

Public Comments to the Concept Design for Revitalized Peavey Plaza

I support the Oslund design for the Peavey Plaza space. I believe it responds very gracefully to the important urban edges of Nicollet Mall and 11th and 12th Streets. The Oslund scheme suggests much greater openness, adaptability and accessibility for the site and will animate both the plaza and Orchestra Hall year round.

Nick Winton, AIA
Anmahian Winton Architects

Cities evolve, people change and our special public places to gather and enjoy ourselves must always resonate with the times. Public places are in service to the community. Peavey Plaza was born of a different time and for decades the plaza has not resonated with the needs of the people.

Minneapolis is fortunate, with Tom Oslund, to have a national leader in the design of public places. His heart is of the community and his proposal to transform Peavey Plaza shows deep respect for the original design, while forging a remarkable place for now and the future.

His design reenergizes the street, celebrates arrival, and honors the original with a new series of lower plazas that engage the Orchestra Hall and provide a range of seasonal activities. Peavey Plaza needs this sensitive transformation that Oslund and Associates is offering.

Martin Poirier

The redesigned Peavey Plaza creates a new kind of urban park that reflects a revitalized city built on civic pride and strong community. The trellised edge completes the Nicollet Mall and for the first time engages the entire park into the street life of the city. The cafe, fountain, skating pond, and performance stage will provide varied destinations that effortlessly weave the lives of daily workers, downtown and suburban residents and visitors together. Minneapolis will finally have a gathering place in the heart of the city."

Catherine M Murray
URS Senior Landscape Architect
Chicago, IL

The new design has such linear alignment that the public will feel compelled to flow out. It does not have the sense of containment and interior focus of the original design. People will be lined up in rows if they choose to sit there, and that is not conducive to good people watching. Spaces are simplified to the point of being sterile and boring. The video wall is a sad copy of Millennium Park, and blocks the amazing architecture of the church.

The original design had mystery and edges around the pool that drew people to playfully explore. Passage through the existing plaza moves like choreography, and people take pleasure in the dance, with platforms and perches and steps jutting in and out to create an

amazing location for people watching. Peavey Plaza is a stage set that makes drama out of people. The new linear design is lifeless.

Minneapolis took a hit when it threw out Halprin's Nicollet Mall to the rage of designers across America. But even though the wiggly street was straightened, vestiges of the original master piece remain. This time Minneapolis will look really stupid as it erases one of the most successful plazas in the world, and replaces it with a space that doesn't engage people.

Marjorie Pitz

Personally the only reasons to visit Peavey were the trees, and the fountain and waterfall feature there are plenty of trees elsewhere, so without the fountain/waterfall I'll have no reason to go near Peavey BTW - take a wrecker ball to orchestra hall - now that would be an improvement!!!

Thank you for taking comments on the Peavey Plaza renovation proposal.

I'm invested in the renovation because I live about two blocks from Peavey Plaza (Loring Green condos), so it's my "front yard" and my gateway to downtown. What I was hoping for in Peavey is a cross between Bryant Park in New York City and Millennium Park in Chicago - both much grander in scale, I realize, but elements of each would make Peavey attractive and functional. I want to see the Plaza used year round. To that end...

I like the water features in the proposal. The shallow pool is both functional and eco-friendly. I envision children playing in the water in summer as in Millennium and ice skating in winter.

I like the green spaces and pergola. They will attract people and provide shelter during the summer heat. Shade and small scale areas to sit like Bryant Park are a must.

I like the permanent stage/screen for outdoor events. However, I'm a little concerned about the "blank wall" effect it makes on the 12th street side. How could that be softened?

Please, please have permanent concessions and tables/chairs - think Bryant Park's 'wichcraft sandwich shops in the park. The park is filled with people at lunch time.

The grass and trees are great, but where are the garden plants/flowers? Any great park/plaza has interesting plantings and flowers. Again, think Bryant and Millennium's gardens.

Lastly, the 12th and Nicollet corner needs a feature that draws people into the plaza. It doesn't have to be as dramatic as the current fountain, but there needs to be a unique draw - how about an appropriately scaled sculpture? Steve Millikan

In looking at the plans, my concern is that it looks like a lot of the plaza is cut off from the street. The performance stage almost completely obscures the plaza from 11th and the pergola and landscaping form a wall along the Mall. The great thing about Rockefeller Plaza, which the Peavey plan seems to emulate, is that you can look down on it directly from the sidewalk without having to go out of your way. Obscuring the plaza as much as this plan does only repeats the problems with the current design. Thanks! Andrew Dahl

I remember studying Peavey Plaza multiple times in design classes in college. It is a well-made, unique node that is nationally recognizable. This renovation is not only awful but heart-breaking. It changes a personable, outdoor space into a dull, flat patio. Please, don't support this. I am a huge fan of our mayor, RT, but I'd like to see the facts behind Peavey Plaza being "unsafe." Minneapolis is filled with quality designers and I have an extremely hard time most of them would support this "renovation."

Thank you,
Chris Stalley, Northeast Minneapolis

I have just taken a careful look at the proposed renovation of Peavey Plaza web presentation.

I am very concerned that there is obviously a front entrance at the 11th and Nicollet corner and that the 12th Street side is designed to be the back wall. The plaza turns its back on Westminster and seems to create a barricade. I'd urge for the consideration for an access to break up that dense wall design. Sincerely, Dr. Rodney Allen Schwartz

Just checked out the new plans for the Plaza and I heartily approve. Many of my concerns--security, accessibility, aesthetics and an inviting space for public usage--have been addressed. Thank you. Barbara Thompson

Hello,
I'd like to make some comments about the Peavey Plaza design. It does not reflect what I would like to see there.

There are two huge factors that are the most important aspects of this public space that I feel are being lost in the proposed design.

1) The historic character: there is little to nothing left of the historic character of this prized modernist space. Peavey Plaza has been held as one of the most endangered and loved modernist public spaces in the world, and we have a charge as the citizens of the Twin Cities to respect its historical character in this redesign. I am not saying that nothing should change, but the central historic features need to remain consistent with the original design.

2) As a public space, Peavey currently accommodates several types of programming through offering a variety of spaces- large gathering spaces and more intimate hang-out

spots. The redesign is mainly a through-way and a large gathering space, and offers little for more intimate uses like spaces for people to eat their lunch. This is a major loss of public space in downtown.

And finally, the proposed design has not used a solid public participation process and has failed to honor the entire design team that was selected as part of the public process. I do not want my public dollars to be spent on the redesign in its current form.

Thank you for listening, Carrie Christensen

I wanted to drop you a note to let you know that I LOVE the proposed plan for the "re-building" of Peavey Plaza!! As a resident of downtown Minneapolis, this change is another great step in re-vitalizing our downtown!

Thanks again,
Pete.

I dislike this design very much! I believe the plan should include more renovations and improvements rather than starting from scratch! What a slap in the face to the original designer of the landmark space.

Do we really need to remove every mature tree that is on the lot? Yes, many of the Honey Locusts need to go, especially toward the Nicollet and 11th corner...but I see no reason that the lot should be clear cut! Minneapolis seems to make a habit of doing this with public works projects...and yes, it is possible to save mature trees and do construction around them...Michigan Ave in Chicago was almost entirely re-done, and the trees that were there before remain, and appear unstressed. Have you seen the track record for new trees in downtown Minneapolis? I have hardly seen any newly planted trees actually live to see maturity in the past 20 years...they make it to about 10 feet tall, and then die and are replaced again. Under this design, the space will be harsh and sunny for MANY years to come. Also, I don't think the landmark fountain at the corner of Nicollet and 12th should go! I think this is a HUGE mistake. Even excluding the "pond" or pool portion of the old water feature, which I agree is space that should be put to better use...this new water feature is very underwhelming to me. The cascading water to many different levels is a wonderful feature...it just needs updating. Yes, maybe reduce it in size and re-landscape, perhaps have it run into a stream that runs through the property towards 11th (maybe including those jets seen in this plan) rather than a "pond" or pool as it was, and also cut out the portion of the fountain that wanders to the east toward Orchestra Hall. There is still plenty of room in the old pond space for the amphitheater idea in this proposal. Overall, I say just open up the middle of the plaza, find a better use for the plaza space toward Nicollet and 11th (plenty of room here for some of the features in this design that are set to replace the landmark fountain and mature trees). Re-use and improve the old fountain, and keep a row of mature trees that are already there along the 12th St. and half of the Nicollet frontage.

Keep the fountain, and at least some of the mature Linden trees, and a few others! I really hope someone who can make a difference thinks my suggestions make sense!

Thank you,

Michael Swiderski

Based upon the images of the new proposed design, there is one major flaw in regards to the stage and the seating area for viewing the stage -- The viewing area is in the middle of water fountains and doesn't contain the steps that form an amphitheater. I see a few stairs to the side, but not many seating rows and none in front of the stage.

Paul W. Barber
1235 Yale Pl Apt 1308
Minneapolis, MN 55403-1947

I remember clearly when I first visited Minneapolis, walking down Nicollet Mall and being absolutely enchanted by the street life, public art, etc. I had no idea that Minneapolis was such a beautiful city. Coming upon Peavy Plaza for me was the high point of that experience. I loved the shelf like water falls and the large bronze "tube" fountains (forgive me for not knowing the correct terminology). I particularly enjoyed that it was broken up into different intimate spaces. In comparison, the "upgrades" to Peavy Plaza seem boring, average, "anywhere U.S.A." It seems to me that Peavy Plaza is losing what makes it "signature" and does not strike me as a place I would want to go and hang out. I understand in part, the changes are for accommodating larger events. I get that - uses of spaces change over time. However, I feel the plan needs to have Peavy's signature "tube" and "ledge" fountains and water falls and intimate spaces surrounding whatever that event space will be. Also, is it just me, or does this redesign not have the depth of the current plaza? The spaces along Nicollet are long, linear, open spaces. This redesign no longer has the elements that to me make Peavy Plaza unique and iconic - depth, texture, and layering. If I were a newcomer to Minneapolis today and walked upon this proposed plaza (in the same way years ago I came upon Peavy Plaza), I do not believe the experience would instill that same sense of awe. It does not strike me as the kind of space you could go to "loose yourself" - an oasis in the midst of the urban environment. That really says something. I think we are literally looking at spending millions of dollars to achieve a lesser result than that which we already have. I believe in the future this will be viewed as a big mistake and will be greatly lamented and oft discussed - much like Block E. Paul Finsted

I have just been informed that a design is being put forward for Peavey Plaza which destroys the Plaza as we know it, eliminating the signature fountain and the many interesting stairs, seating areas and levels.

I care deeply about Peavey Plaza and wish to see it brought into the 21st century while keeping its essential elements. I want Peavey to still be the Peavey that I fell in love with when it was still vital and new.

Peavey Plaza is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. It is a masterpiece of Modernism and a vital, nationally-recognized part of Minnesota history. In addition, it is a marvelous design which is both a festival space and an intimate space.

There are creative solutions to manage change at Peavey Plaza. The key elements in my mind include the signature fountains, the amphitheater and terraces which create many seating opportunities, and the basin of water.

Cost of repairs must not be an excuse to destroy this important place.

Peavey Plaza will be appreciated even more in the generations to come if we are creative and bold enough to meet the challenge of renovating it.

Stephen Malloy, CLARB, LEED AP
Landscape Architect

Thank you for providing this online forum for the public to comment on the new Peavey Plaza design. I hope that all comments will be openly shared with the City Council and other committees that will vote on approval of the new design and demolition permits.

As a full disclosure, I should say that I was consulting landscape preservation historian on one of the design teams not selected for the project.

What concerns me is that the landscape preservationist and the original landscape architect who were on the Oslund team are claiming, in public forums, that they have been excluded from the design process. The resulting design, which completely removes all "character-defining features" of Peavey's original fountains and spatial patterns, clearly reflects their lack of input.

When the designer selection was made a year ago, the City claimed that including Charles Birnbaum of The Cultural Landscape Foundation and Paul Friedberg would ensure a historically-sensitive update. These two renowned leaders in our field have great talents that this design process has cast aside.

No matter how many public meetings that the City claims to have held, no matter how many survey forms filled out, there is a strong perception in the Minneapolis design community that this complete redo was determined long before the selection of a designer and the ensuing public review process. Given the fact that there is two million dollars of state funding in this project, this suspected lack of transparency could have significant long-term consequences for the City and its reputation.

Additionally, during the designer selection process, the Mayor, whom I have long admired, expressed his desire to make Minneapolis a national "design capitol." As a long-term design journalist for national and international publications, I fear that rumors about the process over the last year are going spread. This is not the way for our city to become a design leader. Nor will a reputation, whether accurate or not, of back room decision-making and squandered expert advice encourage emerging design talent to invest in Minneapolis.

I do not feel it is my place to comment on the submitted final design proposal. There are many others in our community who have far more technical knowledge of urban design and construction than I do as a writer and landscape historian. What I do feel strongly is that something has gone very wrong here and that the City should investigate this entire "public" process over the last two years. The bravest and most laudable thing to do would be to start again, learning from our mistakes, and to seek an honest and stimulating discussion that respects everyone.

We should have a new dialogue not driven by fear but by a curiosity about how others find beauty and a sense of place in our downtown. The renewal of Peavey Plaza has never been about either complete restoration or complete redesign. This is a false dichotomy that only polarizes discussion. The promise all along here has been to create a national model for sustainable and sensitive updating, for setting innovative precedents in public policy and community involvement.

From Hubert Humphrey to Don Fraser, this is what Minnesota is known for. It's time that we admit our mistakes and live up to that now. That's what it means to be a "Creative" city. And, this is a very telling moment.

Sincerely, Frank Edgerton Martin

Will you be considering putting obstacles to having skate boarders be able to ruin the edges of the landscaping by the grease from their boards being released as they use the features for their tricks? You probably have seen the mess it makes and it is ugly. I think this is an important consideration. Also will the paving and structural material be Minnesota stone rather than concrete so that it lasts longer than the concrete used before? I think this place should be built to last.

I noticed one other thing, it looks like there are plans for stand alone chairs at the tables, I don't think this is a very good idea, the chairs will be strewn all over the place and some will be stolen and removed and will just look a mess when they are left all over the space. Fixed seating is a much better idea.

The proposed plan lacks character and is not in keeping with Peavey Plaza's traditional role in the community--to encourage people to interact. Peavey Plaza has always been a place where concerts, dancing and activity could be seen by passersby who might stop and be a part of the activity for a time. It has been important that the space be inviting. Instead, the proposed design has two layers of trees and a strip of seating blocking the

view of any activities to people on Nicollet, and a huge wall blocking the view from the west. In effect, the concert area becomes a private area, not inviting to the public as it passes by.

I love the idea of a skating rink. That's been long overdue.

Why is it that in the city's "competitive" bidding process, the same handful of contractors get the bids? Nepotism? The city makes it too prohibitive for others to enter the field? Something's not right there.

I live just across the river in N.E. Mpls, and frequent downtown regularly for business the arts and entertainment.

I would hope that any new construction is done with LEED certified products and green practices throughout. Including low voltage energy efficient lighting. Is there any area that has a covered shelter (roof) to get under in rainy weather? I am not so sure about the water cubes, will this just become a money pit for needed fountain repairs and draining during the winter season? We have a fountain on our property and it is very costly, albeit nice to look at. Maybe large local artist sculptures would be more appropriate with less maintenance and costs.

I love all the trees, and would include as many as possible. We need more greening of our downtown core. Make sure that garbage cans are included please. And places to lock up our bicycles as well.

Unfortunately, this design absolutely does not reflect my desires for Peavey Plaza. I believe the public process has been diluted and it is blatantly obvious that Paul Friedberg and Charles Birnbaum were excluded from the design. This is a tragedy and is not what I was hoping for Peavey Plaza. Quite honestly it almost looks like an entrance to a Super Target. The lights and design of the "New and Exciting Peavey Plaza" look like Anytown, USA. I believe it will be dated very quickly. This plaza design is not respectful of the original design. While I realize the use of the plaza has changed and that just simply restoring the park is not an option, I believe we can do better and develop a more creative solution that actually enhances the plaza's original design intent.

Sincerely,

Renee C. McGarvey, ASLA

While I understand the necessity of the criteria used for the designs released this week regarding the new Peavey Plaza, and I do want to emphasize that I have loved so much of what the City has planned for the future, I do have reservations about these new designs of Peavey Plaza. I feel they are rather sterile, unadventurous and frankly boring. What makes the current Peavey Plaza so intriguing is feeling lost within the city, a disconnect

between the traffic and the plaza. I love the levels, the nooks and crannies and the various waterfalls.

I support a redesign, though I will hate to see the original replaced, but I hope any future tweaks to this proposal will address its current lack of risk.

I have examined the redesign plans of Peavey Plaza. I am a frequent user of Peavey Plaza. I am quite pleased to see the recognizable elements of the existing plaza interpreted into a new plaza design. It is still recognizable as the iconic place of the past in addition to allowing the integration of modern park design elements. The existing plaza had some real problems that seem to be mitigated in the new design. I also like the idea of skating in the winter!

In a nutshell...I really really like the new design! Please approve the plans and proceed with building a world class Peavey Plaza. Karen Rosar

I love the new design for Peavey Plaza. I think your design will really stimulate public use of the space both during the day and at night. Wonderful!

Have you thought carefully about bathroom facilities? There will undoubtedly be an increased need for them as more people - families with small children, older folks, people who linger longer than the average lunch or office break – enjoy what the plaza offers. Thank you, Libby Larsen

As an very avid concert attendee I love the inclusion of a bandshell, however the renderings appear to present a completely flat the spectator area from front of stage to back of the crowd.

Can this entire section be given a grade or slant to provide better sightlines for those in the back as well as front? This would accomplish two key things.

1. Makes the ENTIRE area handicap accessible
2. Provides a substantially better concert experience for all spectators no matter of location or height.

Hopefully this is a reasonable and cost effective suggestion. One of the nice things about the current Peavey Plaza is that there is some tiering that helps with this situation unfortunately there is just not enough.

Thanks for your consideration. Ted Martin

I like this plan/concept. As a downtown resident and employee, I'd like to see how it can be "leveraged" for development of Nicollet Mall all the way to the riverfront. And how it can be "leveraged" for development of additional green/open spaces throughout

downtown. Use this opportunity as a springboard for downtown development. Eric Anderson

I view the Plaza as a historic landmark. I think the current design provides for many uses, while also being unique, beautiful and a reminder of our city's history. I feel the new design, while also functional I am sure, totally destroys the unique character of the Plaza and also those ties to history. Haven't we lost enough of our historical landmarks in the spirit of creating something more modern?

The drawing for the new plan show a very generic and average space, similar to something you might see in the courtyard of a suburban shopping mall. I would hope that the committee would resist eviscerating what makes the current plaza a wonderful common space for those of us living and working downtown (namely the post-modern sense of optimism for the future coupled with the multilevel semiprivate spaces).

Thank you for your time. Jillian Kalogerson, Esq.

I am so excited to see the design of Peavey Plaza on Mayor Rybak's message just now. I especially like the skating rink in the winter. I hope there will be a cheerful warming house with a place to put on skates and have a hot toddy or something like that apres-skate!

Maggie Catambay

I am writing to share some comments about the new plaza design. I think it is an attractive plan, but am very disappointed with two things.

The complete removal of the existing fountains is very troubling. They are a landmark in our city and on the mall. I live and work downtown and walk by them daily. I can't count the number of times I have seen convention visitors stop and comment on their beauty and unique design. If nothing else, please keep the feature at the corner of 12th & Nicollet! Happily we have gotten out of the habit of tearing down old buildings just because they are old. I see no reason why the plaza revitalization has to start from scratch.

It appears as though there is significantly less seating. We have so few gathering spaces in downtown. They contribute to the vitality and livability of downtown. I agree with having the space less "deep", but suspect that the tables & chairs shown will not be there in reality. Is there some way to have built in seating on the orchestra hall side also?

It isn't clear from the renderings - does the clock stay? I hope so.

For the most part I feel the new design works well. My only concern is the removal of fountain at Nicollet and 12th. This is a beautiful, renowned, and historic piece of art I would hate to see removed. I understand the water make up for the fountain itself may not be able to be preserved but I would love to see the structure remain as a sculpture

piece and keeping a remnant of the original design. Libby Payne 1200 Nicollet Mall resident

As a resident of Minneapolis, I would like to comment on the Peavey Plaza change.

First, I think the original architect and designer, M. Paul Friedberg, should not have been excluded from the Revitalization Project, as reported in the Star Tribune. It reflects poorly on Minneapolis city government when design or policy decisions are made without openness and transparency to all project stakeholders. Perhaps oslund.and.associates was not able to work well with the previous designer? Minneapolis should have taken this into consideration before selecting them for this redesign.

Second, overall, I like the design. However, the water wall, water bubbling over black granite, is boring and unappealing. One can see fountains in Europe, even colder climates of northern Europe, that are fun, visually appealing, and that actually provide a place to sit and enjoy the sound and ambience of water. This design, unfortunately, provides none of that. Cold, dark granite, is just that - cold and dark. My suggestion is to go back to the designer and ask them to be more creative, perhaps something with lights. Minneapolis weather can be cold, chilly, dark or grey most of the year. Do we need more dark granite to accentuate that? Or, should a fountain provide a lighter, brighter, visually appealing counterpoint?

Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Terry L. Beyl

I think the new design for Peavey Plaza is terrible and banal -- an insult to the city, given the beauty and significance of the original design.

Efforts should be made to re-establish the original design, properly maintain and preserve it. I am wholeheartedly **OPPOSED TO THE PLANNED REDESIGN AS PRESENTED.**
J. Kimber

The Redesign overall for the Plaza looks great. I look forward to seeing its fruition and using the premises: I like the emphasis on improved security, community, the retention of water elements and the ice rink, and the greenery added for a more eco-friendly and eye-pleasing environment.

My only concern is that the bandshell area has now been relocated in even closer proximity to housing on the opposite (West) end of the Plaza/Mall. I live in one of the condominiums nearby. While my unit does not face Nicollet Mall, I am able to clearly hear outdoor concert music originating from where the bandshell is currently located. I suggest that consideration be given to the actual construction of the bandshell, if kept in its proposed location, which would include some kind of sound barrier insulation within

the back of the structure, as rendered, to prevent sound from further permeation into surrounding private housing and containing it toward the Plaza audience.

A few days ago I saw two Stradivarius violins at The Museum of Modern Art in New York City. I thought what a shame such wonderful instruments like these were silence inside a glass case. Sure they was old, and the finish worn, but they were still capable of making beautiful music from classical to modern jazz. Peavey Plaza is just such a treasure. A bit worn on the outside but with a bit of careful attention still very capable of performing beautifully like no other instrument in the world. It would be a shame to see the pleasure of the dance and the music silenced.

Our own treasure Peavey Plaza is a nationally recognized, much loved design and public space. Unfortunately the city has not maintained it to the level it deserved and it is currently in disrepair. This has allowed other socially unacceptable acts to occur in the space. A management issue not a design issue. At one of the public meeting this summer the speaker from New York said with proper maintenance and good management the Plaza could be very successful. These two things have been lacking for a number of years. Peavey Plaza currently needs to be brought up to date and can be done so successfully while still retaining the key features of the original design. I believe that was the intent when the City hired Tom Oslund along with the original designer Paul Friedberg and Charles Birnbaum of The Cultural Landscape Foundation. So why have Friedberg and Birnbaum been excluded from the final design?

I would hate to see the only remaining piece of Paul Friedberg's design being a small plaque on this site with a picture of Peavey Plaza saying "On this site once stood Peavey Plaza, a nationally recognized public space. 1975-2012" . We have enough of those in the city of Minneapolis already.

John Stark
President Preserve Minneapolis

Brilliant design—clear concept, distinct purposes, and visual appeal that will be apparent to the public as well as design audiences. A plaza is, by definition, a public and visually open space---this design creates the idea of a "piazza" in the true sense of the world.

No, well, partly. I appreciate the design's flexibility as an informal gathering space and event /concert venue. But the aesthetic elements feel like a discount-bin ripoff of Millenium Park. We have an iconic, unique space, one that is like nowhere else---there's a sense of place. I understand the need to improve it, but why are we destroying this unique space and its character-creating elements, namely those tall fountains, in favor of something so generic? It really wouldn't be that hard to find a compromise. Really. Keep the iconic fountains, replace their pumps and implement the rest of the new design. Everyone's happy!

Is the performance area going to be rented to rock music groups that play until midnight and disturb those of us who live in the neighborhood?

No. Where are the fountains, especially the one on 12th and Nicollet? Its iconic. Surely it can be made sustainable with all the technology you tout. I won't feel safe on 12th with that wall of a screen.

No, it does not. This design is essentially an outdoor performance space for the orchestra, complete with concessions and access control. This is not a design for the people but a design for one user group: MOA.

No. It would be very feasible to make this a reuse of a historic property. Costs spoken about being too high are not realistic. Change the existing design to reflect the new uses but do not lose where we came from. New is not always better. Love, passion, and memory of Peavey is very important.

No. Peavey Plaza is a significant piece of Minneapolis. Properly managed and maintained it can still function well with renovation and changes to meet programs in areas outside the key modern historic features. Save what we know of Peavey Plaza and make it better. Do not change it to an unknown place.

No. I think the fountains and water flow and sound are too wonderful to dismiss. There surely is a way to have some kind of fountain at the 12th and Nicollet corner which would work. I really dislike the random squirt fountain in the photo---Boo to that! The current Peavey is so used and so public. The new design does not look inviting.

Partially, but not in spirit. The "respect the past" line, repeated many times in this "open house" presentation, is only a line. Using modernist forms and water is not looking to Friedberg's design. I miss the fountain—a unique and signature item---which is replaced by a now common, overused motif, seen in plazas all over the world. There is nothing that sets this new design apart from its many relatives. I also miss the intimate spaces. I use them, and have never felt unsafe there. It seems to be a space designed for performance and commerce first, casual gathering second. I don't understand the "small spaces" remaining---they appear to be linear, and not designed to shelter 2-12 people. No "back" to those spaces.

No. Addressing the current problems is timely and beneficial, but the design as presented today is just meatloaf compared to the original filet mignon.

Save the fountain.

No. I think the 3 design options should be shared with the public and you should get feedback on all 3 versions. I also think that it is unforgivable that the public selected the design team and is paying for the work and that 2/3 of the design team has been excluded from the process. I also respected the original intention of the team to figure out a way to manage modernist public spaces and this is failing that charge. I see no management of a modernist space here, I see a demolition of it.

Not at all. Looks very amateurish. No respect for original design. What happened to Birnbaum and Friedberg?

No. I've seen better work by 1st year landscape architect students. I give this design a C-grade.

No. We need to take a broader look at the urban open space opportunities as a whole. There are many more open spaces along Nicollet Mall/Hennepin Ave and the river than can reflect this wonderful modern aesthetic. When I travel to Portland OR or I visit the two Halprin Fountains and marvel at their beauty and then I go to Jameson Square and marvel at a new urban expression. I have great confidence that we can retain the fountain and water wall at the corner and embrace many of the ideas and solutions shown in this plan. Once we lose Peavey, it is gone forever and I do not think that is in the best interest of this town. It is important to look at the quality of aspects of the original design, and respect the significance of this plaza within the Modern Movement. Take a moment's pause and challenge yourselves to re-commit to a solution that doesn't throw the baby out with the bath water. The design team is talented and can find the right solution. This plan without any evidence of Peavey is the wrong step for Minneapolis!

Not sure. Tread carefully/thoughtfully. I agree that present plaza is not accessible. However, many of the activities such as Live @5 brought many people here. Plazas in Europe are usually accessible in more than one place. Often restaurants have wait help. Is this what we want?

I think "234 responses were received" should be viewed with alarm. We are a very vocal community so for only 234 to respond should alert the City that communication routes were inadequate or well hidden for us to utilize. At this point, I see not much to get excited about. I walk by this location nearly twice a day all year around so was looking forward to some pizzazz....not seeing it.

No. This re-design doesn't need to be wholesale. Elements of the current plaza should be incorporated into the new design. Lack of maintenance from the past does not excuse gutting the features. This is not NY. This design is generic and represents an effort to make this space feel as if Minneapolis had 8 mill residents. This is already a unique place. No need to make it like a blend of all other public spaces. More time, more public input, more notice of opportunity.

I don't think the water fountain can be replaced with a concession. Put the concession in another location. I agree with the man who advocated for something of stature on the corner of Nicollet and 12th. It seems like it will be difficult for a concession to compete economically with all the food establishments in the area. Please no video screen. It's an insult to one of the few green spaces in downtown. An assault to the senses. Please try to preserve a quiet space for gathering and reflection. Don't obstruct view of church.

No. Not at all! I strongly believe Peavey Plaza can and should be modified and updated but not obliterated as proposed. The existing, excellent design is important and singular. Its character-defining features need to be retained. Aside from, in addition to, the fact that the proposed design has little to do with the existing design, there are numerous things I very much dislike about the proposed design:

- It's a lame imitation of Millennium Park. Let's keep and embrace the special qualities and character of the existing park.
- Lose the video monitor. Its about sound---speakers are fine. It's offensive to propose replacing the verticality of the fountains with a video monitor.
- The scheme looks as if its largely designed to be a programming space for Orchestra Hall. Peavey Plaza needs to look and function more like a multi-purpose public space as it does now.
- What's up with the completely blank northern 20% of the plaza? It also appears to be designed primarily in the interests of the Orchestra---their outdoor lobby and entry.

Please let us as the citizens of Minneapolis not to make the same mistake to tear down a design that has won awards and as many people say is ugly because the city has allowed it to decay. I love the fountains. Why can the design not leave them next to the skating rink? Please reconsider. The plan suggested certainly benefits Orchestra Hall and the vendors that use the space but what about the fountains. They can be incorporated into the design. It is almost like a new design committee wants to put their own mark on the design regardless of the past EXCELLENT design. What about the landscape designer. He has won all kinds of awards. It seems to take generations to recognize design that the current generation does not appreciate. We tear down and then fifty years down the pike we regret. Remember "Lost Minneapolis". When are we going to learn? Now we accept designers like Frank Lloyd Wright as genius and every gift shop shows his designs but only after many years. We do not seem to be able to see into the future and respect what we have. Peavey Plaza should NOT be completely written off the map. Contact the original designer to see how he can incorporate the design and update the needs of Orchestra Hall. I will volunteer to help raise the money to reconsider the design. IT DOES NOT MEET THE NEEDS OF ALL THE RESIDENTS OF MINNEAPOLIS. Contact me @ fcmdesign@gmail.com.

I am on the MN chapter of the Board of DOCOMOMO, an international modernist preservation group, and I would like to urge the City of Minneapolis to re-consider moving forward with the proposed re-design of Peavey Plaza. While the current design of Peavey does need some TLC, I believe the improvements should be achieved in ways

other than a complete re-haul of the plaza. I believe the City of Minneapolis and Oslund & Associates are taking the easy way out by wiping the plaza clean of its acclaimed architectural elements. I would have a lot more admiration for the City and Oslund had there been more thoughtful conversations regarding conservation of the Plaza.

Like the Mayor, I also do not believe cities should remain static. They are ever changing and we must keep up with improvements. But why ruin a unique landmark of our city when you can improve upon it? For example, look at the Foshay tower. In my personal opinion, that building is a great example of conserving the original architectural elements, but improving it for the modern day by adding a top class hotel and making it a destination spot in Minneapolis. We could achieve the same goal with Peavey Plaza by keeping its original beauty, but adding improvements to the design to address handicap accessibility as well as safety.

Another major concern is the exclusion of M. Paul Friedburg and Charles Birnbaum from the re-design process. When Oslund & Associates were chosen to lead the process, I was confident that their collaboration with these two gentlemen would result in an innovative solution to the problem. Since they released their letter to the city addressing their concerns about the exclusion of public opinion, I am concerned that there has been little genuine regard to public opinion, or Friedburg or Birnbaum's advice.

Please re-consider moving forward with the new design. If this plan is passed, I am concerned this will set a precedent for other future restoration processes. I am writing because I really do love downtown Minneapolis and all the different architectural styles and I care about maintaining its unique architectural qualities, rather than turning it city where the buildings all start to look alike.

Thanks for taking the time to read this. Sincerely, Jennie Eukel

I'm writing to express my disappointment with the proposed new design for Peavey Plaza. The new design would remove all of the original architecture and leave us with a bland shopping mall-like space that lacks imagination. I urge the team to reconsider this design and work with the architects to create something new that respects the original space while updating it to our city's current needs. Thank you for your consideration.
Amy Sanders

I am writing in support of the currently proposed plans for improvements to Peavey Plaza. I am a landscape architect who first visited the plaza weeks after it opened. As a young practitioner I found it to be novel and interesting. I also found it to be cold and uninviting. In the early 70's we were all engaged in finding exciting ideas that could revitalize our declining downtowns. Peavey Plaza was one among dozens of such efforts. It is a product of its time, but

times have changed. Today's culture is one that seeks participation in civic life. People desire spaces that provide a venue for encounter, exchange, and engagement. They want to be part of their community. They want to express themselves, and they want to be proud of their town. I believe that the proposed design meets these objectives. Perhaps in 40 years the culture may have changed again and people will question today's proposed design. That is what urbanism is all about – having enough life in a city that it actually lives! I encourage your support for this important step in the life of your city.

Sincerely,

Mark W. Johnson, FASLA
Principal

I do support the new proposed design for Peavey Plaza. As a local Architect here in Minneapolis, I find the timing of this discussion to be counterproductive to the whole process. A fair competition was held, with public commentary made available at that time. A design was selected and the professionals chosen moved forward to create an interesting and dynamic space.

While I do agree that the performance wall would benefit from additional transparency and the signature fountain at 12th & Nicolette should remain, the new design is absolutely a "sympathetic interpretation" of the original design, which is driven by cascading platforms that are aggregated and simplified, for accessibility and increased flexibility, in the new design.

I absolutely believe in open discussion for public design and the careful preservation of historically significant space, but I feel some efforts by preservationist groups are counterproductive to making Minneapolis a better and more vibrant urban experience that everyone can enjoy. Mark Enlow

I am writing to comment on the proposed Peavey Plaza redesign which appears to meet the objectives determined by the redesign committee and looks like an engaging and pleasant space for the Minneapolis community.

I have only one query which is to wonder why there is a small vegetated island placed in the middle of the sidewalk along Nicollet Ave. near the north end of the block. It would appear to me that it would block pedestrian traffic and have the potential to cause a jam during an event. It would also impinge on the sight lines into the park from anyone walking or sitting on the opposite side of the street. I suspect that it was placed where it is to define the main access to the Plaza. It doesn't seem to me that such a definition is necessary and that the negatives of interrupted foot traffic outweigh the possible benefits.

Thank you for taking my comments. I think the project is a good one and I look forward to seeing its completion. Liz Hawn

The proposed design for Peavey Plaza should not be built. The design process should look at ways to preserve the existing plaza while making necessary improvements.

It is not that the proposed design is bad, in fact there are some very nice design moves within the proposal and it would be a good addition to the city on another site. My disappointment comes from what what is lost if the new design replaces the current Peavey Plaza. Yes, the current plaza needs to be updated--accessibility, mechanical systems, sustainability, etc. The proposed design, however, throws out an important, nationally recognized historic landscape and one that I suggest could work very successfully with changes. I think many of the non-physical changes planned for the new plaza--an endowment, programming, policing of the space--would help to address concerns of the current plaza without the need to completely destroy what we have now. Please do not confuse the current plaza's state of disrepair with what it was and can be. With choices made to restore the plaza (with sympathetic changes) I think it could be a remarkable space. Many of our city's great buildings and landscapes have been lost because they were deemed out of style, out of sync with current needs, un-sustainable, etc. We now lament the loss of those places. Please do not let Peavey Plaza be featured in the next book about Lost Twin Cities. Frank Fitzgerald

I am writing to express my dismay at the insensitive changes with the proposed changes to Peavey Plaza. There seems to be a total disregard for the place defining features and elements of the space. I understand the need for some changes; repairs and ADA new needs. The baby has been thrown out with the bath or at least the fountains. The proposed space is destined to become a private dead space only for paying patrons. Don't let Minneapolis turn its back on its own people. Rita Goodrich

While I understand that there are numerous improvements required of Peavey Plaza, I do not support wholesale demolition of this one of a kind, historic space and its replacement with a design that offers little in the way of originality and sense of place.

The Mayor was mistaken when he publicly stated that Peavey Plaza was not intended or constructed to accommodate performances. In reality the ability to hold performances of all sizes was one of the original program features of the space, and one that made Peavey Plaza so iconic, flexible, and fabulous.

We had an iconic linear space in the 1970's as well: Nicollet Mall. It was replaced with a bland, difficult to maintain, and unremarkable street which has fallen into disrepair and disfavor.

Please do not make the same mistake with Peavey Plaza. Jean Garbarini

I have read the criticism of the new plan; i.e. lacks continuity and ignores the integrity of the old, but I must say I never thought the original was never all that redeeming. After

seeing the views posted in Rybak's e-mail I am really excited about the new design.
Clarence Falk

Peavey Plaza Supplemental Comments

Received after October 24 12:01 pm

A brief note to say that, whereas the new Peavey Plaza has some interesting design features, I wish for the original design elements to be preserved as much as possible, bringing them into the 21st century in terms of energy efficiency. Minneapolis will mourn the loss of the original Peavey Plaza design in the future, much as we mourn the loss of the Metropolitan and Lutheran Brotherhood buildings today and the Lutheran Brotherhood garden. Please don't allow one more important mid-century landmark to be forever altered. Karen Duncan

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Peavey Plaza design. I believe that the Paul Friedberg design is an important and good example of landscape architecture from its period, and should be rehabilitated in ways that are sympathetic to its original intent. Adaptations for accessibility, sustainable use of water, and safety should be made while respecting the features that made the original design significant. I do not believe the current proposal does so. Please reconsider a plan for modern uses that better respects the original design. Will Stark

I am completely disappointed in what seemed like a very democratic process for public comment and support of a revitalization of the mid-century modern landscape landmark, Peavey Plaza. As a member of the board, DOCOMOMO, and a passionate voice for preservation of significant architecture, I have been following closely the plan and the process. I did attend the panel discussion prior to Oslund group being selected. I have seen the speed at which the plan is now being "pushed through" what appears to be a very select, already determined, group of few. I strongly encourage a step back in the process and a relook at the preservation of critical elements of design original to Peavey Plaza. We as a board have drawn attention to the critical elements we believe should be updated but kept historically intact. Please consider this strong request by the public with concerns for preservation. Karen Rue

I am very disappointed in the redesign of Peavey Plaza. The sound stage and pergola seem to close off the area to the public and make it close and uninviting. Minneapolis and Minnesota are known for their water, yet there is very little water in the redesign except for a few puny fountains. No waterfalls or "streams" or ponds as we currently have - why are we neglecting our signature feature? There is very little space for casual seating, almost no grass or colorful plantings - why the aversion to life and color? I am no landscape architect, but I think even I could have done better!

Jan Brown, longtime concert and Sommerfest attendee

I am writing to share some comments about the new plaza design. I think it is an attractive plan, but am very disappointed with two things. The complete removal of the

existing fountains is very troubling. They are a landmark in our city and on the mall. I live and work downtown and walk by them daily. I can't count the number of times I have seen convention visitors stop and comment on their beauty and unique design. If nothing else, please keep the feature at the corner of 12th & Nicollet! Happily we have gotten out of the habit of tearing down old buildings just because they are old. I see no reason why the plaza revitalization has to start from scratch. It appears as though there is significantly less seating. We have so few gathering spaces in downtown. They contribute to the vitality and livability of downtown. I agree with having the space less "deep", but suspect that the tables & chairs shown will not be there in reality. Is there some way to have built in seating on the orchestra hall side also? It isn't clear from the renderings - does the clock stay? I hope so. Thank you for your consideration of my comments. Kaymarie Colaizy

Does this design reflect your desires for Peavey Plaza? This design erases the features that make it a well-loved, recognized and cherished landmark that is unique to the city of Minneapolis and to its era. The design shows a lack of imagination in how an iconic urban oasis can be refurbished to meet current ADA standards, ecological goals and social ends, all while providing spaces for new and vibrant programming in the plaza. This design obliterates a nationally significant masterwork of a nationally venerated landscape architect. The new design does not respect the history or context of the site. It does share the same location as the old design. And yes it includes trees, water, lights and a slight elevation change, as most parks and plazas do. However, the new design is now a long, rectilinear space with rows of trees, much like a streetscape, rather than a series of multi-sized tree groves and seating areas that surround and become part of a larger space. The video screen jarringly foregrounds the lovely church façade that formerly made one "wall" of this outdoor plaza. Instead of a cascading waterfall that flows into a basin, the new design features jets of water from the ground into the air. For these reasons, I do not agree that the design respects the history or context of the site. The new design might have merit in another location. There are other places in downtown Minneapolis where this design might work just fine, including the proposed park/plaza near the library. That parking lot could be a wonderful place for a high tech interactive park - one can be the quintessential expression of this era, this time, but not at the expense of losing part of the civic history of Minneapolis.

The Process: I've been involved in many community design processes, and there are always people who don't think the process is open or fair or long enough. HOWEVER, in the case of this process, a bait and switch has taken place. Part of the touted "community" process included the selection of a design team that included the original designer and a renowned expert on modernist landscape architecture. By choosing this team, the city allayed the concerns of members of the design community concerned about the future of Friedberg design. By their own words, but not by their choice, neither of those individuals has been involved in this new design. Furthermore, there is nothing "open" about an open house dominated by a presentation containing only negative descriptions of the existing plaza followed by the unveiling of only one design solution. Time was only allotted for selected answers to selected issues or concerns raised, without any

chance to argue the merits or factual basis of these answers. Many of the negative issues described were either falsely overblown or not the result of the design of Peavey as it exists today. Please consider the following:

Safety: There is nothing about the new design that will eliminate those unwanted park users, unless there is 24 hour security making sure “those people” go somewhere else. Something, if truly desirable, that could be provided for a refurbished Peavey.

Program: The existing Peavey Plaza would benefit from the kind of active management, care and program that this new design is proposed to receive. That issue is not a design issue, but a programming and management issue.

Maintenance: There is nothing I heard about the tech sound/light/video garden features of the new design that will be any easier or less expensive to maintain than the existing design. People will still be needed to clean the trash out of the plaza, pumps will need to be maintained, pavers will need to be replaced, trees will need to be taken care of and at times replanted. The Friedberg design has held up remarkably well and would look just as vibrant and new as the renderings of the new design, if refurbished and reconfigured to adjust to the new Orchestra Hall addition.

Water: There are many creative ways to cycle water through a system, as well as modifying the plumbing and the sources of the water to make the existing design or a slightly modified design work ecologically better than the original design mechanics, while still maintaining the aesthetic qualities of the original design. The "water shortage" issue is a red herring.

As a life-long Minneapolitan, a downtown employee, and an architect, I can say that it is about time Peavey Plaza received some TLC, and I love where the new design is headed. The renderings show an active, accessible and multi-use park space. I think that the design proposed by Oslund and Associates is quite appropriate; it addresses all of the originally outlined issues like visibility, accessibility, appropriate vegetation, accommodating large gatherings at one level, safety, and (hopefully) long-term maintenance. The spirit of the original Freidberg design lives on in very visible ways like creating separation from the street, using the sound of water to mask out the noise of the city, and creating a space in which the people of Minneapolis can gather. Kudos to a very excellent local design firm, with a history of making great outdoor spaces, and, by the way, with whom I have **not** yet had the pleasure of working.

I would also like to comment that it seems some preservationist groups are trying to modify the proposed design. As an architect, I can tell you that there is nothing more frustrating than an outside group coming in at the eleventh hour to critique my design or hold up my project. As a design professional, it is our goal to comply with and expand on the original project brief, to listen to the public's comments, and to protect the public's health, safety and welfare. Some comments, especially comments that can derail a

project's design at the *end* of the process, are not productive, and do not move the city in a positive, future looking direction.

Thank you for receiving these comments, I'm sure there are quite a few.

I am writing on behalf of the Preservation Alliance of Minnesota to express our concerns about the proposed redesign of Peavey Plaza. Our concerns are two-fold: 1) that the proposed design does not incorporate the unique—and historic—character-defining features of the existing plaza, and 2) that the design process did not allow for adequate public input and hence the resulting design does not express the wishes of the majority of citizens who care about this special place.

I was honored to be asked to serve on the Community Engagement Committee and had hoped that my involvement would help shape a design solution that incorporated the most important historic aspects of the plaza. I was encouraged by the collaboration between Oslund and Associates, M. Paul Friedberg, and Charles Birnbaum. I consistently expressed the position of the organization that I represent: that the existing design of Peavey Plaza could accommodate some level of change as it is revitalized and restored, but that the essential form, materials, and characteristics of the space should remain largely intact. At no time did I argue for a strict restoration of the existing plaza or any of its individual features. I had hoped that, in the hands of talented design professionals, a happy middle-ground would be achieved and presented to the city leaders.

Unfortunately, I found fairly early on that my efforts to guide the rehabilitation of Peavey Plaza would be stymied by a restrictive and exclusive process. Last summer, I asked a representative of the Minnesota Orchestra to allow other people concerned about preservation to attend the CEC meetings; my request was denied, and no invitation was extended to other parties. Then, at a CEC meeting early this spring, we were asked questions such as, “Should Peavey Plaza be preserved as-is or reconfigured?” Many respondents, both at the CEC meeting and at the public meeting later that evening, said that they didn’t agree with the black-or-white alternatives that were presented, and instead wanted to see a grayscale solution. I raised this issue directly to Tom Oslund at that meeting, but I saw no effort on the part of the city or the design team to occupy the middle ground.

The CEC was presented with four possible design schemes at its meeting in June—but told not to discuss them outside the room. I later requested copies of the plans so that I could provide more substantive comments, but was denied. When the schedule for the CEC’s meetings was announced in January, we were told that we would have two meetings to discuss multiple design alternatives; in actuality, we were offered just that one, limited opportunity to comment on the four schemes. Ultimately, only one design was presented at the final CEC meeting on October 12 before formal presentation to the public and to the city council for a vote.

While the city made some effort to include the public early on in the design phase, it made no effort to include the public in the decision-making phase, even from my

insider's perspective. I expected more from the city of Minneapolis and the top-notch design team that was hired to shape this vital public space.

The members, board of directors, and staff of the Preservation Alliance of Minnesota still think that there is an alternative that would address the deteriorated conditions and lack of accessibility at the existing plaza while updating it for 21st century visitors and programs. We hope that the city of Minneapolis will not move forward with the design that has been presented. We ask you, instead, to let those of us who care deeply about the history of Peavey Plaza have a stronger voice in shaping its future.

Sincerely,

Erin Hanafin Berg
Field Representative
Preservation Alliance of Minnesota

In answer to the question: Does this design reflect your desires for Peavey Plaza

No it does not reflect my desires. It is a travesty to totally destroy this elegant piece of landscape architecture.

Not ADA compliant is a poor argument for the destruction of Peavey Plaza. Creative minds can find a way to bring it into compliance and keep the significant elements of this historic place, such as the fountains and the water efficiency.

I do not know how anyone can believe that by totally destroying the space will cut out police calls. It is a public space in the heart of the city and you will have the same stuff happening then that happens now.

Can we really compare the space to Bryant Park, the Highline, or the Mellenium Park...or why would we?

To say you have Friedberg and Birnbaum on your team so you are awarded the project and then totally cutting them out does seem disrespectful.

I have lived across the street from this magnificent work of landscape architecture for 33 years. Friends and out of town visitors to the City always remark how wonderful it is to have this space on the "Main Street" of Minneapolis.

It is lack of maintenance that has brought this space to where it is today and that is a shame on all of us for allowing that to happen.

I hope the City Council will give long and careful consideration before they approve of the total destruction of Peavey Plaza.

Please do not let those “good bones” find a resting space next to the Metropolitan building in the Linden Yards.

Let’s see what can be done to reconfigure the area by bringing in the consultants you told us were working with the designer, and find a way to revitalize without destroying this historical place.

Thank you Rosemarie McDonald

Thank you for your efforts in working to put forth what you feel is the best solution for the redesign of Peavey Plaza. However, from what I saw and heard at the open house last week, the overall design process has been problematic and seems to have missed the mark. I attended the first presentation where the four finalists gave their interpretations of what Peavey Plaza should become and how it should be done. The strength of the winning team was impressive in that it included the original designer M. Paul Friedberg and Charles Birnbaum, head of the National Landscape Cultural Foundation.

It appeared from the comments of the selection panel that the participation of these two individuals was a key factor in the decision to hire the team. It was intimated that great care would be taken to preserve the character of the historic public space while giving it much needed upgrades.

I have followed some of the controversy surrounding the design presented last week and have been appalled to learn that both Friedberg and Birnbaum were excluded from participation in the design process from early on. I read the white paper prepared by Birnbaum and noticed that most of his key guidelines and recommendations have been ignored. The most important recommendation revolved around the preservation and refurbishing of the signature fountain at 11th and Nicollet. The new design blows the fountain completely away. The fountain jets in the new water basin are simply jets in a grid....nothing signature about that and nothing you don’t see in most any other city these days.

What happened in this process that led to the complete breakdown of the collaboration promised? I have also read letters from both Birnbaum and Friedberg stating their frustration at being shut out of the process and their sad comments on the resulting design. These letters were sent to all design committee members, City Council members and the Mayor. How could the City have allowed this to go so far down a path so at odds with what many in the local design community had hoped would become a model for the preservation of significant cultural landscapes? I find the lack of respect shown to these nationally recognized leaders in the field of Landscape Architecture to be appalling.

My respect for the mayor was unfortunately eroded when I heard him tell two fellow landscape architects at the open house that he did not know why Birnbaum and Friedberg pulled out of the design process early on. Really? I will give him the benefit of the doubt and assume he did not read his e-mails.

I am embarrassed for the City of Minneapolis as it is about to destroy one of Minneapolis' most recognizable public spaces. Maybe you should go after the spoon bridge next.

Kathryn Ryan, ASLA

The new design for Peavey Plaza does NOT reflect my desires for the plaza. I think the plaza could be a mix of the old and the new.

I appreciate that the new plaza keeps some of the recessed space. I think the iconic pipes that form the fountain on Twelfth Street and Nicollet Mall could be remodeled. I have heard the arguments from Tom Oslund that they are inefficient. With all the technology that is being touted, couldn't they be modified to recycle water and/or use less water. I know that the gold color is not original, but I expect something that is nearly forty years old to have some patina.

I do not like the large performance screen on Twelfth Street or the fact that the back corner near the screen is isolated from the street. I would not want to walk along that street at night with a large wall looming beside me. I think I would worry about someone hiding behind it. I thought that plaza would have a more open feeling, particularly that side, which is generally acknowledged as a troublesome area. The proposed design does nothing to create an open feeling.

I have heard that there were around forty designs that were shown to the city, but only one was shown to the public. How is this an open process that shows how our state money is used? More designs should have been shown to the public and more large-scale meetings should have been held. People would have appreciated hearing each other's views. There might also have been a sense of "buying in" to the design, which is lacking. I think the city is effectively giving the plaza to the orchestra and I don't agree with that. It has led me to doubt the leadership within this city, especially that of the mayor and the councilmembers on the advisory committee.

Please save more of the iconic character in Peavey Plaza.

Thank you,
Elizabeth Gales
Downtown office worker

As a long-time lunch eater at Peavey Plaza, I am not satisfied with the proposed design. I am not satisfied because it completely obliterates a space beloved by myself and many others, as one of the few places to relax in the middle of a hard day's work. Gone is the relaxing sound of falling water, and gone are the quiet spots to contemplate the day. And what replaces this gem of the fair city of Minneapolis? An outdoor performance space, complete with jumbo-tron, stadium seating and restrooms that will only be open when a performance is on-going, and a concession stand. Really? Is this the best we can do with

a beloved landmark? A park eligible for the National Register of Historic places? The proposed design swings the pendulum too far in the direction of those who controlled the input, namely Orchestra Hall. While I love the orchestra, I really do, you can't call it fair due process when the so-called "community engagement committee" is basically run by one of the major stakeholders instead of the city itself! The end result is predictable and sad. Without due process and any expectation of a fair result, the city is prepared to destroy a cherished landmark.

The most disturbing part of all this is that a compromise could have been reached, but instead, at the end of the day, greed has won out because it was given the opportunity. You might as well add a city sales tax to pay for it, since you are essentially building a stadium for a private entity.

Sincerely

Paul Hannemann, Peavey Plaza lunch eater

This design in no way reflects what I had hoped for Peavey Plaza. Instead of distinguishing itself well (as Friedberg's current design does), an utterly boring design emulating many other public spaces in America (Millennium Park, Chicago; City Garden, St. Louis) is presented. The space is less dynamic, less intimate, and wholly generic. Minneapolis deserves better than that. The redesign shows a very linear design which suggests to me merely a place to walk through, not a place one sits down and enjoys. The pergola section is too reminiscent of the Sculpture Garden, just a stone's throw away. A very exciting, three-dimensional public space has been turned into a flat backyard for Orchestra Hall. If Minneapolis wants to be like every other city in the country this redesign will accomplish that. If, however, the city wishes to stand out and draw people in, more of Friedberg's original elements need to be retained.

Sincerely,

Katherine Scott

Thank you for the opportunity to share my thoughts about the reconstruction of Peavey Plaza. I wholeheartedly support the desire to revitalize what has in the last few years been a rather sad state of affairs for Peavey Plaza; however, I can't help but feel as though this has not been handled well and the design that has come out is subpar. The fact that 2/3 of the selected design team have come out in public saying that they have been excluded from the design process; when the Oslund team was selected those members were cited as a significant part of the reason because they would respect the historic design. The fact that the design as proposed does not in any way respect the significant historic elements of the plaza seems to lend credence to their statements.

The end design was disappointing in that it seemed to lack much creativity, riffing off of Millennium Park in Chicago and many of the other high profile parks that have opened in the last decade or so. The water feature which has been cited as respecting the history of

the plaza has only created something new that happens to have the same function and called it history.

Please consider reopening the process and working towards a design that actually respects the historic aspects of Peavey Plaza. I'm not looking for Peavey Plaza to look the same in 2020 as it did in 2000 or 1980, but I want to ensure that some of the most historic features do continue on. Will O'Keefe

I wanted to be able to submit my comments to the City Council regarding Mr. Oslund's proposed plans for Peavey Plaza. I do not want to use too much emotional or unnecessary rhetoric, but this is a very difficult issue and I currently DO NOT like the plan being put forward.

I understand and respect the City's and Orchestra's goals and requirements of adding accessibility, safety and being environmentally conscious regarding Peavey Plaza, but at this juncture, completely destroying Mr. Friedberg's 1974 design is completely unacceptable.

A new design should be able to maintain, preserve and adapt the key fundamental tenants of the Friedberg design and incorporate new functional as well as design elements that help update the space for the new century.

I am also very displeased regarding the evaluation and recommendation process that the City has undertaken. After bringing Mr. Friedberg and Mr. Birnbaum into the design process and then just cutting them completely out of it is simply ridiculous and **very heavy handed** by the City and the Orchestra. Is the City taking its cue from the Destruction of the Metropolitan Building in the 1960s era of Urban Renewal?

If this is how Mayor Rybak wants to make Minneapolis a national design capitol, I am not impressed.

I have been working in downtown of Minneapolis for over 18 years. I have seen a lot of structures torn down in that time frame (The old Minnegasco/Lutheran Brotherhood building) and a lot of great re-use projects with existing historical architecture (the Ivy Tower). I have run, walked and strolled thorough Peavey Plaza hundreds of times over the years and I do not want to see all of it just disappear.

I DO NOT WANT TO SEE THE CURRENT PEAVEY PLAZA COMPLETELY IGNORED AND DESTROYED. I want a smart plan that uses the great signature design elements of Mr. Friedberg, new ideas from Mr. Oslund, and ADA accessible entrances. I think it is time to go back to the drawing board in terms of both design and the transparency of this project.

I would like to see this project as an open discussion with give and take before a public audience with a great plan and outcome for all involved. Thank you for your time and attention regarding this beautiful downtown space, Joe Van Sloun

I have refrained from commenting on this project because the process has not reflected an authentic interest in debating the future of Peavey Plaza. It's fate was sealed before the landscape architect was selected. I personally believe that Peavey is one of the great examples of mid-century modern landscape architecture in the country. It is certainly one of Friedberg's best pieces of work, and he has a lot of wonderful designs. It will be sad to see it go, and we all know it will, this forum notwithstanding. The political will (misdirected, in this case) made it clear from the earliest stages that the existing design was "flawed" – dangerous, difficult to maintain, outdated. It definitely needs attention, in large part because attention has been deferred for so long. But the design itself remains exceptional.

In Portland, the wisdom of the City leaders insured that the great public spaces would be retained while adding new ones throughout the city. What if this new park took its place at the other end of the mall, north of the library? What if Peavey were elegantly restored to become accessible, more visible, better maintained? A visitor to this great city could stroll the mall and witness the remnants of Lawrence Halprin's genius (unfortunately, we took a lot of his design intent away too), experience a renovated Loring Greenway (another Friedberg piece), experience a restored Peavey (look at those early photos and the power, charm and exuberance of the space are clearly evident), and then, at the north end, Mr. Oslund's new park. Mr. Oslund's park has a lot of popular accoutrements and it could work almost anywhere, which is in itself telling. Mr. Friedberg's plaza has become an iconic space anchoring the south end of the mall. I am aware that it would be expensive to restore the water features, but I believe that a modest, sensitive redesign could make the plaza accessible, safe, easy to maintain, and return it to its former elegance.

I remember my architect father showing me pictures of the Metropolitan Building when I was young, describing its charm and uniqueness and showing me where it stood. He lamented its loss, as he did other losses that came later. We are anxious here in Minneapolis, for reasons that I don't understand, the take things down. The Guthrie, one of the best musical and theatrical venues I have experienced, was removed after another "public input process." It's a sad commentary when the privileged few can determine the fate of a major civic space or building in the community. By the way, I am not a strict preservationist; quite the contrary, I have some real issues with someone deciding what the "period of significance" is for a place and denying any variations from that moment in time. But there are occasions when the quality of a design, be it a building, a park, a street or a plaza, is truly special, and in those instances the object should be allowed to remain. It may have to adapt, of course, but wholesale demolition? There would be no Warehouse District if that were the norm, and frankly, the warehouses are far more ordinary as pieces of architecture than the Guthrie or Peavey are as iconic design expressions.

My voice will have no true impact on this debate and I'm acutely aware of that. But I thought I would add my comments regardless.

Good-bye Peavey Plaza. An exceptional design bites the dust.

I am writing in concern for the plans for renovating Peavey Plaza in downtown Minneapolis.

As an inhabitant of Minneapolis and patron of the Minnesota Orchestra, I feel entitled to the involvement in this process promised to me and other members of the public.

First of all, we were promised four design drafts, and only one to date has been disclosed. This lack of options makes difficult the demonstration that preserving elements of the plaza would be more costly than a large-scale restructuring.

While the single proposed layout appears to make a great stage and fountain/ice rink space, I am concerned that not even parts of the original design by M. Paul Friedberg will remain in this plan. I understand the rationale that piping must be completely removed and then reinstalled for the renovation, but additional options exist. These include preserving the presence of the stepped fountain on the corner of Nicollet Mall and 12th St. Such a structure could be preserved in absence of it plumbing being functional.

Unfortunately, I was exceedingly disappointed with the proposed design concept for Peavy Plaza on the City's website.

I respectfully ask that the City Council delay a decision on the project until all options are evaluated and the project is given the same level of citizen participation as would be given any Minneapolis park project.

Coming from the Chicago of Louis Sullivan, Frank Lloyd Wright and Mies Van der Rohe, and having worked downtown in a firm that represented Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, I learned to appreciate great design.

There were plenty of public plazas in Chicago in the mid 70's; but there was nothing like Peavey Plaza. It was always intriguing, very direct, honest and decidedly its own, not a copy of something else. It fit perfectly with Orchestra Hall. Peavey Plaza was a place that my co-workers and I often walked to over the lunch hour or for a concert; but also a place that children also loved.

The new compromise design does not live up to the great landscape design that it is replacing. It seems to borrow too much from projects in other cities rather than having a strong unique voice. No one that I have talked to prefers the new compromise design to the original.

At the High Line lecture at the Walker, I was struck by the open, very inclusive and extensive citizen engagement that was done for the High Line. I have to believe that it helped lead to a better project and the love that so many have for that park.

While the process to pick the consultant for Peavey Plaza was very open, the work on the concept design itself has been far from open. I believe that this has led to issues with the plan.

Sincerely, Edna Brazaitis

I am addressing the new design for Peavey Plaza with knowledge from design background and experience making compromises with new development and historic buildings and sites, and as a new resident to Minneapolis. This past spring I moved here from New York City looking for a slower pace, different weather, and “Minnesota Nice.”

I understand that maintenance issues, security concerns, need for better ADA accessibility, and desire for a venue are driving the new design for Peavey Plaza. I hope that HR&A is able to streamline the management and organization of the property for the future. However, their successes in a city of 8 million with a major tourist industry will not directly translate to the population density and patterns of use in the Twin City area.

Scale of the cities aside, the High Line and Bryant Park were great examples to mention at the public meeting last Wednesday. The recycle and reuse approach transformed the hardscape environment of the elevated railroad and cost less to redevelop than it would have to demolish. Even the modern Bryant Park was coalesced through repair, renovation, and preservation of existing elements and the introduction of new elements. The new design for this public space should be revised and begin with the current Peavey Plaza. Just as the High Line began with the tracks, the new design can take a vestige of the past, reuse it for the future and create something both familiar and new.

The best way to be “respectful of the original Peavey design” as stated in the FAQs, is to leave a portion of the design there and work it into a new context. Additionally, “modernist spirit” should not be confused with the Modern style of architecture. The Mid West and West Coast were able to build more Modern architecture because of later development and less density, and are now in the unique position of being able to speak up for their value as a more recent style.

Minneapolis should honor the original Peavey design by compromising so that the new design includes portions of its inherent value. Keeping the concentration of pipes and stepped fountains at the corner of Nicollet Mall and 12th Street would be an obvious place to achieve this. The new design should maintain the corner elements from the edge of the overlook on each street and should reflect the clean lines and color pallet of the original design. The colors could be similar to those used on the new Target Field. Blending the design between old and new will enable more liberties to be taken on the interior of the plaza.

The proposed design oozes chic-ness and speaks to contemporary trends in architecture, but is lacking focus, vision, and inspiration. Its materials and elements are not unique. The use of the space may represent the desires of Minneapolitans, but nothing about the design does. There is no unifying aspect to the design and many elements need to be

studied further. The firm oslund.and.associates speaks of making exterior rooms, but proposes a stage wall that would partition off the public space from that streetscape from being included in the plaza.

The existing design of Peavey Plaza is unique and deserving of compromise. Please treasure this city's architecture and share my concerns with the City Council Members and Mayor. Lois Watts

I am providing these comments on behalf of the Chicago Field Office of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. As the nation's premier non-profit preservation advocacy organization, our goal is to help protect and preserve the places that are meaningful in peoples' lives. Over the last thirty-seven years Peavey Plaza has been a well-used and well-loved public space in the heart of downtown Minneapolis, and it is most definitely a place that has meaning and significance for many of Minneapolis' residents and visitors. But it is clear that nearly four decades of intensive use and harsh Minnesota weather have taken their toll on M. Paul Friedberg's original design and materials. I applaud the City of Minneapolis and the Minnesota Orchestra Association (MOA) for their willingness to invest considerable funds into the revitalization of Peavey Plaza. Repairs and improvements are definitely needed after many years of neglect, and the goal of rehabilitating Peavey Plaza to ensure that is a safe, vibrant, attractive, and accessible gathering space for a wide range of activities is certainly a worthy one. But I am deeply disappointed by the method the City, the MOA, and Community Engagement Committee (CEC) have adopted to achieve that goal, using a flawed process that has resulted in poor communication about the plans for the Plaza, and very limited engagement with the public to solicit their input and feedback in the design process.

Nearly \$2 million in state bonding funds have been allocated to assist with the rehabilitation of Peavey Plaza, and the tax payers of Minnesota have a right to have their views and interests represented in the design process. The RFP that was issued for landscape architect emphasized that the selected firm must have "[d]emonstrated experience with completed urban landscape projects that involved [an] extensive public participation process," and must "demonstrate prior success in developing high-quality designs for public spaces that require a commitment to a public participation process, facilitating the input of multiple and potentially conflicting constituencies and viewpoints, and integrating the input from this process into a program and final design." (Request for City Council Committee Action from the Department of Community Planning and Economic Development (CPED), Sept. 14, 2010: 4.) The selected firm of Oslund and Associates, along with the CEC, have done little to reach out to the public, to facilitate discussion, or to incorporate alternate or conflicting views into the design process. In fact, the CEC seemed to be designed, both in its composition and function, to steer the design process toward a pre-determined solution that best served the needs of the MOA and Orchestra Hall. And while Oslund and Associates was tasked with developing a minimum of three alternatives based on information gathering sessions and input from stakeholders, it appears that they really only considered two: total restoration of the 1974 Friedberg design and Oslund's new design concept. The restoration option

was dismissed very early as too costly (although the basis of this cost estimate was never shared), leading the CEC to recommend the Oslund redesign as the only viable option. Positioning the design selection as an “either/or” scenario is both misleading and unfair. There are a number of other options that could and should be explored. Options that would maintain those beloved features that make Peavey Plaza such an interesting, attractive, and joyful public space, while also addressing concerns about accessibility, safety, the lack of utilities, and more a sustainable use of water and landscaping. In fact, consultants on Oslund’s team—nationally recognized landscape historian Charles Birnbaum and the original designer of Peavey Plaza, M. Paul Friedberg—proposed a design approach that would do precisely that. Unfortunately no one in the public was allowed to see that option, or any other option, to form their own opinion and provide feedback. Instead the public was presented with only one option at the Open House last week: the Oslund concept design. Peavey Plaza deserves more consideration and respect than that, and the citizens of Minneapolis deserve to have more of a voice in how their great public spaces will respond to their needs. I urge you not to approve the Phase I Concept Design for Peavey Plaza, and to restart the design process in way that will genuinely solicit and consider public input.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Christina Morris, Senior Field Officer

Chicago Field Office, National Trust for Historic Preservation

“The plaza’s design evolved from the objective of making this space a stimulating and provocative urban space which can be programmed and changed by the activity taking place within it . . . and which can also serve as a tranquil space of a more contemplative nature.” While the promoters of the redesign of Peavey Plaza might want to claim this statement as their own, it was in fact written by M. Paul Friedberg and Associates at the time that Peavey Plaza opened in 1975. The quote is from a “backgrounder” piece distributed, ironically, by the City of Minneapolis.

Today, the city maintains that the space was never intended to be programmed. Humbug. The historical record proves otherwise. In fact, over the past decades, the plaza has met the objective of its sponsors and designer very well. Does it need some TLC at this point? Yes. A complete makeover? No.

The process of planning the plaza’s future has been flawed. Two-thirds of the design team has been excluded from most of the process—to say nothing of the public. If the powers that be are so certain that the new design conforms to the design principles that were laid out early on in the process, then why not invite Paul Friedberg and Charles Birnbaum to analyze the proposed design and make their evaluation public?

The Metropolitan Building was demolished by a well-meaning urban renewal program led by well-meaning people wanting to make the city a better place. Their effort backfired miserably, and the city still wears the scars. Compare the building now at 330 Second Avenue South with historic photographs of the Metropolitan Building. It is mediocrity vs. magnificence. While the historic building easily wins this contest, its

stones now rest in a scrapyard. Those who were responsible for the destruction had to bear that sad legacy for the rest of their lives.

We've learned our lesson, for the most part, when it comes to buildings. Do we have to learn the lesson for landscapes the same hard way, by losing a treasure? I sincerely hope that history isn't repeating itself. Charlene Roise
Historian, Preservationist, and Resident of Minneapolis

I'm sorry to say that I am very disappointed in the new design. The current space is far more interesting and builds a feeling of shared community experience while still managing to be an intimate space.

I really hope the city will consider NOT moving ahead with this plan. It is a shame to see such a wonderful and unique space bulldozed. As much as I love my city, we do have a history of tearing down the old in favor of the new, regardless of beauty and quality of design.

I hope this time will be different.

Thank you,
Bridget Ferguson
Minneapolis Resident

I am writing to express my concern about the commissioned designs from Oslund and Associates for revitalizing Peavey Plaza.

The proposed re-design does not preserve the essential form and character of the plaza. The plaza in its current form matters to me and my neighbors. It can be rehabilitated for accessibility and other changes while maintaining important design features including:

1. the fountains with falling and still water;
2. the multi-level space with variety and scale of outdoor "rooms" and
3. period materials.

These are essential components of the design intent of M. Paul Friedberg, a pioneer and master of Modern landscape architecture. I request that you forward my message to NOT approve the re-design. Thank you, Kenton Spading

From Process Architecture in 1973

"The city of Minneapolis has proven itself to be one of the most progressive urban center of the mid-west. After completing an interior atrium [Crystal Court], skywalks and a vibrant mall [Nicollet Mall], the need was felt for a major urban open space for large

scale activities that were in conflict with the mall. The notion of a large paved open space was not appealing and the city suggested we seen an alternative. We proposed a solution with has become to be called the “park plaza”. Truly an American form, a mixture of the American green spare and the European hard space.”

It is unfortunate that this progressive nature that built our downtown is disappearing. By removing this icon and replacing it with a contemporary design that is neither unique or progressive, Minneapolis is significantly altering its history and image.

Granted there are issues with the Plaza, a basic understanding of built forms shows that maintenance and updating is necessary for the vitality of any space. But whole scale replacement is something that I had hoped we had grown from, learned from. Unfortunately this appears not to be the case.

But other questions also arise:

What about the City’s commitment to sustainability...how much are we going to add to the landfill and how much new energy must be created for the new materials?

What about the City’s commitment to an open public process? It seems this process was subverted.

Where are the design options looking at preserving or reusing part of the existing plaza as was touted at the beginning of the design process? This cannot be the only option?

Is this a public plaza or an outdoor venue for Orchestra Hall?

In 2007 I gave a tour of mid-century modern landscape and architecture in downtown Minneapolis to people from across the US who were attending a conference. One of the highlights of the tour was bringing people into Peavey Plaza, a quiet place to rest and talk, a contrast to the bustling Nicollet Mall. The people on the tour sat quietly, in amazement, at this gem of urban landscape architecture. They were in awe at this unique treasure we had in the middle of our city and remarked how lucky we were. It makes me sad to see that the City that was once touted for their progressive ideas is now choosing to destroy part of this legacy.

Todd Grover
Minneapolis resident, Architect, Preservationist

I wanted to express my concern that this design does not retain any of the key signatures of the previous M. Paul Friedberg landscape. This is unfortunate as well as unnecessary. I hope that the future scenario can return some of the great features of the original design. I also hope that we do not set a precedent of changing our major gathering spaces instead of designing with stewardship in mind.

With regards, Eduard Krakhmalnikov

After attending last week's presentation of the proposed "redesign" of Peavey Plaza by the City and landscape architect, Tom Oslund, one would have thought that the process leading up to this event was open and transparent. More important, that the original architect, Paul Friedberg, was an active participant working with the new "team" to develop a conceptual plan that would retain key elements of the original plaza design while at the same time considering the needs of contemporary users of this amazing amenity nearly 40 years later.

It is very frustrating to learn, after reading Mr. Birnbaum's recent article, that these representations by the Mayor and Councilperson Goodman regarding the actual process have for the most part proved illusory. I support all actions that would re-open the design process to include additional public discourse and consideration of other plan options (before the departure of Messrs. Friedberg/Birnbaum), that were not properly disclosed as they should have been.

I would appreciate if you could include me on your e-mail list for future correspondence regarding Peavey Plaza.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

Harvey Ettinger

Co Chair: East Isles Residents Association Zoning & Land Use Committee

Founder: Citizen's Joint Review Committee: Lake of the Isles Renovation Project (2001-2009)

This design is homogenized and stupid....Minneapolis will regret the destruction of a very special place of great artistic significance.

Oslund and associates should stay the fuck out of Minneapolis and stay with another strip mall or pseudo contemporary suburban restaurant!

Shame on Minneapolis city counsel and Orchestra Hall whom I thought was more progressive and sensitive to the arts.

Do I need to sit these shortsighted fools down and read them 'The lost Twin Cities' by Larry Millett

So sad for Minneapolis....

Fredrick Horton, Encompassarts

Have just reviewed the images of Peavey Plaza and was immediately struck by the elegance in the simplicity of approaching the plaza through the seasons of the year, or so it seems to me. The greenery of the Spring and the cheerfulness of the lights during the winter season. In the northern tier of the United States, plaza design is vulnerable to the

harshness of the seasons, particularly winter, but also the storms of spring and summer. Designing a space that accommodates enjoyable usage as well as minimum care while acknowledging the seasonal challenges is often tricky business. The elegance of the plaza design would seem to meet those challenges, while providing a beautiful respite in the midst of daily anxieties. Certainly the formal aspects of the design give a nod to the past, while the consciousness of the present is suggested in the varied usage the Plaza would encourage.

Thank you for sharing this with me. A strong and beautiful design!

Kathryn A. Martin
Chancellor Emerita
University of Minnesota Duluth

I have significant concerns about Peavey Plaza as it is being conceptualized for its renovation. I understand that a solitary design is being focused on for Peavey Plaza and that this design eliminates many of the iconic characteristics that make Peavey Plaza unique, award-worthy, and a great place to be. Peavey Plaza was recognized by the American Society of Landscape Architects in their Centennial Celebration for being a well designed civic space.

As a board member of the American Society of Landscape Architects - MN chapter, I had the opportunity to meet M. Paul Friedberg, the original landscape architect and a member of the new design team. I have also gotten to know Charles Birnbaum. I am shocked that with these individuals on the design team, the design has gone this far from the original intentions as stated at the time of the team selection. It seems that having them on the team served as a veil giving many concerned citizens a false sense of security. Given the description of the current concept, I question the level of involvement they actually have had in the process.

As a landscape architect, I am proud of our profession's ability to creatively problem solve, create incredible spaces that are meaningful and significant to our communities and at the same time very useful. I will reserve complete judgement until I have seen the concept myself, but at this point I am ashamed that there has not been a better solution that celebrates what Peavey has been and can be in the future. I challenge that the final design for Peavey be reflective of the most significant elements of this historic design including separate levels, a variety of spaces created through changes in scale and aspect, a beacon of water drawing people into the space while both animating the space and the sound adding to the tranquility of the surrounding, and a space for all seasons.

You likely are aware that Peavey has been documented as an Historic American Landscape through the National Park Service, and is eligible for the register of National Historic Places. Yet this flexible and masterfully designed plaza seems to be disappearing due to a dangerous combination of:

1. a lack of appreciation for what we have combined with the continued chase for keeping up with "the times" - a running theme through development in Minneapolis; and
2. the need for funders to have their own new sexy signature park to put their names on. (They need to consider that if it is not as successful as Peavey Plaza, it will reflect on them as well.)

Maintenance and repairs have been a real issue over the last decade(s). The park has obviously been in better repair. Even so, it still functions as a great space. I would suggest that the best use of the money that is secured for the project is to create a dynamic plaza that is a nod to the Peavey Plaza we have today, with assurance that there is a stream of funding to maintain the plaza for years to come.

Modernism remains a significant period of design and the region has this plaza to exemplify it. We should be proud of Peavey Plaza, not bury it.

Ellen C. Stewart, ASLA

The October 24th deadline for public comment on this Peavey Plaza proposal, published on October 19th, did not allow enough time for any real citizen review. Three (3) business days for public review of such an important proposal is entirely inadequate.

This is very poor process for deciding the future of a popular public space, and, as process, is insufficiently open and participative to merit the adjective "public".

Peavey Plaza is an urban treasure that should be repaired/restored and if that is insufficient "revitalization" the plaza should be very gently and carefully modified, not replaced or completely reworked as proposed on the 19th.

I have visited and enjoyed the Peavey Plaza many times, even though I do not work in downtown Minneapolis, and have found it one of the most welcoming and comfortable places in our city (yes, I am a long time city resident). It has always been a pleasant place to visit, and when events or performances take place, a remarkably animated, comfortable and pleasant venue.

My only complaint with Peavey Plaza is the lack of maintenance, especially of the water-features. Clearly they need to be repaired and perhaps made more rugged and maintainable. Deferred maintenance is not, however, sufficient reason to redesign and reconstruct the plaza.

The proposed "revitalization" will drastically alter a successful urban amenity. The objectives, beyond needed repair, to be realized are unclear, and neither are any shortcomings of the current Peavey Plaza design. There is no clear argument that the current Peavey Plaza is inadequate or lacking in design, execution or utility. Clearly maintenance and repair are needed.

The current proposal is excessive and unnecessary.
It is likely some small improvements could be made.
Why are we not considering a more modest, less expensive proposal?

Perhaps a more inclusive and open process could have produced a better result? George D. Jelatis

I'm writing in regard to the redesign of Peavey Plaza. I am very disappointed in the final product and even more disappointed in the "public process" that got us to this point.

When the RFP came out last year, my firm and many other landscape/urban design firms that I know didn't even bother to chase it because everyone in town assumed that this project was "wired" for Oslund and Associates and their many corporate friends with their deep pockets. After attending the public interviews and recognizing that the "winning" team was 3rd best out of 4, our assumptions were confirmed. But having Friedberg and Birnbaum on the team and promising an open public process that would become a model for how to respectfully update aging historic public spaces, there was a glimmer of hope.

Fast forward to last week. All of a sudden, without ever having heard a word about the "public process" that was supposedly taking place, there's an announcement that the "final" design would be presented for public comment on 10/19. About the same time, the 2 members of the Oslund team whose role in the project was to carry forward the historic/iconic character of Peavey Plaza published an open letter to the citizens of Minneapolis announcing that they'd been excluded from the design process, that there was in fact no public process at all. Then the design was unveiled and it was immediately clear that zero attention had been paid to the historic design, that everything existing on the site will be erased, that a bland and watered-down Millenium Park knock-off is being put in its place, and that the City and Orchestra Hall love the new design.

I think it's obvious what the problems are here and the Lisa Goodman who was originally elected to the City Council would have been outraged. We've always been able to count on you as a friend of preservation and as a person who values public input. To hear you glad-handing the designer, raving about the beauty of this design and how rewarding this public process has been is a complete disconnect from who you've always been as a Councilmember. The Minnesota Orchestra hand-selected the "Community Engagement Committee" by invitation only and that was the only "public process" that transpired.

You tell me, is that an open and transparent process? How would that process go over with your constituents if you'd have proposed it openly and publicly at the outset, rather than hidden deep in the bowels of Orchestra Hall? You know how it would have gone and that's why nobody outside of Orchestra Hall ever heard a word about this process.

- First we were "given" Gold Medal Park by Tom Oslund and his wealthy benefactors in a location where the City didn't need a park, attached to miles and miles of existing park land. But the donors paid for it, gave us the land, gave us

an endowment to pay for maintenance, so the City took it and smiled and said thank you.

- Next we were "given" Target Plaza (at Target Field) by Tom Oslund and his wealthy benefactors in a location that is arguably not public land, so there's really no reason anyone has to be outraged, me included. I'm fine with "public" spaces on private land that are designed/paid for in this way.
- Now we are being "given" Orchestra Hall Plaza (you can't call it Peavey Plaza any more just because it will occupy the same place if you're going to do this to it) by Tom Oslund and his wealthy benefactors in a location that is highly public, highly visible, and historically significant and we're being told that it is a public process that got us to this point. This is a dangerous and slippery slope.

Ms. Goodman, please act responsibly and put a stop to this before it's too late and we lose another piece of downtown's history. I'm all for a responsible update of the space and I think we have a great opportunity to be a model for how aging public landscapes can be brought up to date. I'm not for tearing down iconic public spaces to make room for new and shiny, corporate-sponsored generic quasi-public spaces that are "given" to the public by magnanimous wealthy donors with our best interest in mind.

Thank you for taking time to read this.

Regards,

Brady Halverson

PEAVY PLAZA REVITALIZATION PROJECT

I am writing this letter as a downtown resident of more than 30 years who has had the opportunity to benefit from this wonderful resource "right in my neighborhood". But change is inevitable and the time has come to renovate this plaza to meet the needs of the 21st century.

In following the renovation plans two things have come to mind as matters of importance:

1. Making the plaza more accessible to a greater number of users
2. Ensuring that the upgrades will be made in such a way that future maintenance of the plaza can be economically sustained for years to come

I was truly pleased to see the proposal for this revitalization which was unveiled last week. Both of the issues I noted have been addressed. Raising the steep grade that now exists to an upper mall extension with a ramp to the lower level where performance activity can take place means this space will accommodate everyone from those in strollers to those with walkers and wheelchairs.

As many in the neighborhood know, maintaining the plaza in recent years has been difficult. The new design offers an excellent opportunity to keep the water feature area, but save the water in both an environmentally appropriate and financially feasible

manner. The removal of the small costly plantings continuously needing labor intensive work and replacing this feature with grass and beautiful trees is a positive solution to this potential challenge. Designed in such a way as to allow for both summer and winter activity is a true reflection of how Minnesotans live, work, and play.

While each of us comes with different needs and interests, I am hopeful that we can all come together to support this effort as the City works with Orchestra Hall in raising the needed funds to make this revitalization effort a reality. Judy A. Karon

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed plans for revitalizing Peavey Plaza, an anchoring civic space at the end of Nicollet Mall. I realize that I am providing my comments after the specified period on the City's website, so I hope you will take them into consideration as the City considers the ultimate direction for the project. I am writing as both a practicing landscape architect, a member of ASLA Minnesota, and a Minneapolis resident. I have sent this letter to my City Council representative, Betsy Hodges, as well.

Great cities are built and evolve over time, respecting the past while innovating for the future. Expectations were high for the redesign of Peavey within the design community. ASLA Minnesota invested considerable time and funds to document the plaza in recent years in recognition of its significance as an innovative modern landscape architecture project. If we simply demo it and start over, we will be losing an important piece of the city's fabric. I strongly feel that there can be a design solution that preserves the inherent character of the existing plaza while accommodating new needs and visions for its use.

I recently attended a concert at Orchestra Hall on a pleasantly warm early fall evening and enjoyed the stroll between the Mall and Orchestra Hall through the plaza in part because of all of the people also out enjoying the scene. I am optimistic that the animated character of the renderings produced for the current redesign can be realized. I only hope that the design backdrop is not such a radical change from the existing one, and that the City will commit to the high level of care that such an important public space demands. Respectfully, **Michael Jischke, ASLA**

