

City of Winsted  
Park Commission  
City Hall - Council Chambers  
August 8, 2016  
5:00 p.m.

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

Staff Present: Daniel Tienter, City Administrator

**1) Call the Meeting to Order**

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

**2) Approval of Minutes – June 16, 2016**

**Ms. Evelyn Fowler motioned to approve the minutes of the Park Commission Meeting on June 16, 2016. Ms. Cindy Racette seconded the motion. Motion carried 4-0.**

**3) No Old Business**

**a) Campbell Field Improvements**

Mr. Dan Tienter, City Administrator updated the Commission on the current status of the Campbell Field Improvement Project that were recommended at the June 16, 2016 Park Commission meeting. The plan was forwarded to the City Council and based on comments at the meeting, the City Council opted not to move forward with the project based on drainage and cost concerns. Mr. Tienter stated that as part of that decision, the City Council asked that the Park Commission reconsider the project.

Mr. Tienter stated that since the City Council Meeting, City staff has been working with Mr. Chris Schultz, a representative of the Winsted Baseball Association. Mr. Schultz submitted a revised plan with eight (8) items, which were then passed along to the City Engineer and Oertel Architects. Mr. Tienter stated that the City received cost estimates of \$81,000 in construction costs and \$20,000 in administrative costs, for a total estimated cost of \$101,500. Per state law and City policy, Mr. Tienter stated that the City would only propose the project on construction cost and would therefore not need to opt to release the project under sealed bids, but rather, seek quotes for the project. That is an important consideration, because one of the items eliminated from the original project was an irrigation system. Mr. Tienter added that the Baseball Association, over the past several years, has received numerous quotes for a one-time irrigation system project and would be comfortable doing this as a project separate from the larger project. He stated that it would also be an easier project to fold in at a later date.

Mr. Jake Saulsbury, City Engineer from Bolton & Menk, Incorporated, reviewed a letter from August 2, 2016 regarding information on the Campbell Field Improvements. Mr. Saulsbury stated that the eight (8) items included in the letter are essentially the original project scope minus the patio and the larger structural improvements. He added that it includes some added cement work, seating, retaining walls, fencing; and fixing and staining the dugout.

1. \$25,500 Install the cement pad and sidewalk next to the concession stand.
2. \$16,750 Remove one tree and install retaining walls.
3. \$8,500 Dugout roof modifications.
4. \$5,000 Driantile behind the retaining walls and dugout connecting to the existing system.
5. \$6,250 Replace the fencing on the backstop, batting tunnel, and along first base.
6. \$5,000 Replace the fencing along Andy Ave.
7. \$3,500 Stain on both dugouts and storage shed.
8. \$10,500 Bleachers and canopy.

Mr. Saulsbury stated that he is concerned with items three (3) and four (4) on the list, because both items are structurally related and both of the those would require connecting drainage into the existing system. Mr. Saulsbury stated that staff from Bolton and Menk have tried to televise the

system to locate the drainage path, but due to poor condition of the tile, they were not able to. The engineers believe it is old concrete tile lines. Mr. Saulsbury added that even televising it from the downstream end, they were only able to go about twenty (20) feet before they found an area that was collapsed. He stated that the draintile likely carries further into the park, which is also evident in the frequency the field floods. Mr. Saulsbury's recommendation was to replace the system through the park before doing structural and drainage improvements. Mr. Saulsbury stated that there are some concerns with the system on Main Avenue, adding that there is some work that would need to be done there in the future. He stated that getting that backbone system through the park would allow a much more significant rainfall event to be handled and there would also be storage in the pipe.

Mr. Ebert asked if the \$85,000 recommendation outlined in the December 16, 2015 letter was the recommendation of Bolton and Menk. Mr. Saulsbury replied that before any structural or retaining wall work is done, this work spelled out in the letter should be done.

Council Member Quast asked how much the drainage improvement portion would cost. Mr. Saulsbury stated that the total estimated project cost is \$85,000. Council Member Quast asked what is gained if Main Avenue is not repaired or improved. Mr. Saulsbury replied that if Main Avenue were fixed it would further improve things. He stated that there is currently a large main under Main Avenue which is basically flat, there has been some settlement at the upstream end so it is not functioning as well as it should, so a ten (10) year rainfall event would not be able to go through that pipe until the Main Avenue pipe is replaced; however, the system in the park is in poor shape as well.

Mr. Ebert asked if the park would see some improvement with the new system and more if or when the stormwater main on Main Avenue is replaced. Mr. Saulsbury replied that there would be some improvement and that the Main Avenue fix is not planned for the near future. Mr. Saulsbury stated that the system in the park would treat a one (1) inch rainfall event, which is about twice as much as an average rainfall event. He added that if there is significant rain there would still be water in the park but not as much as now because there would be a system to get it to Main Avenue.

There was further discussion about the problems and issues that have been caused by water in the park, as well as how and where the water drains into the park. The Commission discussed additional alternatives to fixing the drainage problem, and possible recommendations to present to the City Council. Mr. Ebert stated that the Baseball Association would not be able to even bid for any tournaments until certain items are done or fixed at the park.

Mr. Tienter informed the Commission that the drainage project as outlined in the December 16, 2015 memo was ultimately rejected by the City Council because the sentiment at that level was that there was no desire to basically do a patchwork solution, but rather wait until the opportunity to replace the water main under Main Avenue, because they did not want to spend the money and then ultimately not fix the problem. The City Council opted not to proceed with a bid from R & R Excavating, the general contractor on the Kingsley Street project, for this reason. Mr. Tienter stated that the catch is that there is no recommendation to move forward with the project unless the drainage can be fixed, and the City Council has expressed that they would not like to fix the drainage in a sort of piece meal fashion, but do it all at once, and the improvements to Main Avenue are not planned for several years. He added that ultimately this means the recommendation from the Engineer and staff is to not move forward with the project at this time.

There was discussion about scheduling a work session and the rules about scheduling a Park Commission meeting to provide more time to work out the details so the work could still be done this fall. There was also discussion regarding arrangements of the meeting.

**Ms. Fowler motioned to schedule a work session followed by a formal meeting to address the issue at hand with Campbell Field Improvements. Mr. Fowler seconded. Motion carried 4-0.**

#### **4) New Business**

#### **5) Other Business**

##### **a) Lakefront Promenade**

Mr. Tienter gave an update regarding trees that were donated by Jack and Petie Littfin. He stated that at the June 21, 2016 City Council meeting, the Council accepted the donation of the trees as recommended by the Park Commission. Mr. Tienter stated that the Public Works staff has opted to wait for cooler weather to plant the trees so they will not die because of the ongoing heat. Ms. Fowler requested that Public Works not wait too long to give the trees time to acclimate before winter.

Mr. Tienter stated that the City Council reviewed information prepared by several interested citizens regarding maintenance and perhaps improvement to the Lakefront Promenade. After recommendation from City Staff, the City Council referred the information to the Park Commission for greater consideration.

Mr. Tienter stated that the plan is to factor the Promenade into the continued discussions about the Park System Master Plan. He added that the reason it was added to the Park System Master Plan is that the improvements proposed and recommended to the City Council while certainly an important and valid perspective on what to do with the Lakefront Promenade, are just one perspective, and the opportunity should be given to the Park Commission to 1) bring input to bear as the advisory Commission to the City Council as to what should be done with the Lakefront Promenade and 2) to engage in appropriate public engagement as part of the master planning process to make sure whatever vision is proposed for the promenade receives the proper amount of vetting given the community asset of the Lakefront Promenade.

Council Member Ollig stated that one possible recommendation discussed at a City Council work session is to have the Park Commission look at outside firms to help develop the Lakefront Promenade. He added that until there is a plan and cost strategy for the plan, the City Council cannot move forward and budget for park projects.

Ms. Fowler expressed frustration over what is happening in parks in regards to park projects not being done and how the parks are currently being maintained.

Mr. Tienter stated that as part of the upcoming budget there are recommended reparations for the Lakefront Promenade. What form those take will be decided by the Park Commission with approval of the City Council. There is also \$2,000 included in the Public Works budget that will be dedicated to "City Beautification." Mr. Tienter has also asked staff to research other communities and begin provisions for creating a volunteer program to take advantage of both the resources that exist in the community and the monies that the City can bring to bear. Mr. Tienter stated that City staff is working on multiple fronts; and ultimately, City Council approval is needed to accomplish many of these things.

Mr. Tienter stated that in regards to the Lakefront Promenade, City staff will take any recommendations from the Commission and actions from the City Council very seriously but would still encourage the Commission to consider them against the larger Park System Master Plan planning effort when making decisions about resources, different areas, different parks, and different priorities.

#### **b) Parks System Master Plan**

Mr. Tienter informed the Commission that next month City staff plans to begin the Park System Master Plan again in earnest. He added that Mr. John Anderson, City Consulting Planner from Municipal Development Group, will attend the Commission meeting to discuss and receive input from the Commission on items such as: park classification, overlapping resources in the parks, etcetera, to continue the Commission's effort. Mr. Tienter stated that he has provided Mr. Anderson with the overarching vision and goals adopted in the first part of the Park System Master Plan, and Mr. Anderson will take those and turn them into more discreet steps that are typical to a plan.

#### **6) Adjournment**

**Mr. Tim Fury motioned to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Fowler seconded the motion. Motion carried 4-0.**

The meeting adjourned at 5:51 p.m.

*Daniel Tienter*

---

Daniel Tienter,  
City Administrator  
City of Winsted

ATTEST:

*Amanda Zeidler*

---

Amanda Zeidler,  
Deputy City Clerk  
City of Winsted