

1. Roll Call

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

Chair Lambert called the official meeting to order at 7p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

Lambert noted one typo correction. Goodyear moved and Puspoki seconded a motion to approve the meeting Minutes of March 2, 2011. All voted "Yes." Motion carried.

3. Citizens Wishing to Discuss Items Not on the Agenda

None.

4. Business Items

A. Approval of Park Renewal Concept Plan for Oberlin Park

Chair Lambert asked Perry Vetter, Assistant Public Works Director, to provide a staff report on the Oberlin Park renewal planning process. Vetter informed the board that Oberlin Park was classified as a neighborhood park, approximately 14.7 acres in size and located in the northeastern portion of the city. He noted that neighborhood meetings were held on February 9, and March 9, 2011 in order to obtain resident feedback.

Vetter followed with a review of targeted improvements including:

- Improve the trail surface (done in conjunction with street overlay project)
- Improve and relocate the playground area with separate 2 – 5, 5 – 12 and swing appropriate activities
- Improve and relocate the ½ basketball court to work with full court system
- Upgrade the tennis and basketball court playing surfaces
- Improve and provide ADA access to the playground
- Improve seating areas around playground and trails
- Remove concrete piers that are tipping
- General amenity enhancements

Vetter asked for feedback from the park board members.

Seveland asked if a divider is provided to separate the two basketball courts. Vetter responded there was not a divider; however a backboard post pad is included to protect anyone in case they run in to the pool. He noted that the exterior of both the tennis and basketball courts would be fenced.

Seveland asked what the trail surface is proposed to be. Vetter responded that the existing surface is a combination of crushed aggregate and pavement; however the entire trail would be paved as part of the project. Seveland asked what type of pavement is used, and does the city allow the use of cold tar sealants. Vetter indicated that the trail would be paved with two layers of bituminous pavement and that while cold tar sealants are not banned, the city does not use them.

Goodyear asked if there were any drainage related corrections that needed to be made at Oberlin Park. Vetter indicated that there were no drainage problems, however noted that Oberlin is part of the areas overall storm water management system. Goodyear asked if this has caused any problems in the past. Vetter indicated that there have been some street related issues but not park related issues.

Hearing no further questions from the park board, Lambert opened the floor to public comments. Hearing none, Lambert closed the floor to public comments and asked for a motion from the board.

Gallagher asked if there was any water available at the park. Vetter indicated that there was. Gallagher asked if signage from primary streets and roads could be added, noting that Oberlin can be difficult to find. Vetter noted that he would check with the County to see if a sign off of Hopkins Crossroads could be added. He noted that he would report back to the board.

Goodyear moved and Acomb seconded a motion to approve the park renewal plan for Oberlin Park and develop a long-term maintenance plan for the site. All voted "Yes." Motion carried.

B. Approval of Park Renewal Concept Plan for Mayflower Park

Lambert asked Vetter to provide a staff report on the Mayflower Park renewal planning process. Vetter informed the board that Mayflower Park was classified as a mini park by the city's standards, and was approximately 3.5 acres in size. He noted that neighborhood meetings were conducted on February 9, and March 9, 2011 in order to obtain resident feedback. Vetter explained that the park renewal process includes direct mailings to residents living within 1,500' of the park, noting that this exceeds the city's 400' minimum requirements.

Vetter followed with a review of targeted improvements including:

- Improve trail accessibility within the park
- Renovate the existing play structure (2012)
- Enhance accessibility and seating area/deck
- Remove modified full court basketball and replace with half court adjustable
- Split rail fencing to delineate park boundaries
- Add engineering warning signs of playground ahead
- Increase landscaping for future shading of the play areas
- General amenity enhancements

Vetter noted that park board Acomb attended at the second neighborhood meeting.

Raarup asked if there was ample shade in the play and picnic areas. Vetter noted that trees would be transplanted and planted to improve shade long-term. In addition, design enhancements could be incorporated into the plan to provide shade for needed areas.

Lambert noted that the park description indicated the need for more play equipment and asked how that would be accomplished. Vetter noted that the play equipment selection process includes a separate meeting where those interested (children, parents, grandparents) could assist in selecting the equipment. He added that this is typically broken into two play areas, one for ages 2 – 5 and one for ages 5 – 12.

Goodyear noted that the POST plan recommended a connection to Hilloway Park and asked if that existed. Vetter indicated that it did not, however on-road access was available. Vetter indicated that there is nothing planned in the way of an off-road connection at this time.

Hearing no further questions from the park board, Lambert opened the floor to public comments. Hearing none, Lambert closed the floor to public comments and asked for a motion from the board.

Gallagher moved and Raarup seconded a motion to approve the park renewal plan for Mayflower Park and develop a long-term maintenance plan for the site. All voted “Yes.” Motion carried.

C. Presentation of Adaptive Recreation Services agreement with Reach for Resources

Ann Davy, Recreation Services Programming Division Manager, explained that the city of Minnetonka has an adaptive recreation programming agreement with Reach for Resources (RFR) to provide both programming and inclusion services for residents with special needs. Davy introduced Becca Stenzel, Director of Recreation and Inclusion for RFR.

Stenzel provided background on RFR, noting that REACH is an acronym for Recreation, Education, Advocacy, Counseling and Health, all services provided by RFR. She explained that RFR has both education and counseling departments and has been in existence since 1986 with a long history of contracting with Minnetonka.

Stenzel reported that in 2010, RFR provided 101 different programs; and received 301 registrations from Minnetonka residents. In addition, eight children with special needs benefitted from inclusion services provided by RFR so that they could participate in programs offered through Recreation Services.

Stenzel asked park board members for feedback.

Lambert asked if RFR was a service provider for Hennepin County. Stenzel explained that they were not, but instead contracted with two consortiums of cities, one being Minnetonka, Hopkins, Chaska, Chanhassen and St. Louis Park. Lambert asked if participants paid a fee and Stenzel responded that they do, with scholarships also being available.

Goodyear asked for an overview of program growth over the past few years. Stenzel reported that over the past 6 years, programming staff have added 15 – 20 new programs designed to meet current trends in programming and the interests of participants.

Hearing no further questions, Lambert thanked Stenzel for her time and the programs and services offered by RFR.

D. Update on Adopt-A-Sign Program

Kathy Kline, Senior Services and Facilities Secretary, provided an update on the Adopt-A-Sign program from the initial board meeting held on February 2, 2011. Kline reported that to date, 23 volunteers have signed up to maintain 25 gardens at park signs throughout the city.

A discussion initiated at the February 2, 2011 meeting, included the need to recognize volunteers. Kline provided the board with a sample recognition sign that could be placed at each garden, and asked for their review and comments.

Acomb voiced support for the sample presented, and asked how residents interested in the program could check on availability. Kline indicated that residents could contact her directly, or by checking the City's website.

Acomb indicated that she did not feel the Adopt-A-Sign name was the best fit for the program. Kline agreed and noted that she has referred to the program as the Adopt-A-Park Sign program which has seemed to provide newcomers with a better understanding. Acomb indicated that she liked that description better.

Puspoki asked if the city is required to maintain any signs. Kline reported the city is not, and added that signs not adopted are not maintained for the season.

Puspoki asked if the volunteer recognition plates could also be used to advertise signs currently not adopted. Kline indicated that this would be a possibility and she would check into it.

Lambert asked how many signs were not adopted in 2010. Kline's response was 6-7. Lambert suggested contacting the Hennepin County Master Gardeners organization for possible interest if signs are not adopted. Kline indicated that this was a good suggestion.

Raarup agreed that the Adopt-A-Sign name was not descriptive of the program and suggested using gardening in the description. Kline responded that with several gardening clubs and the community garden plots that are provided by the city, describing the program as "gardening" may become confusing. She noted that with the program already in progress for 2011, she would take the park board's suggestions for changing the name of the program into consideration for 2012.

Lambert indicated that using "park sign" as a description is much better than simply "sign".

Hearing no further comments or questions, Lambert thanked Kline for the work she has done on the program.

5. Park Board Member Reports

Puspoki noted that he and his family recently became members of the Williston Center. He noted that he was surprised that his two young children enjoyed the play pool more than the large pool available at the previous facility they belonged to.

6. Information Items

In response to the scholarship fund report provided in the packet, Lambert asked how donations are made to the fund. Johnson explained that the city's share of the Hennepin County Active Living initiative go towards the scholarship fund, as well as proceeds from the sale of neon products at the Summer Festival and general donations received with individual registrations. He noted that the latter option has been reduced over the past few years due to the increase in on-line registrations. Acomb asked if the option for donating on-line is available. Johnson indicated that he was not sure and would check to see if that option remains on-line.

7. Upcoming Park Board Agenda Items

The board reviewed the upcoming 6-month meeting schedule and made no changes.

8. Adjournment

Lambert adjourned the meeting at 8:05 p.m.