



MEETING NOTES

Rochester Parks & Recreation Master Plan – Advisory Committee Meeting #7

June 23, 2016

5:30 – 7:30 p.m.

National Volleyball Center at 2601 Viola Rd. NE

Attendees:

Park Board Members Vern Yetzer, Larry Mort; Advisory Committee Members Randy Thomas, Ed Hruska, JoAnne Judge-Dietz, Pam Meyer, and Dee Sabol; Rita Trapp and Jess Vetrano from HKGi; Mike Nigbur and Paul Widman from City of Rochester.

1. Meeting Introductions & Welcome

The meeting was kicked off by Rita Trapp of HKGi. The purpose and agenda of the night's meeting were reviewed.

2. Approval of Advisory Committee #6 Notes & Recommendations

Advisory Committee members did not have any changes to the notes or recommendations from the previous Advisory Committee meeting.

3. Review Prioritization

After the last meeting, Advisory Committee members were asked to complete a short survey regarding the prioritization of items under the categories of facilities, marketing, programming and events, and operations. A summary of comments from this discussion can be found below.

Facilities

- The completion of Quarry Hill is ongoing – should it be on the list of priorities?
- Modernization of existing facilities – community input process highlighted this as a higher priority than is displayed in our list.
- Higher priority items on the existing list seem to address the most people, which is how it should be
- Cascade Lake potentially ranked higher than Gamehaven due to its accessibility and ability to impact more residents and visitors – Gamehaven is more of a regional destination that draws from outside the City.
- The potential for privatization seemingly lost traction – should be put at a higher level of importance.
- Addition of user amenities – surprisingly low after community input expressed such desire for it.
 - Not as high impact as other items or as big budget – smaller items can be completed with less funding
 - Upgrading and taking care of what we have has been portrayed as more important

Marketing

- The strategic plan is reflected in this list.

Programming/Events

- Refine definition of “activate downtown parks and open spaces”
 - Currently confusing
 - Which parks are even considered to be downtown?

Operations

- Definition of an Asset Management System – perhaps make more clear within the plan

Overall

- It is difficult to assign priority to things that are not of equal time or cost
 - Is there a more valuable way of conducting a comparison or displaying the list?
 - Should more achievable things (i.e. cheaper, faster) automatically rank higher because they are low-hanging fruit?
- Would feasibility rather than priority be a better way to rank these items to account for funding and duration differences?

4. Implementation Components

As the final discussion topic before reviewing the actual system plan, the Advisory Committee discussed various implementation components, including funding recommendations, proposal review processes, and potential funding sources.

Funding Recommendations

- Support grant statement with new position
 - 1.2.8 – already included in the wording “strategically”?
 - Potentially add wording about pursuing partnerships
- Add 1.3: “Maximize potential volunteer support to off-set expenses”
- 1.2.1/1.2.2. At what price? Increase share and take away from other city departments, or increasing taxes?
 - ASK RITA HOW TO PUT IN NOTES
 - Is that a statement that should be in this doc?
 - Is a goal, but how to word it?
- Should land acquisition be included with philanthropic work?
- 1.2.9 – A lot of the assets are not City-owned and are interconnected

Proposal Review Process

- Equity missing
 - Groups/people who are more knowledgeable and/or eloquent may be more likely to ask for more than people who actually need it but don’t know to ask
 - Will there be more requests from areas that already have more?
 - Sort of addressed by first bullet, but the process still requires a request to start
 - Reword to “balanced” rather than unmet – think about Areas of Need map
 - NRPA “social Equity” pillar could help with wording.

- Some of the questions are two questions – may want to separate because it could cause confusion (i.e. bullet 2 – both economically and environmentally or just one or the other?)
- Way to ensure project proposals are in line with City goals/direction as well as parks and rec goals and direction
- Is “community pride” the right wording? Would “community connectedness” be better?

Potential Funding Sources

- Research/provide data on peer communities that have implemented park bond referendums

5. Evaluation

To ensure this process results in a plan that is in line with the original vision, members of the Advisory Committee reviewed how the developed recommendations and content compares with the guiding principles and intended user groups. No members felt that the process had diverted from the original vision.

6. Next Steps

- Review draft system plan by next meeting.
- July 21st Advisory Committee meeting