MEETING NOTES

CITY OF SAINT PAUL

MEETING DATE: December 3, 2013
LOCATION: Nova Classical Academy
ATTENDING: Emily Shively, John Yust, Gary Brueggemann, Scott Olson, Kent Petterson, Martin Schieckel, Bill Driver, Jennifer Verbrugge, Tonya Johnson- Nicholie, Alice Messer, Adam Robbins, Pete Regnier, Don Ganje, Dave Bredemus, Paula Faughender, Rory Stierler, Halle O'Falvey, Bob Fossum, Betty Moran, Julie Anderson, Dan Pederson, Karin Misiewicz, JoAnna Craighead

NOT IN ATTENDANCE: Deborah Rose, Stephanie Vagle, Manual Cervantes, Liz McMann Lucy Thompson, Brian Bloomfield

NOTES BY: Alice Messer, January 14, 2014

DISCUSSION TOPICS:

Tonya opened up the meeting and highlighting meeting agenda.

Recap of Mtg #8 by Alice Messer.

- Alice stated goal of meeting was to conclude design advisory committee with presentation on preliminary park phasing plan.
- Alice provided a brief recap of Mtg #8.
    1. Reviewed minor changes to master plan. These included:
        - Text addition of "Active Park; generally defined as area north of rail road tracks Passive Park; generally defined as area south of rail road tracks."
        - Text addition of "Explore ADA access to Victoria Park" when Shepard Road and Sam Morgan Regional Trail are reconstructed
- Presented summary of prioritization exercise.
    1. 21 people completed exercise and results tallied by average as well as median ranking.
    2. Results reflect prioritization of plan elements in perfect environment where only criterion was personal preference.
    3. Results of exercise helped to inform development of the Preliminary Park Phasing Plan.

Don Ganje presented Preliminary Park Phasing Plan.

Don presented Preliminary Park Phasing Plan which will serve as a framework for phased implementation of master plan.

- Detail design development of the water feature and overall grading plan is first step of

implementation in order to set site elevations and determine required infrastructure.

- After detail design development; soil remediation can occur. This includes required topsoil and seeding for site.
- Concurrently with soil remediation; the internal trail system can be developed.
- After internal trail construction the following items may be implemented :
    - Construction of south side access road
    - Picnic shelter/restrooms on the north side
    - Multi-use athletic field and related parking lot – north side
    - Re-circulating water feature
    - Community gardens.
- External trail connections can be implemented after internal trails followed by fishing pier/shoreline enhancements, historic quarry/interpretive opportunities, boardwalk/amphitheater and bridge over ravine.

Important to note that the phasing plan is preliminary and elements may vary depending on funding sources and results of detailed design development. A full version of the Preliminary Park Phase Plan is included in the presentation materials posted online under Meeting #9 at the following link: www.stpaul.gov/victoriapark

Questions/Comments in regards to Preliminary Park Phasing Plan:

- Pete Regnier inquired about preliminary grading plan being completed for the park. Stated that he thought development of preliminary grading plan was part of Design Advisory Committee's charge. Don Ganje responded that preliminary grading that has occurred was in response to free fill coming to the site, remediation of existing wetlands and construction of surrounding infrastructure (Victoria Way) and Nova Classical Academy. Review not charge of design advisory committee.
- Tonya Johnson Nicholie stated that HRA currently controls remediation funds and then will turn over to Parks when remediation completed. Tonya stated that she wants to make sure the CIB funding requests are clearly stated and vetted through Fort Road Federation. Requested removal of remediation funding from infrastructure projects. Requested open process for how remaining remediation money to be spent on site. Concern with remediation money going towards large ticket item in plan and not serving the community. Tonya would like transparent process with spending of remediation money when it is available. Tonya wants to make sure that the funding process is more transparent and equitable than the 'Invest St Paul' city program which has not redeveloped properties as promised and has left the neighborhood with deteriorating properties and no money left to redevelop them. Don Ganje responded that City will inform Fort Road Federation and Design Advisory Committee of amount of funding available after remediation efforts. They will present options for spending of money based on amount of money remaining.
- Scott Olsen inquired about what is considered "the park" in the master plan. Many elements are "nice to have" but not central to "core" of park. Don Ganje responded that the master plan will take many years to implement. Construction of internal trails is essential to "core" of park as it provides movement within the site. As additional master plan elements are added; they will only add to the variety of people and experiences of

the park. Important to remember long-range plan and provided perspective on implementation of Como Regional Park. Master plan for Como Regional Park completed in mid-1980's and all the plan elements have yet to be constructed.

Emily Shively facilitated comments around the table. Asked each committee member to state their feeling on the master plan based on the following ranking range:
1 : being love the plan and fully support it
3 : being the plan is good, but have some concerns
5 : being not happy with the plan and do not support it

Scott Olson – Excited about the plan and been great process. Gave plan a "2".

Gary Brueggeman – Commented on facing funding head on and explore fund raising options. Would like to see funding built into master plan. Explore volunteer efforts and have be City wide effort. Like to see disability play ground on south side of park. Feels the devils are in the details and how the plan gets implemented. Gave plan a "2/3".

Dave Bredemus – Remembers oil tanks at site and plan is vast improvement to site. Felt process was "nice" but wanted to have heated debates and discuss "elephant in the room" in regards to artificial versus natural turf for multi-use athletic field with design advisory committee. Gave plan a "1"

Rory Stierler - From Natural Park Service perspective, feels plan is a great amenity to Mississippi River corridor. Unique area with bluffs. Felt committee represented well balanced interests and looks forward to buckthorn volunteer events in the park. Gave the plan a "2".

John Yust – Looking forward to being an advocate at state and federal level to receive funding and hope others will do the same. Wants to be informed of funding sources the City goes after and be able to lobby for. Appreciates connection to river with Great River Passage elements included. Like to keep the door open for changing the name of the park. Suggestion of "William Ferry Park". State he would freak out if multi-use athletic field is first plan element constructed in park. Intrigued by idea of water retention with re-circulating water feature. Excited about the plan, but have reservations until see product in the ground. Still upset about Island Station as feels removal is missed opportunity for community. Stewart Ave is the Old Fort Road alignment that feeds into the park, which is another opportunity for historic interpretation. Would feel better about the plan if the fields were more closely aligned with Nova Classical Academy. Wants to give the plan a "1", but waiting to see how it plays out. Gave plan a "3".

Martin Schieckel – Looked back at old master plan for Victoria Park and had to roll with punches when Exxon stated land only available for park land. Now have a park plan that no-one would have expected. Felt the early process began with heated discussions, but they only bogged down the meeting. Preferred around the table comments as allowed

everyone to state their comments and get sense of where people were "for/against" without having to vote. Gave plan a "2".

Jennifer Verbrugge – So excited and will do whatever she can to make it happen. Gave plan a "1".

Paula Faughender – Thinking about 20 years ago when debating home purchase in neighborhood by oil tanks. Last ten years have been remarkable change and looking forward to future 10 years. Not opposed to any plan elements proposed and feels is a gift to the neighborhood. Feel that having trails and grass land is a great improvement on the past use of the site. Stressed need to keep neighborhood involved. Gave plan a "2".

Karin Misiewicz – Excited with plan, but has one reservation. Gave plan a "2".

Pete Regnier – Felt well taken care of by Parks Staff. Stated that approving concept, not buildings or other specific plan elements. Materials used for multi-use field were not endorsed by the Committee as well as materials for picnic shelters. Estimated costs provided, but general materials not provided with cost. Feels not fulfilling obligation to master plan process as too early to approve without details. Looked back at Park Design Process document from the beginning of Committee and feels that Committee has not addressed general location of all elements and forms, plant materials as masses drawn to scale,3D qualities and effects of the design, and preliminary grading plan as stated in Park Design Process. May have $2.7 million left and committee should decide what this will be spent on. Likes the concepts, but feels haven't completed the job. Is uncomfortable with the weighted evaluation exercise being released as part of the taskforce since 21 people completed exercise and only 16 members on Committee. Gave the plan a 3-4

Halle O'Falvey – Concerned with multi-use field not being closer to Nova Classical Academy. Concerned with the unknowns around the multi-use fields like parking being lost at the residences near the fields. Migratory bird element is important and like to see disabled play area in park. Concerned that money will make decisions on implementation. Realizes that group is advisory and not here to vote on the plan, but committee is a strong voice. Gave the plan a "3".

Bill Driver – Was under impression that committee would not vote on plan, but be consensus process. Represents youth recreation and new housing will have a lot of youth present and need places for youth to recreate. Looking forward to meeting in smaller groups to decide design details of master plan elements. Gave plan a "3".

Kent Petterson – Privilege to be part of Committee. Thanks to Parks and Recreation and co-chairs for facilitating meetings. Happy south area is natural and north area is active. Great River Passage connections are included in the plan and happy that internal trails are #1 priority for implementation. Preliminary cost elements assign values to park elements and really hoping plan is not that expensive to implement. Feels critical junction will be

when Parks knows amount of money left for implementation. Does not want to see fundraising occur until we know how much remediation money remains. Obvious that there are still topics that need work and not sure if committee should "dis-ban" or call a "time-out". Feels name change is important and also reminded people of memorial to Patrick. Gave plan a "3".

Bob Fossum – Thinking about how unique the plan will be with something for everyone. There is an active component, natural, trees, upland, river, bluffs, young and old. Plan does an excellent job of bringing it all together. Gave plan a "1".

Adam Robbins – Great job of providing synergy in plan. Echo's Bob's comments with unique aspect of plan. Remind people that users of the multi-use athletic field should be involved in design advisory group. Adam is "natural resource guy" for City of Saint Paul, but feels missing huge opportunity if not involving users of future multi-use athletic field in discussions. Gave plan a "1".

Questions and Comments where then heard from members of the public.

Dan Pederson – Feels the process was interesting and plan offers a lot. Gave plan a "1"..

Julie Andrews – Not part of committee and feels cannot give ranking as not part of all discussions. Appreciates what she is seeing.

JoAnne Craighead – Gave plan a "2".

Betty Moran – Passed.

Tonya Johnson-Nicholie – Gave plan a "2".

Emily Shively and Alice Messer thanked everyone for serving on the Committee. Stated that next step is for master plan to go before Parks Commission for adoption in February 2014.

- Emily stated she would clarify adoption process with Parks Commission. Response: The Parks and Recreation Commission, in adopting the Victoria Park Master Plan, is essentially acknowledging the work of the advisory committee and affirming that the parks and recreation department can move ahead with plan implementation. The commission's role is not to make changes to the master plan, either adding or removing elements, as that responsibility was delegated to the advisory committee process.

Parks Commission Meeting: February 12, 2014 beginning at 6:30 pm at El Rio Vista Recreation Center

Please contact Alice Messer at 651-266-6412 if any items are missing from the meeting notes or items were listed incorrectly.