



AD HOC COMMITTEE MEETING Minutes

November 10, 2025, 6:00 P.M.

Meeting held in the Richfield Heritage Preserve Park Office

AGENDA

Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 6:03 p.m.

Roll Call

Mike Selig, Holly Price, Park Director John Piepsny and Corey Ringle and Lynn Richardson, representing Friends of the RHP

WORK SESSION

Kirby Mill Swing Bridge Discussion:

Friends presented a prepared presentation on the swing bridge, focused on accessibility, safety and feasibility. They discussed how a design for unlimited use, with no capacity limits and always open to the public, would not only be a very different bridge, but it would also substantially change the look of the mill and the area around the mill. Bridge anchors go through mill; platform on south side is part of the anchor.

Presentation reviewed existing accessibility challenges and ways access could be limited from both sides. Also discussed commitments made based on original restoration. Friends offered to pay for annual inspection of the swing bridge. Presentation ended with comments regarding the Kirby driveway bridge as a potential alternative for full public access.

Mr. Selig discussed driveway bridge and expanded on his position in an earlier board meeting that it should not be an immediate focus. Given his experience with the upper lake dam bridge, he estimates a new bridge could be \$500,000. He believes the park is better served by creating a natural, graded crossing for horses and people until more feedback can be received regarding next steps.

Further discussion regarding the existing restoration plans were discussed.

Ms. Price suggested the group undertake a ranking exercise of the three options the committee was asked to consider: Public access, Restoration and Removal. Each option was ranked using a 3-point scale as follows: Good=1; Better=2; Best=3

Attribute	Remove	Rehab	Public
Accessibility	1	2	3
Safety	1	2	3
Feasibility	3	2	1
Minimal Funding Impact	2	3	1

Historical Accuracy	2	3	1
Board Preference	2	1	3
Friends Preference	2	3	1
Aesthetics	1	3	2
Public Perception/ consistency in policy	1	3	2
	15	22	17

Ms. Price reiterated that the exercise was not meant to determine an absolute decision but a way to help compare the three options.

Following the ranking exercise, Mr. Selig made the following comments:

- No matter what we [RJR] do, it [the bridge] will not be accessible.
- Many of the park structures are already closed to the public; this creates a new one.
- Historic impact of safety improvements.
- Very easy to see, get to it if people chose not to follow the rules
 - Corey responded that vandalism and other problems in the park has decreased with more people present

Mr. Piepsny added:

- Bridge offers nice view – overlook area
- Have had to kick teens and wedding parties off bridge
- Concerned with visitors not respecting the 3-person limit

Bridge there as early as 1935 (mill built in 1922)

The following next steps were agreed to.

RJR asked for:

- Clarification from Redpoint of "supervised" bridge operation and what that means for operators.
- Referrals/contacts for organizations with similarly sized bridges designed/built by Redpoint
- Gather more information about deflection limitations (e.g., maximum allowable movement) to incorporate into the bridge design contract

Friends offered to explore having increased docents during high traffic times to help monitor bridge.

An update of the meeting will be presented at the Nov. 17 Board meeting. Committee to reconvene in early December to review new information and prepare for a final board decision in December.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn by Ms. Price, seconded by Mr. Selig. Meeting adjourned at 7:21 p.m.


Submitted By:



Holly Price, Committee member

Date: 3/10/26

Accepted By:



Mike Selig, Committee Member

Date: 3/10/26