



Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board
Cedar Lake and Lake of the Isles Master Plan
Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #13

8/23/2022 6:00-8:00pm

Board Room at Mary Merrill MPRB Headquarters

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

CAC Members Present: Aaron Shaffer, Adam Braun, Alice Lehman, Anna Eleria, Ben Surma, Constance Pepin, Craig Wilson, Jim Romlin, Joshua Christensen, Linda Mack, Michaela West, Nan Dreher, Drew McGovern, Win Rockwell (CAC Chair)

CAC Members Absent: Eric Gangl, Lilia Theisen, Laura Kinkead, James Reid (Alternate), Will Stensrud (Alternate)

Public: Throughout the evening approximately 16 members of the public joined the meeting

WELCOME AND HOUSEKEEPING

Emma welcomed everyone to the meeting. She began with the land acknowledgment and then moved on to agenda for the night. She briefly introduced the CAC members and reminded everyone of the discussion guidelines for the meeting. She welcomed the public to speak at the meeting and noted other avenues to give feedback, such as the Hopes and Concerns boards. Emma then outlined where this final meeting stood in the larger master plan process. She displayed slides of the top feedback received on the Preferred Park Concept. To conclude, she previewed the four votes that would take place later in the meeting.

CIRCULATION SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS DISCUSSION

Emma invited Craig to share on the Circulation Subcommittee.

(Craig) Thank you. Show of hands, who is unfamiliar with the Circulation Subcommittee? Alright, we're in an audience that we don't need to dig into the nitty gritty. We spent two meetings addressing several motions, there were many that passed, one that was denied, and one that tied. I want to call out one motion where we had a friendly amendment presented by

Constance. Can we go to that wording? Constance, do you want to talk about your friendly amendment?

(Constance) This one relates to the “General” recommendations, if everyone has this packet. So General at the bottom of page two, Pedestrian Safety Improvements. “On the east side of Cedar Lake Parkway, add an additional paved pedestrian path next to the existing bicycle trail to allow for direct pedestrian access alongside the parkway at two specific locations.” I feel this should not have been brought forward this late in the process, but I did suggest one specific change. Instead of this one that talks about for sure building a path, because there’s one area where it’s not needed. There were already improvements made in this area. For those that are unfamiliar, there’s a plaza and sidewalk alongside the parking lot. So I’m suggesting to address bike and pedestrian conflict while minimizing paving and runoff. I think there should be some assessment before a commitment is made because we are trying to reduce hardscape and minimize impervious surfaces.

- (Craig) I ran this motion by Aaron who presented the motion initially. I’d like his feedback.
- (Aaron) Thanks for the suggestion. I think that’s the heart of the plan. If I were to change something, it would be to make sure the project team knows that there is a problem of people who are walking or running, maybe after daylight hours, and don’t want to walk in the forest, so they’ll choose to use the path. So that’s the spirit of this solution.
- (Craig) So Aaron does accept your amendment.

Craig initiated a vote on whether to accept the amendment to the motion. Thirteen CAC members voted in favor of the amendment, with one abstention.

(CAC) This is new to me, so I’m going to abstain.

(Craig) I think the Park Board understands both sides and will do their best with this motion.

Craig went on to explain nuance for a couple of circulation motions.

(Craig) There’s been concern about what we mean by considering a path on southeast shore. And also concern about the bike path on Lake of the Isles that would eat into parkway. So I talked to Park Board staff and it’s very clear to them that this is not permission for them to do those things. Those are things that would need to be discussed later with more community engagement and input.

CAC COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT TOPICS

(Win) Okay, we are going to two rounds of community engagement topics that Project Staff would like to have the group discuss. Do you want to clarify why we’re bringing this up?

Emma introduced two topics that would be discussed by the CAC in a Round Robin format. The first question was whether to add a permanent building or restroom. The second was whether to incorporate a picnic shelter in the plan. Emma explained that these had been important topics in the recent phase of community engagement. At the same time, early in the process there had been a lot of opposition to permanent restrooms and picnic shelters. Through the Round Robin, the CAC would be able to weigh in and the project staff would carefully consider their feedback.

(Win) Thank you. We can do this alphabetically, but it's easier if we go around, is that okay? On whether to consider a permanent restroom, just adding a couple other thoughts. The temporary restrooms are open 24/7, so that's a factor that we all need to bear in mind. The permanent structures are not open 24/7. When we think of permanent, we tend to think "permanently open," but that's not the case, so just bear that in mind. Ultimately, we get the feedback and each of us casts our own individual vote, or in this case, opinion.

(CAC) That's a good point that Win made about the availability, something to keep in mind here. A lot of folks prefer the idea of a permanent structure, but when it's closed it's quite frustrating. I am open to a permanent structure, not sure where it would be. I think it should be in a highly-used area with the most traffic, where it's good for the greatest number of people.

(CAC) I went last weekend all around and through the project area and I was really struck by how nice the structure on Cedar South Beach is. The community worked hard to get that approved. I would guess that Lake of the Isles has many more visitors than Cedar. And port-a-potties are not that nice, you can't wash your hands. I think the southwest corner of Lake of the Isles, near the activity fields, would be a possible location.

(CAC) I could go either way. The availability of a bathroom is on a higher priority for me. If we do put something, water quality is my concern—that we're treating this bathroom.

(CAC) I have spoken in support of a permanent structure before. South Cedar Beach is only open seasonally, but it could be something like that, on Isles. And East Point Beach. They're much more pleasant to use than port-a-potties. And looking at what happened recently with port-a-potties being burned down, permanent is good.

(CAC) I generally support a permanent restroom. From the public comments, people were asking for changing rooms, drinking fountains and the ability to wash their hands. One thing that I acknowledge is for one of these bathrooms to be open year-round, a heated facility.

(CAC) I am also supportive of a permanent restroom structure. For ADA accessibility, washing hands, changing stations, that's easier with a permanent structure. I would like to see it open year-round.

(CAC) I'm in support of one or two additional permanent restroom structures. What's currently available is one at each of the Chain of Lakes. Lake of the Isles does not have one, so that would be a priority for me, for the number of reasons outlined by my colleagues.

(CAC) My concern is accessibility. Making sure that people have regular spaced intervals for bathroom breaks is critical. I think port-a-potties are easier on that front. For a permanent restroom, there needs to be a serious investigation of maintenance costs. I think the one at South Cedar Beach cost \$1 million, which is a lot of port-a-potties. So we need to be prudent with resources. I'm not opposed to one in a discreet location, not in the viewsheds.

(Win) In my ideal world we'd have permanent restrooms, always open. But we don't live in that world. I think the Park Board would have to test itself with existing restrooms to have them always open during daylight hours, cleaned, and safe. And only when we see improved performance there should anyone think of the high cost of adding a structure and maintenance.

(CAC) I would be in favor of a permanent restroom structure. My idea of where is at East Cedar Lake Beach where the light rail is letting off. That would be a welcoming place. I do hear people talking about the lack of restrooms at Lake of the Isles. A million does seem like a lot, it is a nice facility.

(CAC) It would be ideal to have a permanent restroom at each lake and supplement with port-a-potties enclosed by decent structures. I would prefer year-round access. If we can improve what we have, make it as attractive as possible.

(CAC) I'm also in support of a permanent restroom. I like it being at Isles and being discreet is important. It increases accessibility and it's important for water quality.

(CAC) I do not support a permanent structure. We heard a lot from the public that these are not going to meet the need. Port-a-potties do. We talked about updated styles for these. I agree with the concerns about maintenance and it's just not necessary to meet the need so I really oppose this.

(CAC) I support the addition of any restroom. I prefer a temporary because of the usability but I am not opposed to a permanent restroom, if we are able to use it year-round. Every time I've been on a run and needed to use the restroom at South Cedar Beach, it's been locked. If we can find an upgraded port-a-potty, that would be nice.

(Win) We will turn to picnic shelters.

Emma introduced the second question, about whether to add a picnic shelter. As with restrooms, this was a frequent topic in the recent community engagement, despite earlier strong opposition. The design team would incorporate the feedback given by the CAC.

(Win) When you used the term “picnic shelter,” you mean a concrete pad, open sides, and a roof?

- (Emma) There are a lot of design options, but generally, yes.

(Win) There’s only one picnic shelter at Bde Maka Ska and one at Harriet, at the Refectory.

- (CAC) It’s not at the Refectory, it’s further to the south at Beard’s Plaisance.
- (Win) It’s right next to it.
- (CAC) Not really.
- (CAC) Close enough.
- (Win) There is a different one right next to the Refectory.
- (Project Staff) There are two different locations.
- (CAC) There are none in this plan.

(Win) We’re being asked to revisit something that’s already been decided.

- (Project Staff) I don’t know if the CAC has actually visited this topic.
- (Win) Everyone’s had a chance to comment on this plan.
- (Project Staff) The design team decided not to include it, but feedback has pointed in this direction.
- (Win) This is an exception to everything we’ve been doing.

(CAC) I’m agnostic. I don’t see the need for one, but if there has been resounding community engagement, then yes, I agree. Otherwise, it doesn’t matter to me.

(CAC) We already talked about this and it’s similar to the permanent structure conversation. I think people were supportive of picnic tables and I think that’s the idea solution. The tables can easily be moved, don’t require a concrete pad, have some flexibility and seasonality. I don’t support a structure and it doesn’t matter to me that it’s not like the other lakes, they don’t have to be like them. They can be their own unique lakes.

(CAC) I resonate with CAC Member. These are different, unique lakes and I find a large structure here bothersome. I support gathering spaces but not a picnic shelter.

(CAC) I don’t feel strongly. I do not see a place where a picnic shelter would be appropriate on Lake of the Isles. I can imagine there might be a place it can fit in at Cedar.

(CAC) I would, if it were positioned right, be in favor. The logical place is East Cedar Lake Beach. I would say, hearing the discussion come up again and again about impervious surfaces, I would gladly trade some parking spots. When you've got church and community groups that want to schedule a picnic or event, when there's bad weather, they can't do it. It does meet a community need.

(Win) I'm concerned about a picnic shelter because of the continuing maintenance problem. Adding more costs worries me. I understand the need, but I think the Park Board simply has to show a better record with maintenance first.

(CAC) Agreed. If you do proceed, I think the only place that could work is the south side of Lake of the Isles, near Bde Maka Ska. It should not be in the historic Grand Rounds area, on the lawns. If it's at Cedar, it needs to be hidden away. We're seeing an uptick of encampments and I fear this could become a place to live. Birds also have been nesting in these shelters. The Park Board needs to think about it comprehensively and have a strategy for managing it.

(CAC) This was a tough one for me. I think there's a need for picnic tables and I like their flexibility. With the increase in visitor usage from neighborhood and other areas, I see how picnic shelters meet the need. We spend hours with larger groups in our park system and they can't walk across the street to a big back yard and enjoy that space. I can see the need and if the Park Board is hearing from the community, it should be considered and done in an environmentally friendly way.

(CAC) I don't have strong feelings about it, but I would be supportive in an area with a lot of demand, like by the light rail.

(CAC) I am not a big picnic shelter user, but I hear the need from the community engagement and I try to put myself in other people's shoes. I think we should do a timber structure that blends in, with a woody aesthetic. It doesn't need to be 50 tables, maybe two or three. Somewhere people could go if it rains. So I would be in favor, assuming it blends in, and what others have said.

(CAC) I agree that there's need to have something at East Cedar Beach because of the light rail. Something that's discreet and attractive. Hopefully not too difficult to keep up from the standpoint of maintenance.

(CAC) I would support a picnic shelter if done right. I like the idea of something more natural. Something to get out of the rain. We do have gatherings and it's nice to know there's a place to go if it rains. It would be nice to know how often other structures are being rented out at other parks, if there's demand, to help determine the need for it here.

(CAC) Seasonal picnic tables are great, but I don't really see a formal picnic shelter as a need. We heard a lot of opposition against structures earlier and I don't know how the engagement goes against that. I think a permanent restroom addresses a real need for hygiene and a picnic shelter doesn't do it.

(CAC) I'm agnostic, as many others have suggested. At this point in the process, we've discussed it thoroughly and it didn't make it into the design. I'm hearing a lot of people are undecided or leaning against, so I don't think it needs to be included at this point in the process, though I'm neither for nor against it.

PUBLIC COMMENT TIME

Win began to introduce the three recommendation reports, and Emma noted that the agenda called for public comment time.

(Win) Let's limit public comment time to those two topics, restrooms and picnic shelters. We'll have open time later.

- (Project Staff) Actually, we have 15 minutes.
- (Win) Let's just focus on these two.

- (Public) Starting with port-a-potties, you need a few more restrooms somewhere around Lake of the Isles and somewhere around Cedar. In the winter there was one port-a-potty around that entire lake. Isles has one port-a-potty with an enclosure that contains two. Whatever you do, add some port-a-potties. About picnic shelters. I look at Beard's Plaisance at Lake Harriet, that's beautiful, used all the time, it's old, I haven't seen lots of damage to it. The other one at Harriet is more of a restaurant accommodation. The Trailhead at Theodore Wirth, that building serves as a common space, combo picnic and eating, and it has changed the entire nature of Theodore Wirth and made it a richer, more dynamic park.
- (Public) I believe that for a fraction of the money, we can have more port-a-potties and cleaner port-a-potties and not put capital into permanent structures.
- (Public) Thanks to everybody on the CAC. This has been a long process and a huge commitment and we appreciate it. The community feedback I've been hearing has been mixed but predominately against a permanent restroom because they aren't useable year-round and due to maintenance problems. The same applies to picnic shelters. Feedback was overwhelmingly opposed to permanent structures because of maintenance and it conflicts with water quality goals.
 - (Public) I agree with the previous speaker on both accounts.
 - (Public) I agree also with both of them.

- (Public) Very briefly, CAC Member, you said that we are not Bde Maka Ska and Harriet. I think we should celebrate that by not doing those things that make those lakes special, but instead focusing on what makes our two lakes special.

(Win) Because we're ahead of schedule, why don't we go through the reports and then see what your comments are. Okay, we'll do that.

FINAL VOTES

Win moved to the three recommendation documents. He began with the Water Quality Subcommittee and noted the new introduction paragraph, which had been added since the last full CAC meeting. Win read the paragraph aloud.

(Win) We've already unanimously approved this report. This paragraph is the only change. Does anyone have any discussion? Then we'll have a final vote on the water quality goals.

(CAC) I would just like to thank Anna and the committee for that addition which makes it much stronger.

(Win) So let's move to the adoption by the CAC of the Water Quality Recommendations.

A final vote was held on the Water Quality Recommendations. The CAC unanimously voted in favor of adopting the recommendations.

(Win) Now to the circulation recommendations. We had the one change.

- (Craig) One change and was there a second change?
- (Win) Yes, right here. Yellow highlighted.
- (Craig) And CAC Member has maybe a third.

(Craig) For wayfinding and signage, the new amendment reads "Repair and improve wayfinding and signage throughout the master plan area. For example: location of and distance to restrooms. Create welcome, park regulation, and wayfinding signage at 21st Street SWLRT station and Bryn Mawr (Penn Avenue) SWLRT station."

(Win) At the last meeting, there was general approval of the concept of wayfinding. This makes it more specific with good suggestions from others.

A vote was held on the Wayfinding Motion, which had been tabled by the Subcommittee at the last meeting. The CAC unanimously voted in support of the motion.

(Win) Now let's go to the full recommendations as presented by Craig with that change on wayfinding and signage and the change from Constance.

(Craig) CAC Member, did you have something else?

- (CAC) We had one vote that was tied. And so I'd like to comment on that.

(Win) This report will go with the master plan to the Park Board, correct? This exact circulation document?

- (Project Staff) My understanding is that we will take these documents and translate it into the design. Project Staff, maybe you can say more about tied vote.
- (Win) When we adopted these documents, we had the understanding that they would be delivered to the Park Board as written. So the Park Board has firsthand, unfiltered recommendations of the CAC.
- (Project Staff) So almost all of the circulation recommendations affect how we draw the master plan drawings. They will be inherently embedded. The text, as I said in both circulation meetings, will not appear. Part of what goes to the board is all the notes and backup that we did. This will be like an appendix to the master plan, but, first and foremost, they will affect how we draw the lines of the plans.
- (Win) The request is that the Park Board receive the document. So the Park Board has an unfiltered look at what this group has considered.
- (Project Staff) Yes, because all of the documentation and backup sits as an appendix to the master plan that goes to the board at the end. If there are differences in the version that goes to the board, which is unlikely, there will be this document as appendix.
- (CAC) I'm confused because I thought when all of us were working in each group, that it was established that all of those documents would be in a literal appendix to the master plan. Not just an appendix that commissioners see. So I misunderstood.
- (Project Staff) I anticipate to add the Water Quality and Restoration goals as is, because they are written, whereas Circulation motions translate more to design.
- (Project Staff) We will not have separate appendices that get presented to the board in comparison to the public document.

(Win) If we adopt the circulation proposals, we are adopting that split vote. We have to accept that there's a tied vote.

- (Craig) I know CAC Member wants to speak to that tied vote.

(CAC) I just wanted to point out that unfortunately, the proposal to have a soft bike trail in East Cedar Woods controverts one of the tenants of the Cedar Lake Land Management Goals. So we must be aware that we're saying two different things. The goals say "direct bikers to regional bike trails." Just want to make sure we're aware of that.

- (Craig) Thank you for calling that out. Good point.

(Aaron) Rereading this, I think with the part in parenthesis, I think you could squint and see them together. Because the bike trail in Cedar would be part of a regional bike path.

(Win) What we all recognize is that the CAC was equally divided in terms of the Subcommittee, so that's guidance. Guidance can be that we don't have an opinion one way or the other, equally divided. We don't have time to go back and redo this. There are issues on which we're equally divided. We're simply recognizing that that was the result of the Subcommittee.

(Craig) Our goals are all aligned with this CAC. We want to limit bikes in this area. It's a question of how we go about doing that. Some think that having the trail will divert bikes out of a pedestrian area, others feel that eliminating it all together is the solution. The Park Board needs to dig in, research, and determine the best way forward.

(CAC) Are we not going to discuss this issue tonight?

- (Win) That's the next step. Would you like to speak?
- (CAC) About bikes in the woods.
- (Win) Yes.

(CAC) I want to talk about why I oppose bikes in the woods. Why I encourage the Park Board to eliminate what's happening now, which is unauthorized use. Authorizing bikes will not reduce the use. I look at the mission on the wall about enhancing "natural resources, parkland, and recreational opportunities for current and future generations of our region including people, plants, and wildlife." We need wildlife habitat. Our own vision as a CAC is that we'll contribute to "a vital, urban ecosystem with unique experiences that protect, connect, and sustain people, wildlife, and natural resources." To get this vision we have to prioritize environmental protection. We need more spaces off-limits to destructive sports like mountain biking. We need to address invasives. We can't meet the vision unless we make some of these hard choices. Brownie Lake and Theodore Wirth are already fragmented. This activity is already supported in this same regional park. Other wildlife need the space. For pedestrian safety, we need to make the choice that bikes will not be allowed in these woods. This is not to keep people out of the woods. It's about equity, to ensure that visitors have a quiet space in the woods.

(Win) We have time for comments from the CAC and they need to be directed to whether we adopt this report, which is a series of issues. You don't have to agree with every single vote in order to adopt the report. Anyone else like to talk about this?

- (Public) I've been to a lot of these meetings. About this tie vote, the background for the Park Board for the use of this area is the increase in density in the city. We need to treasure these few areas for a larger and larger population. Mountain bikers are a much

fewer number. If this will go to the Park Board as a tie vote, the final decision should be pending the Natural Resources Plan. A more detailed analysis is needed.

- (Public) If I'm out of order, I'd be happy to sit down. But I think this is the public comment period before we vote. On approved circulation, can we have the northwest Cedar trails discussion? For those who remember me, and despise me, I was at the Kenwood Open House and my contribution was to read the room and see what people were saying about boardwalks. I stood up and said, "Would everybody raise their hand if you don't want a boardwalk." In a time of little unity, the room, in my view, exploded with unanimous unity on not wanting a boardwalk. That's how I remember that day. In this report it says, "Prioritize safety for pedestrians by widening existing paved paths to a minimum of six feet for pedestrians and eight feet for two-way biking, keeping separate paths and using the least intrusive methods, considering a boardwalk only as a last resort." Those of us at Kenwood that day thought that we killed dead the boardwalk. There was a lot of discussion about not being able to maintain it, interrupting wildlife, no evidence that Park Board has sufficient resources. We thought it was done. To any CAC member who is sympathetic to my fear, about bad procedure, that this boardwalk will creep back in, that's what my fear is and what my neighbors feel as well. I would like a CAC member to amend this document and make the boardwalk a separate initiative. That is my request.
- (Public) I'm speaking in opposition to the mountain bike trail in East Cedar Woods. As CAC Member pointed out, there's a lot of mountain bike trails around. Theodore Wirth has six that are different levels of difficulty. I'm not here to say we have enough, I'm here to say no matter what our recreational preferences is, running, rollerblading, volleyball, etc., each of us wants more, and we can't always have that. If we want to respect the vision of this plan, to sustain wildlife in addition to people, we have to leave some space. The area in question is only half a mile, can we not have that? Secondly, since the report doesn't go wholesale and gets worked into the design, what will you do with the vote, half a mountain bike trail?
 - (Project Staff) That's a fair question and good process question. Based on the guidance of this CAC, we prepare a large master plan document that has to meet Metropolitan Council requirements. There will be a 45 day comment period. I can't tell you which way that will go but whether there is a trail or no trail, there will be an opportunity to comment and both sides will be sent to the board. We show all the comment themes that come forward through this comment period to the board. This might go all the way through and I'm guessing that it will be on the Board of Commissioners to make the decision, as is usually the case when there's a tight decision where the public is divided.

(Win) We need to give others time to speak.

(CAC) Obviously it's a controversial issue and it's going to be the Park Board that makes the final decision. We just passed this motion about signage and cedar lake is poorly signed, so it would make sense to add more signage in reference to what people are supposed to be doing.

(CAC) What we're talking about isn't a mountain bike trail. It's a trail for all types of cyclists to use. Mountain bikes have become a boogiemer in East Cedar. My wife and I mountain biked last weekend and we stopped when we came upon a group of deer on the trail, we stopped and enjoyed watching them. There's an illusion that just because someone's on a bike that makes them loud and dangerous and I can tell you that's not the case.

(CAC) I would be remiss in not sharing an email I got from Keith Prussing from Cedar Lake Park. He just wanted to clarify that they're very concerned about this trail. They think bikes should be on the regional trail.

(CAC) Project Staff, you don't have split guidance on this. You have the Preferred Park Concept which did not recommend it, and split votes from the CAC. The Preferred Park Concept is being ignored in that it provided specific guidance. I'd like to say I'm very concerned that the feedback is not coming from people in the region. Is there some way to ensure this isn't going out on twitter in order to not get people who live outside of the region?

(Win) Last round for the CAC. Anyone else wish to speak before we vote? This is a process report. You may not agree with all of it

(CAC) I was going to ask about the process. What exactly are we voting on? This entire document? It's saying this is what happened, this is how the discussion went. And this is different from what we adopt from the water quality report? I'd like you to clarify, staff too.

- (Win) CAC Member, I think you put your finger on it.
- (CAC) So in other words, you're not accepting any motions, any amendments?
- (Project Staff) CAC Member, you weren't part of the subcommittee, so if there's anything you'd like to go on the record commenting on, this is your time.

(CAC) I'd like to make a motion then. This is my response to public comment. Northwest Cedar trails D. I want the final phrase to be struck, "considering a boardwalk only as a last resort."

- (Win) The motion is to strike it.

(CAC) Just to clarify for the audience and those CAC members not in the Subcommittee. Where that came up was talking about that there might be a couple of places on the shoreline that the only way to achieve these minimum distances is to say, maybe for 30 or 40 ft something might need to hang out. There was clear rejection to do a boardwalk all the way. But that was where it came from.

(Win) Okay so we're getting short on time. Three more comments from the CAC and two from the public.

(CAC) That language was put in because everyone on the committee agreed that a boardwalk was the last thing we wanted. Removing that statement weakens the language because it allows the Park Board to do anything they want to achieve that goal, including a boardwalk

- (Public) Not having a lot of history with the organizations, I'm trying to listen hard. Listening to us, the public, it feels that the public wants neither more bicycle access nor a boardwalk. Because the boardwalks along the Mississippi River aren't maintained, boardwalks along Lake Harriet aren't maintained. So let's only do things that can be maintained. And let's eliminate your thought about bikes. Listen to the public. We're the public.
- (Public) On the Cedar Lake southeast shoreline restoration, I'm financially burdened by this encroachment removal. There were docks established there before the encroachments. The property owners on that land, one is listed as landmarked by the Minnesota Historical Society, and the thought of putting a public trail through that narrow area—
 - (Win) We're going to hold that.
 - (Public) I just don't want to ruin the historical value of the property.

(Win) Now we will take a vote on CAC Member's motion.

(CAC) I think we're weakening your original argument by removing that. So I don't know which way to vote.

(Win) The motion is to remove language about boardwalk.

A vote was held on the amendment to the Northwest Cedar Trails Motion. The amendment failed with 1 vote in favor and 13 votes against.

(Public) I would like to object and comment. The committee members were looking for a solution. The way to solve that problem is instead of saying "considering a boardwalk," it could say "and there shall be no consideration of a boardwalk." I'm saying that because I want to discover how a boardwalk got back into a plan after there was overwhelming direction from the public to eliminate a boardwalk. Thank you all for doing what you're doing. Can someone make a motion to add language to eliminate a boardwalk? Will the record reflect my request?

(Win) I understand, we have to move on. We're now going to vote on the acceptance of the Circulation Subcommittee Final Recommendations, as annotated by the votes.

- (CAC) Acceptance of the record, you mean?
- (Win) Yes, that's how I meant it.

A final vote was held on the Circulation Recommendations. The CAC unanimously voted in favor of adopting the recommendations.

(Win) It is accepted unanimously. Now, we will turn to the Cedar Lake Restoration Goals. The document before you has only one change, the addition of the names. My name was left out, so I'd like it to be added because I hosted the first meeting. Open for discussion, would anyone like to discuss that report?

(CAC) Is any background helpful. Project Staff, do you want to explain how this came to be?

- (Win) We did that at the last meeting. Let's get public comment first. Does anyone from the public need the background?

(Public) Why is this labeled the way it is, in comparison to the others?

- (Win) I believe that is the way Keith framed it.
- (Project Staff) Yes, that is correct.
- (CAC) I can explain. This was modeled after the water quality goals. So if it's been changed to "recommendations," it would make sense to change this as well. I would be in favor, as a member of this group and someone who was involved.
- (Public) It says "Park Land Management Goals." So, we have water quality, circulation, and land management. So I don't understand the words "land management."
- (Win) Let's take away "proposed" and "land." Cedar Park Recommendations?
- (CAC) Natural Recommendations.
- (Project Staff) Natural Resources Management Recommendations?
- (Public) It says "Park Land Management."
- (Win) It's more than land.
- (CAC) Cedar Lake Park Management Recommendations.
- (Project Staff) Cedar Lake Natural Resources Recommendations? I hear some support from the CAC.
- (Public) Just as long as they match.
- (CAC) Cedar Lake Natural Resources Management Recommendations
- (Win) "Park" should be added because it's more than the land.
- (Project Staff) Do we need the CAC to vote on this?
- (Win) Cedar Lake Park Natural Resources Management Recommendations. This seems helpful and not controversial. Would anyone like to propose something different?
- (CAC) No. We're all okay.

- (Win) Quick show of hands. Project Staff, can this be retitled?
- (Project Staff) Yes, definitely.

(Win) Thank you. We have a title now and the names associated. Is there any CAC discussion before we vote. Okay, members of the public? We're at 7:30 and getting short on time.

- (Public) The most important, important thing we can do is get assurance from the CAC and Park Board that there's a how and a when for how they're going to have a Natural Resources Management Plan for the park. That's the single most important thing that could happen is for these recommendations to be adopted and so far, I don't hear that language. I hope we can build into this that the planners listen in the 45 next days and that they understand what a Natural Resources Management Plan is and how it will be implemented. Whether its systemwide like the skate park plan or the Ecological System Plan, or specific to Cedar Lake Park, or a hybrid. I ask in the next 45 days that the planners listen and are committed to this plan.
- (Public) Is this our last time to comment?
 - (Win) We've done the comment on this plan. We're going to vote on it. Then we will open up the rest of the meeting for comment.
 - (Public) So we will have other opportunities to speak?
- (Public) Consider historical structures and their viewpoint when they're looking at these final goals. I didn't see any consideration in of that in these plans.

(CAC) I don't see this person on this list.

- (Project Staff) We will add them. We can talk afterwards.

(Win) So we will now take the vote on accepting the Cedar Lake Park Natural Resources Management Recommendations.

A final vote was held on the Natural Resources Recommendations. The CAC unanimously voted in favor of adopting the recommendations.

(Win) Now we will go to the open period.

- (Project Staff) This time is for any last motions CAC members would like to bring up.
- (Win) We've got 30 more minutes so the barrier is high to raise something new. But if someone feels there is something outstanding, now is the time. CAC first, anything else? Okay now to the public? We've got 25 minutes, 20 because we have to conduct a final vote.
- (Public) What we haven't discussed is what the commitment to those with disabilities is. That's been completely omitted, and I'd like to hear it. I proposed that we adopt "Birdability." The Audubon society has a society for disabled birders and I think we need

to be sensitive to bringing disabled people into nature and we can collaborate with Audubon and see them as a model. We haven't mentioned disabled people.

- (Public) I'd like to try to implore a sense of urgency. This is a plan that I hope is a verb not a noun. Actions need to follow the plan. It depends on money and other things, but we have to have a sense of urgency, especially with natural resources. The second thing is making sense of our mission and values. In this case, the tie should go to nature.
- (Public) Final words. I acknowledge the CAC and Project Staff, for all their hard work. It's a long hard process. That said, do I like the results? No. No landscape architecture firm anywhere would design a park that is difficult to get to, difficult to get around, and has a reputation of being a hidden gem. Or that it should be secluded. Or that someone would wander through its woodlands in solitude. Or that part of its allure is its inaccessibility. Or that walking around the shoreline is a daunting task. This is a description of a scary park. People vote with their feet, they use spaces that are comfortable. You have ensured that Cedar Lake continue as a hidden gem for their privileged park users. This remains secluded because the public is denied access to their secluded public land. Along the shore, residents have had exclusive use for 70 years, 70! Most important, the exclusion of any hard surface path for ADA, elderly, mobility-challenged, moms and dads with strollers is a breach of the diversity and equity principles of the Park Board and Met Council. I will continue my unique life experience by walking in the road with no sidewalk. I'm sure it's much more satisfying than a lake walk anyway.
- (Public) Thank you, CAC. Thank you, Park Board. I appreciate all the work. Including this [the Preferred Park Concept], this has been a wonderful document. When are you going to update it?
 - (Project Staff) That is on a next steps slide I have.

(Win) Okay, focusing on the public. We've got 19 more minutes, 15 before we vote. Anyone else? Any CAC members?

(CAC) Whatever happened to the conversations we were having making sure that there was good signage at the 21st street station?

- (Win) What we ended up doing, trying to engineer specific signage at specific locations is beyond what we reasonably can do. Once we enter into that, it goes really beyond what makes sense for us. We stay at an altitude higher than that.
- (CAC) People in that community did reach out to me and express that there should be a higher level of information signage at that area, 21st street.
- (Win) Fair point, I think it will be taken into account.

(Public) I'm still unclear as far of the status of permanent structures on Lake of the Isles. Can we request review by the Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office or the Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission for new designs?

- (Win) I think review is any citizens right to request. I think it's beyond our ability to address at this point.

(Win) Okay, we are now going to vote on acceptance of the Preferred Park Concept, subject to reports we've accepted on Circulation, Water Quality, and Natural Resources. The recommended plan is modified by everything we've done.

A final vote was held on the Preferred Park Concept. The CAC unanimously voted in favor of the Preferred Park Concept.

NEXT STEPS

Emma thanked the CAC for their work, which had now officially concluded. She walked through the next steps. A large document will be created and there will be a 45-day comment period, a final opportunity for the public to weigh in on the plan. Emma also discussed the results of a survey on the prioritization of different aspects of the plan, which had been sent out to the CAC. She shared the top short-term priorities. Emma also mentioned that there had been a previous prioritization survey for water quality, which was not reflected in the currently displayed survey results. She explained that staff would look through both prioritization lists and come away with a synthesis of the two.

(Win) Eleven responses means that some didn't respond, and I was one of them.

- (Emma) I'm happy to open that again for those who didn't respond.
- (CAC) [jokingly] We can reply a second time then?

(Project Staff) Just to clarify, after the 45-day comment period, we tabulate all the comments. We see if there are modifications to the plan that need to be made and make the changes. Then that plan goes to the Board of Commissioners for approval and there will be a public hearing at that time. There's a time to comment on the document and to weigh in at a public hearing. After that it goes to the Metropolitan Council for approval.

(Win) When does the 45-day period kick off?

- (Project Staff) As soon as the document is written. It's TBD at this point. I will email when it starts. Currently I've said winter.
- (Win) So before October 1st? Just to get an idea.
- (Project Staff) No.

(Win) If anyone wants to comment generally, in terms of the process, valedictory or criticism, that's fine. I want to thank all the project staff. It's been a long process made more difficult by covid, and three groups did some good work. At the last meeting, there was something good that came out of that because people were mad. We took the time to register that and that

triggered an additional lap in the process that was important. Not everyone agrees with the decision that came out of it but it was an important response.

(CAC) I'd like to thank Win for his leadership. Win pushed public participation and I think the general public owes you gratitude for that. And the CAC deserves thanks, this is only my 6th meeting, but you all have been around for 3 years, so thank you.

(Public) On the vote count, it says that it was 13 for each of the issues. I counted 14.

- (Project Staff) You're correct, it's 14.

(Public) I chastised the Preferred Park Concept, but I do think the Water Quality group, under Anna's leadership, did a really wonderful job and that was our number one priority. So you guys did great.

(Win) I neglected to call out Anna, Keith, and Craig. Great work. Thanks all.

(CAC) Since we've come up with a reasonable plan, without big extensive items, we should argue that the ideas we have come up with should be implemented as soon as possible.

(Win) We stand adjourned. Thank you.