fuel prices - more electronic mail, etc.
- Water export to other states
- Continue with basic services but contract for value-oriented private services
- Conservation services
- Ability to sustain high drinking water demand
- Cooperative efforts
- More green technology - i.e. recycling of grey water
- More educational services
- More feedback on web site
- Use of "thinking" technology
- Reallocation of services for ex. Identity theft
- Rely more on other departments
- Put more burdens on development and private sector
- Internet will be safer due to greater safeguards
- Partnerships with other agencies and cities
- Citizen expectation that services will be faster
- Gas prices higher and will need to respond
- More impersonal communication

3. After construction, what impact will LRT have on land uses and services in Minnetonka?

- Greater density/mixed land uses
- Change in demographics around stations- pre-family, singles, young adults
- Need for services for pre-family (rest., nightlife, etc.)
- Manage other transportation systems near LRT - ramps, P.R.T.
- Higher density
- Affordable housing opportunities
- Public safety and school impacts
- More density
- Mixed uses
- Service demands will increase similar to Cedar Lake Rd/CR 73 area - more crime, congestion, etc.

- New police/fire and other services i.e. rescue, LRT violations

4. What are the transportation conditions or services that will affect residents and businesses in Minnetonka over the next 20 years?

- Driving habits of elderly
- Increase of congestion
- Gas prices will determine impacts
- More congestion
- More MnPass lanes
- Higher reliance on mass transit
- Regional traffic on local roads and problems for public safety/works services
- Local roadway impacts
- System will more closely resemble inner ring suburbs

5. What type of public involvement and public interaction will the city need to prepare for in 2017?

- Use of technology to increase public interaction and demands on staff to facilitate
- Need to adapt to residents that are tech-savvy
- Citizens more savvy, better educated
- Loss of "big picture" because of individual needs
- Need for greater responsiveness
- More accountability and specificity
- Maybe "economically" gated community - will we be able to affect change or control?
- Ability to answer more complex questions will be an issue

6. Are there other groups, cities and agencies that the city will need to partner with to meet the needs of the future population groups in Minnetonka?

- Metro Transit
- Partner with communities and agencies - i.e. JPO's and JPA's esp. for water consumption
- More partnerships with private sector
- Other cities for recreation/services/infrastructure and other programs
- Need to promote partnerships with federal agencies
- Schools - partner with for programs to ease financial burdens
- Share services with other cities

Parks/Open Space and Natural Resources

1. Should emphasis be placed on certain park activities and facilities over the next 10 years?

- Need for new Williston center to accommodate family orientation, programs for changing demographics, families, adult programs
- Yes, need to balance for younger families/older families and young adults i.e. play areas, nature center, trails for year-round use, working w/schools to use resources
- Need balance for all age groups - emphasize specialty activities
- Play lots are probably passé
- Respond to climate changes i.e. should we shift emphasis on ice rinks to something else?

2. How actively should we promote health and fitness in our park and recreation programs?

- Need to increase partnerships
- Already promote activities
- Just by providing facilities, we

with schools, to include programs that fill voids - healthy living, etc.

are providing a benefit

- Promote workers health/wellness activities and provide outreach to workers

3. Are natural resources being sufficiently protected? Why or why not?

- We do more than other cities, but could do more with programs and ordinances
- Need to work on water supply issues
- We are great on education, but need to work on enforcement
- No - but yes compared to other cities
- We do more than most cities
- Need to establish balance
- How much should the city protect?

4. To what level, should we incorporate natural resources into private and public community development activities?

- Balance with housing affordability
- Promote greener technologies
- Don't want to mandate protection - work on incentives/disincentives and develop programs
- Work on providing education
- Educate residents
- City has provided standards for affordable housing, why not natural resources?
- Survey businesses to determine needs
- Seek out demonstration opportunities

D. Comprehensive Plan Discussion

Barone provided background on the city of Minnetonka's process for developing a Comprehensive Guide Plan update to the Metropolitan Council by September, 2008. She explained that input for the plan update is being received through several venues including a steering committee that is providing ongoing direction and oversight throughout the process. Barone noted that an open house to receive resident input is scheduled for November 8 from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m.

As part of the input process, Barone requested park board input related to a series of four questions presented to the board relating to parks, open space, facilities and the promotion of health and fitness in our recreation programs.

The park board listed the following areas as important considerations for the Comprehensive Plan update.

- The continued addition of parks in areas of the city deemed to be underserved.
- Continued expansion of trails and neighborhood connections to meet community needs.
- The addition of new amenities and services in our park systems and facilities to meet the changing needs and interests of our community. The addition of shuffleboard at Wilson Park was cited as an example, along with plowing park trails in the winter and expansion of hockey leagues for adult women.
- Park improvements and recreation program changes designed to meet the needs of the baby-boomer generation.
- Park improvements that address climate change impacts (e.g., with warm weather lasting well into the fall, consider lighting outdoor tennis and basketball courts for early evening use).
- Continued expansion of athletic fields through partnerships to address expanding needs and programs.
- Improvements to the Williston Fitness Center to meet current demands and those expected in the future. A request was made to explore potential partnerships.
- Addition of events that contribute to a sense of community (e.g., festivals, cultural events).

Barone thanked the board for their input and noted that updates related to the Comprehensive Plan process will be provided at future park board meetings.