

**MINUTES OF THE
MINNETONKA PARK BOARD
July 17, 2002**

1. Roll Call

Park Board Members: Jim Calkins, Diane Hayden, Paul Lehman, Bob McFarlin, Lanise Stufft, Steve Watkins and Sue Woodrich were present. Attending staff was Geralyn Barone, Chris Handrahan, Dave Johnson, Craig Sinclair and Perry Vetter. Chair Watkins called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

2. Approval of Minutes

Hayden moved and Calkins seconded a motion to approve the minutes of June 5, 2002 as amended. All voted "Yes." Motion Carried.

3. Business Items

a) Discussion of Providing/Funding Art in the Park System

Johnson provided an overview and summarized the results of a staff survey conducted with five other metro communities. Johnson noted that common themes voiced by other communities included: What art is appropriate?; How is art and landscaping defined?; and how do cities meet the challenges of providing public accessibility to public art projects while providing security?

Woodrich noted that the Park Board's decision to review the issue of art in the park system was based on the Meadow Park Parks Renewal discussion at the June 5, 2002 meeting. She questioned whether a Task Force should be established to review the issue.

Watkins indicated that the appointment of a task force might be a possibility, and added that the Park Board may also be able to work with existing art organizations within the community.

Stufft questioned if the City provides any existing arts related programs. Johnson noted that the Arts Center (Jointly owned by District 276 and the City) provides space for the performing arts. He added that the City also provides a "Music in the Parks" program, and an assortment of arts & crafts related programs through Recreation Services.

Barone suggested that the Park Board define its intent of community art, beginning with landscape art. She suggested asking – How far does the City go?

Calkins voiced agreement with comments made earlier in the discussion by Woodrich. He questioned why the Park Board would consider funding public art in the park system.

**MINUTES OF THE
MINNETONKA PARK BOARD
July 17, 2002**

Woodrich indicated her lack of support for funding public art as part of the CIP process. She noted that if asked to prioritize, she would prefer adding or enhancing park amenities.

Watkins noted that, to some degree, the City already funds visual art through architectural enhancements and decisions made to City facilities. Calkins responded that facilities serve a function while visual art may not. Vetter noted options being explored to correct storm water runoff at Ford Park as an example of how landscaping improvements can also be artistic, yet still serve a specific purpose.

Stuft commented that to her knowledge, one resident has indicated a desire to add art amenities to the park system. She questioned why the Arts Community has not voiced requests for City consideration.

Hayden added that art could be functional noting benches constructed using natural materials. Woodrich voiced concerns related to maintenance and vandalism of natural amenities.

Watkins framed the discussion into two points for consideration. 1.) To what extent should the Parks Renewal process be providing art, and 2.) Should future commissions become involved in providing and/or recommending public art?

Calkins suggested that artistic amenities need to be functional with cost trade-offs clearly defined. He added that a community-based group to determine needs and collect contributions would be of community benefit. Calkins indicated he would not support the use of public funds for art that did not serve a function.

Watkins acknowledged that he felt the use of public dollars to fund art would be difficult for the community to support. Woodrich suggested using the Parks Renewal process as a system for reviewing how artistic amenities could be incorporated into park projects. She added that the function each amenity would serve and the cost trade-offs of each could be reviewed as projects became available for review.

Stuft noted that the Park Board is interested in beautifying the park system and should take into consideration any amenity enhancements that also add beauty.

Hayden and Watkins added support for providing artistic amenities that are not cost prohibitive.

Vetter indicated that throughout the Parks Renewal process, staff would evaluate artistic amenities versus functional art.

**MINUTES OF THE
MINNETONKA PARK BOARD
July 17, 2002**

Barone indicated that she would review previous projects the City has completed that involved the concept of art (example: Community Center) and report back to the Park Board at a future meeting.

Watkins concluded the discussion by directing staff to look for artistic amenity enhancement opportunities throughout the Parks Renewal process.

b) Review of Potential Skate Park Facility Locations

Handrahan provided an overview of information provided in the staff report. He noted that the request of the Park Board, staff had identified seven potential locations for the addition of future skateboard parks. The sties included five city parks (Oberlin, Linner, Meadow, Civic Center, and McKenzie) as well as Bennett Family Park and Minnetonka Middle School East (MMSE).

Woodrich questioned what was driving the need for additional skate parks. Handrahan indicated that the City had received a petition requesting a new park at MMSE which was discussed at the May 1, 2002 Park Board meeting. Handrahan continued by saying that the Park Board requested that staff schedule a discussion for a future meeting regarding the need for skateboarding amenities throughout the City. Johnson added that the Glen Lake Skate Plaza has proven to be a well-used facility, however access to the Glen Lake site by youth living outside of the Glen Lake area is difficult for youth riding bikes or walking to the site. As with other recreational amenities, Johnson noted that skateboarders would like access to facilities at various parks located throughout the City.

Lehman added his desire to provide a skateboarding facility in each ward located in the City.

Handrahan proceeded by noting the advantages and disadvantages for each location identified by staff.

McFarlin indicated concerns for the Bennett Park location noting the parking is a major concern at the site. He added that any potential areas that could be used for a skate park would be better utilized for parking.

Lehman noted that while MMSE might be a good location, he had concerns that there were no commercial establishments near by for youth to access. Lehman added that businesses located in the Glen Lake area add to the excellent environment in Glen Lake.

McFarlin asked if the need for additional facilities is driven by skateboarding related problems that exist throughout the City. Johnson noted that the Glen Lake facility did address problems in the area, however current requests are

**MINUTES OF THE
MINNETONKA PARK BOARD
July 17, 2002**

related more to accessibility needs for those residents who don't live near Glen Lake.

Watkins asked each member to indicate their preference for possible future sites.

McFarlin indicated MMSE and the Civic Center as his preferred locations based on accessibility to both locations.

Calkins supported MMSE and locations that currently have paved ice rinks if the demand for more sites can be proven. Calkins added that school sites seem to make the most sense and asked staff to study demographic information possibly available throughout the school district.

Lehman identified MMSE as a primary site based on trail access to the location. He re-emphasized his desire to have concessions or an area business in close proximity.

Woodrich preferred MMSE and the Civic Center site subject to a review of user numbers at Glen Lake. She requested that staff review problem areas identified by complaints received by the City to determine which locations within the City would benefit the most.

Hayden preferred the MMSE and Civic Center sites and requested that the subject of skateboarding be included in discussions for all park renewal projects.

Stufft indicated initial interest in the Bennett Park location prior to hearing McFarlin's concerns related to parking. She expressed support for both MMSE and the Civic Center locations.

Watkins indicated that MMSE was his preferred location and expressed concern over the potential cost of providing a park at the site if a paved area was needed.

Johnson informed the Park Board that staff would research options with the Minnetonka District for a skateboarding location at MMSE and develop cost estimates for a site at the Civic Center in the ice area "B" parking lot. In addition, staff will work with the Police Department to determine if any areas of the City are experiencing skateboard related problems and research demographics to see where concentrated populations of youth reside in the City.

c) Discussion Regarding Libbs Lake Beach Neighborhood Meeting Results

Vetter provided an overview of resident concerns regarding the operation of Libbs Lake Beach that came up at the March 28, 2002 Parks Renewal neighborhood meeting. Vetter noted that while the purpose of the renewal meeting was to discuss capital upgrades, those in attendance focused more on

**MINUTES OF THE
MINNETONKA PARK BOARD
July 17, 2002**

improving use and management of the park, primarily rules that relate to fishing and parking at the site.

Vetter indicated that fishing related problems include people fishing within the designated beach area, broken fishing line and lures littering the site, and discarded fish within the park and adjacent private properties left by people who fish the site. Vetter noted that adjacent neighbors would like to see fishing prohibited in the park.

Parking related problems centered around a lack of enforcement of parking stickers.

Hayden asked if those fishing at the site were primarily from the neighborhood. Watkins provided his opinion that most were, with a large number of youth from the area also fishing in the park.

Woodrich voiced concern about prohibiting fishing at Libbs Lake Park.

Calkins stated that removing fishing at the site would not eliminate the problem because people could still fish in boats from off shore.

McFarlin noted that he was uncomfortable reacting to input from residents attending a neighborhood meeting, stating that the ability to fish at Libbs Lake is a benefit to the entire community and noted that he had not observed fishing related problems at Libbs Lake. McFarlin suggested that a community meeting be conducted regarding fishing at Libbs Lake so that all sides can be heard.

Watkins suggested that attempts to increase enforcement of park regulations at the site be made prior to conducting a community meeting.

Direction was provided to staff to work with the Police Department to increase enforcement and discuss resident concerns at the next Parks Renewal meeting for Libbs Lake Park.

d) Minnehaha Creek Canoe Landings

Watkins introduced the item and informed the Park Board of problems related to the use of existing rock vein canoe landings at Minnetonka Mills and Burwell Parks. He explained that, as constructed, entrance into the landings is extremely difficult. He added that due to the small boulders that were used to construct these landings, high water levels make the landings ineffective and washouts have occurred. Watkins noted that the landings were constructed jointly with the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District (MCWD).

**MINUTES OF THE
MINNETONKA PARK BOARD
July 17, 2002**

Woodrich asked if the MCWD would participate in funding any improvements. Calkins noted that the agreement included with the staff report includes language stating that both the City and MCWD will participate in maintaining the landings (Section 2E). Calkins added that the MCWD plans to construct additional landings on the creek outside of the city limits and wants to make any required adjustments to ensure the landings are functional.

Calkins recommended that staff investigate the cost of making needed changes to the landings and contact the MCWD with a request to proceed.

Sinclair indicated that he would work with contractors to develop cost estimates for making the improvements.

e) Review of 2002 Park Board Action Steps

Johnson provided a status report of the 32 action steps the Park Board has developed for 2002. Each action step was identified as having been completed, in progress, or has not been addressed to date. All action steps were developed in line with the Park Board's three designated goals for 2002.

Related to the goal "To Renew Parks", Calkins inquired about what the Park Board's role will be in planning improvements to Headwaters Park. Calkins noted that redevelopment of this site is scheduled for 2003 with Parks Renewal improvements slated for 2006.

Watkins suggested moving the Headwaters Parks Renewal planning to 2003. Vetter indicated that this change could be accommodated in the schedule.

Barone informed the Park Board that she would review the Park Board's request for involvement in the project with the Engineering Director and report back to the Park Board in August.

The Park Board expressed appreciation for the progress made on 2002 action steps to date.

4. Park Board Member reports

Lehman thanked Sinclair and his staff for correcting electrical problems at the GAL field in Glen Lake Park.

McFarlin expressed appreciation to Sinclair and his staff for the excellent condition at Big Willow baseball field #4. In addition, he requested that staff look into alternative options for flooring in the baseball batting cage that would allow hitters to use their cleats while hitting.

**MINUTES OF THE
MINNETONKA PARK BOARD
July 17, 2002**

Woodrich noted that the Hilloway Park trail includes a steep incline that may need to be signed. Sinclair indicated that the segment has been signed in the past and will check to see if the sign has been removed. Woodrich added that a section of the trail was damaged and marked for repair, but has yet to be corrected.

5. Informational Items

No additional items were discussed.

6. Upcoming Park Board Agenda Items

The Board reviewed the upcoming 6-month meeting schedule and added the next skateboarding discussion for the September 4th meeting.

7. Adjournment

McFarlin moved and Stufft seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:04 p.m. All voted "Yes." Motion Carried.