

**Greater Minnesota Regional Parks and Trails Commission**

**Minutes for March 22, 2017**

Sartell City Hall, Sartell, MN

**APPROVED**

**Commissioners in Attendance:** Marc Mattice, Rick Anderson, Tim Kennedy, Keith Nelson, Bryan Pike, Barry Wendorf, LuAnn Wilcox, Peg Furshong, Jannik Anderson

**Commissioners Absent:** Tom Ryan, Mike Hulett, Tom Schmitz, Rita Albrecht

**Staff and Consultants Present:** Renee Mattson, Executive Director, Joe Czapiewski, System Plan Coordinator, Jeff Schoenbauer joined the meeting at 10:45 to discuss designations and roles of consultants

**1. Meeting called to order at 10:05am by Secretary/Treasurer Marc Mattice**

Mattice cautioned the Commissioners there is a long agenda that we need to work through and it's important we remain goal oriented to meet our objectives and develop real outcomes and not just philosophies.

**2. Approval of February 22, 2017 Minutes:**

**Motion** by R. Anderson

**Second** by Kennedy

**Motion Approved**

**3. Treasurer's Report:**

**Motion** by Wendorf

**Second** by Pike

**Motion Approved**

**4. Approval of Agenda:**

**Motion** by Wilcox

**Second** by Kennedy

**Motion Approved**

**5. Acknowledge Members of the Public in Attendance:**

Tom Johnson District Planning Committee member from District 4 joined the meeting at 11:45.

**6. Executive Director's Report:**

Mattson provided an additional legislative update on the status of the bills that are currently moving through the House and Senate. Representative Gunther has

requested a meeting with representatives from Greater Minnesota, DNR and Met Council to begin a discussion of the 40-40-20 split, the agreement of which will end after the FY18-19 biennium. A brief discussion of funding options to consider followed. Mattson gave a status report on the work to complete the integrated website and provided a worksheet that has been used by the Liaisons to try to achieve a name for the site. She asked the Commissioners to take a look at the list of proposed names and note their top three choices, and to list any other name suggestions they had for the site. The site is on track to launch in early summer 2017.

We do need to develop a widget to collect the attribute information from our 47 designated parks and trails. The price is around \$12,000 for the work through MN GEO but that cost will be paid for out of the Coordinating with Partners budget. This is a robust application that will have adaptable uses for other needs.

#### **7. Items from Members and Letters to the Commission:**

Commissioner Furshong asked that everyone complete the SNA survey she passed along via email.

Commissioner Wilcox met with Sarah Grover of Project Get Outdoors and talked to her about applying for CPO funding.

Commissioner Mattice has had correspondence with a DPC member and much of it dealt with improving our process as we move forward. How can we make the process better?

#### **8. System Plan Coordinator:**

##### **Report:**

Joe was in Saint Paul for Minnesota Land Commissioners meeting, mostly from Northern Minnesota but meeting in Saint Paul. Many had no idea what the Commission does so it was a good to share with them our work. Was also in Oronoco, meeting with a sub group of the Zumbro River Partnership. They wanted guidance on how to proceed and what it will take to meet our standards. Was also in D4 meeting with Marc and Tom in preparation for this meeting. The DMS is coming together and will be a remarkable transformation for us. There are also subtle website changes in the Commission website. We are also looking in to a log-in site for the Commission to retrieve paperwork and attachments for each meeting.

##### **8.1 Consideration of Designation / Four Facilities**

The material today for discussion is in response to the request from the Commission for more detailed information, higher level of analysis and how the application fits into our system, prior to making final decisions on designations.

Discussion ensued for approval of updated Master Plan submitted by Chester Woods Park in Olmsted County and an additional three facilities, one in D4; Kraemer Lake

Wildwood Park 15-004D and two in Olmsted County; Root River Park and Oxbow Park and Zollman Zoo.

Kraemer Lake/Wildwood Park 15-004D.

Consensus was that the enhanced analysis on each potential designation is helpful.

Discussion points:

How does the park fit into District Priorities, it is similar in nature to Warner Lake Park and in somewhat close proximity, but it is in a large population center of St. Cloud so there is a case for an additional designated facility. Water quality score comparative to other lakes in the region was a concern, particularly with the swimming beach noted as a feature of the park. The 25-Year Plan did address the needs for more parks in population centers. The maple syrup operation is a special feature for the park and there is a good proximity to the trails in the area. Does the addition of this park add value to the system? We need to ensure all designations are thoroughly vetted, meet the criteria and fit within the district and within the state, i.e. overall system plan.

Before deciding on 15-004D a decision was made to review all submissions first.

Chester Woods 15-019D, update to Master Plan, Root River Park 15-021D and Oxbow Park Zollman Zoo 15-020D designations.

Chester Woods has been designated but completed a new Master Plan and requested to be rescored, the score did not change dramatically. Confirm the designation.

Discussion points:

Oxbow has a unique feature in the zoo. Another large population center with Rochester and they have significant acreage within their boundaries. Water quality was again discussed, along with invasive species in relation to Root River Park. Suggestion to address water quality and invasive species in the application process. Be upfront in requesting this information as it likely won't be highlighted by the applicant.

Root River and a partnership with the state, currently not accessible from the park, a bridge would need to be built. Park is nature based and the state forest on the other side of the river is a draw. There is a letter from the DNR that states they are willing to work together in the future. ETeam felt there was more that could be done and this plan doesn't get to that level. There was also a feeling that just natural space shouldn't be dismissed.

Wait to get the input from the districts on Oxbow, Root River and Kraemer Lake, then come back to the Commission for a decision.

Funding discussion ensued about setting expectations with designated facilities; if designated they will be funded for all their master plan work. This is not the message set in workshops or in individual meetings. Another talking point was how to assist smaller communities with fewer resources in the designation process and be more inclusive. Districts are very different with regard to the natural and financial resources available to them. Particularly with master plans.

A suggestion was made to pause the process of designation until after the DPCs look at the applications. The point of are we developing a system plan as we go, or should we be proscriptive in developing a system plan was addressed.

At this point it was determined that waiting to complete the designation decision until after 10.1 DPC Discussion.

**Motion** by Wendorf to put on hold 8.1 until after 10.1

**Second** by Pike

**Motion Approved**

\*At 2:30pm this item was continued for discussion

**Motion** by Kennedy

To accept the Chester Woods updated Master Plan

**Second** by Pike

**Motion Approved**

**Motion** by Pike

To continue discussion of the designations after the system plan has been developed to a point we are comfortable with it.

**Motion Failed** for a lack of a second

**Motion** by R. Anderson

To accept the designations of Kramer Lake and Oxbow Park

**Second** by Nelson

Concerns were raised about the issue of water quality in Kraemer Lake Park.

Nelson suggested we divide the question and vote separately on the designations,

Czapiewski asked for clarity in what additional information we are seeking from Kraemer Lake Park so he can get what we need from the applicant. Address the water quality issue and does the water quality affect the fish spawning areas.

**Motion** to accept Kraemer Lake Park

**Motion Failed**

**Motion** to approve Oxbow Park/Zollman Zoo for inclusion into the Greater Minnesota Regional Parks and Trails System

**Motion Approved**

**Motion** by Wendorf

To have the system plan coordinator seek more information from Kraemer Lake Park

**Second** by J. Anderson

**Motion Approved**

Nelson noted that we had rejected Kraemer Lake for designation, so we cannot go back and seek more information if we did not approve them. Mattice cited the intent that we had to seek more information, not to deny designation. There was not a move to table the motion. Nelson noted that those on the prevailing side can bring the motion back to the table.

**Motion** by Wendorf to table the designation for Kraemer Lake Park until we have further information.

**Second** by Kennedy

**Motion Approved**

**Motion** by Pike

To deny designation to Root River

**Second** by Furshong

**Move** by Nelson to table until further information from staff about Root River. It was pointed out that staff recommended denying designation for Root River in the analysis. Nelson withdrew his motion to table. Kennedy wanted to be clear in our response to Root River that we are not seeking further information we are denying designation. At this time we are doing system planning and this will not be designated but they can reapply in the future and strengthen their application with a better connection to the state land adjacent.

**Motion Approved**

**Motion** to table Root River designation by R. Anderson

**Second** by Nelson

**Motion Failed**

## 9. Old Business:

### 9.1 Connecting People to the Outdoors

Committee recommends that we send out an email to the Commission the criteria for funding and ask for input on eligible and ineligible projects. The email should come through the Executive Director.

### 9.2 DMS Redesign Review

Joe reviewed the new DMS and highlighted the upgrades and changes made to the site. It's much more user friendly and will allow staff to make changes without the need to go to Houston every time. Commissioner Nelson asked for a report that is a synopsis or executive summary of the Designation Applications and Master Plans once they've been submitted. We will research this request to see if we can build this feature into Phase II.

## **10. New Business:**

### **10.1 DPC Discussion**

Joe provided the context for our discussion and gave background on the history of the DPCs and how they work and how they've evolved. Mattice introduced Tom Johnson, a member of the District Planning Committee from District 4. Tom has had a very involved and deep background in planning throughout his career.

Tom stated his five basic rules for Committee work:

1. Assign meaningful roles and responsibilities and stick to them.
2. Give them an assignment that they feel worth contributing toward.
3. Meetings consistent with the process they are using that mirror the process of the decision makers.
4. Bring them the information they need to make a decision. Positive and negative.
5. Ask them to provide recommendations to the decision makers.

Committee involvement and recommendations add credibility to the decision-making process. The work should help the decision maker defend the decisions that are made. Others want to know the process was inclusive, reasonable and defensible. Put them at ease that the process used was solid and invited differences of opinion and concluded with the best outcome they expect. Someday there will be challenges and involving the DPC in asking their advice and including them in the process will help. He recommends staying with the 2/25/2015 DPC operating guidelines and enact them and use them fully. Let each DPC debate and recommend for their own district, not for the entire state. The 2/25/2015 operating guidelines were summarized for the group by Mattice. \*Guidelines are attached.

Czapiewski pointed out that each DPC is in a different place and has developed at a different pace. Discussion continued about the role and responsibilities of the DPC in the overall process. Not every DPC is in the same place but they are all capable of getting there.

### **10.2 Value Stream Map Funding/Designation Applications**

Mattice suggested that on our VSM for applications the DPC be added in the process between boxes 3-4 on the new VSM. The DPC has the opportunity to contribute their comments in the process based on their knowledge of the district. This helps the Commission make decisions on the designations. On the Funding VSM the DPC provides their input between boxes 7-8 and likewise the DPC provides insight on the funding needs within their district.

Mattice noted that since our inception we've worked hard but have not set expectations for our DPC, the Commission, the System Plan Coordinator or the Executive Director. Discussion continued about the role of the DPC and following

the guidelines as set forth moving forward. There also needs to be more consideration of the District Initiatives we set forth in the System Plan in 2016. We have pushed the initiative work back and we need to address it. Furshong questioned what we do with a DPC that is not engaged and not moving forward. Czapiewski noted we have gone through a process to add new member to the DPC but we don't always get applications and we need to be proactive in recruiting good, engaged members. This should be everyone's responsibility. Johnson felt if we give the committees real work with meaning we will have less of an issue recruiting.

Mattice asked if we look at rebooting the DPCs and re-establish them within the guidelines from 2015, and if so, do we task our system plan coordinator and our planner with that reboot? Pike asked if we should reevaluate those guidelines to make sure if we do reboot that they are exactly what we want them to be.

Establish a committee to evaluate the guidelines? System Plan Coordinator and Planner lead the committee work with Commissioners Pike and Mattice volunteering to serve on the committee.

Mattson felt that public advocacy on behalf of the work of the Commission is important and the DPC can fill that role, but we do need to make decisions and not keep pushing decisions off to another meeting. Mattice reiterated that inserting the DPCs into the VSM as he noted earlier would be a good step forward toward including the DPC in the process. The Commission discussed sending the three proposals for designation back to the DPC for their input as the next round of DPC meetings are coming up in April.

Kennedy felt we do not have specific objectives outlined that help us make decisions to add designations for parks and trails and funding. Mattice, then how do we do that? It's something we've been discussing for months, what is the system? How do we develop the system? That question is the purpose of the meeting today.

Mattice - the directive to our planner is "what do we need to do to develop our objectives and our system plan and have our DPCs work well, hard core bullet points that these things need to happen do to get to where we need to be in our leadership as a Commission that we can say yes to and work off of to get to that level where we need to be as a Commission to make these decisions and background information".

Wilcox pointed out we haven't had the luxury of doing the system plan and then doing the funding. Furshong suggested that we dedicate a meeting time to the issue of system planning. The January meeting was valuable and we could do something similar with regard to system planning, feels it is our job to develop a system plan,

and not turn it over to a planner to do for us. We do need a facilitator to help us with this. Executive Committee perhaps frame the discussion with the help of the planner to be able to do the work at a dedicated meeting.

**Motion** by Furshong

To dedicate a meeting to develop a system plan, with the help of a planner to lead the discussion

**Second** by J. Anderson

**Motion Passed 5/4**

Mattice asked Czapiewski and Schoenbauer to develop a plan to do this work for a future meeting.

**Motion** by Furshong

To accept the changes as suggested by Mattice to insert the DPCs into the VSM between 3-4 on the application VSM and between 7-8 on the funding VSM

**Second** by Kennedy

**Motion** by Nelson motion be tabled until the DPC work has been done

**Second** by Wendorf

**Furshong withdrew the motion**

**Motion** by Kennedy

To accept the VSM as presented

**Second** by Furshong

**Motion Approved**

### **10.3 Consultant Team Roles and Responsibilities**

Furshong has been doing the work she offered to do with respect to the ability of the Commission to have consultants doing this work, she has been gathering the information to help with the formulation of job descriptions. Mattson noted that as we add parks and trails we do need to add more contract workers to help with the work in the districts and assist our constituents.

Further discussion on this agenda item is postponed until a future meeting.

### **10.4 Fiscal Agent Review**

Hold for future meeting. Nelson asked to revisit this issue as 7% seems very high and we should be able to get a better rate by shopping this around. Mattson also noted that it can be up to seven weeks before checks are issued in between meetings due to the City Council meeting schedule. Counties meeting regularly and do not need approval to issue checks. Furshong noted we should issue an RFP for

this, Nelson noted that this is a professional service and we are not required to obtain an RFP for this service.

**11. Consent Agenda**

Consulting Expenses	\$16,413.56
Commission Expenses	\$1,856.11
Evaluation Team Expenses	\$2,478.74
<hr/>	
Total March Expenses	\$20,748.41

**Motion** by Wilcox

**Second** by Kennedy

**Motion Approved**

**12. Next Meeting and Agenda Items**

Cancel the April meeting, with the DPC work in April there will be a busy schedule  
May 24, 2017 10am – 3pm Sartell City Hall

J. Anderson asked that we host the June meeting in Bemidji. Mattson will research a meeting site. Mattice suggested that Lake Bemidji Park would be good, Furshong suggested the University would be a good place to meet. J. Anderson also suggested that the shooting range would be an appropriate site.

Wilcox noted that our operating guidelines do not say anything about meeting attendance and they should. Mattice suggested that the next meeting will address this procedure.

**Motion** to adjourn Furshong

**Second** J. Anderson

Meeting Adjourned