



Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board
Cedar Lake and Lake of the Isles Master Plan
Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Water Quality Subcommittee Meeting #5

7/21/2022 6:00-8:00pm
Zoom Online Video Call

MPRB Staff and Consultants Present: Emma Pachuta (Project Manager), Madeline Hudek, Elsa Erling, Rachael Crabb; Erica Christensen (TENxTEN), Pat Conrad (EOR), Adam Arvidson

CAC Subcommittee Members Present: Anna Eleria (Subcommittee Chair), Drew McGovern, Constance Pepin

CAC Members Absent: Win Rockwell (CAC Chair), Nan Dreher, Laura Kinkead, Jim Romlin, Craig Wilson

Public: Throughout the evening approximately 6 members of the public joined the meeting

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

Emma welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked the subcommittee members to introduce themselves followed by staff and project consultants. Following introductions, Emma went through a land acknowledgment, the agenda, CAC group agreement, public online forum guidelines. Anna thanked all for contributing to this process and discussed the purpose of the meeting, which was to finalize the subcommittee's recommendations to bring to the full CAC for adoption. Emma explained where this meeting falls in the master plan process and previewed upcoming meetings.

INFORMATION SHARING AND CAC DISCUSSION

Rachael introduced herself and began by reviewing a timeline of previous water quality work at Cedar Lake and Lake of the Isles. She explained the MPRB approach and schedule for lake monitoring and collecting data on water quality. She explained the importance of having a Lake Management Plan. She moved on to describing MPRB's current aquatic plant management strategy, which is mechanical harvesting. She explained that mechanical harvesting is somewhat limited due to measures taken to avoid spreading zebra mussels between the lakes, and nearby construction is another complicating factor. The need to acquire DNR permits also constrains harvesting efforts. Rachael also discussed the goose management program and explained that it has reduced numbers of geese over time. In addition to managing geese, more can be done in terms of education to reduce bacteria in the lakes. Dog waste is a source of

bacteria in the lake, so continued education is needed for dog owners. Stormwater management and beach maintenance are also factors in the bacteria levels. Rachael explained that at Cedar beaches, most years have good water quality, low bacteria levels, and no beach closures.

(Project Staff, *in chat*) More info on aquatic plant management:

https://www.minneapolisparcs.org/park-care-improvements/water_resources/aquatic-plant-management/

Aquatic Invasive Species program info: https://www.minneapolisparcs.org/park-care-improvements/invasive_species/aquatic_invasive_species/

(CAC, *in chat*) I assume the plants uptake some phosphorus, does harvesting result in a net decrease in phosphorus as new plants grow back? Or is there no link?

- (Project Staff) It's complicated. Some plants, coontail for example, are not rooted so all their phosphorus is from the water column. Milfoil and other plants are rooted so their phosphorus also comes from the ground. It's a little bit of both, because we have multiple kinds of plants.
- (Project Staff) Different plants also hold phosphorus in different parts of their biomass so it also depends on which part of the plant you harvest.
- (CAC) Do you think that the harvesting results in a net decrease in the lake?
- (Project Staff) It decreases it somewhat but I don't know that it makes a difference in the lake at the current level.

(CAC) Relating to the 45,000 pounds of dog waste per day, is that in the Chain of Lakes area or citywide?

- (Project Staff) Citywide and it's a rough estimate.
- (CAC) Do you know to what extent some of that dog waste will impact water quality? My understanding is that when the waste is left, especially on a hardscape, it can be swept into the waterways. I heard that leaves are the main problem and the next problem is dog waste.
- (Project Staff) We had a canine program, Canines for Clean Water, with dog themed movies and tabling. Dog owners took a pledge to pick up waste. You're right that if dog waste is left on a hard surface, it can immediately get to a waterway. I think Minneapolis does quite a good job on picking up dog waste. There has been a study of E. coli that indicated that we were doing a good job of picking up waste because of these awareness programs.
- (CAC) Are you able to quantify it?
- (Project Staff) No.
- (Project Staff) We have some numbers based on general water quality monitoring, so in that way, the dog waste component was captured within those numbers.
- (CAC) Is it true that leaves and dog waste are the main contributors?

- (Project Staff) It varies depending on where you are. Lawn clippings and leaves can be a big component. Open dirt areas and construction sites are another example of components. Even basic atmospheric deposition contains phosphorus. And the city does a good job of sweeping up lawn clippings.
- (Project Staff, *in chat*) Beach Water Quality Status map
<https://minneapolisparcs.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=88319f73c7904adcbabccacdff38bbf1>
 For more on the Canines for Clean Water education program, there's a tab on this page:
<https://www.minneapolisparcs.org/parks-destinations/dog-parks/>

(CAC) Thank you for your presentation and I'm glad that a Lake Management is recommended. You mentioned that the geese management program was effective, what aspect of that program was important in that success? Was it the shoreline restoration? How do the shorelines compare today?

- (Project Staff) Before those projects, most of the lakes had low turf to the water's edge so geese had space everywhere. Having the shoreline be taller, tall to a goose, was important because it cuts off their sightlines and they don't feel as comfortable and will leave. In the 90s, the Park Board was moving toward a taller shoreline but it wasn't fully understood what maintenance was needed, so they did not have the right knowledge or staff for the maintenance that a natural shoreline needs. This led to a lot of informal shoreline access spots. It's good that this current plan proposes reducing some of those informal access. The tall shoreline buffer was probably the most beneficial piece to reduce the goose population because it's not as hospitable for them.

(CAC, *in chat*) (side note, doesnt really add to the overall discussion) A month or two ago the Twin Ports RSPT shared some of what they are doing at an MS4 webinar. They have a lot of PSA's that they have produced and aired on local TV. One of them covered pet waste and was creative. https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC_HnNsJsamQSPwLYENHn3Gw

The conversation moved on to Erica (TenxTen) and Pat's (EOR) responses to outstanding CAC questions from the previous meeting. On the question about Dog Park Treatment, Pat explained that there was not firm evidence that the dog park contributes significantly to poor water quality. He showed a diagram of the dog park topography and explained that an underground treatment would be the most effective water quality improvement strategy. Picking up waste, minimizing eroded areas, and increasing infiltration capacity in the area are other important strategies.

(CAC) Is there a small area that is turf in the dog park? Is that the only turf?

- (Project Staff) There aren't necessarily turfed areas, like mowed, but there are grass areas where the dogs are.
- (CAC) From the road it looks fully mulch inside the fence. Is there turf inside the fence?

- (Project Staff) I believe there is some turf inside the fence. We would propose putting our treatment mostly outside that fence area for maintenance reasons.

(Project Staff) When it comes to dog parks, we have guidance in the Ecological Systems Plan (ESP) to implement treatment. We are about to implement a new dog park at Marcy Park which will include a treatment facility similar to the dry trench that is shown here. So that's the direction we're going, so it wouldn't be out of bounds to be talking about this in this master plan.

- (CAC) Does that plan try to quantify how the flow is treated and where the flow goes?
- (Project Staff) I'm not deeply involved in the project so I know that it's following the ESP but I don't know what quantification was done. I'd have to do some digging.
- (Project Staff, *in chat*) Here's the recommendation from the Ecological System Plan for reference: 4. 5. Ensure interdepartmental coordination on dog park siting, design, maintenance, and signing, to ensure impacts to water bodies are minimized
- (Project Staff, *in chat*) Also 4.6 Develop a standard BMP for bacteria reduction at dog parks. And while we're on the Ecological System Plan, here's language about geese that is applicable to this plan's solutions: 4. 7. Modify habitat to discourage use by geese by reducing preferred food sources, limiting preferred nesting areas, and modifying preferred sight lines and access to open water through shoreline restoration, reduction of turfgrass, and increased emergent vegetation

(CAC) Thanks, Project Staff, for looking at the dog park. Based on what I'm hearing, it seems to me that we should include it in the master plan as a strategy to incorporate. While the hope is most dog owners would pick up after their pets, that may not always be the case and it's difficult to maintain high infiltrating soils over time. This dog park is also very close to the streets so there is no vegetative buffer. So I recommend treatment be included in the master plan.

Erica moved on to a question about a lack of littoral edge in the South Cedar area. EOR assumed that the area was too deep for a littoral edge but upon revisiting the site, there did seem to be some vegetation there. She explained that language could be added to the write up to suggest that pending a site analysis, littoral edge may be possible there. The case was similar at North Lake of the Isles, where the preferred park concept doesn't show littoral edge, though a narrow edge does exist there now. There may not be space to expand it, but it can be maintained. When EOR was mapping, they did not see aquatic beds and assumed it was deeper, but a littoral edge could be maintained here, after a site analysis.

(CAC) Thank you for taking a closer look at those areas. It's good to see that there could be some more areas to restore the shoreline. A lot of areas will need a site analysis but I think it's still good to place these areas.

(CAC) I'm curious as to whether the consultant team talked about the changing water levels that we will experience. We are currently in a semi-drought but there will be years with a lot of flooding. Is it outside of our scope to talk about this?

- (Project Staff) We can't predict what's going to happen but the master plan will make the shoreline more resilient to change. The natives in there are going to be much more resilient to change, something I can see in my own yard. Having that more natural shoreline is really going to make for a more resilient environment.

(CAC) People have been concerned about the invasives that have taken over the areas that have previously been planted. It's very depressing and sad to see. It seems that on the outside of the littoral edge there's all these invasives, like yellow clover, and if you peer through that you can see the quality plants. Are the plants near the water doing their job, and just the outer layer is degraded?

- (Project Staff) In general, most invasives are very opportunistic. They're able to take over areas at the margin, areas that aren't fully vegetated, any open soil. So it's a challenge in any landscaped area, it's just the nature of the beast.
- (Project Staff) Totally agree and it also goes back to maintenance. There is a maintenance component and we have to have the trained staff to meet the quality goals.
- (CAC) I bring this up because it's affecting the openness of the community to supporting this part of the program. Some people have said they don't want this strategy because there's not enough staff to support it. I just am putting that out there because I share this concern. It would be awful if we didn't incorporate some of these features in the plan but it seems like it won't get a lot of support from the public.
- (Project Staff) Sometimes our planning is out ahead of our ability to staff something on purpose. The planning expresses a desire that drives the change in staffing. Look to Nokomis and other master plans that call for naturalization. We will need to be transforming our workforce and our board put forth some naturalizations and presumably that will include changes in the workforce. While I understand the concerns, it's good to put these things in the master plans because it helps us get funding and helps us communicate our priorities for staffing.
- (CAC) I'm encouraged to hear that. I think sometimes the gap is so vast so I'm encouraged that the strategy would include staffing up to close that gap.
- (Project Staff) When we do these naturalized areas. The first three to five years is really critical. At Lake Nokomis, we were able to do a 3-year maintenance agreement with the installer and the state is helping to fund it. So we can get a really good head start without relying on internal forces. So that's a direction we are definitely going; when we do installations with private contractors, we include that they continue maintenance.
- (CAC) That's good to hear. I hope that the contractors are also qualified and have the same aspirations, and don't use traditional landscaping practices that are at odds with these goals.

(Project Staff) Before we move on, another area that was mentioned at the last meeting. CAC member was looking at treatment on the southwest side of Cedar Lake. There is a nice triangle there that could be a rain garden. We will have to look at the grade but that does look like a nice opportunity. So, just wanted to mention that we did look at that.

PUBLIC COMMENT TIME

Following the discussion, Emma transitioned the conversation to public comment time and explained that it was a time for community members to make comments related to the master plan. Emma asked folks to write 'yes' or their name in the chat box if they wanted to share feedback verbally. Folks could also write feedback in the chat box during this time (recorded below).

- (Public) I live in District Three but spend a lot of time at Isles, in the winter especially. I work on the Luminary Loppet. I've seen the goals for reducing phosphorus and I wonder if chloride is also a problem in the lake. In the winter we see a lot of inflow from the stormwater system. Is that a problem in the lake? If it is a problem, why isn't it part of this plan?
 - (Project Staff) It is addressed in the plan in terms of reducing chloride loading to the lakes. That's more of a programmatic and watershed issue and it's being looked at at the metro area scale.
 - (Public) Is there anything in the plan to directly address it through swales or rain gardens or things that would take stormwater and divert it?
 - (Project Staff) Yes, many of the practices we're including for nutrients will also address chloride. It moreso has to do with reduced salt use on paths and more programmatic strategies.
 - (Project Staff) Part of the chloride management strategy is that we have reduced our winter maintenance and are only maintaining one path around the river rather than two. And a lot of the water that drains into the lake is from outside of the parklands so it is a problem best addressed on a higher level.
- (Public, *in chat*) Appreciate Rachel's informative presentation & applaud the water quality initiatives she cited. But we need to admit that these initiatives ultimately aren't working successfully, as water quality has declined continually over the 15 years that I've lived on Isles. Isles was as eutrofied by this May as it usually is in September.... Paddle boarding & kayaking are virtually impossible. Cedar has been closed for swimming several days this summer.
Three questions:
 - Why does DNR prohibit harvesting within 15' of littoral edge (which means that 70% of Isles can't be harvested)? Could that be reduced to 5' or 10'?
 - Has MPRB/City considered installing store after catchments/basins to settle runoff pollutants before they enter Isles?
 - Should Isles be drained & dredged to prevent it from returning to marsh/swamp?

- (Project Staff) Comment times are mostly for sharing feedback and we cannot answer every single question. The second questions are best addressed through the Lake Management Plan.
 - (Project Staff) Currently, we harvest 40%. It isn't 15 ft from the littoral edge, the littoral edge is part of that 15 ft.
- (Public, *in chat*) I missed the beginning was there any conversation about the new algae that came to Cedar this season?
 - (Project Staff) In this meeting we have not discussed anything about algae.
- (Public, *in chat*) Other than the fishing dock on Cedar, will there be any accommodation for people fishing?
 - (Project Staff) We've added formalized access point that can support further fishing.
 - (Public, *in chat*) I asked about fishing because the buffers would block fishing or the fishers would damage the buffer.
- (Project Staff, *in chat*) We just learned that the chatbox was off for attendees until now. I apologies for the error!
- (Public, *in chat*) Is there a recommendation to encourage residents around the lake to create rain gardens and/or ban pesticides?
 - (Project Staff) That is not a goal thus far and it is outside of our jurisdiction.
 - (CAC) There is a broad goal about educating the community about stormwater runoff. It's less specific to rain gardens but there is a goal about education.
- (Public) Thank you for the presentation, I think it really helped connect some dots. Representing CIDNA and myself, we would like to see the recommendations reflect the Clean Water Partnership. I think there's a great opportunity for a public campaign to position the park users to be stewards. If folks don't know about these things, it's difficult to shift behaviors.
- (Public, *in chat*) Kenwood Neighborhood Association has worked with Metro Blooms to help residents install raingardens but it's the streets that create the vast majority of the runoff.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS AND PRIORITIES

Following Public Comment Time, Emma moved on to the last part of the meeting, where the CAC would make final recommendations.

(CAC) Can we strengthen the master plan on public engagement and public involvement? The Canines for Clean Water is a great example of the Park Board going beyond a limited role in trying to influence people's behavior. I think the Park Board is so well positioned to engage the public in protecting our lands and I know we have some really strong agencies that put out a lot of great stuff about using salt. Couldn't this be something that the Park Board takes on? Especially because we talk about volunteers being recruited to care for our parkland? Some

volunteers would be happy to participate in these public education programs. We have the goal and maybe we can develop some more strategies that can be built into the master plan.

- (CAC) Good point. A question I have for the Park Board, we haven't put any programmatic strategies in the park concept and what's in there is all structural. Is this the place to be offering strategies that are nonstructural? If you typically don't, we as a subcommittee could make those recommendations regardless and bring it to the CAC.
- (Project Staff) The ongoing programmatic recommendations in master plans have been more limited. Sometimes there are a few but the master plan really does guide the physical improvement and management of the park site because one purpose of it is to guide capital improvement projects. Our Ecological Systems Plan was created to have some guidance about some of the issues we're talking about right now, and Project Staff is adding details in the chat. The ESP touches the entire city, so in some ways, that's a more powerful location for it rather than making a programmatic recommendation in just two lakes. That's not to say that we can't make programmatic recommendations in the master plan, but the ESP was created more for that purpose. Education is an important part of the ESP at the moment.
- (Project Staff) Our environmental education department works closely with the city and they have a stormwater education requirement. So we do stormwater education all over the city every year.
- (CAC) Sounds like there are larger efforts. I don't feel strongly that we need to include recommendations for education, do others have an opinion?
- (CAC) I hear what Project Staff is saying, but most people don't know about the ESP. It does make sense to me, but I don't want to push it if there's other ways that this will happen. But given that our focus is water quality in this master plan, it would make sense to me.
- (Project Staff) You make a good point about people not knowing, so maybe we can pull out these strategies from the ESP and put them in the master plan as touch points and reminders of other initiatives and policies. We can highlight these recommendations from the ESP in the master plan. There are policy documents that reinforce exactly what you want to do. Maybe instead of reinventing language we can pull some of those documents right in.
- (CAC) Can we suggest that the CAC prioritize certain ones of those strategies that already exist in the ESP?
- (Project Staff) Yes, that's guidance that the CAC can provide.
- (Project Staff, *in chat*) Ecological System Plan: Recommendation 1. 9. Expand public education regarding salt impacts on water bodies
4. 2. Continue and expand public education about no feeding of waterfowl
4. 3. Continue and expand public education about dog waste collection and environmental impacts from dog waste

There's also one in Parks for All, MPRB Comprehensive Plan 2021-2036: Goal 4, Strategy 6: Expand educational and programming partnerships

- environment and water quality;
- youth education and leadership around climate justice;
- art and engagement;
- culturally relevant programs and events.

Stormwater information: https://www.minneapolisparcs.org/park-care-improvements/water_resources/stormwater/

Anna led the CAC through a review of the draft final goals for water quality, and she explained the edits that had been made since the last meeting, mostly minor changes in language and the addition of an introductory paragraph. She recommended that the subcommittee support the goals and agree to bring them to the CAC next week.

(CAC) Minor thing, the goal says to “reinvigorate the partners of the Clean Water Partnership,” but don’t we mean reinvigorate the actual partnership itself? I hear support for that from CIDNA and others.

- (Project Staff) I think it’s just a word choice, but yes it would be the partnership that we’re reinvigorating.
- (CAC) I like that change, CAC Member.

(CAC) Anything else?

- (CAC) I read through these changes before the meeting and I thought it looked good.
- (CAC) I am very impressed. Project Staff, I wanna thank you and the time and effort you have put into this process. I feel very grateful to you for that.
- (Project Staff) Thank you, it’s always a team effort. Do we need anything more formal to move these goals forward?
- (Project Staff) We would usually call for a vote at this point. We can also take a vote on the actual water quality elements of the concept too. You can do those together as a vote, and that will empower CAC Member to go forward to the CAC with the group’s endorsement.

(CAC) My preference is a vote on this first and then move on. Do you approve these water quality goals?

All three present CAC members voted to approve the water quality goals.

Anna moved on to the second action, which was to determine if there is support for the water quality strategies in the plan and to see what additional strategies should be included, if any. Anna reviewed the add list from the meeting, which included BMP treatment near the dog

park, extending the littoral edge areas, sufficient maintenance, and water quality public education programming.

(Project Staff) I wonder if maintenance could fit into the prioritization discussion.

(CAC) I have a related question, can the master plan include dealing with the invasive species that have overtaken the existing plantings? It's not new, but it's not working now. Can we try to retrofit or enhance the effectiveness of previous efforts to improve water quality?

- (Project Staff) That would probably be included inherently in the master plan in some of the descriptive sections, where we could talk about present shoreline buffers that are in need of maintenance and enhancement. I think that's hard to show on a masterplan graphic, but we can certainly include it in the narrative.
- (CAC) It should be focused on invasive species, not just rebalancing the mix but really calling out that it's the invasive species undermining these areas.
- (Project Staff) I think what Project Staff has typed is satisfactory to me and we can include that language if that's satisfactory to the group.
- (CAC) That looks fine
- (CAC) Looks fine to me. We want to make sure, is it also in the goals document?
- (Project Staff) Yes, I believe it is already in the goals to control invasive species.
- (CAC) Oh, I see it in the goals.
- (Project Staff) There's also a strategy in the ESP in case that should be reinforced in the master plan. I will add it to the document.
- (CAC) Could it just say "implement an invasive species management strategy"? And it would imply working with partners.
- (CAC) I would add the word "develop" as well, as invasive species are specific to each area. Those are good additions, anything else?

(CAC) Can we take a look at what there is about the pipes? Are we selecting specific pipes that are doing the worst damage, dumping the most water from the suburbs in?

- (Project Staff) You mean, will we be prioritizing?
- (CAC) yes. I think one of the sentiments expressed during meetings was that rather than spend money on new structures, spend them on fixing this stormwater infrastructure.
- (Project Staff) This graphic identifies all the existing outfalls and then those where we can do stormwater treatment in the park. Some we cannot treat because there is no land. So these are the places where we will do end-of-pipe treatment.
- (Project Staff) Essentially we can't address the worst ones, because the worst are the biggest, which need the most space to treat, which is what we don't have. The biggest one is at Cedar Lake Meadows, so that area is the biggest loader to the lake, and retrofits there will be the best way to improve the lake.
- (CAC) Where is that on our goals?
- (Project Staff) Our goals might not name it, but we have it in our priorities.

- (Project Staff) The link to the goals is through the one about reinvigorating the Clean Water Partnership, as there will need to be top and middle pipe interventions. The pipes that we can't treat default to the Clean Water Partnership goals.
- (CAC) Maybe there can be another sub-bullet. Right now there's the perception that our stormwater system is outdated. So should there be mention that we will be trying to modernize some of that infrastructure?
- (Project Staff) I think the second bullet goal was trying to touch on the retrofit.
- (Project Staff) The fourth bullet was also addressing this. It might not be totally explicit, but it's in there. The staff has identified the pipes we can treat and the ones we can't, where we must rely on the CWP, so that is our philosophical stance.
- (CAC) Maybe in that second goal, where it says "it's still working," we can say "can accommodate the increased challenges of climate change," something like that?
- (CAC) Maybe, "it's still working and has the capacity to convey runoff in a changing climate."
- (Project Staff) Is that a friendly amendment to your agreed upon goals?
- (CAC) Yes
- (CAC) Yes, I like bringing up climate change. My only concern would be encouraging bringing bigger pipes into the lake, but I see the intent here.
- (CAC) Okay, so we have a friendly amendment there. Can we go back to the strategies?

(Project Staff) We may have to do prioritization as a survey out to the CAC as we are running out of time.

(CAC) Yes, there was one last strategy I wanted to bring up, which CAC Member has talked about. We'd like to see the included strategy of taking advantage of the triangle of green space west of France Ave, pending an assessment of that area.

- (Project Staff) It would also be important to look at the current use of space there.
- (CAC) Any other thoughts?
- (CAC) It makes sense, and addresses more regional outflow, and could encourage our other partners like St. Louis Park to do something.
- (CAC) Could we also include that it should be designed to expand habitat as opposed to another type of treatment that wouldn't do that?
- (Project Staff) Our Ecological System Plan would only allow regional treatment in our parks if there are other stacked benefits for park visitors, for example, being around wildlife. But I think that's fair to put in this recommendation. All of our treatments in our plan would have to have stacked benefits and not just be holding basins.
- (CAC) Great, I think we have support for including that triangle in our water quality treatment strategies. Anything else? I think we can call a vote about what's listed in this document. Those in favor say Aye.

All three CAC members present voted in favor of the list of recommendations.

(CAC) Alright, we have consensus. Great!

- (Project Staff) That deserves applause.
- (Project Staff) I'm sure all the other members who could not be here tonight would have voted "Aye" as well.

(CAC) Okay, I know there was one action we were going to take which was prioritizing the actions. Do we have time to do this now or should we do this offline?

- (Project Staff) The CAC should decide if you want to take 30 min to do it now. Otherwise I can send out a survey and get together a draft.
- (CAC) I would prefer the survey and I like the idea of pulling in the rest of the CAC.
- (Project Staff) I'm hearing you have interest in sending it to the full CAC?
- (CAC) Yes
- (CAC) I like the idea of a survey and like how you've set it up. If we sent it to the CAC would we need to have a meeting to bring them up to speed?
- (CAC) Good point. I think we've taken a vote on the other two actions, so I'd like us to do the same for this. Maybe we can meet early?
- (Project Staff) The Water Quality Subcommittee is well versed on these items and this survey can be a litmus test among the subcommittee. I think the CAC will want to weigh in on prioritization among the whole master plan and water quality is an important part of that. The whole CAC, who are less informed about water quality, could use the subcommittee's opinions and roll them in with their overall prioritization of other parts of the master plan. My recommendation is that the survey just goes out to the Water Quality Subcommittee.
- (CAC) That makes sense. We can go forward with the survey, adding the new recommendations to the list, and then the Park Board staff can evaluate the results and present it to us at the CAC meeting.
- (Project Staff) I can get that survey out tomorrow so that subcommittee members have a chance to look at it ahead of time.

Emma thanked all for their attendance and work.

(CAC) I wonder if we can just ask if the remaining two attendees have any last comments.

- (Project Staff) Yes, we can pull them in.

(CAC) The triangle area across the street, what's it being used for now?

- (Project Staff) I think it's just lawn with some large trees.
- (CAC) I drive by that space regularly and see people maybe throwing a ball with some dogs, but it's underutilized.
- (CAC) There's a big bike group that meets there once a week. I can see it from my house and my kids sometimes use it. There's an intersection area that floods.

(Public) I appreciate the opportunity to reflect at the tail end here. I think they were all value-add movements and that discussion about that land around France was a good one. It wasn't in the master plan originally and we pushed to include it, otherwise it'll just be no mans land and turf forever. And the goal is to migrate away from turf. That's all that comes to mind right now, thank you!

(CAC) Is planting trees, would that be better than an open lot? I would hate to lose mature canopy trees to a treatment feature.

- (Project Staff) Yes absolutely, I don't see any need to remove those trees. I think we can work around them.

(Project Staff) Wonderful, I hope everyone's okay if I wrap the meeting. Thank you all!

Public comments from the chat:

- Thank you all! 1/6 hearings on also here so keeping mic off