



Parks and Recreation System

Master Plan

Part D | Appendix 1: Citizen Advisory Team meeting notes





Park and Recreation System Master Plan Update

Citizen Advisory Team

Meeting One: Master Plan “Kick-Off” Meeting

NOTES

10 September 2009
 6:30 to 8:30 p.m.
 Willow Room, Roseville City Hall

Attendance

CAT members

Erin Azer	Bob Bierscheid	Karen Bracht	Michael Butler
Gregg Cummings	Bill Farmer	Alisa Famer	Rick Goodmanson
Cecelia Green	Gary Grefenberg	Elfrieda Hintze	Brent Huberty
Jake Jacobson	Julia Jacobson	Sheila Mahnken	Rose Masanz
Gale Pederson	Brad Peper	Dan Roe	Matthew Sundeen
Tom Turba	Bob Willmus	Ken Yokanovich	Katie Young

City Staff

Lonnie Brokke	Jill Anfang	Jeff Evenson
---------------	-------------	--------------

Consulting Team

Dan Cornejo	Michael Schroeder
-------------	-------------------

Others

NOTES

- 1 Introductions
 - City staff, Citizen Advisory Team members, and the leaders of the consulting team were introduced. Jake Jacobson introduced himself as the facilitator of the Community Advisory Team.
- 2 Master Plan
 - Lonnie Brokke provided an overview of the background and need for the master planning effort, noting support for this effort from the Imagine Roseville 2025 effort and other input from the community regarding the park and recreation system. The team structure was reviewed using a chart provided to CAT members, and a short description of the Technical Advisory Team, Design Team, and Community Advisory Team composition, roles, and responsibilities was discussed.
 - Michael Schroeder reviewed the general schedule for the master plan, noting that “Kick-Off” meeting is the beginning of work on the project, and that completion is targeted for mid-June 2010 (for a draft document). Michael also reviewed the general process for the work, and suggested that the consultant work plan be made available to CAT members.

Community Advisory Team

Meeting One: Master Plan “Kick-Off” Meeting

NOTES

10 September 2009

Page 2

3 Citizen Advisory Team

- Jake Jacobson discussed the idea of “rules” for CAT meetings, suggesting that no firm rules will be used unless it becomes evident that greater order is needed.
- Michael Schroeder reviewed the schedule for meetings of the CAT, as well as the general structure for meetings. He noted that the meetings are intended to provide the CAT with time to work toward their charge in guiding the master plan, that CAT meetings are open to the public, and that input from the public should be allowed near the conclusion of each meeting. While a schedule of meetings for the CAT (and other meetings that might occur during the process) was provided, CAT members requested that an integrated schedule of meetings be provided.
- While there are a number of meetings indicated in the schedule, it was noted that the CAT may determine that additional meetings might be required, with or without the consultant team.
- Adjustments to the schedule will be made to avoid conflicts identified by member of the CAT.
- A question was raised regarding the role of the CAT, particularly relative to their advisory capacity. It was noted that this body is responsible for assembling and forwarding a plan for Roseville’s park and recreation systems to the Park and Recreation Commission and the City Council.
- Meeting times were discussed. Some members wondered whether “double meeting times” could be established to help ensure participation from the CAT. It was noted that duplicate meetings would be difficult, and that there is a need for a coordinated discussion to occur at each CAT meeting. It was decided that, even though not all members of the CAT would be able to attend each meeting, the CAT would conduct single meetings at scheduled points during master planning process.

4 Public involvement and community outreach

- Methods of reaching the community during the planning process were discussed. It was noted that Bob Bierscheid would be leading a Community Outreach Team composed of members of the CAT and other volunteers from the community. The master planning process intends to engage as many residents and stakeholders as possible, using community meetings, outreach at events, questionnaires, and other methods that might be defined during the planning process.
- A handout was provided to the CAT highlighting the community outreach strategy. A sample of a questionnaire was also shared; CAT members suggested a questionnaire oriented to children, as well as connecting to students through their schools.

5 Initial thoughts

- The agenda intended to devote time for input from the CAT. It was decided that a more intensive input session would be scheduled as a follow-up to this meeting to ensure reasonable time is devoted to gaining the initial thoughts of the members of the CAT.

- 6 Workbook
 - Each member of the CAT was provided with a workbook for the master planning process. The contents were briefly discussed.
- 7 Questions
 - Questions from the CAT were generally discussed during the course of the meeting.
- 8 Public comment
 - There were no comments from the public.
- 9 Adjourn
 - The CAT adjourned at approximately 8:30 p.m.

Upcoming meetings

- | | |
|-----------------|--|
| 14 October 2009 | CAT Meeting 1a: <i>follow-up from Kick-Off meeting</i> |
| 29 October 2009 | CAT Meeting 2: <i>Review Stage One results</i> |
| 5 November 2009 | Community Meeting One: <i>Issues and Ideas</i> |

These notes represent the author's interpretation of discussions and decisions occurring at the meeting. Corrections or deficiencies may be directed to Jeff Evenson, Roseville Parks and Recreation Department (jeff.evenson@ci.roseville.mn.us) before the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CAT, or they may be addressed at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CAT, after which the notes will be recorded as approved upon a vote of the CAT.



Park and Recreation System Master Plan Update

Citizen Advisory Team

Meeting 1A: Master Plan “Kick-Off” Meeting <<<Follow-up meeting>>>

NOTES

14 October 2009

6:30 to 8:30 p.m.

Willow Room, Roseville City Hall

draft

Attendance

CAT members

Michael Butler	Gregg Cummings	Bill Farmer	Alisa Farmer
Rick Goodmanson	Cecelia Green	Gary Grefenberg	Andrea Gruver
David Holt	Brent Huberty	Jake Jacobson	Sheila Mahnken
Mike Maristuen	Rose Masanz	Nancy O’Brien	Gale Pederson
Brad Peper	Dan Rose	Matthew Sundeen	Bob Willmus
Ken Yokanovich	Katie Young		

City Staff

Lonnie Brokke	Jeff Evenson	Brad Tullberg
---------------	--------------	---------------

Consulting Team

Lydia Major	Michael Schroeder
-------------	-------------------

Others

Notes

- 1 Review meeting notes
 - Notes were discussed and approved without changes
- 2 How well do you really know your parks?
 - Jeff Evenson led a pictorial quiz of park pictures, asking CAT members to name parks pictured.
- 3 CAT communications procedures
 - The procedure for communicating among CAT members was discussed, with a focus on receiving information via a website. Jeff Evenson noted that the mailbox where materials would be distributed would not receive replies. As a result questions should be directed to Jeff, via email or telephone.
- 4 Community outreach efforts
 - Lonnie Brokke reviewed the distribution of questionnaires to date, and highlighted upcoming distribution events—and solicited CAT members help in distribution

- CAT members suggested other venues for distribution of the questionnaire—such as church events and scout meetings.
- “Meeting in a Box”
 - There was a brief description of meeting set-up and a display of the tub, followed by discussion of possible locations/groups to have meetings.
- Questionnaire
 - Michael Schroeder described the use of ACCESS as a means of tabulating results from the questionnaire. Some changes were made to the questionnaire—to obtain data more appropriate for our purposes, and to facilitate tabulation of results.
 - Michael noted that the results are not statistically valid as a cross section of the community because the questionnaires are largely being distributed at park and recreation events—where people oriented to parks may already be in attendance. Still, the results will be useful as a reference.
 - Members of the CAT were interested in viewing the data. It was made clear that they will have access to the raw input and tabulated results and well as the original responses to the questionnaire.
 - The results of responses received to date will be input to the program once LHB has a chance to “test” the set up of the program. Volunteers from the CAT were encouraged to help with data entry.
 - Queries resulting from the responses will be formulated, but if there is additional information desired CAT members should let staff know.

5 [other business]

6 Evolution of Roseville’s Park and Recreation System

- Jeff Evenson presented a PowerPoint show describing the evolution of the park and recreation system and changes in demographics in Roseville. He highlighted the 1960 Master Plan and the development of Central Park as an example of the changes in one park over a number of years.

7 CAT input

- CAT members completed the initial input session that was intended to be completed during the first meeting. The input also included a discussion about the future of parks relative to broader changes that might be anticipated in the future of the community. The CAT responses were recorded as follows:
 - Goals
 - Preserving/enhancing park legacy
 - Preserve public space/landscape
 - Preserve wild areas
 - Parks as common meeting & “backyard” area, town squares
 - Develop programs for ever-changing demographics

Community Advisory Team

Meeting 1A: Master Plan "Kick-Off" Meeting <<<Follow-up meeting>>>

NOTES

14 October 2009

Page 3

- Serve diverse needs (multi-generational, multi-cultural)
- Mold plan to be flexible
- Involve 33,690
- Parks as part of "friendlier" community
- Enhancing connectivity
 - Pathways and connections
 - Integration and transportation between parks
- Market plan and parks to community and beyond
- Recognize current economic conditions (phasing, parks to serve Roseville vs. grand plans)
 - Identify funding mechanisms
 - identify partnerships
 - Explore partnerships w/ schools, county, other organizations
- Maintenance
- Simple and user-friendly master plan
- Bring parks to people/neighborhoods
- Relationship to 2025
 - Incorporate goals from above
 - Variety of facilities, events, and programs
 - "World class/renowned" definition
 - Roseville manages system in a way recognizable as excellent
 - Park system is an example of civic commitment/involvement
 - Term applies to system as a whole
 - Park serves community, not world
 - Term may sound provincial
 - Can't excel at everything
 - System is a model
 - Roseville parks recognized beyond city and beyond Metro
 - Environmentally friendly/sustainable park maintenance
 - Roseville has unique features
 - Programs for everyone (not exclusively sports)
- Futures
 - Technology
 - Population/demographic changes
 - Pollution/environmental challenges
 - Social norms, structures change (family, crime/safety, etc.)
 - Funding
 - Collaboration
 - Invasive species, environmental threats, public health threats
 - Economic shifts (lake homes? Staycations?)
 - Middle class opportunities
 - Fewer "traditional" park users
 - Free facilities
 - Maintenance issues
 - Geographic boundaries

Community Advisory Team

Meeting 1A: Master Plan "Kick-Off" Meeting <<<Follow-up meeting>>>

NOTES

14 October 2009

Page 4

- 8 Questions
 - Questions from the CAT were generally discussed during the course of the meeting.
- 9 Public comment
 - No public questions or comments
- 10 Adjourn
 - The CAT adjourned at approximately 8:30 p.m.

Upcoming meetings

29 October 2009	CAT Meeting 2: <i>Review Stage One results</i>
5 November 2009	Community Meeting One: <i>Issues and Ideas</i>

These notes represent the author's interpretation of discussions and decisions occurring at the meeting. Corrections or deficiencies may be directed to Jeff Evenson, Roseville Parks and Recreation Department (jeff.evenson@ci.roseville.mn.us) before the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CAT, or they may be addressed at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CAT, after which the notes will be recorded as approved upon a vote of the CAT.



Park and Recreation System Master Plan Update

Citizen Advisory Team

Meeting 2: Phase One Investigations

NOTES

29 October 2009

6:30 to 8:30 p.m.

Willow Room, Roseville City Hall

draft

Attendance

CAT members

Erin Azer	Bob Bierscheid	Gregg Cummings	Bill Farmer
Cecelia Green	Gary Grefenberg	Andrea Gruver	Jake Jacobson
Julia Jacobson	Sheila Mahnken	Nancy O'Brien	Brad Peper
Dan Roe	Tom Turba	Bob Willmus	Ken Yokanovich

City Staff

Lonnie Brokke	Jill Anfang	Jeff Evenson	Brad Tullberg
---------------	-------------	--------------	---------------

Consulting Team

Lydia Major	Michael Schroeder	Dan Cornejo
-------------	-------------------	-------------

Others

Minutes

- 1 Review meeting notes
 - Notes were discussed and approved without changes
- 2 How well do you really know your parks?
 - Jeff Evenson presented the second pictorial quiz of park pictures, which was enjoyed by all.
- 3 CAT items
 - This agenda item is intended as a placeholder for issues of concern to the CAT that will not be addressed in other portions of the agenda.
 - No CAT items were discussed.
- 4 Community outreach efforts
 - Bob Bierscheid explained the Meeting in a Box procedures and a sign-up sheet was passed to CAT members
 - Questionnaire
 - Michael Schroeder updated the CAT on the status of the tabulation process, noting that the ACCESS module has been created and provided to the city for data input.

- The “Discover Your Parks” program was discussed, noting that the program offered the opportunity to bring notice of the master planning process to each of the city’s parks during the next eight or so months. Given the number of parks (30), this is a significant undertaking and will require assistance from members of the CAT.
- 5 Phase One investigations; establishing parks and recreation systems contexts for planning
 - Several documents were distributed that help build an understanding of the current parks and recreation system, including:
 - a Foundation Document summary, for which Michael Schroeder noted that the summary of the 1960 Parks Master Plan needs to be added; this was an item that Jeff Evenson reviewed at CAT meeting 1a;
 - a copy of the PowerPoint presentation by Jeff Evenson from CAT meeting 1a summarizing the history of parks and recreation in Roseville.
 - Michael Schroeder presented a investigations of park service areas, a demographic snapshot, and a general comparison of Roseville’s park and recreation system to a series of peer communities.
 - The park service areas were defined using the National Park and Recreation Association methodologies for parks, classifications, and service area. Bob Bierscheid noted that the NRPA methodology is a tool used to help communities formulate a park system appropriate to their community, but it is not a standard. The application of this methodology to Roseville noted that service areas would be truncated by roadways (which limit walkability for some parks users), and by applying elements of some park classifications in “higher” park classifications if those parks included certain park features. The result of the service radius investigation, even at a preliminary stage, was noted by CAT members—that the southwest corner of the community is not well served by parks in the community (although some members noted that parks in nearby communities did serve them, and that Roseville, in some instances, provides programming at parks located beyond the city limits in Lauderdale). CAT members also noted that the location of some facilities (a play structure, for instance) in a large park might be misleading, in essence suggesting that a play structure was located within a 1/8 radius of a park, when in fact the play structure might be located significantly distant from the edge of the park.
 - Using the comprehensive plan and readily available statistical information, a snapshot of local demographics was presented. This information was used to compare park service in the community based on population in each of the sixteen planning districts noted in the city’s comprehensive plan. CAT members noted that the planning districts may not be an appropriate

boundary for parks; it was noted that those boundaries were used for making comparisons and for consistency with the comprehensive plan, but that other methods might ultimately be defined for park planning during this process.

- A comparison of Roseville's park and recreation system to its peers was presented. It was noted that the information for the comparison was obtained from a single source on the internet, but there is no way to define precisely what comprises the information presented in that website.
- All of this information was distributed in a handout to the CAT.

6 Community Meeting One

- Michael Schroeder described the agenda and process for taking input at the first community meeting. CAT members agreed with the process for taking information, but noted that more time on the agenda should be directed to participation, and less to presentation. Those changes will be made in the agenda.
- It was noted that CAT members should feel free to actively participate in the small group discussions, but their insights about the nuances of small group discussions may be important to discuss at the next CAT meeting.

7 Questions

- There were no questions addressed.

8 Public comment

- No public questions or comments

9 Adjourn

- The CAT adjourned at approximately 8:30 p.m.

Upcoming meetings

5 November 2009
18 November 2009

Community Meeting One: *Issues and Ideas*
CAT Meeting 2A: Review input from Community Meeting One

These notes represent the author's interpretation of discussions and decisions occurring at the meeting. Corrections or deficiencies may be directed to Jeff Evenson, Roseville Parks and Recreation Department (jeff.evenson@ci.roseville.mn.us) before the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CAT, or they may be addressed at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CAT, after which the notes will be recorded as approved upon a vote of the CAT.



Park and Recreation System Master Plan Update

Citizen Advisory Team

Meeting 2a: Review input from Community Meeting One

NOTES

18 November 2009

6:30 to 8:30 p.m.

Willow Room, Roseville City Hall

draft

Attendance

CAT members

Bob Bierscheid	Gary Grefenberg	Rick Goodmanson	Andrea Gruver
David Holt	Jake Jacobson	Sheila Mahnken	Mike Maristuen
Rose Masanz	Nancy O'Brien	Gale Pederson	Dan Roe
Matt Sundeen	Bob Willmus	Katie Young	

City Staff

Lonnie Brokke	Jill Anfang	Jeff Evenson	Brad Tullberg
---------------	-------------	--------------	---------------

Consulting Team

Dan Cornejo	Michael Schroeder
-------------	-------------------

Others

Notes

- 1 Review meeting Notes
 - Notes were discussed and approved without changes
- 2 How well do you really know your parks?
 - Jeff Evenson presented the third pictorial quiz of park pictures, noting a slight twist in the quiz format that was understood by all.
- 3 CAT items
 - A number of emails have been received by the Parks and Recreation Department regarding the master planning process. Emails submitted to the city will be collected and distributed to the CAT at their regular meetings, rather than forwarding each email when received.
 - A master copy of the Workbook will be updated with new information, so CAT members and the public can view it to make certain they have the most current and complete information.
- 4 Community outreach efforts
 - Nearly 80 questionnaires have been tabulated by city staff to this point, and there have been more than 25 group/neighborhood visits.

- There are two “Meetings in a Box” scheduled for gatherings of neighbors, and more requests have been submitted to city staff.
 - CAT members noted that questionnaires are too long to be filled out at an event, and it should be shorter. Many are being submitted after an event, or not being submitted at all after being distributed. While it may be problematic to change this questionnaire, future versions will be designed to be shorter.
- 5 Community Meeting One
 - The first community meeting was held on 5 November 2009, with more than 60 people attending. A full summary of the input received was distributed to the CAT separately.
 - A discussion regarding the results of the meeting included the following broad ideas:
 - It was suggested that meeting participants were largely those who were already engaged;
 - The notion of Roseville as a small town generated discussion among CAT members, but parks are a common thread and a high ranking feature of the community for most people;
 - Changes in the community result in new people, all of whom might be parks users, but at the same time it was noted that there is a segment of the community’s population that do not use the parks;
 - Public safety and the relationship to parks is an important feature of the planning work, with engagement through parks and recreation leading to a safer community.
 - A discussion about getting “unengaged” residents to come to a meeting focused on targeting input sessions to those groups, making direct invitations, and getting CAT or staff connected to a key person in an “unengaged” group. This discussion resulted from the recognition that the first Community Meeting may have failed to engage a good cross-section of the Roseville community.
 - Engaging businesses as a part of the process was discussed, along with ways that input from churches and schools might be gained.
 - The process for Community Meeting Two was discussed, particularly in regard to the possibility of a “sector” approach. As one of the key strategies for gaining public input is taking our work to where people are, the sector approach (essentially, conducting the same meeting in several locations throughout the community) has validity. Staff will consider ways that this approach can be used in the next community meeting.
 - 6 Investigations
 - Michael Schroeder showed maps that built on the input from the CAT at the last meeting, showing park service areas based on distance from play structures in neighborhood parks. There were also refinements to the service areas based on population. Ultimately, this information results in the same types of findings that the earlier maps presented—that the southwest portion of the community is underserved by parks in Roseville.
 - Comparisons of the Roseville park system to others was noted as being

difficult, or even irrelevant, because the information cannot be portrayed equally.

- The information we now have in a physical and census-based database will allow us to perform any number of similar mapping exercises as those already presented to the CAT. It was noted that we need to be thinking about issues beyond the physical analysis, and perhaps follow up on the mapping once we have established some preliminary ideas for the master plan.
- As a part of the investigations, the information gained from the first community meeting was interpreted to try to determine some key messages as noted in the attached document.

7 Questions

- There were no questions addressed.

8 Public comment

- Bob Willmus noted that the City Council budget process will be occurring over the next few weeks, and the CAT may want to pay particular attention to the budget related to parks.

9 Adjourn

- The CAT adjourned at approximately 8:30 p.m.

Upcoming meetings

16 December 2009

CAT Meeting 2b: *Programming Ideas*

7 January 2010

CAT Meeting 3: Review conditions, directions

Note meeting time! 6:00 to 9:30 p.m.

These notes represent the author's interpretation of discussions and decisions occurring at the meeting. Corrections or deficiencies may be directed to Jeff Evenson, Roseville Parks and Recreation Department (jeff.evenson@ci.roseville.mn.us) before the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CAT, or they may be addressed at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CAT, after which the notes will be recorded as approved upon a vote of the CAT.



Park and Recreation System Master Plan Update

Citizen Advisory Team

Meeting 2b: Programming ideas

NOTES

18 November 2009

6:30 to 8:30 p.m.

Willow Room, Roseville City Hall

draft

Attendance

CAT members

Bob Bierscheid	Gregg Cummings	Bill Farmer	Alisa Farmer
Cecelia Green	Andrea Gruver	David Holt	Jake Jacobson
Sheila Mahnken	Rose Masanz	Nancy O'Brien	Gale Pederson
Brad Peper	Dan Roe	Matthew Sundeen	Tom Turba
Bob Willmus	Ken Yokanovich	Katie Young	

City Staff

Lonnie Brokke	Jill Anfang	Jeff Evenson	Brad Tullberg
---------------	-------------	--------------	---------------

Consulting Team

Dan Cornejo	Michael Schroeder
-------------	-------------------

Others

Notes

- 1 Review meeting notes
 - Notes were discussed and approved without changes
- 2 How well do you really know your parks?
 - Jeff Evenson presented a pictorial quiz of park facilities, elements, and equipment, noting that all pictures are pretty.
- 3 CAT items
 - It was noted that the numbering of CAT meetings has been confusing for all concerned. The renumbering intended to insert additional meetings that were not anticipated in the original work scope. From this point forward, the numbering should be consecutive and integer-based.
- 4 Community outreach efforts
 - A discussion of the geographic location of the next round of meetings focused on the desire for "sector based" meetings. A map was shared that divided the community into five sectors which will be used for the next round of public meetings (in addition to one community-wide meeting). It was noted that residents can attend any sector meeting, and while the focus will be on issues of community concern, discussion of local sector issues will likely occur.
 - Listening sessions are being planned for three or four interest groups (Arts

& Culture, Sports & Facilities, Friends & Facilities, and perhaps an "unaffiliated" group. An outline for the listening sessions was shared, noting that invitations will be made to an extensive list of groups. Input from participants will focus on finding common ground, so a large turnout from any one group will not be needed.

- A listening session was conducted with the Parks Programming staff and the Parks Maintenance staff on 14 December 2009. Programming staff directed their comments to programs they felt were significant or unique to the community, or ideas for new programs. Maintenance staff expressed concerns over their lack of ability to properly care for the parks and facilities, but it was noted that they exhibited a great deal of pride for the park system and their role in it.

5 Parks and recreation programming

- Jill Anfang presented an overview of current parks programming, services, and facilities, and Brad Tullberg presented highlights of the Skating Center programming. While the details are extensive, the presentation was an impressive summary of the role parks programming plays in the community. Copies of the PowerPoint will be made available to the CAT, however the breadth of programming available to the community cannot be reflected in the PowerPoint alone. It was suggested that, if such a presentation is made again, it be recorded so the information can be better shared with the CAT and others interested in the park programming.

- Michael Schroeder summarized a discussion held with staff regarding outcomes, and in particular the need to respond to a City Council request for "outcome-based budgeting." It was noted that staff generated a list of five broad outcomes during the discussion. Without elaboration, the list included:

- Sense of community
- Healthy community
- Public safety
- Community and economic development
- Life-long enrichment

- The CAT offered insights about desired outcomes, often using words that were more eloquent than those in the staff list. Summarizing, with apologies if the full intent or actual words used are not fairly reflected, the CAT offered the following suggestions for outcomes:

- Public health physical and emotional health, and living as a community
- Public safety stemming issues and problems by keeping children active and engaged, and by getting people out in public and populating the city's public spaces
- Property values referencing a McKnight study that indicated that property values are higher with proximity to parks

- Community cultural values focusing on what a community aspires to be, and noting that programs and facilities might be considered in a separate evaluation to avoid competition for resources
- Environmental awareness noting the presence of wildlife in the community and its parks, and the need for the continued presence of wild places in the city
- Life-long experiences the idea that children in Roseville are being raised and are participating in programs related to parks that they will carry with them for their entire lives
- Life education lessons learned in the parks and programs are valuable to a person’s life experiences—more than memories, but ways to act and interact
- Affordable and accessible parks and programs should be within the reach of every resident, that the sense of inclusion in these programs lends a sense of connection that is central to the idea of community
- Civic responsibility a sense of obligation about what has been handed to the current generation of residents, and the need to convey something equally profound to succeeding generations of residents; also noted was the ways that parks and programs teach people to appreciate and protect Roseville (the community, not just the parks), and a heightened sense of stewardship resulting from engagement in parks
- Retain and attract residents parks and programs are something that new residents consider when making a home location decision, and that are considerations for residents deciding if they will remain in the community
- Volunteerism another connection to community-building, but with the added idea that employment of high school students as part-time park employees builds leadership skills and offers life training as a part of their employment
- Stabilizing influence parks and programs offer a way of creating stability in a community that goes beyond economic conditions
- Funding residents go out of Roseville to work, and they need to bring Roseville in, finding partnerships for funding; parks and programming offer an entry point for private businesses and investments

- Total experience a park experience is not a singular thing, but rather a combination of activities and experiences; Roseville’s parks and recreation should somehow focus on capturing the total experience
 - Ongoing participation leveraging qualitative participation by continually engaging parks and programs users using information to guide decision-making, focusing on tools like web reviews and statistics to “sell” programs
 - Peer review
 - Sense of community was noted as an overarching outcome—that all of the outcomes noted and discussed resulted in a greater sense of community and commitment to the idea of community
 - Ultimately, the outcomes will be matched to metrics that will allow staff to measure success in meeting the desired outcomes. It shouldn’t be construed as a “pass-fail” measurement, but rather as a means of directing resources appropriately to meet desired outcomes. As a result, a series of baseline metrics will need to be established. It was noted that some measurements, like the number of people using a trail or the ability to see a sunset cannot be measured. Still, given that some kinds of outcomes do not have quantitative measurements, a series of metrics will be proposed as a way of evaluating outcomes—including benchmarks that might be instituted in 2010.
 - Discussions of metrics, resources needed to meet outcomes, and the ability to meet outcomes with aggregated vs. dispersed facilities was mentioned, but time limited the ability to engage in a full discussion. Those topics will be continued to a future meeting.
- 6 Questions
 · There were no questions addressed.
- 7 Public comment
 ·
- 8 Adjourn
 · The CAT adjourned at approximately 8:30 p.m.

Upcoming meetings

7 January 2010	CAT Meeting 3: Review conditions, directions Note meeting time! 6:00 to 9:30 p.m.
16 January 2010	CAT Meeting 4: Park system components Note meeting time! 8:30 am to noon

These notes represent the author’s interpretation of discussions and decisions occurring at the meeting. Corrections or deficiencies may be directed to Jeff Evenson, Roseville Parks and Recreation Department (jeff.evanson@ci.roseville.mn.us) before the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CAT, or they may be addressed at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CAT, after which the notes will be recorded as approved upon a vote of the CAT.



Park and Recreation System Master Plan Update

Citizen Advisory Team

Meeting 3: Review of conditions, directions

NOTES

6 January 2010

6:00 to 9:00 p.m.

Willow Room, Roseville City Hall

draft

Attendance

CAT members

Erin Azer	Bob Bierscheid	Gregg Cummings	Cecelia Green
Brent Huberty	Jake Jacobson	Sheila Mahnken	Michael Maristuen
Rose Masanz	Nancy O'Brien	Gale Pederson	Brad Peper
Dan Roe	Tom Turba	Ken Yokanovich	

City Staff

Lonnie Brokke	Jill Anfang	Jeff Evenson	Brad Tullberg
---------------	-------------	--------------	---------------

Consulting Team

Dan Cornejo	Michael Schroeder
-------------	-------------------

Others

Notes

- 1 Review meeting Notes
 - Notes were discussed and approved without changes
- 2 How well do you really know your parks?
 - Jeff Evenson presented a pictorial quiz in a format that he admitted was not nearly so well-crafted as previous versions assembled by Jill.
- 3 CAT items
 - Jeff reminded CAT members of the meeting on Saturday 16 January, 8:30 am to noon, at City Hall.
- 4 Community outreach efforts
 - Staff will distribute a list of dates for Listening Sessions and the five sector meetings that are planned for later in January and February.
 - Michael Schroeder discussed a simple tabulation of results from the questionnaire, noting that 239 responses were included in the handout provided to CAT members. He urged the CAT to review the information provided, noting that it was a simple listing of responses without any cross tabulation, and compare those responses to the actual questionnaire. CAT

members should forward any requests for queries that might cross tabulate the information provided with other information requested in the questionnaire. It was suggested that simple cross tabulations such as the age of respondents, the numbers of children in the household, and the length of residency in Roseville for those responses listed in the handout might offer insights. Michael noted that most respondents were in two age cohorts (age 37-54 and age 55-69), and that the location of questionnaire distribution influences some responses (questionnaires distributed at a dance-related program yielded several requests for a new dance studio). Requests for queries of information from the questionnaire should be directed to Jeff.

- 5 Conditions/directions for a parks and recreation system vision
 - Michael led the CAT through a PowerPoint highlighting key points and messages that might form the "vision" portion of the overall master plan. A copy of the presentation will be distributed to the CAT. Prompted by questions from the CAT, the purposes of the "vision" and "master plan" elements were discussed, including highlighting the potential audiences and uses for each element. In short, Michael described the "vision" as a 12-16 page document that highlights the broad directions for the parks and recreation system, shares compelling ideas about needed or desired additions to parks, facilities, and programs, and inspires readers to commit or act. The "vision" portion of the document, being shorter, will be more widely distributed and targeted to the general public. The "master plan" element offers more comprehensive guidance for individuals or groups seeking more information, direction and policies for staff and decision-makers, and input on practices that support the vision. There will also be an appendix that includes a range of information collected during the master planning process.
 - Each of the seven proposed sections of the "vision" (The Setting, The Challenge, A Parks and Recreation Framework, Outcomes, Themes, Unifying Ideas, and The Need to Act) were discussed, and the CAT offered the following questions and comments:
 - Can the master plan make any recommendations for Twin Lakes? While Langton Lake offers an opportunity for open space related to new development or redevelopment, the CAT discussed the potential for other kinds of parks or park facilities to be created with new development.
 - We don't want to forget that sometimes non-tangible things, like the Parade, are the things that help people decide that Roseville will be their home.
 - A comment was offered about Owasso Hills Park based on the sense that it felt like a private park (it is, in fact, a public park developed at the same time as the surrounding neighborhood).
 - Somewhere in the "vision" discussion, the number of volunteer hours that are contributed to the parks and recreation system each year should be highlighted.

- Under the topic of “The Setting,” other demographic information that might be useful would include statistics or comparisons for income (particularly relative to affordability of the community and parks programming/services), family formation (the age when people decide to start families—with an assumption that it is occurring later in life), limited financial resources, and possibly transit futures (the Diagonal Corridor that would follow CR C between Minneapolis to White Bear Lake).
- For “Challenges,” the CAT noted that financial challenges should be highlighted, as well as the changing nature of families (particularly among some immigrant groups where the family unit is significantly large).
- Under the “Framework,” the highlights might be expanded to include the idea that parks will remain available to the public (as they always have been—that parks belong to the people of the community), and that this section might emphasize participation and engagement.
- “Outcomes” might be elaborated by including a discussion about bringing dollars into the community for events and leagues; the outcome discussing public safety should be modified to note the parks keep “people” active; that the emotional tie between the first and third listed outcomes should be highlighted; that education, particularly environmental education, should be a priority outcome; the communication should be discussed in terms of an outcome; and that the parks system should remain public and publicly supported—it is for everyone, and there may be no reason to continue the park system if it becomes overly reliant on a fee-based system (placing it, essentially, in direct competition with the private sector). In this section, the ability to coalesce several outcomes should be explored as there are currently too many to be well understood or appreciated, and that somehow the key ideas need to be highlighted or underscored in each outcome.
- The discussion of “Themes” may be integrated into other sections to more directly get to the key message.
- “Unifying Ideas” were generated by the CAT for review and expansion at the next CAT meeting. Staff will work to expand, refine, or define the list of parks/facilities and programs/services that will be used to guide the discussion at the meeting. The important thing about the “Unifying Ideas” is that they demonstrate ways in which outcomes can be satisfied—that the ideas are grounded in the vision for the parks and recreation system.
- Finally, “The Need to Act” was discussed. While there will be a need to discuss this element further, the basic idea is that the vision needs to be linked to an imperative to take action (not necessarily generating funds for improvements; it may be as simple as volunteering or participating more in the parks and recreation system). A discussion of a marketing “tag line” focused on whether

we need one as a part of this vision; it seemed that something like that might be needed, but the discussion would be continued to another meeting.

- 6 Questions
 - There were no questions addressed.
- 7 Public comment
 - No comments were addressed from the public.
- 8 Adjourn
 - The CAT adjourned at approximately 9:00 p.m.

Upcoming meetings

16 January 2010	CAT Meeting 4: Park system components Note meeting time! 8:30 am to noon
10 February 2010	Community Meeting Two: Sharing the vision 7:00 to 9:30 pm, Roseville Skating Center
<i>A series of Listening Sessions and Sector Meetings will also be occurring over the next several weeks; refer to the website for current information on events, dates, and times.</i>	

These notes represent the author’s interpretation of discussions and decisions occurring at the meeting. Corrections or deficiencies may be directed to Jeff Evenson, Roseville Parks and Recreation Department (jeff.evenson@ci.roseville.mn.us) before the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CAT, or they may be addressed at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CAT, after which the notes will be recorded as approved upon a vote of the CAT.



Park and Recreation System Master Plan Update

Citizen Advisory Team

Meeting 4: Park system components

NOTES

16 January 2010

8:30 am to noon

Willow Room, Roseville City Hall

draft

Attendance

CAT members

Erin Azer	Bob Bierscheid	Gregg Cummings	Bill Farmer
Cecelia Green	Gary Grefenberg	David Holt	Brent Huberty
Jake Jacobson	Mike Maristuen	Rose Masanz	Nancy O'Brien
Brad Peper	Dan Roe	Tom Turba	Bob Willmus
Ken Yokanovich			

City Staff

Lonnie Brokke	Jill Anfang	Jeff Evenson	Brad Tullberg
---------------	-------------	--------------	---------------

Consulting Team

Dan Cornejo	Michael Schroeder
-------------	-------------------

Others

Notes

- 1 Review meeting Notes
 - The Notes of CAT Meeting 3 were approved.
- 2 How well do you really know your parks?
 - We skipped the quiz.
- 3 CAT items
 - No items were discussed.
- 4 Community outreach
 - Listening session and sector meetings were quickly reviewed, and dates of upcoming meetings were highlighted.
 - Invitations are being made to the sector meetings and the community meeting. Jeff Evenson described the ways the invitations are being sent.
 - The number of questionnaire responses continues to grow with numbers greater than 1000. No tabulation has been conducted at this point.
 - A Technical Advisory Team meeting occurred on 13 January and included

representatives from Ramsey County Parks, Active Living Ramsey Communities, the two school districts, Rice Creek and Capitol Regions watershed districts, and city staff.

5 Unifying ideas

- Ideas were developed from input from various meetings and listening sessions plus the questionnaire responses to date, and were separated into a parks and facilities category and a programs and services category.
- CAT members “voted” to identify those ideas that would be discussed during this meeting. Each idea would be “vignetted” (described in a brief but elegant way), with discussion taking approximately 20 Notes per vignette. The summary that follows highlights the recorded points provided during the meeting.
- Community center
 - Not necessarily a single building
 - Parks might be a community center
 - Could be a building
 - A gathering place
 - Intersecting circles of community interaction
 - Intergenerational
 - Some functions exist at Fairview
 - Operating costs and subsidies need to be considered
 - Theater/performing arts and lectures
 - Coffee shop
 - Wifi—it needs to be modern
 - Active and passive space—“meet a friend”
 - Meet people
 - Flexibility—allow spaces to accommodate multiple uses
 - Community meeting rooms
 - Pool and water park
 - Climbing, ropes
 - Indoor and outdoor spaces
 - Reflect natural aspects of Roseville’s park and recreation system
 - Should include the surrounding area—not just a building
 - Banquet hall
 - Locations—Twin Lakes—“public-private”
 - One stop
 - Locations—City Hall campus—co-location
 - Include some civic activities—a license center
 - Location—go to where people are going
 - Lifestyle coaching (nutrition education, education opportunities)
 - Joint library/community center/church at Payne-Maryland as an example of a partnership
 - Bringing people into Roseville—What is unique about this facility?
 - Studios, meditation center
 - Add “ball and bat” activities, informal and creative play

- Need a center but not necessarily everything
- Location—co-locate with schools
- Farmers market
- Weight and exercise rooms
- Tie to other community events—“the end of the parade”
- Outdoor movies
- Indoor play area
- Evening classes
- Park and recreation offices
- Skate park in winter
- Seeing neighbors in winter—“block parties”
- Easily found/accessible, walk to it, connectivity, leave from and come back to
- Not a lot of space in Roseville—re-task an existing park, re-task other places (Har-Mar)
- “Swiss Army Knife” program
- Introduce ideas to other parts of the park system/community
- Dog park
- Challenge/adventure
 - Serving Roseville or appealing to a region, financial support with critical mass
 - Expand idea to include social service
 - Service challenges, volunteerism—tie to users (stewardship and education, maintaining, expose users to year round expansion of an activity)
 - Not “Outward Bound” in a building
 - Volunteerism as a recreation program
 - Do activities inside in the winter
 - Events related to challenge
 - Safe and not an organized sport
 - Reverse “lazy river” walking
 - Indoor disk golf—practice and learning
 - Mentorship through adventure club
 - Obstacle course
- Challenge/adventure programs
 - Mental challenges
 - Engage teens—maybe include a teen center, not just younger children
 - Outdoor based activities
 - Terrifying activities
 - Base for other activities—to get to real facilities (mountains)
 - Geocaching
 - Mobile climbing tower
 - Convertible spaces
 - Wii tournaments

- Urban interactive
- Trust games and team buildings
- Ropes course over swimming pool
- Immersion experiences/challenges, including cultural—outcome
- Safe, affordable, educational experiences
- Teen center without attending adults—run by teens for teens
- Not a Disneyland
- Preparing for real experiences
- Parks stewardship program
- Challenge leadership—trying things you wouldn’t normally try
- Non-motorized movement
 - Education as part of trails (wildlife)
 - Move from one park to another without cars, greater connectivity
 - Maybe not connected to every park, but connections between smaller groups of parks
 - Maybe one main path with loops
 - Greenway
 - Bike cooperative—Red Bike, four person bike
 - Bike lockers
 - Horse and buggy
 - Safe pathway, safe movement, encourage movement without cars
 - Not just bikes—also walking
 - Pedestrian/walker comforts
 - Big and little connections, multifamily housing to another pathway, or to a corner where a connection to a larger pathway might be located, signage for directions and location
 - Build awareness of a network
 - Between neighborhoods, between restricted-access neighborhoods (sometimes very short links with a “mini-park”)
 - Trail as a destination—art, landscaping
 - Lexington to Dale on CR B2—missing link
 - Accommodating multiple uses/modes in the same space
 - Lighted trails
 - Sidewalks in neighborhoods
 - Natural surface trails, non-programmed trails
 - Scenic bike trails, not always on a street
 - Emphasizing neighborhood communities that allow people to walk between houses/private properties
 - Park bikes at schools—not currently allowed
 - Education about active living
 - Walking school bus
- “Ball and bat” activities
 - Diversity of activities— for pick-up games
 - Sledding, free, accessible, especially winter activities
 - Exercise stations—Central Park started this way

- Groomed ski trails
- Some facilities should always be open—spontaneous
- Organized “sand lot”—simple equipment
- Open gym time—“let kids figure it out”
- Funding to maintain facilities is needed
- Available times on website (shelters are on-line now, but other facilities are not)
- Lights for fields
- Bike rally—example of education for free play activities—“belt loop” awards
- Unique games from other cultures
- Mobile recreation—organizing unorganized activities, with adults having activity as well
- Game invention, “MacGyver” games
- Not always a sport—checkers, discussion group, art
- Wild places
 - Cleveland and CR B—Midland Grove condos
 - HANC—revitalize what support exists
 - Make people aware of remnants—let them do something with it
 - Access balanced with wildness
 - Adopting wild places/remnants
 - Managing invasive plants
 - Remnants as part of cultural history of Roseville
 - Restore prairies on unused areas of parks—don’t mow everywhere
 - Improving approaches to the community, aesthetic improvements, Snelling Avenue
 - Water trail
 - Appreciation of wild things, education and interpretation
 - Partner with watershed districts
 - RR rights-of-way in the city
 - Spectrum of groomed to wild—is it mapped? Focus attention to areas of varying maintenance
 - Board walk replacement at HANC
 - Habitat consideration
 - Functional considerations for wild places, not just aesthetics
 - Take care of what we have
 - Keeping wild places wild allows for focus on maintenance where it is needed—but still a need for management
 - Over-commercialized parks is a concern—community use must support the park
 - Like it was 100 years ago
 - Wild places near shopping centers
- Additional ideas for vignettes to be discussed at future CAT meetings include:
 - Accessibility/public orientation/public-ness/aids to users/ park

- Comforts/maps
 - Partnerships and hospitality
 - Art in parks
 - Water play/water recreation/water facilities
 - Artificial turf/state-of-the-art outdoor hockey/high intensity use facilities
 - Traditional park facilities/neighborhood park components
 - Specialty activities/archery range/mini-golf
 - Intellectual recreation
 - Mobile recreation
- 6 Questions
- There were no questions addressed.
- 7 Public comment
- Residents were present to address concerns related to the development of a softball field at Parkview that would satisfy a Title IX complaint against Roseville’s schools. They summarized the complaint, noting that girls in Roseville did not have a facility equal to the standards offered to boys. They were clear that they did not object to the complaint, and, in fact, believe the complaint is fair; their purpose is to ask for consideration of another location for the proposed softball field. They feel residents of southwest Roseville are subsidizing parks in the community because there are many parks in other parts of Roseville but little or nothing in their immediate neighborhoods. If a softball field is built at Parkview, all of the open space at the fields would be consumed, and an opportunity for a park in their part of the community will be lost. They also noted that the open areas at Fairview are used by the community on a regular basis, largely for passive and unprogrammed activities, and they view the fields as their community park; elimination of the fields would change the nature of their neighborhoods, and the fields would become too much like Evergreen Park. They would like the city to work with the schools to find a responsible solution, one that would be equitable in terms of park use areas. It was restated that their intention in presenting this information to the CAT is to ensure the need for a park in southwest Roseville is recognized, and that the Fairview fields represent the last sizable piece of land in southwest Roseville. The neighbors presenting this information to the CAT would like to see a small team study the issue and hopefully achieve a more creative solution.
- 8 Adjourn
- The CAT adjourned at approximately noon.

Upcoming meetings

These Notes represent the author's interpretation of discussions and decisions occurring at the meeting. Corrections or deficiencies may be directed to Jeff Evenson, Roseville Parks and Recreation Department (jeff.evenson@ci.roseville.mn.us) before the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CAT, or they may be addressed at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CAT, after which the Notes will be recorded as approved upon a vote of the CAT.



Park and Recreation System Master Plan Update

Citizen Advisory Team

Meeting 5: Review of Community Meeting Two

NOTES

18 February 2010
 6:30 to 8:45 p.m.
 Willow Room, Roseville City Hall

draft

Attendance

CAT members

Erin Azer	Bill Farmer	Gary Grefenberg	Andrea Gruver
David Holt	Jake Jacobson	Sheila Mahnken	Mike Maristuen
Rose Masanz	Nancy O'Brien	Gale Pederson	Brad Peper
Dan Roe	Katie Young		

City Staff

Lonnie Brokke	Jill Anfang	Jeff Evenson	Brad Tullberg
---------------	-------------	--------------	---------------

Consulting Team

Dan Cornejo	Michael Schroeder
-------------	-------------------

Others

Randall Doneen	Kristin Doneen	Mike Holt	Mark Penning
Steve Muscanto			

Notes

- 1 Review meeting Notes
 - No Notes were available for review from CAT Meeting 4
- 2 How well do you really know your parks?
 - Jeff Evenson presented a review of construction projects in Roseville's parks and facilities.
- 3 CAT items
 - CAT members requested that the master plan address a definition of neighborhood parks, noting that athletic fields by themselves do not constitute a neighborhood park. Michael Schroeder indicated the master plan would provide definitions for parks throughout Roseville's park system based on a combination of recognized "standards" and application of Roseville context and conditions.
- 4 Community outreach
 - Sector listening sessions and affiliated group listening sessions have been continuing and will be largely complete by the end of February.

- Emails have been submitted to the Parks and Recreation Department, and will be collected and distributed to the CAT at the next meeting.
 - Michael Schroeder noted that a summary of input across engagement methods is being prepared and will be distributed at the next CAT meeting.
- 5 Review of Community Meeting Two
 - CAT members who attended Community Meeting Two felt the session was a good effort, and it produced a significant dialog with solid input to the questions posed. They also noted that residents of the southwest portion of the community were well-represented, and advocated strongly for correcting what is noted as geographic disparity in the parks distribution in Roseville.
 - Bill Farmer volunteered to help facilitate a Meeting in a Box with high school students through the National Honor Society.
 - Michael Schroeder noted the variations in the dot voting portion of Exercise 1, suggesting that some meeting participants may not have used all of their dots, or may have placed all of one color of dots on a single issue or idea on the boards.
 - The Vision boards will be available on the city's website, and will also be available for CAT members through department staff. Suggestions were made to create hyperlinks between information shared in the Vision boards and other resources or examples.
 - CAT members added to the ideas shared in the Vision boards by suggesting that links between parks would allow parks to "share" components (so that every park would not need to contain every type of park component). They also noted that splash pads are not needed in every park, but they may be more important than suggested by the dot voting from the community meeting. It was noted that the idea of connectivity is an important goal, even if it is not exactly as represented in the Vision boards as a community parkway; it was further noted that the wrong department at the city is in charge of trails—that the Parks Department should be responsible for trails.
 - A summary of input from the community meeting, in draft form, was provided to CAT members.
 - 6 Park idea vignettes
 - Mobile recreation was discussed as way of bringing parks to people, through micro parks, programs, and other methods of delivering services to people where they are—and not necessarily in parks. Possibilities discussed included the idea of bringing balls, bats, and gloves to a park for a non-programmed ball game; bringing people to parks other than the one in their immediate neighborhood; providing educational programs through the HANC but not at the HANC; using the website for more recreation-based uses; taking kids to non-Roseville parks; and using technology to create an oral history of the parks.
 - Water play was suggested an activity that need not occur in every park, with a focus on smaller scale wading pools or splash pads (as opposed to a full aquatics facility). Comparisons were made to a facility in St. Louis Park.

Concerns were noted about health issues related to water play activities. Water play might also be achieved through the canoe and kayak trails that were identified as an idea in the first community meeting, more beaches, or by fire trucks. Ultimately, there seemed to be CAT members on both sides of the question of the need for splash pads or water play activities, but it was generally agreed that not every parks would need such a facility.

- High intensity activity areas would include facilities like an artificial turf field area. It was noted that these kinds of facilities would have a high up-front cost, and that maintenance received a fairly high response at the community meeting, while fields had a more tepid response. Partnerships with schools might be a good direction for these facilities, but some CAT members suggested that the artificial turf fields at the schools were not well-used—although others disagreed with this statement. Other partnerships were also discussed. A question was raised about the potential for artificial turf fields to be a revenue source. A question was also raised about the possibility of fencing fields, similar to the Dale Street fields, to better control use; here, Hmong would use the fields for family-based social recreation (it was noted, interestingly, that Hmong seem to gain recreation through families and not through a system). The number of fields needed for tournaments was raised as a concern, and whether artificial turf would be used as a base for tournament fields. It was also questioned whether artificial turf might be used for non-programmed field areas.

7 Questions

- Gary Grefenberg asked that the consultants consider differentiating in their terminology parks composed primarily of open and green space for passive recreation and those parks consisting primarily of athletic fields and other sports facilities.

8 Public comment

- Residents were present to address concerns related to the development of a softball field at Parkview that would satisfy a Title IX complaint against Roseville's schools. They summarized the complaint, noting that girls in Roseville did not have a facility equal to the standards offered to boys. They were clear that they did not object to the complaint, and, in fact, believe the complaint is fair; their purpose is to ask for consideration of another location for the proposed softball field. They feel residents of southwest Roseville are subsidizing parks in the community because there are many parks in other parts of Roseville but little or nothing in their immediate neighborhoods. If a softball field is built at Parkview, all of the open space at the fields would be consumed, and an opportunity for a park in their part of the community will be lost. They also noted that the open areas at Fairview are used by the community on a regular basis, largely for passive and un-programmed activities, and they view the fields as their community park; elimination of the fields would change the nature of their neighborhoods, and the fields would become too much like Evergreen

Park. They would like the city to work with the schools to find a responsible solution, one that would be equitable in terms of park use areas. It was restated that their intention in presenting this information to the CAT is to ensure the need for a park in southwest Roseville is recognized, and that the Fairview fields represent the last sizable piece of land in southwest Roseville. The neighbors presenting this information to the CAT would like to see a small team study the issue and hopefully achieve a more creative solution.

9 Adjourn

- The CAT adjourned at approximately 8:45 p.m.

Upcoming meetings

9 March 2010	Park and Recreation Commission mid-course update City Hall, 6:30 pm
22 March 2010	City Council mid-course update City Hall, 6:00 pm
22 April 2010	CAT Meeting 6: Park system plans City Hall, 6:30 to 8:30 pm

These Notes represent the author's interpretation of discussions and decisions occurring at the meeting. Corrections or deficiencies may be directed to Jeff Evenson, Roseville Parks and Recreation Department (jeff.evenson@ci.roseville.mn.us) before the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CAT, or they may be addressed at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CAT, after which the Notes will be recorded as approved upon a vote of the CAT.



Park and Recreation System Master Plan Update

Citizen Advisory Team

Meeting 6: Stage Two results

Notes

4 March 2010

6:30 to 8:45 p.m.

Willow Room, Roseville City Hall

Attendance

CAT members

Erin Azer	Michael Butler	Gregg Cummings	Bill Farmer
Rick Goodmanson	Gary Grefenberg	Andrea Gruver	David Holt
Jake Jacobson	Sheila Mahnken	Rose Masanz	Nancy O'Brien
Gale Pederson	Tom Turba	Bob Willmus	Ken Yokanovich

City Staff

Lonnie Brokke	Jill Anfang	Jeff Evenson	Brad Tullberg
---------------	-------------	--------------	---------------

Consulting Team

Dan Cornejo	Michael Schroeder
-------------	-------------------

Others

Notes

- 1 Review meeting notes
 - Meeting notes from the previous meeting were held over for discussion at the next CAT meeting.
- 2 How well do you really know your parks?
 - There was no quiz.
- 3 CAT items
 - Jeff Evenson noted that emailed correspondence that has accrued during the course of the planning process was available as part of the CAT packet at tonight's meeting.
 - Jeff also mentioned the gap in meetings that would occur between this meeting and the subsequent meeting in April, and suggested that another meeting would be useful before the April meeting. CAT members indicated a willingness to have another meeting in the gap, and that staff should identify a date and forward it to the CAT.
 - It was requested that materials be provided to the CAT in advance of the meeting if they would be reviewed at the CAT meeting. When possible, this request will be accommodated.
- 4 Community outreach

- A question was asked about reaching out to PTA groups at schools, and offering them a "Meeting in a Box" opportunity. Staff will make contact with the PTA groups.
- A meeting will be scheduled with high school students after spring break, using the National Honor Society as the organizing group at the school.
- Michael Schroeder shared a summary of input gained to date through all methods of input, noting in particular the kinds of input methods limits statistically valid interpretations, as does the methods used to correlate or aggregate the responses. However, it is clear that across input methods, several kinds of improvements are supported (community center, trails/sidewalks/connectivity, informal play areas, and some form of aquatics/water play); refer to the consolidated input summary for a more refined breakdown of input offered through the various methods of engagement. Michael also noted that the consolidated input summary shared with the CAT tonight was not yet complete. There were issues noted relating to the meaning of questions posed in the survey, and how many respondents may have interpreted the questions in different ways.
- Michael Schroeder noted that a new survey should be prepared to follow through on the original survey. Rough notes on ideas were distributed to the CAT, and the CAT engaged in a discussion about the content of the new survey (gauging support for facilities and programs, assessing funding potential to support for park improvements, specific questions about new community facilities). It was determined the a sub-committee would be formed to develop content for the second questionnaire (including Rose Masanz, Nancy O'Brien, Mike Butler, Gary Grefenberg, and Erin Azer).

5 Broad directions for parks

- Michael Schroeder presented two diagrams that explored the idea of a "focus" activity for a park (this idea was previously discussed as a "themed park") using—solely for the sake of discussion—Oasis Park. One diagram demonstrated a potential layout for a park that included the core components of a neighborhood-serving park, while the second highlighted the aggregation of a broader, community-oriented use as the focus of the park (while still providing for many, but not necessarily all, of the recreation components needed in the neighborhood). Benefits of the "focus park" might include facilitation of programming and maintenance, as well as the possibility of building a stronger sense of neighborhood identity. The benefits of the neighborhood-serving park are directed to the ability to serve as many of the neighborhood recreation needs as possible in a single location.
- The diagrams of a focus park lead to the suggestion of a grouping of parks in the neighborhood (that largely equate to the 16 planning districts noted in the city's Comprehensive Plan), where the groups of parks would serve the neighborhood's recreation needs. Trails would form links between parks in a "constellation," and eventually be extended to form connections between constellations and across the community. Within each constellation, a core group of parks facilities would be provided (such as

natural areas, ball fields, a shelter; the specific facilities will be discussed at the next CAT meeting).

- Both ideas will be considered further at the next CAT meeting.

6 Unifying ideas

- The discussion of unifying ideas was postponed due to lack of time during this meeting.

7 Questions

- There were no questions addressed.

8 Public comment

- There were no comments from the public

9 Adjourn

- The CAT adjourned at approximately 8:35 p.m.

Upcoming meetings

12 April 2010	City Council mid-course update City Hall, 6:00 pm
25 March 2010	CAT Meeting 6A, 6:30-8:30 pm
22 April 2010	CAT Meeting 7: Park system plans City Hall, 6:30 to 8:30 pm

These notes represent the author's interpretation of discussions and decisions occurring at the meeting. Corrections or deficiencies may be directed to Jeff Evenson, Roseville Parks and Recreation Department (jeff.evenson@ci.roseville.mn.us) before the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CAT, or they may be addressed at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CAT, after which the notes will be recorded as approved upon a vote of the CAT.



Park and Recreation System Master Plan Update

Citizen Advisory Team

Meeting 6A: Park Constellations and Components

Notes

25 March 2010

6:30 to 8:45 p.m.

Willow Room, Roseville City Hall

draft

Attendance

CAT members

Erin Azer	Bob Bierscheid	Bill Farmer	Rick Goodmanson
Gary Grefenberg	Andrea Gruver	Elfrieda Hintze	David Holt
Jake Jacobson	Sheila Mahnken	Mike Maristuen	Rose Masanz
Gale Pederson	Brad Peper	Dan Roe	Tom Turba
Bob Willmus	Ken Yokanovich	Katie Young	

City Staff

Lonnie Brokke	Jill Anfang	Jeff Evenson	Brad Tullberg
---------------	-------------	--------------	---------------

Consulting Team

Dan Cornejo	Michael Schroeder
-------------	-------------------

Others

Notes

- 1 Review meeting notes
 - Meeting notes from the previous meeting were approved by the CAT.
 - Gary Grefenberg noted a discrepancy in the notes from CAT Meeting 5 on 18 February 2010 related to Item 7 of the agenda. He will forward a suggestion for the revision based on a question he posed to the CAT and master planning team.
- 2 CAT items
 - Another CAT meeting is needed to address items in advance of Community Meeting Three. It was agreed that CAT Meeting 6B would be held on 8 April 2010 at 6:30 p.m.
 - It was noted that Erin Azer was appointed to the Roseville Park and Recreation Commission.
 - Jake Jacobson discussed the overall master planning schedule, noting the date of 23 June 2010 for a review of the draft plan. He further noted that the delivery of a final plan document would come later, allowing time for more definition of funding and implementation strategies by the CAT during the summer.
 - It was noted that the engagement process must continue through the

- process of implementation—after the final plan has been completed.
- A discussion regarding a community center focused on issues of what a community center means in Roseville, and how it might be addressed in the master plan. Comments from the CAT include:
 - During the master planning process, it may be too difficult to narrow options to a single site; the implementation strategy might better deal with a site location.
 - Planning for the facility from a concept perspective should move forward, and once agreement is reached on the concept a realistic price could be attached.
 - The process should include the definition of a core program of components with options for other components to be added—all at the level of a concept. The concept could be shared with the community at Community Meeting Four.
 - A similar process should be directed to aquatic elements, first deciding if they should be a part of the program, and then defining what specific components should be included.
 - Efforts should be directed to creating a facility that is not too lofty.

3 There was no item 3 on the agenda

4 Community outreach

- Jill Anfang noted that the master plan vision boards have been shared with the community at several locations, including the Skating Center, golf course, HANC, and City Hall, and there is a “travelling set” of boards that can be used for meetings or other locations.
- Bill Farmer has been working with RAHS to bring a listening session to high school students. He has arranged for a session to occur in three classes on the morning of 16 April 2010.
- Elfrieda Hintze asked if the process has directed attention to the diverse populations of the community, noting that there is a lack of understanding about parks for some residents. She was asked by a resident if parks are available to all residents. She wanted to know if we were reaching these residents. It was noted that outreach efforts have tried to reach minority residents, but our engagement process has not resulted in a good participation from those groups.
- Jill noted that questionnaire responses are still coming in, and Lonnie indicated that the CAT should continue to encourage input and participation. Jill indicated that she is taking information about the master planning process to summer park activities and programs.
- It was also suggested that comments directed to the Parks and Recreation Department should continue to be shared with the CAT.
- Several CAT members volunteered to assist with the development of the second questionnaire. A notice of the meeting time (which has not been scheduled) will be sent to the entire CAT, and participation is encouraged.
- The master planning team has met with the Technical Advisory Team, with a focus on the watersheds in the city. There seem to be several parallel goals between our efforts and those of the watersheds that can be used to

the advantage of both the city and the watersheds. It was noted during the meeting with the TAT that watershed improvements related to water quality basins will be implemented this summer in Villa Park and Oasis Park.

5 Broad directions for parks

- The discussion of the parks constellation concept was continued from the previous CAT meeting. Michael Schroeder explained the constellation diagram and the spreadsheet depicting constellation components, as well as handouts highlighting the level of delivery of components to the constellations, sectors of the community, and the community as a whole. He noted the information shared is still being developed, but as a concept it addresses the need to deal with the master planning of a parks and recreation system, not just a series of distinct parks.
- The key concept of the constellation is that parks within a reasonable walking distance of a population (a neighborhood)—defined as a ten minute/half mile walk—would provide the base level of park services and facilities, but not necessarily at a single park. In addition, parks and other facilities would be more strongly linked by a series of pathways, trails, or sidewalks within each constellation, focusing first on local connections and then branching out to reach other constellations and their parks.
- Michael indicated that the CAT is seeing a draft of the constellation concept that is more refined than the version they saw at the last CAT meeting, but that it is very much a work in progress. He further noted that the diagram, at this point, has all information layered onto a single diagram, perhaps making it less clear. But the process of creating the concept and interacting with the CAT intersect frequently, so the CAT is seeing ideas as they are being developed.
- The CAT offered the following questions or comments about the constellation concept:
 - Parks will not be the same in the future as they are today; there needs to be flexibility in the parks and their programs, and it seems the concept allow for needed flexibility.
 - The area designated with question marks (the commercial and industrial area along I-35W) should be its own constellation.
 - The concept should address how people are using remnant parcels; those parcels will be added to the constellation diagram as they are identified through the master planning process.
 - The constellation should very directly address the issues of connectivity, perhaps even more definitively than demonstrated in this version.
 - There is a fine line between transportation trails and recreations trails, but someone needs to take ownership of the system of trails. It was noted that, outside of parks, trails are currently the domain of the Public Works Department in Roseville.
 - It was noted that we have to somehow include what we haven't fully considered in the constellation concept. Michael Schroeder

noted that the diagram and spreadsheet will continue to evolve, becoming more robust as information is compiled and integrated.

- Jake Jacobson asked if the constellation concept was one of several alternatives to be considered or if this was the concept that the CAT would be asked to endorse. Michael Schroeder noted that the constellation concept is an attempt to deal with parks, facilities, and programs (programs have not been integrated yet) on a system basis, and that the proposal is that the master plan would be organized around the constellation concept. Jake questioned the CAT about their support for the constellation concept, and members agreed that it seems to provide a progressive framework for parks in Roseville and for organizing a master plan.

6 Park concept plans

- Jeff Evenson addressed the process of creating concept plans for eight parks in Roseville as a part of the master planning process. The process of creating the concept plans would include direct participation of residents in a design workshop, and then allowing the Design Team to refine the input and concepts shaped by residents into at least two alternatives for review by residents in a follow-up open house. All of this would occur in the second half of May and the first week in June so that it can be incorporated into the master plan and shared with the community at Community Meeting Four.
- Jeff noted that several parks already have master plans in place (Reservoir Woods, Pioneer, Owasso Hills, Lexington, Acorn, Ladyslipper, Central Park—Lexington, and the arboretum), and would not be considered for concept planning as a part of the master plan.
- Selection of parks was discussed for some time, but ultimately it was determined that the master planning team would review criteria and forward a list of parks for concept plan development to the CAT at the next meeting.

7 Questions

- There were no questions addressed.

8 Public comment

- There were no comments from the public.

9 Adjourn

- The CAT adjourned at approximately 8:30 p.m.

Upcoming meetings

22 April 2010	CAT Meeting 7: Review of Community Meeting Three	6:30 to 8:30 pm, City Hall
---------------	---	-------------------------------

These notes represent the author's interpretation of discussions and decisions occurring at the meeting. Corrections or deficiencies may be directed to Jeff Evenson, Roseville Parks and Recreation Department (jeff.evanson@ci.roseville.mn.us) before the next regularly scheduled

meeting of the CAT, or they may be addressed at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CAT, after which the notes will be recorded as approved upon a vote of the CAT.



Park and Recreation System Master Plan Update

Citizen Advisory Team

Meeting 7: Review of Community Meeting Three

NOTES

22 April 2010

6:30 to 8:45 p.m.

Willow Room, Roseville City Hall

draft

Attendance

CAT members

Gregg Cummings	Gary Grefenberg	Andrea Gruver	Jake Jacobson
Mike Maristuen	Rose Masanz	Nancy O'Brien	Gale Pederson
Brad Peper	Bob Willmus		

City Staff

Lonnie Brokke	Jill Anfang	Jeff Evenson	Brad Tullberg
---------------	-------------	--------------	---------------

Consulting Team

Dan Cornejo	Michael Schroeder
-------------	-------------------

Others

Notes

- 1 Review meeting notes
 - Corrections to the Notes of CAT Meeting 6A (25 March 2010), as submitted by Gary Grefenberg, were approved.
 - Notes of CAT Meeting 6B (xx April 2010) were approved.
- 2 CAT items
 - It was noted that an email signed by 49 people was submitted to the Parks and Recreation Department for consideration by the CAT.
 - An update of the calendar was noted for changes in topics to be addressed at CAT Meeting 8 (13 May 2010) and CAT Meeting 9 (3 June 2010) to accommodate policies and park concept plan review, respectively.
- 4 Community outreach
 - Jeff Evenson and Michael Schroeder conducted at Listening Session and Roseville Area High School on 16 April 2010. Students from Grades 10 through 12 in the AVID class participated in the second and third exercises from Community Meeting Two. The results will be compiled and provided as input to the master planning process. Thanks to Bill Farmer and the students and teachers at RAHS for arranging the sessions.

- The session at the school caused members of the CAT to ask about trends in the demographics at the schools, noting that both Roseville and Mounds View schools draw their enrollment from beyond the borders of the city.
- A very preliminary draft of Questionnaire Two was distributed to CAT members, with the understanding that they would:
 - Complete the survey noting the time needed to complete; and
 - Offer comments for content changes (only after they had completed the questionnaire for the "time test").
 Comments should be directed to Jeff Evenson, and the questionnaire group will reconvene to prepare a revised version for review by the CAT.
- It was requested that a simple survey be prepared for high school students to take at an upcoming assembly. The survey should be short, and be able to be completed within five notes.
- A subgroup of the TAT will be meeting on 4 May 2010. Representatives of the neighboring communities of Falcon Heights, Lauderdale, and Saint Anthony have been invited to participate.

4 Broad directions for parks

- It was requested that an assessment of population within constellations be prepared, and if possible include some indication of the demographic makeup of each constellation. Michael Schroeder noted that the census data that is available to us allows for that kind of assessment, but also noted that the information is a decade old. Information will be prepared for review by the CAT.
- Michael Schroeder shared an updated set of constellation diagrams that demonstrated Constellations, Connections, and Additions in separate maps. CAT members asked about potential links show in the connections map, and Michael noted that the diagram utilized existing trails or sidewalks where they would serve the constellation concept, and showed new links where none currently exist. He further noted that those new links were not defined according to facility type (trail, sidewalk, striped shoulder), and that discussion would occur with input from Public Works, the department responsible for trails and sidewalks (located outside of parks), once the master plan is complete.
- In the Additions diagram, a CAT member inquired about the presence of tax-forfeit land, particularly in portions of the community currently lacking in parks. Jeff Evenson noted that he was working with city staff to identify those kinds of parcels throughout the city, and they would be added to the diagram as potential acquisitions once they have been identified and if the parcels support the constellation concept.
- A CAT member asked about meeting rooms as a part of the constellation concept, and Michael Schroeder pointed out that meeting rooms have been identified as a component in the park list. Where meeting rooms would occur in the constellation concept has not been determined.
- The community center was discussed in terms of past efforts in Roseville, including one that was considered with a private recreation/fitness center. The nature of a community center, should one be pursued, was also raised

as an issue, beginning with the question of whether the facility should be concentrated in a single location or dispersed throughout the community (with separated, not replicated, components). Collaboration with schools was also noted as a point of exploration for a community center, with information on past planning effort being a part of the CAT's desire for information.

5 Community Meeting Three review

- It was noted that about 100 people participated in Community Meeting Three, with a good percentage of those in attendance participating in for the first time. It was noted that the demographics of the group might somewhat shape responses (it was noted that the crowd seemed to be generally older than average), but some members of the CAT noted that responses could not necessarily be directed to an older/senior stereotype. It was also noted, as has been the case in other community engagement events, that the input from this meeting will be balanced with all the other input gathered during the planning process
- The summary of input recorded by Dan Cornejo was distributed. A full summary was not available because the community meeting occurred the night before this CAT meeting. A full summary will be provided to the CAT, but translation of the exercises, in particular for the policy exercise, may take more time.
- In general, CAT members attending the community meeting felt the session, attendance, and input made for a successful event.
- Michael Schroeder asked CAT members to review several of the policy continuum questions, noting that these may serve the purpose of defining policies to be reviewed at the next CAT meeting.

6 Parks concept planning

- Jeff Evenson provided a brief review and update of the upcoming parks concept planning session. It was requested that a highlight be added to the homepage for meetings for about one week prior to each event. It was noted that, at times, information is difficult to find on the website. Staff noted that they can make suggestions about the website organization, but they don't control the website.

7 Questions

- There were no questions addressed.

8 Public comment

- No comments were offered.

9 Adjourn

- The CAT adjourned at approximately 8:30 p.m.

Upcoming meetings

Thursday 13 May 2010 CAT Meeting 8: Policies
6:30 to 8:30 pm, City Hall

Wednesday	19 May 2010	Parks concept planning workshop 6:30 to 9:30 pm, Skating Center
Wednesday	2 June 2010	Parks concept planning open house 7:00 to 9:00 pm, Skating Center
Thursday	3 June 2010	Citizen Advisory Team Meeting 9: Park concept plan review, guidelines for art and programming
Thursday	17 June 2010	CAT Meeting 10: Review draft plan , joint meeting with City Council and Parks and Recreation Commission

These notes represent the author's interpretation of discussions and decisions occurring at the meeting. Corrections or deficiencies may be directed to Jeff Evenson, Roseville Parks and Recreation Department (jeff.evenson@ci.roseville.mn.us) before the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CAT, or they may be addressed at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CAT, after which the notes will be recorded as approved upon a vote of the CAT.



Park and Recreation System Master Plan Update

Citizen Advisory Team

Meeting 8: Policy review

Notes

May 13, 2010

6:30 to 8:45 p.m.

Willow Room, Roseville City Hall

draft

Attendance

CAT members

Erin Azer	Bob Bierscheid	Bill Farmer	Gary Grefenberg
Elfrieda Hintze	Sheila Mahnken	Rose Masanz	Nancy O'Brien
Dan Roe	Tom Turba	Bob Willmus	Ken Yokanovich

City Staff

Lonnie Brokke	Jill Anfang	Jeff Evenson	Brad Tullberg
---------------	-------------	--------------	---------------

Consulting Team

Dan Cornejo	Michael Schroeder
-------------	-------------------

Others

Notes

- 1 Review meeting notes
 - Meeting notes from the previous meeting were approved by the CAT.
- 2 CAT items
 - Michael Schroeder noted that the CAT meeting scheduled for June 17th will include an hour with the City Council and Parks and Recreation Commission. It was decided that this meeting would be an opportunity to update these bodies prior to Community Meeting Four. Michael also noted that the meeting will be held in the Willow Room, and that the City Council and Parks and Recreation Commission were invited to meet with the CAT, and this is the CAT's opportunity to share their directions with these bodies.
- 3 Community outreach
 - Michael Schroeder noted that a listening session was conducted with the Business Networking Initiative, a group of Roseville-related businesses formed for networking purposes. About eight members of BNI attended. It was clear that businesses valued parks, and several noted that they conduct business regularly in parks (home remodeling and repair contractors meeting with potential clients). As a result, they value the maintenance of the parks. They noted a desire for parks and recreation

components in the industrial park, suggesting there is a large population of workers who might benefit from some park elements near where they work. It was also noted by one BNI member that he uses parks in other communities for commercial photography, and questioned whether that was possible in Roseville and that in other communities photographers pay a permit fee (with the understanding that their fees are directed toward maintenance). Staff noted that there are no prohibitions against commercial photography.

- Lonnie Brokke described a Community Town Hall meeting that was held at City Hall on May 3, 2010, noting that while participation from the public was limited, positive attention was directed to parks and recreation and the master planning process. Attention was directed to the term of the master plan, with Lonnie suggesting the plan will look out over a period of twenty or thirty years. Participants noted that this was a good time to be making investments in Roseville, using those investments to attract new residents. This spurred a discussion about the trends in demographics in the community—whether trends in ownership and families were trending upward with greater enrollment in schools, or if the trends indicate an aging community.
 - Jeff Evenson attended a PTSA meeting at Parkview School and provided an update on the master plan process to those attending, and invited them to participate in the upcoming parks concept planning workshop.
 - Michael Schroeder noted that a survey was provided to the Roseville Area High School that would be distributed to every student, and that the students would be required to complete and return the survey. Around 2100 surveys are expected to be returned. A copy of the survey was provided to CAT members in their packets. This survey was facilitated by Julia Jacobson.
 - Jeff Evenson discussed the second questionnaire, noting that it is nearly ready to distribute, and that it will be forwarded to everyone who has provided an email address during the master plan process.
 - Michael Schroeder noted that a subgroup of the TAT met to discuss the master plan. Representative of Falcon Heights, Lauderdale, and Saint Anthony participated. While Saint Anthony seems to relate more directly to parks and recreation opportunities and resources in New Brighton, Falcon Heights and Lauderdale expressed interest in more closely cooperating with Roseville on parks and recreation issues and opportunities. Both noted the existing relationship between their cities that focus on engineering and IT.
 - Michael Schroeder summarizes a meeting with Roseville staff department heads, where the focus was the possible locations for major facilities. Some sites were suggested as having limiting conditions (due to traffic or ownership), while others were reinforced as possibilities.
- 4 Community Meeting Three summary
 - Michael Schroeder offered a more detailed review of the input gained

than was provided during the last CAT meeting. He reviewed the policy exercise, where he had aggregated the responses of all groups (consensus and minority opinions), and then suggested the consolidated response of the entire group (as well as the trends within responses that might suggest an orientation to one of the policy positions).

- The discussion then focused on who participated in this meeting. There is still a concern that we are missing immigrant groups in our engagement process. It was noted that Pat Kennedy might be a good resource for finding ways to engage segments of the population that are not currently involved. It was also noted that we may have to find the more singular spokesperson for each group. Staff noted that language can be a problem, and that they have attempted to engage immigrant groups in locations where they already are (as opposed to solely relying on invitations to broader meetings).

5 Proposed park policies

- In the review of park policies, discussion included the following:
 - Parks are not just about recreation; they play an important role in setting identity, creating a sense of place, and offering a sense of belonging for neighborhoods.
 - We should be strongly linking these policies to the outcomes discussed earlier in the process.
 - Pathways are not just about transit, but are a way of creating connections for other purposes; the master plan should demonstrate the role of pathways in building a stronger community, and not just using pathways as a way to access transit.
 - We should take a broader view of parks, and deal with open space character in the community. A discussion focused on the image of Roseville offered by Snelling Avenue, having Parks and Recreation Department take on an advocacy role in the design of these spaces.
 - Gateways and corridors, and associated mobility issues, need to consider links that are not yet planned or constructed. These areas need to be considered from a Parks and Recreation perspective, not just a Public Works viewpoint.
 - The policies should deal with reforestation, which might begin to address issues related to community character along some key routes.
 - Open spaces related to schools should be zoned as park space, creating a way of ensuring that these open spaces are not lost.
 - CAT members requested staff to explore the balance between programmed recreation space and non-programmed space in the parks and recreation system
 - There should be flexibility in programming, not just a ballfield focus.
 - Public art discussions highlighted a number of ideas for incorporation of art into the parks, but suggested that art is typically more integrated into the design of space or a building, and that art

may serve purposes beyond decoration. It was also noted that programmed events are often arts related, and that art could help build a stronger sense of neighborhood identity. Finally, it was suggested that the policy might be as direct as suggesting that a policy needs to be developed.

These items will be considered as policies are further refined.

6 Park classification

- Michael Schroeder reviewed briefly a comparison of the current park classification definitions, and noted that the master plan will likely carry forward a version similar to the current definitions, but that an expanded definition will be provided to demonstrate a parks relationship to the constellation concept. He noted that having parks classifications is an important part of the parks accreditation process.
- CAT members suggested that the definition of some parks be reconsidered, noting in particular the need to address the classification of parks as athletic fields.

7 Parks concept planning

- Jeff Evenson briefly reviewed the upcoming parks concept planning workshop and the notification procedures used to invite participation.

8 Approach to major facilities

- It was suggested by the CAT that a separate meeting be scheduled to deal exclusively with the community center and other major facilities. Staff will forward a date for this meeting, which will occur before the next scheduled CAT meeting. This topic will be the sole agenda item.
- It was suggested that dog parks and splash pads be noted as community-wide facilities.
- A summary of considerations will be forwarded to the CAT to prepare for the next CAT meeting, which will include a list of possible components and considerations for locations

9 Questions

- There were no questions addressed.

10 Public comment

- There were no comments from the public.

11 Adjourn

- The CAT adjourned at approximately 8:30 p.m.

Upcoming meetings

Wednesday May 19, 2010	Park Concept Plan Workshop Skating Center, 6:30 to 9:30 pm
---------------------------	---

Thursday May 27, 2010	Special CAT meeting dealing with major facilities Skating Center (Fireplace Room), 6:30 to 8:30 pm
Wednesday June 2, 2010	Park Concept Plan Open House Skating Center, 7:00 to 9:00 pm
Thursday June 3, 2010	CAT Meeting 10: Policy review City Hall, 6:30 to 8:30 pm

These notes represent the author's interpretation of discussions and decisions occurring at the meeting. Corrections or deficiencies may be directed to Jeff Evenson, Roseville Parks and Recreation Department (jeff.evenson@ci.roseville.mn.us) before the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CAT, or they may be addressed at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CAT, after which the notes will be recorded as approved upon a vote of the CAT.



Park and Recreation System Master Plan Update

Citizen Advisory Team

Meeting 9: Policy and concept plan review

Notes

Thursday, June 3, 2010

6:30 to 8:30 p.m.

Willow Room, Roseville City Hall

draft

Attendance

CAT members			
Erin Azer	Gregg Cummings	Bill Farmer	Dave Holt
Dan Roe	Gale Pederson	Tom Turba	Ken Yokanovich
City Staff			
Lonnie Brokke	Jill Anfang	Jeff Evenson	Brad Tullberg
Consulting Team			
Dan Cornejo	Michael Schroeder		
Others			

Notes

- 1 Review meeting notes
 - Meeting notes from the previous meeting were approved by the CAT.
- 2 CAT items
 - Michael Schroeder noted that the next CAT meeting would include representatives of the City Council and the Parks and Recreation Commission. He reminded the CAT that the invitation was extended to these groups, and that the meeting is for the CAT to share their progress. The meeting will be conducted as a part of the regular CAT meeting
- 3 Community outreach
 - Questionnaire Two was shared with the CAT and final comments were received. The questionnaire will be ready to distribute Friday, June 4, 2010.
 - The results of the high school survey were distributed. It was noted that care must be taken in the interpretation of the graphs because the charting indicates the relative ranking of priorities; in this case, a lower number indicates a high priority, which is reflected by a shorter bar in the graph.
 - A Technical Advisory Team meeting will be conducted on Thursday, June 10, 2010 to review the concept plans and, in a particular, the early concepts for major facilities.

4 Policy review

- Dan Cornejo reviewed the proposed policies and highlighted the questions that the CAT needed to offer insights or responses. He noted that many of the policies have been carried forward from the existing system plan, with additions directed to the constellation and sector idea, and other items discussed during the policy exercise from Community Meeting Three.
- CAT members offered the following comments:
 - The connectivity within constellations needs to be more directly addressed in the policies.
 - The community center is addressed as an implementation idea, which is good. Details will be offered in the master plan section of the final plan.
 - Essential services and the idea of maintaining well what we have need to be included in the goals and purpose statement. A policy should be added near 1.12 dealing with “Maintain well what we already have.”
 - A policy should be added that addresses “no net loss” was discussed. Currently, the policies are silent. Having a policy puts the city in a better position to protect parks. There may be exceptions that deal with buildings that are essential to a park’s function or that enhance the use or utility of a park.
 - The policy dealing with commercial use is reasonable, but a section that deals with sponsorship needs to be added.
 - Naming policies were discussed, but it was determined that this should remain an administrative policy (meaning it’s handled by the department, not in a master plan).
 - References to the comprehensive plan were discussed. Pathways and maintenance need to be addressed, along with references to departments or a specific plan. The relationship between the policies in the master plan and those of the city’s comprehensive plan will be reviewed to ensure there is consistency where needed, and differentiation where desired.
 - This part of the document should also clearly reference IR 2025, making sure there is alignment without necessarily quoting the document.

5 Concept plan review

- The concepts were reviewed and comments offered by the community were distributed to the CAT.
- The difference between the neighborhood focus and the community focus was discussed. Michael Schroeder suggested that, as broad direction, the community-oriented focus will be the more likely direction for these parks—noting the need to address components needed within a constellation. Still, every park that includes a neighborhood function, in these concept demonstrations, will include neighborhood-oriented functions as well.

- 6 Major facilities
 - Michael Schroeder reviewed concepts for an aggregated ball field at the Unisys site and a community center on the civic campus site. The ideas were well-received by the CAT, but will be refined for further review at the next CAT meeting.
- 7 Questions
 - There were no questions addressed.
- 8 Public comment
 - There were no comments from the public.
- 9 Adjourn
 - The CAT adjourned at approximately 8:40 p.m.

Upcoming meetings

Wednesday, June 17, 2010	CAT Meeting #10 City Hall, 6:30 to 8:30 pm
Thursday, June 23, 2010	Community Meeting Four Skating Center, 6:30 to 8:30 pm

These notes represent the author's interpretation of discussions and decisions occurring at the meeting. Corrections or deficiencies may be directed to Jeff Evenson, Roseville Parks and Recreation Department (jeff.evenson@ci.roseville.mn.us) before the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CAT, or they may be addressed at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CAT, after which the Notes will be recorded as approved upon a vote of the CAT.



Park and Recreation System Master Plan Update

Joint Commission/City Council/Citizen Advisory Team

Meeting 10: Review of key directions and recommendations

Notes

Thursday, June 17, 2010

6:30 to 8:30 p.m.

Roseville City Hall, Willow Room

draft

Attendance

CAT Members

Erin Azer	Bob Bierscheid	Bill Farmer	Rick Goodmanson
Gary Grefenberg	Elfrieda Hintze	David Holt	Sheila Mahnken
Rose Masanz	Mike Maristuen	Nancy O'Brien	Gale Pederson
Dan Roe	Bob Willmus	Ken Yokanovich	

City Staff

Lonnie Brokke	Jill Anfang	Jeff Evenson	Brad Tullberg
---------------	-------------	--------------	---------------

Consulting Team

Dan Cornejo	Michael Schroeder
-------------	-------------------

Others Present

Commissioner Randall Doneen, Mary Holt, Harold Ristow and James Stark
 Council Member Amy Ihlán and Jeff Johnson
 Mayor Craig Klausung
 City Manager Bill Malinen

Notes

- 1 Review Meeting Notes
 - Meeting notes from the previous meeting were approved by the CAT.
- 2 CAT Items
 - There were no CAT items discussed.
- 3 Community Outreach
 - Questionnaire Two was shared with the CAT and it was noted that it is available on line.
 - The Technical Advisory Team met on Thursday, June 10, 2010 to review concept plan for parks and the directions for major facilities. Questions were addressed regarding the constellation concept, making it clear that we need to do a better job establishing the key directions related to constellations and sectors.

- 4 Overview of Key Directions and Recommendations
 - The draft plan presentation being prepared for Community Meeting Four was shared with representatives of the City Council and Parks and Recreation Commission. Michael Schroeder shared the draft plan in PowerPoint format. Questions and comments were encouraged, and the general sense was that the draft plan was reflective of the needs of the community and the CAT was encouraged to proceed as suggested in the presentation.
- 5 Community Meeting Four
 - Michael Schroeder reviewed the process for Community Meeting Four, noting that this meeting would likely have a greater amount of time directed to a presentation than previous community meetings. He indicated that at least half of the time, however, would be directed to exercises that gauged reactions to the draft plan by asking meeting participants to note areas of agreement (Resonance), disagreement or missing elements (Omission), and clarification (Clarification). General comments would also be encouraged.
 - A summary of the plan was also shared with the CAT. The summary is an 8 page highlight document that reviewed the master planning process and the key directions and recommendations. Michael noted that it is a significantly expanded version than the previous draft, with a notable change in type size that is much easier to read. Copies will be made available to all meeting participants.
- 6 Major Facilities Review
 - This time was listed in the agenda as a time when CAT members could react to the reactions of the City Council and Parks and Recreation Commission. Since the general impression of the CAT was that the draft plan was well-received, there was no discussion.
- 7 Questions
 - There were no questions addressed.
 - Questions were asked about the date of the next and final CAT meeting. No decision was reached, so staff will identify a date and forward it to CAT members. The general timing would be toward the end of July.
- 8 Public Comment
 - There were no comments from the public.
- 9 Adjourn
 - The CAT adjourned at approximately 8:30 p.m.

Upcoming meetings

No date defined	CAT Meeting 11	6:30 to 8:30 p.m., City Hall
-----------------	----------------	------------------------------

These notes represent the author's interpretation of discussions and decisions occurring at the meeting. Corrections or deficiencies may be directed to Jeff Evenson, Roseville Parks and Recreation Department (jeff.evanson@ci.roseville.mn.us) before the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CAT, or they may be addressed at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CAT, after which the notes will be recorded as approved upon a vote of the CAT.

- 6 Major facilities
 - Michael Schroeder reviewed concepts for an aggregated ball field at the Unisys site and a community center on the civic campus site. The ideas were well-received by the CAT, but will be refined for further review at the next CAT meeting.
- 7 Questions
 - There were no questions addressed.
- 8 Public comment
 - There were no comments from the public.
- 9 Adjourn
 - The CAT adjourned at approximately 8:40 p.m.

Upcoming meetings

Wednesday, June 17, 2010	CAT Meeting #10 City Hall, 6:30 to 8:30 pm
Thursday, June 23, 2010	Community Meeting Four Skating Center, 6:30 to 8:30 pm

These notes represent the author's interpretation of discussions and decisions occurring at the meeting. Corrections or deficiencies may be directed to Jeff Evenson, Roseville Parks and Recreation Department (jeff.evenson@ci.roseville.mn.us) before the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CAT, or they may be addressed at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the CAT, after which the Notes will be recorded as approved upon a vote of the CAT.