

City of Winsted  
Park Commission  
City Council Chambers  
April 11, 2016  
5:00 p.m.

Present: Steve Ebert  
Evelyn Fowler  
Tim Fury  
Petie Littfin  
Bonnie Quast (Council Liaison)  
Cindy Racette

Staff Present: Daniel Tienter, City Administrator  
Raquel Kirchoff, Administrative Assistant

**1) Call the Meeting to Order**

Mr. Ebert called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

**2) Approval of Minutes**

**Ms. Fowler motioned to approve the minutes from the following meetings and work sessions. Mr. Fury seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.**

- a. September 14, 2015 Park Commission Meeting
- b. September 14, 2015 Park Commission Work Session
- c. October 12, 2015, Park Commission Work Session
- d. November 9, 2015, Park Commission Work Session
- e. December 14, 2015, Park Commission Work Session
- f. January 11, 2016, Park Commission Work Session

**3) No Old Business**

**4) New Business**

**a) Chairperson and Vice-chairperson Recommendation**

Mr. Tienter requested candidates for a Chairperson and Vice-chairperson. As mentioned in the memo, it has three items for the outline of the criteria for a Chair or Vice-chair:

1. The member maintain good attendance and/or expects to be able to attend most, if not all, meetings while serving as Chair;
2. The member demonstrated involvement and leadership in past Commission activities;
3. The member demonstrated the ability to understand and further the overall mission of the City, specifically those areas concerning the Commission.

**Ms. Littfin nominated Steve Ebert president. Ms. Fowler seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.**

**Ms. Littfin nominated Tim Fury for Vice president. Mr. Ebert seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.**

Mr. Tienter stated that the recommendation would be included in the next City Council Meeting for consideration and approval.

**b) Campbell Field Improvements**

Mr. Tienter stated that there was a large packet of information regarding Campbell Field improvements including a rendering on the screen. The last time Parks Commission considered the Campbell Park improvements was in 2014 when the initial cost sharing arrangement was struck between the Winsted Baseball Association and the City of Winsted. The improvements, which were

developed by the Baseball Association, included: additional bleachers and shading; a bull pen; retaining walls; and a new third base dugout to replace the current, failing structure.

On October 13, 2014, the Park Commission (Commission) reviewed and recommended to the City Council (Council) the abovementioned improvements to Campbell Field at a cost not to exceed \$136,500, which would be funded through a cost sharing arrangement of about 70% the City and 30% the Baseball Association through annual contributions of \$13,500 (for a total of \$94,500) and \$6,000 (for a total of \$42,000), respectively, for the next seven years. That recommendation was reviewed at the April 7 City Council work session and then approved at the subsequent Council Meeting.

At the same meeting, the Council further approved Oertel Architects. The packet includes several memos from Oertel outlining their recommendation as well as several renderings and some geotechnical work led by the City Engineer.

There was a meeting on August 6, 2015, where the scope provided by the architect was reviewed. At that time the architect's estimate for the project was approximately \$204,180, which would be 49.5 percent over budget. At that meeting, Oertel met with City staff and representatives of the Baseball Association discussed different ways the project could realize some cost saving (Value Engineering). In this situation they are using some higher grade material and doing things beyond ADA standards. Some of those things can be reined in which will ultimately result in cost savings.

Thereafter there were two more project management team meetings on February 10 and on March 31. The Baseball Association raised concerns about drainage and having some form of water or storm sewer structure in the project at the February 10 meeting. Originally there was some money in the project for that but there was a request for further investigation. The City Engineer looked at drainage situation. The packet includes his report (attachment B) which says due to failing pipe, missing pipe, and negative slope (the pipe doesn't sit the correct way so the water can flow. Significant changes would have to be made at a cost of about \$85,000. All these costs were reviewed at the City Council goal setting retreat in January and, while not taking official action, gave general direction to city staff that the two projects combined would be cost prohibitive and they did not want to exceed their initial cost contribution of \$94,500.

On February 10, 2016, City staff met again with representatives of the Baseball Association to review revised project cost estimates, Oertel was able to reduce project cost by \$41,350, or 25.4 percent, to \$162,830. However, with the addition of the drainage problem, the project costs would total an estimated \$247,830, approximately \$111,330 or 81.6 percent over budget.

There was a request made by the City and representatives of the Baseball Association for additional value engineering and the possibility of phasing the project over a longer period of time in order to make it more affordable for both parties. Included in the packet (Attachment D) is a memo from the architect making a strong recommendation against that approach, believing that "it may compromise the quality of the construction and the intended use of the facility, or both". Essentially telling us that while it may be possible to save some additional monies, it would likely lead to a project that we didn't envision at the onset.

On March 31, 2016, City staff and representatives of the Baseball Association met once again to review the various information, memos, renderings, and financial data and talked through a variety of options of how the City and the Baseball association could accomplish the project. Ultimately give the increase in over cost and scope of the project, it was determined to go back to Park Commission and thereafter the Council to see what their thought are on the project.

As mentioned during the most recent meeting, to date the City has spent approximately \$19,963 on the project. That was geotechnical work, architectural engineering, additional design engineering that was performed by the City Engineer for the drainage work. There is a summary in the memo for the work to date.

Mr. Fury asked if the \$19,963 was part of the \$94,500 commitment made by the City. Mr. Tienter replied that at this point the City does not consider that to be part of the \$94,500. The architectural design (about \$5,500), the geotechnical review (about \$3,400), and the drainage engineering (about \$4,600) where authorized by the council under a separate action.

Mr. Ebert asked if the \$19,963 was coming out of the Park Commission budget.

Mr. Tienter replied that the architectural design and the geotechnical review came out of the Park Commission fund. The drainage engineering came out of the general fund through their professional services line item.

Mr. Ebert asked how much is there in the Park Commission fund to date. Mr. Tienter replied that based on 2016 budget documents the City estimates about \$43,082 in the Park fund.

Mr. Ebert requested a Park fund update. Mr. Tienter replied depending on this project, the City puts in about \$16,538 in specific park revenue fee (the \$1.50 park improvement fee that the City charges city wide). There is also a general fund transfer of about \$5,000. The CIP anticipates \$6,000 in other revenue which would be the cost sharing which the City would expect to receive from the Baseball Association. In total in 2016 the City estimates about \$28,000 in revenue. At the end of our 5 year planning window we estimate about \$31,600 annually. That increase in revenue is predicated on a recommended increase in the park improvement fee which would increase over time. It would take an additional action by the City Council as part of the budget. At the end of a 5 year planning window, assuming that this project goes forward under the same cost sharing arrangement (\$13,500 for the City would contribute and \$6000 from the Baseball Association), the Park Fund would have about \$16,900 left.

Mr. Schultz addressed the Park Commission regarding the drainage issue and stated that adding improvements to the Field do not make sense if water that will not drain will destroy these improvements.

Mr. Ebert asked if the Baseball Association has considered moving. Mr. Schultz replied that they have considered it but haven't researched it yet. Mr. Tienter added that it was discussed at an earlier meeting with the City Engineer and the cost of purchasing and outfitting a new field would be about \$400,000 - \$500,000. A major expense in that are the lights. The city already has lights that could be repurposed.

Mr. Schultz stated that the Baseball Board would like to find a way to move the project forward but are not sure how to do this. The Baseball Board is adding to their portion for a total of \$8,000 a year. One of the main reasons to complete the drainage project is to maintain competitive in a bidding scenario for tournaments. Campbell Field is set to host a region 7c game in four years and all those requirements but cannot without the proposed improvement project completed. If the turn is lost to host this game, it is a nine year wait. A good share of the money raised from these tournaments goes back into facility and the maintenance of the facility. The Board is not willing to go over \$8,000 per year for over seven years. This \$8,000 already includes fundraising and donations. At minimum the drainage needs to be fixed before anything else can be done.

Ms. Littfin asked if Howard Lake-Waverly-Winsted play there and if so, could they contribute donations. Mr. Schultz stated that he has approached them and Holy Trinity with no significant resolutions. They have other opportunities and facilities that they invest in.

Ms. Quast asked if the third base dugout is safe facility. Mr. Schultz replied that the ball club is going to put some money into it to ensure that it is safe.

Mr. Ebert asked what the cost would be for the drainage and the third base dugout. Mr. Schultz replied that they could scale back and take care of the drainage and dugout issues for about \$130,000 to \$140,000, but it would not meet the minimum requirements to host tournaments in the future. The Board would want to fix the drainage problems and use the maximum amount of funds available to get the most done possible.

Mr. Ebert asked if we can meet the minimum requirements for hosting within current budget constraints. Would we be able to get the bull pen or will it only address the drainage, the dugout, and some other smaller cosmetic issues. Mr. Schultz replied right now probably not, it would probably needed to be phased over time. That could happen over time but hosting of these events what helps pays bills so if they can't host games they won't have that extra income. Mr. Tienter added the cost for drainage and dugout would cost about \$120,000. The additional \$16,500 would not cover a bullpen as currently designed.

Mr. Fury asked what the length of the agreement was to partially finance the improvements to Campbell Field. Mr. Tienter replied that it has a seven year term. City staff would be comfortable

recommending several more years of financing if need be, but the Park Commission needs to understand that this would tie up money for other park projects.

Mr. Fury asked if creative fundraising has been looked at raising funds from outside of the constituency. Mr. Schultz replied that they are already very aggressive in their fundraising and do not want to lose future donations. They have looked at grants from the Minnesota Twins. They have also used options from the Minnesota Amateur Baseball Association for low cost financing and now have to wait their turn to apply for that option again. Mr. Tienter added that the City's Engineer, Bolton and Menk, Incorporated provided a list of grants but this project does not meet requirements for many of the grants.

Mr. Tienter recommended discussion be tabled until financing could be researched further. Mr. Ebert added that the next steps will be predicated on the financing analysis.

**Ms. Littfin made a motion to table discussion/recommendations on the Campbell Field improvements until the June 13, 2016 meeting. Mr. Fury seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.**

## **5) Other Business**

### **a) Dirt at Barrett Field**

Mr. Ebert stated that Holy Trinity approached him regarding a pile of dirt at Barrett field and who will be distributing this dirt. They would like to have it gone before their game in May. Mr. Tienter stated that he would contact the Public Works Supervisor regarding this dirt.

### **b) Southview Park**

Ms. Littfin asked how for the Kingsley Street Area Improvements Project will affect access to Southview Park. Mr. Tienter stated that access will be impeded but the construction company is not allowed to mobilize on the south side of the park. Communication will be given to affected parties once details are worked out.

### **c) Luce Line State Trail Gap**

Ms. Littfin requested an update on the Luce Line State Trail. Mr. Tienter stated that City staff and the Mayor have been working to close gap in the Trail. Preliminary conversations have been held with the property owner. In regards to the section north of the Winsted Municipal Airport, City staff has been working with the Federal Aviation Association (FAA).

## **6) Adjournment**

**Mr. Fury motioned to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Littfin seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.**

**The meeting adjourned at 6:02 p.m.**

*Daniel Tienter*

---

Daniel Tienter,  
City Administrator  
City of Winsted

ATTEST:

*Raquel Kirchoff*

---

Raquel Kirchoff,  
Deputy City Clerk  
City of Winsted