

Florence Township Park Commission

Meeting Minutes – Sept. 16, 2013

Attendance: Brad Stone, Bill Siewert, Julie Karlsrud, Ron Knudsen, Dean Nelson and 10 guests

Minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

Old Business:

Park Activity Applications: 1 pending for Carolyn Hedin
1 approved for Ron Knudson

Park Business: Wakondiota – Roof over bleachers – pending

Frontenac Station – Projects completed

Community Center – New TV and security camera

Steamboat Landing – Rip rap along shore line – pending

Valhalla – presentation from Bill Bleckwenn with discussion

We reviewed the Park Design progress for the last 9 months (see below) which brought those in attendance up to date. The next step is to address the needs and steps to proceed with Valhalla plans so that the grant applications can be completed and in by February deadline.

After lengthy discussion we formatted the following plan and will check with McGhie & Betts to see if they are comfortable with this plan.

October – McGhie & Betts present first design draft

Early November – Have a Saturday morning meeting for the community to review the design and submit to McGhie & Betts

November – McGhie & Betts back with feedback revisions

December – Final plan with the Town Board approval to McGhie & Betts

January – Grant apps and design

February – Yes or no from grant sources

Items discussed and follow-up:

Will we need county approval – Brad will check with Mike at the county.

Have the design for the park posted to the web site prior to community meeting for all to review.

Grant writing done by whom? – McGhie & Betts and Bill Webster will check with some additional folks for help. Other suggestions were to check with the Red Wing Area Fund and St. Paul Foundation.

How much can we get done for the \$5,000 in the budget. Grant money can be used to help pay for the design work.

Focus will be on all invasives and not just the buckthorn.

Check with Audubon Society to see if they would help pay for design or removal of invasives or possibly both. Jamie will get a copy from Robert Hedin to review to help with this.

New Business:

The Minnesota Association of Townships recommends we not use Roberts Rules for meeting guidelines (see below) as does the Florence Town Board. We have voted to amend our bylaws accordingly. The new bylaws will be available on the township web site. Motion carried.

A reminder to all to check the township web site under the Park Commission tab for future information. All Park Commission meetings are regularly scheduled, public meetings, and the public is invited to attend them without needing to be sent email notices of when these meetings are held. Community residents can check the township web site to view meeting times, dates and minutes. It was also clarified, that the Park Commission members are all volunteers and their role as park commissioners is to make recommendations to the Florence Town Board regarding the Florence Township parks.

The next meeting will be October 21, 2013 at 6:00 pm.

Park Commissioners contact information:

Brad Stone	612-226-6066	jbradstone@aol.com
Bill Siewert	651-345-4694	wvsiewert@gmail.com
Julie Karlsrud	651-345-4591	julie.karlsrud@gmail.com
Ron Knudsen	651-345-4359	rrknudsen@qwestoffice.net
Dean Nelson	651-380-0814	lund1800@hotmail.com

Meeting adjourned at 7:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted – Julie Karlsrud

Florence Township Park Commission Valhalla Park Design Process - Last 9 Months:

History

- December 2012 Interviewed Consultants, McGhie and Betts Environmental Services
- January 2013 Interviewed Consultants, U of MN, Center for Changing Landscapes
- February 2013 Interviewed Consultants, U of MN, Department of Forest Resource Service
- March 2013 Selected McGhie as Design Partner
- April 2013 McGhie presents general ideas for Design
- May 2013 Audubon Minnesota presentation regarding Birds and the Mississippi River Valley
- June 2013 McGhie proposal accepted to begin a
community-based process with two community visioning opportunities in July and August
- July 2013 Community Visioning led by McGhie and Betts
1. What do you think of when you think of Valhalla Park?
 2. What do you like best about Valhalla Park?
 3. What would you like most to change/add to Valhalla Park?
 4. How do you see Valhalla Park in the future?
- August 2013 McGhie feedback regarding first visioning session,
and additional community-based visioning, project scope, and goal setting.

Tonight

September 2013 Discuss and determine Process for next steps - focus and timeline

Future

	<u>Process Possibility #1</u>	<u>Process Possibility #2</u>
early October	Conduct Design Workshop	---
October mtg	Review Results of Workshop	Consultant Presents First Draft of Design community feedback opportunity
November mtg	Consultant Presents First Draft of Design community feedback opportunity	Consultant Presents Second Draft of Design community feedback opportunity
early December	second workshop to update draft Design	---
December mtg Dec Town Bd	Review Results of second Workshop ---	Consultant presents Finalized Design <i>Park Commission presents to Town Bd</i>
January mtg Jan Town Bd	Consultant Presents Second Draft of Design community feedback opportunity ---	Review Grant opportunities and applications <i>Park Commission requests Supervisor signatures on Grant Applications</i>

February 2014 Grant Deadlines Grant Deadlines

February mtg Feb Town Bd	Consultant presents Finalized Design <i>Park Commission presents to Township</i>
March mtg Mar Town Bd	Review Grant opportunities and applications <i>Park Commission requests Supervisor signatures on Grant Applications</i> -- Major Grant deadlines missed --

Conducting and Controlling Town Board Meetings
MAT 2002 Summer Short Courses

Most town board meetings occur with few if any problems. From time to time, however, whether due to a controversial issue, a simple misunderstanding, or personality conflicts, challenges are made to how the board is conducting its business. Further, townships occasionally have to deal with unruly participants, whether in the audience or on the board itself. Having an understanding of what is and what is not required by law, as well as what is authorized by law, and developing internal by-laws, can go a long way towards conducting productive meetings and avoiding challenges to the actions being taken by the board. The following is an overview of some of the key issues town boards should consider when conducting a typical public meeting.

1. Open Meeting Law. Before convening any meeting, be sure that proper notice has been given pursuant to Minn. Stat. Chapter 13D (formerly ' 471.705). While actions taken at an improperly noticed meeting are not automatically invalid, they will be subject to questions by the public and the participating officers could face serious legal consequences. Avoiding the appearance of secrecy and impropriety can go a long way in establishing and maintaining the public's trust, which in turn can help town business be conducted in an efficient and effective manner.

2. Convening and running the meeting. The town chairperson is normally the person who will convene and run the meeting. Meetings should be convened at the time provided in the notice, but only if a quorum of the supervisors is present. If no quorum exists, the meeting will need to either be delayed until a quorum arrives, or canceled and rescheduled. Because state law does not create the chairperson position, it is up to each town board to determine how it will decide who will be the chairperson. In the absence of the chairperson, the remaining supervisors will need to decide who will run the meeting. Chairpersons have the same authority to participate in the meeting as does any other supervisor. This means that, absent some express reason to the contrary (i.e. local by-laws, conflicts-of-interest, etc.) he or she can make motions and vote on any issue. It is traditionally the chairperson's role to recognize speakers, to make sure that everyone is clear on an issue, and to call for any vote that is required to be taken. It is also the chairperson's discretionary duty to end discussions as needed to keep the order, and to try to keep the meeting moving at a good pace while allowing complete discussions on each issue.

3. Agenda. There is no statutory requirement that an agenda be prepared for a town board meeting. It is, however, a good way to help inform audience members of what will be discussed at the meeting. An agenda can also help keep the meeting orderly and thus more time efficient. The most common way of developing an agenda is for the town clerk to collect requests from the supervisors, and to keep track of both routine business and special items that need to be taken care of, and to then compile them into a logical order to be dealt with. At a regularly scheduled meeting, the board is not limited to acting on only those items listed on the agenda and so any supervisor can raise any additional item he or she wishes to discuss. At a special meeting,

however, the board can only discuss and act on those items that were included in the notice provided for the meeting and thus the agenda can be constructed straight from the notice.

4. Parliamentary Procedure. Contrary to popular belief, neither Roberts= Rules of Order, nor any other parliamentary process, is statutorily imposed on townships. This means that from a purely legal perspective, a town board can conduct its business in just about any manner it so chooses. The board does not need to worry about what motion should proceed what other motion, etc. Many townships elect to adopt certain rules of order to help keep things organized and to help prevent any one member from dominating a meeting. MAT, however, discourages townships from officially adopting a formal process, such as Roberts= Rules, by name. The reason for this is that once adopted by the board, that process does become binding and any deviation from the procedure can be grounds to challenge the validity of an action taken by the board. Because very few people truly know all of the intricacies of Roberts= Rules of Order, mistakes can easily occur subjecting an otherwise valid decision of the board to possible challenge based on a technicality. Instead, it is encouraged that each town board adopt its own set of by-laws that set forth the basic principles of parliamentary procedures that it wishes to follow. Adopting a basic operating procedure dealing with such things as making motions, recognizing speakers, and voting process helps meetings remain orderly and minimizes confusion.

5. Conducting Business. It is important to know the difference between motions, by-laws, resolutions, and ordinances and what type of action may be taken by each. In general, by-laws refer to internal operating procedures discussed above. Motions are generally the process by which action is requested (i.e. "I move that...") Resolutions are generally used to make official appointments, recognize special issues, and to adopt administrative policies, etc. Resolutions generally start with a series of "whereas" clauses that state the reason for the resolution, followed by a "therefore be it resolved" provision that states the actual action being taken. Ordinances are generally reserved for official regulations that will be enforced and for which penalties may be imposed for violations. Ordinances must be adopted pursuant to formal statutory procedures, including the general requirements of Minn. Stat. § 365.125. Knowing the differences between these actions and how to adopt each will minimize confusion and the risk of successful challenges to town board actions.

6. Votes. Most actions taken by a town board only require a simple majority of those voting on the issue to be approved. Some matters, however, requires a majority vote of the town board as a whole, and still others require a super-majority vote such as a two-thirds vote. For most townships this is not an issue because a majority vote of a three person board is also a two-thirds vote. Townships with a five person board, however, will need to be more aware of these requirements. In addition, absences, abstentions, and vacancies can all effect how a vote should be counted. For example, if a supervisor is absent from a meeting he or she is still a member of the board and thus his or her absence has the effect of being a $\frac{1}{5}$ vote on issues requiring either a unanimous or set percentage of the entire board for approval. If a supervisor abstains from voting because of a conflict-of-interest, the board is temporarily reduced in size and any required percentage vote is based on the smaller number. If, however, a supervisor merely wishes to avoid controversy, his or her vote would still be needed to achieve the necessary

percentage. Vacancies also serve to temporarily reduce the size of the board for the purpose of calculating required votes.

7. Keeping Records. The Open Meeting Law requires that all actions be recorded in a journal and that the votes of each board member be recorded when approving the expenditure of funds, except for court ordered payments and routine bills. A verbatim recording of all discussion is not required, but enough of the conversation should be recorded to provide a full and accurate record that can support the decisions made by the board. Only the final minutes approved by the board constitute the official public record. If the town clerk tape records a meeting for his or her own personal benefit in transcribing the minutes, that fact should be recognized by board resolution and the tapes should be destroyed immediately following the adoption of the official record. Otherwise, any tape recording or other documentation will constitute a public record even if it is not the official record. So long as the person does not disrupt the meeting, any member of the public who wishes to record the meeting must be allowed to do so.

8. Controlling Unruly Participants. The Open Meeting Law gives people the right to attend town board meetings, but not to participate and certainly not to disrupt the proceedings. Disrupting a public meeting is actually a criminal offense punishable as a misdemeanor (Minn. Stat. ' 609.72). Taking the step of actually citing and prosecuting someone for a violation of this statute should, however, be the option of last resort. If it becomes necessary to try to remove a person from a public meeting, the assistance of a law enforcement officer should be sought and not just a Sergeant-at-arms. If a person has repeatedly been the source of uncontrollable disruption, it may be possible for the town board to seek a restraining order against the person. Again, however, this approach should only be used in the most extreme circumstances. Instead, trying to prevent a meeting from getting out of control in the first place is a better approach to take. Adopting rules of procedure, and informing the public of what the rules are, is a good means of achieving this task. Such rules may include: (1) having a fixed time for public input; (2) placing time limits on each speaker; (3) requesting that groups appoint a spokesperson to represent their position on an issue; (4) require people to submit in writing any request to address the board or to raise a new issue; (5) restricting comments to issues of public concern; and (6) requiring recognition by the chair before speaking. If a meeting gets particularly rowdy, it may be advisable to recess the meeting to a later time to allow a cooling off period. If problems have existed at prior meetings despite following these suggestions, or if there is any concern about the physical safety of the either board or attendees at a town board meeting due to the actions or threats of someone, then it is strongly encouraged that the board request that law enforcement be present during and immediately following the meeting.

Dealing with a disruptive town board member or staff can be even more challenging, particularly if the person is the town chair. Assuming the disruptive party is not the chair, the chairperson should try to cut off improper and out-of-order comments by other board members. The person should be reminded that as a town officer they have a duty to the township to provide good leadership and that their actions reflect on the entire community. If the chair is the problem, the other board members could vote to elect a new chairperson. If any town officer's or staff member's actions are particularly offensive, the board should pass a motion to disavow the behavior. Ultimately, a truly disruptive member could be removed from the meeting but only in

3 4

the worst scenarios. A town officer generally cannot be removed from office simply due to his/her actions at a meeting, but such actions may affect the elector's vote at the next election.