

Comprehensive Park, Trail, & Open Space Plan Update – Meeting #2

Bonestroo Project No. 000077-06-116

Meeting Date: February 12, 2007

Present:

Lenny Schmitz	Citizen
Zac Miller	Citizen
Michael Leek	City of Shakopee
Ryan Hughes	City of Shakopee
Bill Egan	City of Shakopee
Mark Themig	City of Shakopee
Andrea Weber	City of Shakopee
Don Hedlund	Jackson Township
Sonja Bercich	Shakopee PRAB
Brad Tabke	Shakopee PRAB
Arvid Sornberger	Shakopee PRAB
Stuart Krahn	Bonestroo & Associates
Holly Reid	Bonestroo & Associates
Jay Demma	Bonestroo & Associates

Review from Meeting:

1. The results of the 1998 Comprehensive Plan Goals survey that was conducted at the January 8th meeting were revealed. Areas of improvement were highlighted to understand where the goals were not being met. Refer to the February 12 Powerpoint Presentation for details on areas of improvement.
2. A summary presentation of 3 City Peer Reviews was given. These Peer Reviews were conducted to learn what progressive methods were being used in park & open space planning as well what cities would have done differently in accommodating park needs. Interviews were conducted by Mark Themig, Stuart Krahn, and Holly Reid over the past two weeks. These bulleted summaries on Eden Prairie, MN, Bend, Oregon, and Broomfield, CO are provided in a separate document titled *Shakopee Peer Review Summary*. The committee was sent a copy of one of these plans to review prior to the meeting. Their comments on the plans are as follows:
 - o Eden Prairie, MN: Goals were not concise and the plan was difficult to understand.
 - o Bend, OR: Was easy to read and follow the layout of the plan.
 - o Broomfield, CO: The vision and goals were well written. The document as a whole was easy to read. The page numbering was more difficult to follow. The financing strategy was clear and suggested a feasible way to implement & achieve the park plan goals. The plan represented much of the community by including citizens in the

planning process and enabling ownership of the park system. The highlighted sections were a good addition to summarizing each set of goals. Protection of ridgelines became a unique feature to their trail system. Would like to see this implemented in Shakopee.

3. The committee felt that educating the public on this planning process was important to get the community involved and developing a sense of ownership for the plan and park system.
4. The committee discussed their feedback on three reading assignments given at the previous January 8th meeting. These assignments and committee comments included the following:
 - VanCouver-Clark, WA (goals & objectives of comp plan): Liked the “action” verbiage in the goal statements. Part of the plan’s vision is to build a healthy community which is similar to Shakopee’s vision. Goals were specific, the plan was easy to read, and the layout was clear.
 - Broomfield, CO (goals & objectives of comp plan): discussed above
 - Virginia Ave Park, Santa Monica, CA (sustainable park building methods): Liked the wireless internet access setup in the park, high tech. The beautification pieces added a lot to the success of the park such as gateways, fountains, and plantings. There was a strong community participation component. A police office building was located within the park and had been renovated. The park took 15 years to get built. The park also offered diverse activities. Could the land around the Shakopee Community Building be utilized in this manner?
5. The committee had a few questions on the importance of sustainability such as:
 - What are the implications of not incorporating a sustainable piece into the plan or vision? The implications would include not being a leader and model to the Public and surrounding communities in regards to environmentally sensitive design. With the changing requirements by governmental agencies, projects may have to be renovated or reconstructed to meet future environmental quality guidelines.
 - Is there grant funding specifically for sustainable design? Will this be a trend in the future? A few grants recognize the benefits of sustainable design considerably in water quality categories. The trends suggest that sustainability could be a priority for future grant funding sources.
6. The current city ordinances do not support sustainability or environmental plantings. For example, community members desired to plant native grasses outside of the community building and are not allowed based on the city ordinances. During this comprehensive planning process the community will review ways to utilize the plan for positive change to current city codes.
7. The committee was asked to generate a list of items based on the question “What do you value most about Shakopee’s current Park System.” Then they

were asked to rank the top five most valuable items from their list. Each member wrote the five items on individual sheets of paper and worked together to identify similar topics that were generated from this exercise. The most valuable topics that the committee identified are as follows:

- **Community/Neighborhood Parks** (residents are within walking distance to a park, variety of uses, located within a neighborhood, allow for community members to gather, Huber Park-centerpiece)
 - **Sporting & Special Facilities** (athletic facilities, sports fields, picnic areas, aquatic center or renovated pool, diverse playground systems, community center, special features add uniqueness such as sand pool, burial mounds, disc golf)
 - **Open Space & Natural Areas** (interaction with the environment, buffer areas between athletic fields & housing, natural resource preservation, natural resource viewing opportunities, scenic, greenspace/wildlife corridors, community identity, visual relief)
 - **Vision** (potential, growth of future parks)
 - **Variety of Facilities** (recreational opportunities, cutting edge)
 - **Accessibility & Inclusiveness** (accessible to all ages and abilities, over activities for all types)
 - **Trail System** (overall improvements, connections, along river, along Verling Rd)
 - **Land Distribution** (diversity of the location of parks, well distributed in the city)
 - **Diversity** (general usage of the population, offers multiple active & passive opportunities)
 - **Ownership** (community involvement, parks & facilities are well maintained & show pride of place)
 - **Quality Control** (parks are constructed with good quality materials)
8. Jay Demma gave a snapshot look at Shakopee's demographics compared to the Twin Cities Metro and United States demographics. Jay also reported on National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) trends in sporting participation rates and acres per park classification. These data tables and calculation examples can be found in the February 12th Power Point presentation. This information will be a guide in setting facility projections and future land acquisition needs.

Follow-up Items:

1. **The next meeting will be held on March 5 at 6:30pm at the Shakopee Police Building Training Room.**

The above represents the author's understanding of items discussed and conclusions made. Please report any corrections/additions to Holly Reid at Bonestroo (651) 604-4807 prior to the next meeting.

End of Minutes