

**MINUTES OF THE
MINNETONKA PARK BOARD
October 2, 2002**

1. Roll Call

Park Board Members: Jim Calkins, Diane Hayden, Paul Lehman, Bob McFarlin (7:16 p.m.), Steve Watkins and Sue Woodrich were present. Lanise Stufft was excused. Attending staff were 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

Watkins noted a correction on page 2 regarding Sunrise Ridge Park. Information regarding a "1-1/3 basketball court" was corrected to read a "1/3 basketball court". Calkins noted a typo on page 3. Lehman moved and Hayden seconded a motion to approve the Minutes of September 4, 2002 as amended. All voted "Yes". Motion carried.

3. Business Items

A.) Discussion with Hopkins and Minnetonka School Districts regarding potential options for a common field scheduling system

Johnson provided an overview of the item and reviewed a summary of potential advantages and barriers to a common scheduling system that staff had outlined.

Johnson introduced Ted Sauer, Community Education Director for the Hopkins School District, and Dan Kuzlik, Community Education Director for the Minnetonka School District. He noted that both were in attendance to provide their organizations perspective to the Park Board's desire to incorporate a common scheduling system.

Sauer indicated that keeping a future goal in mind of providing a common working system, he felt a positive initial step might include the ability for each organization (two school districts/City) to "look-up" field availability through a computerized link. Sauer noted that all three organizations currently utilize the same scheduling software program making a look-up option possible.

Lehman noted that airlines use a similar technique for scheduling flights.

Kuzlik indicated that he appreciates the desire of the Park Board to work collaboratively to schedule facilities more efficiently. He added that the discussion regarding a common system was important. Kuzlik voiced support for Sauer's recommendation to incorporate a look-up option for each organization's staff to utilize. He added a recommendation for all scheduling staff to meet on a regular basis to share related experience and practices.

Kuzlik noted that the process for scheduling space is complicated by several factors including organizations that shop for space, and multiple municipalities

**MINUTES OF THE
MINNETONKA PARK BOARD
October 2, 2002**

in each School District, noting that Minnetonka School District serves 10 communities. Kuzlik felt that a common system might help to control or monitor those organizations that shop for space.

Hayden indicated an interest in a look-up or read-only schedule. She added that the ability to share this information would benefit both scheduling staff and facility users.

Woodrich asked Kuzlik to explain his District's relationship with other municipalities. Kuzlik noted that as an example, Minnetonka Community Education schedules fields owned by the City of Shorewood. Sauer added that while Hopkins Community Education primarily serves the Cities of Minnetonka and Hopkins, other cities such as Golden Valley also utilize District facilities.

Lehman indicated that he had previously represented the GAL organizations when meeting with the Hopkins School District for space. He asked if other organizations that Hopkins Community Education serves would be interested in the capability of a common system. Sauer indicated that it would most likely depend on the group, noting that some may view the possibility as a disadvantage. Sauer added that the ability to view what access each organization has to fields across City and District lines might help to control those organizations that may abuse the system. He added that the District's current "meet and confer" process provides a similar check and balance capability.

Sauer reiterated that while a view-only system would seem to provide a benefit, a common scheduling system would present concerns it implemented at this time.

Kuzlik added that the complexities of scheduling space requires the scheduler to know the inter-relationships with the requested facility and other adjacent facilities.

Pavelka indicated that a view-only arrangement could possibly be implemented through web access. Watkins asked if staff was aware of any cost implications for such an arrangement. Johnson indicated he did not, but could consult with the city's IT staff.

Johnson questioned whether either District would require formal approvals if a web-based look-up system for facility availability was implemented. Both Kuzlik and Sauer indicated that the issue would require them to provide an informational report to their respective Boards.

**MINUTES OF THE
MINNETONKA PARK BOARD
October 2, 2002**

Barone questioned if the proposed look-up system would be available for indoor and outdoor facilities. Johnson, Sauer and Kuzlik agreed that the system would be most beneficial for outdoor facility use.

Lehman requested that staff review options and potential costs for implementing a shared look-up system for outdoor facility scheduling and report back to the Board. Hayden added that she supported the concept and felt such a system would help maximize use of facilities.

Calkins questioned if there is actually open facilities available for scheduling. He added that implementing this look-up system might help clarify if facilities are actually going unused, and also assist in the potential planning of future facilities by determining the needs of the facility uses.

Watkins requested that staff continue discussions with both Districts regarding a common look-up system for the scheduling of outdoor athletic field space and report back to the Board at a future date regarding potential costs associated with the option.

B.) First review of a designated use policy for athletic fields

Johnson provided an overview of a draft policy staff developed to address athletic field use and maintenance levels within City parks. Johnson indicated that while policies for fields at Big Willow and Guillian Parks are in place, other athletic fields do not have formal policies. Johnson noted that staff has managed use of several fields in the city based only on past practices.

Lehman questioned if the draft policy would also detail the use of auxiliary structures available at athletic fields such as concession stands and batting cages. Johnson responded that organizations receiving use of athletic fields for operation of their programs are required to sign a Use Agreement outlining use and liability requirements. He added that this Use Agreement included reference to any related structures or amenities associated with the field, however the addition of this information into the draft policy would be beneficial.

Lehman asked how the use of "dedicated fields" (as described in the draft policy) was monitored to ensure other uses were not taking place. Johnson responded that in most cases, dedicated fields were located in parks such as Big Willow that are regularly monitored by either city staff or organizational representatives. He added that during non-use times/seasons, fields are either locked or signed to inform people that the field is not available for use.

Lehman noted that the draft policy indicated that dedicated fields generally received a higher level of maintenance than non-dedicated fields, and asked if staff outlined maintenance levels. Johnson indicated that maintenance levels

**MINUTES OF THE
MINNETONKA PARK BOARD
October 2, 2002**

for fields are managed by Public Works with no formal policy currently in place. He added that adoption of a policy defining use levels could be followed by management guidelines for field maintenance if the Park Board requested so.

McFarlin asked what problems would be addressed if the draft policy were adopted. Johnson provided two examples, the first being a clear policy on the use of fields such as in Glen Lake Park where historically, the GAL and GLMM programs have received priority use; and the second being a set policy to address what is now considered off-season requests for field use such as a request for summer soccer use on a field that traditionally has been maintained for baseball.

McFarlin indicated that he felt the intent of the policy was good and would allow for the primary users of fields to be more efficient in their scheduling.

Calkins suggested that staff incorporate all existing policies into a single comprehensive athletic field use policy. Johnson noted that this option was considered by staff initially and could be easily done. Watkins agreed with Calkins suggestion noting that a single policy would be much easier to understand.

Johnson noted that staff would combine the intent of the draft policy with other field policies and agreements currently in place. He added that the comprehensive field use policy would then be brought back to the Park Board for review at a future meeting.

C. Status report on potential skateboarding locations

Vetter reviewed the potential cost range of \$89,000-\$143,000 for providing a new facility at Minnetonka Middle School East (MME). Vetter noted that costs included paving, fencing, drainage needs and equipment. Vetter added that these costs were only estimates because soil conditions at the site were unknown and, if poor, could result in additional costs.

Johnson reviewed a discussion held with District representatives regarding a joint effort to develop a skate park at MME. He noted that the District is interested in providing the land only, and that no funding was available for equipment, maintenance or supervision. These areas would be the responsibility of the City if the project were completed. In addition, Johnson noted that the District requested that the City conduct all public meetings for the project.

McFarlin indicated that he supported a project at the site, noting that access by the trail system would be a benefit.

**MINUTES OF THE
MINNETONKA PARK BOARD
October 2, 2002**

McFarlin questioned if the District had any plans to utilize the skate park for physical education classes if constructed. Johnson indicated that the District had not made this request.

Johnson asked for Board input on an additional facility on Civic Center grounds. Calkins questioned whether both sites were needed and recommended not developing a park at the Civic Center. Other Park Board members agreed.

Watkins directed staff to include funding in the draft 2004-2008 CIP for the Park Board to review at the February 2003 meeting. The Park Board directed staff to schedule the project in the earliest possible year that funding allowed.

4. Park Board Member Reports

No additional reports were provided.

5. Information Items

In addition to the information provided in the Park Board's packet, the following information was provided.

Glen Lake Park

Tom Mooney of the Glen Lake Mighty Mites (GLMM) updated the Park Board on his organization's request to construct a storage facility at the park to house a new lawn tractor. Mooney indicated that the GLMM had contacted the Optimists and GAL programs to determine if they had any needs or concerns about their request. Mooney noted that the only feedback received was on interest by the Optimists for space to store equipment used in the Optimist's annual holiday tree sale.

Johnson noted that staff had concerns regarding the conflict a permanent facility may have with the 2005 parks renewal planning process for Glen Lake Park. He added that a temporary or movable structure would reduce any concerns staff had.

Watkins questioned if there might be a better location for the facility that would not impact park renewal planning. Mooney indicated that the Public Works Director preferred the proposed location, adjacent to fields #2 and #3.

Watkins suggested that staff meet with Mooney to review the Glen Lake Park Master plan developed approximately five years ago to see what impact the proposed location would have.

The Board expressed support for letting the GLMM's construct a permanent building with the understanding that they would be responsible for any costs related to changes as a result of the Park Renewal process.

**MINUTES OF THE
MINNETONKA PARK BOARD
October 2, 2002**

Johnson indicated that staff would meet with Mr. Mooney to determine the GLMM's desired location and building type.

Headwaters Park

Calkins asked when Headwaters Park was scheduled for renewal. Vetter indicated that the project had been moved up to 2003 to coincide with Libb's Lake improvements. He added that notification would be sent out to the neighborhood, Task Force representatives, MCWD, and County.

Open Space

Barone informed the Board that the Council would review strategies for securing open space acquisitions at their October 21 study session. Barone provided an overview of potential properties and potential wetlands to be utilized including the use of conservation easements, purchase, and development rights.

4. Upcoming Park Board agenda items

The Board reviewed alternative dates for the November and December meetings due to scheduling conflicts and project review schedules. No official changes were made.

Items included to the 6-month calendar included a second review of the GLMM request to construct a storage facility in Glen Lake Park, and a review of the comprehensive athletic field use policy to be developed by staff.

McFarlin requested a summary of Gray's Bay lease returns when available.

7. Adjournment

Woodrich moved and Calkins seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:28 p.m. All voted "Yes". Motion carried.