



Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board
Cedar Lake and Lake of the Isles Master Plan
Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #12

7/28/2022 6:00-9:00pm
Lake of the Isles Lutheran Church

MPRB Staff and Consultants Present: Emma Pachuta (Project Manager), Cliff Swenson, Elsa Erling, Madeline Hudek; Maura Rockcastle (TENxTEN)

CAC Members Present: Aaron Shaffer, Adam Braun, Anna Eleria, Ben Surma, Constance Pepin, Craig Wilson, Jim Romlin, Joshua Christensen, Linda Mack, Michaela West, Win Rockwell (CAC Chair), Will Stensrud (Alternate)

CAC Members Absent: Alice Lehman, Drew McGovern, Eric Gangl, Laura Kinkead, Lilia Theisen, Nan Dreher, James Reid (Alternate)

Public: Throughout the evening approximately 68 members of the public joined the meeting

WELCOME AND HOUSEKEEPING

Emma welcomed everyone to the meeting and went through the land acknowledgement, agenda, and meeting rules for the evening. She highlighted the Hopes and Concerns boards as a place for the public to share feedback throughout the meeting. Emma then summarized the feedback from the general public so far, listing the top ten topics that people commented on. Win introduced himself and walked through the agenda in more detail, highlighting the times for public comment. Win asked the public to name any key issues that should be added to the existing list of CAC Discussion topics. Two were added: park safety and the proposed new dock at W 27th St at Lake of the Isles.

CAC ROUND ROBIN

Each member of the CAC had about two minutes to share their thoughts on the Preferred Park Concept.

(CAC) The media coverage calls this plan minimal, but there are elements that are not minimal. There are many positive changes. The trail along the north side of the Kenilworth Channel is one of the elements I'm most positive on. More restrooms would be good, especially permanent. Those are my two priorities.

(CAC) I saw these changes as mostly minimal. My concerns will be covered later in the circulation meeting. I think there are good proposals put forward by Aaron. In terms of bathrooms, I think temporary restrooms would be better for year-round use, as permanent ones are locked up for half the year.

(CAC) I am generally supportive of the plan, but I have mixed feelings. I'm extremely excited about the water quality goals and I think they are very forward-thinking. I commend the park board for making that an emphasis here and I think it'll serve as a model. Where they've fallen short is the aspects for circulation and access. As a longtime resident, I think about what it will look like in 15 or 20 years, what can we say we accomplished? And I don't think it will look very different. So I think there are important improvements we can add in terms of circulation and amenities, which will also improve safety. I want to make sure this plan reflects the broader, diverse community.

(CAC) This plan takes a step in the right direction, I like the focus on water quality. It's important that we're doing more than our fair share in water quality. I think it's important that we're reducing erosion and formalizing water access. I think there should be a two-way bike way all around Lake of the Isles and would like to improve the NW Cedar bike proposal. I think more bathrooms are necessary, and I would like to see more amenities added to the park.

(CAC) I was really excited about water quality and I really appreciate the conservation and maintenance of the forest. Everyone here cares about the park in their own way and everyone is coming here with good motivations. My personal take on things other than water quality is that some of the circulation plans are great (for example, the Kenilworth Channel path), but we can do better, and go further. What motivates me is that I want every person that comes to the park to be safe and feel comfortable, if they're walking, biking, in a wheelchair, or in an adaptive bike. I hope that our final recommendations, which may revisit old conversations, can bring us to new conclusions.

(CAC) I most support the water improvements most. Water quality should be number one. One of the things I'm concerned about is the NW corner of Cedar. I would support something that's more aggressive than what's in the current proposal, which doesn't call for separated bike and ped paths. I'm not in agreement about the shared section, which seems like a recipe for disaster, for collisions. I think East Cedar Beach usage creates a huge impact in that neighborhood in terms of parking, and I would like to see something done in that area on parking, such as a small parking lot. I like the Kenilworth Channel pedestrian and bike connections.

(CAC) I would like to discuss the semantics of "permanent" and "temporary" restrooms. The actually permanent restrooms are the portapotties that are available 24/7 365. The truly temporary ones are the buildings that are closed half the year. I've seen a lot of degradation of the woods on the NE side of Cedar Lake and I think those paths need to be simplified and

improved, uses separated, and land set aside for nature. We need to be clear about putting pedestrians first. Pedestrians, before bikes, bikes before cars. We need to be clear about this.

(CAC) This plan is a step forward. It is nuanced and seems grounded in the way this area is actually used. There are significant improvements, such as intersection improvements, which can go a long way. A small move like that can make a big difference. I look forward to our discussion of the circulation issues, which are challenging and interesting, and we will come up with something good.

(CAC) Echoing water quality. I applaud Anna for her leadership and Keith for his leadership on these issues. We're dealing with degraded landscapes and volunteers are fighting back invasives, and in this plan we need more detail than saying we're going to do an "oak mesic restoration." We need areas, such as the Mound area, that really could be a great gathering area and restoration area. I'm not in agreement about what to do on water quality at Lake of the Isles, because of community resistance for new plantings. People are speaking very loudly about those plantings needing to be maintained and they're currently infected with invasive species, and volunteers like me and others in the audience are fighting back. I'd like to move the pedestrian dog park path over to the east side of the dog park. I share concerns about NW Cedar Lake, I don't think it's addressed sufficiently at all. I'm not in favor of off-road two-way biking on Isles, though there is a possibility for two-way using on-street lanes. Pedestrian safety important and the plan doesn't do enough. I share concerns about permanent restrooms that are not permanent.

(CAC) My high-level opinion is that over this process, having arrived at a number of consensus decisions, it seems that when we got here, that all went away. At NW Cedar, I think the parkway should be made one way. This is the only lake with two lake traffic. I live over there and all this would mean is that I'd have to drive a block or two over to make a left turn, which doesn't seem that bad. It was wonderful during the pandemic when the street was open to pedestrians. I think we did a lot of discussion and came back to something that seemed quite similar to where we started. I think there are some good circulation suggestions. There is another choke point to the south where pedestrians empty out onto a shared path, and I think a lane of traffic being taken back would improve that area.

(CAC) I would like to thank Commissioner Cathy Abene for being here. Thanks also to the Lake of the Isles Lutheran Church for hosting us. First, the lack of a systematic approach to wayfinding and signage in the whole park system is distressing. We've all been places with a well-developed system and we don't have that in this park system. So I propose that the park board start focusing on a system that can be extrapolated, to help us find places, know how far away things are. Second, education is important and a park system should bring its communities into natural areas and educate them. I think the Park Board should have a systematic approach to education opportunities. The Park Board is struggling to maintain what it has. Former Superintendent Jayne and I were working on developing funding to renovate all

of the neighborhood park community centers and the estimate was that they needed \$2 million. We launched a public bonding campaign. The Trust for Public Land told us to run a public opinion poll. We then made an appointment with Dean Phillips to get funding for poll. We ran the poll and 60% said they'd be willing to pay taxes to do more to fund their park systems. Parks are overwhelmingly important to the public. The Park Board has been too timid in going to the community to ask for the funding it needs. This is beyond the writ of the CAC but I'm taking this moment to say the Park Board needs to stand up and think about getting the funding for these proposals.

WATER QUALITY CAC SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Win turned it over to Anna to present on the Water Quality CAC Subcommittee recommendations. Anna introduced herself and the rest of the Subcommittee. She thanked them for their time and effort. She explained that water quality has been seen as very important from the start of the process.

Anna described the process of the Subcommittee, showing a list of their meetings. She also displayed a map of the entire watershed for both lakes and explained that the watershed is especially large for Cedar Lake and this was something the Subcommittee paid close attention to. Anna described the history of cooperation and work done by various agencies and organizations on water quality for these lakes. Anna displayed a graph of the Cedar Lake trophic state index, pointing out that current data shows the lake failing to meet the goals established in the 1990s through the Clean Water Partnership on a few measures. Lake of the Isles, in comparison, is largely meeting these goals, except for on Chlorophyll-a. Lake of the Isles is stable.

Anna then moved to the goals, describing the different categories of goals and encouraging the public to read through the four page document. She walked through each category. She announced that the Subcommittee supports what's in the Preferred Concept plan and listed three main design changes: dog park, littoral edge, triangle near France Ave. There were also three narratives to consider adding in the master plan document. She also displayed a graph of subcommittee suggestions for priorities. The highest were the creation of a Lake Management Plan, the initiation of partnership work, and consensus about restoring the marsh areas, ex. Cedar Meadows.

(CAC) Is it right that the Water Quality Subcommittee is asking the CAC to accept this report and incorporate in total in the master plan?

- (Anna) Yes, that is correct.

(CAC) Water quality management is deeply grounded in science and I just want to offer this as a prelude, because the committee was getting deeply into the science.

Public Comment on Water Quality

- (Public) Why doesn't the plan mention milfoil?
 - (Anna) We do have goals related to the control of invasive species
 - (Public) Doesn't it deserve special mention? The Park Board does spend money with the deployment of that machine. It's such an obvious problem, why isn't it mentioned by name?
 - (Anna) It is on page 6, "invasive species, such as milfoil." These strategies will hopefully get the root of what is causing the problem.
 - (CAC) Anyone else want to speak to milfoil?
 - (Public) I never see them trying to clear it.
 - (Public) Milfoil needs permission from the DNR and the standards are that only 50% of what is in the lake can be cut. Probably largely for fish habitat.
- (Public) Do these comments have to be just about water quality?
 - (CAC) We are trying to focus the conversation on water quality. We'll have other opportunities to comment on other topics.
 - (Public) My point is, what is critical and vital? Water quality is critical and vital. Natural conservation is critical and vital. Everything in the plan is on the same level. I wish to see something in the plan that says that this is the priority
 - (Public) Water quality was prioritized on this whole plan from the get go. I think it has been addressed as a major issue.
 - (CAC) He's saying it's not reflected in the park concept.
 - (Public) Because it's science-driven, it seems like this Subcommittee should continue to work out the priorities. It would be a lost opportunity to disband before the committee has a chance to do that. I think it's a matter of presentation. Most folks connect with the concept through the maps and legends, and I think there should be narrative about the water quality, because it's not coming through in the concept.
- (Public) One of the ideas is to put paved trails on the southeast side of Cedar Lake. A paved trail would increase runoff and would have a negative effect on water quality.
 - (Anna) A paved trail is not a significant source of pollution to our lakes, comparatively speaking and in the context of the larger watershed. Cars are more impactful and degrading. I think trails can work with our conservation.
- (Public) Has anything been done with chloride?
 - (Anna) Yes, it was looked at. I looked at the Park Board's 2020 report and the lake does not exceed the allowed levels, but it is something we're still making note of.
- (Commissioner Abene) I appreciate the mention of reinvigorating the Clean Water Partnership. That's coming up in other parts of the city as well.

CAC Discussion of Water Quality

Win brought the issue of Water Quality up for discussion and a later vote, explaining that the CAC could either do a straw vote or a final vote to accept or reject the Subcommittee's recommendations.

(CAC) My sense is that we're in general agreement about what's being presented. We hit goals in the 1990s that were set and we were able to maintain, but things fell by the wayside in the 2000s. If we don't have accountability with our maintenance and who is responsible, then ultimately we will end up in the same situation. We have climate change as an issue, which compounds this. Our group is in support of this, but we have to emphasize that the Park Board must be responsible and accountable for maintaining this infrastructure.

(CAC) I got confused about pavement on the southeast shore of Cedar because the water quality goals don't have anything to do with that.

- (Anna) There are no goals that have a paved path in the southeast corner of Cedar Lake. I was responding in general to the public comment about that.

(CAC) Early on, we had some focused discussion on the opportunity to urge the Park Board to be a much stronger leader in convening agencies and government to act in a coordinate way, because we recognize that much is beyond the Park Board's control. As I read the report, I don't see that point being made as strongly as it should be. You have a large park system, that was rated number one for many years, why aren't you leading on this? Why aren't you going to fellow agencies? I'd like us to have a straw poll, suggesting that we write a paragraph to the Park Board encouraging them to do this.

- (Anna) This is a good point and the Park Board is here at the table, while the other agencies aren't. So we can make a stronger point on that. Our subcommittee voted on that as a high priority.
- (CAC) Yes you referred to that. Can we empower Anna to come up with a draft and circulate it to be part of that? Everyone okay with that? [General agreement from CAC] Any other comments?

Continued Public Comment on Water Quality

- (Public) I'm curious about the lake management plan. Why isn't there a lake management plan already in place?
 - (CAC) So are we.
- (Public) How does water quality equate to visual appearance? Cedar Lake—during the summer it looks like a swamp. Visually, it does not look healthy. Actually I mean Lake of the Isles.
 - (Anna) Lake of the Isles is shallow, so it's appearance will look different than a deep water lake. Even though it has turbidity, there is still transparency through the water column. It's currently meeting water quality standards, but yes, things need to be done to address invasives

- (Public) The plants are the visual part. Anyone driving by can see that there's muck.
- (Anna) Aquatic plants are good, it's just about getting the right ones.
- (Public) I'd like to request that we train the public and the Park Board to not blow clippings into the lake.

Following the Restoration Recommendations, Win conducted a straw vote for both the restoration and water quality recommendations, for CAC adoption. Both were unanimously adopted in the straw poll.

RESTORATION WORKGROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

Win moved the conversation on to restoration recommendations and introduced Keith, president of the Cedar Lake Park Association. Keith explained how his working group on land management goals came to be. He described the process of their meetings, which has resulted in the document. He also thanked the CAC and the Park Board staff and the engaged community members. He listed the fundamental recommendations, with the most important being that the nature park at Cedar Lake. He walked through a diagram that captured all the initiatives and work that has happened around natural resources in the past at Cedar Lake. There is no comprehensive land management plan, so the recommendations call for a Natural Resources Management Plan. He listed some policies and plans that the Park Board already has passed, such as the Ecological System Plan. Keith gave a broad overview of the goals, noting goals for education and programming.

Public Comment on Natural Resources

- (Public) Is now the time to comment on northwest circulation issues?
 - (Project Staff) That'll be later.
- (Public) Honing in on it being a nature park. Its beautiful, wild, and natural. It's something we want to keep and nurture it, it's a jewel. We can't just leave it the way it is. It's gotta be nurtured, it's gotta be managed.
- (Public) Thank you for your presentation. As the Park Board goes about creating these management plans, does the proper staff exist at the park board to handle that now and will it require lots of resources?
 - (Keith) Our goals talk about staffing up and finding resources. We're talking about applying what's already Park Board policy. And they will need more people in environmental services, but the environmental budget has not increased in recent years.
 - (Project Staff) This is a 30 year plan, so it does give the Park Board time to build up resources.
- (Public) Can we ask about the bike path?
 - (CAC) Yes, later.

- (Public) Question for Keith, as a former park employee, I know CLPA has always been hands off in the Cedar Lake area. Trees that fall... You've always said "hands outta there." Give me a concrete thing for the Park Board to do in that area.
 - (Keith) The Natural Resources Management Plan, everything will evolve from there. A lot of work has happened, as I showed in the graphic, we even had goats.
 - (Public) Yeah, I know you had goats. There's still a lot of buckthorn.

CAC Discussion on Natural Resources

(CAC) Keith, when you talk about this high level regional park goal. The subpoint says maintain a low impact pedestrian and trail impact. That does not seem compatible with our suggestions on circulation.

- (Keith) That relates to the idea of room for all kinds of activity, but not everywhere. The west side of Brownie Lake is an MPRB-sanctioned area for mountain bikes, as are other areas, such as north of Highway 55. The mountain bike folks have been heard overtime and lots of resources are going into it, so the question becomes if that needs to be seen in Cedar Lake Park. It's pretty flat in Cedar Park so it's not great for bikes, that's what I'd say to that.

(CAC) Curious about if we're going to be approving this?

- (CAC) Yes.

(CAC) I have some questions under master plan level goals. Just a point of clarification on "boats, docks, and beaches," do we mean "boat racks"? I get the feel that we want to limit numbers of things.

- (Keith) We're introducing the idea of carrying capacity. The Park Board has established that they're not going to put more boats on the water than there are right now. Racks and docks are TBD, but the notion of how much is too much, of whatever kind of use, what's the carrying capacity of the land? That's what that means.

(CAC) Looking at the fifth line about directing bikers to regional trails, I would have trouble given what we're about to be proposing. I think everyone's aware of the existence of those regional trails, but I don't want to vote in favor of something that shuts down other things.

- (Project Staff) The Park Board is aware of the tension between the natural resources recommendations and the circulation recommendations.

(CAC) Thank you for your article, Keith, about the prairie maintenance that has not happened over the past several years. I'm surprised I don't see that in this.

- (Keith) We didn't call it out specifically, but it's alluded to in the need for a land management plan.

- (CAC) I think it would be helpful for our group to be as specific as possible for things that must be maintained. For example, we must burn these prairies every few years and if we do that, other species will take over. I don't think we have on the agenda to talk about the vast parcel of land that the Park Board is planning to take on. And I think that's something we need to discuss as a CAC and this plan would play right into that.
- (CAC) Are you proposing the language be edited to include burning the prairie?
- (CAC) Yes and include the remnant land.
- (Project Staff) The remnant land is in there already.
- (Keith) Yes, remnant is in there, and you make a good point about the prairie. But to date, there's not much written about how to manage these lands. There's been an inventory of the lands and a lot of them show up as high value. Phase 2 after the inventory calls for hiring and deciding how you're going to deal with the land. But we don't have details on it because they don't have staff, it hasn't been brought forward, there's many details.

(CAC) You didn't include the list of names who were involved, and I think it would be valuable to have that.

- (Keith) They're not there, but Project Staff has the roster.

(CAC) We can take a straw vote tonight but there are outstanding questions, so I think we need a finalized document. Is your group recommending that the CAC adopt this, as written? And that it be included in the master plan without changes?

- (Keith) Yes to all. And yes, no changes without discussion.
- (CAC) Okay, is the CAC okay with doing a straw poll? [General agreement among CAC] Any other last questions?
- (Public) I would offer a suggestion that the CAC not move conflicting documents forward.
- (CAC) Yes, if we are faced with this conflict, we must go back and revisit it.

Win conducted a straw vote for land management and water quality, for CAC adoption. Both were unanimously adopted in the straw poll.

A five minute break was called.

CIRCULATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Emma reconvened the group after the break. Win introduced Aaron's group and said that the process was very different with this group in comparison to the Water Quality Subcommittee, in who participated and how the process unfolded. Aaron responded that he had reached out to all the present CAC members and the working group was formed late because it was a response to the Preferred Park Concept. The working group consisted of seven members and Aaron reached out to them individually, as time and Park Board policy prevented group

meetings. The seven members had come to a consensus, and even those who didn't put their names in the seven had an issue with circulation and wanted something better.

The first recommendation was for a separate two-way bike path at Lake of the Isles, that would move around trees so as not to involve tree removal. To keep the net amount pavement from increasing, the recommendation included a 6ft width reduction of the parkway road around Lake of the Isles, which would still meet city design standards.

(Public) Would this take away parking?

- (Aaron) No, parking stays the same.

The next recommendation was for safety landing zones, which would squeeze the parkway to allow more space for pedestrians, so that they wouldn't walk right into a busy bike path. Aaron noted some spots where this would be especially beneficial, for example, along the south side of Cedar. The third recommendation called for a bike connector trail in Cedar Lake Park. This would be a sustainable, clearly separated, clearly signed, natural bike trail, which would resolve conflict between pedestrians and bikers. The fourth recommendation was for a boardwalk at northwest Cedar Lake and the final recommendation was that the encroachments at southeast Cedar Lake be terminated in 10 years.

Public Comment on Circulation

- (Public) Wearing my church council president hat here. When it comes to the narrowing of the parkway, the church has significant concerns related to access and safety. We are predominantly a commuter church here, the vast majority of our members drive here and they need to be able to access the area and then park and get to the building. The front of our church is signed handicapped parking on Sunday and during events. With a 16ft wide roadway, it works fine. If you take away 40% of the road, I'm concerned about accessibility, especially for handicapped members. I'm also very concerned about ice encroachment in the winter. Twenty-first street already narrows to the point of being effectively single lane. The parking doesn't get plowed in time. We have concerns about emergency vehicle access and we're concerned about special events where we might have limousines or funeral vehicles.
- (Public) I don't quite understand what the rationale is for the two-way bikeway. The distance is about 2.3 mi from what I recall. I've never heard anyone complain that it's one way. Maybe you can talk about why Isles and what the two way seeks to accomplish?
 - (Public) Some of us bike to commute. It's faster and safer. Also biking is my church, so I would prefer to bike than go to church.
- (Public) Hearing about the difficulties brought up, I don't understand. There were two groups that the public was invited to, but now there's a new group with private meetings that sprung up. We're part of the community too, we are the public and we

need to be consulted. This needs to unfold in front of us. With all of the fanfare about public engagement, I feel betrayed.

- (Public) I'm concerned about the two-way bike path for access and safety issues. To have a 6 ft bike lane and a 10 ft bike lane, the 6 ft is bad, you need that full width of the existing path. It's crazy to imagine. You have commuters, you have electric scooters, you have kids. This isn't for commuters, this is for recreation and families. This is where kids come to learn. A narrowing of these paths seems very dangerous. Crossing two bike lanes to get to the walking lane is inaccessible. I've crossed that path with a baby carriage and wheelchair, it's hard to cross a bike lane.
 - (Public) When I was thinking of narrowing, the points that you just made. I was thinking about the ebikes. You have children, commuters, and ebikes is a lot of traffic on a 6ft lane.
- (Public) I am absolutely opposed to this. I am a biker and I bike every day. An extra couple of miles should be no problem to you. Lake of the Isles is not meant of commuting, it's meant for exercise and enjoyment. In this neighborhood now, they've turned every road into a shared bike lane. The money should be spent on what this beautiful lake has to offer. Water the plants, clean the garbage, take out the weeds. I have lived here for 25 years and what I see is an interest to create something permanent that you can look at and see that you did. It's not okay.
- (Public) What do you envision is the speed limit on this path? It's 10 mph. It's really inappropriate for commuting.

CAC Discussion on Circulation

(CAC) I want to assume positive intent in what happened. There's been a lot of compression in all of this and I did see your email reaching out. But I don't remember being asked to be an actual official participant in this process and I would've liked to be involved. I would like to have an official process and an actual working group that is Park Board organized. And I'd like to have another meeting.

(CAC) I second that, I think this is an idea that needs vetting. I think we need to hear what the highway and road experts say about this. I think it has potential. I think there is a great need for a two-way bike path around Lake of the Isles and if there's a way to do it on the park lane, or in the street. If there was a two-way path, I would've ridden my bike tonight. But I didn't want to bike in the street in the dark.

(CAC) I saw that there were places in this plan where it needed to be two-way. I don't care about whether it's all the way around the lake but there are some places where it should be separate. In terms of anyone feeling blindsided, compared to many aspects of the plan, this was a response to what we didn't like about the plan. We saw pages and pages of public comment responding to the shortcomings with the plan. Aaron was responding to these. I don't think that

this, in comparison to land use and water quality, is the same. This is a response to concerns and an earnest proposal to respond to some of these concerns.

(CAC) I'd like to go back to what CAC Member said. There's not enough time to go into this, while project staff try to cut people off. So I like the idea of having a special meeting to hammer out this issue. I provided input and Aaron never got back to me on why he didn't include it. These proposals are new. I don't know if people know that you mean moving the curb out into the street. The other groups had goals and this is like engineering, sort of, doing the consultants jobs. I just think we really need to make sure we have enough time and we don't need to finish the evening.

- (Project Staff) We have been consulting with our multimodal consultants and we've gone over these recommendations and many are feasible.

(CAC) It's not that this was never discussed. We discussed this some time ago. I feel like this idea was vetted, and has been chosen not to be included. There's other things that this working group has come up with that I like but I don't think we need to relitigate this.

(CAC) To talk about the reasons I support the two-way—I hear, just ride in the street. I get passed too close, I get honked at. That's why I support that.

- (CAC) If the parkway is narrowed, anyone who rides there still will get doored or hit from behind.

(Aaron) The purpose of this wasn't that we would come here tonight and just vote. I'm open to continuing conversation because I want something strong. There are some comments about feeling blindsided. What was happening was one-on-one conversations with anyone who wanted to talk to me. There were no groups. This was a direct response to the concept, in a limited amount of time. CAC Member, your input wasn't included because I was working from a consensus. I apologize that it wasn't clear that input from everyone was valuable. About the lane width, I spoke with a transportation planner about their minimum width for a road with parking and including gutter and curb, it's 18 ft. What we measured, on the narrowest one way road without parking on Lake of the Isles Parkway, was 18 ft wide. So you could put parking everywhere around Lake of the Isles, because the narrowest part has 18ft.

(CAC) We can vote. I disagree with the Park Board policy about limiting the number of meetings.

- (Project Staff) The CAC members are volunteers. I have the responsibility to ensure that they all get to vote and don't peter out because they don't have time after years of working on this.

Continued Public and CAC Discussion on Circulation

(Public) I am concerned about process. What is the process going to be for reconciling what is up here on this screen and what's on the boards? I'm skeptical about this entire process.

What's the process going to be?

- (Project Staff) I have tried to do a clear and transparent process. The CAC is trying to balance all the feedback they receive from many different forms of engagement. Aaron was trying hard to find solutions that address the feedback but also hold community feedback in mind on the opposite side.
- (Public) Thank you. I have come to appreciate the process. But this doesn't jive with the process going forward.
- (CAC) I'm troubled by the process too. It either means vote it down tonight or keep going with more meetings. We're going to have another meeting. We've had no engineering review.
 - (Project Staff) We don't get into those details in the master plan. We try to assess feasibility and be fairly realistic. We're not going to get into the engineering.
 - (CAC) We certainly don't want to approve something that's not feasible. It'll be millions of dollars and ripping up the parkway.
 - (Project Staff) Our responsibility is to verify feasibility and we have done that. All of these things presented are feasible. I think making a group sounds great.

(CAC) The issue right now is process and how to move forward. I don't think anyone suggested that it was clandestine, but it is causing tension on this CAC. What I think everyone wants is a more transparent and more group-based consideration of some of these new ideas that would drastically change the process. A couple of us have already said let's table this tonight and figure.

- (Project Staff) Table all conversations?
- (CAC) Table the Circulation Working Group.
- (CAC) Let's take a look at these five issues as a whole. So everybody has a chance to participate, because this has been a difficult conversation tonight. We will obviously have to have another public meeting of the CAC, but we'll work offline as a committee as a whole
- (Public) We, as a public, have a right to be involved, and be part of the discussion of the five points. I don't want you guys to discuss it and come back.
- (CAC) We will do that.

(Project Staff) These recommendations are the result of engagement, which take into consideration the larger community beyond the folks in this room.

(Public) You've been showing us those plans and now he comes up with these plans.

- (Project Staff) He brought them to the CAC and the public to discuss.

(Public) Nobody listened at the last few meetings.

(CAC) Nothing's been adopted. It's all proposed. And that's why we're here. This is our first chance to provide feedback. It's a process of presenting feedback, iteration, feedback. I mean we're still going to have another feedback on a draft. Yeah, we keep talking about things, that's how we come to a better answer. We're doing what we can.

(Public) After all this, I don't have any questions. I don't have that document, I just have the plans. I live near Cedar Lake and I ride my bike 1hr a day, in the northeast corner some times. I thought a lot of what Aaron said was brilliant, particularly the boardwalk, because I don't see any other solution. I really appreciate your comments and work, I don't know about the process issues, but I like the work you did.

(CAC) We will clearly need more discussion on this, it needs to include the public. We haven't gotten to the other four topics tonight. I think patience is valuable and important. We have done that tonight. And we've heard what you have to say and we will figure out how to move forward.

(Project Staff) Should we create a subcommittee?

- (CAC) Yes, we can confirm later but would anyone like to be on a subcommittee?
[Approximately 8 CAC Members raised their hands] I'm not sure if there's any point trying to bring up another topic. We will figure out the process next.

A Circulation Subcommittee is forming and meetings are scheduled. See [Get Involved tab on project page](#) for details.

(Commissioner Abene) I would like to read a comment from Commissioner Shaffer. We do not have an easy job in managing these parks and all their users. There are gaps we see now, and gaps we will see in the future. Problems include water quality, maintaining healthy habitats, and maintenance. Already this summer, swimming has been closed at Cedar Lake. Will we lose it in the future? St. Louis Park continues to grow and their impact on water quality increases. In terms of healthy habitats, invasive jumping worms have been found. For maintenance, the community wants MPRB to better maintain its parks. We are expecting increased density and park usage and the question is whether the amenities will support these gaps? We want to make our parks great, and these parks are our basis for making Minneapolis great.

Win thanked all for attending the meeting and remaining mostly courteous in their comments.