

**ROSEVILLE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES FOR
MAY 5, 2020 6:30 p.m.**

PRESENT: Arneson, Baggenstoss, Brown, Carlson, Dahlstrom, Heikkila, Hoag, Kim, Lenhart, O'Brien, Stoner

ABSENT:

STAFF: Brokke, Christensen, Johnson

1) INTRODUCTIONS

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

2) ROLL CALL/PUBLIC COMMENT

Roll Call: Arneson, Baggenstoss, Brown, Carlson, Dahlstrom, Heikkila, Hoag, Kim, Lenhart, O'Brien, Stoner.

Chair Hoag called for public comment by members of the audience on any non-agenda items. No one indicated a desire to speak.

3) APPROVAL OF MINUTES – MARCH 5, 2020 MEETING

Commissioner O'Brien proposed adding "*An issue was identified regarding the communication structure within the Natural Resources Volunteer Leadership Program. Meetings have taken place with Jim Taylor and Rachel Boggs, along with one of the volunteer leaders, to work towards resolving this.*" to item #4 on the Commission Goals under progress.

Vice-Chair Dahlstrom moved to approve the minutes with amendment. Commissioner Stoner seconds.

Roll Call

Ayes: Arneson, Baggenstoss, Brown, Dahlstrom, Hoag, Lenhart, O'Brien, and Stoner.

Nays: None.

Stays: Heikkila.

4) INTRODUCTION AND OATH OF OFFICE FOR NEW COMMISSION MEMBER

The Oath of Office was completed by Commission Chair Hoag for new Commission member Michelle Lenhart.

5) **PARK DEDICATION REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION – LEXINGTON WOODS – SE CORNER OF LEXINGTON AVE. AND COUNTY ROAD C2**

Both Chair Hoag and staff reviewed the role of the Parks and Recreation Commission in the Park Dedication process. The role of the Commission is to review and make recommendations to the City on Park Dedication matters only, namely whether to take land or cash to satisfy the requirement. Staff reviewed the Park Dedication process, history, purpose and options with the Commission.

The City received an application from the Civic Site Group to develop the property on the southeast corner of Lexington Ave. and Co. Rd. C2. The proposal summary for Lexington Woods includes:

- Qualifies for Park Dedication
- Total Acreage = 4.95
- 20 new lots
- Cash Amount \$80,000 (\$4,000 x 20)
- Land Requirement = .495
- Land Proposal = ~~1.5~~ acres new information from the developers is that they will include an additional 3 lots = 2.19 acres

Developers Matt Pavcek and Peter Knaeble joined the call to discuss the additional acreage option with the Commission. They also noted that there is land contamination on a portion of the proposed Park Dedication parcel.

Commissioner Arneson asked what the city would need to move forward with the land knowing it is contaminated. Staff responded that the city would need to do due diligence of the property prior to accepting the land to understand the possibilities for future park amenities.

Commissioner Heikkila examined the sidewalk connection options (C2 to Woodhill) and the need for soil remediation. Staff responded that the C2 to Woodhill connection is not contingent on the acceptance of Park Dedication land.

Commissioner O'Brien asked what a space like this could potentially be used for if land is chosen. Staff responded that it could be left as wooded space, add trails, benches or flowers.

Commissioner Brown noted that he appreciated the potential for additional greenspace in the community.

Commissioner O'Brien stated that she has trouble being excited about taking contaminated land for this development as there is already an abundance of land in this quadrant of the city.

Chair Hoag added this area has lost a lot of green space in the last three years with the building of the Senior Housing residences near this site. He also noted that with the additional lots the park dedication land amount may be worth more than the cash value.

Pavek noted that the developer has done extensive research on the sites contamination. Their understanding is that the contamination consists of bituminous debris that needs to be hauled away to a landfill. The contamination only exists in the north 20% of the proposed Park Dedication parcel. The rest of the parcel is clean with fill soils.

Commissioner Stoner motioned to recommend land per the developer's proposal (including the three extra lots to the south) contingent upon a review of soil that would show that the city could utilize the land for low intensity amenities such as trails. Commissioner Brown seconds.

Roll Call

Ayes: Arneson, Baggenstoss, Brown, Dahlstrom, Heikkila, Hoag, Lenhart, and Stoner.

Nays: O'Brien.

6) PARK DEDICATION REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION – MIDLAND LEGACY ESTATES - 2395 COUNTY ROAD B WEST

Staff once again reviewed the role of the Parks and Recreation Commission in the Park Dedication process. The role of the Commission is to review and make recommendations to the City on Park Dedication matters only, namely whether to take land or cash to satisfy the requirement. Staff also reviewed the process, history, purpose and options of Park Dedication.

The Commission reviewed location maps of Midland Legacy Estates and the proposed site plan for the development which includes a sidewalk along Eustis as part of the development. The project qualifies for Park Dedication. The proposal summary for Midland Legacy Estates includes:

- Total Acreage = 5.04
- 18 new lots
- The cash amount for the additional 18 lots would be \$72,000 (\$4,000 per additional lot)
- Land Requirement = .50 acre
- Land Proposal = .56 acre

Staff emphasized that they have greatly pursued this parcel. However, this parcel was never at a price that the city would consider as they don't pay premium price for parkland. Staff reiterated the role of the Commission is to review the development for land or cash to satisfy the Park Dedication recommendation.

Todd Ganz and Tom Collins from Integrity Land Development joined the Commission to answer any questions on the proposed development.

C. Ross, Noted there is no parking and no access at the park on Co. Rd. B and Cleveland. He questions how you can take the last piece of wilderness land in this area of Roseville and turn it into property. Noting, this is the only viable wetland area on this side of Roseville. He feels this is the time for the city to come with fresh eyes and talk with the family and determine what this last piece of land is worth to Roseville.

M. Manns, 2232 St. Croix St. Stated last night she spoke with the daughter of the Shannon Family and she was told that the only time the city ever spoke with the Shannon Family about the land was 20 years ago and at that time they were asked to donate the land.

Staff responded that they met with the Shannon Family personally and they were told by the property owner that if they ever felt they could sell the land for what the city could purchase it for they would come forward.

J. Lomnicki, 2191 St Croix St. Is not in favor of the proposed park at its current location and finds it unacceptable and unusable. He would take the money as this is not useful land. He feels it is a shame that a city that prides itself on having parks has 1/3 of the city without any. He is sort of disgusted that nothing was done in a positive manner to acquire this property. He is not happy more money was not sought from the City Council for this piece of property which could have made the city world-class.

D. Ostrom, St. Croix St. Noted in the previous discussion that Chair Hoag said a .5 acre lot is not a park. Ostrom also noted that with this .56 acre park proposal 2/3 of it is on unusable land. Echo's all the other concerns that his neighbors have brought forward.

S. Reddy, 2180 Highway 36 W. Whole family is listening to the Zoom meeting. Recently moved to the neighborhood 1 year ago. Reiterates what all the other neighbors stated about not having access to a park that is within biking or walking distance without crossing a major street. Feels the developer is just "checking the box" as this is not usable parkland. She stated that it sounds like the city has not put in enough effort to purchase the land as a wetland or wild space. Therefore, she encourages the commission to table the vote for land or cash as it puts a cash value on land that is not worth being a park.

Nancy Nelson, Questioned why can the developer give the worst parcel of unusable land? Can the city not designate the portion of land that would actually make a usable park? Also, questioned if the development would be on both sides of Eustis.

Staff noted that the exact park land location would be up to the City Council, not the developer.

Staff also stated that the developer has offered the one acre of land across the street to the city at a price the city would not entertain and that land is not part of the Park Dedication discussion.

S. Martineau, 2311 St. Croix. Stated that the city is missing a once in a lifetime opportunity to get a piece of parkland for the city in this area of town. He does appreciate the developer trying to accommodate the changes of everyone. He has a lot of issues with the development itself but he will take those up with the planning Commission and the City Council.

Commissioner Arneson noted that the .5 acres that was proposed is not appropriate for a park and would not be a useable park for an area that really needs parkland.

Staff noted that they did speak to the developer to try and buy individual lots to increase the size of the proposed park. However, the prices were quite high for each smaller lot.

Developer Ganz added that the elevation is hard to develop on this property.

Commissioner Stoner felt it would be irresponsible to accept the piece of proposed land as it does not meet the statutory guidelines for what the city would accept for Park Dedication. As a result he may not feel comfortable making a decision this evening but rather would prefer to see another proposal from the developer after hearing tonight's feedback and concerns.

Developer Ganz relayed that they will be bringing in over 10,000 in fill in order to make the houses buildable and walkouts. The wetland will be setup as a storm water wetland not an original wetland because in 1974 the county dumped in storm sewer into the property. The developer feels that the yellow outlined location is the best place for the city to have usable land, based on the elevation of the property. The developer is willing to sell the adjacent 1 acre parcel to the city for market value.

Commissioner Stoner, reiterated that what is being presented does not appear to be the only option. Especially, seeing the piece across the street being offered at market value. It appears that only the easiest options have been thought through. He appreciated the developer joining the meeting and answering questions tonight. However, he would like to have the developer come back next month with a reasonable option for land in lieu of cash.

Commissioner Baggenstoss asked the developer what the market value of the parcel across the street would be.

The developer stated that if it was sold right now it would go for \$780,000. It was offered to the city for \$650,000.

Commissioner Baggenstoss agreed that this proposal is premature for a vote. Especially, with the amount of cash that would be accepted vs. the amount that the developer is asking for the parcel across the street.

The developers noted that they do not agree with the \$4,000/unit price. Also, they reiterated the steep grading of the property and the difficulty that poses.

Commissioner Baggenstoss asked if they have a purchase agreement for the property. The developer confirmed that they do have a purchase agreement contingent on the rezoning with a purchase price of \$1,000,000.

Commissioner Baggenstoss questioned why the smaller plat across the street of only 1 acre would be worth \$650,000? The Developer noted that the land is worth a higher value, they have more money into that property already and the parcel has received final plat approval from the city.

Chair Hoag questioned how the Park Dedication will change if the rezoning of this property is not approved. The Developer noted that they went with a medium density option for people who want to live here but don't want to shovel snow or mow their lawn. However, per Roseville regulation they could put 20 single family homes on this parcel. Their proposal is to put in 19 town houses. Therefore, the only reason for the density request change is due to the single family townhouse project.

Commissioner Baggenstoss questioned what happens to the project if the city requests the parkland on Co. Rd. B. The developer responded that they do not know if the project would still go and they don't know how the Parks Department would fit it in there and keep it in safe.

Commissioner Stoner motioned to defer a Park Dedication recommendation for Midland Legacy Estates - 2395 County Road B W. until staff can find out about the location across the street and attempt to arrive at an agreeable price. Commissioner Baggenstoss seconded.

Staff noted that the parcel across the street is not tied to the Park Dedication recommendation item.

The Commission discussed the parcel across the street and zoning of the parcel.

The developer confirmed that regardless of the zoning they would be moving forward with development of the property.

Commissioner Baggenstoss stated that we owe it to Roseville and especially the residents who live in this area to table this and choose the best half acre location for a park on this parcel.

The Commission discussed the options for moving forward with their recommendation.

Commissioner Stoner withdrew his prior motion. Commissioner Baggenstoss withdrew his second.

Commissioner Baggenstoss motioned to table the discussion until there has been a reasonable and creative thought process on the .5 acre land dedication for Midland Legacy Estates - 2395 County Road B W. Seconded by Commissioner Stoner.

Roll Call

Ayes: Arneson, Baggenstoss, Brown, Dahlstrom, Heikkila, Lenhart, O'Brien, and Stoner.

Nays: Hoag.

Chair Hoag motioned for staff to work with the developer on an agreeable price for the parcel across the street from Midland Legacy Estates to bring another usable park to the SW quadrant of the city. Seconded by Commissioner Arneson.

Roll Call

Ayes: Arneson, Baggenstoss, Brown, Dahlstrom, Heikkila, Hoag, Lenhart, O'Brien and Stoner.

Nays: None.

7) COVID-19 UPDATE RELATED TO PARKS AND RECREATION

Staff provided an introduction of Roseville Parks and Recreation's response to Covid-19. Staff's main goals have been to have a planned and thorough approach, prioritize safety, share the important role that Parks and Recreation plays in Covid-19 and always do what is right for Roseville. The Covid-19 response can be broken down into three phases:

- Phase 1: Early Stages
 - Facility Closures
 - Program Cancellations
 - Staffing Impacts
- Phase 2: Current Operation Plan
 - Gradual Reopening of Select Facilities
 - Modified Program Offerings
 - Limited Traditional Programs and Events
- Phase 3: Looking to the Future
 - Summer Programs and Events (Decision Timeline)
 - Developing new programs and activities within new framework
 - Parks
 - Helping the Community heal

Phase 1: Early Stages

- Programs and facilities
 - All recreation facilities and recreational programs cancelled beginning March 16
 - Special Events Cancelled
 - Parks remained open in a limited capacity
 - Reduced maintenance staff, office staff working remotely
 - Emphasis on informing and facilitating social distancing
 - Staff developing phased reopening plans

Phase 2: Current Operation Plan

- Virtual Programs
 - Earth Day on-line
 - At Home With Roseville Parks and Recreation
- Cedarholm is Golfing
 - Opening Day with an abundance of Caution
 - Tee times spaced at 20 minutes, no carts, no interaction between groups or staff, inverted cups, building closed
 - Turning the Dial
 - Tee times spaced at 12 minutes, some carts, limited staff interaction with social distancing barriers
 - Future Considerations
 - League play, normal tee times, interior access, kitchen grill
- Parks
 - Early Stage
 - Available: walking trails, open space, tennis, disc golf
 - Closed: playgrounds, basketball courts, volleyball courts, athletic fields, restrooms
 - Turning the Dial
 - Opening 10 restrooms in the system on May 4, athletic space for same household/non-organized play, community gardens open May 5, modified Blooming Boulevard planting May 16
 - Future Considerations
 - Use of volunteers, youth activities, playgrounds, additional restrooms, staffing uncertainty, enforcement, picnic shelters

Phase 3: Deadlines to Decisions

- Dated Decisions
 - Summer Events (mid-May)
 - Rosefest
 - Discover Your Parks
 - Concerts
 - Summer Recreation Programs

- Youth in mid-May
 - Adult Delay is Possible
 - Summer Staffing (mid-May)
- Progress Based Decisions
 - Park Amenities
 - More restrooms, playgrounds, basketball, volleyball, etc.
 - Affiliated Groups
 - Recreational Facilities
 - Skating Center, HANC, Cedarholm (indoors)
 - Rental Spaces
 - Picnic Shelters
 - Volunteer Usage
- Considerations
 - Governmental Guidance
 - Federal Government, State of MN, Ramsey County, Roseville Emergency Management
 - Specific Guidance
 - Parks and Recreation Professional Associations, activity specific, other communities
 - Other considerations
 - Community appetite, staffing and training considerations, availability of PPE and other resources, ability to create/embrace modifications, runway needed for activities

Commissioner Lenhart noted how proud she is to live in Roseville where the bathrooms are open. She also noted what a great opportunity Covid-19 presents to get people outside and exploring the outdoors. Finally, she relayed that she feels there are opportunities for children’s programs that are in small groups. She offered her assistance and expertise with these programs.

8) STAFF REPORT

a. NEW OR RELEVANT COMMUNICATIONS AND UPDATES

- If there is a joint meeting with the City Council it would be on June 22nd
- An update on Bennett Lake is on the list for a future Commission meeting
- An update on the deer population will be at a future meeting

9) OTHER

Meeting adjourned at 10:01 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Danielle Christensen, Department Assistant