

**Commission
Members:**

Darrell
Baggenstoss
Ronald Bole
Philip Gelbach
Luke Heikkila
Gregory Hoag
Terrance Newby
Nancy O'Brien
Jerry Stoner
Cynthia Warzecha



**Parks and Recreation
Commission Agenda
Tuesday, September 5, 2017
City Council Chambers
6:30 PM**

Address:
2660 Civic Center Dr.
Roseville, MN 55113

Phone:
651-792-7006

Website:
[www.cityofroseville.com/
parks](http://www.cityofroseville.com/parks)

1. Introductions

1.I. Meeting Notes For September 5, 2017

Documents:

[V. 2NOTES - SEPT 2017 - V.2.PDF](#)

2. Public Comment Invited

3. Approval Of Minutes Of August 3, 2017

Documents:

[8.MINUTES - AUGUST.PDF](#)

4. Comprehensive Plan - Master Plan Review And Update - Sections 5, 6 And 7

Documents:

[P_R HOMEWORK PDF.PDF](#)

5. Park Dedication Method Discussion

Documents:

[PARK DEDICATION METHOD.PDF](#)

6. Prepare For Joint Meeting With Ramsey County Parks And Recreation Commission

7. Possible November Meeting Location Change

8. Ongoing Topics

8.I. Cedarholm Community Building Replacement

Documents:

[CEDARHOLM RCA - ALL.PDF](#)

8.II. City Council Joint Meeting Review

Documents:

- 8.III. Commission Education Primer
9. Staff Report
10. Other
11. Adjournment

Roseville Parks and Recreation
"Building Community through People, Parks and Programs"

To: Parks and Recreation Commission
From: Lonnie Brokke
Date: August 30, 2017
Re: Notes for Commission Meeting on Tuesday, September 5, 2017

1. **Introductions**

2. **Public Comment Invited**

3. **Approval of Minutes of the August 3, 2017 Meeting**

Enclosed is a copy of the minutes of August 3, 2017. Please be prepared to approve/amend.

Requested Commission Action: Approve/amend meeting minutes of August 3, 2017.

4. **Comprehensive Plan – Parks and Recreation System Master Plan Review and Update**

The Parks and Recreation System Master Plan Goals and Policies are in the review process as part of the City Comprehensive Plan update. These will eventually substitute those currently in the Parks, Open Space and Recreation Section in the Comprehensive Plan.

The enclosed spreadsheet is the review process that you arrived at in your May 2, 2017 meeting, which lists the Goals and Policies and then indicates whether to keep, delete or revise.

A review of Goal and Policies #1 was at your June 6, 2017 meeting.

A review of Goals and Policies #2, #3 and #4 was at your August 3, 2017 meeting.

A review of Goals and Policies #4, #5 and #6 will be at this meeting (September 5, 2017).

A re-review of all sections will occur in October for final review and recommendation.

These Goals and Policies are relatively recent and were developed by the Community and adopted by the City Council in 2010 as part of the Master Plan update.

Requested Commission Action: Review/Comment on Goals and Policies #4, #5 and #6

5. **Park Dedication Method Discussion**

This is a topic that the City Council was interested in the Commission's review and recommendation.

The Commission had a lengthy discussion at the August 3, 2017 meeting (please reference draft minutes). It was felt that because there were three Commission members absent from that meeting, a brief review of the topic was in order for this meeting for any additional input.

The Commission discussed the benefits of the current method using comparisons of surrounding cities, the Master Plan and the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). Specifically, that it seems appropriate, clear, concise, and understandable. Other cities use the same method.

The Commission reviewed the systematic League of MN Cities Method. They commented that it seems complex and may allow more room for interpretation/negotiation.

Overall, the Commission felt comfortable using the current method. However, it was generally felt that it might be helpful to use the League of MN Cities Method as an additional guide, possibly calculating comparisons every couple of years.

The current Park Dedication rate for residential is 10% of the land or \$4,000 per unit. For non-residential, the rate is 5% of the land or 10% of the FMV. There was discussion at the City Council level and at the Commission about making the commercial land amount the same as the commercial FMV amount.

The Commission typically reviews the Park Dedication Rates annually for any adjustments. The last review and recommendation was in November 2016 (see attached 2016 rate comparisons) when the Commission recommended an increase in the Residential Park Dedication rate from \$3,500/unit to \$4,000/unit and an increase in the Commercial Park Dedication rate from 7% FMV to 10% FMV. It may be appropriate to remain the same in 2017/18 except to equalize the land FMV as has been discussed (making the commercial land amount 10% which is the same as the FMV cash amount).

In your packet for your reference is the park dedication ordinance and the Leagues of MN Cities Methodology outline and comparisons of a residential and commercial development. **Requested Commission Action:** Review, discuss and consider recommendation on method.

6. **Prepare for Joint Meeting with Ramsey County Parks and Recreation Commission**

As we have discussed, a joint meeting with the Ramsey County Parks and Recreation Commission will occur at your regularly scheduled October 3, 2017 meeting.

This is an opportunity for you to provide suggestions on topics of interest for the meeting with the goal to narrow the list to two or three topics.

Topics to consider may include areas of common interest such as deer management, dog park, Josephine Park and McCarron's Park (the two parks in Roseville that Ramsey County owns and operates), trails or outreach programming . Ramsey County is also interested in understanding where each agency is at in the Comprehensive Plan process.

Benefits and outcomes anticipated include improved communications and relations, increased awareness, discovery of resources available, and perspective sharing from a broader group.

Requested Commission Action: Provide feedback, suggestions and topics of interest for the joint meeting with the Ramsey County Parks and Recreation Commission

7. **Possible November Meeting Location Change**

Your meeting date for November is set for Thursday, November 2, 2017 due to the election on your regular Tuesday meeting date (November 7, 2017).

Thursday, November 2, 2017 is also the Master Plan Open House for 2132 Cleveland Avenue at Fairview Community Center beginning at 6 p.m.

This item is for you to consider the possibility of moving the Parks and Recreation Commission meeting to Fairview Community Center for that evening to allow Commissioners to attend the open house and convene to a Parks and Recreation Commission meeting after, as needed.

Requested Commission Action: Consider moving the November 2, 2017 meeting to the Fairview Community Center as part of the 2132 Cleveland Avenue Master Plan process

8. Ongoing Topics

I. Cedarholm Community Building Replacement Update

The Request for City Council Action presented to the City Council on August 14, 2017 is in your packet.

Based upon all the work completed and the bids received, the City Council approved moving forward with the low bid from Jorgenson Construction. The contracts are finalized and the project is underway with preliminary set ups.

The Golf Course will remain open during construction in temporary quarters that is set up on site.

Staff will plan to provide you with an update at your meeting.

This topic is a regular agenda item each month in order to keep the Commission updated, allow for continued community input, and to gather advice.

Requested Commission Action: Review, update, provide feedback.

II. Follow-up to City Council Joint Meeting

A review of this item was at your August Commission meeting; however, with three Commission members absent, Commission members felt that it is appropriate that it be an agenda item again for final review at this meeting.

Included in your packet are the minutes of that meeting for your reference.

Requested Commission Action: Review and discuss.

III. Commission Education Primer

Chair Gelbach and Vice Chair O'Brien are interested in and have been working on a "primer" for current and future Commissioners. This is an education tool to assist new and existing Commission members with history and knowledge.

Gelbach and O'Brien will review their efforts with you at the meeting.

Requested Commission Action: Review, update, provide feedback.

9. **Staff Report** - Other new or relevant communications will be provided as necessary.

10. **Other**

11. **Adjourn**

1 **ROSEVILLE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION**
2 **DRAFT MEETING MINUTES FOR**
3 **August 3, 2017 6:30pm**

4
5 **PRESENT:** Baggenstoss, Bole, Gelbach, Hoag, Stoner, Warzecha
6 **ABSENT:** Heikkila, Newby, O'Brien
7 **STAFF:** Brokke, Christensen
8
9

10
11 **1. INTRODUCTIONS**
12

13 **2. ROLL CALL/PUBLIC COMMENT**

14 Chair Gelbach announced that Heikkila, Newby and O'Brien notified staff prior that they
15 would not attend. No public in attendance.
16

17 **3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – June 6, 2017 MEETING**

18 Commissioner Hoag moved to approve the June 6, 2017 meeting minutes. Commissioner
19 Warzecha seconds. Motion passed unanimously.
20

21 **4. PARK DEDICATION METHOD DISCUSSION**

22 Staff provided a history of Park Dedication in Roseville and updated the Commission on the
23 current Roseville method. Current Roseville rates in residential areas is 10% of land or
24 \$4,000 per unit. Non-residential areas is 5% of land or 10% of Fair Market Value (FMV).
25

26 As part of the Subdivision Code discussion, it was suggested that the non-residential rate be
27 the same at 10% for both land dedication and cash dedication. As a result, the City Council
28 asked that staff review and evaluate the League of MN Cities Sample Park Dedication
29 Methodology with the Parks and Recreation Commission.
30

31 Chair Gelbach inquired on what the role of the Commission will be in reviewing the League
32 of MN Cities methodology. Staff confirmed that the City Council will be looking for
33 thoughts and a recommendation on what might be best for Roseville.
34

35 Staff provided a step-by-step walk through of examples of the League of MN Cities 7-step
36 methodology for determining Park Dedication amounts.
37

38 Chair Gelbach questioned how "need" was defined in Step 3 of the League of MN Cities
39 Methodology. Staff answered that it was defined by use. Roseville has assigned a use of
40 approximately 75% (or "need") to residents and 25% of "need" to Roseville workers. This is
41 simply an estimate including an analysis of Recreation Program Registrations.
42

43 Commissioner Hoag inquired if a Community Center is included in the "need" category.
44 Staff stated that a Community Center was not included specifically in the "need" calculation.
45 However, the acreage could be.
46
47
48

49 Staff provided the following comparisons of the current method vs. the League of MN Cities
50 methodology for the collection of Park Dedication of recent Roseville developments:
51

Development	Type	Current Methodology Collection Amount (2017 Rate)	League of MN Cities Methodology Collection Amount
Farrington (2016)	Residential	\$20,000	\$12,168
2201 Acorn (2016)	Residential	\$7,000	\$20,233
Home2 Suites & Hampton Inn (2015)	Commercial	\$194,980	\$398,346

52
53
54 Commissioner Baggenstoss noted that the higher rate for non-residential would be a put off if
55 he was a potential developer.
56

57 The Commission discussed ways to reduce the potential for too broad of an interpretation in
58 the League of MN Cities methodology. Discussion points included varying employee counts,
59 average person/household, residential/commercial need and varying plat size. The
60 commission agreed that they would want to limit the use of arbitrary numbers and potential
61 differing of interpretations in the Park Dedication calculation.
62

63 Commissioner Baggenstoss questioned if other Cities are utilizing the League of MN Cities
64 Methodology. Staff provided information on surrounding Cities (Saint Louis Park, Eagan,
65 Plymouth, Golden Valley and Maplewood) current methodology for determining their Park
66 Dedication rates. All of the cities surveyed were utilizing a similar list to Roseville of
67 surrounding community's rates to determine Park Dedication. Golden Valley had looked at
68 the League of MN Cities Sample Methodology for potential guidance. No cities are known to
69 be using the League of MN Cities method.
70

71 Commissioner Stoner suggested that we review statistical information every other year
72 during the Commissions Park Dedication analysis (in addition to the survey of surrounding
73 communities rates). He stated that this would provide empirical data for the Community to
74 review and not just a comparison of other cities rates. He also commented that he liked the
75 idea of potentially looking at "densities by development" as part of the Park Dedication rate
76 analysis.
77

78 The Commission suggested providing a recommendation at the September 5, 2017 meeting.
79 This would allow further review of the methodologies.
80

81 Staff reiterated the importance of Park Dedication to be clear, concise, consistent, non-
82 negotiable and fair. They also suggested that the Commission consider one method, rather
83 than a hybrid that is open to too much interpretation.
84

85 Commissioner Hoag added that we need our Park Dedication rates to be competitive, in order
86 to spur growth and development in the City.
87
88

89 5. **COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – PARKS AND RECREATION SYSTEM MASTER**
90 **PLAN REVIEW AND UPDATE**

91 Review of Goal 1 was completed at the June 6, 2017 Parks and Recreation Commission
92 Meeting.

93
94 **Goal 2 Review**

95 Commissioner Warzecha asked for clarification on Goal 2.4. Specifically, what times the
96 parks are open. Staff confirmed that the parks in Roseville are open from 5 a.m. to 10 p.m.
97 daily (except Reservoir Woods, which is open from dawn to dusk).

98
99 The Commission suggests no changes to Goal 2.

100
101 **Goal 3 Review**

102 Staff suggested adding potential language to Goal 3 that would provide consideration for the
103 City to purchase land that becomes available, when adjacent to existing parks.

104
105 The Commission discussed how best to identify potential adjacent land.

106
107 The Commission recommended potentially adding a note in Section 3 to possibly prioritize
108 the purchase of properties adjacent to current parkland.

109
110 **Goal 4**

111 Chair Gelbach questioned the roles of Public Works and Parks and Recreation in the Trails,
112 Pathways and Community Connections. Staff confirmed that it is a joint effort between
113 Public Works and Parks and Recreation.

114
115 The Commission suggested defining roles of Public Works and Parks and Recreation as it
116 applies to the Trails, Pathways and Community Connections to reduce confusion.

117
118 6. **FOLLOW-UP TO CITY COUNCIL JOINT MEETING**

119 Commissioner Stoner suggested that this topic be listed again on the September 5, 2017
120 Parks and Recreation Commission Meeting Agenda as three Commissioners were not able to
121 attend the meeting tonight, and they may like to comment.

122
123 The Commission discussed the signing of Resolution No. 11422 – A Resolution Declaring
124 the City of Roseville as a Pollinator-Friendly Community.

125
126 Commissioner Warzecha suggested adding directions on how to make your own bee habitats
127 to the City of Roseville Pollinator Page.

128
129 Commissioner Stoner suggested adding that there is no restriction in code on beehive size.

130
131 Commissioner Bole stated that all of the presenters did a very good job at the Joint Meeting.

132
133
134

135 Commissioner Stoner noted the mention of new deer contraceptives by the City Council at
136 the Joint Meeting. Staff updated the Commission on their research of deer contraceptives:
137 • Only one immunocontraceptive (GonaCon) is currently approved by the U.S. Department
138 of Agriculture for use in deer populations
139 • GonaCon is currently not permitted for use in Minnesota
140 • GonaCon works best in fenced environments – The ability to give the booster shot is
141 difficult in a non-controlled area due to deer movement

142

143 7. ONGOING TOPICS

144 i. Cedarholm Community Building Replacement

145 Two bids were received for the Cedarholm Community Building Project. They
146 are being sorted out and appear to be approximately 20% or more higher than
147 projected. Parks and Recreation staff are planning to bring additional details to
148 the City Council on August 14, 2017.

149

150 ii. Emerald Ash Borer (EAB)

151 Staff relayed that there is an update on “EAB in MN” in the August 3, 2017 Parks
152 and Recreation meeting packet.

153

154 8. STAFF REPORT

155 • The October 3, 2017 Parks and Recreation Commission Meeting will be a joint meeting
156 with the Ramsey County Parks and Recreation Commission. Potential topics could
157 include current joint efforts (dog park, pathways, and parkland). Commissioner
158 Baggenstoss suggested including the Rice/Larpenteur revitalization project, specifically
159 the lighting along the Rice St. walkway to the list of discussion topics.

160 • Park Planning:

161 1716 Marion Street: Meeting Sept. 12 @ 1716 Marion Street

162 1716 Marion Street: October 17 @ Galilee Church

163 Cleveland: August 29 @ Fairview Community Center (6 p.m.)

164 Cleveland: October 6 @ Fairview Community Center (6 p.m.)

165 Cleveland: November 2 @ Fairview Community Center (6 p.m.)

166 • Rick Schultz retired after 31 years with the Roseville Parks and Recreation Department

167 • Lauren Deal has been named the new Recreation Superintendent

168 • Puppet Wagon – additional dates through August 10, 2017

169 • Discover Your Parks (DYP) – Wednesdays from 6:30-8:00 through August 16, 2017

170 • Roll in Movie – “Sing” on August 18, 2017 (7:30 p.m.)

171 • Live @ The Rog – additional performance dates through August 13, 2017

172 • Fall Brochures will be in homes the week of August 7, 2017

173

174 9. OTHER

175

176 Meeting adjourned at 8:31 pm

177

178 Respectfully Submitted,

179 Danielle Christensen, Department Assistant

Goal 1: Parks and Recreation Systems Management

Goal: Maintain ongoing parks and recreation planning, maintenance, and asset management process that involves citizen engagement, adheres to professional standards, and utilizes prudent professional practices. Ensure timely guidance for protecting the community's investment in parks, open space, and recreation programs and facilities to enhance their long-term and sustained viability.

Policy	Keep	Delete	Revise	Notes
1.1: Re-evaluate, update, and adopt a Park and Recreation System Master Plan at least every five years to reflect new and current trends, changing demographics, new development criteria, unanticipated population densities, and any other factors that affect park and recreation goals, policies, and future direction of the system.	x			
1.2: Monitor progress on the Parks and Recreation System Master Plan annually to ensure that it provides actionable steps for maintaining, improving, and expanding the system.	x			Vice-Chair O'Brien suggested adding a potential tracking timeline to this policy.
1.3: Maintain and operate parks, open space, and recreation facilities in a safe, clean, and sustainable manner that protects natural resources and systems, preserves high quality active and passive recreation opportunities and experiences, and is cost-effective.	x			
1.4: Consider staffing and resource needs in the evaluation of proposals for additions to parks, programs, and facilities.	x			
1.5: Use the Sector and Constellation organization structure as the basis for park, recreation program, and facility locations, development, and service delivery.	x			
1.6: Enhance neighborhood and community identity in the design of parks, programs, and facilities through public art, special events, and stewardship of natural features.	x			
1.7: Establish a service standard of having a neighborhood park or active play space in every park service constellation.	x			
1.8: Preserve parks and school open space areas as part of the citywide systems plan for structured recreation space and unstructured preserved natural areas.	x			
1.9: Include Ramsey County park land and open space in planning and providing recreation services to Roseville residents.	x			
1.10: Seek partnership to provide the community with a greater diversity or number of parks and facilities, and to offer a more expansive catalog of programs and events.	x			

Goal 1: Parks and Recreation Systems Management

Policy	Keep	Delete	Revise	Notes
1.11: Seek sponsorships and scholarships and other revenue streams to facilitate program fee reductions.	x			
1.12: Continue to coordinate, cooperate, and collaborate with adjacent communities, school districts, and governmental jurisdictions to leverage resources regarding the use of parks on common municipal boundaries and on joint programming where appropriate for mutual benefit to optimize open space, fitness, and recreation programming and facility options.	x			
1.13: Complete park concept plans for all parks.	x			
1.14: Evaluate the maintenance implications of potential park land acquisitions and capital improvements.	x			
1.15: Annually recommend the adoption of a ten-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for Parks and Recreation.	x			
1.16: Use the procurement methods that deliver the best value for the community.	x			
1.17: Research, develop, and recommend to the City Council and citizens periodic bond referendums, park and trail dedication fees, urban forest management fees, special assessments, or other funding programs to reinvest in parks and recreation facilities needed within Roseville.	x			
1.18: Explore the potential for implementing a park service district as a means of creating a sustainable, independent source of local funding for the parks and recreation system.	x			
1.19: Supplement the development and maintenance of parks and recreation lands and facilities with the use of non-property tax funds.	x		x	Add: "whenever possible"
1.20: Pursue local option sales tax or State bond funds to support Roseville facilities of regional or State-wide significance.	x		x	Update: Pursue additional funding such as local option sales tax or State bond funds to support Roseville facilities of regional or State-wide significance where possible.

Goal 1: Parks and Recreation Systems Management

Policy	Keep	Delete	Revise	Notes
1.21: Discourage commercial uses in parks, programs, or facilities and/or parks and recreation facilities. However, commercial uses could be permitted in situations in which the proposed use complements the park or recreation function, is benign, or where it does not conflict with the purpose of the park, recreation facility, or the overall intent of the Parks and Recreation System Master Plan. In no case should a commercial use be permitted in designated conservation or natural use areas.	x			
1.22: Involve the Parks and Recreation Commission in the parks and recreation planning process. Support the Commission in its role as liaison between citizens and Roseville's elected officials and appointed staff to interpret citizen needs and interests and to recommend programs, facilities, and services that serve them. Stimulate additional volunteer involvement in the delivery and support of the parks and recreation system.	x			
1.23: Involve a diverse and representative group of participants in the parks and recreation planning process. Conduct active and continuous interaction within the community with neighborhoods, special interest groups, and individuals of all ages to achieve effective recreational programming and facility development.	x			
1.24: Parks and recreation staff should play the key role in the delivery of parks, programs, and facility services. Community volunteers should be used whenever and wherever possible and appropriate to enrich the experience for the participant and volunteer.	x			
1.25: Develop and implement an ongoing public information and marketing program to inform the public of their investments, opportunities, and benefits of a quality parks and recreation system.	x			
1.26: Assign names, or change names, of City- owned parks or recreation facilities, in consultation with the Parks and Recreation Commission, based on natural habitat, geographic location, and appropriate non-descript terminology. Only under certain and exceptional circumstances will consideration be given to names of individuals and/ or organized groups, associations, or businesses.	x			

Goal 2: Parks Development, Redevelopment and Rehabilitation

Provide a high-quality, financially sound system of parks, open spaces, trails, and waterways that meets the recreation needs of all city residents, offers a visual/physical diversion from the hard surfacing of urban development, enhances our quality of life, and forms an essential part of our community's identity and character.

Policy	Keep	Delete	Revise	Notes
2.1: Evaluate and refurbish parks, as needed, to reflect changes in population, age, and diversity of residents, recreational activities preferred, amount of leisure time available, and best practice designs and technologies, and asset management strategies.	x			
2.2: Orient parks and programs equally to youth activities that focus on community building activities teaching them life-long skills, and exposing them to a variety of recreation experiences, and to adult activities which accommodate adults' needs for wellness and provide a range of social interaction opportunities.	x			
2.3: Focus parks on passive and active recreational activities and activities that take advantage of the unique natural features. Pursue opportunities for incorporating art and cultural programs, which enrich citizens' mental and emotional well-being, as a complement to primary physical focus of parks and recreation programs.	x			
2.4: Organize all parks and facilities so that a component is provided for informal, non- programmed activities—those open to anyone in the community, at any time.	x			
2.5: Maintain parks and open space according to the standards outlined in the Park Maintenance Manual which recognizes that levels of service must be provided based on the intensity of use and purpose of the site.	x			
2.6: Use innovative methods for park and facility improvements that offer lower lifecycle costs, even if the initial cost is higher. Develop park and recreation facilities that minimize the maintenance demands on the City by emphasizing the development of well-planned parks, high- quality materials and labor-saving maintenance devices and practices.	x			
2.7: Promote and support volunteerism to encourage people to actively support Roseville's parks and open spaces.	x			
2.8: Encourage the preservation of features in parks considered to be of historic or cultural value, especially those features that do not conflict with other park uses and activities. Consider the potential of historic landscapes in parks, including agricultural landscapes or features. Work to perpetuate those landscapes and other features of historic or cultural significance when they are identified through recognized investigations.	x			

Goal 3: Parks and Open Space Acquisition

Add new parks and facilities to achieve equitable access in all neighborhoods, accommodate the needs of redeveloping areas, and meet residents' desires for a range of recreation opportunities serving all ages, abilities, and cultures.

Policy	Keep	Delete	Revise	Notes
3.1: Ensure that no net loss of parkland or open space occurs during alterations or displacement of existing parkland and open space. If adverse impacts to parkland or open space take place, ensure that mitigation measures include the acquisition of replacement parkland of equal or greater size and value.	x			
3.2: As areas of Roseville evolve, and properties undergo a change of use and/or density, land should be dedicated to the community for park purposes to ensure adequate park facilities for those new uses.	x			
3.3: Determine potential locations and acquire additional park land in neighborhoods and constellations that are lacking adequate parks and recreation facilities.	x			
3.4: Determine locations for new park and recreation facilities in redevelopment areas as part of the redevelopment process and use the park dedication process to acquire appropriate land.	x			8.3.17 - Commission suggests potentially adding the possibility to prioritize the purchase of properties adjacent to current parkland.
3.5: Make continued effective use of the Park Dedication Ordinance. Park land dedication will be required when land is developed or redeveloped for residential, commercial, or industrial purposes. Review annually park dedication requirements in order to ensure that dedication regulations meet statutory requirements and the needs of Roseville.	x			
3.6: Use park dedication funds to acquire and develop new land in addition to other funding sources.	x			
3.7: Acquire properties necessary to implement adopted park concept plans and in Roseville's Comprehensive Land Use Plan, and consider other additions based on needs identified in the sector or constellation concept. Acquire land on a "willing seller" basis unless otherwise determined by the City Council.	x			

Goal 4: Trails, Pathways and Community Connections

Goal: Create a well-connected and easily accessible system of parks, open spaces, trails, pathways, community connections, and facilities that links neighborhoods and provides opportunities for residents and others to gather and interact.

Policy	Keep	Delete	Revise	Notes
4.1: Develop, adopt, and implement a comprehensive and integrated trails, pathways, and community connections system plan for recreation and transportation uses, including separate facilities for pedestrians, and bicyclists (including off-road unpaved trails for bikers and hikers that offer new challenges while protecting resources).	x			SUGGESTION: Highlight responsibilities that Parks & Recreation is responsible for the maintenance (sweeping, plowing, etc.) and Public Works is responsible for the repairs and construction of the Trails, Pathways and Community Connections.
4.2: Develop, adopt, and implement a Trails Management Program (TMP).	x			
4.3: Advocate the implementation of community parkways on the County Road C and Lexington Avenue corridors to accommodate pedestrian and bicyclist movement and inclusion of community character and identity features.	x			
4.4: Maintain the trail and pathway system through all seasons.	x			
4.5: Make the park system accessible to people of all abilities.	x			
4.6: Align development and expansion of non-motorized trails, pathways, community parkways, and other routes with the need to provide connections to and within parks, to open spaces, recreation facilities, and key destinations, as well as between neighborhoods, constellations, and sectors.	x			
4.7: Educate the public on the advantages and safe use of non-motorized trails, pathways, and community parkway connections.	x			
4.8: Develop clear and communicative signage and kiosks for wayfinding.	x			

Goal 5: Recreation Programs and Services

Goal: Provide Roseville residents with opportunities to participate in a variety of recreation, athletic, wellness, art, social, learning, and environmental education activities and programs through well- designed, cost effective, and relevant services.

Policy	Keep	Delete	Revise	Notes
5.1: Provide recreation programs and services that address the recreational desires of people of all abilities and all segments of the community including children, teens, adults, and older adults.				
5.2: Organize a variety of community special events that stimulate interest in recreation participation, promote community identity and pride, encourage volunteerism, and bring together all segments of the community.				
5.3: Celebrate Roseville’s heritage and cultural potential by acquiring and exhibiting quality works of art, providing access to a variety of performance arts, and by offering a diverse mixture of community events.				
5.4: Administer all programs and services equitably to ensure that all individuals and groups receive adequate representation.				
5.5: Monitor new trends, patterns, and activities in recreation and leisure service programs and incorporate revisions to Roseville’s programs to reflect these changes at a broader level.				
5.6: Establish ongoing communication, information, and marketing programs that broaden recreational interests and encourage participation in Roseville’s recreation programs.				
5.7: Coordinate and cooperate with school districts, community, county, and state agencies, private businesses, and surrounding municipalities to provide diverse and extensive programs and services that are affordable to all participants.				
5.8: Facilitate community recreation groups by providing technical support, equipment storage, promotional assistance, mailboxes, and meeting space.				
5.9: Act as liaison to recognized community groups providing recreation programs and services.				
5.10: Evaluate all programs and services quarterly and annually for quality, participant satisfaction, financial feasibility, and community desirability.				
5.11: Develop and maintain a system of program fees and charges that assess direct costs to the participants, while remaining affordable to the community.				
5.12: Provide residents with community activities and events using subsidies or fee waivers through scholarships, sponsorships, or other methods of fee assistance.				

Goal 6: Community Facilities

Goal: Locate, design, construct, and manage community facilities to meet the needs of current and future residents.

Policy	Keep	Delete	Revise	Notes
6.1: Provide community facilities that include desired community amenities for recreation and social interaction at an appropriate level within sectors and constellations.				
6.2: Assess community needs and desires for the use of existing community facilities and the need for additional space, renovated space, and improved space.				
6.3: Facilitate a system of community and recreation spaces in conjunction with the school districts that provides for both structured and unstructured times as managed and scheduled by the City.				
6.4: Identify a site, confirm a program, and define a strategy for implementing a community center.				
6.5: Manage and maintain facilities using best practices and cost-effective methods to provide desired recreation services.				
6.6: Leverage private involvement in the form of sponsorships, joint ventures, and contract for services to support facilities.				

Goal 7: Natural Resources Management

Goal: Preserve significant natural resources, lakes, ponds, wetlands, open spaces, wooded areas, wildlife habitats, and trees as integral aspects of the parks system.

Policy	Keep	Delete	Revise	Notes
7.1: Encourage dedication of parks, open spaces, and trails in new development and redevelopment areas, especially those that preserve significant natural resources and/or adjacent to the subject site.				
7.2: Create, adopt, and use Natural Resources Management Plans to preserve, restore, and manage the significant natural resources in the park system.				
7.3: Preserve wooded areas and implement an aggressive reforestation and forestry management program to ensure that Roseville has a substantial aesthetically pleasing and environmentally critical tree population in its parks, open spaces, boulevards, and other City property.				
7.4: Provide community environmental education programs to increase the community's awareness, understanding, and appreciation of natural areas, including the need for trees, proper tree care and plantings procedures.				
7.5: Cooperate with the three watershed districts with jurisdiction over parks in Roseville to effect water quality improvement projects within parks, and to create landscapes that are sensitive to stormwater management goals for park lands. Work with the watershed districts to add features to parks that help park users appreciate the water quality improvements, focusing on features such as overlooks or seating areas that take advantage of view to surface water features, with educational and interpretive signage aimed at creating a better understanding of the need for attending to water quality in our parks and in the community. Work with the watershed districts to create park-like environments surrounding water quality improvement projects and stormwater management basins in non-park areas that are accessible to Roseville residents and the community's working population.				
7.6: Create landscape improvements and design parks to enhance opportunities for wildlife, where those improvements and facilities are not in conflict with other park uses or activities. Direct particular attention to the creation of wildlife habitat in parks, where wildlife would not be compromised by the presence of park activities.				

Comparative Park Dedication Data - October 2016
Prepared for: The Roseville Parks and Recreation Commission

City	Residential 2015	Residential 2016	Commercial 2015	Commercial 2016
Andover	\$2,899 per unit	\$2,962 per unit	\$8,691 per acre or 10% FMV	\$8,849 per acre or 10% FMV
Apple Valley	\$2,089 per unit	\$1,935 per unit	\$1,272 per 1,000 sq. foot	\$1,272 per 1,000 sq. foot
Blaine	\$3,404 per unit	\$3,744 per unit	\$8,704 per acre	\$8,704 per acre
Bloomington	\$5,700 per unit	\$5,700 per unit	\$585 per 1,000 sq.foot	\$585 per 1,000 sq.foot
Brooklyn Center	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Brooklyn Park	\$4,600 per unit	\$4,600 per unit	\$8,000 per acre	\$8,000 per acre
Burnsville	\$2,717 per unit	\$2,717 per unit	\$17,500 per acre	\$17,500 per acre
Chanhassen	\$5,800 per unit	\$5,800 per unit	\$12,500 per acre	\$12,500 per acre
Champlin	\$4,370 per unit	\$4,370 per unit	\$8,323 per acre	\$8,323 per acre
Cottage Grove	\$3,400 per unit	\$3,400 per unit	4% FMV	4% FMV
Eagan	\$3,562 per unit	\$3,730 per unit	\$895 per 1,000 sq. foot	\$913 per 1,000 sq. foot
Eden Prairie	\$6,500 per unit	\$6,500 per unit	\$11,500 per acre	\$11,500 per acre
Falcon Heights	8% FMV	8% FMV	FMV equal to 10% Land Value	FMV equal to 10% Land Value
Fridley	\$1,500 per unit	\$1,500 per unit	\$1,000 per acre	\$1,000 per acre
Golden Valley	2% FMV	4% FMV	2% of the Land Market Value	4% of the Land Market Value
Inver Grove Hts.	\$2,850 per unit	\$2,850 per unit	\$7,000 per acre	\$7,000 per acre
Lakeville	\$3,781 per unit	\$3,781 per unit	\$7,693 per acre	\$7,693 per acre
Little Canada	\$2,600 per unit	\$3,500 per unit	10% Land or 5% FMV	10% Land or 7% FMV
Maple Grove	\$3,993 per unit	\$3,993 per unit	\$11,000 per acre	\$11,000 per acre
Maplewood	\$3,540 per unit	\$3,540 per unit	9% FMV	9% FMV
Mounds View	10% FMV	10% FMV	10% FMV	10% FMV
Oakdale	\$2,800 per unit	\$2,800 per unit	\$491 per 1,000 sq. foot	\$491 per 1,000 sq. foot
Plymouth	\$7,500 per unit	\$8,000 per unit	\$8,000 per acre	\$8,000 per acre
Richfield	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Roseville	\$3,500 per unit	\$3,500 per unit	7% FMV	5% of Land or 7% FMV
Shakopee	\$5,340 per unit	\$5,340 per unit	\$6,930 per acre	\$6,930 per acre
Shoreview	4% FMV	4% FMV	Up to 10% FMV	Up to 10% FMV
St. Louis Park	\$1,500 per unit	\$1,500 per unit	7% FMV	7% FMV
Woodbury	\$3,500 per unit	\$3,500 per unit	\$6,930 per acre	\$6,930 per acre
AVERAGES	\$3,911	\$3,954		

1103.06: Park Dedication

- A. Authority: Minnesota Statutes 462.358, subdivisions 2b and 2c permits the City to require dedication of park land, or cash in lieu of land, as part of the subdivision process in order to fulfill its plans for recreational facilities and open spaces. The City Council, at its discretion, will determine whether park dedication is required in the form of land, cash contribution, or a combination of cash and land. To properly use this authority, the City will base its determination on existing development, the need created by the proposed development, and the plans and policies of the City embodied by the Parks and Recreation System Master Plan, Pathways Master Plan, and Comprehensive Plan.
- B. Condition to Approval: Park dedication will be required as a condition to the approval of any subdivision of land involving one acre or more and resulting in a net increase of development sites. The Parks and Recreation Commission shall recommend, in accordance with Statute and after consulting the approved plans and policies noted herein, either a portion of land to be dedicated to the public, or in lieu thereof, a cash deposit given to the City to be used for park purposes, or a combination of land and cash deposit.
- C. Park Dedication Amount: The portion of land to be dedicated in all residentially zoned areas shall be 10% and 5% in all other areas. Park dedication fees shall be reviewed and determined annually by City Council resolution and established in the fee schedule in Chapter 314 of this Code, and the fee shall be paid as part of the Development Agreement required in Section 1102.~~07~~05 of this Title.
- D. Utility Dedications Not Qualified: Land dedicated for required street right-of-way or utilities, including drainage, does not qualify as park dedication.

Appendix: Sample Park Dedication Methodology

(This is a sample of one methodology; a city is not required to take it into account.)

Step 1.

The city should conduct a parks study to generally determine what it would like to see in the community regarding parks, recreation, trails, and open space. That study should consider whether current facilities are sufficient to meet the needs of current residents. If there is a deficiency, the city should calculate what additional expenditures would be necessary to meet that city's desired parks plan.

Step 2.

The city should calculate the total amount of city parks, recreation, trails and open space, plus any additional amount to meet current, but unmet park goals.

Step 3.

The city should evaluate usage of city parks, recreation, trails, and open space with a goal of estimating the percentage of facilities that exist to serve residential landowners and percentage that exists to serve the needs of commercial development. In arriving at these percentages, it is helpful to consider the use of park facilities by businesses and their workers and the use by sports teams that may be sponsored by businesses. From this analysis, the city will be able to identify the percentage of its parks needs that should be met by residential development and what percentage should be met by commercial/industrial development.

Step 4.

The city then will use the results of step 2 and step 3 to calculate parkland acreage, per resident or per employee. The following examples may be helpful:

Per Capita Residential Share/Per Capita Commercial Share

Existing Park Lane and Trail Acreage
300 acres

Residential Share
 $90\% \times 300 = 270$ Acres

Per Capita Residential Share
 $270 \text{ acres} / 15,000 \text{ residents (population)} = .018 \text{ acres per Resident}$

Commercial Share
 $10\% \times 300 = 30$ acres

Per Capita Commercial Share

30 acres/1000 employees in city = .03 acres per Employee

Step 5.

Establish park dedications by ordinance. The amount of land to be dedicated as part of residential subdivision or plat will be equal to the per acre residential share (determined in Step 4) times the number of residents expected in the development or subdivision. To arrive at an amount in lieu of land dedication, take the per acre value of undeveloped land times the amount of land the city could have required to be dedicated.

Step 6.

To calculate the amount to be dedicated as part of a commercial development, multiply the per acre commercial share (determined in Step 4) by the number of employees expected in the development. To arrive at a cash payment in lieu of land dedication, take the per acre value of undeveloped commercial land times the amount of land the city could have required to be dedicated.

Step 7.

Make provisions in your ordinance to provide that these are the maximum amounts the city can charge and give the council discretion to vary from these requirements as a result of unique attributes of the development or to account for parks or open space that may already be included the development. (Note: The city is not required to take any of these considerations into account when arriving at the park dedication amount.)

PARK DEDICATION

CURRENT CITY OF ROSEVILLE METHODOLOGY

	Residential	Non-Residential
Land Dedication	10% of Land	5% of Land
Cash in lieu of Land	\$4,000 Per Unit	10% of FMV

PARK DEDICATION

LEAGUE OF MN CITIES SAMPLE PARK DEDICATION METHODOLOGY

Assumptions:

Step 1

Current Parkland:	680
Additional Park Need:	25
Roseville Population:	33,690
Roseville Workers:	36,000
Residential Need:	75%
Commercial Need:	25%
Average Person/Household - Ramsey County:	2.47

Step 2

Residential Share (Residential Need X Current Park Land):
 $75\% \times 680 = 510$ Acres

Per Capita Residential Share (Residential Share/Population):
 $510 / 33,690 = 0.0151$ Per Acre Residential Share

Commercial Share (Commercial Need X Current Parkland):
 $25\% \times 680 = 170$ Acres

Per Capita Commercial Share (Commercial Share/Roseville Workers):
 $170 / 36,000 = .0047$ Per Acre Commercial share

Step 5

Residential:
 Land: (Per acre residential share X number of residents in development)
 Cash: (Per acre value of undeveloped land X amount of land the city could have required to be dedicated)

Step 6

Commercial:
 Land: (Per acre commercial share X number of proposed employees)
 Cash: (Per acre value of undeveloped commercial land X amount of land the city would have dedicated)

S t e p 4

PARK DEDICATION

STEP 5 (RESIDENTIAL) – ROSEVILLE METHODOLOGY COMPARISON

Farrington (2016)	
Total Existing Fair Market Value (FMV):	\$227,800
Existing Plat:	1
Total New Plats:	5
Total Plats:	6
Original Parcel Size:	3.5 Acre
Undeveloped Land:	2.25 Acre
Undeveloped Land Value: $(\$227,800/3.5)*2.25$	\$146,442
Per Acre Undeveloped Land Value: $(\$146,442/2.25)$	\$65,085

Current Methodology:

Original Parcel Size X 10%: (3.5 X 10%)	0.35	Acres Land Dedication
Total New Plats X Rate: (5 X \$3,500*)	\$17,500	Total Dedication Dollar Value

*2016 Rate: \$3,500
2017 Rate: \$4,000

League of MN Cities Sample Methodology:

Total New Plats X Average Person/Household: (5 x 2.47)	12.35	Total Person/Development
Per Acre Residential Share X Total Person/Development: (.015 X 12.35)	.187	Acres Land Dedication
Per Acre Undeveloped Land Value X Acres Land Dedication ($\$65,085 \times .187$)	\$12,168	Total Dedication Dollar Value

PARK DEDICATION

STEP 5 (RESIDENTIAL) – ROSEVILLE METHODOLOGY COMPARISON

2201 Acorn (2016)	
Total Existing Fair Market Value (FMV):	\$519,500
Existing Plat:	1
Total New Plats:	2
Total Plats:	3
Original Parcel Size:	1.9 Acres
Undeveloped Land:	1.9 Acres
Undeveloped Land Value:	\$519,500
Per Acre Value Undeveloped Land: (\$519,500/1.9)	\$273,421

Current Methodology:

Original Parcel Size X 10%: (1.9 X 10%)	0.19	Acres Land Dedication
Total New Plats X Rate: (2 X \$3,500*)	\$7,000	Total Dedication Dollar Value

*2016 Rate: \$3,500
2017 Rate: \$4,000

League of MN Cities Sample Methodology:

Total New Plats X Average Person/Household: (2 x 2.47)	4.94	Total Person/Development
Per Acre Residential Share X Total Person/Development: (.015 X 4.94)	.074	Acres Land Dedication
Per Acre Undeveloped Land Value X Acres Land Dedication (\$273,421 X .074)	\$20,233	Total Dedication Dollar Value

PARK DEDICATION

STEP 6 (COMMERCIAL) – ROSEVILLE METHODOLOGY COMPARISON

Home2 Suites & Hampton Inn (2015)	
Total Existing Fair Market Value (FMV)	\$1,949,800
Original Plat Size:	3.72
Undeveloped Land:	3.72
Undeveloped Land Value:	\$1,949,800
Per Acre Undeveloped Land Value: (\$1,949,800/3.72)	\$524,140
Estimated Employee Count:	162

Current Methodology:

Original Plat Size X 5%: (3.72 X 5%)	0.186	Acres Land Dedication
FMV X 7%: (\$1,949,800 X 7%)	\$136,486	Total Dedication Dollar Value
FMV X 10%: (\$1,949,800 X 10%)	\$194,980	Current Total Dedication Dollar Value

League of MN Cities Sample Methodology:

Per Acre Commercial Share X Total Proposed Employees: (.0047 X 162)	.76	Acres Land Dedication
Per Acre Undeveloped Land Value X Acres Land Dedication (\$524,140 X .76)	\$398,346	Total Dedication Dollar Value

*2015 Rate: 7%
 2016 Rate: 7%
 2017 Rate: 10%

ROSEVILLE
REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION

Date: 8/14/2017
Item No.:

Department Approval

City Manager Approval



Item Description: Consider Bids for the Cedarholm Community Building and Cart Storage

BACKGROUND

After more than a yearlong community input process including the Parks and Recreation Commission, Resident Advisory Team and their final report, on January 9, 2017, the City entered into an agreement with Hagen, Christensen & McILwain (HCM) Architects for preliminary design services to replace the Cedarholm Community Building.

At the March 20, 2017 City Council Work Session, further direction was provided to: 1) pursue a larger community building with seating up to one hundred 2) establish clearer costs to better determine funding sources 3) no longer consider the Historical Society as part of this project but rather that it would be a better fit in the City Hall Campus area, and 4) seek a proposal to complete final building plans and specifications.

On April 10, 2017 the City Council authorized an agreement with Hagen, Christensen & McIlwain (HCM) Architects for further design services that included Design Development (Task One) and Construction Documents (Task Two) for the replacement of the Cedarholm Community Building with progress check in.

On April 24, 2017 HCM Architects provided a progress report on the Design Development phase and sought input on the site plan, floor plan and building image options #1, #2A and #2B. There was general consensus that it was moving in the right direction with image option #2B preferred by the City Council. Direction to the architects was to focus on option #2B and proceed.

On June 5, 2017, a final Design Development (Task One) review was provided to the City Council and input was received. The highlights included an aerial site plan, architectural site plan, building image rendition, building elevation plan, building floor plan and cart storage area plan. Comments were received and direction to the architects was to proceed with Construction Documents (Task Two).

On July 10, 2017 a final review after the Construction Documents (Task Two) was provided to the City Council and advertising for bids to construct a Cedarholm Community Building and a Golf Cart Storage area was authorized.

32 The following complete and responsive bids were received on August 1, 2017:

34 <u>Vendor</u>	<u>Base Bid</u>	<u>Alternate 1</u>	<u>Alternate 2</u>	<u>Alternate 3</u>	<u>Combined</u>
35 Jorgenson Construction	\$2,438,000	\$90,000	\$82,000	\$6,600	\$2,616,600
37 Project One Construction	\$2,655,263	\$42,000	\$100,000	\$10,000	\$2,807,263

38
39 Alternate 1 is bird friendly glass, alternate 2 is certified sustainable lumber and alternate 3 is exterior
40 roof materials.

41
42 Based on the lowest complete and responsive bid from Jorgenson Construction, the following is a
43 summary of the expected future total project costs when considering the funding options.

45 Sealed Base Bid Results for Community Building/Cart Storage	\$ 2,438,000
46 Furniture/Equipment	\$ 200,000
47 Technology/Security	\$ 40,000
48 Temporary Quarters	\$ 20,000
49 Asbestos Removal	\$ 17,000
50 Green Relocation	\$ 29,000
51 Contingency (5% of Construction)	<u>\$ 121,900</u>
52 Subtotal	\$ 2,865,900
53 Planning and Management	<u>\$ 88,000</u>
54 Subtotal	\$ 2,953,900
55 Alternate 1 – Bird Friendly Glass	\$ 90,000
56 Alternate 2 – Certified Lumber	\$ 82,000
57 Alternate 3 –Exterior Roof Materials	<u>\$ 6,600</u>
58 Total Including Alternates	\$ 3,132,500

59
60 Below and in your packet is the history of budget estimates.

61		3/20/17	6/5/17	7/10/17	ACTUAL 8/14/17
62					
63	Cedarholm Community Building/Cart Storage	\$ 2,321,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,438,000
64	*Furniture and Equipment (kitchen and other)	\$ TBD	\$ TBD	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000
65	*Technology/Security	\$ TBD	\$ TBD	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000
66	Contingency (5% of construction)	<u>\$ TBD</u>	<u>\$ TBD</u>	<u>\$ 101,450</u>	<u>\$ 121,900</u>
67	Total Project Construction/Contingency	\$2,321,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,341,450	\$ 2,799,900
68	*Putting Green Relocation	\$ 29,000	\$ 29,000	\$ 29,000	\$ 29,000
69	*Temporary Quarters	n/a	n/a	\$ 30,000	\$ 20,000
70	*Asbestos Removal	<u>n/a</u>	<u>n/a</u>	<u>n/a</u>	<u>\$ 17,000</u>
71	Total Pre-Const/Const/Furn/Ops/Green reloc	\$2,350,000	\$ 2,029,000	\$ 2,400,450	\$ 2,865,900
72	Planning and Management	<u>\$ 285,000</u>	<u>\$ 285,000</u>	<u>\$ 285,000</u>	<u>\$ 285,000</u>
73	Total Pre- Const/Const/Furn/Ops/Green/P&M	\$2,635,000	\$ 2,314,000	\$ 2,685,450	\$ 3,150,900
74	Bid Alternate # 1 - Bird Friendly Glass	\$ n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 90,000
75	Bid Alternate #2 – Certified Sustainable Lumber	\$ n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 82,000
76	Bid Alternate #3 – Exterior Roof Materials	<u>\$ n/a</u>	<u>n/a</u>	<u>n/a</u>	<u>\$ 6,600</u>
77	Total With Alternates	\$ 2,635,000	\$ 2,314,000	\$ 2,685,450	\$ 3,329,500

78
79 *To be purchased and/or handled separately by city staff

80

81 Potential funding options for the construction of the Cedarholm Community Building have been previously
 82 discussed. As outlined by Finance Director Chris Miller, those options include available amounts shown in
 83 the table below as well as others.

<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>Remaining Amount Available</u>
Park Dedication	\$1,300,000
*Park Renewal Program	\$ 250,000
**Park Renewal (SW Commitment)	\$ 600,000
***Park Renewal (Potential Remaining)	-
* Golf Course Fund	\$ 165,000
Bonding	-
Internal Loan	-
Other	-
Total Potential Available Funding Sources	<u>\$2,315,000</u>
Actual Remaining Project Cost w/o Alternates	\$2,953,900
Actual Remaining Project Cost with Alternates	\$3,132,500
Additional Funds Needed w/o Alt	\$ 638,900
Additional Funds Needed w Alt	\$ 817,500

- 99
- 100 * Takes into consideration funds already used for design work completed to date.
- 101 ** Funding commitment to Southwest Roseville for Park and Recreation improvements. This
- 102 assumes \$200,000 for development of the Cleveland and County B site that is currently in the
- 103 planning stage.
- 104 *** Potential remaining is still yet to be fully finalized after closeout of all projects.

105

106 It is the recommendation of staff to utilize the entire Park and Recreation Renewal Program Funds for
 107 nearer term projects.

108

109 As noted in the table, one potential funding option is to utilize the City’s bonding authority to borrow
 110 monies and pay it off over time. However, Staff generally does not advocate for this option if the bond
 111 amount is less than \$2 million or so. This is due to the fact that the City will incur significant issuance costs
 112 of at least \$50-\$75,000 regardless of the size of the bond. This in turn, increases the cost of the project.

113

114 To address smaller financing needs it is oftentimes more advantageous to utilize internal loans instead. They
 115 are more cost-effective and have less negative effect on the City’s bond rating compared to an actual debt
 116 issue. A likely source of funds for the internal loan would be the Street Replacement Fund, which has a
 117 current balance of \$10 million.

118

119 If either a bond or internal loan were used, the Council would also have to identify a funding source(s) to
 120 repay the bond/loan. The most viable options would be future Park Dedication Fees or Tax Levy.

121

122 The final source of funding and the total amounts can be determined at a later date.

123

124 Asbestos Removal – it has been determined that a double layer of asbestos exists within the ceiling of
 125 the existing building. It is expected that the city turn over a clean building to a contractor. Staff has
 126 received proposals to do this work. It is estimated to costs \$17,000 for the removal and proper disposal.

127
 128

129 Other topics of discussion and considerations have included the following:
130

131 1) Sustainable Design Features

132 Based upon previous City Council discussions, the Cedarholm Community Building has many
133 sustainable design features. Please see attached summary memo from HCM Architects.
134

135 2) Temporary Operating Quarters During Construction

136 Temporary operating quarters will be needed for approximately 7 months (September –
137 November of 2017 and March – June of 2018) while the new Cedarholm Community Building
138 is being constructed. This will include trailer rental, temporary electrical and communications
139 hookup and portable restrooms/washing stations. The budget for this is included in the attached
140 overall budget and is estimated at \$20,000 total.
141

142 3) Annual maintenance and operation budget projections are as follows. A more detailed operating
143 budget projection is included in your packet.
144

	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
145 Personal Services	\$185,990	\$191,970	\$196,625
146 Supplies and Materials	\$ 23,600	\$ 32,770	\$ 33,600
147 Other Services and Charges	<u>\$ 43,675</u>	<u>\$ 62,350</u>	<u>\$ 63,575</u>
148 Total Community Building Operations	\$253,265	\$287,090	\$293,800
149 Total Grounds Maintenance	<u>\$145,000</u>	<u>\$206,000</u>	<u>\$208,000</u>
150 Total Operations and Maintenance	\$398,265	\$493,090	\$501,800
151 Total Revenue Projections	<u>\$366,450</u>	<u>\$429,675</u>	<u>\$445,000</u>
152 Difference of Expense and Revenue	(\$31,815)	(\$63,415)	(\$56,800)
153 *Administrative and Depreciation	<u>\$36,500</u>	<u>\$36,500</u>	<u>\$ 36,500</u>
154 Total w/o Administrative and Depreciation	\$ 4,685	(\$26,915)	(\$20,300)

155
156
157 Notes:

- 158 ○ Currently, there are 1.75 FTE employees at Cedarholm Golf Course. Anticipating the
159 year round and increased use of the Community Building, the projections include the
160 necessity to increase FTE staffing to 2.0. Specifically the existing $\frac{3}{4}$ time position is
161 suggested to be increased to full time. This was a full time position until 2009. The need
162 is anticipated as soon as the replaced facility becomes operational.
163
- 164 ○ * Because a decision has not been made on the Enterprise Fund status, the expense
165 budget includes Administrative charges of \$20,000 and Depreciation charges of \$16,500
166 for a total of \$36,500. These funds are paid to city accounts. The forecast above shows
167 the budget with and without these charges.
168
- 169 ○ Budget projections are realistic, conservative, include community use features and
170 custodial services and are consistent with other Roseville facility and use rates.
171

172 4) Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

173 The following lifecycle intervals for the Cedarholm Community Building are consistent with
174 industry standards and the Roseville Asset Management Program. Attached is a detailed 20-year
175 Capital Improvement Program projection for the Cedarholm Community Building based on
176 intervals below.

177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223

- a. 5 Year Intervals
 - Painting Interior
 - Parking Lot
 - Technology/POS/computers
 - Furnishings
- b. 10 Year Intervals
 - Painting Exterior
 - Flooring
 - Furnishings
- c. 15 Year Intervals
 - Furnishings
- d. 20 Year Intervals (replacement)
 - HVAC
 - Roofing
 - Fixtures

It is the plan to auction the furnishings of the existing facility. The general list of items includes the grill/fryer and tables and chairs. The items are older with an estimated value of around \$5,000.

Timeframe

The following is a review of the overall timeframe:

- June 5, 2017 – Design Development (Task One) update
- July 10, 2017 – Construction Documents (Task Two) update
- July 10, 2017 – Request for City Council Action to advertise for proposals
- July 11, 2017 – Begin process for advertising for Bids
- August 14, 2017 - Consider project by the City Council.
- Anticipated Calendar – research has been done on all preparation areas leading up to the beginning of construction. However, no commitments have been made. If the City Council chooses to move forward, final arrangements would need to occur.
 - August 21, 2017 – last day of existing clubhouse use
 - August 24, 2017 - remove any existing clubhouse equipment
 - August 28 – September 1, 2017 - asbestos removal
 - September 1, 2017 - turn over site to contractor to begin demolition
 - September 5, 2017 - demolition of existing clubhouse
 - September 1, 2017 - begin project – In and around September 1, 2017
 - June 30, 2018 – project completion

POLICY OBJECTIVE

The process for involving community members and City Council as necessary to review public facility improvements is consistent with past City efforts.

FINANCIAL IMPACTS

A final funding source for the project is yet to be finalized. Project and funding options are identified above. The final funding source and amount can be determined at a later date.

224 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

225 As a result of the community process and work completed to date, staff recommends consideration for
226 acceptance of the low bid of \$2,438,000 and a contingency of 5% (\$121,900) to construct the Cedarholm
227 Community Building and Cart Storage as well as authorize the Mayor and City Manager to sign all necessary
228 contract documents. This recommendation also includes asbestos removal, creating temporary quarters and
229 construction administration and seeking bids/quotes for furnishings/equipment/technology/security.

230 **REQUESTED COUNCIL ACTION**

231 Consider accepting the low bid as presented from Jorgenson Construction at a cost of \$2,438,000 plus a
232 contingency of 5% (\$121,900) to construct the Cedarholm Community Building and Cart Storage area with a
233 definite funding source yet to be finalized.

234
235 Consider acceptance of alternate number one, two and three from the low bid as presented from Jorgenson
236 Construction at a cost of \$90,000, \$82,000 and \$6,600 respectively as presented with a definite funding source
237 yet to be finalized.

238
239 Consider authorizing staff to seek bids/quotes for the furniture, equipment, technology and security portions of
240 the Cedarholm Community Building project.

241
242 Consider authorizing the Mayor and City Manager to sign the necessary contract documents for construction of
243 the Cedarholm Community Building and Cart Storage area as described.

244
245 Consider authorizing asbestos removal from the existing Cedarholm Building at a cost of \$17,000.

246
247 Consider authorizing temporary quarters at the Cedarholm site for current golf operations at a cost of \$20,000.

248
249 Consider authorizing HCM Architects for Construction Administration (Task #3) at a cost of \$47,700 to be
250 taken from the planning and management portion of the budget.

251

Prepared by: Lonnie Brokke, Director of Parks and Recreation
Jill Anfang, Assistant Director of Parks and Recreation
Chris Miller, Finance Director

Attachment: A. History of Budget Estimates – Cedarholm Community Building
B. Operating Budget Projections - 2018-2020
C. Cedarholm Community Building Capital Improvement Program - 2018 – 2028
D. Memo from HCM on Sustainable Features

HISTORY OF BUDGET ESTIMATES – CEDARHOLM COMMUNITY BUILDING 8/14/17

	3/20/2017	6/5/2017	7/10/2017	Actual - 8/14/17
Cedarholm Community Building/Cart Storage	\$2,321,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,438,000
*Furniture and equipment (kitchen and other)	TBD	TBD	\$200,000	\$200,000
*Technology/security	TBD	TBD	\$40,000	\$40,000
Contingency (5% of construction)	TBD	TBD	\$101,450	\$121,900
Total Project Construction	\$2,321,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,341,450	\$2,799,900
Green Relocation	\$29,000	\$29,000	\$29,000	\$29,000
Temporary Quarters	N/A	N/A	\$30,000	\$20,000
Asbestos Removal	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$17,000
Total Construction and Furnishings	\$2,350,000	\$2,029,000	\$2,400,450	\$2,865,900
Planning and Management	\$285,000	\$285,000	\$285,000	\$285,000
Total Construction/Furnishings and Planning/Mgmt.	\$2,635,000	\$2,314,000	\$2,685,450	\$3,150,900
Bid Alternate # 1 - Bird Friendly Glass	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$90,000
Bid Alternate #2 – Certified Lumber	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$82,000
Bid Alternate #3 – Exterior Roof Materials	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$6,600
Total With Alternates	\$2,635,000	\$2,314,000	\$2,685,450	\$3,329,500

*To be purchased and handled separately by city staff

**

City of Roseville Cedarholm GC Operations
2018-2020 Budget Projections

Budget Item	2017	2018	2019	2020
	Budget	Projected Budget	Projected Budget	Projected Budget
REVENUES				
Green Fees	\$263,000.00	\$287,000.00	\$290,000.00	\$295,000.00
Evening league Registration	\$2,500.00	\$2,250.00	\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00
Junior League Registration	\$1,400.00	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$2,100.00
Day League Reg.	\$8,500.00	\$9,000.00	\$9,000.00	\$9,000.00
Equipment Rental	\$22,000.00	\$23,000.00	\$27,500.00	\$28,000.00
Equipment / Clothing sales	\$4,500.00	\$1,200.00	\$1,500.00	\$1,600.00
Concession Sales	\$20,000.00	\$20,000.00	\$28,000.00	\$29,000.00
Fee Program Revenue	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,500.00	\$1,725.00
Investment Income	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00
Facility Rental	\$2,500.00	\$20,000.00	\$65,675.00	\$74,075.00
	\$326,400.00	\$366,450.00	\$429,675.00	\$445,000.00

Total Revenues from Services

City of Roseville Cedarholm GC Operations
2018-2020 Budget Projections

Budget Item	2017	2018	2019	2020
	Budget	Projected Budget	Projected Budget	Projected Budget
EXPENDITURES				
Personel Services				
Community Building	\$100,000.00	\$102,500.00	\$96,720.00	\$99,700.00
Grounds Maintenance	\$46,000.00	\$46,300.00	\$105,000.00	\$108,000.00
Community Building	\$37,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$61,250.00	\$62,125.00
Grounds Maintenance	\$13,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$12,000.00	\$13,000.00
Community Building	\$17,900.00	\$18,380.00	\$18,500.00	\$19,000.00
Grounds Maintenance	\$7,900.00	\$8,020.00	\$12,000.00	\$13,250.00
Community Building	\$14,600.00	\$15,110.00	\$15,500.00	\$15,800.00
Grounds Maintenance	\$7,200.00	\$7,280.00	\$15,000.00	\$15,500.00
Personel Services Grounds	\$74,100.00	\$71,600.00	\$144,000.00	\$149,750.00
Personel Services Comm. Building	\$169,500.00	\$185,990.00	\$191,970.00	\$196,625.00
Total Personel Services	\$243,600.00	\$257,590.00	\$335,970.00	\$346,375.00
Supplies and Materials				
Grounds Maintenance	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Community Building	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Grounds Maintenance	\$1,800.00	\$1,200.00	\$1,350.00	\$1,400.00
Community Building	\$500.00	\$600.00	\$770.00	\$800.00
Grounds Maintenance	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$500.00
Vehicle Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Vehicle Supplies	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00	\$4,200.00	\$4,200.00
Grounds Maintenance	\$10,500.00	\$17,000.00	\$16,000.00	\$19,400.00
Community Building	\$17,000.00	\$12,000.00	\$17,200.00	\$17,200.00
Community Building	\$11,000.00	\$11,000.00	\$14,800.00	\$15,600.00
Supplies and Materials - Community Building	\$28,500.00	\$23,600.00	\$32,770.00	\$33,600.00
Supplies and Materials - Grounds Maintenance	\$16,800.00	\$22,700.00	\$22,050.00	\$25,500.00
Total Supplies and Materials	\$45,300.00	\$46,300.00	\$54,820.00	\$59,100.00
Other Services and Charges				
Grounds Maintenance	\$2,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00
Community Building	\$1,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$2,200.00
Community Building		\$475.00	\$500.00	\$500.00
Community Building	\$3,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$3,500.00	\$3,000.00
Grounds Maintenance	\$5,250.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00
Community Building	\$5,250.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00
Community Building	\$7,600.00	\$7,600.00	\$7,500.00	\$7,700.00
Grounds Maintenance	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$1,200.00
Grounds Maintenance	\$7,200.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,500.00	\$2,000.00
Community Building	\$1,000.00	\$7,500.00	\$7,500.00	\$8,500.00

City of Roseville Cedarholm GC Operations
2018-2020 Budget Projections

Budget Item	2017	2018	2019	2020
	Budget	Projected Budget	Projected Budget	Projected Budget
Grounds Maintenance	\$1,100.00	\$2,600.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,500.00
Community Building	\$2,500.00	\$2,300.00	\$17,000.00	\$17,325.00
Grounds Maintenance	\$300.00	\$300.00	\$300.00	\$300.00
Community Building		\$0.00	\$350.00	\$350.00
Grounds Maintenance	\$300.00	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$500.00
Community Building	\$500.00	\$300.00	\$700.00	\$700.00
Grounds Maintenance	\$800.00	\$300.00	\$800.00	\$1,200.00
Community Building	\$300.00	\$800.00	\$800.00	\$800.00
Grounds Maintenance	\$16,000.00	\$15,000.00	\$15,000.00	\$15,000.00
Community Building		\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00
Grounds Maintenance	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00
Community Building	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00
Grounds Maintenance	\$22,000.00	\$16,000.00	\$20,150.00	\$11,550.00
Community Building	\$6,200.00	\$6,200.00	\$8,000.00	\$8,000.00
Other Services and Charges - Grounds Maintenance	\$48,650.00	\$50,700.00	\$39,950.00	\$32,750.00
Other Services and Charges - Community Building	\$32,450.00	\$43,675.00	\$62,350.00	\$63,575.00
Total Other Services and Charges	\$81,100.00	\$94,375.00	\$102,300.00	\$96,325.00
Expenses				
Total Grounds Maintenance	\$139,550.00	\$145,000.00	\$206,000.00	\$208,000.00
Total Community Building	\$230,450.00	\$253,265.00	\$287,090.00	\$293,800.00
Total Grounds Maintenance and Community Building Operations	\$370,000.00	\$398,265.00	\$493,090.00	\$501,800.00
Total Revenues	\$326,400.00	\$366,450.00	\$429,675.00	\$445,000.00
Revenue Less Expenses	-\$43,600.00	-\$31,815.00	-\$63,415.00	-\$56,800.00
Total Less Dep and Admin.	-\$23,600.00	\$4,685.00	-\$26,915.00	-\$20,300.00

Cedarholm Community Building and Grounds Projected Capital Improvement Program (CIP - 2018-2028)

Cedarholm Community Building CIP - 2018-2028

Description	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	2038	20year total
Painting Interior						\$6,000					\$6,000					\$6,000					\$6,000	\$24,000
Parking Lot						\$3,500					\$3,500					\$3,500					\$3,500	\$14,000
POS/ Comp. SYSTEM						\$5,000					\$5,000					\$5,000					\$5,000	\$20,000
Furnishing						\$5,000					\$5,000					\$5,000					\$5,000	\$20,000
Painting Exterior																						
Club House											\$10,000					\$10,000					\$10,000	\$20,000
Cart Storage											\$1,000					\$1,000					\$1,000	\$2,000
Shop											\$1,000					\$1,000					\$1,000	\$2,000
Paint Ceiling CH											\$5,000					\$5,000					\$5,000	\$10,000
Flooring											\$10,000					\$10,000					\$10,000	\$20,000
Patio Furniture											\$5,000					\$5,000					\$5,000	\$10,000
Interior Furniture											\$10,000					\$10,000					\$10,000	\$20,000
General Kitchen Appliances											\$5,000					\$5,000					\$5,000	\$10,000
Large Kitchen Appliances																\$15,000					\$15,000	\$15,000
Hot Water Heater																\$4,500					\$4,500	\$4,500
Tables/ Chairs																\$5,000					\$5,000	\$5,000
HVAC																					\$32,000	\$32,000
Roof																					\$33,000	\$33,000
Light Fixtures																					\$5,000	\$5,000
Total Community Building Capital Improvement Program (CIP)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$19,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$66,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$44,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$136,500	\$266,500

Cedarholm Community Building CIP - 2018-2028

Cedarholm Community Building Projected Capital Improvement Program (CIP - 2018-2028)

Description	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	2038	20year total	
Painting Interior						\$ 6,000					\$ 6,000					\$ 6,000					\$ 6,000	\$ 24,000	
Parking Lot						\$ 3,500					\$ 3,500					\$ 3,500					\$ 3,500	\$ 14,000	
POS/ Comp. SYSTEM						\$ 5,000					\$ 5,000					\$ 5,000					\$ 5,000	\$ 20,000	
Furnishing						\$ 5,000					\$ 5,000					\$ 5,000					\$ 5,000	\$ 20,000	
Painting Exterior																							
Club House											\$ 10,000										\$ 10,000	\$ 20,000	
Cart Storage											\$ 1,000										\$ 1,000	\$ 2,000	
Shop											\$ 1,000										\$ 1,000	\$ 2,000	
Paint Ceiling CH											\$ 5,000										\$ 5,000	\$ 10,000	
Flooring											\$ 10,000										\$ 10,000	\$ 20,000	
Patio Furniture											\$ 5,000										\$ 5,000	\$ 10,000	
Interior Furniture											\$ 10,000										\$ 10,000	\$ 20,000	
General Kitchen Appliances											\$ 5,000										\$ 5,000	\$ 10,000	
Large Kitchen Appliances																\$ 15,000						\$ 15,000	
Hot Water Heater																\$ 4,500						\$ 4,500	
Tables/ Chairs																\$ 5,000						\$ 5,000	
HVAC																					\$ 32,000	\$ 32,000	
Roof																					\$ 33,000	\$ 33,000	
Light Fixtures						\$ 19,500										\$ 44,000					\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	
	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 19,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 66,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 44,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 136,500	\$ 266,500	



HAGEN, CHRISTENSEN & MCILWAIN
ARCHITECTS

MEMORANDUM

To: Roseville PRC
From: Tim McIlwain
Date: 06/26/2017
Comm. No: 1758
Subject: Roseville Parks
Copies To: File
**Cedarholm Community Building –
Sustainable Design Features**

The design for the Cedarholm Community Building has the following sustainable design features and systems:

a. Civil / Site Design:

1. Best practices for storm water treatment & management.
2. Use of native plant species where practical.
3. Use of low water consumption plants where practical.

b. Architectural Design:

1. Use of regionally harvested / manufactured exterior materials (wood trim, stone veneer).
2. Use of durable exterior materials (stone and cement siding).
3. Use of Certified Sustainable Wood for framing and structure.
4. Required recycling of demolition materials
5. Required separation and recycling of construction waste
6. Building is prepped for solar array installation.
7. Window units are locally manufactured and maintain a Forestry Stewardship Certification (FSC), SCS Recycled Content Certification.
8. Materials such as wood substrates, paints and stains, finishes and fabrics will be low-emitting materials containing no volatile organic compounds.
9. Strategies will include utilizing local fabricators for millwork, signage, window systems, furniture fixtures and equipment and specifying construction materials that are manufactured within 250 miles of the site such as quartz countertops, wood veneer and trim, flooring, etc.
10. There will be an emphasis to specify materials with a high percentage of recycled content as well as bio-based materials for such elements as steel structure, ceramic tile, carpet, table tops and fixtures.
11. The Project will have acoustic materials to maintain background noise less than 70 Dba and reverberation times within acceptable ranges.
12. Specify Bird -Friendly Glass panels as a Project Alternate.

c. Mechanical Design:

1. Low flow plumbing fixtures
2. High-efficiency Furnaces – 95% efficient
3. ECM Fan Motors on furnaces
4. New mechanical equipment including make-up air units, exhaust fans and VAV units will meet MN 2030 Energy Efficiency Guidelines and the hot water heaters and kitchen equipment will be Energy-Star, EPEA or Water Sense certified whenever possible. Cooling systems will have ozone safe refrigerants.
5. Heating and cooling systems will be controlled with a Building Automated System (B.A.S.) for better control, efficiency and monitoring.

d. Electrical Design:

1. The lighting for all general illumination will be color balanced LED fixtures on a programmable lighting control system that will provide for any daylight harvesting opportunities.
2. Access to natural light will be provided whenever possible.
3. Motion sensors and vacancy sensors for lighting auto-off
4. Electrical distribution system layout and the building's structure are prepared for future solar array installation.

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, June 19, 2017

Page 3

Mayor Roe recessed the meeting at approximately 6:28 p.m., and reconvened at approximately 6:29 p.m.

6. Items Removed from Consent Agenda

7. Business Items

a. Joint Meeting of Parks & Recreation Commission with the City Council

Mayor Roe welcomed Park & Recreation Commissioners to tonight's joint meeting. Representing the Commission were Chair Gelbach and Commissioners Luke Heikkila, Cynthia Warzecha, Jerry Stoner, Terrance Newby, Nancy O'Brien, Greg Hoag and Ronald Bole.

In addition to the commission's list of community outreach activities, 2016 project type activities, and work plan items for the upcoming year, Chair Gelbach noted the commission's interest in the City Council's direction on three topics: a pollinator-friendly city resolution, an update on the deer reduction program and next steps, and discussion on the Emerald Ash Borer (EAB) program.

Pollinator-friendly city resolution

Chair Gelbach referenced Attachment A as a draft resolution for consideration outlining the use of best practices where possible and minimization of chemical use where possible. Chair Gelbach asked that the City Council consider adoption of this resolution at some point in the near future.

Councilmember McGehee offered her support for immediate adoption of such an ordinance, opining there were very few places where chemicals were called for. Councilmember McGehee referenced her recent attendance, along with Parks & Recreation Director Brokke, of a webinar about EAB. Councilmember McGehee spoke to the use of chemicals to treat some Ash trees, and suggested that the number of trees be further reduced to focus on those considered as critical or representative of the species. Councilmember McGehee noted that there is no current data available on the impact to birds eating grubs from EAB-infested trees that are chemically injected.

Willmus moved, McGehee seconded, to adopt Resolution No. 11422 Attachment A) entitled, "A Resolution Declaring the City of Roseville as a Pollinator-Friendly Community."

Councilmember Laliberte stated her support of a resolution; asking that staff confirm whether its adoption would imply an expectation of residents that the city as an organization could not meet.

Mayor Roe opined that this served as another example of the City of Roseville leading by example, as confirmed by Mr. Brokke from the audience.

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, June 19, 2017

Page 4

Councilmember Etten stated his support for the resolution; noting the need for the practice to fit the policy, and recognizing existing efforts by the city.

Roll Call

Ayes: McGehee, Willmus, Laliberte, Etten and Roe

Nays: None.

Deer Reduction Program

Commissioner Newby provided a brief recap on the first deer hunt, and supporting documentation from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) on the harvest report for the 2016-17 deer control project (Attachment B), as well as the deer feedback map and deer sighting map (Attachments C and D). Commissioner Newby reported that the deer harvested appeared to come from unhealthy herds indicating the area was still over-populated, with ongoing reports of excess deer still in the community based on the amount of activity being observed, even though not necessarily considered a nuisance. In light of the first hunt, on behalf of the commission, Commissioner Newby suggested that the City Council consider whether it may be necessary for an additional hunt to further cull the herd in the future. However, since the first hunt was held in January of 2017, Commissioner Newby suggested a longer period of time (e.g., until January of 2018) to further study the health of the remaining herd and further analysis of the results of the first hunt, and subsequently report that data to the City Council for their consideration.

Mayor Roe spoke in support of further analysis of USDA information and their timeline.

Councilmember Willmus opined that, while the culling action had been undertaken, he didn't think it notably impacted the number of deer remaining in the community, if his neighborhood was any indicator, where he was aware of ongoing extensive damage from the herd. Councilmember Willmus stated his support for using this as an ongoing management tool when high numbers of deer are observed in order to minimize property damage and to address traffic safety issues. Councilmember Willmus offered his support of a more aggressive approach in the future.

Councilmember McGehee stated that she was more in favor of the study approach, opining that she was unaware of any traffic accidents with deer; and further noted the recent examples of clear-cutting in development areas that eliminated deer habitat. Councilmember McGehee suggested that if repeated, the hunt only take does based on information available from bat stations; and also that consideration be given to a birth control method now available. Councilmember McGehee suggested that this also could be used as a teachable lesson for use of non-lead ammunition in this type of hunt in consideration of the environment.

Councilmember Etten stated his support of the appropriateness of an aerial survey as done in the past to check results of this first hunt. Councilmember Etten noted that he had heard from residents within days of the hunt asking why more of the herd were not taken, or why other parts of the community were not included for eradication of the herd. Councilmember Etten stated that as late as last week, he was still hearing from residents who weren't seeing any change in the deer population. Councilmember Etten stated that he would support another aerial survey this coming winter; and also clarified that his information indicated that the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) did not allow the city to perform birth control methods on the local deer herd, negating that option.

Councilmember Laliberte stated her agreement with the commission for further review after the first hunt performed only six months ago. Councilmember Laliberte stated that she too received continued feedback from residents and their perception that there remained a considerable number of deer in the community. While appreciating the hunt as a tool and option for the city to repeat if deemed necessary, Councilmember Laliberte reiterated her support of the commission's continued assessment of the situation and subsequent to the City Council in the future.

Commissioner Newby spoke to Councilmember McGehee's comment about changes to deer habitat, particularly removal of buckthorn, opining that there were many variables in deer movement including habitat; and suggested that when habitat is altered, there may be a perception from residents that there are more deer in an area as they relocate.

Even though removal of buckthorn may have changed deer habitat somewhat, Mayor Roe referenced last year's presentation indicating that open areas between more forested areas was considered a more favorable habitat for deer than undergrowth habitat. Specific to a new birth control method to control deer herds, Mayor Roe asked that the commission stay in contact with and alert the DNR that the city would be interested in any practical, cutting edge pilot programs as a possibility.

Commissioner Newby advised that the commission would look into that beyond the DNR's initial presentation given their cost at this time.

Emerald Ash Borer (EAB)

Commissioner O'Brien reported that with the inception of EAB in approximately 2013, the city had not been considered fully-infested. To-date, Commissioner O'Brien advised that the city had inventoried 1,869 Ash trees on public land (e.g. parks and boulevards) and ranked them according to their location and importance. Commissioner O'Brien advised that the current thinking is that all will eventually become infested and die unless treated. Commissioner O'Brien reviewed the different approaches other cities are taking, including removal of all or some Ash trees or their chemical treatment. Commissioner O'Brien noted that

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, June 19, 2017

Page 6

229 Ash trees in Roseville had been treated to-date and they seemed to be in better shape than before treatment. Commissioner O'Brien noted that the cost for tree removal averaged \$500 and replacement at approximately \$400; with those trees being chemically treated under continual evaluation with treatments cut back as trees are replaced. Commissioner O'Brien noted that there had initially been some grant monies available for removal and replacement that had been since expended, with no more anticipated in the immediate future.

Councilmember McGehee again referenced her and Mr. Brokke's attendance at the webinar on this issue, and reported on the importance of considering overall tree canopies for the city; as well as educating the public about the trees on private property as well as addressing other potential tree diseases (e.g. Five Needle Pines).

Councilmember Etten thanked the commission for continuing to address this issue, and asked if they were seeking additional dollars in the budget to address the EAB issue. Councilmember Etten asked if the city was replacing trees when they looked sick, or if they were targeting specific trees or areas with denser Ash tree populations or those neighborhoods that would be most heavily impacted by the loss of Ash trees.

Commissioner O'Brien noted the need to fund in order to meet the EAB challenge.

Parks & Recreation Director Lonnie Brokke

Mr. Brokke advised that the city was starting to review specific neighborhoods, but until recently had primarily focused on Ash trees in poor condition and replacing them; while treating those considered in good or fair condition. In an effort to reduce the number of trees being chemically treated, Mr. Brokke reported that Ash trees continued to be removed and replaced. At the request of Councilmember Etten, Mr. Brokke confirmed that replacement trees were being planted at Cedarholm Golf Course and Autumn Grove Park.

Councilmember Laliberte noted that at the beginning of the last state legislative session, there had been a request for EAB appropriations for additional grant monies; and asked if that had fallen away; with Mr. Brokke confirming that those efforts to get that additional funding had proven fruitless.

Mayor Roe suggested there may be the need for another resolution of support from the city before the next legislative session. Specific to funding, and as noted by Councilmember Etten, Mayor Roe suggested that the current allocation in the annual capital improvement program (CIP) for natural resource restoration be adjusted or shifted to EAB efforts similar to that used for the Pavement Management Program (PMP) with funds moving from sealcoating to rehabilitating streets with those same dollars. Therefore, Mayor Roe suggested that the commission

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, June 19, 2017

Page 7

may want to provide the City Council with a reprioritization of a portion of those available CIP funds accordingly.

Councilmember McGehee suggested the need in the natural resources budget to address the current excess amount of burdock and thistles that she had observed in Oasis Park and on the south end of Langton Lake, noting their negative impact on birds and bats.

City Council Direction / Comments

Councilmember McGehee urged the commission to take time to address program sustainability issues of facilities for the CIP and bring forward recommendations for consideration and their perspective on various issues. Councilmember McGehee stated that she didn't find the commission's financial information as transparent as she'd like in showing how things are funded. Also, moving forward, Councilmember McGehee asked the commission to pay special attention to meeting disability and accessibility needs beyond the American Disability Act (ADA) for residents when rehabilitating areas,

When he served on the commission several years ago, Councilmember Etten noted that the city was about to undertake the Park Master Plan process and subsequently had implemented the Park Renewal Program, culminating in a unique time for planning for the overall system and a positive for the community. With the considerable monies reinvested in the city's park and recreation system, Councilmember Etten asked that the commission take up the charge presented by Councilmember McGehee and recommend the "new next steps" including bigger and smaller ways to continue improving the current system. Councilmember Etten noted his interest in ideas from the commission on what they planned to do to connect with the city's diverse communities, noting the work of numerous city departments in addressing those same issues; as well as the commission's consideration of improved types of playing surfaces or opportunities, and possible game that would address other cultures and that diverse population. In other words, Councilmember Etten asked what the commission considered as their role in making the overall park and recreation system work for Roseville's growing diverse community.

Councilmember Laliberte noted that the newly-created Human Rights, Inclusion and Engagement Commission would be talking later this week on how to reach out to other advisory commissions for joint programs or initiatives that they could cooperatively pursue. Councilmember Laliberte suggested that the commission work with them on that idea in order to expand its own resources.

While progress is being made in the Parks Department for CIP rehabilitation and/or replacement needs, Mayor Roe noted that diligence was still needed, especially the need to plan and prepare now for next year's legislative session and the OVAL funding for this facility's major needs, including the need for advocacy assistance from the commission for those efforts. Also, Mayor Roe asked that the

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, June 19, 2017

Page 8

commission look at the short-and long-term CIP to determine where adjustments could be made to fund needs without a resulting negative fund balance.

As addressed by Councilmember Etten, Mayor Roe noted the things remaining in the Parks Master Plan effort that had yet to be addressed beyond Phase I to accomplish full implementation.

Chair Gelbach suggested the need for more discussion in a joint forum for ideas, noting the ongoing focus of the commission on funding issues moving forward. Chair Gelbach noted that the commission was currently revisiting these issues point by point as part of the comprehensive plan update process.

Councilmember McGehee opined that it was important, before asking residents to support further investment for additional assets, that the commission provide a clear plan for how to keep existing assets in good shape to prove the city's commitment and stewardship of that investment.

Chair Gelbach reported that the commission planned to come prepared at the next joint meeting to show how the recent upgrades have resulted in expanded use by the community of those parks and facilities.

Mayor Roe thanked the commission for their attendance, update, and informative discussion.

Recess

Mayor Roe recessed the meeting at approximately 7:07 p.m., and reconvened at approximately 7:08 p.m.

- b. Request by the City of Roseville to Approve a Comprehensive Technical Update to the Requirements and Procedures for Processing Subdivision Proposals as Regulated in City Code, Title 11 (Subdivisions) and Revision of Lot Size Standards Established in City Code, Chapter 1004 (Residential Districts (PROJ-0042))**

Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd briefly summarized the latest revisions of this final draft and highlighted various areas of an amended Subdivision Ordinance, with final vetting having been done by the Planning Commission and now the City Council.

Title 11 (Subdivisions), Chapter 1101 (RCA Exhibit A)

Page 1, line 30-32 (Owner)

Mr. Lloyd noted Lloyd questioned the use of "owner" and how it should be described in this sense or what other kinds of owners may be indicated.

Mayor Roe pointed out the use of "owner as applicant" (page 4, line 133) under the Minor Plat process, stating the "owner shall file an application."

City Attorney Gaughan suggested not getting into that much detail as to the extent of ownership, but let them self-identify since the intent was to refer to the measure of ownership over a subject property or duration of ownership, with any fur-