

1. Roll Call

Park Board members in attendance included, Patty Acomb, Kyle Gallagher, Tim Goodyear, Denny Lambert, Marvin Puspoki, Elise Raarup, and Patrick Robben. Staff members in attendance included Geralyn Barone, Dave Johnson and Perry Vetter.

Chair Robben called the meeting to order at 7 p.m.

Robben welcomed new member Marvin Puspoki to the park board.

2. Approval of Minutes

Lambert moved and Goodyear seconded a motion to approve the meeting Minutes of February 3, 2010. All voted "Yes." Motion carried.

3. Citizens Wishing to Discuss Items Not on the Agenda

Nikki Slatkin, a staff representative from the Hopkins School District requested that students from North Junior High be allowed to present a request to ban the use of tobacco in city parks. Slatkin explained that students in the Students Promoting Positive Actions (SPPA) program have been working all school year on a plan to meet with Hopkins and Minnetonka City officials to consider policy changes that prohibit use of tobacco in the parks. She noted that the SPPA had previously met with Dave Johnson, Recreation Services Director who suggested they request to be added to the May meeting agenda for consideration by the park board.

Slatkin introduced Karissa Wentzel who explained the objectives of the Tobacco-Free Youth Recreation organization. Wentzel provided statistics on increased tobacco use and risks from exposure of second-hand smoke, and explained that over 100 communities have enacted resolutions or ordinances in support of no tobacco use in city parks.

Johnson provided some background on the issue noting that the park board was approached back in 1998 by a non-profit organization requesting the city adopt a no tobacco policy for the park system. Citing concerns related to the city's ability to enforce a tobacco ban covering all city parks, the park board rejected the request and instead provided youth organizations using the parks the option of providing and enforcing tobacco free policies at their events. In addition, the park board adopted a no tobacco policy for Shady Oak Beach operations.

Lambert asked if the request was for Minnetonka parks only. Slatkin responded that the students were interested in policies for both Minnetonka and Hopkins parks and would be working with the Hopkins Park Board in upcoming weeks.

Robben indicated that the subject would be worth reviewing, and added that an understanding of how a policy would be enforced would be beneficial.

Puspoki added that information on what the other 100+ cities have done in the way of enforcement would be helpful.

Robben asked if there were resources available for funding signage. Wentzel indicated that her organization does provide signs for cities that enact policies.

Barone asked if the SPPA program included only Hopkins North Junior High students. Slatkin responded that the program was recently expanded to Minnetonka High School and added that the two organizations will be working collaboratively on the policy request.

The park board directed staff to include a presentation on the issue from the Hopkins North Junior High SPPA and Tobacco-Free Youth Recreation for the May 5, 2010 meeting.

4. Business Items

A. Consideration of the 2011 – 2015 Capital Improvements Plan

Perry Vetter, Parks, Trails and Buildings Division Manager, introduced the item noting that the park board annually reviews the Park Dedication portion of the city's CIP to develop project recommendations for the city council. Vetter provided a detailed summary of recommendations previously provided from 2007 – 2014 categorized in four areas; New Construction; Existing Rehabilitation; Athletic Fields not owned by city; and Building Maintenance/Systems Planning.

Vetter reviewed the following projects:

- Athletic Field Improvements
- Burwell House Improvements
- Miscellaneous Trail Connections
- Trail Rehabilitation
- Trail Improvement Plan
- Trail Segments – Unfunded
- Park & Trail Investment Plan
- Upper Minnehaha Creek Corridor
- Archery Range – Unfunded
- Parks, Open Space & Trails Plan (POST) Update - Unfunded
- Oakhaven Park Improvements Phase II - Unfunded

Lambert questioned what was included in trail rehabilitation. Vetter responded that it could include a surface overlay, mill and overlay, or complete repair including the sub-surface and repave.

Robben inquired about the POST Plan update and asked what that entailed. Vetter responded that 98% of the cost was related to consultant time. Barone added that staff

was currently researching the possibility of converting to a web-based document. Robben supported the concept of a web-based system, noting that it seems like the only way to go.

Goodyear indicated that he felt the POST Plan update should be a priority.

Robben requested an update on Oakhaven Park and asked if there were any indications for use by the neighborhood. Vetter responded that 25 – 40 families actively use the park, noting that the park was developed with the immediate neighborhood as the main priority.

Goodyear questioned if the improvements included in the Oakhaven Park Improvements – Phase II, listed as unfunded, could be split up and phased in. Vetter indicated they could.

Raarup asked if residents in the Oakhaven area had been provided a timeline for improvements. Vetter responded that a timeline had not been developed, only a future plan.

Goodyear indicated that he felt the priority listed for Athletic Field Improvements should be changed from a priority 3 rating to a priority 2, due to funding that will now be collected from users as part of the fee process developed. Barone noted that previous joint projects with school districts were listed as a priority 3, and agreed that city projects could be listed as a priority 2.

The board spent an extended amount of time reviewing 94 potential unfunded trail projects for consideration in the 2011-2015 CIP and developed the following list of 10 projects for highest priority:

1	South Frontage Rd - Ridgedale Dr to CR 73
2	Greenbrier Rd - CR 73 to Cedar Lake Rd & to local trails
3	CR 5 - Oakridge Rd to HWY 169
4	Minnetonka Dr - Williston Rd to LRT/McGinty Rd
5	Hutchins Dr - CR 101 to Old Excelsior Blvd
6	CR 5 - The Marsh to Fairchild Ave
7	CR 3 - Glen View to I-494 (IHM)
8	CR 3 - Pioneer Rd to Nelson/CR 61
9	CR 4 - CR 3 to Glen Lake Blvd
10	CR 60 - CR 5 to CR 3

Lambert indicated that he was concerned that so many projects required to be listed as unfunded and asked if there were other available resources for funding. Vetter indicated that one possibility might be a further expanded use of the Community Investment Fund (CIF). GERALYN BARONE, Assistant City Manager, added that the city council will review the CIP in May and also consider expanded uses of the CIF.

Raarup notes that she felt residents may have concerns with so much funding going towards trail projects when the city's streets are also a concern.

Gallagher asked if trail projects are ever completed using city crews. Vetter responded that several projects are completed internally, also some using both city and outside resources.

Hearing no further comments, Goodyear moved and Lambert seconded a motion to adopt recommendations for the 2011 – 2015 CIP as developed by staff with the following changes; consider future trail links using the priority list reviewed by the park board; funding the POST Plan update over a two-year period; funding Oakhaven Phase II improvements over multiple years; and changing the Athletic Field Improvements Priority from a priority 3 rating to a priority 2 rating. All voted "Yes". Motion carried.

5. Park Board Member Reports

Acomb noted that she attended the Non-Point Education for Municipal Officials (NEMO) Workshop and found it beneficial.

6. Information Items

No additional items were discussed.

7. Upcoming Park Board Agenda Items

The board reviewed their upcoming 6-month schedule and cancelled the April 7, 2010 meeting and rescheduled it for May 5, 2010. In addition, the annual park board tour of parks and trails was rescheduled to May 19, 2010.

8. Adjournment

Gallagher moved and Goodyear seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:27 p.m. All voted "Yes". Motion carried.