

City of Winsted  
Park Commission  
Winsted City Hall – Council Chambers  
Tuesday, April 10, 2012  
6:30 p.m.

Park Commission Members Present: Amanda Alguire  
Steve Ebert  
Petie Littfin  
Bonnie Quast, Council Liaison

Park Commission Members Absent: Kurt Landin  
Kimberly Moen

Staff Present: Brad Martens, City Administrator  
Raquel Kirchoff, Administrative Assistant

### 1) Call the Meeting to Order

Ms. Alguire called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

### 2) Approval of Minutes – March 13, 2012

**Ms. Littfin made a motion to approve the minutes of the Park Commission Meeting on March 13, 2012. Mr. Ebert seconded the motion. Motion carried 3-0.**

### 3) Staff Report

Mr. Martens gave the following City of Winsted Public Works Staff Report related to the Park Commission:

- Water turned on at Barrett Park and Campbell Field
- Bleachers have been set at the parks
- Picnic tables have been delivered to the parks and work has been done on the picnic tables
- Downed branches have been removed at the parks
- Mowing contractor has started mowing; very early this year
- Inspections of the playground equipment at the parks were completed

#### **Luce Line State Trail**

Mr. Martens also gave an update on the Luce Line State Trail and stated that the Senate version of the bonding bill does name the Luce Line State Trail as a funded, paved trail. It is not named in the House bill at this time and it is not guaranteed that a bonding bill will pass this session; however, it is important for the trail to be named in the Senate bill. Mr. Martens continued by stating that Senator Newman, Senator Gruenhagen, and Representative Urdahl have sent letters of support for the pavement of the Luce Line Trail to the Department of Natural Resources (DNR), and that he believed Representative Shimanski was also going to send a letter to the DNR.

#### **Temporary Fence – Barrett Field**

Mr. Martens stated that he was approached by Mr. Tony Hausladen regarding the newly purchased temporary fence for Barrett Field, after the March 13, 2012 Park Commission meeting. Martens stated that when the Park Commission approved to help fund the purchase of the temporary fence, it was under the assumption that the fence would be put up and taken down after each game. Mr. Hausladen informed Martens that it was not going to be done this way, and would not be taken down after every game.

Mr. Ebert stated that he was a part of that decision and explained that the manufacturer of the fence does not recommend this with the fence because it causes more wear and tear on it, than if it would be left up. Ebert did acknowledge that if the fence is left up, there is the risk of vandalism.

Mr. Martens read a message that he received from Mr. Hausladen on his opinion of putting up and taking down the fence and how he believes it would be an inconvenience for the volunteer coaches and parents.

Martens continued by stating that the process that will happen with the temporary fence is, to him, completely different than what the Park Commission approved at the March 13, 2012 meeting. He asked the Park Commission if they had any comments on the fence not being taken down after each game.

Ms. Littfin asked what the new fence looked like. Mr. Ebert stated that they had not looked at the fence yet, but it should be comparable to a rubber snow fence, with a tighter weave. Ebert continued by stating that he has now volunteered to coach a team and is not looking forward to putting up and taking down the fence, if that is something that they are required to do.

Council Liaison Quast asked if the manufacturer recommended not taking down the fence after each game. Mr. Ebert responded that their opinion is that because it is being handled so much with the putting up and taking down, or if someone does not properly install the fence, there is a risk of damaging the fence. He continued by stating that the fence weighs approximately 200 pounds and will not be easy to work with, because there is no readily available system of rolling it up and hauling it.

Council Liaison Quast stated that she remembered discussing a system to aid with the installation and taking down of the fence at the March 13, 2012 meeting. Mr. Ebert responded that the Youth Association did inquire with AWI Manufacturing to see if a system could be created, but AWI has not responded to the Association yet. Quast asked if anyone inquired with Mr. Brad Millerbernd, of Millerbernd Manufacturing. Ebert responded that he did not know.

Council Liaison Quast stated that she does not approve of the City's Public Works Department being responsible for the installation and taking down of the fence as the City is trying to cut expenses, and the Public Works Department would need to be paid overtime for this process.

Ms. Alguire stated that the \$500 that the Park Commission approved to contribute toward the purchase of a new fence was a one time approval and asked if damage happened to the fence, would the Youth Association be back to the Park Commission asking for money to help with the repairs. Mr. Ebert replied that he cannot guarantee that they would not come back and request funding, but hoped that the fence will last its lifespan, between seven (7) to ten (10) years, and when that lifespan is finished and a new fence is needed, the Association would ask the Park Commission for help again to purchase a new fence.

Mr. Martens stated that the premise of the request for the purchase of the fence was that the fence would be taken under the City's insurance so that if it was vandalized, it would be covered; but again, that was under the assumption at the approval that the fence would be taken down after each game and stored for protection of the fence.

Mr. Martens stated that he could discuss with Mr. Hausladen that if the process will be to leave the fence up for the season, the City would support the normal lifespan schedule of the fence; however, if repair was needed prior to the normal lifespan due to vandalism or other things that could damage the fence, the City would not help to fund these repairs.

Mr. Ebert stated that another issue of taking down the fence after each game is how to ensure that all who take it down will store it properly, to make sure that damage does not occur from improper storage. He gave an example of when the fence was first taken out of storage in the summer of 2011, it was found frozen to the bottom of the storage shed which had done damage to the fence. It is hoped that racks can be placed inside of the shed to hang the fence on, and also hoped that the doors will be fixed on the shed.

Council Liaison Quast asked what the dimensions of the fence were. Mr. Ebert replied that it is approximately 180 feet of fence, approximately three (3) feet high.

Mr. Martens acknowledged that it is a heavy fence that will be hard to put up and take down for each game, and further stated that if the Park Commission agreed, the new fence can be left up after installation and the City will check in as months pass to see how it goes; however, the City will not guarantee that if the fence is left up, the City will cover it for vandalism because that was not the original plan. The Park Commission members agreed with Martens' plan.

Ms. Alguire asked if there was a guarantee that when the season was finished, the fence would be taken down and properly stored. Mr. Ebert stated yes.

#### 4) Old Business

##### a) Park Entrance Signage

Mr. Martens stated that at the December, 2011 Park Commission meeting, it was mentioned that he and Ms. Alguire would be working to receive a quote to update park entrance signs. A quote was received from the Herald Journal with the following options:

- Option 1: Whitewood signs to replace or cover existing park signs at a cost of \$1,937
- Option 2: Alumacorr signs to replace or cover existing park signs at a cost of \$2,312

Martens reviewed what the existing signs look like, and also what the first design received from the Herald Journal looked like.

The comments from the Park Commission, after reviewing the first design were:

- Need to get away from the “scroll” look
- Like to see oval signs similar to the City signs as you drive in, tie design into those signs
- City logo should be larger and included on the sign, possibly on the side
- Needs a “wow” factor to make it “pop”
- Name of the park font can be larger than the word “park”

The Herald Journal took those comments into consideration and has an updated design for review. Mr. Martens stated that he sent this design to the Park Commission earlier than April 10, 2012 to receive initial feedback from Park Commission members and the feedback was unanimous that option two (2) was the preferred design.

The eight (8) signs would be whitewood signs with a high performance vinyl application and two options are available:

- With Steel Plates: \$3,648
- Without Steel Plates: \$2,632

Those costs do not include new posts and caps, tax, or installation. Cost of new posts and caps from Ram Buildings is \$873.60. Installation could be completed by the Public Works Department.

Mr. Martens requested more feedback from the Park Commission members to see if these signs were something that the Park Commission wanted to move forward with and make a recommendation that the City Council purchase signs, or if more time was needed to review the options and make some adjustments.

Council Liaison Quast asked if there were any grants available to help with the purchase and Martens replied that he was not aware of any that would help with signage.

Ms. Alguire asked if the Park Budget could afford the option without the steel plates, for approximately \$3,500. Mr. Martens replied that this would exhaust the Park Budget for the year.

Ms. Alguire reviewed that the Park Commission had approved \$500 for the temporary fence purchase for Barrett Park and then asked what Skate Park improvements had been made. Mr. Martens replied that the Skate Park improvements were part of the 2011 Park Budget and were not completed because they were too expensive. He continued by stating that there may be funds that can be used from the prior year in addition to the 2012 budget.

Council Liaison Quast asked if she could speak with some local manufacturers to see if they could help with getting the posts needed for the signs. The Park Commission members encouraged Quast to do so. They stated that if they would donate, there could be the possibility of putting a “donated by” statement on the signs.

Mr. Ebert stated that he liked the way the signs looked and thinks they should be purchased but is concerned about using the entire Park Budget. Ms. Alguire agreed with Ebert but stated that it is her hope that the signs will be updated for Winsted's 125<sup>th</sup> Anniversary celebration during the 2012 Winsted Summer Festival. She continued by stating that to accomplish this, they may need to look at more options; originally the plan was to do a basic vinyl overlay and paint or stain the existing posts. The Park Commission discussed if new posts were needed and the possibility that the existing posts might not be in the best of shape. They liked the idea

of metal posts, which Council Liaison Quast was going to inquire with local manufacturers about, to avoid the rotting that can occur with wood posts, and that they also would match the Winsted welcome signs.

Mr. Martens recommended that if the City is going to spend \$2,632 on new signs, new posts should be purchased to do the job right.

Mr. Martens asked the Park Commission for comments on the design and stated that he thought the Herald Journal did an outstanding job. The Park Commission members agreed, stating that the signs look very dignified.

Martens stated that the Park Commission could make a motion to recommend that the City Council purchase new park entrance signs at tonight's meeting, or it could be reviewed again at the May meeting. Ms. Littfin asked if there was enough time to have the signs completed and installed by Winsted's 125<sup>th</sup> Anniversary celebration. Martens stated that he believed there was enough time.

**Mr. Ebert motioned to recommend that the City Council approves the purchase of new park entrance signs, with design option number two (2). Ms. Littfin seconded. Motion carried 3-0.**

Council Liaison Quast stated that before the Park Commission approves everything for the signs, they would want to know the information that she receives from the local manufacturers. Mr. Martens stated that the final approval needs to be received from the City Council, so all of the information gathered will be included when the City Council reviews the signs for approval.

## 5) New Business

### a) Park Commission Meeting Schedule

Mr. Martens stated that there were two (2) items he would like to discuss regarding the Park Commission Schedule for 2012. The first item was that he had planned a tour of Winsted parks for the May, 2012 meeting; so instead of meeting in the Council Chambers, the Park Commission would meet at a park. He asked the Park Commission to schedule a date, where to meet, and time to start the tour, and stated that this meeting/tour would last approximately two (2) hours. The Park Commission stated that they would meet on May 8, 2012, at 5:30 p.m., at Mill Reserve Park to begin their tour.

Ms. Alguire asked if the Park Commission would still do business on this tour, in case Council Liaison Quast brought back information regarding the posts. Mr. Martens stated that since the Park Commission made the motion at tonight's meeting regarding the signs, further action would not be needed; however, the City would post that the meeting would be taking place at the parks so business could be done during the tour.

Ms. Littfin asked if the meeting would still happen if it was raining. Mr. Martens replied that the meeting would be rescheduled if it was raining.

Mr. Martens stated that the second item to discuss was a City staff consideration and asked the Park Commission if they would consider meeting after the Planning Commission, that meets on the second Monday of the month at 6:00 p.m. If so, the Park Commission meetings would start at 7:30 p.m. on these Mondays. This would reduce the number of nights that City staff attended meetings, to be able to have another night free for family.

Ms. Alguire asked what would happen if the Planning Commission meetings would have a lengthy meeting and need more time. Mr. Martens stated that the Planning Commission meeting would be limited to ninety (90) minutes.

The Park Commission members in attendance had no conflict with this meeting time. Mr. Martens stated that he had asked Mr. Landin, who had not replied to him yet, and that he would ask Ms. Moen. He stated that the Park Commission could motion to change the meeting time with the condition that it worked for the absent Park Commission members.

Council Liaison Quast asked if the meeting could be scheduled before the Planning Commission meeting, at 5:00 p.m. This was too early for some of the members to meet. Quast stated that 7:30 p.m. was too late to meet. Ms. Alguire asked if the meeting could start at 7:00 p.m., with the Planning Commission possibly

moving their meeting time up. Mr. Martens stated that the Planning Commission could not meet earlier than 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Ebert stated that the meetings normally run between thirty (30) minutes to one (1) hour and that he does not feel that 7:30 p.m. is too late. Ms. Alguire suggested that they try this new meeting time first, instead of voting to reschedule all of 2012 meetings.

**Mr. Ebert motioned to schedule the June, 2012 Park Commission meeting on the second Monday of the month, June 11, 2012, at 7:30 p.m., on a trial basis. Ms. Alguire seconded. Motion carried 3-0.**

**6) No Announcements**

**7) Adjournment**

**Ms. Alguire made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Ebert seconded the motion. Motion carried 3-0.**

**The meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m.**

*Brad Martens*

Brad Martens,  
City Administrator  
City of Winsted

ATTEST:

*Raquel Kirchoff*

Raquel Kirchoff  
Administrative Assistant  
City of Winsted