

Lake Harriet CAC Meeting Agenda and Results

Linden Hills Recreation Center, 22 June 2009, 7-9 p.m.

Goals

1. Improve CAC members' understanding of concession economics: what revenues support, additional revenue opportunities, and opportunities and constraints of using private concession operators
2. Review, revise, and approve draft documents and proposed decision and meeting frameworks: previous meeting notes, Stakeholder Engagement and Work Plan, proposed decision-framework questions, and proposed goals for future CAC meetings
3. Create and direct task forces to implement upcoming stakeholder engagement

Input

1. Past process summary / lessons learned from Joseph and Sarah
2. Economic information from staff, including concession background, revenue tied to user information, review purpose for generating concession revenue, economic/budget changes with introduction of Tin Fish and Minnehaha Falls, concession operators interview update
3. Proposed goals for future CAC meetings
4. Revised Stakeholder Engagement and Work Plan and proposed decision-framework questions

Agenda Item	Lead	Results
1. Welcome and introductions	Matt	CAC members attending: John Finlayson, Matt Perry, Roann Cramer, Janet Hallaway, Bruce Manning, Joel Chechik, Donovan Hart. Staff: Heather Ocel, Shane Stenzel, Don Siggelkow. Consultant: Anne Carroll. Guests who signed in: Commissioner Tracy Nordstrom, Harvey Ettinger, Arlene Fried, Dolores Pospescl, Peter Sussman, Cristof Traudes (SW Journal), Brad Bourn
2. Learning from the past: Brief report from Joseph and Sarah on learnings from previous process	Joseph, Sarah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tabled until a later meeting as neither were able to attend
3. Updates		
a. Report: Progress on e-letters out to first group of stakeholders from the Stakeholder Engagement Plan	Matt, Elizabeth, Heather	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matt Perry will post e-letters to Ning site as they are sent out • Letters have been sent to: Commissioners (all at-large commissioners as well as Commissioner Fine and Nordstrom) Lake Harriet Yacht Club, event organizers, buoy permit holders, canoe permit holders, Lake Harriet church groups • The CAC will discuss another time how to further engage the Metropolitan Council
b. Update, discuss, approve: Work Plan Task Force deliverable, Work Plan and SH Engagement Plan,	John, Janet, Lisa, Matt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend that we use the three guiding questions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should food concession options be expanded at the Lake Harriet

<p><i>including</i> chair-proposed decision-making framework of three key questions</p>		<p>pavilion area, and if so, for what purpose and to what end?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. If they are expanded or changed, what are the impacts and how are they best addressed? 3. If more food options are offered, what structural and/or physical layout changes to the pavilion area would be necessary (if any). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The last column of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan now gives status updates and allows us to be specific about which of the three key questions we are trying to answer • There will be narrative above the guiding questions about how all the stakeholder interests will help shape CAC recommendations and guide the process, and the CAC will continue to discuss how to demonstrate to stakeholders how their input is being used
<p>c. Review, revise, approve: Proposed goals for future CAC meetings <See goals for future CAC meetings below></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the structure and layout discussion scheduled for next meeting, options include: no change, remodel existing, expand existing, any of above and new, different concepts (e.g., food wagons), etc. • Staff will create a table of some kind that addresses pros and cons of each option and potential costs involved. • July meeting will also begin the discussion of feedback coming in; people need to go to Ning site and get a feel for the feedback to be somewhat prepared for the meeting
<p>d. Update: Plans and timing for meetings with current concession vendors</p>	<p>Joseph, Janet, Don</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These three CAC members are in the process of scheduling meeting with the food vendors.
<p>4. Moving forward:</p>		
<p>a. Operations staff call: Confirm time for conference call with operations staff (all CAC members welcome)</p>	<p>Matt</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wed. June 22nd 11am; will include Matt, Anne, Bruce, possibly Roann, Don, Shane, Heather; all CAC members welcome • Anne will send conference call information to everyone
<p>b. Foundation call: Identify CAC volunteer for call with Foundation</p>	<p>Matt</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bruce volunteered to join in on this call, as did Roann
<p>c. Intercept survey: Create Task Force to develop, pilot, and organize implementation of intercept surveys; ideal would to pilot and begin implementation at the end of June, and continue into early July; identify others who may wish to participate</p>	<p>Matt, Anne</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pilot this Friday night with CAC members to try it with a good crowd; then redesign as necessary • After that, CAC members and hired college grads can conduct these various days and times of day • Design Task Force members to work with Anne: Joel, Bruce, Matt • Friday evening pilot volunteers: Roann, Donovan, Anne, Matt, Joel
<p>d. Web survey: Should be completed by midweek, hopefully with help from Intercept Survey Task</p>	<p>Matt, Anne</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Done with task force of Joel, Bruce, Matt

Force		
e. Neighborhood input: Create Task Force to work with neighborhood organizations to design and implement input session by end of July; identify others who may wish to participate	Matt, Anne	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community input sessions: Need Task Force to work with community organizations to design format; Task Force will be Janet, Bruce, Matt, Donovan • Matt has already made initial contact
f. E-updates to electeds: Scheduled for this week and will be done routinely	Matt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matt is doing
5. Staff presentations/CAC discussion: Concessions background; revenue report tied to user information	Don	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's always been about service, and continues to be that way • Concessions run by whoever can do it best • There is not enough taxpayer money to pay for this park system, therefore other revenue needs to be produced • Using a public, accessible decision-making process • Questions about presentation information: • Why should MPRB profit from private vendors? Private vendors shouldn't receive the sole benefit from a public good • Why different percentages for different vendors to return to MPRB? Tin Fish was the first private vendor and there were none with previous experience; MPRB and Tin Fish worked together on both service and revenues. Vendor must continually reinvest in facility. MPRB focused on what's best for the public. • Group walked through revenue numbers in tab 14 in the CAC binder; staff noted that in 2001 this was direct MPRB revenue and beginning in 2002 it was a percentage of vendor sales per each contract • Staff noted that MPRB does not work off of net sales because there are many ways that it can be manipulated; they work off of gross sales plus sales tax; comparing net income is apples to apples • Better revenue years due in part to great weather (fewer rain days) as well as vendors who are highly motivated to make it best when it is their business • With operators, now have penalty to ensure they stay open regardless of weather • MPRB golf courses have professional golf managers who do great job • Operating revenues=what MPRB receives from vendor, % of sales • Operating expenses=bldg. maint., repairs and improvements, staff

		<p>costs, some utilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An additional building would result in some additional maintenance and operating expenses • Any new building costs would be distributed over the building life (assume 25 years) • Earlier estimates were that a freestanding concession stand could generate make \$50-60,000 net; 20-25 yr building; \$250,000 building investment • Estimates of “let’s do something different” venue would be \$800,000 to \$1 million. • If you had a better designed facility for concessions, you’d do better
6. Next steps/adjourn: Confirm work to be done before next meeting	CAC	

Outputs

7. Task Forces created and charged
8. Approved Work Plan and Stakeholder Engagement Plan, including decision on proposed three-question decision framework
9. Economic drivers, benefits, and impacts of expanding or not expanding food options, and delivery structure