



Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board
Cedar Lake and Lake of the Isles Master Plan
Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #8

3/10/2022 6:00-8:00pm
Zoom Online Video Call

MPRB Staff and Consultants Present: Emma Pachuta (Project Manager), Adam Arvidson, Madeline Hudek; Maura Rockcastle (TENxTEN), Erica Christenson (TENxTEN), Sydney Shea (TENxTEN), Zakcq Lockrem (Asakura Robinson)

CAC Members Present: Aaron Shaffer, Adam Braun, Alice Lehman, Ben Surma, Constance Pepin, Craig Wilson, Drew McGovern, Joshua Christensen, Laura Kinkead, Linda Mack, Michaela West, Nan Dreher, Win Rockwell (CAC Chair), James Reid (Alternate), Will Stensrud (Alternate)

CAC Members Absent: Anna Eleria, Eric Gangl, Jim Romlin, Lilia Theisen

Public: Throughout the evening approximately 40 members of the public joined the meeting

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

Emma started the meeting by thanking everyone for joining the eighth Cedar-Isles Master Plan Community Advisory Committee Meeting (CAC #8). Emma named all of the CAC members present and asked the newest CAC member, Craig to do a brief introduction. Emma then reviewed the draft project timeline followed by a more detailed CAC meeting timeline outlining meetings from December 2021 through July 2022 (*see slides for details*).

Emma then turned it over to Zakcq who provided some background information related to transportation projections as well as the mobility goals for the initial park concepts and they connect to the draft guiding principles. (*see slides for details*)

Zakcq then turned it back over to Emma to provide community engagement highlights related to transportation and access from December and January. Community engagement from the initial concepts phase is also continuing to be compiled. (*see slides for community engagement summary details*)

Win then provided some introductions about the topic for tonight's meeting and that the next meeting will be about programming and parking, which will also include structures.

(CAC) Putting a thought on the table related to access. The canoe racks don't provide full access since people can have a canoe rack for as many years in a row as they would like. Would like to see that changed by having some slots on a regular rotation and possibly some free. Would also like to take a moment to see if anyone else has something they'd like to share.

(CAC) Data and access to a lot of water quality data and reports. Think it's important for the CAC to have access to the raw data so they can be aware at a more detailed level. Emma, can this data be sent out to the CAC?

- (CAC *in chat*) I agree! Just hearing that there are views "for" and "against" isn't very helpful ... quantifying that would be much more helpful.
- (Project staff) It's possible to provide raw data. Would like to caution that with the community engagement it's not about a vote. MPRB engagement isn't able to bring in every single voice into the conversation and would hope the CAC would see it's also about good design and balancing perspectives and not just about a community vote.

Public comments from the chat:

- Quick question: should community members have any mute/unmute options? I don't see any and I just don't want to disturb the meeting :)
 - (Project staff) Community members don't have that function. You can type in the chat (obviously). Later, during the public comment time, we will be able to have you speak if you want to.
- Just wondering where the ridership numbers came from? They are different from what I've seen before.
- I assume you have heard from leadership and members of Lake of the Isles Lutheran Church regarding their concerns about reconfiguring any access or circulation related to their stretch of Lake of the Isles Parkway and wanted to make certain the CAC and staff are working proactively with that community to understand their needs when it comes to services, wedding, funerals and continuation of access that meets their needs. Thanks!
- I appreciate the work in compiling the responses, but without seeing actual numbers we didn't really learn anything. We already knew there were people for and against those concepts. What does "a lot" mean? "Some"? "Considerable?" Is there a reason we are not allowed to see the real numbers?
- I appreciate this open forum but as Zakcq outlined, one of the biggest challenges the Park Board has is staying true to the Principles of Equity. How is the CAC able to justify any of the costs associated with the proposals discussed today in view of the vast disparity of where funds are currently allocated: always to the wealthy neighbors and rarely to part of city and County that are underserved. Are we going to continue this practice despite the rhetoric around DEI! It would be helpful to know how vast those disparities are today and what efforts the CAC is taking to close those gaps within the land the Park Board oversees. Indeed access is relative! By contrast water quality is not.

Water quality is steadily getting worse and with all the proposals under review water quality will get worse as more and more people visit and use the Lakes. I urge you to prioritize based real issues regarding DEI and water quality.

CAC DISCUSSION

Following introductions and an overview of the evening's topic, the presentation transitioned into an overview of the first CAC discussion topic followed by a CAC discussion. This format was followed for four discussion topics.

Kenilworth Channel Connection:

Overview by Zakcq: Proposal for a pedestrian connection, likely a soft surface trail, from the northern part of the channel up to Cedar Lake, a boardwalk along the southeast portion of Cedar Lake, and a bike and pedestrian trail

(CAC) How is what's proposed different than what's there today?

- (Project staff) Fairly direct connection from the lightrail to Lake of the Isles.

(CAC) In how it's shown now, is there any portion of this that's envisioned as paved?

- (Project staff) Yes, the portion between Lake of the Isles and the railroad (*solid white line on the concepts*).

(CAC) How would this path interact with the lightrail and Lake of the Isles Parkway? Would there be a stop sign and crosswalk to connect the it to the parkway? How would people get around the lightrail?

- (Project staff) In getting into more detailed design, would look at adding a stop sign at the parkway. For the connection at the lightrail, would go underneath the bridges at the lightrail, back up to the greenspace, up to Burnham Road, and back down along the channel (*moving east to west*).

(CAC) There are permeable pavement options for a paved trail. If it can be as ecologically sound as possible and out of view as possible.

- (Project Staff) The master plan will provide guidance around selecting materials that don't have negative impacts to water quality.
- (CAC *in chat*) I would be concerned about ADA accessibility on a non-paved trail
 - (CAC *in chat*) We could seek to use permeable paving to maintain ADA accessibility and minimize environmental issues
 - (CAC *in chat*) Good idea
- (CAC *in chat*) Has the park board used pervious pavements? If so maybe that is an option to consider.
- (CAC *in chat*) <https://www.usgs.gov/centers/upper-midwest-water-science-center/science/evaluating-potential-benefits-permeable-pavement#overview> It also has cold weather benefits of less ice / salt needs

(CAC) Good concept and agree about materials. One detailed concerned with is the shared bike and pedestrian trail as it doesn't seem to usually work very well.

- (Project Staff) There would be enough space to have more separation
- (CAC) There should be separation
 - (CAC) Agree about having separation

(CAC) Support Concept B because from the lightrail station you can access a lot of trails following the trail along the railroad and access the two the trails leading in either direction.

(CAC) Support formalizing a walking path, caution against over formalization.

(CAC) In the absence of the connector path, pedestrians have to walk along Burnham Road without sidewalks, windy, and not very safe. Pedestrian access should be a priority.

(CAC *in chat*) The trail bridge over the channel is going to be east of the rail bridges so a trail connection going east to Lake of the Isles lines up well with the positioning of the trail as it crosses the channel.

(Project Staff) What are thoughts about the southeast section and the possibility of a bridge?

(CAC) Walk this area a lot, and there are no sidewalks. What about doing a sidewalk along the backyards or front yards rather than a boardwalk in the lake.

(CAC) Done deal about a path along the southeast side of Cedar Lake? There's been a lot of concern about the possibility of trees having to come down to have a path in this location.

(CAC) Encroachments will expire on transfer of ownership. Revocable, but indefinite license. Width of ownership varies along the shoreline in this area.

- (Project staff) What's proposed is a boardwalk over the water and not an on-land trail.
- (Project staff) Could also consider an on-land option trail.

(CAC) Boardwalk will feel like a wall – wall off access to the beach to swimmers and boaters and will be a barrier. Open to the idea to access over time as access is brought back. Bridge over the channel may be a little strange, is it possible to have it cross near the railroad rather than at the opening?

- (Project staff) Possible to look at, but there may be some constraints with the bridge.

(CAC) Under the impression that encroachments could be revoked and ask homeowners to remove structures on parkland. Has that changed?

- (Project staff) Encroachment licenses are revokable. The Board of Commissioners has chosen not to revoke them yet. The Board in December put a trigger that they will be removed with transfer of ownership.
- (CAC) Agree strongly about no boardwalk. Expensive, introduce maintenance costs, not passable in the winter. If there is access along the shore it would be better on land rather boardwalk. The edge would be better served as a littoral edge.

(CAC) Sounds like MPRB has set policy on encroachments over time. Unclear why we're considering this now if encroachments preclude anything being done.

- (CAC) MPRB has the legal power to revoke licenses at any time.
- (CAC) Support the idea of a path along the shore, even if the timeline is long.
- (CAC) Don't want to preclude any path from happening due to easements. If we were to do a boardwalk, move the boardwalk out a little further so there could be a littoral edge and separate trail from homes. Don't want to remove the path from the plan.
- (CAC) Have a path and possibly blend having a paved path and boardwalk using as much land as possible and then a boardwalk and overlook where parkland is limited. Trails around the lake are important.
 - (CAC *in chat*) Agree with this idea
 - (CAC *in chat*) Agree with the idea and needing a path
- (CAC *in chat*) If I lived on the lake I would rather give up the encroachment for a path than a boardwalk wall...

(CAC) If there was a bridge and enough land along south side of lagoon, have a soft path connect to a path like the Kenilworth Trail or the streets currently used for walking without sidewalks or take a path down Park Lane.

Public comments from the chat:

- What's a soft path made of?
- My headphones are not working. I can't listen using speakers. I can't see a closed captioning function, so I am going to leave. My comments about circulation are: Pleasure driving should be accommodated by maintaining the historic roads. For some people it's the only way they can enjoy the lake. So it's part of providing accessibility to all ages and abilities. It's more realistic to assume than most folks will switch to electric vehicles rather than transit, given the density of the Twin Cities. Cedar Lake Parkway could be one way northbound with the bike path moved to the other lane. The bike path could become the walking path and the walking path removed. The parking lots could be accessed from France via Franklin and the local street opposite the south parking lot.
 - (Project staff) Thank you. I'm sorry the meeting didn't work for you, but we appreciate your comments.

- What are the environmental implications of the paved pedestrian path and the boardwalk?
- I'm having a hard time seeing how this could go OVER the rail.
- I think these new pedestrian paths are really interesting to consider. However, it also seems there is a certain leaning toward keeping the Burnham woods "natural" (without paved paths). How would we prevent cyclists from using these new paved (or boardwalk) access points from accessing the natural trails of Burnham wood? Bikers are already compromising the natural grounds in these woods and that needs to be addressed in this process and considered moving into the future.
- Can crushed stone be considered instead of hard asphalt surface?
- Paved paths will not cause great environment damage. They can prevent erosion and guide people to stay on the path. They are also provide access to all.
- It has to go under.
- Should be a paved trail from Isles to Cedar. Why is the south side not considered for access-ped on south side bike on north side
- Are the bridge designed for people to going under them?
- I'm so sorry. Can you please clarify exactly how the path with run? You mentioned Burnham Road and then you also mentioned the clear patch of land closer to the dog parks??
- Separation between bikes and walkers is important. I was recently walking with someone who's friend was killed by a bike on LOI and led to the current separation.
- I agree with separation-- there are two sides of public park space available at the channel
- The path should connect around the lake with a bridge so walkers can circumnavigate the lake without wading in the street
- How do you get across the canal without a bridge?
- I really think Burnham woods needs to be discussed in this discussion. We are now openly talking about encouraging bike traffic into this area which means we are formalizing bikes coming through Burnham wood. The access point from the lightrail is going to be at the entrance to East Cedar Lake Beach. How are we now connecting the channel to the light rail station for bikers?
- What are the homeowners expectation about how that land is used?
- Notice no green on map thru a portion of SE corner cedar as this is VERY narrow park strip
- The public park land--shoreline must be available for public access--80 years of privilege at the expense of public access is inexcusable and a breach of public trust
- What does the community say about a path along the north end of the channel, or is it what the CAC members want?
- Bike and pedestrian path tough under that light rail bridge. Narrow
- I agree with a bridge over cedar--there are 19 connecting bridges over mn'haha pkwy

- I agree --walking in Burnham road is dangerous
- Final statement, I keep hitting the enter. (Showing my age.) Don't jump to conclusions and say it can or can't be done without checking it in the field. Also, the traffic problem on Dean Parkway in late afternoon should be studied and reduced or eliminated and the dangerous freight rail crossing of cedar lake parkway (because people disobey signs and signals.) needs redesign before it is reconstructed.
- At the last meeting, there were strong concerns that a boardwalk in the water (at the north end of LOI) might lead to degrading the water. The same might be true here.
- There is plenty of public park space to create a public path access along this section--in a tight space a boardwalk would work--80 years of public deprivation is way too long park board has to provide a trail -park property has been available for 80 years
- Designer might want to look at the designs for the pedestrian bridge that is being built in conjunction with the LRT. The MPRB (Michael Schroeder) had a great deal of input into that bridge.
- Two new house are going up right NOW have they lost their encroachments?
- CAC member is correct--two homes have recently sold and new ones are being built, Is the park board exercising their rights for the public land
- A path should be installed immediately! It is park land that should be accessible to the public!
- I like the CAC member idea of having a pedestrian bridge going over the canal closer to the rail line. You could even have this pedestrian crossover somewhere in the middle. What this would prevent is formalized (paved or bikes) continuing along the north shore of the canal into Burnham Woods. The paved trail would then continue all the way around Cedar Lake and the hard surface path would not go along the shoreline on the north or east side of Cedar Lake. Instead the hard path that would be used currently exists. There are already bike and walking trails through the prairie area on the north side of Cedar Lake and along the rail on the east side of Cedar Lake back to this new access point on the channel.
- Yes, soft surfaces around Cedar, as CAC member recommends. Best for the environment.
- CAC member is correct I agree totally-except for soft paths which cannot be maintained through the winter

Cedar Lake Connection

Overview by Zakcq: Formalizing a soft surface trail along the eastern side of Cedar Lake. The two concepts show two different alignments, one that's further back from the lake in the woods versus being closer to the lakeshore. What's the best placement?

(CAC) Would be good to choose one of the existing paths that's not close to the shore. This area has high wildlife value and utilize the littoral edge in this area. Have trail away from this area, so wildlife isn't disturbed.

- (CAC) Agree, important to set aside as much land as possible to wildlife. When walking this area, often times looking behind to see if there are mountain bikers coming. What are strategies that can be implemented to ensure it's just a pedestrian path?
 - (Project staff) Strengthening the signage and directing people to parts of the park that can handling larger amounts of people. Additional research on strategies will also need to be done.
 - (CAC) Would you put any physical obstructions along the path to limit bike access?
 - (Project staff) Would like to do some more research on this.
 - (CAC) A big part of why mountain bikers end up on those trails is because the paths are narrow and "feel" like a mountain bike trail or a general purpose trail. A formalized trail, even a soft-surface one, would likely prevent that.

(CAC) Where are the wetlands?

- (Project staff) The wetlands are being shown as water on this map.
- (Project staff) Slides 11 and 16 show the marshland extents in the [initial park concepts](#)

(CAC) Seems like there's a lot of support for a trail in this area. Where are existing trails? Where are the wetlands relative to what's proposed?

Public comments from the chat:

- Burnham already has a bridge over the channel w/ sidewalks on both sides that don't connect to sidewalks along Burnham Road. A solution that involves installing sidewalks and bike lanes to slow the traffic on Burnham would be something to consider. It could also be implemented sooner and connect the existing bike and pedestrian paths that already go around much of Cedar Lake.
- Why soft surface--a hard path for all!
- What would formalizing a path entail?
- Yes, protect the area as a bird sanctuary
- The preferred route has been established---use the "cow path" already established
- Wild life AND TREES!!!
- Approximately where are the wetlands in the area of NE Cedar? The National Wetlands Mapper indicates wetlands in this vicinity but it lacks specificity and detail accuracy.
- The current conditions at N/NE Cedar are privileged positions not user friendly. Zach is correct on the ability for elderly folks to move through the area
- People will likely continue to follow the existing "desire path" regardless of where the formal path goes.
- There is a significant amount of wildlife activity in the shallow waters around all of Cedar Lake.
- The cow paths around the lake will not go away.

Lake of the Isles Two-Way Bike Connection

Overview by Zakcq: The top cross section shows the existing conditions. The second line is Concept A and shows an off street bike trail as it is today and an on-street bike lane going the other direction. The last line is showing Concept B, which is a two-way off street bike trail utilizing the existing bike trail width.

(CAC) Would the on-street bike lane lead to removal of parking?

- (Project staff) Bike lane would be 6 feet and including separation would be another 2 feet and would require either widening the parkway or removing parking bay.

(CAC) Winter bike path is for both bikes and pedestrians, concerned about that. When people come to the lakes, they are coming with kids or coming for recreation. Afraid about head on collisions and pedestrians having to crossing the bike path, dogs with leashes. A lot of variables that would decrease the safety of having two-way biking. Would become more of a commuter use rather than recreational use. Preference would be to keep the bike path as is.

- (CAC) Agree, can't imagine the extra impervious surface to build a new lane for the new bikeway. This is an example of the tradeoffs for water quality. Water quality is for everyone. Take advantage of existing parkway and bikeway as two-way without harming or paving over area near the lake. People pass all the time on the existing one-way path, passing would be a major safety concern if the existing trail became a two-way.
- (CAC, *in chat*) I second the concern of a two path in winter and crowding in summer

(Project Staff) There's a lot of research that having a two-way bike path reduces speeds

- (CAC) There's research and then there's experience. Not viable to have bikes going both directions. Would also like to bring us back to why there needs to be a two-way bike trail around Lake of the Isles. Would like to see a map of trails in the City – question if it's necessary to have a two-way bike connection around Lake of the Isles.

(CAC, *in chat*) 16-foot travel lane is excessive and way above standard design. So there is room to work with there.

(CAC, *in chat*) I wonder if only a certain section would be two way or bike lane in road for connectivity

(CAC) Not hearing that there's a requirement for a two-way

- (Project Staff) Correct

(CAC) On the BAC, one thing I try to do is expand access to people. One way would be that coming from Bde Maka Ska with a child carrier and trying to get to ice skating on Lake of the Isles is not easy to get to without having to go around most of the lake. Assuming that taking an existing bike path and turning it into a two-way doesn't seem realistic. Take 6 extra feet of travel lane (on parkway road) and then split the directions to go around trees and separate

them. Important to think about this possibility and not eliminate it based on current experience.

(CAC) For people who take biking seriously (ex: commuters and racers) already use the parkway roads today.

(CAC, *in chat*) Sorry if my comment already posted, but I support two way off street bike path. separating directions where possible is best too

(CAC) No matter recommendation, an existing 16-foot travel lane is wide, 12 feet is typical highway width. Travel lane width being as wide as it is should be discussed and consider it to be narrowed. Would open up options for more space for bike trail and generally.

(CAC) Notion that converting 10-foot bike path to two-way isn't realistic or safe. Reconfiguring the entire parkway or eliminating parking to make a two-way bike trail, not worth the convenience of two-way biking.

(Project Staff) Existing two-way trails at Cedar Lake

Public comments from the chat:

- With narrower bike paths in Concept B, where will people walk in the winter and where will bikes go? This might be very problematic unless signage was extremely clear and perhaps changed to one way bike path in the winter.
- The city doesn't have jurisdiction over the parkways, right? So MPRB doesn't have to follow the city's guidance re: on-street bike paths.
- Why do we need two way bike traffic on LOI???
- Is the status quo (one-way bike trail around the lake) an option?
- I have never heard such a complicated discussion about a park plan--it is simple -- provide access to public parkland; provide public access through the Kenilworth channel; provide a hard path access through the N,NE section of Cedar Lake
- What about bicyclists wanting to pass slower bicyclists? If you don't widen the existing path, how will you accommodate passing options?
- Parking is absolutely needed along the LOI Parkway.
- 100% agree with CAC member on this
- I share the concerns about a 2-way bike trail for safety reasons!
- Very much agree with the points regarding changing the LOI bike trail
- If the existing off street bike path was turned into a two-way path, where would widening be needed and how many trees would be removed?
- Is a two-way bike lane truly needed on LOI? I would be very hesitant to take my small children on the bike paths with a shift to the lay out.
- Lived experience trumps research —
- Nearly getting run over by bicyclists now while walking around the lake now (on what is the bike trail in summer, walking path in winter)

- So, make bikers traffic calmers?!!!
- Yes, let's not turn LOI into a commuter highway. Two-way obviously complicates safety for everyone. Why do we need two way bike path?
- What would the speed limit be on two-way bike paths? Current speed limit is not enforced. 10mph is inconsistent with commuting.
- Once again, agree with CAC member. LOTI is too congested and full of casual pedestrians. We love to ride LOTI with our kids because we don't have to worry so much about their bike skills. People can easily pass them. There are also some tighter turns at points around LOTI that would make for dangerous points when bikes are trying to pass on a two way system.
- Agree with CAC member — the Kenilworth Trail will eventually be open again.
- Bikers use the trail for exercise and don't want to go too slow. Bikers going north can take the Greenway Trail or Hennepin.
- Also re: CAC member's point that there are slow bikers, kids, recreational bikers that use this path, other bikers going fast pass them. If there was two-way bike traffic it would be an accident waiting to happen
- Providing two-way paths can help people like children who might not be capable of completing a full loop of the a lake access to enjoy the bike paths with everyone else
- I would like to see any numbers available for park usage around cedar lake/ park usage around the N/NE section of natural and wild cedar lake section
- Your expectation that people will truly slow down with a two-way path isn't necessarily correct. Thinking about cyclists passing with concept B with your average cyclists is a recipe for disaster.
- In addition to the fact that safety was mentioned re: inexperienced bikers on the lake... I see piles of kids of scooters. From age 3 to 13! I know we're talking bike/walk paths but I think our city's 3yr old have the right to learn to scooter on a nice flat path (unlike our sidewalks...) and the idea of 2-way just makes me imagine my kid colliding w biker aficionados - or them yelling at her when she has as much of a right to our Mpls Parks as they do.
- The Lake of the Isles citizens advisory committee from the last renovation of the lake did consider and vet the issue of two-way bike path issue. It was roundly rejected for safety issues. No need to revisit this. If anything, safety considerations should be more important now. Please, leave the path configuration as it is. Let's not forget about the TREES!!!
- I totally agree with two CAC members
- Snaps to CAC member!!!
- The two-way bike paths along West River Parkway become a real safety issue in busier biking months. Many accidents!
- I reiterate the PB's mission--to preserve and protect GREEN SPACE!!!
- +1 CAC member and the comments in the chat about preserving trees!

- The roadway is wide enough to put in a bike lane. The road around Lake of the Isles has pocket parking, so you would not be removing parking.
- Please select trip advisor for the usage of cedar lake vrs. the feedback for the chain of lakes--accessibility is the most important quality for lake usage
- At a previous CAC meeting, it was stated that the bike trails would need to be widened for two way traffic.
- AGAIN--why do we need two way bike traffic? Can someone please answer this question.
 - Please answer this question
 - Agree
 - yes! Please answer this question. Why are 2-way a need?!?
 - Yes please address the question -- is this a solution in search of a problem?
- Bicyclists are free to ride on the parkway now, and do. speed limit is 20mph, consistent with commuting.
- I would like to hear CAC/consultant thoughts about proposed one-way traffic on the west side of Cedar Lake Parkway if time. I have heard from many Bryn Mawr residents about flow issues
- Is there space to have a physically protected bike lane on the parkway. It should be duly protected (concrete) unlike the awful and dangerous bike lane on Franklin.
- Do NOT remove trees, vegetation or any other kind of green space to add another bike path!
- Btw, I want to put it out there that for any of you who weren't here in the beginning — one of the CAC members stated that they should discount the results from the community surveys because they know about the type of people who answer surveys That is hugely problematic, particularly given that this is a committee entitled Community Advisory
- Losing trees IS NOT AN OPTION.
- To whoever is in charge - will there be enough time on this call to discuss the “primary access route” plans for 21st next to our neighborhood’s elementary school?
- Why would you want two-way bike trails on LOL? there is not enough bike traffic to merit this drastic change
 - +1

Temporary and Permanent Parkway Closures

Overview by Zakcq: There are a few different areas to discuss for this topic. The first one is the proposed permanent parkway road closure along a section of the northern part of Lake of the Isles in Concept A. Feedback for this propose closure has generally not been very supportive.

(CAC) Does anyone feel we should be pursuing the permanent parkway closure proposed at Lake of the Isles?

- (CAC) Don’t favor permanently closing the road.

- (CAC, *in chat*) I am in favor of closing parts of the parkway

(CAC, *in chat*) What would a benefit of a permanent closure of that area? Any water quality implications?

The next topic is the proposed one-way along the northwest portion of Cedar Lake Parkway in Concept A.

(CAC) What are the implications?

- (Project staff) It's likely that most traffic would move to France Avenue. The numbers are different on the northern section versus the southern section, which suggests people are taking different routes.
 - (CAC, *in chat*) Not a county road (*in reference to France Avenue*)

(CAC) Which direction would the one-way be?

- (Project staff) Not determined, but likely moving south.

(CAC) People need access moving north to get to Theodore Wirth and Eloise Butler. If the problem is a lack of space, is there an option to reconfigure the parkway to allow for more space for the bike and pedestrian trail?

- (Project staff) Not sure there is a way to reconfigure it with in its current configuration.
- (CAC) Totally understand this area is not ideal or perfect when biking through. Though not sure that closing a portion of the parkway is the solution.
- (CAC, *in chat*) Is there a possibility to widen parkway into property land?

(CAC) Could there be a boardwalk for pedestrians to divide the trails and create space?

- (Project staff) A boardwalk is the solution suggested in Concept B.

(CAC) Making paths safer for all users is important. This particular stretch is one of the most dangerous areas in the project area. Would be interested in the current lane width. One-way would create a safer trail connection and add some additional green space. Two-way bike path should be 10 feet at an absolute minimum here and all around the lake.

- (CAC, *in chat*) +1, the Cedar Lake trail needs to be wider for safety of both peds and cyclists

(CAC) Running that section is a constant making sure there isn't a bike coming. Closing the parkway to a one-way so trails. Visitors and park users would eventually plan route along France Avenue, would be a learning curve, but wouldn't automatically drive traffic to the neighborhood over time.

- (CAC, *in chat*) Agree

(CAC, *in chat*) The roads thru neighborhood are already narrow with areas if no side walks

(CAC) Boardwalk should be discussed more, could fully solve problem in this area. Short area could be fun to go across the water and could separate trails more.

(CAC) Would be helpful to see some conceptual things or examples. One that comes to mind is the one along the Mississippi River. Live on the northwest side of the lake when the parkway was closed – consider a change to the direction. Think about how the direction could potentially eliminate existing bottlenecks.

(CAC, *in chat*) I wonder if extending the one way all the way to south beach would help cut down on some of the neighborhood cut through. The trail is falling into the lake on the south sw corner of cedar as well.

(CAC) Would temporary parkway closures be limited to what's identified?

- (Project staff) No

(CAC) Remember when the parkways were closed on Sundays. Don't understand why they would need to be redesigned for temporary closures.

(CAC) Why is this even in the plan? The Park Board already does closures for races.

- (Project staff) To do a temporary closure, there would need to be some infrastructure in place like gates to do long term rather than pulling out barricades each time.

(CAC, *in chat*) I'm in favor of opening up parkways for pedestrians, cyclists, and others on a temporary basis

(CAC) Would be in favor of closing it to the summer months and keep access to the parking lots.

- (CAC) Will this be temporary or seasonal?
 - (Project Staff) Not determined at this time.
- (CAC) Support periodic closures.
- (CAC) Periodic yes, but not seasonal.
- (CAC) Don't oppose periodic closures but think it's a mistake to put it in this master plan. This is something the commissioners should pursue with additional community engagement.
- (CAC) Endorsing permanent closures

Public comments from the chat:

- NOT DESIRABLE!
- There are not enough social events to close this pkwy--ever
- I am personally in favor of considering returning the north section of the parkway to permeable space.

- When West River Parkway was closed during Covid, the bikers totally took over the road, plus still used the bike paths, despite MPRB posting signs to share the space. Pedestrians were very much negatively impacted.
- I am stoutly opposed to a closure of the LOTI parkway.
 - +1
- We should be considering all options to returning rainwater to the water table.
- I do not favor closure of the parkway!
- Can you provide a link to the FAQ you've been mentioning?
 - +1 - where is this FAQ so that we can see it
 - (Project staff) The FAQ will be added to the meeting page with the meeting notes following the meeting.
 - Thx Emma
 - Thank you
- Thanks to all of you on the CAC for listening to community input on the proposed north parkway closure!
- Where are these FAQs? Accessible to the public?
- I believe I've heard advocacy for this being an important link from N. Mpls to the Chain of Lakes.
- That serves Golden Valley more than North Minneapolis
- That one-way would drive traffic through our CIDNA neighborhoods! Have you talked with the folks on France about this? Sometimes the traffic is back to back from Penn Avenue, around the lake through Dean and to Lake Street. I know this for a fact — it's in front of my house. Extremely dangerous to drive all those cars through neighborhoods — and it would be a permanent detour causing much more pollution. THERE IS NO PROBLEM! What would be alleviated? There is no problem.
- The one way on the W side of Cedar lake will indeed put a lot of cars through the neighborhood. Could losing a few parking space on the west side of the parkway help give you the space needed?
- Cedar Lake does not have the volume of bikers, pedestrian volume to change traffic patterns--show me the usage--there is not a large volume usage to narrow roadways. Good idea to have boardwalk along the cedar lake edge
- Yes, I agree a boardwalk might be great in this area.
- Could staff confirm that the proposed "closure" only applies to the street level (travel lane)? It does not include closure to pedestrian and bike circulation?
 - (Project staff) You are correct.
- Bwt, I want to say that the CAC chair is doing an excellent job of ensuring that voices are heard
- The intersection by the bridge is very dangerous to cross and people cross the tracks on foot under the bridge to get to Brownie. Is there a solution to solve the dangers of the intersection and the tracks?

- A Boardwalk here raises the same issues about accessibility, maintenance, blocking views, vegetation disruption.
- Cedar Lake trails seem much less used, and the overlapping narrow area is quite short
- Like the boardwalk concept on NW Cedar!...could even consider some bump-out deck/bench spots to enjoy the city skyline views without becoming an impediment/safety concern for through ped+bike traffic. Consider looking at the design at north side of Wirth Lake as a model.
- It would be extremely unfair to neighborhoods, making them dangerous.
- The West and south side of Cedar--hard paths most accessible most used by park users is also the most impacted by vehicle traffic! Hence, a reason to make the east N/NE section of cedar available to all park users!
- What would these boardwalks you imagine be constructed of? Concrete like the one in Lol? Concrete is terrible for the environment. It's curious we are not thinking it's intrusive to build things in lakes that impact the health of and wildlife in a lake and yet you can't imagine taking space away from cars on already paved roadways.
- What happens in the winter with boardwalks?
 - Agree this question has to be addressed: what would happen in winter assuming boardwalks are not cleared in winter
- We floated making Cedar Lake Parkway a one-way 20 years ago and Commissioner Lisa Goodman was adamantly opposed.
- Yes to CAC member's idea
- I agree to make Cedar one way north IF it is one way.
- I worry that "temporary" is ill defined. And therefore doesn't this plan just become a permanent closure UNLESS there are specific policies around when it might be closed
- YEARS ago--they shut down LOI on the same day at the same time every week. What a great idea.
- Even temporary closures will prevent access to parking lots for beach goers, kayakers, canoeists.
- Can you clarify what temporary would mean? Like how Memorial Drive is shut down every Sunday morning in Boston for walking, running, cycling? That type of cadence or another type of cadence?
- I love that CAC member, thank you for sharing that memory.
- Isn't this a traffic issue, not a design issue?
- Am I supposed to haul my 50 pound kayak a couple of blocks?
- Forgot about that, CAC member. That's why you do it on the same day at the same time--once a month? People would figure it out.
- This seems like "cover" to make more hardscape changes to the lakes. Sorry.
- There are no large events that merit closing cedar lake pkwy
- Yikes — it seems that periodic can turn into permanent given how open ended and undefined this is

- Periodic closures are a delight. No need to make permanent changes like the blight of signage and gates.
- What is the benefit of closing just a short stretch?
- +1 CAC member.
 - +2 CAC member
 - Yes, CAC member
- Yes to community engagement
- I don't understand why it is out of your realm.
- The current system of event based closure works well and is sufficient. We don't need more closure and its a far more complex matter than the realm of this CAC master plan
 - +1
- Capital considerations will be required for the kinds of infrastructure proposed in this long-range plan.
- Good, as long as that's stated clearly
- Why close the pkwy here? Cedar lake under its current usage does not merit closure of pkwys, lake harriet and bde maka do have large events and should be closed

PUBLIC COMMENT TIME AND THANK YOU

Emma transitioned the conversation to public comment time and explained that it was a time for community members to make comments related to the master plan. Additionally, if questions were asked, Project Staff would try to answer them at future meetings as much as possible. Emma also asked folks to write 'yes' or their name in the chat box if they wanted to share feedback verbally. Folks could also write feedback in the chat box during this time (recorded below).

- (Public) Thinking about easements and about getting around safety. Park Lane will be redone, could that be one lane so there would be space for a bike and peds?
 - (Public *in chat*) Great suggested use of existing infrastructure.
- (Public) Event based closure is fantastic and works well but doesn't disrupt the neighborhood as much. Severely opposed to the parkway closure on Isles.
 - (Public *in chat*) +1!!
- (Public *in chat*) How many members of the public are here tonight?
 - (Public *in chat*) Good question
 - (Public *in chat*) Two members of the public here
 - (Project staff *in chat*) There are 41 members of the general public here.
 - (Public *in chat*) Thank you
- (Public *in chat*) Is it possible that we could see who the members of the general public are? This seems to be rather exclusive. At least so we can see who are listening so attentively to the CAC. On most Zoom platforms, there is a "Participants" list that can be accessed.

- (Project staff *in chat*) Thanks, I'll see if I can change the settings to be able to be more transparent. The webinar platform is difficult for that specific reason.
- (Public *in chat*) Can you explain the comment, I think it was Adam Arvidson, who cautioned about paying attention to the survey results because only certain types of people answer the surveys?
- (Public) Equity is a value and we should be thinking of safety of all users, walkers, bikers, rollers – in favor of creating space in public right of way – expanding bike and pedestrian trails is a priority for me. Another priority is two-way bike trail on Isles – tutor on the south side of Isles and have to bike on the road to get home in order to avoid going around the whole lake. The opportunity to reduce lane widths and slow vehicles down is a benefit. Design is a way to improve public safety and accessibility. Infrastructure lasts for decades – make sure we're planning for the future and not just what has been working in the past.
- (Public *in chat*) One comment I want to share: I support two-way bicycle access on Lake of the Isles
- (Public) 80 years has been long enough for the easements to exist, time for public access in this area, public access for pedestrians and if possible, for bikers would be beneficial. A decent, accessible path through the north/northeast section of Cedar Lake for the public, seniors, and increase mobility is important.
 - (Public *in chat*) I agree. We need access to the SE corner of Cedar Lake along with the corridor to Isles and the NE side of Cedar. 80 years of landowners using our park land is long enough. Many of these landowners have fertilized lawns running into Cedar Lake.
- (Public *in chat*) Please do not remove any trees - please no addition of any paths/boardwalks that need salting
- (Public *in chat*) There is a wonderful paved trail through Cedar Lake Park. It is called the Cedar Lake Park Regional Trail. The regional trail, along with the Kenilworth Trail allows people to move along the and circulate around Cedar Lakes's North and East side without destroying the natural, unique piece of Cedar Lake.
- (Public *in chat*) One other way to improve accessibility and circulation is to have maps on the Park Board's website
- (Public *in chat*) Many thanks to the CAC
 - (Public *in chat*) +1. Thanks to the CAC!
- (Public) Would like to convey a feeling: there's another way of getting around Cedar Lake and that's to saunter. There's also a piece of music to note: Invitation to the Dance – the dance is nature and we have to get invited somehow. We have to figure out where the emeralds are and how to protect them and enjoy them. Create a charm bracelet with various charms – maple basswood forest, prairie, and a nice path to enjoy them. Don't you think we need to saunter?
 - (Public *in chat*) Thank you
 - (Public *in chat*) This speaker is awesome!!! Saunter!!!

- (Public *in chat*) Way to go!!!
 - (Public *in chat*) Thanks!
- (Public *in chat*) As you consider circulation, please remember that lots of people use the paths around the lakes to walk dogs.
- (Public) Going back to the beginning of the meeting and reality of Southwest lightrail and how planning relates to that. There's a reason MPRB is an independent agency. It has the power to make the lakes, trees, water the primary focus. MPRB is not in the service of Met. Council or railroads. That's why MPRB is independent, to ward off challenges, if they don't do it nobody else will. Don't want MPRB to sell out to the lightrail.
 - (Public *in chat*) +1000!
 - (Public *in chat*) Agree
 - (Public *in chat*) Absolutely
 - (Public *in chat*) Thank you
 - (Public *in chat*) Thank you
 - (Public *in chat*) Well said
- (Public *in chat*) Tuned in very late. But here.
- (Public *in chat*) Yes, let's keep the east side of cedar lake accessible for trees!
- (Public *in chat*) are the parks for privileged residents on se cedar lake
- (Public *in chat*) Absolutely!
- (Public) Thanks CAC for serving on this body, process and work is important. Think not about changes that would be easy for tomorrow, but what can be done for people and wildlife in the next 50 years. Envisioning an environment that facilitates the things done in the parks – access for people walking and rolling, reducing paved surfaces – see in the diagrams that there's arguing over width of bike trails and not the 16-foot width for driving. Consider two-way bike trails and do what you can to protect natural resources.
 - (Public *in chat*) Thank you!
- (Public) Cedar Lake is unique, natural, and the only lake that has that unique and natural feel. There are ways to get around Cedar Lake. Don't believe we need to ring the lake with a paved trail. Will lead to part of the destruction of what makes Cedar Lake unique, natural, and wonderful.
 - (Public *in chat*) Thank you!
 - (Public *in chat*) I agree
- (Public *in chat*) I will reiterate that CAC member's ideas about a pedestrian bridge from the north side of the canal to the south side of the canal prior to it terminating at Cedar Lake allows for both a protection of the Burnham woods and also provides access to the shoreline in the SE corner of the lake. It's the best solution I've heard so far.

Emma concluded public comment time and thanked everyone for joining the meeting. *Public comment went to the very end of the meeting. Emma's contact information is outlined on the last slide of the presentation.*