

ROSEVILLE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES FOR
APRIL 6, 2021 6:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Arneson, Baggenstoss, Boulton, Brown, Dahlstrom, Heikkila, Hoag,
Lenhart, Ybarra
ABSENT: Carlson, Kim
STAFF: Brokke, Christensen, Johnson

1) INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Hoag introduced the virtual Zoom format for the meeting due to the COVID-19 pandemic. State Law allows for an exception to in-person public meetings during pandemics to ensure the safety of commissioners, staff and the public. The public was still encouraged to participate in the meeting using the Zoom platform.

2) ROLL CALL/PUBLIC COMMENT

Roll Call Commissioners: Arneson, Baggenstoss, Boulton, Brown, Dahlstrom, Heikkila, Lenhart, Ybarra, Hoag.

Chair Hoag called for public comment by members of the audience.

H. Weber, joined the meeting to thank the Commission for their service and to comment on the height of the basketball hoops at Autumn Grove Park. Mr. Weber estimates that the hoops are set at 10ft and 8ft. As a resident of the Autumn Grove Park neighborhood, Mr. Weber frequents the basketball hoops often. Overwhelmingly, on the occasions that he has visited only the 10ft hoop is being utilized. As a result of COVID he is hesitant to use the 10ft hoop with other groups of people. Mr. Weber has observed groups of children using the lower hoop. However, they have been Middle or High School aged children and anecdotally they could use the higher hoop but appeared to be utilizing the smaller hoop to dunk. He asked that the heights of the basketball hoops be looked into and that the lower hoop potentially be raised or have an adjustable height mechanism added.

Staff responded that typically hoops in the parks are set at 7ft and 10ft to allow all ages and abilities to use at least one hoop. In addition, if both hoops are at 10ft older players tend to use them for full court games which could potentially deter younger users.

Staff added that Maintenance staff were out today to check the hoop heights at Autumn Grove as a result of another resident who called requesting that the 7ft hoop be increased. Maintenance staff was planning to raise both hoops to 10ft at Autumn Grove as a result of the resident feedback. However, staff did ask that people keep an eye on if the higher hoops leave out younger users.

41 Mr. Weber thanked staff for listening to resident feedback and added that as a former basketball
42 coach he would never want to do anything to discourage younger participants of the sport.

43
44 Future Commissioner Ybarra asked staff if the basketball hoop that was in the parking lot at Autumn
45 Grove would be replaced. Staff responded that typically the department policy has been to not
46 replace basketball hoops that are in parking lots due to safety concerns.

47
48 **3) APPROVAL OF MINUTES – FEBRUARY 2, 2021 MEETING**

49 Commissioner Baggenstoss moved to approve the minutes. Vice-Chair Dahlstrom seconds.

50
51
52 **Roll Call**

53 **Ayes:** Arneson, Baggenstoss, Brown, Dahlstrom, Heikkila, Hoag, Lenhart.

54 **Nays:** None.

55 **Abstain:** None.

56
57 **4) INTRODUCTION AND OATH OF OFFICE FOR NEW COMMISSION MEMBERS**

58 The Oath of Office was completed by Commission Chair Hoag for new Commission members Leah
59 Ybarra and Nick Boulton. The new Commissioners introduced themselves to the group and provided
60 a brief overview of why they chose to join the Roseville Parks and Recreation Commission.

61
62 **5) PARK DEDICATION ORDINANCE ANALYSIS DISCUSSION**

63 Background Information

- 64 • January 25, 2021 – Joint Meeting with the City Council
 - 65 ○ City Council expressed interest in Park Dedication
 - 66 ■ What others are doing, what can be done differently to maximize Park
67 Dedication
 - 68 ■ Mentioned recent examples
 - 69 • New development by Sandcastle Park
 - 70 • Former Boaters Outlet located at Co. Rd. C
 - 71 ○ Both of these examples brought in a significant amount of new
72 residents which directly impacts park usage. However, they did
73 not qualify for Park Dedication under the current language in
74 Roseville’s ordinance as the new developments did not replat
75 or subdivide
 - 76 ■ Review of neighboring communities and ordinances
 - 77 • Consideration of two other areas in the ordinance
 - 78 ○ Park Dedication amount
 - 79 ○ Utility Dedications not being qualified

- 81 • Staff research – legal aspects are yet to be sorted out
- 82 ○ Staff has connected with surrounding communities to understand how their
- 83 ordinances are written and in what scenarios they collect Park Dedication

84

85 Staff provided a brief overview of the history, purpose and land or cash options for Park Dedication.
86 Roseville’s Park Dedication Ordinance (1103.07) was reviewed with the Commission. Staff noted
87 that if pathways or right of ways are required as part of the development they would not qualify as
88 Park Dedication.

89

- 90 • Key Factors in Roseville that Activates “Triggers” Park Dedication:
 - 91 ○ A “net increase” in development sites
 - 92 ○ Can only capture for new lots being created
 - 93 ○ Involves 1 acre or more

94

95 Outreach was completed by staff to 9 communities (Andover, Arden Hills, Burnsville, Champlin,
96 Cottage Grove, Mounds View, New Brighton, Shoreview and St. Louis Park) to understand their
97 Park Dedication requirements and triggers. Some of the key language differences appear to be:

- 98 • Do not require a “net increase” in sites but rather focus on increased density
- 99 • Some do capture Park Dedication on all units as long as they have not contributed Park
100 Dedication in the past
- 101 • Do not have a minimum acreage

102

103 Commissioner Baggenstoss relayed that he was happy to see this research on the agenda tonight as
104 population density is going to continue in Roseville and Park Dedication needs to address the
105 increases in order to offset the additional park usage.

106

107 Commissioner Dahlstrom questioned if there may be any unforeseen consequences to changing the
108 ordinance. Staff responded that they did not anticipate any consequences as Roseville is fortunate to
109 have a great location and people come to Roseville for the park system. In addition, staff noted that
110 the surrounding communities are currently utilizing similar ordinances.

111

112 The Commission discussed how Park Dedication funds are used to acquire new park properties and
113 how changing the ordinance language could have helped address the population density impacts to
114 the parks for development projects that did not qualify for Park Dedication.

115

116 Commissioner Arneson asked at what point the city would be willing to pay greater than the
117 assessed Fair Market Value (FMV) for parkland in southwest Roseville. Staff responded that the city
118 would be willing to pay a higher price. However, the exact amount over would be based on
119 reasonableness.

120

121 Chair Hoag suggested to consider stronger language around “useable parkland”.

122
123 The Commission reviewed the cash Park Dedication amount. Including, the most recent Park
124 Dedication comparison of surrounding communities.

- 125
126 • Park Dedication – cash amount
 - 127 ○ Reviewed annually
 - 128 ○ Part of the city fee schedule
 - 129 ○ Residential is \$4,250
 - 130 ○ Non-residential is *10% FMV*
- 131
132 • Park Dedication – land amount
 - 133 ○ Residential – land amount is currently at 10% of the land
 - 134 ○ Non-residential – land amount is currently at *5% of the land*
 - 135 ■ Non-residential has lagged behind and is not consistent with the cash amount of
 - 136 10%. Staff provided a suggestion that this discrepancy potentially be reconciled
 - 137 with the updated ordinance language
- 138
139 • Utility Dedications Not Qualified
 - 140 ○ Set periodically in ordinance
 - 141 ○ Utility Dedications Not Qualified
 - 142 ■ Land dedication for required street right-of-way or utilities; including drainage,
 - 143 does not qualify as Park Dedication (Ord. 1530, 7/10/2017)
 - 144 ■ This issue has come up recently with some Park Dedication proposals from the
 - 145 developer
 - 146 ■ Pathways and sidewalks are typically required as a part of a Public Improvement
 - 147 Contract
 - 148 ■ Staff is suggesting language to including “required pathways or sidewalks” in the
 - 149 proposed ordinance update
 - 150 ■ Currently in practice

151
152 The Commission had a clarification discussion on when pathways or sidewalks would be included in
153 a Park Dedication recommendation and how/who determines if a pathway or sidewalk is required.

154
155 Staff provided the draft potential Park Dedication Ordinance. The updated language has relatively
156 simple language adjustments that would allow the city to capture additional Park Dedication
157 contributions. Staff noted that Roseville invests heavily in the parks and Park Dedication is one way
158 to help offset additional usage that comes from new developments. Staff reiterated that the legal
159 aspects are yet to be sorted out. However, the redline changes are based on information gathering as
160 suggested by the City Council.

161 The Commission reviewed the draft potential Park Dedication Ordinance language.

162

163 Chair Hoag suggested adding the word “sidewalks” to Part D and possibly “useable parkland” to
164 Part B of the draft ordinance.

165

166 Next steps in the process for the Park Dedication Ordinance language review would be to:

167

- Consider a recommendation
- Sort out legal aspects and approach
- Schedule a meeting with the City Council to report back

168

169

170

171 Commissioner Arneson added that a definition of “useable land” may be helpful.

172

173 Commissioner Heikkila noted that residents and businesses are willing to pay a premium to live in
174 Roseville due to the location. He believes that developers would be willing to pay additional Park
175 Dedication in order to develop parcels that offer a convenient location and great park opportunities.

176

177 Staff and the Commission discussed next steps in the process to move the draft language forward to
178 the City Council.

179

180 Chair Hoag moved to recommend that the Parks and Recreation Commission, upon
181 recommendation from the City Council, has reviewed the suggested updates in the draft Park
182 Dedication Ordinance. The Commission agrees with the suggested ordinance updates that staff
183 has provided and along with the Commissions additional suggestions, recommends moving the
184 draft Park Dedication Ordinance forward for a legal review and then to the City Council.
185 Commissioner Baggenstoss seconds.

186

187 **Roll Call**

188 **Ayes:** Arneson, Baggenstoss, Boulton, Brown, Dahlstrom, Heikkila, Hoag, Lenhart, Ybarra.

189 **Nays:** None.

190 **Abstain:** None.

191

192 **6) POCAHONTAS PARK NAME CONVERSATION**

193 Staff provided an update on where the Commission left off last meeting with the Pocahontas Park
194 name conversation and outlined potential discussion objectives for the group, including:

195

- Briefly summarize resources and information received thus far
- Recommend possible next steps
- Hear feedback from the Commission

196

197

198

- Introductory information

199

- Who Pocahontas the person was

200

- 201 ○ GARE process overview
- 202 ○ HRIEC and Parks and Recreation engagement overview
- 203 ○ Community Aspirations and Racial Equity Narrative
- 204 ● Guidance from Groups/Experts/Community Leaders
- 205 ○ Feedback received to date
 - 206 ▪ Shannon Geshick of the Minnesota Indian Affairs Council
 - 207 ▪ Wayne Ducheneaux of the Native Governance Center
 - 208 ▪ John Bobolink of St. Paul Public Schools
 - 209 ▪ The Metropolitan Urban Indians Directors Group
 - 210 ▪ Numerous individuals in various capacities
- 211 ○ Additional proposed contacts
 - 212 ▪ Roseville Area Schools American Indian Parent Advisory Group
 - 213 ▪ Dakota representatives
- 214 ○ Individual study
 - 215 ▪ Reclaiming Native Truth documents
 - 216 ▪ Why Treaties Matter Webinar
 - 217 ▪ Reclaiming Bde Maka Ska Webinar
- 218
- 219 ● Inform and engage the Community
- 220 ○ Informal Engagement
 - 221 ▪ Individual conversations
 - 222 ▪ General Awareness
 - 223 ▪ News Media
 - 224 ▪ Community Events
 - 225 ● Natural Resources events
 - 226 ● Discover Your Parks (DYP) events
- 227 ○ Formal Engagement
 - 228 ▪ Website (live)
 - 229 ▪ Newsletter (May)
 - 230 ▪ Direct mail
 - 231 ● Prior to listening session
 - 232 ▪ Listening session
- 233
- 234 ● Receive feedback
- 235 ○ Expert/leader feedback
- 236 ○ Informal feedback received through public comment
- 237 ○ Website feedback
- 238 ○ Informal conversations with neighbors
- 239 ○ Discover Your Parks (DYP)
 - 240 ▪ 6 DYP events are planned for the summer of 2021

- 241 ▪ Commissioner
- 242 ○ Listening Session
- 243 ▪ Proposed date of September 7, 2021
- 244 ▪ Invite the neighborhood and other potentially impacted groups to hear from each
- 245 other and provide feedback to the Commission
- 246
- 247 • Equity lens
- 248 ○ Community Aspirations
- 249 ○ Racial Equity Narrative
- 250 ○ City of Roseville Racial Equity Action Plan
- 251 ○ Utilization of the GARE Racial Equity Toolkit to develop the process
- 252
- 253 • To do list
- 254 ○ Continued guidance from Native American Groups/Experts
- 255 ○ Further inform the community
- 256 ○ Individual study
- 257 ○ Continued conversations with neighbors/others
- 258 ○ Discover Your Parks (DYP)
- 259 ▪ Pocahontas Park DYP – August 4
- 260 ○ Listening Session on September 7
- 261
- 262 • Questions received from the Commission
- 263 ○ Among the Native American groups would they prefer that a new park name recognize
- 264 the Native American people? If yes, how might this happen.
- 265 ▪ This question was submitted by more than 1 Commissioner
- 266 ▪ Staff will ask this question to any future contacts that they speak with to gain
- 267 feedback for the Commission
- 268

269 Commissioner Lenhart commented that she would like to better understand the historical use of the
270 land in Roseville. In addition, she asked staff what type of feedback is requested on the website.
271 Staff responded that they have reached out to various groups to try to gather information on the
272 historical land use in Roseville but have not received responses. It was suggested that individual
273 Commissioners could research the topic and report back to the Commission. Staff added that the
274 website currently has just a general area to provide open feedback.

275
276 Commissioner Lenhart asked when the question of: “What would you suggest for a new name?”
277 should be asked. Staff responded that their suggestion would be for Commissioners to ask this
278 question throughout the remainder of the process.

279 The Commission discussed potential ways a final name could be chosen.

280

281 7) **STAFF REPORT**

282 a) **NEW OR RELEVANT COMMUNICATIONS AND UPDATE ITEMS**

- 283 • Ethics Training and New Commissioner Orientation – Wednesday, April 14
- 284 • The DYP sign-up sheet is now available online for Commissioners to sign-up to attend
- 285 • The Spring/Summer Parks and Recreation Brochure has been mailed to homes
- 286 • Recreation program registration opened April 6
- 287 • The Ice Show will be April 23 and 24 with limited spectators
- 288 • Earth Day at Harriet Alexander Nature Center on April 24 (10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.)
- 289 • Kite Day at Central Park Victoria Ballfields on April 24 (10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.)
- 290 o Free event
- 291 o Sponsored by Roseville Parks and Recreation, Do Good Roseville and Kiwanis Malt
- 292 Shop at the MN State Fair
- 293 • Staff requested input and feedback regarding COVID-19 and the upcoming large events that
- 294 Roseville Parks and Recreation hosts each summer
- 295 o Party in the Park (15,000-20,000 people)
- 296 o Parade (15,000-20,000 people)

297

298 8) **OTHER**

299 Commissioner Lenhart relayed that the Summer Spectacular Camp filled up within 1 hour upon the

300 registration opening. She suggested potentially expanding the program as it is so popular and helpful

301 to so many families. Staff responded that they appreciate the comment and with safety in mind staff

302 always works to do everything possible in order to maximize attendance for programs.

303

304 Commissioner Ybarra asked who makes the final decision to hold or cancel events such as the

305 Parade and Party in the Park. Staff relayed that it is a joint decision with the city’s Emergency

306 Management Team in consultation with the Health Department and State of MN.

307

308 Meeting adjourned at 9:06 p.m.

309

310 Respectfully Submitted,

311 Danielle Christensen, Department Assistant

312