Scott County
Park Advisory Commission
November 6, 2019
6:00 PM

Scott County Government Center
Scott County Board Room
200 Fourth Avenue West
Shakopee, MN
Regular meetings of the Scott County Parks Advisory Commission are normally held the first
Wednesday of the month at 6:00 PM in the County Board Room of the Scott County Government
Center. Meetings are open to the public. Contact Patty Freeman at 952-496-8752 if you have an
item you would like placed on the agenda.

SCOTT COUNTY PARKS ADVISORY COMMISSION AGENDA
6:00 P.M. – November 6, 2019
Scott County Board Room, 200 Fourth Avenue West, Shakopee, MN

1) Roll Call – Pat Stieg, Chair

2) Pledge of Allegiance

3) Approve Agenda

4) Approve Meeting Minutes for October, 2019

5) Recognition of Interested Citizens for Items Not on the Agenda (No action will be taken.)

6) Administration, Planning and Development
   a. 2018 Resident and Visitor Study Presentation – Guest presenter Alyssa Olson from Three
      Rivers Park District (6:15 to 6:50 PM)
   b. Scott County Parks and Trails at a Glance – Park and Conservation Land Acres and Regional
      Trail Miles (6:50 to 7:00 PM)
   c. Resident/Non-Resident Fee Structure Concept (7:00 to 7:20 PM)

7) Informational Items (7:20- 7:45 PM)
   a. Advisory Commissioner Reports (Verbal)
   b. Projects/Other Updates (Verbal)
      i) Update on 2020 – 2024 Capital Budget
   c. Upcoming Recreation and Education Programs and Events (Verbal)
      Highlighted Winter Events and Programs/Volunteer Opportunities:
      (1) Full Moon Snow Shoe with S’mores at Cleary Lake – December 13, 6:00 to 8:00 PM
      (2) Kicksled Adventure at Cleary Lake – January 25, 1:00 to 2:30 PM
      (3) Geocaching to Build a Snowperson at Cleary Lake – February 1, 1:00 PM to 3:00 PM
      (4) Family Snowshoeing with Hot Cocoa at Cleary Lake – February 8, 4:00 PM to 5:30 PM
      (5) Fat Bike Fun Race at Cleary Lake – February 15, 9:00 AM to 1:00 PM
      (6) Beginner Showshoeing at Cleary Lake – February 23, 3:00 PM to 4:30 PM

8) Upcoming Meetings - Tentative (7:45PM to 7:50 PM)
   a. December – Wayfinding and Kiosk Project Update; Year in Review? End of Year/Holiday
      Celebration
   b. January – Elections; 2020 Operating Budget Overview; PAC Tours and Goals for the Year
      Discussion

9) Adjourn (7:50 PM)
SCOTT COUNTY PARKS ADVISORY COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
October 2, 2019

The Scott County Parks Advisory Commission held their October meeting on October 2, 2019 at The Landing, 2187 County Rd 101, Shakopee, MN 55379. Staff members present were Patty Freeman, General Manager of Scott County Parks and Trails, Alysa Delgado, Parks and Natural Resources Coordinator, and Beverly Cox-Alexander, Secretary.

1) Roll Call: Chair Patrick Stieg called the meeting to order at 5:05 PM and proceeded with roll call. Members present: Kristin French, Kathy Gerlach, Barb Hedstrom, Jerry Hennen, Eric Spieler, Patrick Stieg, and Mark Ewert.

Members Absent: Commissioner Jon Ulrich
Three Rivers Park District Members Present: Luke Skinner, Anne Jaeger, Tyler Thompson, and Bill Walker

2) Pledge of Allegiance – (Ommitted the Pledge of Allegiance - no flag available at off-site meeting)

3) Approval of Agenda

    Motion by Commissioner Ewert; second by Commissioner Gerlach to approve the agenda. The motion carried unanimously.

4) Approve meeting minutes for September 4, 2019

    Motion by Commissioner Spieler; second by Commissioner Ewert to approve the 09/04/19 meeting minutes as written. The motion carried unanimously.

5) Recognition of Interested Citizens for Items Not on the Agenda

    No citizen comment.

6) Administration, Planning and Development

   • The Landing Update and Tour
     Presented by Luke Skinner, Three Rivers Park District Associate Superintendent

     Proposed changes are in partnership with Three Rivers Park District Staff, Scott County Park District Staff, the City of Shakopee and the Shakopee Mdewankanton Sioux Community

     • A new approach to The Landing historical story telling
       o Communicating a history that is more accurate and comprehensive
     • Opening up The Landing for more general park usage including:
       o Walking
• Modernizing the approach to interpretation and historical story telling
  o Telling the story in unique ways
    ▪ Self-guided
    ▪ Augmented reality
    ▪ Integrated signage
    ▪ Native settler story
• Partnership with the Scott County Historical Society
• A cultural trail and naturalized river corridor from The Landing to the County’s Historic Holmes Street Bridge
• Embracing the State Trail and Memorial Park as an opportunity to bring awareness to The Landing
• Opening the West Entrance as the gateway
  o More accessible and welcoming
  o Physical appearance
  o Ambience
  o Redesign parking lot
  o New signage
  o Bike trail connecting from Memorial Park
  o Remove vegetation
• No admission to gain entrance into the park
• Seasonal Programming
  o Fee is associated with certain programs

Commissioners enjoyed a tour of The Landing
7) Outreach, Visitor Services, Recreation and Education
a. Recreation Pass Plus
Presented by Alysa Delgado, Parks and Natural Resources Coordinator

What is Recreation Pass Plus?
- A program that hopes to target underserved communities
  - Household incomes less than $50,000 per year
- Includes
  - (2) free recreation passes per family member
  - Free equipment rentals
  - 60% discount on Three River Park District programs and events

How is it different?
- The previous fee assistance program, “Parks for all People” included:
  - Free swimming or cross country skiing pass
  - Discount equipment rentals
  - Discount educational programs and camping
- Recreational Pass Plus
  - Increases the variety of activity passes
  - Offers free equipment rentals
  - Increases the number of programs that are offered at a discount
- Before:
  - Cross-Country Skiing
  - Swimming
- After:
  - Archery
  - Boating
  - Cross-Country Skiing
  - Disc Golf
  - Dog Off-Leash
  - Horseback Riding
  - Snowmobiling
  - Swimming

Recreation Pass Plus Goals
- Easy for both the public to acquire and use
- Remove any and all associated stigma
- Add choice for users
- A better / real benefit for users
• Easy for Three Rivers Staff to use

Who Qualifies?
• Currently, Hennepin County residents who are enrolled in any of the following:
  o Supplemental Security Income, Emergency Medical Assistance, Minnesota Care, General Assistance, Minnesota Family Investment Act, Medical Assistance, Minnesota Supplemental Aid, Hennepin County Emergency Assistance Program, Refugee Cash Assistance, Work Benefit, Diversional Work Program, Supplemental Nutrition Program Employment and Training Program, Free and Reduced School Lunch Program

Implications
• Budget implications of this program are yet to be known due to the newly implemented nature
• Potential budget implications include:
  o Displacement of full-paying customers for programs and equipment rentals
  o An increase in program participation
• Long term impact:
  o Increasing visitors by reaching current non-users that contributes to creating a healthier community
  o Promoting equitable access to outdoor recreation and education

Current Metrics:
• July
  o Approximately 500 individuals signed up for the program
• September
  o 1,092 individuals (288 families) signed up

Commissioners in agreement Recreation Pass Plus would be a beneficial program to bring to Scott County to increase usage of our parks from one of our underrepresented groups of Scott County residents in an approachable and partnership consistent way

b. Outdoor Recreation Review – Winter, Spring, Summer 2019
Presented by Tyler Thompson, Three Rivers Park District Recreation Program Specialist and Ann Jaeger, Three Rivers Park District Outdoor Recreation Supervisor

Overview Review:
• Outdoor Recreation School Overview and Participation
• Public and Private Group Education Definitions
• Outdoor Education and Recreation Department Vision
• Winter Programs
• Spring Public Programs
• Summer Camp Deep Dive
• Summer Public Programs
• Group Education
• Outdoor Recreation School (ORS) future vision
  o Opportunities for further partnership and collaboration with county public and mental health departments
  o Program offerings at The Landing
  o Senior programming
  o Free “Try-it” programs
  o Large school group education
8) Informational Items
   a. Projects / Other Update
      i) Operations Budget Update

      • There was a general wage and benefit increase proposal revenue issue of approximately $30,000.00 on the county side which has been addressed
      • The Maintenance position is not in the budget

   b. Upcoming Events, Programs, Camps
      i) Recreation and Education Opportunities

      • Commissioners and staff receiving email blast on Scott County Three River upcoming events

      • Patty Freeman shared updates provide by Justin Markeson and Tom Balk
        o Upcoming Deer Hunts at Cleary, Murphy and Spring Lake
        o Spring Lake Trailgate is Sept 28th
        o Surf the Murph is coming up
        o Savage 100
        o 5K at Cleary
        o HSCV 5K
        o End of camping season is October 27th
        o Fall golf programs ends October 3rd and October 7th
        o Golf Course is closing Mid-November
        o Pavilion wedding rentals at Cleary next 4 weekends
        o Fall aeration on golf course
        o Maintenance team is working with the Scott County Highway Maintenance team building an access road

   c. Advisory Commissioner Reports

      • Commissioner Patrick Stieg is continuing to work on efforts to bring Park Rx programs to the Scott County area.
      • Commissioner Eric Spielers son attended the youth volunteers end of season raffle with Herman Gorman
      • Commissioner Spieler attended the Prior Lake Community Festival on October 16th and suggested having a booth next year at the event
      • Commissioner Jerry Hennen attended the Spring Lake Regional Park Open House where Three Rivers passed out a handy consolidated Three Rivers map that was well received by attendees
      • Commissioner Barb Hedstrom commented much of the western and southern county accesses the Ney Nature Center. The Ney Nature Center has experienced a lot of growth in recent years and is open and free except for membership and programming.
      • Commissioner Hedstrom recently attended the Three River Project Community Connect, a large community event that provides services to residents of Scott County that are “living on little” and expressed disappointment there was no information at this event about the upcoming Spring Lake Trailgate event that was occurring the following week.

9) Upcoming Meetings
   a. November 6
i) Scott County – 2018 TRPD Resident and Park Visitor Survey Presentation on Results
ii) 2020 Budget Update

b. December 4
   i) Year in Review
   ii) 2020 – 2022 Work Plan
   iii) Operational analysis for future developments

10) Adjourn

   Motion by Commissioner Ewert; second by Commissioner Gerlach to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

   • The meeting concluded at 8:10 pm

Patrick Stieg, Chair                                      Date

Beverly Cox-Alexander, Secretary
Administration and Planning
PARKS COMMISSION AGENDA ITEM: 6.a. 2018 Resident and Visitor Study Findings

MEETING DATE: October 2, 2019

PREPARED BY: Patricia Freeman

REQUESTED ACTION: Discussion and Feedback

Background:

Findings from the 2018 Resident and Visitor Study will be shared by Alyssa Olson, Research and Evaluation Coordinator, with Three Rivers Park District. The Parks Advisory Commission is asked to discuss the findings and provide feedback on the results.

Attachments

1. 2018 Resident and Visitor Study Findings - Presentation
2018 Research Results
For Scott County
What We’ll Cover

• 2018 Park and Trail Use Estimates from Metropolitan Council

• 2018 General Population Survey Conducted by the Morris Leatherman Company

• 2018 Park Visitor Survey Conducted By Three Rivers Park District Research Section
Park and Trail Use Estimates from Metropolitan Council

Regional Distribution of Visits

- **Scott County 1%**
- Carver County 1%
- Bloomington 2%
- Dakota County 3%
- Washington County 3%
- Ramsey County 8%
- Anoka 8%
- Saint Paul 19%
- Three Rivers 20%
- Minneapolis Park Board 35%

TOTAL: 60 Million Visits Annually
Park and Trail Use Estimates from Metropolitan Council

- Summer Estimate from Counts
- Program and Event Numbers
- Seasonal Multipliers and Historic Averages

2018 Annual Use Estimate
# Park and Trail Use Estimates from Metropolitan Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Estimated Number of Annual Visits in 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleary Lake Regional Park</td>
<td>367,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott County Regional Trail</td>
<td>161,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy-Hanrehan Park Reserve</td>
<td>112,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Lake Regional Park</td>
<td>89,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Lake Farm Regional Park</td>
<td>46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>777,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Park and Trail Use Estimates from Metropolitan Council

Annual Visitation By Year

![Graph showing annual visitation by year from 2010 to 2018. The graph indicates a general increase in visitation over the years.](image-url)
General Population Survey Conducted by the Morris Leatherman Company

Methodology

- Phone survey conducted by the Morris Leatherman Company between September 10th and October 12th, 2018
- Random sample of 1,000 households (250 in Scott County)
- Re-weighted to reflect population differences
- Average completion time of 21 minutes
- Non-response rate of 4.5%
- Cellphone-only households are 42% of the sample
- Projectable to entire adult population in Scott County within +/-6.2% in 95 out of 100 cases
General Population Survey Conducted by the Morris Leatherman Company

Park Visitation Within Last Year, Ever

- Cleary Lake
- Murphy-Hanrehan
- Cedar Lake Farm
- Spring Lake
- Scott West Regional Trail

- Yes, within the past year
- Yes, but not in the past year
- Never
General Population Survey Conducted by the Morris Leatherman Company

Current Participation and Future Interest in Different Activities

- Walking/Hiking
- Picnics
- Dog Parks
- Playgrounds
- Fishing
- Educational Programming
- Viewing Nature
- Swimming
- Bicycling
- Non-Motorized Boating
- Sledding/Tubing
- Golf
- Camping
- Summer Camps
- Cross-Country Skiing
- Snowmobiling
- Snowshoeing
- Horseback Riding

- Participated in the Last Year
- Has Not Participated but is Interested
General Population Survey Conducted by the Morris Leatherman Company

Major and Minor Obstacles to Visiting More

- No Time
- Unaware of Facilities or Programs
- Doesn’t Interest Me
- Too Far Away
- Fees are too High
- Rules/Regulations too Restrictive
- Too Crowded
- Lack of Transportation
- Uncomfortable in Large Natural Areas

Percentage by Year:
- 2018
- 2013
- 2008
General Population Survey Conducted by the Morris Leatherman Company

Perceived Safety in Three Rivers Parks and Facilities

- 2008: 75% Very Safe, 25% Somewhat Safe, 0% Somewhat Unsafe/Very Unsafe
- 2013: 79% Very Safe, 21% Somewhat Safe, 0% Somewhat Unsafe/Very Unsafe
- 2018: 80% Very Safe, 20% Somewhat Safe, 0% Somewhat Unsafe/Very Unsafe
General Population Survey Conducted by the Morris Leatherman Company

Satisfaction With Services and Facilities

- **Cost of Programs and Services**
- **Times Programs and Classes are Offered**
- **Access to Information about Facilities and Services**
- **Upkeep and Maintenance of Parks, Trails, and Facilities**
- **Program and Class Offerings**
- **Quality of Service Provided by Employees**
- **Design and Layout of Parks, Trails, and Facilities**

Legend:
- Orange: Fair/Poor
- Light Blue: Good
- Dark Blue: Excellent

0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%
General Population Survey Conducted by the Morris Leatherman Company

What do You Like **Most** About Three Rivers?

- Well-Maintained: 18%
- Convenient Location: 13%
- Trails: 12%
- Variety of Programs: 9%
- Variety of Facilities: 9%
- Playgrounds: 3%
- Swim Areas: 2%
- Dog Parks: 2%
General Population Survey Conducted by the Morris Leatherman Company

What do You Like **Least** About Three Rivers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor Trail Upkeep</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Fees</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Crowded</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Signage</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Trail Connections</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Few Programs</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Few Locations</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Maintenance</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Population Survey Conducted by the Morris Leatherman Company

Suggested Improvements

- More Bathrooms: 7%
- More Lights: 6%
- Better Signage: 6%
- Better Trail Upkeep: 5%
- Lower Fees: 3%
- Dedicated Bike-Only Trails: 2%
- More Parks: 2%
- Clean Up Pet Waste: 2%
- More Advertising: 1%
- Cleaner Bathrooms: 1%
- Park Benches: 1%
- Drinking Fountains: 1%
General Population Survey Conducted by the Morris Leatherman Company

What Should Be the Primary Goal of the Park District?

- Preserve Open Spaces
- Place for Recreation
- Both Equally

2008: 
- Preserve Open Spaces: 10%
- Place for Recreation: 5%
- Both Equally: 85%

2013: 
- Preserve Open Spaces: 20%
- Place for Recreation: 15%
- Both Equally: 65%

2018: 
- Preserve Open Spaces: 30%
- Place for Recreation: 25%
- Both Equally: 45%
General Population Survey Conducted by the Morris Leatherman Company

- Preserving natural areas and habitats is very important to maintaining the quality of life in this area
- Offering outdoor recreational opportunities is very important to maintaining the quality of life in this area
- Regional parks are valuable even if you don’t actually use them very much
General Population Survey Conducted by the Morris Leatherman Company

Priorities Moving Forward

- Well Maintained Parks and Trails: 79% Very Important, 17% Somewhat Important
- Improving Natural Resources: 72% Very Important, 24% Somewhat Important
- Provide Outreach Programming where Parks are Not Located: 45% Very Important, 32% Somewhat Important
- Acquiring Land for Future Parks and Trails: 42% Very Important, 36% Somewhat Important
- Increasing Nature Education Programming: 34% Very Important, 39% Somewhat Important
- Developing Additional Nature Education Facilities at Existing Parks: 26% Very Important, 46% Somewhat Important
- Develop Additional Recreation Facilities at Existing Parks and Trails: 26% Very Important, 45% Somewhat Important
- Increasing Opportunities to Learn about the History of Parks and Trails: 23% Very Important, 41% Somewhat Important
- Increase Recreation-Based Lessons and Programming: 21% Very Important, 42% Somewhat Important
General Population Survey Conducted by the Morris Leatherman Company

What Should Three Rivers do to Manage Increasing Costs for Current Services

- Increase User Fees
- Don't Know
- Increase Property Taxes
- Reduce Services
- None

![Bar Chart](chart.png)

Legend:
- 2008
- 2013
- 2018
Park Visitor Survey Conducted By Three Rivers Park District Research Section

Methodology

• Surveys were collected in person by Three Rivers Research Staff
• 576 surveys were collected at Cedar Lake Farm, Cleary Lake, Murphy-Hanrehan, and Spring Lake Regional Parks
• Surveys were completed during the Summer of 2018
Park Visitor Survey Conducted By Three Rivers Park District Research Section

Age of Park Visitors vs. Scott County Population

- 2018 Park Visitors
- Scott County
Park Visitor Survey Conducted By Three Rivers Park District Research Section

Race of Park Visitors vs. Scott County Population

- African American/Black
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Pacific Islander
- White
- Other/Multiple

- Scott County Population
- Park Visitors 2013
- Park Visitors 2018
Park Visitor Survey Conducted By Three Rivers Park District Research Section

Annual Household Income for Park Visitors vs. Scott County Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Park Visitors</th>
<th>Scott County Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $25,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 or More</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Park Visitor Survey Conducted By Three Rivers Park District Research Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Types</th>
<th>Under-Represented (difference from population)</th>
<th>Over-Represented (difference from population)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Residency</td>
<td>Residents of:</td>
<td>Residents of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shakopee (-17%)</td>
<td>Prior Lake (23.63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belle Plaine (-5%)</td>
<td>Credit River Township (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Savage (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Education Attained</td>
<td>High School or Less (-17%)</td>
<td>College or Graduate Degree (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Household Income</td>
<td>Under $75,000 (-9%)</td>
<td>$75,000 - $149,000 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Under Age 18 (-8%)</td>
<td>Ages 25-44 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Non-White (-1%)</td>
<td>White (1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Park Visitor Survey Conducted By Three Rivers Park District Research Section

Perceived Safety in Three Rivers Parks and Facilities

- Very Safe: 89% (2013), 90% (2018)
- Moderately Safe
- Somewhat Unsafe
- Not Safe

Year Comparison: 2013 vs. 2018
Park Visitor Survey Conducted By Three Rivers Park District Research Section

General Satisfaction

- Very Satisfied: 88% (2018), 71% (2013)
- Satisfied: 17% (2018), 27% (2013)
Thank You!

Questions?
PARKS COMMISSION AGENDA ITEM: 6.b. Scott County Parks and Trails at a Glance

MEETING DATE: November 6, 2019

PREPARED BY: Alysa Delgado

REQUESTED ACTION: Discussion and Feedback

Background:

When considering the successes and challenges of Scott County Parks and Trails, it is important to contextualize Scott County’s existing and planned parklands and trails within the rest of the Metro Region. This report combines datasets to compare implementing agencies across the Metro Region based on 2018 available data. As a result, this report allows Scott County to better understand where we are excelling, where we are meeting the mark, and where there is room for improvement. General themes from this report can help influence our planning and implementation efforts to keep up with progress across the region and continue to provide excellent parklands and trails for our community moving forward. This report does contain limitations related to the data used, and it therefore it should be used as a summarizing tool rather than one for direct comparison.

Summary Points:

Scott County has:

- About 8% of county acres protected by current Regional Parkland, future Regional Parkland, and Conservation Lands (Department of Natural Resources and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)
- Almost 17,000 acres are currently being protected as Conservation Lands or Regional Parks within Scott County

Within the Metro Region, Scott County is... (in order of appearance within the report):

- Average for Conservation Lands + Existing Regional Parks
- Above average for Conservation Lands + Planned Regional Parks
- Below average for both Existing Regional Trails and Existing + Planned Regional Trails
- Above average for Existing Regional Parks + Planned Regional Parks
- Above average for Conservation Lands
- Below average for total parks (this includes local parks)
Please see the attached report for figures and tables related to these summary points.

The PAC is asked to share their thoughts about how the county is doing according to these figures. Parks and Trails staff encourage feedback for the value and usefulness of these comparisons to the PAC members and also welcome any recommendations and/or clarifications for future use.

**Attachments:**

1. Scott County Parks and Trails – How do we Stack Up?
SCOTT COUNTY PARKS AND TRAILS: HOW DO WE STACK UP?

This report compares Scott County, MN with 8 other Twin Cities Metro area regions (Anoka County, Carver County, Dakota County, Hennepin County-Three Rivers Parks District, Minneapolis, Ramsey County, St. Paul) with regards to park and conservation land as well as regional trails. The goal is to understand how Scott County compares within our region with parkland, trails, and conservation land provided. (Calculations for this report are in general separated by geographic boundary; Bloomington is included in Hennepin County numbers.)

Almost 17,000 acres currently acquired by State, County, and Federal Lands!

(Numbers do not include any planned DNR and FWS lands)
On average, the agencies have preserved a total of 6.9% of their areas for parks or conservation land. Scott County is just below average, conserving 6.7% of land between regional parks, state, and federal lands!

On average, the agencies have planned to preserve a total of 7.3% of their areas for parks or conservation land. Scott County is just above average, planning to conserve 8.3% of land between regional parks, state, and federal lands!

(These do not include planned DNR and FWS lands or regional park search areas.)
The average area for the Metro Area of Regional Parks is just under 7,000 acres. Scott County falls above average and ranks 3rd out of 9 areas surveyed.

The average amount of open trails within the Metro Area is approximately 56 miles, with about 90 planned miles. Scott County currently has 11.8 miles of trail, with 38 miles planned.
The average amount of combined DNR and FWS land is just around 7,700 acres. With the help of the Minnesota Valley Wildlife Refuge and State Recreation Area, Scott County ranks #3 for most conservation acres (~11,700 acres)!

The average amount of acres covered by parkland is just over 20,500 acres. Scott County ranks 5th out of 9 with just over 18,000 acres covered.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Total Park Land (Federal, Regional, Local) in Acres</th>
<th>County Area Acres (google)</th>
<th>Percent Park Land *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anoka</td>
<td>39136.80891</td>
<td>285440</td>
<td>13.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carver</td>
<td>13974.11428</td>
<td>240640</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota</td>
<td>28329.653</td>
<td>375680</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin-TRPD (not Minneapolis)</td>
<td>41957.19687</td>
<td>351686.4</td>
<td>11.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>3516.86242</td>
<td>3679.6</td>
<td>9.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey (not St. Paul)</td>
<td>10168.82191</td>
<td>72844.8</td>
<td>13.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>18218.40317</td>
<td>235520</td>
<td>7.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>4584.977068</td>
<td>35955.2</td>
<td>12.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>24791.72087</td>
<td>270720</td>
<td>9.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Planned &amp; Existing Trails in Miles **</th>
<th>Open Trails in Miles **</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anoka</td>
<td>162.0395</td>
<td>92.0378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carver</td>
<td>67.2017</td>
<td>31.2216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota</td>
<td>142.4119</td>
<td>66.2529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin-TRPD (not Minneapolis)</td>
<td>232.850204</td>
<td>171.950904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>49.206796</td>
<td>49.206796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey (not St. Paul)</td>
<td>44.462609</td>
<td>32.244774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>38.0308</td>
<td>11.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>32.576191</td>
<td>27.154526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>42.0631</td>
<td>19.9312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Regional Park Land (Open)***</th>
<th>Regional Park Land (Open &amp; Planned)</th>
<th>DNR Land^</th>
<th>FWS Land^^</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anoka</td>
<td>7922.286483</td>
<td>8167.87904</td>
<td>20421.28578</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carver</td>
<td>4649.690077</td>
<td>4821.369028</td>
<td>1026.363903</td>
<td>6638.24675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota</td>
<td>5837.30891</td>
<td>6329.13654</td>
<td>12487.95988</td>
<td>3313.01413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin-TRPD (not Minneapolis)</td>
<td>18368.81635</td>
<td>18493.48624</td>
<td>891.925378</td>
<td>6029.54423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>3124.465625</td>
<td>3124.465625</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey (not St. Paul)</td>
<td>3241.96881</td>
<td>3246.670513</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73.585966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>4064.644692</td>
<td>7921.048539</td>
<td>6722.429442</td>
<td>4954.64139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>3522.931888</td>
<td>3528.032901</td>
<td>408.809284</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>3795.584915</td>
<td>7130.108314</td>
<td>6047.143612</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Current Regional Park + DNR + FWS</th>
<th>Planned Regional Park + DNR + FWS</th>
<th>Percent Park Land Current (no local parks)</th>
<th>Percent Park Land Planned (no local parks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anoka</td>
<td>28343.57226</td>
<td>28589.16482</td>
<td>9.929782884</td>
<td>10.01582288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carver</td>
<td>12314.30073</td>
<td>12485.9796</td>
<td>5.117312473</td>
<td>5.188655122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota</td>
<td>21638.28292</td>
<td>22130.11055</td>
<td>5.759764405</td>
<td>5.890681044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin-TRPD (not Minneapolis)</td>
<td>25290.28596</td>
<td>25414.95588</td>
<td>7.191146988</td>
<td>7.226596153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>3124.465625</td>
<td>3124.465625</td>
<td>8.491872568</td>
<td>8.491872568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey (not St. Paul)</td>
<td>3315.554776</td>
<td>3320.256479</td>
<td>4.55153254</td>
<td>4.557986952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>15741.71553</td>
<td>19598.11938</td>
<td>6.683812639</td>
<td>8.32121327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>3931.741172</td>
<td>3936.842185</td>
<td>10.93511139</td>
<td>10.94929853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>9842.728527</td>
<td>13177.25193</td>
<td>3.635759651</td>
<td>4.86748372</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scott County at a Glance

- Report created to help contextualize Scott County’s Parks and Trails efforts within the Metro Region

- Combines multiple datasets (with limitations)

- Provides an “at a glance” overview of Scott County’s rankings in several Parks/Trails categories
Scott County

- Over 8% of land is planned to be protected!*

- Almost 17,000 acres are currently being protected as conservation lands within Scott County (DNR, FWS, Regional Parks)

*This does not include planned DNR (NEY WMA) or U.S. FWS (MN Valley Wildlife Refuge) data.
Below Average

Overall Parklands Acres (All Park Types Included)

Met Council 2016 General Land Use Dataset

Regional Trail Miles

Met Council 2018 Regional Trails Dataset
Current Conservation and Regional Parkland Acres
Above Average

Conservation Lands with Planned and Existing Regional Parks Percent Acres

Planned and Existing Regional Parks Acres

Conservation Lands Acres

Met Council 2018 Regional Parks Dataset

MN DNR 2019 Managed Areas Dataset
U.S. FWS 2018 Cadastral Dataset – FWS Interest
Above Average

Conservation Lands with Planned and Existing Regional Parks Percent Acres

Planned and Existing Regional Parks Acres
Met Council 2018 Regional Parks Dataset

Conservation Lands Acres
MN DNR 2019 Managed Areas Dataset
U.S. FWS 2018 Cadastral Dataset – FWS Interest
CONCLUSION

- Scott County has room for improvement when it comes to Regional Trails
- Scott County is providing comparable parkland amounts to other implementing agencies
- Maintaining our parks is critical to keep parks a notable asset to the county
PARKS COMMISSION AGENDA ITEM: 6.c. Resident and Non-Resident Fee Concept

MEETING DATE: November 6, 2019
PREPARED BY: Patricia Freeman
REQUESTED ACTION: Discussion and Feedback

Three Rivers Park District is examining introducing a fee structure that includes different fee rates for residents and non-residents, where residents of suburban Hennepin and Scott County would pay use fees that would be lower than what residents living outside of these areas would pay. The Parks Advisory Commission is asked to provide questions and feedback that can be brought back to the Park District and the work team that will be investigating the concept of a resident and nonresident fee structure and its implementation.

Background:

Incorporation of a nonresident fee differential arose during the Park District’s preparation of its 2020 General Fund Budget. (Note that the Scott County–Three Rivers Partnership Budget is separate from the Park District’s General Fund budget, but a policy change such as this would have implications to the regional system in Scott County and thus the Scott County Parks Advisory Commission is asked to consider the concept and give feedback.) To provide the PAC with context to the nonresident fee idea, an overview of the Park District’s 2020 General Fund Budget considerations is below. This information is based on memo prepared by Howard Koolick for the October 10, 2019 regular Board meeting of the Three Rivers Park District Board (Attachment 1). (Staff will not provide a detailed discussion of the Park District’s General Fund budget in this memo or at the November PAC meeting. If detailed questions arise, the PAC can certainly consider extending an invitation to Howard Koolick, the Park District’s CFO, for a more in-depth presentation and discussion.)

The Park District faces significant budget pressures for 2020, with personnel cost increases, an underfunded Equipment ISF Fund, and service growth, inflation and new initiatives. After a ten year period of conscious decisions to hold down total suburban Hennepin County property tax growth by using a series of mostly one-time adjustments, the Park District is now shifting towards future operating budgets that are structurally balanced, which means that ongoing program expenditures must be paid for with ongoing revenues, like taxes and fees.

Four Goals were outlined by the Park District for its 2020 General Fund budget:

**Goal 1:** Continue to provide high quality facilities, programs and recreational opportunities.
**Goal 2:** Continue to manage natural resources, be a leader in natural resource management issues and educate the public on natural resource management issues.
**Goal 3:** Provide value and equity to the taxpayers of Three Rivers Park District.
**Goal 4:** Provide services to Park District users both within existing park locations and in resident’s local communities.
Goal number three included discussion of ways to continue to search for ways to bring value to the taxpayers of suburban Hennepin County, particularly as the Park District shifts towards implementing increased property taxes to create a structurally sound budget.

Consideration of a nonresident fee differential is also a byproduct of the metro wide regional park and trail system that was envisioned in the 1970’s to receive 40% of its operating dollars from the State. State funding has covered an average of only 9% of the operating and maintenance expenditures of the regional park system.

The concept was discussed by the Three Rivers Park District Board at their October 10, 2019 regular board meeting. There was consensus from the Board that there is merit to the concept and staff were directed to convene an internal work group to prepare an implementation plan. Overall the Board agreed that the philosophy of a nonresident fee makes sense and that a thorough review of feasibility of implementation and projected cost of implementation and projected revenue is merited with what is a very customer facing policy change.

The 2020 General Fund Budget within the Park District does not include revenue or costs associated with this concept. By the end of 2020 there well may be nonresident fees implemented, however there’s still much unknown about the details of implementation and what revenue may or may not be generated, so at this stage, this is a concept that is being researched for implementation and will be reviewed over the next several months.

Attachments
1. Memo to Three Rivers Park District Board of Commissioners, Regular Board Meeting 10/10/19
   a. 2020 General Fund Budget Review, by Howard Koolick
REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION

Meeting Date: 10/10/19  Business Item: Current  Item Number: 6G

Division: Superintendent's Office  Originating Source: Boe Carlson, Superintendent

Agenda Item: 2020 General Fund Budget Review

Superintendent's Recommendation:

NO ACTION REQUIRED; THIS ITEM IS FOR INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION.

The following information was prepared by Howard D. Koolick, Chief Financial Officer with substantial input from Luke Skinner, Associate Superintendent for Recreation, Education and Natural Resources, Jonathan Vlaming, Associate Superintendent for Design, Planning and Information Technology and Mandy Whiteside, Director of Communications and Community Engagement.

Note: Following Board feedback on the recommended preliminary budget, staff will prepare a comprehensive budget for review and adoption at the November 14th Board Meeting.

Background:

An annual budget is often viewed as a set of numbers showing what resources are available and how an organization is planning to use them. However, the real value of a budget comes from understanding the organization’s goals, priorities and planned actions that helped determine the budget amounts. These goals are detailed in Reference 6G-1.

Goal 1: Continue to provide high quality facilities, programs and recreational opportunities.

Goal 2: Continue to manage natural resources, be a leader in natural resource management issues and educate the public on natural resource management issues.

Goal 3: Provide value and equity to the taxpayers of Three Rivers Park District.

Goal 4: Provide services to Park District users both within existing park locations and in resident’s local communities.

Based on previous Commissioner discussions, staff has prepared a preliminary budget for Board review and feedback. The information that follows summarizes the goals and priorities of the budget numbers that make up the preliminary budget, outlines current and continuing budget challenges, and describes the steps being taken to responsibly manage Park District finances.

2020 Budget Challenge

As discussed at the September 5th Study Session, Three Rivers faces significant budget pressures for 2020:
• **Personnel cost increases.** Total personnel costs represent 78% of all General Fund expenditures, and are therefore are the single largest source of cost pressures each year. Based on existing multi-year contractual commitments and current staffing levels, compensation plan costs for both full time and part time regular employees will increase $952,258 next year. Health insurance costs, which reflect unfavorable experience ratings, will go up an additional $435,336 in 2020.

• **Equipment ISF Fund.** As previously discussed, Internal Service Fund balances need to increase by $1 million to provide adequate funding for both current and future operations and equipment replacement needs. Phasing in this significant increase is recommended to moderate 2020 budget impacts.

• **Service growth, inflation & new initiatives.** Based on initial department requests and past trends, an additional $1.6 million was identified as needed to address growing service demands, cost inflation and new initiatives associated with the System Plan.

At its September 19 Board Meeting, Commissioners approved a preliminary 2020 total tax levy increase of up to 3%. Even if this full amount is eventually levied, it would only address about one-fourth of the total budget challenge. Consequently, **significant cost control measures are necessary to balance the 2020 General Fund Budget.**

**Structural Balance**

Over the past ten years, Three Rivers made conscious decisions to hold down total property tax growth by using a series of mostly one-time adjustments, such as drawing down excess balances in both the general fund and debt service fund or significant internal reallocations. As a result, the **total tax levy has only increased a total of 1.1% over the entire past decade, at a time when operations had to be expanded to accommodate a 61% growth in visitors.** Unfortunately, similar one-time adjustments are no longer available to fund ongoing commitments.

As a result, future operating budgets must be structurally balanced, which means that ongoing program expenditures must be paid for with ongoing revenues, like taxes and fees. Adopting this fiscal discipline going forward will ensure that the necessary resources remain available to maintain quality services well into the future.

**2020 Budget Principles**

With such a significant budget challenge, three major principles are recommended to guide preparation of the 2020 Budget:

A. **Balanced Budget Solution.** One-half of the budget challenge will be met with tax, fee and other revenue increases, and one-half of the solution will come from resource reallocations, deferrals and spending reductions.

B. **Nonresident Fees.** In addition to a modest property tax increase, which will only affect Suburban Hennepin taxpayers, park use fees will be increased for nonresident program participants. This policy change will both generate more non-tax revenue, and also help offset the imbalance in who pays for Three Rivers services. Phasing in non-resident fees will take some time, so no significant new revenue is expected to be realized in the 2020 budget.
C. **New Initiatives.** New initiatives, including implementation of the new System Plan, will be funded through reallocations of existing resources, rather than with higher taxes and fees, which will be used to maintain current service quality that is being impacted by growing visitor demands and inflation.

**Revenue Changes**

**Property tax increase.** Staff recommends a total tax levy increase of 2.9%, which is slightly below the 3% maximum total preliminary levy adopted in September. This modest increase will only cost the median Suburban Hennepin County household about $2.40 annually (20 cents a month).

**Nonresident fees.** The most significant budget policy change involves nonresident fees. Property taxes and park use fees account for 95% of total general fund revenue: 77% and 18% respectively. Since property taxes are only paid by Suburban Hennepin County taxpayers, nonresident visitors should appropriately pay higher park use fees to more equitably cover the costs of the services they use.

- Consistent with Three Rivers’ Cost Recovery Pyramid, an additional fee band will be added to the tiers. The middle band remains the same for Suburban Hennepin residents and groups, while a new higher fee band will apply to nonresidents. The lower fee band reflects the greater subsidies provided to underserved residents and groups to enable their participation, such as with Explorer Camps.

- Nonresident fees will increase on all space rentals, activities, programs and passes for individuals, and for schools and other groups not living in or based in Suburban Hennepin County. Fee increases will vary, with differentials generally higher for those programs and activities with predominantly greater nonresident participation.
• Fee increases will be phased in throughout the year to allow for adequate notice to participants, administrative processing changes, and honoring advance registrations made at previous rates. As a result, no significant new revenue is expected in 2020.

• Since park and program usage is not strictly dependent on the geographic location of Three Rivers facilities, the higher nonresident fees will apply throughout the District. For example, visitors at Carver Park, which is located outside the District, are 40% from Suburban Hennepin, 35% from Carver County, and 25% from other areas.

• As a result of the Scott County-Three Rivers cooperative agreement, the County directly reimburses the Park District, so Scott County individual and group participants will pay resident rates in the new fee structure.

• Because the new nonresident rate structure will not fully offset funding differentials, staff also recommends exploring the potential for enrollment preference for Suburban Hennepin (and Scott County) residents. Such an approach would be most applicable for high demand registration programs like summer camps.

• During the initial year, impacts on usage will be closely monitored to gauge pricing sensitivity on total revenue collections. Similarly, no nonresident fee changes are initially planned for business enterprise activities, like Hyland Skiing and Baker Golf, until a more comprehensive analysis is undertaken.

Spending Changes

Spending changes in the preliminary budget are detailed in Reference 6G-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spending Changes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compensation Plan for Full and Part-time Staff</td>
<td>$952,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Life &amp; Dental Insurance Premiums</td>
<td>435,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISF Equipment Fund for Fleet Maintenance</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other (Service Growth, Inflation &amp; New Initiatives)</td>
<td>185,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Changes</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,873,153</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since 2020 personnel cost increases are contractually-based, compensation and benefit plans are fully funded in the preliminary budget. Restoration of ISF funding is phased in over three years to moderate impacts on the 2020 operating budget.

Only about 12 percent of the requested $1.6 million increase to cover service growth, inflation and new initiatives are funded in the preliminary budget. Significant management choices were made to reallocate, defer and reprioritize spending to achieve these results.

Continuing budget challenges. Although the 2020 preliminary budget is balanced, there are a number of ongoing budget challenges that will need to be addressed to insure that service levels and quality will continue to meet expectations. For example:

1. **Seasonal staffing.** As a result of market pressures and minimum wage requirements, it is increasingly difficult to recruit and retain staffing at historic hourly wage rates. As an example of the seasonal stresses being experienced throughout the District, funding for winter sports staffing at Elm Creek was increased by $65,000 this year.
2. **Equipment ISF funding.** The 2020 budget funds the first year of a three year plan to fully fund the annual cost of operating, maintaining and replacing the District’s fleet of vehicles and equipment. After 2022, General Fund contributions will still need to increase about $40,000 each year to cover higher operating costs for staff salaries and benefits, fuel and repairs.

3. **Personnel-intensive services.** Like school districts, Park District personnel costs account for nearly $8 of every $10 in operating costs. As a result, options are limited to significantly reduce operating expenditures without impacting service levels and quality by downsizing program staffing and facility operating hours.

4. **Non-personnel inflation.** Contract, supply and other non-staffing costs have not been increased to cover the impact of inflation for more than ten years. Additional funding is necessary from time to time to maintain current services, especially for those cost accounts with fewer options, like escalating utility rates.

5. **Professional development training.** Staff training budgets have been flat, and with increasing costs and new hires, the need for training dollars will continue to grow.

**New initiatives.** Consistent with the budget principles, new initiatives are being funded by reallocating resources, rather than by adding to current spending. As examples:

- Reallocating one position from The Landing to the Outreach program to increase offerings and options for underserved communities.
- Changing how historical interpretation is done district-wide by using staff from The Landing at other locations throughout the year.
- Reallocating portions of two positions to focus on special events and fundraising so Outdoor Recreation School staff can spend more time programming for the public.

**Next Steps**

The Board will set a November 14, 2019 public hearing for the budget following this discussion. In preparation for that hearing and subsequent budget adoption, staff will prepare a formal budget document that will include a narrative about the District, its goals and challenges, and information about the 2020 budget, which will include both a narrative description and financial tables and charts. This document will be the budget that the Board will be asked to approve and forward to the Hennepin County Board for their review.

Final approval of the budget and approval of the final 2020 tax levy will occur at the December 12, 2019 Board Meeting.
Budget Goals

Based on Commissioner and staff discussions over the last several months, staff recommends the following budget goals, priorities and actions for 2020.

Goal 1: Continue to provide high quality facilities, programs and recreational opportunities.

Priorities: Continue to strive to maintain the high standards for facilities and programs for which the Park District is known and admired. Maintain parks and trails to allow users to enjoy these facilities and the opportunities they offer safely. Offer a variety of programs and recreational opportunities across the entire recreation spectrum.

Budget Actions: Provide salaries and benefits, including increases in 2020, that allow the Park District to hire and retain highly qualified and creative staff. Provide staff with appropriate and well maintained tools and equipment to perform their duties effectively and efficiently. Provide appropriate levels of staffing to meet customer demand and expectations.

Goal 2: Continue to manage natural resources, be a leader in natural resource management issues and educate the public on natural resource management issues.

Priorities: Maintain, restore and protect natural resources in and near Park District locations. Provide the public the opportunity to learn about natural resources, natural resource management and how to appropriately interact with their surroundings. Provide expertise and support for other organizations dealing with natural resource issues.

Budget Actions: Provide salaries and benefits, including increases in 2020, that allow the Park District to hire and retain highly qualified staff. Provide staff with appropriate and well maintained tools and equipment to perform their duties effectively and efficiently. Provide funding to protect natural resources against invasive and destructive species.

Goal 3: Provide value and equity to the taxpayers of Three Rivers Park District.

Priorities: Minimize the need for property tax increases. Seek new revenue sources to offset the dependence on property tax revenue. Concentrate resources within Suburban Hennepin County.

Budget Actions: Eliminate low priority positions and costs using the resources from these items to provide higher priority services or reducing the need for property tax revenue. Study the use of non-resident fees including how and when to implement them and to which fees they should apply. Reallocate staff and change operational plans to maximize the benefits to Suburban Hennepin County taxpayers.
Goal 4: Provide services to Park District users both within existing park locations and in resident’s local communities.

Priorities: Make Park District facilities and programs welcoming.
Provide outreach opportunities to underrepresented communities and groups.
Provide a variety of activities and opportunities for the public to experience the Park District.

Budget Actions: Use technology and other means to make people aware of opportunities to learn and recreate.
Continue programs such as Pathway Interns and Cultural Liaisons to work with communities and groups to discover and remove barriers that discourage them from using Park District facilities and programs.
Continue outreach efforts from all facilities and continue to provide a presence in Hennepin County cities through attendance at various city festivals and city parks.
## Preliminary Budget Spending Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Summary Amounts</th>
<th>Detail Amounts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compensation Plan Costs for full-time and part-time staff</td>
<td>$952,258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Life and Dental Insurance Premiums</td>
<td>$435,336</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment ISF Contribution to fund maintenance of fleet</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Service Growth/Cost Inflation/New Initiatives)</td>
<td>$185,559</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor FTE changes to use staff more efficiently</td>
<td>$37,776</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtime required for Natural Resource Management activities</td>
<td>$5,754</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elimination of Vacant Finance Position</td>
<td>($68,623)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seasonal Staff Changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance increase due to rate increase required by union contract</td>
<td>$43,060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Fund Pathway Intern program with 12 interns</td>
<td>$13,364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm Creek Recreation Area staffing increase to meet actual needs</td>
<td>$65,560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Outreach Programmers and Cultural Liaisons</td>
<td>$12,909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State mandated minimum wage increase</td>
<td>$32,825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Trail winter maintenance payments</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion services for park users</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver Trapping to protect resources</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals for water quality analysis</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies for public events</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit card fees for increased use of credit cards by park</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce small equipment budget from $150,000 to $125,000</td>
<td>($25,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce contingency to $20,000</td>
<td>($67,066)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce miscellaneous accounts by minor amounts</td>
<td>($1,189)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time expenditures from the portion of the tax levy that will be needed in 2021 for the debt service levy (see description below)</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time transfer to the Equipment ISF fund for the purchase of replacement equipment (see description below)</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,373,153</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Information

- Contribution to 2020 Asset Management Program to decrease the amount of bonds to be issued: $775,000
- Interpretive exhibit signage, park kiosk and entrance sign planning, design and installation/replacement: $257,000
- Community engagement online tool multiyear contract: $40,000
- Small equipment replacement: $28,000
- Total: $1,100,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two rotary mowers from Glen Lake Golf that are more than 16 years old with extremely high hours of usage (3,600 to 4,300 hours)</td>
<td>$100,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two public safety vehicles that are 7 years old and have more than 125,000 miles on them</td>
<td>$98,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Dump, Plow and Sander with 67,000 miles and in poor condition</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 cargo van used by forestry to move supplies and materials with 42,000 miles and in poor condition</td>
<td>$73,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 compact pickup used for trail maintenance with 108,000 miles and in poor condition</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two public safety snowmobiles that are 17 years old</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$400,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Informal Items / Other
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Team Priority</th>
<th>PAC Priority</th>
<th>Recommendation Confirmed with Lynn, Doug, Patty</th>
<th>Submitted to CPC? (TRPD Leadership)</th>
<th>Submitted to County Governance Team? (SC Leadership Team)</th>
<th>County Approved?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Well Cleary Campground - Cleary Lake</td>
<td>Install well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tied for 2</td>
<td>Yes - Pass through to Park District CPC and Scott County Process</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cleary Lake Master Plan Update - Cleary Lake</td>
<td>Complete master plan update for Cleary Lake</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tied for 2</td>
<td>Yes - Pass through to Park District CPC and Scott County Process</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sanitary Dump Station - Cleary Lake</td>
<td>Install a dump station</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tied for 2</td>
<td>Yes - Pass through to Park District CPC and Scott County Process</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fence around maintenance compound - Cedar Lake Farm</td>
<td>Install a new fence approximately 1,050 feet long, 6 feet high, galvanized or black chain link with two sliding gates</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No Votes</td>
<td>Yes - Pass through to Park District CPC and Scott County Process</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Regional Trails Master Planning - System Wide</td>
<td>Master Plan for portions of So. Scott RT New Prague to Cedar to Doyle to Cleary including some preliminary engineering and Louisville RT</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes - Pass through to Park District CPC and Scott County Process</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Towing Vehicle and 12-passenger Van - System Wide</td>
<td>Dedicated towing vehicle to transport new kayak trailer and other recreation trailers.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tied for 2</td>
<td>Yes - Pass through to Park District CPC and Scott County Process</td>
<td>Submitted to Fleet Operations. Fleet recommended to Governance Team; on hold due to funding gap</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Well - Dog Off Leash Area - Cleary Lake</td>
<td>Installation of potable well at CL Dog Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No Votes</td>
<td>Yes - Pass through to Park District CPC and Scott County Process</td>
<td>Submitted to Fleet Operations. Fleet recommended to Governance Team; on hold due to funding gap</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Shade Shelter - Beach - Cedar Lake Farm</td>
<td>Install Two Commercial Shade Umbrellas at the Cleary Lake Dog Park</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes - Pass through to Park District CPC and Scott County Process</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Automatic Entrance Gate - Main Trailhead Parking Lot - MHP</td>
<td>Automatic entry gate at Murphy-Hanahan main trailhead</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>No Votes</td>
<td>ON HOLD Further research cost versus need. And review of cost - electrical and site work.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Automatic Entrance Gate - Horse Trail/Group Camp Parking Lot - MHP</td>
<td>Automatic entry gate at Murphy-Hanahan shared horse trailhead and group camp parking lot</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ON HOLD Further research/review of need versus cost. Need better cost estimates for electrical and site work.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Electric Utility Vehicle - System Wide</td>
<td>Electric utility vehicle for Park Service Officers.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>No Votes</td>
<td>Yes - Pass through to Park District CPC and Scott County Process</td>
<td>No. On hold for further research on need.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Install Windmill - Cedar Lake Farm</td>
<td>Refurbish and Re-Install Old Windmill</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes - Pass through to Park District CPC and Scott County Process</td>
<td>No; Deemed a cosmetic; not preservation or need.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Shade Shelter - Dog Off Leash Area - Spring Lake</td>
<td>Install Two Commercial Shade Umbrellas at the Spring Lake Dog Park</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes - Pass through to Park District CPC and Scott County Process</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No; &quot;On Hold?&quot; Questions about adding grill; Lack of user input on need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Shade Shelter - Dog Off Leash Area - Cleary Lake</td>
<td>Install Two Commercial Shade Umbrellas at the Cleary Lake Dog Park</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>No Votes</td>
<td>Yes - Pass through to Park District CPC and Scott County Process</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No; &quot;On Hold?&quot; Questions about adding grill; Lack of user input on need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Play Area - Cleary Lake</td>
<td>Install Off the shelf small play area for the existing footprint</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No Votes</td>
<td>ON HOLD UNTIL CLEARY LAKE MASTER PLAN IS COMPLETE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Automatic Entrance Gate - South Entrance - Cleary Lake</td>
<td>Automatic entry gate at Murphy-Hanahan main trailhead</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>No Votes</td>
<td>NO - NOT ENOUGH SUPPORT FROM TEAM AND NOT ENOUGH SUPPORTING EVIDENCE OF NEED</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Splash Pad - Cleary Lake</td>
<td>Install Splash Pad at Cleary Lake Beach</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>No Votes</td>
<td>ON HOLD UNTIL CLEARY LAKE MASTER PLAN IS COMPLETE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Nature Play Area - Cleary Lake</td>
<td>Install Nature Play Area at Cleary (replace existing playground)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>No Votes</td>
<td>ON HOLD UNTIL CLEARY LAKE MASTER PLAN IS COMPLETE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>