



CITY OF SAINT PAUL

Mayor Christopher B. Coleman

400 City Hall Annex
25 West 4th Street
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55102
www.stpaul.gov/parks

Telephone: 651-266-6400
Facsimile: 651-292-7405

May 26, 2011

**Lilydale Regional Park Design Advisory Task Force
Meeting Notes – May 10, 2011
Wellstone Center Room 31**

Meeting Attendees

City Staff: Anne Hunt, Mike Hahm, Don Ganje, Ellen Stewart, Karin Misiewicz, Cy Kosel

Consultant Design Team: Michael Shroeder, CJ Fernandez, Jack Becker, Rick Carter

Advisory Task Force Members Present: Bob Spaulding, Grit Youngquist, Richard Arey, Gjerry Berquist, Jan Carr, Jim Ingemunson, Jon Kerr, Peggy Lynch, Wendy Moylan, Susan Overson, Gregory Page

Ellen Stewart presented an overview of the meeting and the goals for this meeting, reinforcing the need to make decisions to keep the project moving forward. CJ Fernandez presented the designs and highlighted comments gained through the entire planning process related to specific design directions.

Comments and questions offered by the Task Force included the following:

Richard – Give priority to trail users with a three way stop condition at the DNR boat launch road.

Gjerry – Footpath around dog park should be shown as a dual-use path. Plan to make it a bike path.

Bob – Proving a variety of experience for hiking trails and regional trails on both river and lake was a directive from early meetings.

Peggy – City policy to separate bicyclists from pedestrians; keep bicyclists off pedestrian path.

Jon – Concern over amount of pavement; try to do something to control traffic at Boat Launch Road; boardwalk deserves a lot of consideration, and tie into a fishing pier.

Richard – Separated paths are the way to go; use gravel in walking paths (create a walking path loop).

Ellen -Richard's suggestion of separated paths was considered, but given the limited land area, existing habitat and new on-road bike lane for faster cyclists, the thought has been a combined trail was the best balance.

Jon – Will funds from the turn back be applied to Lilydale Park. There should be funding applied to trails.

Ellen -Funds for the turn back of the roadway are likely to be allocated for roadway improvements.

Peggy – Primary a biking/walking park, not a picnic shelter park. We're going backward.

Bob – Charge was to design the roadway and shelters; we need to stick to that.

Richard – Views to the lake... keep in mind.

Jan – More input to trail design needed – how will it fit together?. Questions about process and design going forward still need to be addressed.

Bob – We've seen a very similar concept of the trail before, and the Task Force seemed generally okay with it. We can use it as a general framework to use to think about everything will fit together.

Gregory – This meeting is not about trail design but about other components that are in LHBs charge.

Grit – So many comments at Open House were related to trails... how did we get to the point where trails were not the priority.

Ellen - It not correct to say that trails are not a priority –the work we are moving forward with first rose to the top because of construction sequencing, the agreements entered into for the funding. We will not construct the road without also amending the trail system to be intact and continuous as an interim step. We have received many comments related to the trails and we understand the importance of trails throughout our park system and in particular in Lilydale. We will move forward with comments gathered during this process as we design the trail system.

Jan – Concerned about cutting off public comment relating to trails; understands that funding has directed the course of the design process.

Ellen - a task force process can occur when funding is in place for trail design and public process.

Jon – Agrees with Jan; have task force look at trail design

Ellen - Current Legacy funding is specific for the design of the roadway and the shelter. The city has committed a large percentage of Legacy funding to the clean up and development of Lilydale. We will continue to pursue funding sources appropriate to construct the elements of the master plan in a logical order given construction sequencing.

Jon - Does a trail design involve a consultant?

Ellen – The design of the trail will require design and engineering which may be done by a consultant or may be done by city staff. In either case, we would need funds to complete this work and they have not been identified at this time.

Richard – Funding for road will screw up the paths; get funding and then get a group together.

Jon – Continued access points should be a point of design

Ellen – Gates will be included at parking areas and maybe in the future if needed, at other locations. The City does understand that there are issues which have been expressed by the

community and users of the park. The current roadway design includes mitigation practices to address those concerns. The current design does not preclude the closing of the road in the future.

Jon - Why wasn't this brought to the task force?

Ellen – Public Works and public safety issues still need to be addressed by the city. The closing of the road is more complicated than putting up gates. The larger system of roadways and streets would need to be looked at comprehensively before making this kind of a decision. The police department also favors continued access along the road. But in terms of safety, we are concentrating on CPTED improvements that will redesign the park in ways to make it safer. I think we'll see the improvements we're adding here and some of the other elements will bring more eyes to the park and change expectations, and help reduce unwanted activity in the park.

Gjerry – Roadway designed to make it safer – less volume, lower speed; wants to continue the process with people who are willing to show up.

Jan – Gateway design should accommodate gates if needed in the future.

Jim - Barriers are used now when the park floods and subsequent road closing. Should consider putting the gates in now for that use at least.

Bob – Grit, Ellen and I have talked about working with the consultant to identify how you could put gates in as part of this design effort, so we at least don't needlessly limit the possibility down the road. But closing the road is a dramatic change, and the thought is there's good reason to think that less dramatic solutions can help get at safety issues.

Grit – Thank you for leaving the asphalt. Height reduction was good to hear, what the horizontal dimensions are.

Wendy – Steel is most durable, will not show abuse – also likes it because it is more open.

Peggy – How many buildings?

Ellen - Construction will be phased and we will most likely construct the road, the restroom/storage structure and the 6 table shelter to start with along with one of the parking lots near Pickerel Clearing. We can add structures and/or parking in the future if use warrants.

Peggy – Do we have to build structures?

Ellen – The City is committed to providing a shelter in this regional park.

Jon – Appreciates work in scale – green roof and homage to Lilydale. Will live with the size of the structure; accepted responsibility for suggesting multiple buildings.

Gregory – Scale relates to program; while schools are in a crunch now, it won't necessarily always be that way.

Bob – This is a regional park and it's a large park. Speaking as a representative of Friends of the Mississippi – movement to smaller scale is positive, especially with 2 buildings posed for implementation; would be fine with either, but prefers steel; better message for Lilydale; better scale.

Jim - Is green roof "dry" underneath?

Ellen – Yes. The shelter will keep people underneath it dry.

Gjerry – Green roof will require maintenance beyond capabilities. This needs to be addressed.

Ellen – The designs have been vetted with Operations and Maintenance staff who are comfortable with these options. Their concerns have been discussed in this presentation and will continue to be considered as the consultants design the shelter and restroom facility. What we need from the Advisory Task Force is their recommendation on which style of shelter they prefer.

Mike Hahm– There are options for maintenance that don't rely as heavily on city resources. What we need to think about is. "How do we get into green roof business with a partner? How can we make it safe for the city to start investing in this kind of system?" As we move forward we will consider capitalizing on partnerships and engaging volunteers to help care for and maintain the green roof. That would be much easier than trying to get people to adopt a clay tile roof or clean off graffiti.

Richard – Likes green roof, transparency...

Jan – Is the fireplace necessary? Removing it would reduce size; maintenance for green roof can be accompanied by volunteers.

CJ - the fireplace could be moved to the side or end and that would reduce the interior space needed to accommodate the program of 6 tables.

Jon – Likes green roof; education programming was not a part of the master plan.

Grit – Is there a willingness to revisit the fireplace? Education was not a master plan program. Size of structure driven by education when it wasn't part of the master plan is wrong.

Bob - noted the time was up and asked if anyone objected to the recommendation of moving forward with the shelter with the green roof design. If anyone objects at this time, it is important to say so and why.

Without any objections, the recommendation of the task force is to move forward with the design of the shelter with the green roof, the roadway alignment as shown in concept, gateway elements which reflect a likeness to the materials of the shelter but using the more upright concept shown and the design of the associated spaces as discussed and presented.

This constitutes my understanding of items discussed and decisions reached. If there are any omissions or discrepancies, please notify the author in writing.