

**MINUTES OF THE
MINNETONKA PARK BOARD
April 3, 2002**

1. Roll Call

Park Board Members: Priscilla Bue, Jim Calkins, Diane Hayden, Paul Lehman, Bob McFarlin and Steve Watkins were present. Attending staff was Geralyn Barone, Dave Johnson, Mike Pavelka and Perry Vetter. Chair Watkins called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

Lehman moved and Calkins seconded a motion to approve the minutes of March 6, 2002 as submitted. All voted "Yes". Motion carried.

3. Business Items

a) Open Space Preservation

Barone reported on two recent developments. She noted that staff has been meeting with the Minnesota Land Trust (MLT) to see if they are willing to assist the City in preserving open space. The MLT receives donated land or conservation easements for property owners in exchange for tax benefits and long-term preservation. Barone reported that the MLT then works with property owners to assure that when property is secured, the landowner continues to uphold the environmental features of the property.

The second update that Barone provided involved two of five parcels located on Highway 7 that are currently active from a potential development perspective. These parcels are identified as # 29 and #31 on the open space priority list. Barone noted that in situations when a developer has indicated a desire to develop the property, the cost to the City to protect the land has the potential to become inflated. A decision the City will need to make in these cases involves either paying the higher price or working on a conservation development option with the developer.

Scott Sirovy, a local developer who owns one of the parcels identified as #29 was in attendance. Calkins asked if the 1-2 parcels from the five located at the Highway 7 location impacted the rest of the property. Barone responded that if the City was to acquire one or more of the properties, the remaining parcels may be placed as a higher priority to protect. Calkins responded that two options could develop in such cases, noting that the City may be willing to pay a higher price for the remaining parcels, or the opposite could occur with the higher property secured, the remaining parcels could be reduced in value.

**MINUTES OF THE
MINNETONKA PARK BOARD
April 3, 2002**

Bue questioned what the open space value was for the Highway 7 parcels. Barone responded that the parcels were of value primarily for viewshed purposes. Watkins added that the area is very visible from Highway 7.

Sirovy noted that he was in attendance to gain a perspective on where the City was in the open space process.

Watkins asked if staff has an estimate for the funds needed to secure parcels indicated as "high priority" on the priority list. Barone responded that an exact amount is not known, and added that the timing of negotiations and the method used to protect the space will determine the cost to the City.

Barone reminded the Board that several options exist for protecting open space including the outright purchase, conservation easements, conservation development techniques, and purchasing development rights. Calkins cautioned that the longer the City waits to secure a property, the more expensive the property will be.

McFarlin asked Sirovy if, as a property owner, he views his parcel purely from a business standpoint. Sirovy responded that he has been working closely with the Planning Department on several potential plans for the property and currently favors a plan that would include town homes and the use of a conservation development technique. The plan could possibly include options for low-income housing as well. Sirovy concluded by saying that the higher the density, the greater the return on his investment. He indicated that he is concerned to some degree that his plans will be closely scrutinized because the property is included as a priority by the City to protect. He added that he is interested in reviewing all options for the property including those from neighbors who have indicated an interest in purchasing the property.

Watkins indicated that he feels the City needs to aggressively pursue high priority parcels. However, the Park Board concurred the price paid by the City must be reasonable. In the case of the parcels along Highway 7, the Board felt higher priority properties throughout the City should be acquired first if the cost of the Highway 7 parcels is too inflated.

McFarlin asked if the current priority map includes all developable parcels located in the City. Barone indicated it did not, noting that many parcels under two acres in size are not included.

b) Review of park development agreement with Faith Presbyterian Church

Johnson explained four significant changes negotiated into the agreement since the Park Board last reviewed this item in October of 2000. These changes included section 4.4e regarding capital replacement costs; section 5.2 pertaining

**MINUTES OF THE
MINNETONKA PARK BOARD
April 3, 2002**

to the termination clause; section 7.4 involving construction claims; and section 8.1 which reduced the length of the agreement from 20 to 15 years.

Lehman suggested that section 4.5 read “as soon as reasonably possible”. In addition, he questioned whether the agreement should include language to protect the City in case the property was found to be contaminated in any way. Johnson noted that both comments would be forwarded to the City Attorney for consideration.

McFarlin inquired as to funding for this project. Johnson noted that \$60,000 was carried over from the 2001 CIP for this project.

Hayden moved and Bue seconded a motion to approve the revisions to the agreement as negotiated by staff. All voted “Yes”. Motion carried.

c) Gray’s Bay Public Access boat slip lottery application process

Pavelka provided an introduction noting that staff had developed a draft lottery application and timeline for the Park Board’s consideration. He noted that, if adopted by the Park Board, the deadline for lottery applications would be August 23, 2002 and the lottery would be conducted at the September 4, 2002 Park Board meeting.

Lehman questioned why applications could not be faxed and suggested that this option be added. Pavelka responded that faxed applications could be incorporated into the process.

Watkins requested language be added that made it obvious that only residents of the City of Minnetonka are eligible. Hayden suggested that information critical to eligibility be noted as mandatory to complete.

McFarlin suggested that information included in the draft application, that was not relevant to the actual lottery, be eliminated and included as part of the lease agreement if the applicant is selected.

Calkins suggested that a comment section be added to the applications so that applicants can provide any questions or comments they have regarding the process to the City.

McFarlin questioned the reasoning for having the lottery conducted at a Park Board meeting. Johnson explained that staff’s recommendation was intended to provide a public forum that could not be construed as unfair. It is staff’s intent to televise the lottery and devise a system that ensures that all applicants are

**MINUTES OF THE
MINNETONKA PARK BOARD
April 3, 2002**

treated fairly. He added that the Park Board, serving as representatives for all residents, would serve as an impartial party to conduct the lottery.

Bue suggested, and Watkins agreed, that the lottery should be conducted in an alternate location such as the Council Chambers.

Calkins questioned the two payment dates of December 2002 and January 2003 that were recommended by staff. He suggested that the first-half payment be due along with the lease on October 4, 2002, and the second-half payment be due by January 10, 2003.

Johnson summarized changes recommended by the Board, which included:

- Add fax option for return.
- Add a signature clause (residency, knowledge of operations plan).
- Note mandatory information.
- Remove "non-relevant" information from form.
- Provide a comment section.
- Adjust payment due dates to October 4, 2002 and January 10, 2003.

Pavelka noted that the recommended changes would be made to the form and schedule. He noted that applications will be mailed by May 1 to interested residents, and continue to be made available until the August 23 deadline.

d) Review of Parks Renewal play equipment vendor selection criteria

Vetter provided an introduction noting that staff's recommendation is to pre-qualify play equipment vendors interested in bidding for park renewal improvements. He noted that to complete this process, staff has developed a list of criteria for which each vendor would be evaluated. Vetter explained that the benefits of using pre-qualified vendors include a quicker and more efficient process, and a wide variety of equipment.

Calkins asked if having a limited number of pre-qualified vendors could potentially raise the average bid. Vetter explained that a similar system was used for the new O&M facility and was successful. He added that the process would still provide ample competition between those vendors who qualify.

Hayden noted that a wide selection of equipment was important and voiced support for the pre-qualification process.

McFarlin noted that where possible, it will be important to use criteria that are measurable and specific. Vetter indicated that this had been taken into account when developing the staff recommended list. Vetter added that a point system will be implemented to grade the vendors interested in the process.

**MINUTES OF THE
MINNETONKA PARK BOARD
April 3, 2002**

Bue moved and McFarlin seconded a motion to recommend the selection process developed by staff for pre-qualifying play equipment vendors for projects scheduled for 2002 and 2003. All voted "Yes". Motion carried.

e) Review of Park renewal website

Vetter reviewed information to be included on a new Park Renewal Website. He explained that when activated, residents will have access to all content related to the parks renewal projects including meeting notes, upcoming meeting locations and times, and view updated plans for projects in the works.

Once activated, Vetter noted that the site will be able to be accessed at eminnetonka/parksrenewal.com Vetter added that contractors assisting the City in the completion of various projects will also be able to access the site to provide updated design and equipment schematics.

The Park Board expressed appreciation for the extent of work put in by staff to design the site and suggested no changes.

4. Park Board Member reports

None

5. Informational Items

In addition to the items included in the Park Board's packet, Barone provided an update on negotiations for a park in the Sunrise Ridge neighborhood. Barone reported that the State will review a new proposal from the City to place a park in the area where the Minnetonka Circle cul-de-sac currently exists. She added that the county has indicated a willingness to allow storm water runoff from 494 to be collected on the County property located to the north of Minnetonka Drive.

Barone concluded that City, County and State representatives will continue to work on the new concept and keep residents informed of any progress.

Johnson reported that the Natural Resources Stewardship Volunteer program, cancelled on April 1 due to snow, has been rescheduled for May 7.

6. Upcoming Park Board agenda items

The upcoming 6-month schedule was reviewed with no changes or corrections made. Watkins reminded the Board of the April 25 Earth Day/Arbor Day event scheduled for Purgatory Park.

7. Adjournment

Bue moved and Calkins seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:25 p.m. All voted "Yes". Motion carried.