

Graco Park Virtual Open House

On Zoom

January 11, 2021, 4:30-6

In attendance:

- 21 public attendees
- Design team members from Barr Engineering, Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, Snow Kreilich Architects, and Aune Fernandez Landscape Architects

Agenda:

1. Introductions
2. Presentation on Graco Park Preferred Concept ([based on video presentation posted on project website](#))
3. Invitation to share formal comments on the concept from your agency, organization, or coalition, by email at cchristensen@minneapolisarks.org. Or fill out the survey on the project website at <https://aflandarc.com/graco-park-community-engagement-3/>
4. Q and A
5. Next steps: The design team will refine the concept to create a final concept based on the feedback tonight and from the other meetings and survey. Then the final concept will go to the MPRB Board of Commissioners for a public hearing and consideration of approval in February 2022.

Notes from Q and A:

1. Public attendee question: Are there plans to further naturalize Boom Island? We've been disappointed in the lack of native landscaping and trees on this site, esp. as its location is important on the Flyway.
 - a. Design team response: Boom Island has plans for more vegetation in the master plan.

2. Public attendee question: Do you consider handicapped in demographics and design?
 - a. Design team response: Yes, as a stakeholder group. We have engaged with the Minneapolis Advisory Committee on People with Disabilities about the project and they have provided feedback on design elements including feedback on intersection design and a preference for an underpass to cross Plymouth. We are presenting the preferred concept to them next week. We also need to follow American's with Disabilities Act (ADA) guidance provided by federal regulation in our site and building.

3. Public attendee question: Further south at Boom Island seems like a much better location for a dog park, how would it be determined whether to pursue that and how would it relate to this process?
 - a. Design team response: We can also think about doing a dog park there. When there is a CIP allocation to Boom for a capital project, we will engage in a design process for Boom similar to what has been done for Graco that may include options for a dog park. Here is the Central Riverfront Plan with a master plan for Boom:
https://www.minneapolisparks.org/_asset/d6kv9t/central_riverfront_master_plan_approved.pdf

4. Public attendee question: Are you imagining signs on the island to discourage hiking? I imagine people will arrive by watercraft and be tempted to walk around the beach
 - a. Design team response: We have not developed a specific plan for this, but signage is a good idea. It is the intention to limit human access to the island.

5. Public attendee question: Why is a MPRB park office building included?
 - a. Design team response: The building is not an MPRB office, but is a community center with restrooms and a public space with MPRB staffing the building.

6. Public attendee question: I wonder about the width of path I think it is the yacht trail wouldn't more plant cover be preferable
 - a. Design team response: There are several possible functions planned for the promenade including vehicle access to bring boats closer to the water, possible food trucks and farmers' market stalls, bikes and pedestrians that require it to be wide.

7. Public attendee question: Is the current stair connection to the Plymouth bridge from Boom Island being removed?
 - a. Design team response: The current plan is to re-establish the stairs in a similar location as part of the underpass project.
8. Public attendee comment: The third greatest rivers in the world! The fly way for millions of creators and what do we propose? Mowed grass, buildings. Animals need continuous food not patches here and there with people, more people and more buildings. Resultant design? Great vocabulary however that is not this design.
9. Public attendee comment: An “artistic” water fountain seems strange and wasteful of water (becoming and ever more precious resource) and even odd in a riverfront park. The River herself is a beautiful “water feature”
10. Public attendee comment: Night markets! Yes that is what we have seen in this area. Drugs and prostitution. Public safety not a word in the proposal.
11. Public attendee comment: Good comment on the "architectural water feature" as those kinds of Water features have been a maintenance problem at the nearby Pierre Bontineau library also - with it not working after a few years - so that may be a lower priority.
 - a. Design team response: We will design the water feature with maintenance in mind. We are even considering reusing stormwater for the feature or using water from the river.
12. Public attendee comment: Since the Island is strictly for habitat, a “bird-of-prey sculpture” seems odd/incongruous. Humans can observe real raptors from the park; also maintaining a sculpture would cause disruption to habitat and wildlife.
 - a. Design team response: The sculpture is still in development and the intention is to create a low/no maintenance sculpture that will have habitat benefits and be a terminus for the promenade.
13. Public attendee question: Are permeable pavers being used? If so, where? If not, why not? Less stormwater management.
 - a. Design team response: We haven’t considered yet, but will look into it. Although permeable pavers still require stormwater management consideration. And there can be maintenance requirements with permeable pavers that present challenges.
14. Public attendee comment: How about some trees instead of sculpture?

15. Public attendee question: What kind of bird safe glass design are you using?
 - a. Design team response: Haven't decided on glass yet but will get spacing right so it's a deterrent. Besides glass, we will also control the amount of glass in the building. The other piece is the slatted scrim that goes over the glazing is a feature that helps make that glass more bird safe.
16. Public attendee comment: The large expanses of turf seem redundant to the same on Boom Island. Turf is the antithesis of habitat.
 - a. Design team response: There is a large amount of turf at Boom Island and the Graco Park design distinctly does not include large swaths of turf, but more of a more targeted area for flexible use of the open green space. (added after: The turf area is also planned to be a bee lawn with pollinator benefits.)
17. Public attendee comment: This will be an incredible improvement on what is currently there, and I appreciate the care toward both social, artistic and environmental concerns all coming together in the design... the pollinators will only get happier (they're already benefiting from the work on Hall's Island there!)
18. Public attendee comment: There are many more buildings in the city than Nature focused spaces. It is important to consider what "amenities" already exist at Boom Island. Re: logs and stones as "habitat"--with a lot of people, these areas would not be the best habitat for Turtles or Otters.
19. Public attendee comment: It's already a well-used outdoor place, but this design actually incorporates the existence of the river (which is more than can be said for the current post-industrial site)
20. Public attendee question: What percentage of the site would be covered with concrete and other hardscape materials? The amount of hardscape is a bit mind-boggling and the huge plazas and wide walkways fragment the site and decrease space available for habitat.
 - a. Design team response: not sure of the ratio, but will take concerns about impervious surface into account as we finalize the concept.
21. Public attendee question: How are the indigenous people of the riverfront considered. Who was consulted?
 - a. Design team response: Tribal leadership was informed of the project when it kicked off along with several other MPRB projects, but despite the invitation for more information or engagement, this site/project has not been

prioritized by local Tribal leadership. There has also been some engagement with a grassroots Indigenous organization on the design.

22. Public attendee comment: We would like to see no access to hall's island. This would ensure considerably less human disturbance on an already fragile ecosystem within the metro area

23. Public attendee question: There seems to be a disconnect between the overhead map (which looked promising, considerable native habitat) and the simulated video, which looked so dominated by hardscape and lawn. Which will it be?

a. Design team response: the vegetation in the flythrough does not accurately reflect the diverse and native plant pallet that is planned for the site (in part due to technology limitations)

24. Public attendee question: What are the public safety strategies?

a. Design team response: As part of our design process, we work with Park Police to ensure that proposed park features are safe from their perspective. We also have circulation routes for patrol cars in the park that are wide enough for safety and maintenance vehicles. And by having the park building on the site, we will have more activation of the park by having more people there and eyes on the site that will make it safer. There will be site lines and lighting considered for the underpass, building, and other parts of the park.

25. Public attended question: What is the plan for watercraft/kayak?

a. Design team response: May have a boat rental or storage on site, possibly Paddle Share, the kayak rental facility currently at Boom. MPRB has been in communication with an organization that is interested in doing programming around human powered water craft as well. The promenade is design for livery for Paddle Share or other possible scenarios. Will coordinate with NPS staff on this – and have an MOU with Paddle Share that needs to be revisited. We could even do another Paddle Share site in addition to Boom.

26. Public attendee comment: That seems redundant to have two kayak rental stations right next to each other

27. Public attendee comment: (Comments from STAWNO) 1)Critical to keep activity as a part of this site. Since it is adjacent to an industrial area there is strong concern on public safety. There have been problems with the Boom Island parking area so this needs more "eyes " to prevent bad behavior. Need to have planned activity and this building needs to have active use. 2) Tunnel is critical to keep connectivity - there

are some in our group who would like to assist with funding as our dedicated funds could address on the Boom Island side.

28. Public attendee question (from STAWNO): Winter activities are not listed - please detail how this will be activated the winter. What happens? What is plowed or what trails could be used for cross county?
 - a. Design Team Response: Could consider having winter rentals in the building for snowshoeing or skiing, but no plans for an ice rink. The plowing will likely follow other MPRB plowing standards including plowing the regional trail, sidewalks, and primary path to building, but not all interior walkways.
29. Public attendee comment: They may be removing some of the dams and I think this might impact river usage.
30. Public attendee question: Will all trees, shrubs, flowers, grasses, etc. all be true native species since non-native species don't provide the habitat benefits of native species? Will a plant list be available as part of the final concept? The vegetation in the video looks like monocultures—not at all the diversity needed for wildlife.
31. Public attendee comment: Thank you! I think it's very important for a stair connection from Boom Island to Plymouth remain, even if it's not the current exact location.
32. Public attendee comment: From me personally - need to have a historical marker explaining the Halls Island Bath connection. This is a great "teaching moment" on the water quality of the river and the whole water infrastructure of our public welfare. Besides - it is just a fun fact from 100 years ago.
33. Public attendee comment: The stairway from Plymouth to Boom Island isn't a great loss because it's not very functional and the tunnel is (in my mind) more important. How about a path down from Plymouth to Boom Island along the berm on that side of Plymouth and how about creating a similar berm from Plymouth to Graco Park along with a path down to Graco Park from Plymouth? The bridge is a large barrier and anything you can do to limit it's visual and functional presence would be appreciated.
34. Public attendee question (included in notes but ran out of time in the meeting): Why are buildings being built on this site? Large buildings were removed to create a view corridor?
 - a. Design team response: The existing schematic design shows a building directly in the view corridor between 8th/Sibley and Hall's Island. That view

corridor is highlighted in the design as the entry to the park and it is unimpeded by buildings. Furthermore, the mission and vision of the MPRB is not only to enhance and protect natural resources, but also to provide recreational opportunities, and promote health, wellbeing, and community for people. The building will play a key role in activating the site, which will enhance public safety at the park.

35. Public attendee question: What does it mean for humans to “interact with habitat”? which was mentioned during the presentation. If humans disrupt wildlife habitat in an area, the area ceases to be meaningful habitat?

- a. Design team response (included in notes but ran out of time in the meeting):
At Graco Park, the most significant habitat opportunity is Hall’s Island, which is located near enough to the east bank of the river that humans may be able to view wildlife. There is a great improvement and establishment of habitat in the design (none of which exists currently), that will develop within this edge condition with the species that find it accommodating rather than an existing habitat that will be disrupted. The meaningful habitat opportunities with the project is limiting human access to Hall’s Island, establishing canopy to support the flyway, and the aquatic habitat potential. The prairie and pollinator habitat is meaningful but, marginal in value when considering true habitat value. The Aquatic habitat is in and of itself and has more habitat potential for more rare/unique wildlife such as the mussels, turtles and fish. The River offers a buffer to activity and protects the below surface conditions. Thus far, we have identified some areas that may improve the movement of wildlife by establishing more prairie than turf (north side of park near the picnic shelter) and I anticipate we will continue to evaluate these appropriate revisions where it results in meaningful improvements. As an urban setting, habitat in Graco Park is in a fragmented context, and the plant and animal species that will thrive here are all accustomed to some disturbance and exhibit a resilience to people and disruption.

36. Public attendee comment: I have to leave the meeting. Thanks for the presentation. I appreciate a lot of the comments from people. I am glad such a strong interest in parks.

37. Public attendee comment: Hall’s Island habitat looks very skimpy. For suitable habitat, Hall’s Island should look more like the habitat on the Lake of the Isles islands, plus more habitat of varying height and density would more readily deter public access.

38. Public attendee question: Could you clarify if the “sculpture” is meant to provide a nesting location? That would significantly impact the conversation - I frankly hate how it looks in the flythrough and Hall’s Island itself should be the visual focus, and any habitat features should be sited with an ecological and not aesthetic basis
- a. Design team response: See 12.a
39. Public attendee comment: The’ reservoir under permeable pavers at least would allow a slower infiltration of water into the soil.
40. Public attendee comment: please beware of creating population "sinks" when designing habitat in this urban context. It's reassuring to know the project team includes a specialist.
41. Public attendee comment: please allow space and budget for power receptacles (metered) at the market and food truck areas to avoid use of portable generators.
42. Public attendee comment: Even if permeable pavers still require some type of underdrain, please explain whether permeable pavers will be used, which will increase natural infiltration and decrease the amount of space needed for an under drain.
43. Public attendee comment: +++ excellent point about power sources for any vendors
44. Public attendee question: estimates of climate impacts of various elements, 'improvements' ?
- a. Design team response (included in notes but ran out of time in the meeting):
The building is intended to be design in a very sustainable way with a strong climate resilient approach. Flooding and shade are two other environmental inspirations for the design of the park that will help create a more climate resilient park.
45. Public attendee comment: Generally there is too much construction in this concept. There should be no buildings and no performance spaces, also smaller trails. The Upper Harbor Terminal site has a performance space in addition to numerous performance spaces throughout the city. This site really needs to be natural esp. as we a facing an extinction and climate crisis. E.g. while maybe the proposed buildings will be less energy intensive, consider the environmental and carbon impacts of procuring the materials.
46. Public attendee comment: Climate mitigations of elements?

47. Public attendee question: Can the number of promenades be reduced to one?
Having two is redundant and really fragments the site rather than create contiguous habitat.
- a. Design team response: We are still refining the concept and will take that into account.
48. Public attendee comment: We would like to see less turf on #8 area and in general, and more native flowers and grasses as well as pollinator gardens
49. Public attendee question: Which pathways are not paved? Do the renderings show concrete? Can some pathways be not paved?
- a. Design team response: The pathways are all planned on being paved in the current concept and the design team will take into account incorporation of natural surface pathways in the final design as well.
50. Public attendee question: Will there be opportunity to comment on the intersection improvements? (Apologies if this was mentioned)
- a. Design team response: The intersection design will be a parallel process and the design team will share it with the City's Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Committees for feedback and post it on the project site for feedback as well in coming months.
51. Public attendee comment: Another critical maintenance piece: Note the channel between Halls and Graco is already getting filled with silt (Kayaking is ok but NO other boats can use it) and will need to be dredged - as the boat landing at Boom Island also needs to be dredged.
52. Public attendee comment: We want more native plants that support pollinators and native wildlife
53. Public attendee question: What will the condition of Lot 1 be and how will it interact with the park?
- a. Design team response (included in notes but ran out of time in the meeting): Graco plans to keep the lot vacant for the time being as mown turf but plans to develop it in the future to expand their campus. We have no details on the current plan.
54. Public attendee question: My question is whether all the trees and plants will be true native species. Will the lists/details be available before approval of the final concept?

- a. Design team response: The various plant communities and the concept of a habitat in the concept will be approved in the final concept by the Board, but the plant list will not be generated until after the final concept as it is developed as part of the construction document development process. There are ecologists and native plant experts on the design team that are helping with plant selection to ensure habitat benefits are incorporated into the vegetation.

55. Public attendee comment: Second Sally's comment on Indigenous history on the site

56. Public attendee comment: Interested in how history is being reflected: the history of lumber industry is a big one, we have the Mill City Museum for the milling, but this site could tell the story of lumber. Maybe the Scherer Bros could fund and interpretation. Also, it's called Graco Park, but would like to have something explaining more about what they do. How do we tie in with some of the history and the area? Is there any way of engaging the Teachers' Union right next to the site.

57. Public attendee question: Where can we send written comments at this point?

- a. Design team response: To sign up for project updates, visit the MPRB project page at https://www.minneapolisparcs.org/park_care__improvements/park_projects/current_projects/scherer_bros_site_-_parcel_d_development/
- b. To email comments: cchristensen@minneapolisparcs.org
- c. To fill out the survey: <https://aflandarc.com/graco-park-community-engagement-3/>

CHAT RECORD:

16:44:53 From Carrie Christensen to Everyone:

If anyone would like to make comments or ask questions during the open house, feel free to use the chat function to write them and we will address questions following the presentation.

16:47:00 From Carrie Christensen to Everyone:

We will also have an opportunity for conversation about the preferred concept after the presentation. If you would like to share formal comments on the concept from your

agency, organization, or coalition, you are welcome to send them to me by email at cchristensen@minneapolisparks.org.

16:48:30 From Internet10 David Luce to Everyone:

David Luce; I'm at the library without a mike or camera *** Internet 10 aka David Luce Farview Lowry Block Club

16:48:50 From Carrie Christensen to Everyone:

Thanks, David! Welcome.

16:50:06 From Tess D (she/her) to Everyone:

Is this event being recorded?

16:51:55 From Catherine Zimmer, Legacy of Nature Alliance to Everyone:

Are there plans to further naturalize Boom Island? We've been disappointed in the lack of native landscaping and trees on this site, esp. as its location is important on the Flyway.

16:51:56 From Carrie Christensen to Everyone:

No it is not being recorded.

16:52:41 From Carrie Christensen to Everyone:

We do have a recording of the presentation on the project website if you are interested. We will share the link soon.

16:52:57 From Mel (Melissa) Winn to Everyone:

Do you consider handicapped in demographics and design ?

16:53:55 From Carrie Christensen to Everyone:

These are great questions and comments, and we will answer them at the end of the presentation.

16:55:02 From Tess D (she/her) to Everyone:

Further south at Boom Island seems like a much better location for a dog park, how would it be determined whether to pursue that and how would it relate to this process?

17:01:23 From Karen Katz to Everyone:

Are you imagining signs on the island to discourage hiking? I imagine people will arrive by watercraft and be tempted to walk around the beach

17:05:13 From Carrie Christensen to Everyone:

<https://aflandarc.com/graco-park-community-engagement-3/>

17:05:20 From Catherine Zimmer, Legacy of Nature Alliance to Everyone:

Why is a MPRB park office building included?

17:07:17 From Karen Katz to Everyone:

I have a question about the kayak rental when there is time for Q&A

17:08:44 From Mel (Melissa) Winn to Everyone:

I wonder about the width of path I think it is the yacht trail wouldn't more plant cover be preferable

17:10:07 From catherinewindyk to Everyone:

Is the current stair connection to the Plymouth bridge from Boom Island being removed?

17:12:13 From Diane Hofstede to Everyone:

The third greatest rivers in the world! The fly way for millions of creators and what do we propose? Mowed grass, buildings. Animals need continuous food not patches here and there with people, more people and more buildings. Resultant design? Great vocabulary however that is not this design.

17:13:45 From Constance to Everyone:

An "artistic" water fountain seems strange and wasteful of water (becoming and ever more precious resource) and even odd in a riverfront park. The River herself is a beautiful "water feature"

17:14:10 From Diane Hofstede to Everyone:

Night markets! Yes that is what we have seen in this area. Drugs and prostitution. Public safety not a word in the proposal.

17:16:17 From Sally Grans Korsh to Everyone:

Good comment on the "architectural water feature" as those kinds of Water features have been a maintenance problem at the nearby Pierre Bontineau library also - with it not working after a few years - so that may be a lower priority.

17:17:11 From Constance to Everyone:

Since the Island is strictly for habitat, a "bird-of-prey sculpture" seems odd/incongruous. Humans can observe real raptors from the park; also maintaining a sculpture would cause disruption to habitat and wildlife.

17:17:44 From David Luce to Everyone:

like

17:17:52 From annlaughlin to Everyone:

Are permeable pavers being used? If so, where? If not, why not? Less stormwater management.

17:18:05 From Mel (Melissa) Winn to Everyone:

How about some trees instead of sculpture >

17:18:57 From Karen Katz to Everyone:

what kind of bird safe glass design are you using?

17:19:08 From Constance to Everyone:

The large expanses of turf seem redundant to the same on Boom Island. Turf is the antithesis of habitat.

17:19:12 From Kalen to Everyone:

This will be an incredible improvement on what is currently there, and I appreciate the care toward both social, artistic and environmental concerns all coming together in the design... the pollinators will only get happier (they're already benefiting from the work on Hall's Island there!)

17:19:52 From Catherine Zimmer, Legacy of Nature Alliance to Everyone:

There are many more buildings in the city than Nature focused spaces. It is important to consider what "amenities" already exist at Boom Island. Re: logs and stones as "habitat"--with a lot of people, these areas would not be the best habitat for Turtles or Otters.

17:23:31 From Carrie Christensen to Everyone:

Here is the Central Riverfront Plan just referenced:

https://www.minneapolisparcs.org/_asset/d6kv9t/central_riverfront_masterplan_approved.pdf

17:23:41 From Kalen to Everyone:

It's already a well-used outdoor place, but this design actually incorporates the existence of the river (which is more than can be said for the current post-industrial site)

17:24:57 From Tess D (she/her) to Everyone:

Could we put up the slides again during Q&A? I didn't catch the details of the building blueprint

17:25:04 From Constance to Everyone:

What percentage of the site would be covered with concrete and other hardscape materials? The amount of hardscape is a bit mind-boggling and the huge plazas and wide walkways fragment the site and decrease space available for habitat.

17:27:09 From Diane Hofstede to Everyone:

How are the indigenous people of the riverfront considered. Who was consulted?

17:27:55 From oriana to Everyone:

We would like to see no access to hall's island. This would ensure considerably less human disturbance on an already fragile ecosystem within the metro area

17:28:18 From Stephen Greenfield to Everyone:

There seems to be a disconnect between the overhead map (which looked promising, considerable native habitat) and the simulated video, which looked so dominated by hardscape and lawn. Which will it be?

17:29:13 From Diane Hofstede to Everyone:

What are the public safety strategies?

17:30:03 From Tess D (she/her) to Carrie Christensen(Direct Message):

Hi Carrie, could we get the slides back up? I didn't catch the details of the building blueprint for one

17:30:46 From oriana to Everyone:

That seems redundant to have two kayak rental stations right next to each other

17:31:17 From Sally Grans Korsh to Everyone:

Comments from STAWNO 1)Critical to keep activity as a part of this site. Since it is adjacent to an industrial area there is strong concern on public safety. There have been problems with the Boom Island parking area so this needs more "eyes " to prevent bad behavior. Need to have planned activity and this building needs to have active use. 2) Winter activities are not listed - please detail how this will be activated the winter. What happens? What is plowed or what trails could be used for cross county? 3) Tunnel is critical to keep connectivity - there are some in our group who would like to assist with funding as our dedicated funds could address on the Boom Island side.

17:31:23 From Mel (Melissa) Winn to Everyone:

They may be removing some of the dams and I think this might impact river usage.

17:31:45 From Constance to Everyone:

Will all trees, shrubs, flowers, grasses, etc. all be true native species since non-native species don't provide the habitat benefits of native species? Will a plant list be available as part of the final concept? The vegetation in the video looks like monocultures—not at all the diversity needed for wildlife.

17:33:27 From catherinewindyk to Everyone:

Thank you! I think it's very important for a stair connection from Boom Island to Plymouth remain, even if it's not the current exact location.

17:34:36 From Karen Katz to Carrie Christensen(Direct Message):

Thanks I feel a little silly that I must be out of the loop. I'm currently the Paddle Share person at NPS and the Outdoor Rec Planner that collaborates with our partners on park master plans. I've been doing that since June though so heard about this meeting through a coworker. Can you make sure I'm included on project updates in the future?

karen_katz@nps.gov

17:34:54 From Sally Grans Korsh to Everyone:

From me personally - need to have a historical marker explaining the Halls Island Bath connection. This is a great "teaching moment" on the water quality of the river and the whole water infrastructure of our public welfare. Besides - it is just a fun fact from 100 years ago.

17:35:31 From Gary Meyer to Everyone:

The stairway from Plymouth to Boom Island isn't a great loss because it's not very functional and the tunnel is (in my mind) more important. How about a path down from Plymouth to Boom Island along the berm on that side of Plymouth and how about creating a similar berm from Plymouth to Graco Park along with a path down to Graco Park from Plymouth? The bridge is a large barrier and anything you can do to limit it's visual and functional presence would be appreciated.

17:36:29 From Diane Hofstede to Everyone:

Why are buildings being built on this site? Large buildings were removed to create a view corridor?

17:37:18 From Constance to Everyone:

What does it mean for humans to “interact with habitat”? which was mentioned during the presentation. If humans disrupt wildlife habitat in an area, the area ceases to be meaningful habitat?

17:37:35 From Mel (Melissa) Winn to Everyone:

I have to leave the meeting. Thanks for the presentation. I appreciate a lot of the comments from people. I am glad such a strong interest in parks.

17:37:35 From annlaughlin to Everyone:

Hall's Island habitat looks very skimpy. For suitable habitat, Hall's Island should look more like the habitat on the Lake of the Isles islands, plus more habitat of varying height and density would more readily deter public access.

17:40:51 From Tess D (she/her) to Everyone:

Could you clarify if the “sculpture” is meant to provide a nesting location? That would significantly impact the conversation - I frankly hate how it looks in the flythrough and Hall's Island itself should be the visual focus, and any habitat features should be sited with an ecological and not aesthetic basis

17:41:35 From annlaughlin to Everyone:

The reservoir under permeable pavers at least would allow a slower infiltration of water into the soil.

17:41:47 From Andrew Caddock to Everyone:

comment not a Q: please beware of creating population "sinks" when designing habitat in this urban context. It's reassuring to know the project team includes a specialist.

17:43:10 From Andrew Caddock to Everyone:

comment not a Q: please allow space and budget for power receptacles (metered) at the market and food truck areas to avoid use of portable generators.

17:43:36 From Constance to Everyone:

Even if permeable pavers still require some type of underdrain, please explain whether permeable pavers will be used, which will increase natural infiltration and decrease the amount of space needed for an under drain.

17:43:44 From Tess D (she/her) to Everyone:

+++ excellent point about power sources for any vendors

17:44:40 From David Luce to Everyone:

estimates of climate impacts of various elements, 'improvements' ?

17:45:12 From Catherine Zimmer, Legacy of Nature Alliance to Everyone:

Generally there is too much construction in this concept. There should be no buildings and no performance spaces, also smaller trails. The Upper Harbor Terminal site has a performance space in addition to numerous performance spaces throughout the city. This site really needs to be natural esp. as we are facing an extinction and climate crisis. E.g. while maybe the proposed buildings will be less energy intensive, consider the environmental and carbon impacts of procuring the materials.

17:45:37 From David Luce to Everyone:

Climate mitigations of elements?

17:46:26 From Constance to Everyone:

Can the number of promenades be reduced to one? Having two is redundant and really fragments the site rather than create contiguous habitat.

17:47:21 From oriana to Everyone:

We would like to see less turf on #8 area and in general, and more native flowers and grasses as well as pollinator gardens

17:47:22 From Constance to Everyone:

Which pathways are not paved? Do the renderings show concrete? Can some pathways be not paved?

17:48:04 From catherinewindyk to Everyone:

Will there be opportunity to comment on the intersection improvements? (Apologies if this was mentioned)

17:48:35 From Sally Grans Korsh to Everyone:

Another critical maintenance piece: Note the channel between Halls and Graco is already getting filled with silt (Kayaking is ok but NO other boats can use it) and will need to be dredged - as the boat landing at Boom Island also needs to be dredged.

17:49:45 From oriana to Everyone:

We want more native plants that support pollinators and native wildlife

17:50:10 From Tess D (she/her) to Everyone:

What will the condition of Lot 1 be and how will it interact with the park?

17:50:27 From Constance to Everyone:

My question is whether all the trees and plants will be true native species. Will the lists/details be available before approval of the final concept?

17:58:27 From Tess D (she/her) to Everyone:

That's why I ask!

17:59:56 From catherinewindyk to Everyone:

Second Sally's comment on Indigenous history on the site

18:00:54 From Karen Katz to Everyone:

Where can we send written comments at this point?

18:01:25 From Carrie Christensen to Everyone:

https://www.minneapolisparcs.org/park_care__improvements/park_projects/current_projects/scherer_bros_site_-_parcel_d_development/

18:02:31 From Lee W Munnich Jr to Everyone:

Thank you, very exciting project!

18:02:36 From catherinewindyk to Everyone:

Thank you!

18:02:53 From Catherine Zimmer, Legacy of Nature Alliance to Everyone:

Thank you for engaging us.

18:03:00 From David Luce to Everyone:

Lots more to talk about . . .

18:03:13 From David Luce to Everyone:

David Luce

18:03:17 From Carrie Christensen to Karen Katz(Direct Message):

I will follow up with you!

18:03:40 From Karen Katz to Carrie Christensen(Direct Message):

great thanks, I just wrote down your contact info, too

18:03:41 From David Luce to Everyone:

Thanks!

18:03:55 From Karen Katz to Carrie Christensen(Direct Message):

Very informative meeting, thanks. Have a good night

18:03:56 From Carrie Christensen to Karen Katz(Direct Message):

We have reached out to NPS about the project as a whole but not yet with Paddle Share. We have an MOU that I need to look at again too.

18:04:06 From Carrie Christensen to Karen Katz(Direct Message):

Oh good.