



**Minneapolis
Park & Recreation Board**

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board
Cedar Lake and Lake of the Isles Master Plan
Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #2

10/26/2020 6:00-8:00pm
Zoom Online Video Call

MPRB Staff and Consultants Present: Emma Pachuta (Project Manager), Adam Arvidson, Dan Elias, Madeline Hudek, Alyssa Gilmore; Maura Rockcastle and Erica Christenson (TENxTEN); Shelby Scharen (Quinn Evans)

CAC Members Present: Win Rockwell (CAC Chair), Aaron Shaffer, Adam Braun, Alice Lehman, Anna Eleria, Ben Surma, Drew McGovern, Eric Gangl, Jim Romlin, Laura Kinkead, Lilia Theisen, Linda Mack, Michaela West, Nan Dreher, Will Stensrud (Alternate), James Reid (Alternate), Constance Pepin (Alternate)

Public: Throughout the evening approximately 15-20 members of the public joined the meeting

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

Emma Pachuta (MPRB, Project Manager) started the meeting at 6:03pm, thanking everyone for joining the second Cedar-Isles Master Plan Community Advisory Committee Meeting (CAC #2). Emma then asked Win Rockwell (CAC Chair) to start the meeting by saying a few words. Win grounded the group by reminding them that the focus of the CAC's work is to think about the big picture in order to craft a 20-30-year vision for Cedar Lake and Lake of the Isles. Win also mentioned the virtual tours for the project site which will be distributed online. These virtual tours, when they are finalized, will allow people to follow the narrative online, or do their own self-guided tour. Win mentioned that one of the tours is a boat tour and offered to coordinate taking people out in canoes before the lakes freeze. Win also thanked the consultants for providing the pre-meeting materials (*Staff Note: available on the [project page](#)*), and explained that as the project process continued, the history of the area will be added to, adding significant things as they are discovered. Win thanked folks for their feedback and participation.

Emma thanked Win for his introduction and asked the CAC members and alternates to introduce themselves. Emma gave a Land Acknowledgement statement and shared the Dakota name for Minnesota: Mni Sota Makoce and its meaning, "Land Where the Waters Reflect the Clouds". Emma then went through the agenda, ground rules, and online forum guidelines for the virtual meeting.



STAKE AND POWER MAPPING ACTIVITY DEBRIEF

Emma explained how the Stake and Power activity was done at the previous meeting (*Staff Note: recap of the activity can be found in the [CAC #1 Notes](#)*). The purpose of the debrief was to look at what the three small groups work, and reflect on some questions:

- Do you notice any differences or similarities between the boards?
- How do you see this exercise playing out in the master plan process?
- How should we engage different levels of stakeholders?
- Are there any missing stakeholders that should be added?

Madeline shared her screen for the discussion. Different colors represented the different small groups work. Madeline walked the CAC through the Miro board quadrant by quadrant, giving the CAC about a minute to review each section of the board before beginning the discussion. (*Staff Note: [The Miro Board is available online](#)*). The conversation was first open for the CAC, then was extended to the public.

CAC DISCUSSION

(CAC Member) In general, your average park user (captured by a number of different groups) seem to have more high stakes and low power. Noticed that local government is in the high stakes and high power.

(CAC Member) The low stakes half of this chart is pretty scarce. Folks who are most interested in this project will have high stakes regardless of how much power they have or think they have.

(Project Staff) Are you saying that there are fewer folks that were identified in the low stakes category because they aren't going to be as engaged in the project?

(CAC) Yes, saying that folks with high stakes have an active interest in the project regardless of their power. Those with low stakes aren't going to be as engaged, but the CAC still has to consider everyone that uses this space. Question how we engage with folks who fall into the low stakes category.

(Project Staff) This is one of the big reflection questions; how should different levels of stakeholders be engaged. There are ideas for how to do that (through community engagement plan), but would like to hear ideas of what that may look like from CAC perspectives.

Emma read off some of the comments in the chat:

- Questions about the placement of some of the stakeholders, believe that some groups have higher stake than they were identified as having (i.e. Indigenous People and Minneapolis Residents)



**Minneapolis
Park & Recreation Board**

- Struck by the fact that organizations with the MOST power (Met. Council, Legislature, SWLRT, etc.) have little “stake” in the processes.
- Belief that many high stake holders will not be involved.

(CAC Member) Would be helpful to review the community engagement (CE) plan, would make this conversation easier. Don’t want to cover/suggest something that is already covered in the CE plan.

(Project Staff *in chat*) Posted the [link to the updated Community Engagement Plan](#)

(CAC *in chat*) What can be learned from other CAC processes about how to engage stakeholders?

(Project Staff) From the staff perspective have done the best to learn from other CAC processes, included/addressed in the CE plan. Responds to lessons learned from past processes in terms of what stakeholders are listed in the CE plan and how project staff plan to engage with them.

(Project Staff) Any missing stakeholders, or any feeling that the stakeholders are in the wrong place on the map? Mentioned that there are very few low stakes groups identified, mention in chat that some groups may have higher stakes than were identified.

(CAC Member) Young people/youth are missing. Since this plan will be a 20-30-year vision, need to hear youth voices because they will ultimately be the voters, decision makers, etc. (*Staff note: youth missing from the Miro board was echoed in the chat*). Glad to see the watershed’s included as important stakeholders since the lakes fall within their purview. Notice that the highest stake and highest power groups are organizations that represent specific interests (business owners, neighborhood organizations, etc.) Those groups with lower power are much broader. Means the CAC and MPRB have to find ways to prioritize getting input from lower power groups; high stakes and high power groups will weigh in because they are already more active/involved because they recognize vested interest and power. Groups with low power may not feel as though they can influence the project as much.

(CAC *in chat*) Nonprofit groups who have walks/races for fundraising purposes around Lake of the Isles are missing.

(Project Staff) Have the Loppet on here, not sure what other specific groups to name.

(CAC *in chat*) Kenwood Elementary School is a missing stakeholder.

(CAC Member) Seems like a strange presumption that the Met. Council would have low stakes in the project since they are ultimately reviewing the park plan.

(Project Staff) Do we also need to distinguish that the SWLRT is different than the Met. Council?



**Minneapolis
Park & Recreation Board**

(CAC Member) Yes, there is a difference, distinguish between because the Met. Council will be reviewing the long term plans, ultimately will be submitting the plans to the Met. Council for adoption.

(CAC *in chat*) People getting wedding/prom photos taken around the lakes are missing stakeholders on the board.

(CAC *in chat*) Funding agencies - foundations, CWL funds missing stakeholders on the board

(CAC Alt *in chat*) Volunteers are another stakeholder group missing from the Miro Board, would be low power, high stakes.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION

(Public) Southwest Light Rail (SWLRT) is identified as being low stake but high power. Feel like the SWLRT has high stake and high power. Their high stake is did they ruin the ambience/nature of the area or will the LRT enhance the area. They have very high stake in ensuring they have not lowered the recreational value of the area. Hope that after landscaping and things have been put back in place it will have enhanced the area.

(Project Staff *in chat*) Can we move the groups that were called out as not in the appropriate place?

(Project Staff) Just using the board at this point to prompt the conversations, have made note of the disconnects.

(Public *in chat*) Beach users are missing—low power/high stake.

(Public *in chat*) Nonhuman users are missing from the board

DISCUSSION SET-UP // CAC Q&A

Emma shared with the CAC some of the futures that the MPRB thinks they will have to respond to, that will either impact the organization or be impacted by parks. These futures are not necessarily things that the MPRB wants to happen, and in those cases the response to those futures is to mitigate them through parks. Sharing this information because it will be important context for decision making.

Moved into a CAC Q&A, a place to unpack CAC role and ask questions; conversation first opened up to the CAC then opened up to the public.



**Minneapolis
Park & Recreation Board**

(CAC Alternate) Audubon Chapter in Minneapolis oppose the future of fewer wild plants and animals. Believe that we can protect and conserve.

(CAC *in chat*) Agreement

(Project Staff) Exactly right that this is not a future that the MPRB wants to see actualized. But it is currently a threat. This is an example of a future that MPRB hopes to mitigate through its practices. The futures aren't things that the organization wants to happen necessarily, but they are things that MPRB needs to keep their eyes on.

(CAC Member) Recognize that there is a difference between a forecast (a statement that something may likely be happening) and a goal. The goal is more birds and animals, but the fear is that there will be less. Have to recognize the forecast to solve for the goal.

(CAC Alternate) Think the future statements are confusing. Hope planning staff add more clarity. Seems like it doesn't belong.

(Project Staff) Will connect if there are any changes to the futures.

(CAC Member) Reading through the timeline of land acquisition around Cedar Lake and Lake of the Isles, has there ever been a renewed conversation about trying to acquire lands along the east side of Cedar Lake? Too expensive at this point?

(Project Staff) Asked if he was talking about the land that is current publicly owned but where residents have private docks, or land that is privately owned by homeowners.

(CAC Member) Referring to the fact that a loop trail wouldn't be able to wrap completely around Cedar Lake because of houses.

(Project Staff) The Park Board owns the waterfront/shoreline and land that varies in width from 8-50 feet from the waters edge. Right now, the landowners that are behind the public land hold easements with the MPRB. It is certainly appropriate to talk about the shores of Cedar Lake and determine what the ultimate future of the area should look like. The easements are revocable in order to make improvements on the public land, expect that this will be a more robust conversation as the process unfolds. In terms of additional land acquisition (beyond what the MPRB already owns), trying to be really strategic about acquisition where there is a lack of park land (North Loop/Downtown)

(Project Staff) Addressing some comments in the chat, will make sure to clarify where easements are in future access and circulation meetings (delineate between public and private land)

(CAC Alternate) Asked if the CAC member was asking about the 8-50 feet of parkland along the shoreline, or did he mean acquisition of the homes along the shore?

(CAC Member) Unaware of the easements, asking about those, question was answered!

(CAC Member) Question about one of the historical documents. Talked about at one point a pathway that was going to connect Lake of the Isles along the Kenilworth Lagoon Channel to Burnham, possibly all the way to Cedar Lake. Don't think there was ever a path installed along



Minneapolis
Park & Recreation Board

the North or South side of Kenilworth Lagoon. With LRT and heavy rail over Kenilworth lagoon, should consider how a pedestrian path could be co-located underneath the railroad and LRT bridge to connect people to Burnham Blvd/Road. Seems like a natural connector.

(Project Staff) Asked if he meant is there a previous plan to do this, or asking if this is a conversation that has come up?

(CAC Member) Don't know that it has ever been brought up as a possible way to connect the two lakes. In previous access/circulation conversation talked about navigation between the two lakes. This this connection could create natural flow between Cedar Lake and Lake of the Isles since the heavy rail and LRT create an obstacle. Could create a pathway underneath heavy rail/LRT or some kind of pedestrian overpass.

(Project Staff) Haven't come across anything that indicates this was a connection that was considered. Historically the connections between the lakes were conceived to be by WATER rather than by foot.

(CAC Member) Have maybe seen that as part of the [Michael Van Valkenburgh plan \(for the Chain of Lakes, 1997\)](#). Perhaps never implemented? Talked about but never happened? Something that can be discussed later on.

(Project Staff) Will look into the adoption/implementation history of the Van Valkenburgh plan in the next meeting in more detail. Not officially adopted, has been used for some improvements of the area. Asked if CAC have process/role questions? If not, might be more helpful to introduce the consultant team to work through maps and history discussion together.

(CAC Member *in chat*) Isn't there a design project going on right now with the Kenilworth Channel?

(Project Staff) Moving forward with shoreline stabilization plan, focusing on the removal of the wooden retaining walls west of Burnham and bridge. Doesn't include the addition of natural paths, but the design doesn't prevent that from happening if the desire for a path comes out of this process.

(CAC Member) Putting anything in to replace deteriorated wooden walls other than a natural bank?

(Project Staff) The stabilization solution is utilizing a natural bank; stabilizing with plantings/vegetation. Won't be retaining walls of any kind.

(CAC Member) That work and planning would not preclude any recommendation from this CAC about improving the area?

(Project Staff) That is correct, there are some limitations in terms of space and such (ex. south side)

(CAC Member) What does the term preclude mean?



**Minneapolis
Park & Recreation Board**

(Project Staff) If this CAC were to recommend, and the Board of Commissioners approved, a trail connection from Cedar Lake to Burnham and even further, it would not be made more difficult or expensive by the stabilization project.

(CAC Member *in chat*) It would be helpful at some point to see maps that clearly delineate public/private land in the Channel and Cedar Lake (maybe you are going to show the CAC this already)

(Project Staff) The maps don't do that today, but we will eventually zoom in and show that.

Several more questions about Kenilworth Channel were asked in the chat by members of the public. Dan Elias (Project Manager for the Kenilworth Channel Stabilization Project) answered questions in the chat as to not take away from the verbal Q&A session about the Cedar-Isles Master Plan.

(Public *in chat*) Will they dredge Kenilworth Channel

(Project Staff *in chat*) Regarding dredging the Kenilworth Channel: Current MPRB water resources staff are unaware of the past practice of regularly cleaning the channel bottom. They do not know if it ended due to budget reasons, the fact that it is not necessary, or due to permitting constraints.

The elevation of the channel has no statutory standing. The only reason MPRB would have dredged the channel would be if MPRB wanted larger watercraft to be able to go through the channel. In that case, a permit from the DNR would be required. Since the bottom of the channel has not impeded boat traffic and has been without dredging for a decade or more, it is not necessary to dredge regularly.

Even when done well, dredging a lake/channel bottom disturbs sediment and releases it to the water column. Releasing sediment can result in increased nutrient loading to a lake, a detriment to water quality. If done at the wrong time, sediment can cover fish and amphibian eggs, which can kill them.

While dredging sediment is sometimes necessary to remove accumulated sediment, it is typically only done when necessary to meet the goal of providing necessary depth for the navigation of watercraft, especially since it has adverse effects on the lake and channel ecosystem.

(Public *in chat*) The Channel Project does also include removal of the private fencing currently preventing access to the lake shore.

(Project Staff *in chat*) Private fencing on public land adjacent to the Kenilworth Channel will be removed in advance of the shoreline stabilization project by the private resident or removed by the contractor as part of the construction project.



Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board

(Public *in chat*) There are large trees that have fallen into the channel in that area—depending on water height, there are submerged trees that have fallen into the channel. They can be as little as 8 inches below the surface. Will they be removed?

(Project Staff *in chat*) The designed depth of the channel following the stabilization project in comparison to the typical water elevation will be 2.5 feet. Any major vegetation found submerged will be removed.

HISTORY

Maura Rockcastle (of TENxTEN) introduced the consultant team staff on the call, as well as the work that was done to date. She explained that the conversation tonight would be focused on the Indigenous Legacy (pre-1800s history) through the 1950s. More contemporary history was not a part of this deep dive but will be the focus of next meeting's conversation.

Shelby Scharen (of Quinn Evans) went over the findings of the historical research that was done [Staff Note: the video that was created by Quinn Evans, that provides an overview of the historical research done can be found [here](#); the historical timeline and context can also be found on the [project page](#)]. Shelby also emphasized that where the Minnesota and Mississippi Rivers connect in the Twin Cities is a significant place for Indigenous communities. There are sites all along the river that have their own names and significance., important to respect this as planning for the lakes continues. Shelby outlined the major take away from the listening session with Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs) and the shared stories [Staff note: these important takeaways/listening session summary can be found in the presentation from CAC #2 on slides 17 and 18].

(Public *in chat*) Can you provide any explanation of the Dakota name of Lake of the Isles that appears on some of the slides?

(CAC Member *in chat*) Believes it means Four Island Lake

(Project Staff *in chat*) Wita Tomna or Wita Topa—yes, it means four islands

(Public *in chat*) Can you describe the difference between Tomna or Topa please?

(Project Staff) There are a couple of versions of “Four Islands”. For the Dakota people, place names are different than how we name places in English, they act more as descriptors for places; and being that it is an oral language rather than a written language, there are a couple variations. Also, not sure if that is currently an appropriate name for Lake of the Isles because there aren't four islands anymore.

(CAC Member) Doesn't seem like there's a lot of clarity around a specific formal name for the area?

(Project Staff) Yes, these were some of the names that came up in the literature during preliminary research.



CAC DISCUSSION

Erica Christenson then helped to lead the CAC conversation, explaining that Shelby and Maura would be using the platform Mural to document.

For the most part, participants chose to respond to these brainstorming questions via chat, below are some of the answers that were provided, and the more in-depth conversation. [Staff Note: View the Mural Board that was created by TENxTEN available on the [project page](#)]

The first question that Erica opened to the CAC was: **What physical changes over time have had the most impact on how the lakes are experienced today?**

- Dredging and filling in the east and northern shores of Cedar Lake
- Channel connections, linking the lakes
 - o Cedar lake was lowered 5 feet in 1913 to connect the lakes and create Cedar Lake Parkway
 - o More land and less water
- Loss of wetlands; although more recently see restoration
- Creating the boulevards (which meant infilling), construction of the Grand Rounds
- Railroad construction
- More manicured gardens with exotic/ornamental/non-native trees and vegetation—impacts on birds, habitat, wildlife, foraging assets for Indigenous peoples
- Directing stormwater runoff to the lakes
 - o Declining water quality
 - o More impervious surfaces—resulted in reduced infiltration, increased runoff, increased pollution
- Changes to lake level, managed (pumping) versus carriable (reflecting natural conditions and precipitation)
- The area around the east and north side of Cedar Lake was used as a public dump, this destroyed the natural springs, and lowered the quality of the lake
- Deforestation to make room for humans' use
- Invasive species (ex. buckthorn) degrade ecological function; change in vegetative cover
- White, wealth people moving into the area
- Construction of private homes on lakeshore [Cedar Lake; only ones in Minneapolis]—has reduced access to the general public
- Legacies of exclusion of “non-white” residents in many residential areas

(CAC Member *in chat*) Question; a lot of the suggestions in the chat happened long ago, what about physical changes in the past 20-40 years?

(Project Staff *in chat*) Planning to start the conversation about contemporary history in Meeting #3.



**Minneapolis
Park & Recreation Board**

(CAC Member) Roadways, parkways, and pedestrian paths have all contributed to usage in a very effective manner in terms of getting people to and around the lakes, a reality to keep in mind.

(CAC Member) See that the addition of infrastructure also required heavy adjustment of the areas.

(CAC Member) Timeline documents show huge changes to the Lake of the Isles when it was dredged. Huge increase of land that expanded the footprint and increase in the surface area of the lake.

(Project Staff) Yes, there's a movement from solid to liquid real estate, see that in the connections between lakes as well.

Erica then asked a **question about how these physical changes have impacted the site and how these places are experienced.**

(Project Staff) Going to be talking about these impacts in terms of scale, Maura and Shelby were organizing the feedback on the Mural Board

(CAC Member) High impact: Conversion of 4 islands into 2 islands

(CAC Member) Dredging and filling on north and east sides of Cedar Lake

(Public *in chat*) The entire East Bay of Cedar Lake vanished when the lake was lowered; gradually vanished and the railroads started infilling, now it's all gone. There are nice flat trails there. To the west of the trails and to the east of the lake there are these mounds/hills that used to be a garbage dump.

(Project Staff) Anything that has had a high impact that hasn't been covered yet?

(CAC Member) Railroad use of the land

(CAC Member *in chat*) Creating roads/trails that bring many people to walk/run/bike/etc. around the lakes (and docks for boats)

(Project Staff) Seems like the trend is that infrastructure changes have high impacts; and the impact is bringing in more people

(CAC Member) When talking about physical changes, the railroad and causeways are the biggest physical changes. But, can't wind the clock back to remove the railroad and recreate the bays. May be worth acknowledging there are elements that have been lost and may be permanently lost moving forward.

(Project Staff) Not sure exactly what's going to be done with this feedback moving forward, depends on the response. Conversation is to generally get everyone on the same page.



**Minneapolis
Park & Recreation Board**

(Project Staff) Talking about change over time as an experience, what kinds of changes cause fundamental shifts in how people or animals use and interact with these spaces. Not yet projecting forward or thinking about future design. Thinking about how these significant impacts and changes affect experience of places.

(CAC Alternate) Believe the lake/east bay used to come up all the way to where the railroads are. Aren't going to turn it back into a bay, but it's currently just a dump of road waste (ex. cement), this is something people live with now, that can be taken into consideration. Think about what can be done with remnants (ex. public art). Think about what kinds of purposes spaces can serve with thoughtful change and restoration; how is the existing landscape shaped by history and used; how can that be brought forward and held onto in the future?

(Public) The bay extended beyond where the railroad is now, went further east to where the houses are on Sheridan.

(CAC Member *in chat*) Neil Trembley wrote a terrific book on the preservation of the parkland on the north end of Cedar Lake (buying the land from the Railroad and saving it from development). [Staff Note: [Link to Neil Trembley's book can be found here](#)]

(Public *in chat*) Good points. Also, the SWLRT is compressing the former bay further for the light rail station.

(Public) Important to remember that there is no way of going back. Great to acknowledge and understand history. Don't want the bay back, appreciate the bike trail.

(CAC Member *in chat*) Linking the lakes had a medium to high impact.

(Public *in chat*) Impacts of the physical changes on WATER QUALITY.

(Public *in chat*) Places where tree fall is extensive in east park, north of Kenilworth Channel, south of beach. Remove some?

(CAC Alternate *in chat*) Fallen trees provide habitat for birds and other wildlife.

Erica asked another question: **How should the park's historical development be honored, while incorporating contemporary needs and values?**

(Project Staff) Will be talking more about contemporary history in Meeting #3, will revisit similar questions in the following questions as well.

Erica started the conversation by asking for examples of contemporary needs and values. Again, the chat function was used heavily and periodically verbally shared out by Erica and documented on the Mural board. below are some of the answers that were provided, and the more in-depth conversation.



Contemporary Needs and Values

- Incorporating resiliency into parks to mitigate impacts of climate change
 - o Protecting ecological function
 - o Reducing stormwater runoff to prevent/reduce pollution; consideration for increased and more severe rainfall events
 - o Protecting the urban forest/canopy by preserving native trees and vegetative cover and planting more trees
- Aligning land use with the historical context of Indigenous Peoples (nature based)
- Changing needs for changing uses (ex. are people still driving for pleasure in 2020 and will they in 2040 or 2050?)
- Accommodating able/disabled-bodied capabilities
- Accommodating multigenerational differences (smoother surfaces, mobility aids, etc.)
- Use of the parkways for commuting
- Increased public transit access
- Continue having unique, natural areas in the city (ex. area on the east and north side of Cedar Lake, due to the history of rail roads)
- Additional restrooms, water fountains/drinking fountains, etc. for parkgoers who aren't in easy walking distance.

(CAC Member) Having enough space for everyone who wants to use the space in different ways. Not talking about specific spaces, but enough spaces (capacity).

(CAC Member) Intersection of walking, biking, etc.

(CAC Alternate) Confusing to include commuting as a need, in charge of recreation not in charge of parkways use for commuting.

(CAC Member) Didn't mean it negatively; the system was designed to allow for transportation for people moving for different reasons. Need to be aware of commuting, but not judgmental.

(CAC Member) Important to consider if the parkways should be used for transportation or recreation or both and how to design for that.

(CAC Member) Remember that this is future facing. With addition of LRT and bus restructuring the transit usage of the area will change and there will be significant commuter function for people using the area.

(CAC Member *in chat*) Increased public transit access will impact contemporary uses

(Public *in chat*) The Kenilworth bike trail supported at least 600,000 annual bicycle commuters and recreation users prior to the construction of SWLRT.



Erica transitioned the conversation to; **what are some means for honoring stories of the past?** Overview of the answers provided in chat, and more robust conversation provided below.

Means for honoring history:

- More education about park history
 - o Ex. could be more signs about Indigenous history, lost islands, etc. similar to the one at the Bde Maka Ska and Lake of the Isles Lagoon
 - o Significantly increase signs explaining, illustrating and teaching history of parks so people can more easily understand, value and advocate for the continued care of the parks.
 - o Signage with “then and now” photos or drawings
 - o History of ice house and ice harvesting
 - o Areas where there are history boards
- Interpretive signage and wayfinding signage for non-English speaking visitors
- Self-guided walking maps with historical content/landmarks (with photos of historical landscapes)—guided tours with different themes?
- Indigenous medicine garden
- Sacred Land dedications
- Consider artwork as a way to tell stories
- Programming
 - o for local schools to learn about park history in field trips
 - o something like the temporary forest bathing activity boards that were up over the summer, could be installed more permanently
- Caring for natural resources
 - o Removal/management of invasive species
 - o Restoration of native landscapes and vegetation

(CAC Member) Going back to talking about what is or isn’t permanently changed. One means for honoring stories of the past is considering what can be changed back in a reasonable way, if it can’t be restored how do we acknowledge that past?

(CAC Member) Feedback from the THPO’s was for Indigenous peoples to have access and space to connect with nature. Should provide gathering spaces that allow people to connect in ways they have in the past.

(Project Staff) What does history tell us about the current use, how could that inspire the landscape, how we treat and view the land, etc.

(Project Staff) Think can also include the act of caring for a resource as a way of honoring.



**Minneapolis
Park & Recreation Board**

(CAC Member *in chat*) Also, if the landscape can't be changed to bring back the historical version, acknowledge the past through creative ways (paths, interpretive signs, stories, etc.)

(CAC Alternate) Walking through the woods see natural artworks that's taken place; could expand this. Use buckthorn branches to create sculptures; work with artists to incorporate cement embedded in ground into pieces; also retaining natural areas.

(CAC Alternate *in chat*) Here is a link to the local artist that many of you might be familiar with who has some stone sculptures outside of Kenwood School. Look at his website to consider the types of art installations that could be curated in East Cedar Lake Wood using material that is already there and part of the history of the land (Buckthorn, concrete, etc.) www.zoranmojsilov.com

(Project Staff) Lot of the feedback is about how people experience history and stories; how history is embedded in the landscape impacts how we experience the history of an area. Lot of things you still feel in these landscapes that were plans from long ago. Acknowledge that so much of what is seen now has been there for some time.

PUBLIC COMMENT

(Public) Live on the lakeshore, southeast corner of Cedar. There's a wall that the landowners have maintained, narrowest part of publicly accessible shoreline; provides challenge for continuous pathway. Also, a large silver maple.

Emma read off the comments that were provided in the chat:

(Public *in chat*) Please remember that there are many people who use the current walking trails around both lakes. Bicycling, people coming from many neighborhoods, is also a heavy use of both lakes. Dog walking is another heavy use.

(Public *in chat*) Think that adding a paved path along the entirety of Cedar Lake's shoreline would really degrade the natural quality of the lake as well as the water quality.

(Public) Expanded on his comment. Believe the desire for a loop trail completely around Cedar Lake is because that's what every other lake has. Believe that what make's Cedar Lake unique is how much natural beauty there is. Water quality is better than some of the other lakes in some respects because there aren't paved paths all the way around, more permeable area. There are access points to the lake that exist. Want people to use the lake, but a path all the way around would be ill advised and expensive.



**Minneapolis
Park & Recreation Board**

(Public) Encourage the CAC Members to consider working with neighbors/community members to find solutions to improve access to Cedar Lake. Understand concerns about silver maple, know there are creative solutions that could allow for the inclusion of a natural trail along the whole lake.

(CAC Member) Hear and agree with the difficulty for the inclusion of a path all the way around Cedar Lake. It would be great to add signage that tells people how to utilize existing connections (sidewalks and such) to show how to navigate the whole way around Cedar Lake. There is walking access around the whole lake via Burnham, Washburn Circle and the existing trail system. Less biking access though.

(CAC Member *in chat*) Will want to have a view of the trails near the 21st station and access there.

THANKS, AND NEXT STEPS

Emma closed the meeting by assuring folks that these conversations will continue to happen in more detail in future meetings. Emma shared out the timeline for upcoming meetings, with CAC Meeting #3 and #4 being planned through January, with reflection for moving forward in February. Reminded the CAC to participate in meeting evaluation survey. Thanked everyone for coming and participating in a wonderful, robust conversation

[ADJOURN 8:01pm](#)