## ROSEVILLE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES FOR October 6, 2020 6:30 p.m.

PRESENT:	Arneson, Baggenstoss, Brown, Carlson, Dahlstrom, Heikkila, Hoag,
	Lenhart, O'Brien, Stoner
ABSENT:	Kim
STAFF:	Brokke, Christensen, M. Johnson

#### 1) INTRODUCTIONS

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

#### 2) ROLL CALL/PUBLIC COMMENT

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

Chair Hoag called for public comment by members of the audience. No one indicated a desire to speak.

### 3) APPROVAL OF MINUTES – SEPTEMBER 1, 2020 MEETING

Commissioner Baggenstoss moved to approve the minutes. Commissioner Lenhart seconds.

#### **Roll Call**

Ayes: Arneson, Baggenstoss, Brown, Dahlstrom, Heikkila, Hoag, Lenhart, O'Brien and Stoner. Nays: None.

### 4) POCAHONTAS PARK NAME DISCUSSION

Staff provided the racial equity narrative that was adopted by the City Council and information from the Government Alliance on Race and Equity (GARE) to the Commission. GARE is a national alliance of Government entities making a commitment to achieving racial equity. Agencies who join GARE commit to putting focus on normalizing racial equality by using their influence for change. The city became a member of GARE in 2018.

The Racial Equity Tool Kit is used by GARE to articulate the process and its impacts prior to implementing a change. Staff suggested that this tool be used to understand and analyze the Pocahontas Park name project and noted that they will be sending out a questionnaire related to the

Racial Equity Tool Kit via e-mail for the Commission to fill out prior to next month's Commission meeting.

The six areas that are reviewed as part of the GARE Racial Equity Tool Kit include:

- Objective: What is the desired result of what is being proposed?
- Data: What data is relevant? Who does the data tell us in the impacted group?
- Engagement: How are you most affected communities targeted? Must be a planned and thorough approach.
- Analysis: How will the proposal increase or decrease racial equity? What are the potential unintended consequences? Does the objective, impacts and engagement plan align?
- Implementation: What is the plan? Is it realistic? Adequately resourced including personnel?
- Accountability: How will actual impacts be evaluated/addressed? What is the communication strategy? How can we leverage inroads made in the process into the future?

The Human Rights Inclusion and Engagement Commission (HRIEC) has also put together an Engagement Best Practices (draft) document that has been presented to the City Council. This document has valuable points on community engagement that should be remembered during this project:

Quality Engagement...

- Ensures quality decision making
- Engages community members who are impacted
- Creates broader diversity of opinions/views prior to decision making
- Increases public understanding/support of the process

Engagement Best Practice:

- Be intentional about engagement and outreach (utilize planning tools)
- Identify existing assets and leverage them for effective engagement
- Go where the people are (will need to be creative with this during Covid-19)

The staff proposed process for this project could potentially include the following steps:

- Process conversation Oct. 6
  - Commissioner input (due by Oct. 13)
- Process developed/presented based on feedback Nov. 3
- City Council input Nov. 30
- Process revision and/or finalization TBD (based on the City Council's input)
- Implementation and assessment

The Commission discussed the origin of the current name and the request to change the name.

Commissioner O'Brien commented that she believes the GARE toolkit is a good way to move forward with this process. Her understanding of the current issue is that there are two parts to the project. First, a fair number of people have expressed that they find the name Pocahontas Park hurtful and the Commission and city need to listen to their concerns as no name in Roseville should cause hurt or harm. Second, is what direction should be taken for renaming? Should indigenous peoples be honored with the name or is there another route that should be utilized?

Commissioner Baggenstoss noted that he believes the park name should honor local indigenous people and the city/Commission should reach out to groups in the area who can bring those voices forward.

Commissioner Lenhart agreed with both Commissioners O'Brien and Baggenstoss on changing the name due to it causing harm and that engagement is extremely important in this process. She also added that she would like to understand the history of the land and any connection to American Indian tribes who were here pre-European settlement as the park already has a connection to American Indian history and she would like to see that same sentiment leveraged in an updated way.

Chair Hoag reminded the Commission that if they have any questions on this issue they should reach out to staff directly and not CC all Commissioners. He also asked if any other Commissioners would like to present at the City Council meeting on this topic as he may have a conflict during that timeframe. Vice-Chair Dahlstrom volunteered to help.

Commissioner Stoner suggested that context be included in all communication about the name change project so as to avoid any potential misunderstandings.

# 5) PARK DEDICATION ANNUAL RATE REVIEW

Staff provided background on Park dedication including:

- Land set by ordinance in code
- Cash set by resolution
  - Resident \$4,000/unit
  - Non-Residential 10% of Fair Market Value (FMV)
- Last increase was in 2017

Park Dedication is defined in state law. Requirements include a Comprehensive Plan and a Parks and Recreation System Master Plan as well as a Capital Improvement Program to indicate need.

Staff reviewed a comparison of recent residential and non-residential properties that were eligible for Park Dedication and potential different ways to assess collections. Including:

- FMV
- Flat Rate Percentage

- Per acre rate
- Per 1,000 sq. ft. (non-residential)

Staff discussed a comparison of other metro cities Park Dedication rates. The average 2020 residential rate is \$3,329 of the metro cities surveyed.

Chair Hoag noted that it does not appear that the League of Minnesota Cities formula that the Commission reviewed last year has been adopted by other cities in the metro based off of the comparison chart. He also added that as the last increase was in 2017, the city may be due for a cost of living increase. However, it does appear that the current rate is right in the middle of the metro rates.

Staff relayed that they are continuing to look at the League of Minnesota Cities formula. However, at this time some parts of the method need further examination and explanation before staff would feel comfortable with moving forward.

Commissioner Baggenstoss stated that based off of the metro cities comparison chart it appears that some cities have built in a system for single family vs. multifamily residences and vice-versa. He questioned what the City of Roseville's priority would be.

Commissioner Stoner analyzed the metro cities comparison table and relayed that a rate of \$4,500 would put Roseville's Park Dedication rate in the upper 75% of cities. Stoner offered that a \$500 increase is appropriate for residential rates because Roseville does not use FMV and land prices are increasing along with Roseville placing a high priority on its parks compared to other cities. In addition, he noted that the non-residential rates appear appropriate to other cities.

Commissioner Brown questioned what justification would need to be provided by the Commission to increase the rates. Staff responded that it would be based off of the needs laid out in the Master Plan.

Vice-Chair Dahlstrom stated that a \$500 increase would be 12.5% which he feels is too high. He would support an increase of 2%-4%.

Commission Heikkila asked if staff has ever spoken with developers to understand their feelings or feedback on potential increases.

Vice-Chair Dahlstrom relayed that he felt that developers and the Builders Association may view a 12.5% increase as too high and they may start lobbying for a change in the laws to limit the Park Dedication fees. Dahlstrom stated that he believes that a consistent incremental increase each year would be a better approach to reach the 12.5%.

The Commission discussed the option to increase Park Dedication and the risks of increasing by a large amount versus incrementally.

Commissioner O'Brien agreed that land prices are going up and that it does make sense to increase the rate. However, she feels that a 5% increase this year would be appropriate. She added that the Commission looks at Park Dedication rates each year and the rate can be increased again next year when society is a little more settled.

Commissioner Lenhart asked who pays the Park Dedication fee. Staff responded that the developer pays the fee and then passes it on in the property sale price.

Commissioner Arneson reminded the Commission that Roseville is landlocked with finite land to develop.

Stoner recounted to the Commission that when he started serving on the Commission that the rate that was being charged was well below average, even when the city was providing an above average park system. He stressed that the Commission should not be afraid to charge more as the city provides more and Roseville can justify the higher rates. However, he does understand that it makes sense to increase the rate in smaller increments each year and he advocated that the Commission increase it yearly so as to avoid having to do a larger rate correction after a few years.

Chair Hoag motioned to recommend an increase of \$250 in Park Dedication for the residential land rate from \$4,000 to \$4,250 to the City Council. Seconded by Commissioner Stoner.

## **Roll Call**

Ayes: Arneson, Baggenstoss, Brown, Dahlstrom, Heikkila, Hoag, Lenhart, O'Brien and Stoner. Nays: None.

# 6) STAFF REPORT

## a) NEW OR RELEVANT COMMUNICATIONS AND UPDATE ITEMS

## **Operational** Update

- ALL programs, events and rentals are modified and have safety plans
- Indoor fall programs have started and have very good participation
- Larpen"TOUR"
  - Parks and Recreation staff participated in this community event with crafts and outreach
- Fall photo shoot
  - New offering at the Arboretum. All slots were filled.
- Halloween Spooktacular Sat. Oct. 24 (1 4 p.m.)
  - Pre-registration required

### Skating Center

- Skate park season ends Oct. 11
- MN OVAL winter prep
- Figure Skating School (230 signed up for the fall session)
- Open hockey and public skating
- Banquet room increase in requests

## Cedarholm

- Building Use
- Golf Season
  - Green fees up 15%
  - Fall registration up 25%

## Projects

- Tennis court resurfacing and repair
- Youth bike track Pump Track at Autumn Grove
  - Thank you Matt Johnson for leading it from the city perspective
  - Thanks to Derek Brown, a neighbor for leading from a volunteer perspective
  - Thanks to all the volunteers!
- Natural Resources Group
  - Tree planting
  - o Thanks to Jim Taylor and Rachel Boggs for organizing
  - Thanks to all the volunteers!
- Muriel Sahlin Arboretum Lighting Project
- Orchard harvest
  - With the help of volunteers and Wells Fargo Bank, who contributed the funds, the orchard idea went from conception to fruition. Those volunteers and contributions made it possible to donate 100lbs. of fruit to Second Harvest Heartland from the Orchard this year.

# 7) OTHER

Meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted, Danielle Christensen, Department Assistant