



Request for City Council Committee Action from the Department of Community Planning and Economic Development – Planning Division

Date: February 13, 2008

To: Councilmember Gary Schiff, Zoning and Planning Committee

Referral to: Not applicable

Prepared or Submitted by: Carol Ahlgren, Senior Planner, (612) 673-2847

Approved by: Jack Byers, Planning Supervisor

Subject: Appeal of the decision of the Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC) to deny the Amendment to a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness for Installation of Artificial Turf on the DeLaSalle Athletic Facility located at 25 West Island Avenue and 201 East Island Avenue, Nicollet Island, within the St. Anthony Falls Historic District and the National Park Service Mississippi National River Recreation Area.

Recommendation: Deny the appeal

Previous Directives: Condition of Approval by City Council on April 27, 2007 specified that the field be of natural, not artificial, turf.

Prepared by: Carol Ahlgren

Approved by: Jack Byers, Planning Supervisor

Presenters in Committee: Carol Ahlgren

Reviews

- Permanent Review Committee (PRC): Approval ___ Date _____
- Policy Review Group (PRG): Approval ___ Date _____

Financial Impact

- No financial impact
- Action requires an appropriation increase to the ___ Capital Budget or ___ Operating Budget
- Action provides increased revenue for appropriation increase
- Action requires use of contingency or reserves
- Action is within the Business Plan
- Action requires a change to the Business Plan

- Other financial impact
- Request provided to the Finance Department when provided to the Committee Coordinator

Community Impact (use any categories that apply)

Ward: 3

Neighborhood Notification: Notice to the neighborhood and surrounding property owners sent on February 11, 2008

City Goals: See staff report.

Comprehensive Plan: See staff report.

Zoning Code: See staff report.

Living Wage/Job Linkage: Not applicable.

End of 60/120-day Decision Period: Not applicable.

Other: Not applicable.

Background/Supporting Information Attached:

The appellant, Erick Galatz, on behalf of DeLaSalle High School, has appealed the decision of the Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC) to deny an Amendment to a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness, for installation of artificial turf on the DeLaSalle athletic facility to be constructed on Nicollet Island, at 25 West Island Avenue and 201 East Island Avenue. The project area is located within the St. Anthony Falls National Register of Historic Places Historic District, is a City of Minneapolis Historic District, and is located within the National Park Service's Mississippi National River Recreation Area (MNRRA). The proposed Amendment was denied by unanimous vote at the Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC) public hearing on February 5, 2008.

A Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of the DeLaSalle Athletic Field, and associated structures for joint use by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board and DeLaSalle High School was denied by the Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC) August 8, 2006; the denial was appealed to City Council and received approval on September 22, 2006. On March 20, 2007 an Amendment for a Modified Design to the previously approved COA was denied by the HPC. The decision was appealed by DeLaSalle. On April 27, 2007, the City Council conditionally granted the appeal; one of the conditions of approval was that the field surface be of natural, not artificial turf.

On February 5, 2008, an Amendment to the previously approved COA for the installation of artificial turf on the proposed athletic field was unanimously denied by the HPC. The Commission concurred with staff findings that the proposed synthetic material is not compatible with the St. Anthony Falls Historic District.

Supporting Material:

Exhibit 1. February 5, 2008 HPC Actions

Exhibit 2. Meeting Minutes HPC, February 5, 2007

Exhibit 3. Staff Report, February 5, 2008, including attachments

A. Application for Amendment of Certificate of Appropriateness by DeLaSalle High School, December 17, 2007

B. Technical specifications for artificial turf for the DeLaSalle athletic field; supplemental material submitted by the applicant, January 9, 2008

C. City of Minneapolis City Council, Zoning and Planning Committee, Findings of Fact and Recommendation, as amended, April 19, 2007.

D. Minneapolis City Council, minutes, April 27, 2007, page 360.

E. "Artificial Turf (AstroTurf™) and How It Grew," www.astroturf.com/history.htm.

F. *The New York Times*: David Gonzales, "On Playing Fields, Grass is an Endangered Species," August 13, 2007; Jeff Holtz, "Parents Raising Concerns Over Synthetic Turf," October 28, 2007.

G. Eric Galatz to Carol Ahlgren, email correspondence, January 9, 2008; January 15, 2008.

H. *Baristanet*: "If You Build It They Will Protest," September 13, 2006.

Exhibit 4. Appellant Materials

Exhibit 5. Notice to neighborhood group, February 11, 2008

Exhibit 6. Items submitted during or after the public hearing, February 5, 2008

**CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS
HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION STAFF REPORT**

FILE NAME: Amendment to Certificate of Appropriateness for Installation of Artificial Turf on
Athletic Field at DeLaSalle High School

DATE OF APPLICATION: December 17, 2007

APPLICANT: Eric Galatz for DeLaSalle High School (612) 335-1509

DATE OF HEARING: February 5, 2008

EXPIRATION OF APPEAL PERIOD: February 15, 2008

HPC SITE/DISTRICT: St. Anthony Falls Historic District: Nicollet Island

CATEGORY: Contributing

CLASSIFICATION: Amendment to previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness

STAFF INVESTIGATION AND REPORT: Carol Ahlgren (612) 673-2847

DATE: January 16, 2008

A. SITE AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposed DeLaSalle High School Athletic Field project is located at 25 West Island Avenue and 201 East Island Avenue and currently consists of playing fields, tennis courts, soccer fields, and open space. The area is located in the St. Anthony Falls Historic District, Nicollet Island Sub-District, is listed on the National Register of Historic Places, is a state of Minnesota Historic District, and is locally designated as a District by the Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC). The St. Anthony Falls Historic District and Nicollet Island are also located within the boundaries of the National Park Service Mississippi National River Recreation Area (MNRRA).

The Modified Design for the DeLaSalle Athletic Facility, which was conditionally approved by the Minneapolis City Council on April 27, 2007, will encompass the construction of a soccer/football field adjacent to DeLaSalle High School on Nicollet Island. The project will require the vacation and removal of a portion of Grove Street which is a contributing resource to the St. Anthony Falls Historic District. The approved Modified Design calls for the construction of three one story brick structures: a press box building, a ticket/storage building, and a concession/restroom which will be added to the existing high school building. The approved design will feature a sunken athletic field and construction of a 6 foot 11 inch tall berm on the west side of the field that will be used for bleacher seating.

The conditions of approval concerned development of an archeology assessment and mitigation plan, subject to approval by the HPC; and that the field is natural, not artificial turf (Attachment C, p. 2, Finding # 15).

B. BACKGROUND

An Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) was prepared for the initial athletic field Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) application. The EAW recommended archeological

mitigation prior to and during the proposed new construction. The COA for the Athletic Field was denied by the HPC on August 8, 2006; the decision was appealed to the City Council by DeLaSalle. On September 22, 2006, the Zoning and Planning Committee of the Minneapolis City Council granted the appeal and approved the project. An amendment to the original COA for a Modified Design was presented to the HPC for approval on March 20, 2007 and was subsequently denied. The decision was appealed by DeLaSalle. The project conditionally received City Council approval on April 27, 2007. Two of the conditions of approval from the City Council decision concerned archeological mitigation (See Attachment C, p. 4):

2. Archeological testing and phased plan for excavation, recovery, and dispensation of resources and artifacts will be developed and approved by the Heritage Preservation Commission prior to the issuance of construction permits; and
3. Applicant will develop an interpretive plan for the public dissemination of recovered artifacts and data which should be developed and approved by the Heritage Preservation Commission prior to the submission of final architectural and engineering drawings.

In October, 2007 an Archeological Resource Assessment and Mitigation Plan for the DeLaSalle High School Athletic Facility was prepared for DeLaSalle by Dr. Michelle Terrell of Two Pines Resource Group, LLC. On October 23, 2007 the plan was presented to the HPC and received approval with two conditions 1) that the consultant will schedule a minimum of one public open house on site during the course of fieldwork; and 2) the consultant will return to HPC following the completion of fieldwork and present a plan for mitigation of historical artifacts. At the present time, archeological excavation is underway; it is expected that the HPC will review the mitigation plan in the next few months and that a public open house will occur in the spring.

A third condition of approval for the Certificate of Appropriateness for the Modified Design, approved by the Minneapolis City Council on April 27, 2007 specified that the surface of the field would be “natural turf” (Attachment C, p. 2; Attachment D).

On December 17, 2007 Eric Galatz on behalf of DeLaSalle, submitted an Amendment to the COA for the Modified Design, for artificial turf (Attachments A and B).

Background: Artificial Turf

Artificial turf originated in the 1960's; its rise in prominence occurred following its installation in the newly-built Houston Astrodome in 1966. Originally patented as Chemgrass, its inventors renamed it AstroTurf following its well-publicized use in the Astrodome. The name AstroTurf became synonymous with all types of artificial turf. Since the 1970's artificial turf has been used for indoor and outdoor playing fields (Attachment E).

Since its initial use over 40 years ago, artificial turf has evolved in terms of appearance, composition, installation, and longevity. The original AstroTurf and its competitor brands basically consisted of nylon carpet with a thin foam backing that was placed over dirt in large strips held together with zippers. As the product evolved the dirt was paved with asphalt and topped with foam for cushioning. Porous asphalt was later used to solve drainage problems. By

the 1980's, installation of an artificial turf system consisted of leveling the dirt of the field, then applying several inches of crushed rock, porous asphalt, and foam padding, topped by the turf which was sewn together and reinforced with glue. Tiny holes were punched in the foam padding to permit drainage.

In the 1990's an innovation occurred with the change from nylon to polyethylene which was deemed to be both stronger and softer. Polyethylene turf is akin to a shag carpet with long fibers up to 2 ½ inches in length; with repeated use the fibers shred, making the surface softer. The installation is similar to that of nylon turf: leveled dirt followed by a layer of crushed rock, porous asphalt, foam and turf. With polyethylene turf, however, the surface is filled with rubber crumbs from recycled tires or sneaker soles which are frozen then shattered and placed on the field so that less than an inch of turf is visible.

Advocates of artificial turf cite its lower maintenance costs, all weather use, and durability; with a life span of at least 10 years. As noted in the manufacturers guide provided by the applicant, however, artificial turf is not maintenance free. Debris such as paper and leaves do not decompose and must be removed or swept from the field. Furthermore, after approximately 10 years the artificial turf, or top layer, must be removed and disposed of; the potential to recycle the polyethylene has not, to date, been determined by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) (Attachment A: p.38). Opponents to artificial turf cite its extreme temperatures resulting from exposure to sunlight which may create urban heat islands, and potential carcinogens in the recycled tires used for fill (Attachment F).

The Certificate of Appropriateness application stated that "artificial turf is in use on the athletic fields in historic Fort Snelling (Minnesota) and in other historic districts" (Attachment A, p. 8); the Fort Snelling reference was subsequently retracted (Attachment G; p. 1). Other examples referred to included historic stadiums at Berkley, CA; Newton KS; Tacoma, WA; and Columbus, OH, all of which are individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places. In Faribault, Minnesota, the 250 acre Shattuck-St. Mary's School campus, a National Register listed Historic District includes a recently installed synthetic turf outdoor field (Attachment G, p. 1).

The applicant provided additional information regarding installation of a synthetic turf field as part of recent proposed improvements to Central Park, Pasadena, California, located within the Old Pasadena Historic District, listed on the National Register of Historic Places (Attachment G, pp 3-19). The appropriateness of artificial turf for individually listed stadiums or within historic districts has been considered on a case-by case- basis in recent years; generalizations regarding its appropriateness for all historic districts can not be made. In Glen Ridge, New Jersey, for example, allegedly hundreds of residents in the city's historic district showed up at a public hearing to debate the installation of artificial turf fields (Attachment G, p. 20).

C. PROPOSED NEW CONSTRUCTION

The applicant is applying for an Amendment to a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness for the following work:

Application of artificial (polyethylene) turf to a previously approved regulation size football field and associated support facilities for shared use by DeLaSalle High School and the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB). The field will also provide one regulation size soccer field and three junior soccer fields, superimposed upon the football field, and seating for up to 750 spectators.

The project area is bounded by the railroad tracks to the north, DeLaSalle High School to the south, Island Avenue to the east, and Nicollet Street to the west. The site consists of a portion of Grove Street, tennis courts, practice fields and open land. The area north of Grove Street and south of the railroad tracks is public land, owned by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board. An Archeological mitigation plan, one of the previous conditions of approval, is currently underway. The proposed change in material will likely not cause further disturbance of archeological resources since the depth will be 10 inches below the sub grade; two inches less than the original proposal.

Installation of the synthetic turf field calls for modification of the previously submitted plans. As indicated on number 3C of the revised plans (Attachment A, p. 14), the change from proposed natural turf to artificial will require an excavation of prepared sub grade to 10 inches below proposed finished grade instead of 12 inches. The installation of artificial turf will also eliminate the drain tile and irrigation systems; a flat drain tile system and collector drain will be connected to the originally proposed storm sewer system. The artificial turf will require installation of drainage fabric, 1 x 12 inch flat train tile followed by layers of porous aggregate (granite and trap rock), topped by the synthetic turf and rubber infill. The approximate area to be covered by the artificial turf is 78,220 square feet. As indicated on the cross section plan submitted by the applicant (Attachment B, p. 9) a concrete pier will be installed 14 inches below the surface with nailer boards. The top of the curb, which will encircle the perimeter of the field, will consist of a 6 inch wide exposed strip of concrete.

The current application represents an Amendment to the previously approved Modified Design of the Certificate of Appropriateness. The amendment concerns material, i.e. artificial versus natural turf. The resulting findings therefore, do not and are not required to address the merits of the construction of the field or the project as a whole. Given that construction of the athletic field has been approved, the current issue concerns the change in material from natural to artificial turf. The St. Anthony Falls Historic District guidelines do not address landscapes per se; recommended materials for buildings in the district however, consist of brick, concrete, and wood siding. The Secretary of the Interior's guidelines also do not specifically address synthetic material in terms of landscapes. The most applicable Secretary of the Interior's guidelines as determined by staff are as follows:

C. APPLICABLE REGULATIONS, POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

U.S. Department of the Interior National Park Service
1990

Building Site

Recommended:

-Protecting, e.g. preserving in place known archeological material whenever possible.

Alterations/Additions for the New Use

Not Recommended:

-Removing or radically changing buildings and their features or site features which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building site so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

-Introducing a new landscape feature or plant material that is visually incompatible with the site or that destroys site patterns or vistas.

District/Neighborhood

Alterations/Additions for the New Use

Not Recommended:

-Using a substitute material for the replacement part that does not convey the visual appearance of the surviving parts of the building, streetscape, or landscape feature or that is physically or chemically incompatible.

Energy Retrofitting

Recommended:

District/Neighborhood

-Maintaining those existing landscape features which moderate the effects of the climate on the setting such as deciduous trees, evergreen wind-blocks, and lakes or ponds.

D. FINDINGS

1. The proposed DeLaSalle Athletic Facility is located within the Nicollet Island sub-District of the St. Anthony Falls Historic District. The District is listed on the National Register of Historic Places, is a state of Minnesota designated district, and is locally designated.

2. The development of a plan for the excavation, recovery, and dispensation of resources and artifacts, was approved by the HPC on October 23, 2007.

3. The proposed artificial turf field will not require additional depth of excavation and will likely not impact archeological resources.

4. An artificial turf athletic field will be visually and materially incompatible with the existing Nicollet Island landscape and will diminish the historic integrity of the Island and the District as a whole. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards recommends *against* substitute materials that do not convey the visual appearance of the surviving parts of the landscape, or that are physically and chemically inappropriate to the district. Installation of artificial turf on the DeLaSalle Athletic Field will be analogous to applying vinyl siding on a contributing building within the St. Anthony Falls Historic District. The proposed material will detract from, rather than enhance the historic character of the surrounding area.

5. Supporting material supplied by the applicant and staff indicates that due to the relative newness of the proposed artificial turf, data concerning potential health and environmental issues is unavailable or incomplete.

6. The long-term environmental impacts of the proposed materials for those who live, work, and play in the Historic District are difficult to accurately predict without further evidence. Possible concerns are: a) potential high temperatures/heat island caused by the field's exposure; b) the chemical stability/instability of the fill in relation to the surrounding vegetation; c) the potential for the proposed fill to inadvertently be dispersed into the Mississippi River given that this part of the district will be transformed into an actively used recreational space.

E. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Heritage Preservation Commission **adopts** the staff findings and **denies** the Second Amendment to the Certificate of Appropriateness.

Attachments:

- A. Application for Amendment of Certificate of Appropriateness by DeLaSalle High School, December 17, 2007.
- B. Technical specifications for artificial turf for the DeLaSalle athletic field; supplemental material submitted by the applicant, January 9, 2008.
- C. City of Minneapolis City Council, Zoning and Planning Committee, Findings of Fact and Recommendation, as amended, April 19, 2007.
- D. Minneapolis City Council, minutes, April 27, 2007, page 360.
- E. “Artificial Turf (AstroTurf™) and How It Grew,” www.astroturf.com/history.htm
- F. *The New York Times*: David Gonzalez, “On Playing Fields, Grass is an Endangered Species,” August 13, 2007; Jeff Holtz, “Parents Raising Concerns over Synthetic Turf,” October 28, 2007.
- G. Eric Galatz to Carol Ahlgren, email correspondence, January 9, 2008; January 15, 2008.
- H. Baristanet: “If You Build it They Will Protest,” September 13, 2006.

2008 Meeting Schedule

Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission

Regular Meeting

February 5, 2008

4:30 p.m. - Room 319, [City Hall](#), Minneapolis, Minnesota

Commissioners Present: Chair Larsen, Crippen, Dunn, Kelley, Lee, Lemmon-Selchow, Messenger and Ollendorf

Absent: Commissioners Anderson

Committee Clerk: Cindy Phillips (612-673-3552)

Public Hearings

1. **25 West Island Avenue, and 201 Island Avenue East, St. Anthony Falls Historic District, Nicollet Island Sub-District, Ward 3 (Staff: Carol Ahlgren)**
Amendment to Certificate of Appropriateness for Installation of Artificial Turf on the Athletic Field at DeLaSalle High School, Nicollet Island

Action

Motion by Commissioner Lemmon Selchow to **adopt** staff findings and **deny** the Certificate of Appropriateness. **Second** by Commissioner Ollendorf. **Motion approved** with no abstentions.

Testimony:

Commissioner Ollendorf: A couple of questions, the map that you showed on B9, it doesn't appear that it's been drawn to scale, so I just want to confirm the concrete curb that is shown on the left side, is the total length of that ten inches?...never mind my Co-Commissioner just answered that one.. I do have some other questions though. The archeological expedition, is that already underway?

Ms. Ahlgren (staff): that is correct Commissioner Ollendorf.

Commissioner Ollendorf: Okay, so if this were a curve the archeological ...(inaudible) ...have not been found.

Ms. Ahlgren (Staff): Chair Larsen, Commissioner Ollendorf, the archeology will be completed before doing this work, as I mentioned earlier I did receive last week the plan for what is proposed ...and that will be presented to you probably within the next month.

Commissioner Kelley: Speaking to the agreement for putting in the Astro Turf at the Astro Dome and some of the supporting materials it was described as an urban playground and have you heard any credible reasons why natural turf would not survive here? Due to the volume of use, the projected volume of use, anything of that nature?

Ms. Ahlgren: Chair Larsen, Commissioner Kelley, that is a very good question, I did not receive any information submitted by the applicant and I don't know what the use projections are.

Commissioner Crippen: Given that the HPC did not issue the Certificate of Appropriateness, but the City Council did, it was the City Council's requirement to have natural turf; I'm wondering if legally, what would happen if we choose to abstain on this question? If we decide that it's not really the sort of a question ... that there are many issues involved around this. I'm just wondering if that is an option available to us, or how we play into this process.

Ms. Ahlgren (Staff): Chair Larsen, Commissioner Crippen, that is a very good question, I was advised by our attorney that we should proceed with this application as it was presented to us. I'll defer to Mr. Byers.

Mr. Byers: Mr. Chair and Commissioner Crippen the Commission has always several choices for action ... approve, approve with conditions, deny or continue; abstention is a personal choice that a Commissioner could make but it is not a decision the Commission can make. Keep in mind that you are making decisions about real property and the applicants have paid their application fee and have a complete application and all applicants deserve to come before the Commission.

Chair Larsen: I wondered if you had discovered the applicant had provided locations of properties in Historic Districts or fields in the Historic Districts that utilize turf, and while that seems to be probably more the aberration of the norm, I'm wondering if you have supporting information in terms of other decisions where turf was denied or natural grass chosen for a particular school.

Ms. Ahlgren (Staff): Chairman Larson, Commissioners, that is an excellent question, I did address that, there was some material submitted to me by the applicant, I believe that is section G in your attachments, and it seemed to me that the examples that were provided concerned the replacement in existing stadiums, replacement with artificial turf. So those were individually listed National Register properties. We don't have a stadium in Minneapolis. There was also an example provided of ... a Minnesota example which concerned one of the campuses, I can't remember now if it was a large private school. It is a 250 acre campus and therefore, presumable the stadium would be one significant element in a much larger district. The final example was in Pasadena California where the district approved having a synthetic field. My feeling is that each of those was decided on a case by case basis of what those districts were or what those stadiums were, and in terms of whether or not this is approved. I did provide in the report an

extra page, page 1, the very last piece of paper you got, a case in New Jersey where there was a great deal of opposition to the installation of artificial turf.

Chair Larsen: If I recall correctly, in that case it was denied.

Ms. Ahlgren (Staff): Chair Larsen, that is correct.

Chair Larsen: Are there other instances of that or other districts where turf has been ... or grass has been used in lieu of turf, is there any other information regarding the use of grass versus turf?

Ms. Ahlgren (Staff): Chair Larsen, Commissioners, I think that points out the importance of having district guidelines that do address landscape and I'll certainly be thinking about that in the future. I did find one example which has not been included in your packets it was for a district in Nevada and it stated very specifically that there would be no artificial grass, turf, either for lawns or for athletic facilities.

Commissioner Crippen: One more question on the Archeology, your report says that the artificial turf would require two inches less excavation, which I would presume means a little bit less impact on the archeological resources that may be there, would the elimination of drain tile and irrigation be in addition to that? Are those deeper than two inches or how does that ... am I surmising the right thing? Artificial turf could actually have a net decrease in the impact on archeological resources.

Ms. Ahlgren (Staff): Chair Larsen, Commissioner Crippen, I don't know that I want to say with any certainty that that would have less of an impact. I mean there are two ways for us to look at it. I don't believe that the depth of excavation going to impact this. Building this field will eliminate the Eastman house, or discover it, let's put it that way, so to go down six feet on that field, we will find the Eastman house and then address that when the archeology report is before you. As far as the drain tiles, I don't see that that would make a real difference in the plan. Now in terms of what that's going to do for archeology, well, I imagine that ...the area ...target area number 1 is not going to be that area's not going to have that depth of excavation, so presumably, and this is where some of the 19th century houses were, so presumably if there's anything there that's an archeology resource it will still be there whether or not there is a field on top of it.

Eric Galatz: I'm an attorney I represent the applicant, DeLaSalle High School. I think I'm going to start by answering Commissioner Crippen's question about whether this application necessarily belongs here except for the fact that the City Council in overturning this body imposed natural turf as a condition of approval. Therefore, part of our certificate of appropriateness the code says to amend a certificate of appropriateness we are required to start here. This body did decide, to not decide, put it that way. The first time around we were in here, this body just turned down the application in the first place. Our application had asked for approval of either alternative on the basis of approval of (inaudible) Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, which is consistent with our agreement with the Park and Recreation Board. Without getting too far back into the history of our agreement, this is being developed jointly by DeLaSalle High School and the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board. There are representatives of the Park and Recreation Board here to talk to you tonight about why they want turf here. Our agreement with the Board was we would provide the field surface that the Park and Recreation Board required us to provide. We're happy with natural turf as a use as a surface for our proposed use of that field, but the Park and Recreation Board has concluded that the degree of use they intend to put this field to and the time of year, requires artificial turf. In order to keep a green grass growing in the summer time when the Park and Recreation Board will be using it the most, required a lot of maintenance, a lot of fertilizer, a lot of irrigation, and it is still likely that the field won't survive a summer's worth of soccer which I think would be their primary use. So the Park Board decided they would need a synthetic field in order to get the use out of the field that they intend.

Commissioner Crippen: So the Park Board has decided that they need a synthetic surface field in order to get the use out of the field?

Mr. Galatz: In terms of whether the decision is within your jurisdiction, again, I don't want to argue about that, I want your approval, we're asking for it. But...there's a couple of distinctions, Carol Ahlgren mentioned the examples that we gave of locations in which they have ... where jurisdictions have approved artificial turf in an Historic District. I guess, one of the things I would like to point out is the extent the Park Service has standards for landscape, they are talking about replacing of existing landscape, so, those standards would probably properly apply in someplace like Ohio State University, where the campus is historic, the field has been in place and has been replaced with turf. There the Historic use of that property use as a landscape planted grass field and the Historic authorities there determined it was okay to replace that historic grass with non-historic synthetic turf. Here, we're talking about replacing a non-historic brick street and a non-historic grass football field and non-historic asphalt tennis court with synthetic turf and I think the extent this Board wants to consider its impact on the district, I think you should be thinking about it the same way you think about the grass field. You've already decided that it's okay ... I'm sorry, you haven't decided, but the City Council has decided to grant us a permit for a grass field, which is replacing industrial barren (inaudible) if you go back to the historic period. There wasn't a landscaped field here, so I think we should think about in terms of what is appropriate to replace a landscape field with an artificial field, it isn't really the question. In terms of what is, I think, probably rightly before you, I think what is it going to look like? So I brought some pictures. I think this one might be maybe the most significant and Jay Pomeroy, our landscape architect might be able to tell us exactly where this is, but I thought this was a good picture because it shows the artificial grass planted set...inset into a natural environment so you can see the difference between in grass meadow and the artificial field. We're not pretending it's not looking just like grass all year long. This time of year, I will promise it will look exactly the same under the snow as real grass does. This is a picture of the surface, but I think what matters the most here is, this is the surface we are replacing, bricks were planted on this site in 1996 to replace the asphalt street which replaced I think historically the evidence being remnants found by one of the professors at DeLaSalle High School what was actually a wood street in the first place. Here is the view from East Island Avenue; the street will be replaced with a planted hill with natural prairie grasses which is what this body has determined as appropriate though is isn't what would have been grown there during the period of significance. It would have been some sort of landscaped lawn, but...What you're going to see in this is the street replaced with natural plantings; you're not going to see the field surface from the street. Here is a view from the other angle going northwest on East Island Avenue. This area here is going to essentially look just like this when we're done. It's going to be natural plantings; you're not going to see the field. This is looking back the other way from the same location. You'll see the natural plantings; you're not going to see the field. We are going to be replacing that with 10' high retaining walls, and natural plantings, and I think this is maybe the one view where you don't get to see the field and it is taken from the bridge, from the Nicollet Street Bridge. You're going to see a 1980's vintage asphalt tennis court with ... where that tennis court sits, is where you'll be able to see the synthetic surface what you're seeing around it...natural plantings,...are going to be natural plantings again. I hope you get my point. In terms of what you're going to observe on the surface from places where pedestrians are likely to be observing this field; they are going to see what they see now. To the extent that they are going to see natural plantings. The environmental issues that...it's a little difficult doing this, and I hope you'll ask questions you want to hear. The questions I heard from the Commission to staff is it sounds like you understand that this isn't really in your jurisdiction. It doesn't mean it is not going to be considered. Environmentally have regulations how this (inaudible). The drainage system works the same way for this field as it will for a natural field. The difference is primarily it won't have the sprinkler system; it won't have regular applications of fertilizer or infill. I've got Judd Rietkerk is here from the Park Board and he'll talk to you a little bit about the Park Board's interest in having an artificial surface and Jay Pomeroy is here the DeLaSalle landscape architect and he's got some of the details about the actual technical issues addressed by the field. One last thing about the archeology, as Carol Ahlgren said we will be back here with the mitigation. What we've found so far is what I think everybody expected. We're going to propose to excavate and document those foundations before the construction of the field. In terms of the geography, geology of Nicollet Island the mansion goes down to bedrock the field will go down to bedrock so we'll essentially be exposing what is there. The fact that it's an archeological site changes the way we are going to go about it.

Judd Rietkerk: Minneapolis Park Board, (inaudible) encouraging the use of artificial turf. I have a letter of support that I'll read, but to keep it short, basically we have about 127 athletic fields in the City of Minneapolis, only one of those has artificial turf on it and that's the only one that we can keep grass on. We can not keep turf established on fields. We actually have fields out at Fort Snelling, where we've put in under drainage sand fields, athletic turf, tried to control the amount of use on them and we still have large bare areas in those field. On the environmental side, we are chemical free in the Park System, so we appreciate not using chemicals on projects that we do. We do understand the affects of those on kids and their health. Also with these fields, they do reduce the use for water about 80% there will be a real significant reduction in the water. Our fields are used a lot. They are played winter, spring, fall, summer, we have ice on them, those fields are hard to keep up. (Inaudible) That's pretty much it. We have artificial turf on one field and we haven't had any problems with it and we feel very comfortable with recommending it.

Chair Larsen: The one field that you're talking about is that...

Mr. Rietkerk: That's Parade

Chair Larsen: How long has that been artificial turf?

Mr. Rietkerk: We've used it one full season.

Chair Larsen: And what is your anticipation for the amount of play of the field?

Mr. Rietkerk: Our anticipation would be at 50%. I can't give you the number of games. We would see it (inaudible)

Commissioner Lemmon Selchow: At Fort Snelling (inaudible)

Mr. Rietkerk: It wasn't available at that time. We had some cost constraints, but if you asked us to go (inaudible)

Commissioner Crippen: Mr. Galatz talked about the screenings particularly from the overpass the railroad, the natural plantings, could you describe a little bit more what sort of plantings? I'm wondering if you're going to be planting trees that would reach enough of a height that you wouldn't see the field from that overpass.

Mr. Rietkerk: I think I would defer that to the landscape architect.

Council Member Lisa Goodman: Good evening Chair Larsen and members of the Commission wanted to explain what the City Council was thinking, at least what I personally was thinking when the amendment came up by Council Member Schiff to add the requirement that we use natural grass instead of artificial turf. Never at any time during that conversation was it discussed how many times the Park Board would actually be using the field and at what time of year they would be using the field. I do have the opportunity to watch from the very beginning to the very end the Park Board meeting where they discussed this and what it sounded like to me, and maybe you can verify, the amount of use that will be used in the spring when it is wet and when the field is not in very good shape and in the fall around the time the eight games that DeLaSalle will be playing in will create a tremendous impact on the natural grass. From an environmental perspective to put in underground irrigation and fertilizer required to keep the field in the condition that would allow it to be acceptable for youth soccer to be played there. Apparently it's very hard on the field itself. So when we were discussing it we were looking at the seven or eight game season. Okay well, football, it's going to get a little bit torn up...we didn't really take into consideration nor did it come up or did anyone on the Park Board or their staff testify of the intended of use that was anticipated. So, in retrospect, if I had known that and known that the Park System intended to use it quite a bit, especially since their not going to pay for it, turf is the state of the art kind of thing that everyone would put in if they could, in fact, that's what suburban districts are doing all over the state, they're putting in artificial turf for soccer fields and other fields. This is an opportunity for the Park Board to have DeLaSalle pay for a state of the art field that's

going to be used a lot. The impact of fertilizer on natural grass and water is going to be a mess. I will note that I'm not sure where Ms. Ahlgren comes up with the chemical concern. I feel that that's probably hearsay and I think DeLaSalle probably want to have their lawyers question whether or not there are actual chemicals in it. But I'm unaware that a chemical issue that has been brought to Parade Stadium. Today there are a number of suburban fields in the area and I doubt that with the hundreds if not thousands of kids that have been using the artificial turf, the Park Board would actually want children to be affected by chemicals if that were in fact true, so I would note that that testimony by our staff probably doesn't have any fact as it pertains to chemicals seeping out of artificial turf. I will note you won't have to have irrigation and artificial turf is pervious surface also so it's not like it has some sort of membrane in it that holds water and is bad for the watershed. So, if I was asked in my official capacity, and I'm sure I will be on appeal, whether or not it makes a difference, I would say ultimately you should go with what the users think is most important and even if the Preservation Commission does not take a position to order artificial turf, and left it to the city and the City Council, myself included, does not do due diligence to determine the use of the field by the Park System, and what the users think will make the most sense as long as it is not injurious to users... (inaudible).

Brother Michael Collins: I'm President of DeLaSalle High School, I just have a couple of comments it's surely a segway from what Council Member Goodman had to say. This whole process has been one series of ironies after another and this particular situation is no exception. I say that because I'm promoting the idea of artificial turf for a project that DeLaSalle is paying for; no one else, not a penny from any source except the generous donors at DeLaSalle. Artificial turf is going to cost us more money. I'm going to have to raise more money and that is the irony. Here I am promoting artificial turf when I could do this cheaper, but I can't do it better. And that came home to me very dramatically this past fall when after many rains we were fortunate enough to be in the football sectionals and we were playing against Minnehaha Academy which has a field, but its natural turf. So they could not host the game on their field, because of the mud and consequences of weather, and so we went to Breck, but guess what – has artificial turf. And to look at it I never would have known. It looked like good grass to me, but of course it wasn't. So here we are now, we're asking you to consider this because we have made a commitment to DeLaSalle ... has not just made a commitment to DeLaSalle families, through the park board, we have made a commitment to provide athletic opportunities for the kids on the near north side in the summer to play soccer; again, no expense to anyone but us. Well, if we are going to be credible, we have to have a field for them to play on in the summer and if we have torn it up as always happens to some extent through natural turf, we will not be able to really honor our commitment, and we take that commitment seriously, because we take service to the community seriously and that's part of the conversation we have had for four years...four years of conversation in order to get permission for us to create this opportunity not just for DeLaSalle kids, but kids on the near north side, other city kids and we can't do that if we don't have a field on which they can participate. So that's what it's about and it's more money for us. And I'll tell you quite honestly, I don't slit my wrists if you think we have to have natural turf, I'll just have to go along with it and save about \$400,000. Thank you very much.

Jay Pomeroy: landscape architect with Anderson and Johnson Associates and I'll speak quickly. Brother Michael mentioned Breck, that's one of the fields we did several years ago, but we as a company have probably developed about 30 of the synthetic turf fields in the metro area and it's basically because campus have a closed limit where they overuse their fields, where they just don't have anywhere to expand, that's the perfect opportunity for natural turf to be replaced with synthetic turf, because it's ... whether it's soccer and football and now lacrosse and sometimes rugby, it's just overused and you can't use it more than 20 or 30 times a season and that's the type of situation we're at now. The other one I wanted to mention is...Carol was nice enough to route around the sample that I provided her, I got this one just the other day and strangely it's from Astro Turf. They've just come back into the lime-light again. They've kind of reared up and said let's get a new turf, a new generation turf, so, I'm going to pass this one around, and this one is much more grass like, it even incorporates a thatch material to hold the rubber in and provide more of a consistency on levelness of the rubber and so that it doesn't migrate away...so, I'll just pass this around real quick. One thing with the natural grass...or with the synthetic turf, It's going

to use recycled tires, so, all these tires that are piling up, this is a use for those tires, it's recycling the rubber and using it in the systems. Carol didn't have a site plan that showed what the area is that we're going to be moving from natural grass to artificial. It's going to be the majority of the field, but the east side along East Island Road is going to have a grass strip between the edge of the synthetic surface over to our decorative fence and then as Eric mentioned the slope down to East Island Road is landscaped with natural plantings and shrubs again to buffer and provide some natural landscape between that synthetic turf. Use and safety as in some people have mentioned is that hard grass is going to get muddy, it's going to get rocky, it's going to get slippery and potholed and that's where the safety issues really come into play that Judd mentioned. As for its proximity to the river and Brother Michael mentioned Breck, this field here is a synthetic turf field, in the flood plain, it's actually in the 100 year flood plain and 100 year storms seem to happen every three or four years now-a-days, so, they are prepared for that field to be inundated and flood. Actually this one did flood a few years ago, in that case what will happen is they will sweep the mud off the field, they'll rake it as clean as they can, wash it through and it becomes a sponge basically. These fields have been built in areas where they are very proximity to streams, lakes, in this case within a flood plain, and so they really provide for good mesh with the environment if you will. If you have any technical questions, I'm here for that. Oh, plantings, this site plan unfortunately doesn't show the plantings that are going to be transplanted in this corner here. There is a lot Ash, which unfortunately with the Ash bore coming this way we don't know how long those will survive, but a lot of those transplanted trees are one inch whips right now, they'll of course grow up to be significant 30-40 foot high trees, that's your view from the bridge. As well as either side there'll be Oak, no Ash will be planted new anyway, Oak, Maple, Hackberry, that type of thing, those are the larger trees along the street to give that street-scape and provide that entrance if you will. So...does that answer your question? Any technical questions I can answer?

Commissioner: What would be the cost of reversing this?

Jay Pomeroy: The ... as it has been mentioned before, there is about a 10 inch depth of aggregate and then the carpet and then the infill. That is very similar, two inches less actually than a sand peat installation of natural grass, so, if to reverse this, I don't know that you'd have to take all the aggregate out of there. There's drain tile and fabric, soil separation fabric, but you'd probably strip off the carpet and the infill and probably six inches of that aggregate and bring in...if it were to go back to natural turf that is...bring in a sandy topsoil and seed it incorporating irrigation, so maybe a six inch excavation.

Commissioner Lemmon Selchow: At Breck where it flooded out, even if something were to happen on this field, what happens with all the granulars?

Jay Pomeroy: Well, in the sample that went through, the newer generations of turf have the fibers actually fold over and hold that...a majority of the rubber in. The big complaint these days and you'll see it on NFL games where it's turf splash...a rubber splash, they make a cut and you can see the rubber kick up. They're trying to eliminate that or reduce that. Other companies have gone to a cytogenetically frozen EPDM, which actually doesn't float, some of the SBR rubber will float, so there're newer things on the market everyday. In this case, between the fibers meshing over the top providing that interlocking system, the weight of the rubber and just the knowledge that the turf will still be there, some of the rubber certainly will migrate away or hopefully drop down back, but some of that may require raking back in.

Commissioner Ollendorf: Regarding staff findings five and six, potential health and environmental issues and long term environmental impacts? Are you aware of any in your experience?

Jay Pomeroy: More and more are brought up each day, whether it's with the silica sand or the SBR rubber, but as Carol mentioned there is nothing definable or concrete if you will. A lot of the synthetic turf manufacturers put out information to certainly refute that. I think there was a case on staff infection on 60 minutes actually about two months ago, and again there was nothing to directly point to synthetic turf, it could have been in the locker room or somewhere else that that player contracted it, so there is really nothing that I've seen anyway concrete to point the finger

there. I'm probably not the guy to answer it on a chemical level, but, you know more and more people put it through and some of the indoor installations actually use a spray application to get rid of the bacteria where it is inside and the UV rays can't affect it and the rainwater can't flush it through.

Chair Larsen: Thank you very much. Anybody else that wishes to speak for this application?

Robert Roscoe: I live at 1401 East River Parkway, I served on Heritage Preservation Commission from 1980 – 2001 and I was chair of it for two different times, I've been involved in preservation on a day by day basis both professionally and with various activities. Whatever knowledge I have about preservation, I think that there are some rather fundamental things here that you can't help but be aware of. First of all, the first time when they presented their permit to you it didn't have artificial turf then, the assumption then was that it was fine to use natural turf. Now, they're coming back with it, so it's strictly an option for DeLaSalle and it's certainly something...you should look at the issue in that regard. Second thing is, the three acres that this will cover, three acres of artificial turf, it's six percent of Nicollet Island. Nicollet Island is one of the most unique natural resources as an Island on the Mississippi River. I think to use artificial turf I think is really...it's an insult I think to all those that really respect the Mississippi River and respect the preservation and heritage of it. It's clearly an optional issue. I'm just repeating that and they ... it's been presented here and there that other historic districts use this, well, you know that you're...you call it a certificate of appropriateness, in other words, there are multiple ways to judge particular things that are appropriate for a situation. It's not a pass/fail, and I think you have to look at this in terms of what's appropriate and I would advise you that artificial turf has no place on Nicollet Island. Thank you.

Edna Brazaitis: I live at 4A Grove Street and I'm here to support the staff recommendation and to ask you to deny artificial turf in this particular location. I first, as Bob Roscoe said, the school is happy with natural turf, and I believe that is the more appropriate use for this location. Despite what has been represented, there are many places where Nicollet Island can be seen. Driving over the Hennepin Avenue Bridge, there are a lot of places where it will be elevated and this will be very visible. It will be visible 365 days a year. One thing that's controversial about this particular product is that it has a tremendous heat gain. This was demonstrated in a study by Brigham Young University where the trainer had blisters that he had received through his shoes and measured the difference in temperature between the field surface and the natural surface and the field surface I think was 163 degrees. This thing will gain heat, so the impact on the Historic District is that this heat sync will do things like melt snow. It is something that will be green when other things are white or brown, and will be an unnatural surface in a large part of an island. Like Carol, I have looked around for other examples where Historic Districts or people have preferred a natural surface vs. an artificial surface. One of the things that's happened over time is that natural surface has gotten better too. People have understood different grass mixtures have come along, different ways to planting and I think maybe they've improvements over what was done at Fort Snelling. But to give you an example of one place where a natural surface was used was Central Park. The great lawn in Central Park, which gets a heavy use, but by using different kinds of materials, they are able to prolong that use. I also have seen a number of examples where artificial turf has been not recommended for use in Historic Districts in homes, in front of homes. One thing that I think we should talk about a little bit too, is the environmental impact of this. I have had the opportunity to look at the Park Board's files on Parade Stadium and their studies on artificial turf and they did not enter into putting artificial turf at Parade Stadium without some thought, however, they did not look at two significant issues. One of them is the heat and to deal with this heat, what people are recommending doing is putting in sprinkler systems, so for the use that the Park Board is going to use during the summer, they actually irrigate the field before the game and sometimes they irrigate it during the game in order to reduce the field temperature, especially when young children are using the field and it's actually recommended, there are some communities that have warnings against young children using the field because of the heat. Not only because of the fact that children burn easier, but also that they are more susceptible to heat prostration and a large percentage of sports injuries occur from that. The other issue is the issue of recycled tires and as Jay has mentioned, there is a growing concern from communities that have been early adopters of this product that there are

unanswered questions and just as Carol said, you know, while something may be sold to you as maintenance free, over time you find out that there are a lot more things that you have to do to maintain it. In the case of recycled tires, we would be talking about putting a quarter of a million pounds of recycled tire material on Nicollet Island close to the Mississippi River. I ask, if this is only the second field that we're going to have in the system, is this where we really want it? The growing body of concern, yes, the people have put them near water and lakes and things like that, but now, there's a growing body of people who are turning that down and the *New York Times* reported in November that a community in Connecticut turned a replacement of natural field turf to artificial turf because of concern over the water quality. The issue is with it that tires contain a lot of heavy metals, and other materials that it's not proven yet, whether they're good or bad for the environment. So the question is, is this where we want to do it? Now, DeLaSalle has said that this isn't...they'll go either way, in fact, we'd be saving them if you turned it down today, and I guess I urge you to save my neighbors some money. Make this a better Historic District by not having a perma-green surface over two or three acres of the island since there's so little of it there as it is, and support Carol's staff report. Thank you.

Bob Daley: 177 Nicollet Street, I had the misfortune of being summoned before this body about a dozen years ago, I refer to it as misfortune because in the complex restoration of my property on Nicollet Island, I made a mistake and what I did, and Mr. Roscoe can perhaps remember this, rather than put two-over-two true divided light windows in my home, I put in one-over-one windows and I was going to supplement that with wood mullion to give the appearance of two-over-two. I was a naive, want-to-be restorer of a property and I made this mistake and I was called before the commission and was strongly encouraged to get those windows out of there and get the proper windows in so that perhaps the one person in ten looking at the home from the street would truly know that that was a two-over-two true divided light window. I share this story with you because, here we are fast forwarded a dozen years, and there's been a lot of debate about the appropriateness of using a large swath of public land for a private purpose and there's been a lot of debate about whether a Historic street should be torn up and used. It strikes me and sort of keeping with the strong legacy that the HPC has and I've come to honestly respect the decision that the HPC made about my windows. I learned a lesson the hard way, but, twelve years later you're being asked, can we lay 78,000 square feet of plastic down on the Island, it strikes me that there's ... why is there even a debate occurring? When a one foot by one-half-inch wide strip of wood isn't sufficient, clearly, 80,000 square feet of bright green plastic on the ground doesn't strike me as appropriate either. Thank you.

Chris Stellar: 95 West Island Avenue, I want to point out that this is a ...we're here tonight because both times this project has come before you, it's been a partial application. The applicant did not say what the surface would be of the field in their agreement with the Park Board, it was left open, and that was a part of their presentation to you. So the first time we didn't know, now the second time when you have a preservation architect redesign the project and make the building on the Historic street smaller and, but unfortunately make the field go deeper, where the actual historic resources are, he is not here today, but again, that was left open, we had a partial application. So, those of us who've for three years been saying this would be Astro Turf, I hate to say "we told you so" but we told you so. Now I want to try to tell you about something else. How is this application partial? We haven't heard about covering this field. This is Eden Prairie, the high school uses this there and they have a dome over their field, an inflatable dome, artificial turf. This is Academy of Holy Angels; they call it the Star Dome, the same situation. There's another view of that one. And I'll give you one more, Minnetonka, the Tonka Dome. This is an option when you have artificial turf. It's not an option when you have grass. You might be familiar with one in the city. Augsburg College, and if you've ever been over to Murphy Square, the oldest park in the city...when this dome is up, you can have a look and see how it feels to be in an historic setting, not an Historic District, but a historic setting and have an inflatable dome near you. Now that's why it's partial, but you won't have that presented to you because a dome like that, is a ... can be taken down, it's impermanent. Here's a precedent for that. The Commission reviewed renovations to the Nicollet Island Park Pavilion. Made by the private concessionaire that now operated that public facility year around. After they came to you, they added this...so they asked you about the roof and some other things; they didn't tell you about this. This is the tent structure that has been there for years now and you didn't get to review it because it is not permanent.

There're aspects of being a permanent structures that you might want to review, how it meets the building would be one thing. What kind of windows does it have? Do they fit the Historic District guidelines? What does it do to historic views? This is your view of St. Anthony Falls, now that this impermanent, but been there for three years, structure is there and all because the steel that it's made out of isn't bolted to the ground. So you're getting a partial application. They're not telling you that they will want to dome this. Why will they want to dome it? Basically for fun and for profit. Fun, they can use it year around. Profit, you can rent it out in the winter. That's what Augsburg does, they rent it out to various other teams and people that like to have football camps and so forth. They want to compete with the suburban high schools. They've said that this is...this is the point of this project is to do that. Also, their co-developer which is the Minneapolis Park Board, the Superintendent in his January report to the Park Board said "we were very interested in the Augsburg Field house "dome" as we believe our system could benefit from one. So here they are a co-owner of a facility with Astro Turf with a co-developer with deep pockets who's willing to pay for the Astro Turf and why not be willing to pay for the dome. Here are the impacts it might have. Obviously use – year around use, impacts on parking and traffic. These are all things you worried about the last few times this came before you. Views – to and from the river. The view partially maintained down Grove Street, what would happen to that with a dome? Height – you talked about height with both previous versions of this project. Material and color, shape and form, there's a path around the field which is supposed to preserve access to the Historic District for pedestrians. It's unclear ... would a path survive installation of a dome, and just generally public access and enjoyment of the Historic District. Do people sidling up next to one of these domes feel like they can get beyond it to the Historic District or will they be able to see beyond it? So I urge you to think about what the implications of the project are. We didn't think of the Astro Turf before, it turned out to be Astro Turf. No one has said anything about a dome, but all signs are that there will be a dome and when there is, people will ask what did the Historic Preservation Commission say about it. That's what people ask about the tent outside the pavilion and the answer is ... they didn't get to review it. I'm telling you ahead of time, you have a chance to review it now. Thanks.

Brother Michael: As President of DeLaSalle High School I swear to you we will never build a dome on Nicollet Island as long as I'm President. For the record.

Chair Larsen: Seeing no other comments I'm going to close the public hearing. Commissioners, what is your pleasure, are there questions?

Commissioner Crippen: It seems to me there are a lot of issues in this, many of them that don't affect the Historic District, and the more I think about this and distill it down to what does affect us, it's the views, it's what impact is this going to have on the Historic District visually. We've heard conflicting testimony here. I think this is a serious issue. So, in the interest of time, because we're moving pretty quickly out of here this evening, but also more importantly, I think in terms of more information, I'd like to move that we continue this and ask staff to give us some more information, particularly some views of what this development will look from different vantage points. We've seen a couple of different vantage points this evening; one is aerial which I think has less impact on how people day-by-day experience the District. The other is from the railroad overpass; however, I'm intrigued by the comment of what does this look like from the Hennepin Bridge? Is this in fact going to be invisible, is the field surface itself going to be invisible from most or all aspects, so with that in mind, I would move for continuance and ask staff for some better documentation about those few questions.

Chair Larsen: Is there a second to that motion?

Commissioner Lee: I second the motion.

Chair Larson: Okay, discussion on that motion? I'd like to discuss that. I guess my feeling is that it's very clear that there'll be a visual impact. I think from no matter where you look at it. You can look at it from the multitude of condos, office buildings, bridges, and I think that we can safely assume that there'll be a visual impact. What that impact is, will vary, dependent upon where you're looking at it from. But I don't think honestly that additional aerial perspectives or views will

shed much additional light on whether or not there's a visual impact. I think that's pretty clear. I would not support that motion.

Commissioner Kelley: Chair Larsen, I agree with what you just said and point out that it is an athletic field. Whichever surface is chosen it will look like an athletic field, so I really don't see that there's a real compelling visual argument.

Commissioner Lemmon-Selchow: I do however think there is a compelling argument to be made to introducing this material to a Historic District.

Chair Larsen: Well, let's focus on the motion at hand. The motion at hand is to continue ... and we have a second and we're having discussion on that item, so if there is additional conversation on that...that's fine.

Commissioner Lee: I guess along with sight lines, I would like to add that there is a potential possibility that the luminosity of the field will change, based on lighting and how that will affect over the seasons. So it's not just visual impact from sight lines, it is how is this field going to glow in the wintertime as a green surface?

Chair Larson: So you'd like to know how that's going to affect?

Commissioner Lee: Yes.

Chair Larson: I'll call the questions, so on the motion, to continue, all those in favor signal by saying aye.

Aye: Commissioner Crippen and Commissioner Lee.

Nay: Messenger, Dunn, Kelley, Larsen, Lemmon Selchow and Ollendorf.

Chair Larson: That motion does not carry. Alright, other discussion.

Commissioner Lemmon Selchow: I would like to make a motion that and I'll give you a brief description why I would make this motion. I've listened to both sides and I actually have waffled back and forth and with my background in preservation, my concern really is the introduction of this material in an Historic District, and whether it's been done previously or done currently, we can't respond to the environmental impacts of this. We can't respond to how much of this will run or how much of this will off-gas or any of that, but we can respond to what we've been asked to respond to – is what we allow in Historic Districts in the City of Minneapolis. And even though the Secretary of Interior standards and perhaps the guidelines specifically for this district don't call for it, I do believe we do have a responsibility to look at what is appropriate in an Historic District and to me I would feel...I do feel that the introduction of this material into an Historic District is not appropriate. And I'm not ... I'm normally for ... if we need to do something modern and if we need to do something in an improvement on things, I mean that's not how I act or perform as a preservationist, but in this particular instance, I think there are other things that could be investigated and done versus this material. That said, I would like to make a motion to approve staff findings and deny the certificate of appropriateness.

Commissioner Ollendorf: I'll second that motion.

Chair Larson: Okay, we have a second is there discussion on that item? Okay, I guess I'd like to follow up on a couple items that were made. I think Commissioner Selchow; I would agree that this is within our jurisdiction. That it does fall and I think it goes directly to sight lines and view and even as the ... one of the people pointed out, when it's a two inch strip of wood or whether it's 78,000 square feet of synthetic carpet. I think that does play an impact. I think we're looking at here within the National Park Service one of the crown jewels, and so I think that does play an impact. I think service...you know we talked about service to community and I think likewise, the service to community from DeLaSalle is very important and likewise I view our service to the community as a larger whole as the City of Minneapolis and to the nation through it's National

Park Service and along the Mississippi River is also important. So I think it's important that we preserve the past and the fact that we're looking at replacing a tennis court and a street and you know those things were introduced all along the way, and so things do go back over time, but as we look at new projects, that do replace inappropriate infill we can view this current state as inappropriate infill and we look back to what can we do given the circumstances and given our quest to make it as appropriate as possible. So I'll certainly support that motion. Is there any additional discussion. Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion to approve the staff findings and deny the certificate of appropriateness, artificial turf signify by saying Aye.

Aye: Commissioner(s) Messenger, Crippen, Dunn, Kelley, Larsen, Lee, Lemmon Selchow and Ollendorf.

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None

Chair Larsen: Motion carries.