



Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting # 12

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board

Southwest Service Area Master Plan (SW Parks Plan)

July 25th, 2019, 6:00 – 8:00pm

Pershing Recreation Center

CAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Brian Nalezny, Tony Sterle, Craig Wilson, Janel Farrell, Jana Griffin, Chris Des Roches, Patrick Smith, Paul Ragozzino, Katie Jones, Jane Schommer

CAC MEMBERS ABSENT:

Aria Campbell, Larry Moran, Shaelyn Crutchley, Cha'foxey Mitchner, Jarret Folley, Mayumi Park, Aron Lipkin, Anj Petsch,

PUBLIC PRESENT: Approximately 40 members of the public attended the meeting.

STAFF, CONSULTANTS, AND SPEAKERS PRESENT:

MPRB Staff Included: Colleen O'Dell, Adam Arvidson, Madeline Hudek, Alyssa Gilmore

SRF Consultant Staff Included: Joni Giese, Alexandra Olson

INTRODUCTIONS

Meeting called to start at 6:02pm. CAC members, MPRB Staff and SRF Staff all introduce themselves to the members of the public attending.

GROUNDRING WELCOME AND REVIEW

Madeline led a grounding exercise followed by a discussion on the meeting format: 1) review of using post its to capture public Hopes and Concerns that may be missed during the park discussions; 2) review project timeline, events to date, where the designs have come from, CAC overview, CAC charge, service area overview, and where on the website you can find more information.

Adam recapped the previous Bike/Skate/All-Wheel, Tennis/Pickleball, and Basketball discussion.

Request to update Kenny concept as there is pickleball striping on the tennis courts there now.

DISCUSSION OF PARKS

Lynnhurst Park

Adam discussed how this park is included in two master planning projects and that the CACs for both recommended creation of a subcommittee. The Subcommittee met twice and recommended a plan after some changes based on their discussions. The current plan calls out a portion of the park in the SE the design of which will be resolved later by the Minnehaha Parkway Regional Trail Master Plan CAC. The SW Service Area Master Plan CAC reviewed the remaining portion.

Discussion:

(CAC) There were some concerns with the parking lot and walking to the community center that were brought forward at the subcommittee. The parking lot was moved with the idea that congestion would be lessened on 50th.

(CAC) What is the reason that the park staff wanted the courts and parking where they are and what about parking making people walk past the basketball courts?

(Project Staff) The placement in the new plan is a common practice for MPRB, we like to have basketball close to our recreation centers.

(Public) What would the bridge look like and would the street be raised?

(Project Staff) The street would be raised a bit in the middle. This would be a gentle slope.

(Public) How long would 50th street be closed?

(Project Staff) This is a long term vision plan and there isn't a good way to predict how long that would be closed for construction. There are other agencies that would be involved in creating a timeline for the road changes.

(CAC) How long is the estimate for when this park gets worked on?

(Project Staff) It is challenging to give a timeline on upgrades and funding. We have an equity funding matrix that assigns each park a number and we work through that list in allocating funding. However, projects – especially large projects – often aren't funded by MPRB alone. There are other entities and groups that may contribute, and additional funding sources. The project could be built sooner than with MPRB capital funds alone. Could maybe say 8-10 years?

(CAC) Could MPRB hold off on moving this park forward until the Minnehaha Parkway Regional Trail Master Plan comes to a consensus?

(Project Staff) Holding off until the other CAC comes back to session would result in a delay in getting the SWSAMP document out to the public for review. The Minnehaha project is currently on hold and doesn't yet have a date set for reconvening. The subcommittee of that CAC did vote unanimously to move this latest version of the Lynnhurst plan (including the call-out portion) forward.

(CAC) Could you daylight the creek without the bridge?

(Project Staff) You would need a bridge of some sort for the water to be daylighted.

(Public) With all the changes and the fact that there are only 3 ways to access 50th, will it even be safe to go through with all these changes? Also, the neighborhood is satisfied with how things are, is there a way to do some of these things without spending so much money?

(Project Staff) These plans articulate a vision for the future of these parks and are not constrained by currently available funding sources since many park projects are implemented with funding sources outside of MPRB's existing Capital Improvement Program.

(CAC) Will this CAC take a position on the roadway?



(Project Staff) The roadway decision will be determined by the Minnehaha Parkway Regional Trail Master Plan CAC.

(Public) Would like to see a detailed inventory of trees impacted by these plans.

(Project Staff) Concepts were created with efforts to avoid impacting existing trees whenever possible. It is difficult to provide an inventory for a couple reasons: 1) this is master plan level of design so exact amenity location and footprint will be determined later during detailed design. For example, it's possible that a proposed playground could be constructed to avoid or even incorporate existing trees; 2) These are 20-year plans and implementation for some parks may be years away. Existing trees could have already been impacted by then by diseases such as emerald ash borer or extreme weather events which could reshape the landscape. At the last meeting, a CAC member proposed a guiding principle for the plan that mature trees be impacted as little as possible by implementation of these plans.

(Public) People need to walk to the gym in the winter and the parking lot is far, what about handicap parking? Would also like to have 6-8 court Pickleball added here.

(Staff) The parking lot is approximately 100 feet from the building.

(CAC) What are we looking to approve tonight?

(Staff) The drawing that is updated with the note that was added.

(Public) Will this plan address the flooding that happens here?

(Staff) There is flood control addressed in this plan but is mostly addressed in the Minnehaha Parkway Regional Trail Masterplan.

(CAC) * Motion to support the current design. There have been 2 committees looking at this park, a subcommittee and many other discussions that have been talked about.

Unanimous votes in support. There will be 45-day public comment period after the document is released.

Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Park

CAC Discussion:

CAC member C. DesRoches, brought recommendations along with a graphic. Adding seating into peace garden, adding more entry features into the park to make it as welcoming as possible, extending the pollinator gardens in the southeast corner for more green space, shifting the amphitheater up to bring it close to the center of the park and activity, moving the basketball courts down for the addition of a bike pump track, taking out the adult fitness, and moving the multi-use diamond to the NE corner of the field and making it a bit smaller.

(CAC) What does the change in the diamond do to the programming of the park?

(Staff) There wouldn't be much of a change. This is similar to what is happens there now.

(CAC) Why move the basketball courts?



(CAC) It was changed this way and to keep activity more concentrated toward the center of the park.

(CAC) Why move the amphitheater?

(CAC) Again, to move to center of park activity and to be able to use it while diamond sports are happening at the same time.

(CAC) Does the bike pump track closer to the playground make more sense for parents watching kids?

(Staff) This would be a good thing to consider. There is a height difference between the 2 areas now.

Public discussion:

(Public) Could fit at least 4 dedicated pickleball courts if not more. This could be investigated.

(CAC) What happens if the CAC votes to accept more pickleball courts?

(Staff) This design could be moved toward consensus with the addition of pickleball courts.

(Public) Could there also be a multi-sport field added since it was taken out from the last plans?

(CAC) *Motion to move the C. DesRoches modified design forward, but briefly return at the next meeting with staff recommendations on bike park/basketball positions and adding additional pickleball.

Approved. *This park is moved toward consensus.

The Mall

The main question brought up last time was if MPRB should use so much park land for parking?

CAC discussion:

CAC member K. Jones brought a recommendation that would incrementally removing parking on the western side of the park in order to reclaim park land from being used primarily to park cars. This would be a way to start providing more park land in a dense area.

(CAC) This is something that is also being heard from the neighborhood. The north-south connections being kept would be good and getting to add the additional green space over a longer period of time would be a great way to create more park space in a very dense area.

(CAC) The woonerf should be kept and pushed to Irving. This would be good for adding more green space rather than impervious surface. This is something we have heard many times from the public and this is a place we could do that.

Public Discussion:

(Public) The public doesn't understand what this would change here. There should be more time to get public feedback.

(Staff) MPRB wanted to be sure that this would have support from the CAC before trying to move this idea forward to the public.



(Public) Has anyone contacted the neighborhood about this plan? This should have more engagement now. There should be very serious movement by MPRB to make sure they are contacting the residents and neighborhood surrounding this park in order to get more feedback.

(Staff) Going forward this would stay in the “warrants further discussion” category with further feedback before moving it forward. Staff can do additional engagement.

*Motion to hold this design for more discussion and community engagement from MPRB.

Motion Approved.

*MPRB will make a new drawing to share with the public, conduct more engagement, then bring the plan back to the CAC.

Lyndale Farmstead

A discussion was brought up at a past CAC to bring the mountain bike skills course/soft surface trail back into the plan.

(CAC) Would like to move the urban ag to along the maintenance wall to get more sunlight.

Public discussion:

(Public) The mountain biking would make it dangerous for people walking on the path and this hasn't had the changes added for the public to look at the option on a mountain biking skills course.

(Staff) There has already been engagement on the addition of a mountain biking skills course. It was in one of the original designs and was taken out with mixed feedback on keeping it or taking it out.

(CAC) We should know where the historic landscape is for Wirth House.

(Staff) We will confirm that and let you know.

(CAC) What is the space needed for a bike skills course?

(Staff) During CAC #10 staff showed how this can be a flexible size. It can be a smaller space that goes through the trees for kids to learn skills.

(Public) This is a big and dangerous thing that will not be welcome. We don't need to have large areas that will have people going through it.

(Staff) This could be a small track for younger kids to develop skills to take to other mountain biking trails.

(Public) Parks are not just for kids and we shouldn't take away walking paths and seating.

(Staff) This addition would not take away the paths that are used by people walking and sitting in the park. It would be a small track that could be used as another activity for people to watch in the park.

(CAC) This facility has a demand and if it isn't going to be added to this park then we should find a way to add it back in somewhere in SW.

(Staff) We discussed other locations at a prior CAC meeting, and it was determined that this would be the best location when looking at all the other parks.



(CAC) Could this just be added onto a larger adult trail at Theo Wirth?

(Staff) That wouldn't change the geographic need since there is not a larger adult trail nearby.

(CAC) There is a large amount of money allocated for this park. How do you evaluate where the money is allocated first?

(Staff) There is an internal and a public discussion when budget becomes available to prioritize implementing projects in the master plan. Staff works with all the available channels of funding and communication.

(CAC) I like the idea of the bike skills track. I understand that the design process doesn't always work in the way it is originally laid out. Park board staff should take another look at including it and then the CAC could look at it.

(CAC) We shouldn't add things in parks that we can't take away.

(CAC) I would like us to look again at what this would actually look like. It isn't a big change. These parks are for everyone in Minneapolis and not just for the people who are living closest to the park. Looking at the example images of bike skills trails from the CAC #10 this is shown as a small path through the trees. Not a big bike track or skate park.

(CAC) We may go against the room on a vote.

(CAC) We need to table this plan and see changes on a design.

* Staff will make some changes, do some more research, and return to the CAC.

Mueller

*CAC member K. Jones would like to move Mueller back to "warrants further discussion" since she was having trouble connecting via mobile at the last CAC meeting.

*Approved.

THANKS AND NEXT STEPS

Colleen thanked everyone for coming to the meeting and let everyone know a date will be coming out soon for the next Fields/Diamonds/Ice subcommittee meeting.