

**HOPKINS PARK BOARD AGENDA**  
**Monday, February 28, 2022**  
**6:30 pm**

**THIS AGENDA IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE**  
**UNTIL THE START OF THE PARK BOARD MEETING**

The public may attend this meeting via zoom.

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**II. ADOPT AGENDA**

**III. COMMUNITY COMMENT**

1. *At this time, any interested resident may come to speak on an item not on the evening's agenda.*

**IV. CONSENT AGENDA**

1. Minutes of the January 24, 2021, Park Board Meeting

**V. GENERAL BUSINESS**

1. Vote on Chair and Vice Chair Assignments
2. Review 2022 Annual Calendar

**VI. GENERAL PARK UPDATE**

1. Hopkins Academy
2. RFP Interviews + Questions

**VII. PARK AREA ASSIGNMENT REPORTS**

1. **Emma Figgins (Chair):** Buffer Park, Central Park
2. **Megan Slindee (Vice Chair):** Harley Hopkins Park, Maetzold Field
3. **Anna Pohmer:** Hilltop Park, Burns Park
4. **Dre Jefferson:** Cottageville Park, Park Valley Park
5. **Emily Waitz:** Minnehaha Creek Preserve, Valley Park
6. **Matthew Miller:** Oakes Park, Hiawatha Oaks Preserve
7. **Kimberly Stiele:** Elmo Park, Downtown Park
8. **Annika Burman & Misheel Battur:** Shady Oak Beach, Interlachen Park

**VIII. ADJOURN**

1. March 28, 2022 – at Hopkins City Hall, 1010 1<sup>st</sup> St S.

**HOPKINS PARK BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING PROCEEDINGS  
JANUARY 25, 2022**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Pursuant to due call and notice thereof a regular meeting of the Hopkins Park Board was held on Tuesday, January 25 at 6:30 p.m. via Zoom and in the Council Chambers at City Hall, 1010 1<sup>st</sup> Street South.

Vice-Chair Emma Figgins called the meeting to order with Commissioners Jefferson, Miller, Stiele, Pohmer, Waitz and Slindee. Staff present included Management Analyst Imihy.

**ADOPT AGENDA**

**Motion** by Waitz. **Second** by Miller.

**Motion** to Adopt the Agenda.

**Ayes: All.**

**Nays: None. Motion carried.**

**CONSENT AGENDA**

**Motion** by Miller. **Second** by Waitz.

**Motion** to Approve the Consent Agenda.

1. Minutes of the December 13, 2021 Park Board

**Ayes: All.**

**Nays: None. Motion carried.**

No public comment.

**GENERAL BUSINESS**

**V.1. Review of Adopted 2022 Park Board Work Plan and Calendar**

Management Analyst Imihy let the board know the work plan was approved by City Council at their December meeting after Vice Chair Slindee presented it to them. Imihy informed the board that the plan may change and it is approximate. Imihy also answered questions from board members.

**V.2. Review of Draft RFP for Master Parks System Plan and Implementation Plan**

Imihy explained there was a request for proposals for services for the City of Hopkins parks system master plan. It was explained that the idea is the board will receive similar plans from consultants and be able to score them adequately and evenly. Imihy explained there were also members of the Public Works and Planning departments that contributed and that the Economic Development Authority will be paying for a portion of the plan as well.

**HOPKINS PARK BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING PROCEEDINGS  
JANUARY 25, 2022**

The board discussed the purpose statement. Member Miller had submitted comments regarding access to nearby municipal park systems and how they influence Hopkins parks. Chair Figgins also noted in the fifth bullet point race was not mentioned and it was decided that it would be added in the demographic portion.

Pages 2-4 of the plan explain what type of community Hopkins is. Imihy answered questions from board members and members commented on some of the statements regarding high priority populations for community engagement involvement. The board continued to discuss community engagement and sports groups place in that plan. Member Waitz wanted to clarify that the section is trying to say that the board wants their plan to ensure it addresses groups that are unlikely park users and to be aware of issues. Imihy will clarify on the document. They also discussed adding a bullet point for people who are not in walking distance to the parks.

Pages 4-7 of the plan are the scope of services and tasks. Imihy briefly explained this portion of the plan to the group and noted that it was the largest part of the plan. The board discussed implementation and the role of the park board within said implementation. The board discussed community engagement opportunities and the number of them. The board decided they would separate the recreation and capital expenditures to help see the difference with finances. Imihy proposed an overall timeline to the board and a timeline for recommending a consultant. The board will interview 2-4 consultants. Member Miller noted that zoning will be putting on community engagement events at the same time this spring and Imihy suggested the park board combine with them to reach more residents. The board continued to discuss community engagement and a consultant's role in it. Imihy explained the process after a firm is chosen to the board. Imihy suggested a special meeting in March or April for consultant interviews and to choose a firm after members expressed concerns about doing both in one meeting. Imihy provided a timeline to the board of a special meeting the week of March 14. March 28 they would make a recommendation to the city council unless they decide on a consultant at March 14 meeting.

Imihy explained to the board that pages 9-12 of the plan are submittal requirements. Pages 13-14 of the plan are evaluation criteria. She also recommended to the board to first grade the firms without budgets. Members discussed the scoring system/rubric for consultants and Imihy told the board that some City staff will also review and attend interviews. The board will leave the rubric as a point scale and also have the ability for the full range of points.

**APPROVAL OF REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

**Motion** by Figgins. **Second** by Miller.

**Motion** to Approve Request for Proposals.

**Ayes: All.**

**HOPKINS PARK BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING PROCEEDINGS  
JANUARY 25, 2022**

**Nays: None. Motion carried.**

**V.3. Prepare and Discuss Annual Meeting + Chair/Vice Chair Assignments**

The annual meeting is in February and the board will vote on chair and vice chair positions at that time instead of voting in July when new members onboard. Positions are voted on annually. Imihy gave the board a rundown of what the positions entail and the members in the positions currently described what their tasks are. Member Steile expressed interest in the vice chair position and other members also expressed support for vice chair Slindee to step in to the chair role.

**GENERAL PARK UPDATE**

**Warming House Hours**

Imihy reported to the board that the City of Minnetonka has cut warming house hours during the weekdays due to a lack of staffing and a lack of skaters during those hours. Central Park and the Pavilion are open during the day if residents need a place to skate. Shady Oak Beach is also going to begin hiring for summer. Vice chair Slindee commented she would like to see the beach open longer during the summer and Imihy will pass that along to Minnetonka.

**PARK AREA ASSIGNMENT REPORTS**

Imihy asked the board members to note the last time they visited their parks and something they observed there. This agenda topic can be revisited next meeting to see if the board would like to keep the reports on the agenda.

The park assignments are as follows:

Emma Figgins: Buffer, Central: NTR (nothing to report)

Meg Slindee: Harley Hopkins, Maetzold Field: Maetzold Field turns in to a toddler sledding hill on the side of 12<sup>th</sup> Ave and it's a popular spot for small kids to sled.

Anna Pohmer: NTR

Dre Jefferson: Cottageville, Park Valley: NTR

Emily Waitz: At Valley Park there was no one there for the first time and the bathrooms in the warming house were barricaded with garbage cans.

Matthew Miller: Oakes, Hiawatha Oakes Preserve: NTR but wanted to give a compliment to the parks department for closing the speediest slide at Burnes Park as it was very fast. Suggested that these park updates are submitted before the meeting so members can see them, but not take up any time during the meetings.

Kimberly Stiele: Elmo, Downtown: Some the parks are more used at different times of the year so maybe this is a seasonal question/agenda topic.

Annika Burman: Interlachen, Shady Oak Beach: N/A

Misheel Batur: Interlachen, Shady Oak Beach: N/A

**ADJOURNMENT**

**HOPKINS PARK BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING PROCEEDINGS  
JANUARY 25, 2022**

There being no further business to come before the Park Board and upon a motion by Emily Waitz, second by Anna Pohmer the meeting was unanimously adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Lizzie Miller, Administrative Assistant

ATTEST:

---

Emma Figgins, Park Board Chair

**PARK BOARD ANNUAL CALENDAR – 2/23/2022**

<b>January</b>	Begin RFP Review and Development
<b>February</b>	Annual Meeting
<b>March</b>	Review RFP Submittals Select Consultant Team
<b>April</b>	Consider tactics to advance relationships relating to the park board and identify documents will be helpful for future park boards
<b>May</b>	Begin research on Park Board role in sustainability Continue conversation regarding relationships to the park board and documents for transition of park boards
<b>June</b> <i>New members observe</i>	Continue conversation on Park Board role in sustainability Partner Presentations
<b>July</b> <i>New members join</i>	Continue conversation on Park Board role in sustainability Partner Presentations
<b>August</b>	Work plan prep
<b>September</b>	Formalize recommendation regarding sustainability & the Park Board
<b>October</b>	Work plan draft for council finalized 6-month MPP Check-in
<b>November</b>	Review feedback from Council
<b>December</b>	Finalize work plan for next year

**City of Hopkins Park System Master Plan RFP Questions and Responses  
2/17/2022**

**Q: Page 10, Submittal Requirements: It is requested that we provide ten total copies of the proposal. Should that be on 10 separate flash drives, or two total - one with nine copies of the technical proposal on it and one with the technical and cost proposal on it?**

A: We would like 10 separate flash drives with the technical proposal, and one flash drive with both the proposal and the budget.

**Q: Page 11, Work Examples and References: We're allowed to show 3-5 representative projects. Does that include projects from our subconsultants as well? Or would you like to see 3-5 projects from each firm on the team.**

A: Please show 3-5 projects total, including any subcontractors.

**Q: Page 13, Cost Proposal and Approach to Budget: Does the city have a budget, or budget range identified for this project that we should aim for?**

A: We have identified a maximum of \$150,000 but I anticipate our board being most comfortable with spending around \$100,000.

**Q: Page 2, Addendum #1: We see that 30% of the budget should be going to a firm that is certified by the State of Minnesota (MNUCP) – Can the prime consultant count toward that goal?**

A: If the primary consultant is a DBE, then yes you can be counted towards that goal.

**Q: Will the project have a dedicated website? If so, will the city be hosting and managing the site, or will this be the responsibility of the consultant team? (Section: Scope of Services/Task, B. Community Engagement pg. 6)**

A: The City will not provide a dedicated website for the project, this responsibility will fall to the consultant to design and assist in managing. If a site were created City staff can assist and monitor, but the consultant should maintain responsibility of the site. The City will at a minimum create a dedicated webpage, or series of webpages hosted on the City's website.

**Q: Could you speak further to the city's role in community engagement outreach (i.e. email blasts, social media, etc.)? (Section: Scope of Services/Task, B. Community Engagement pg. 6)**

A: The City anticipates the consultant will lead engagement efforts, but City Staff will assist. Communications staff will help with email blasts, social media, etc. and various members of departments will be present at events. The project manager, PeggySue Imihy Bean, will be present at all engagement events and can assist in design / planning, etc.

**Q: Does the city have an online engagement platform – i.e. Bang the Table, ArcGIS for interactive geographic mapping, etc.? (Section: Scope of Services/Task, B. Community Engagement pg. 6)**

A: The City expects that the Consultant team would provide any online engagement tools needed for this process.

**Q: A key member of our team is in process of receiving her DBE certification. She would have a significant role on our team. Would this meet the DBE requirement? (Addendum, Section: Equity, pg. 2)**

A: No, the intent of this requirement is to have a DBE consultant or subconsultant benefit financially from the City's RFP. If this staff member is working as a subconsultant and would be paid at a higher rate

outside of her hourly wage and this can be documented, then we would consider this fulfilling the requirement. But it would not be counted if the staff member was being paid her hourly wage through a firm which is not a DBE.

**Q: Can you provide further clarification on the composition and role of the city staff and project team coordination? (Section: Scope of Services/Task, B. Community Engagement pg. 6)**

A: The project will be led by the City's liaison to the Park Board, PeggySue Imihy who will be the main point of contact for project coordination. Many other staff will be involved regarding plan details such as the City's Community Development Director and the Public Works Director and members of their department. This project is led by the Park Board but there will be collaboration between Public Works and Park Maintenance as well as the Economic Development Authority.

**Q: Is there a Community Steering Committee or Project Advisory Committee identified to serve as the guiding entity/decision-making entity? (Section: Scope of Services)**

A: The Park Board as well as staff from the above-mentioned departments will be the guiding entities, and the City Council will be the final decision-making entity.

**Q: Aside from the current partnership with the City of Minnetonka Recreation Service Area, what other 'nearby' municipal systems do you anticipate this study would cover? (Sections: Background and Community Engagement, pgs. 4 and 6, respectively)**

A: Hopkins is four square miles, surrounded by Edina, Minnetonka, and St. Louis Park, as a small and fully developed community we would expect that as new amenities are desired by the community, we also consider both the feasibility of them being made available in Hopkins as well as if something is available in an adjacent community (ex. a waterpark).

**Q: What is the expectation level anticipated for recommendations? Does the planning effort anticipate individual park recommendations based on the Phasing Plan and Budget requested? (Sections: Purpose and Emerging Issues and Opportunities, pgs. 3-5)**

A: We expect that a firm can offer initial ideas of what they might propose for recommendations based on their initial understanding of Hopkins prior to selection. That said, it would be anticipated that the final plan includes both some high level either master plans or 30% plans with general plans for key parks as well as generic recommendations and standards for the system.

**Q: Page 13, Cost Proposal and Approach to Budget, Can you please identify a budget range for the project?**

A: We have identified a maximum of \$150,000 but I anticipate our board being most comfortable with spending around \$100,000.

**Q: Page 14, Proposal Evaluation Criteria, "Project team has considered a way to compensate some community members for time and expertise." Are there any ethics or codes of conduct around compensation (i.e., maximum value, extents, use of public funds for incentives, etc.)**

A: The City does not have a policy regarding codes of conduct around compensation. This is not considered an incentive.

**Q: Page 14, Proposal Evaluation Criteria, "Project team has considered a way to compensate some community members for time and expertise." Please elaborate on the definition of "some community members"? Have the members been identified, is there a quantity?**

A: “Some communities members” refers to the high-priority community members on page 5 of the RFP. The term “some” indicates that we do not intend to pay all residents who participate in engagement.

**Q: Page 14, Proposal Evaluation Criteria, “Project team or subcontractors are certified as a DBE with the State of Minnesota and are budgeted for at least 50% of the work plan.” Does this mean that it is the desire to have the prime consultant as a certified DBE?**

A: An addendum to this project was issued 1/31/2022 which reduces this percentage to 30%.

**Q: We're interested in finding a firm to partner with to submit to your Park System Master Plan RFP. Would it be possible to get a plan holder list or a list of firms that submitted questions, along with contact information?**

A: The following consultants have submitted questions:

- Confluence
- Ayres Associates
- Damon Farber
- Asakura Robinson
- WSB

**Q: Would the City consider a consultant who is pursuing a DBE requirement through the state of Minnesota but has not been fully approved as fulfilling this requirement?**

A: Yes, the intent of this criterion is to have a disadvantaged business benefit from the City’s RFP.

**Q: Would the City consider a consultant whose business is woman or minority-owned, but is not DBE certified as fulfilling the equity scoring criteria?**

A: Yes, if the firm meets the qualifications as defined by the Minnesota Unified Certification Program. <https://mnucp.org/Apply-for-Certification.aspx> If the firm is not certified, please provide documentation detailing how they meet this criterion.