



## Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board Cedar Lake and Lake of the Isles Master Plan Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #11

6/22/2022 6:30-8:30pm  
Kenwood Community Center

**MPRB Staff and Consultants Present:** Emma Pachuta (Project Manager), Adam Arvidson, Elsa Erling, Madeline Hudek; Maura Rockcastle (TENxTEN), Erica Christenson (TENxTEN)

**CAC Members Present:** Aaron Shaffer, Adam Braun, Alice Lehman, Anna Eleria, Ben Surma, Constance Pepin, Craig Wilson, Jim Romlin, Joshua Christensen, Laura Kinkead, Michaela West, Nan Dreher, James Reid (Alternate), Will Stensrud (Alternate)

**CAC Members Absent:** Drew McGovern, Eric Gangl, Lilia Theisen, Linda Mack, Win Rockwell (CAC Chair)

**Public:** Throughout the evening approximately 26 members of the public joined the meeting

### **WELCOME AND HOUSEKEEPING**

Emma welcomed everyone to the meeting and had CAC members and project team members do a round of introductions. She then went through the land acknowledgement, agenda, and meeting rules for the evening. Emma reminded folks that this is the first time a preferred park concept (PPC) had been released at a CAC meeting, and that tonight's meeting purpose was to inform people about what has been proposed within the PPC and why those decisions had been made. Constance reminded folks that there would be weeks of engagement to share feedback on the plan, but tonight was really about asking questions to learn about the design.

### **CAC DISCUSSION ON PREFERRED PARK CONCEPT**

*Discussion was divided into a series of brief presentations that were each followed by time for questions and answers.*

#### **Water Quality Presentation/ Q&A**

Maura provided an overview of the water quality goals and then started to talk about the water quality strategies related to stormwater runoff (7 and 8) and lake access (9).

Following Maura's overview, the CAC was invited to ask questions about what was shown. Members of the public were also invited to ask questions as time allowed.

(CAC) Page 9: Where it's existing, those will remain? Are the proposed adds (except for erosion)?

- (Project staff) The orange dots are what's to be removed and the dark blue dots, which are the existing stone steps, will remain.

(CAC) Page 9: For access points, I see that orange dots are informal access points. East Lake of the Isles is the most heavily approached side of the lake, even with SWLRT, would be good to add one or two more on the east side.

(CAC) Page 8: Expanded littoral edge and shoreline buffers, will those be short to allow for views to the lakes?

- (Project staff) Yes

(CAC) Page 7: Existing outfalls for stormwater treatment in park boundary – why differentiate between existing and those identified for treatment?

- (Project staff) Sub-watershed districts are small enough to be treated within the project area.

(Public) Page 9: By Basswood Rd – proposed formalized water access, right now on Cedar Lake there is a boat access already. What do those look like compared to what's there now?

- (Project staff) The master plan won't get into that level of detail, but right now it's the one that will remain, and the others will go away.

(Public) Can you provide a list of locations of what littoral edge of shoreline buffer looks like already in the park system?

- (Project staff) An example is the north end of Lake Nokomis. There's a shoreline restoration that was done under and around existing trees, with graded shoreline and invasives removed.

(CAC) Can you clarify if all stormwater improvement strategies treat 100% of hardscape, including parkways.

- (Project staff) Intent is to treat all of parkway and parking lot surfaces within the strategies shown in the plan.

(CAC) Plans in the mid-90s had an alum treatment for Cedar Lake that was highly successful – in the plan or later down the line?

- (Water Quality CAC Subcommittee Chair) Those are in lake treatments and fit better in the lake management plan to address internal loading. Goals are captured here, but in lake strategies like alum or dredging would be addressed for lake management plan.

(CAC) Control of invasive species – anything in the master plan that will address that?

- (Project staff) No, could discuss at a future meeting.

## **Amenities and Land Acquisition Presentation/ Q&A**

Maura provided an overview of the amenities and proposed land acquisition page of the preferred park concept (12). Following Maura's overview, the CAC was invited to ask questions about what was shown. Members of the public were also invited to ask questions as time allowed.

(CAC) Land that would be acquired – is it the onus of the CAC to forecast what to do with that land?

- (Project staff) Has been done either way – the smaller parcel of land identified for acquisition does have a plan as shown, the larger parcel of land currently does not.

(CAC) Enhanced welcome entry point, what does enhanced mean?

- (Project staff) The intent is to build off locations that have park signage already as well as identifying some additional locations. Could include benches, bike racks, city bikes, gardens, and/or some additional infrastructure to support welcome entry into the park.

(CAC) For the picnic areas – does this mean just tables or adding a structure?

- (Project staff) Tables

(CAC) What does an ADA picnic area entail?

- (Project staff) Accessible to get to it and tables are a little different for seating.

(CAC) Have either of the owners of the land shown been approached at all?

- (Project staff) Current homeowner is aware that this is being proposed. This is a 20-year plan, so it's possible it may become a different owner.

(CAC) Is land acquisition in the channel required in order to have a path through the channel?

- (Project staff) There is a pedestrian connection shown in the preferred park concept, and currently on site, there's already a path built with bricks and feels very public located on land that is privately owned. If that land were not acquired, the path may not work.

(Public) I'm interested in the ADA picnic areas – what will they look like and why those locations?

- (Project staff) Locations were selected because topography allows them to be accessed without a lot of slope or grade change and not too far away from parking. The look would entail longer picnic tables on a concrete pad.
- (Public) Would they include permeable concrete?
  - (Project staff) No

(CAC) There are a number of new amenities at Lake of the Isles compared to Cedar. Will the plan speak to improvements to existing amenities?

- (Project staff) By calling it out as existing in the master plan, it's a commitment to keep it and upgrade as needed over time.

(CAC) If there's existing amenities that should be upgraded in the master plan, should it be noted?

- (Project staff) Yes, it can be noted.

(CAC) An existing map and proposed maps side by side would be helpful. And also having a map showing all of the amenities together would be helpful.

- (Project staff) There is more detail in the zoom ins.
- (CAC) Would be helpful, even just an online document.

(Public) Picnic areas – Will there be barbeques too? More trash?

- (Project staff) Yes, picnic areas would probably have some grills and additional trash collection.

(Public) What's the reason to have a plan, even long-range plan, for land acquisition? Why is MPRB trying to acquire land just to acquire land? Don't understand why that's needed.

- (Project staff) Two different acquisition parcels have been proposed for different reasons. The larger parcel is responding to community desire to expand the park once SWLRT is done. Smaller one, interest from homeowner and would help make a train connection work.

(Public) Can you clarify on page 12: Notes a dock proposed, adopted on South Cedar Lake concept plan. Does that mean this process does not include addressing additional amenities at South Cedar Beach?

- (Project staff) No new amenities are proposed as South Cedar beach outside of dock and welcome entry point.

(CAC) 2 of the 3 ADA picnic areas are off paths that are not maintained in winter. How will that work?

- (Project staff) Will check with maintenance on how those are maintained.

### **Circulation and Access Presentation/ Q&A**

Maura provided an overview of the proposed circulation and access including trails, enhanced welcome entry points, and proposed intersection improvement locations (14). Following Maura's overview, the CAC was invited to ask questions about what was shown. Members of the public were also invited to ask questions as time allowed.

(CAC) Can you explain the combined two-way and one-way bike path around Lake of the Isles and MPRB's experience in enforcing two-way to one-way?

- (Project staff) There are a couple of spots at Lake Harriet that transition from one-way to two-way. And Cedar Lake with the two-way trails. With regard to challenges, will need to do some research. The reason these two sections were chosen is because they help to support connections to the existing bike network (Example: West 26<sup>th</sup> Street on street bikeway that's proposed and the connection up to Kenwood Park).

(CAC) What is the level of detail you'll get into? For ex: two-way bike paths, expand width or totally separated?

- (Project staff) Expand width from 10 to 12 feet and will need some realignments to retain as many trees as possible.

(CAC) There are two bridges that this would cross that are already narrow and a pinch point. How will this be addressed?

- (Project staff) Pages 21 and 23 show sections for the bridges, which provide more detail on how that would work.

(CAC) Page 21: Kenilworth Channel – What is a cyclist supposed to do to be safe and not interact with vehicles?

- (Project staff) Kenilworth Place is a low volume street and would become a bike boulevard. In preliminary conversations with City, this would meet requirements for bike boulevard.

(CAC) Hearing you talk about 12-foot wide single bike facility. Were two separated 6 to 8 foot trails considered?

- (Project staff) Heard concerns from the CAC about tree loss, so looked at tightest option possible.

(CAC) Page 21: Can you explain how the bike trail will connect with Kenilworth Trail and safety landing?

- (Project staff) The topography rises up; safety landing would be a bump out to allow for safe slowing and turning of the bikes. The soft surface trail cut down the hill and go under the SWLRT bridge.

(CAC) Page 14: Looking at the northeast corner of Cedar Lake, purple trails are staying, and blue trails are going away. How did you pick them? Picked coast path below East Cedar Beach and take it away north of the beach.

- (Project staff) Did site walks, chose paths that aren't eroding as quickly and ones that create loops, and access to existing cross country ski trails. Path along the shoreline north of the beach was removed in part due to erosion close to the water and improved water quality.

(CAC) Page 21: Any thought to having a trail going under the Burnham bridge?

- (Project staff) Bridge abutment wouldn't allow for a trail underneath the Burnham bridge.

(CAC) Would there be a marked pedestrian crossing? (*At Burnham*)

- (Project staff) Yes, it would be.

(CAC) For the paths on northeast Cedar – what does formalization entail?

- (Project staff) A soft surface material like woodchips and natural edging with logs.

(Public) Kenilworth Place – to accommodate a two-way bike lane, would you have to remove parking? Low volume traffic, high volume parking.

- (Project staff) Parking is planned to remain.
- (Public) Page 21: If you remove the sidewalk on [the west side of the] bridge, walkers will now have to cross twice if doing a loop around the lake.

(Public) Page 21: Assuming people will want to walk along Burnham Road, has there been consideration for pedestrian improvements along Burnham Road?

- (Project staff) Not on this plan, not parkland.

(Public) Page 14: Dean Parkway and Cedar Lake South Beach, heavily impacted by SWLRT, don't see any improvements along that stretch. How will this interface with SWLRT project?

- (Project staff) Typically restoration of trails is done following construction projects as part of the permit. For items that are shown as existing, it's assumed that all trails will be improved.
- (Public) Would suggest widening since it is a two-way bike trail and pedestrian trails.

(Public) Soft surface on northeast Cedar Lake. Right now, there are trails – will they be wider?

- (Project staff) Formalized sections will be standardized width.

(Public) Pedestrian crossings should be highlighted better, like flashing lights.

- (Project staff) Don't get into level of detail as to the specific of improvements, identifying the locations for where the improvements should be made.

(Public) Narrowing Cedar Lake parkway road, already have bikers on the street, may be unsafe for bikers.

What is the rationale for new trail to Midtown Greenway along Lake of the Isles dog park? There's access at Dean Parkway and southeast Lake of the Isles. Concerned bikers will use it even though it would be stairs.

- (Project staff) Page 22 also shows this trail in a zoom in. Improved crossing on Lake of the Isles to dog park – making a connection to Midtown Greenway helps to make loops and be safer and serve as additional access.

(Public) Did you consider east side of dog park for the trail?

- (Project staff) Did walk it, could look at it again.

(Public) Page 21: Pinch point bridge on Lake of the Isles bridge. Tight already. Did you consider removing two-way vehicle traffic across the bridge?

- (Project staff) Current two-way only accessible to buses and emergency vehicles. Did not look at removing the two-way traffic there.

(Public) Page 21: Proposed soft surface trail going underneath Kenilworth Trail. Any steps involved to go up and down Burnham? How will bikes be prevented from going through here?

- (Project staff) Improving bike infrastructure and connecting regional trails are strategies being used at the master planning level.
- (Public) Not shortcuts, used for mountain biking.

(Public) Page 14: North side of Kenilworth channel and proposed bike routing along Kenilworth Place. Where are the bikes going?

- (Project staff) On page 21, it's shown a little clearer. It's a connection from Lake of the Isles to Kenilworth Regional Trail.

(Public) How would you limit bike use, currently high mountain biking use.

- (Project staff) Adding signage and formalizing soft surface trails to make that area feel less like a mountain bike course are a couple strategies. Master plan doesn't get into the level of detail for what to specifically use.
- (Project staff) Conversations about whether there should be a mountain biking trails, challenge that we'd like to discuss with the CAC.

(Public) Page 14: Are you considering accommodating bike and pedestrian crossing at the enhanced crossings?

- (Project staff) Yes

### **Restoration Presentation/ Q&A**

Maura provided an overview of the natural resources restoration strategies (15 and 16). And following Maura's overview, the CAC was invited to ask questions about what was shown. Members of the public were also invited to ask questions as time allowed.

(CAC) The word restoration is a curious one. As I understand it, was a dump at some point and restored later. Is it being restored? Oak savanna versus mesic oak – are those what's already present or what we'd like to see?

- (Project staff) Particular forest types are building on what's already there. Not showing degraded woodland versus healthy woodland. Restoration may not be the right word; however, proposal is to remove low value species and replace over time with higher

quality species. Not restoration in a way that it's starting from zero and building from ground up, more of an adaptive strategy.

(CAC) Lake of the Isles islands are marked for restoration and they're wildlife refuges. What will be done there?

- (Project staff) Remove low value plants and replace with higher value areas. Master plans identify areas where we'd like to improve management over time.

(CAC) Can we identify primary areas to focus on or leave alone?

- (Project staff) Sometimes CACs will do a prioritization of particular master plan areas, up to you. Could identify high priority areas.

(CAC) Certain sections of south side of Cedar Lake have little or no littoral edge.

- (Project staff) Area is very narrow. Littoral edge also based on bathymetry

(Public) Call outs for boat use – a lot of people who fish, not acknowledged here?

- Formal access points can be for water access, views, fishing, or boat launches.

(CAC) Connection between water quality and natural resource restoration. Tied together and how they impact each other. Not shown.

- (CAC) Can talk about that at other CAC meetings.

(CAC) Could be a better word than restoration, restoration would take us back to pre-settlement.

(CAC) Page 15: What is restoration infill?

- (Project staff) As species are removed over time, the space where species are removed would be filled in with new species.

## **Zone 1: Northwest Cedar Lake Presentation/ Q&A**

Maura provided an overview of the Zone 1: Northwest Cedar Lake zoom in (17).

Following Maura's overview, the CAC was invited to ask questions about what was shown. Members of the public were also invited to ask questions as time allowed.

(CAC) Section B shows shared bike and pedestrian path. Why is that safer?

- (Project staff) Can't widen path. Shared path will calm traffic.

(CAC) Would the Park Board allow this trail to be shared?

- (Project staff) Yes.
- (CAC) Very dangerous and should be changed.

- (Project staff) Shared trails are a design strategy used in Minneapolis and have worked effectively in several locations. We can reevaluate whether it makes sense at this specific location.

(CAC) What is standard minimum width for a pedestrian path?

- (Project staff) Stand-alone paths are usually 6 feet; however, they vary quite a bit to avoid trees and other obstacles. Standard width for bikes would be 10 feet.

(CAC) At 21<sup>st</sup>, there are a lot of recreational boaters that go to proposed water access. Are the dashed lines new paths where there's erosion?

- (Project staff) Yes

(CAC) Box culvert south of north point parking lot near 22<sup>nd</sup> – lots of fishing, looked at as an improved area?

- (Project staff) No.

(CAC) Assume bikes won't be on the road where it narrows?

- (Project staff) Yes.
- (CAC) Not a good assumption.

(CAC) Proposed Section B: Would two-way bike traffic and pedestrians share the same path? How long a stretch is that and is there consideration for a dismount area?

- (Project staff) About 250 feet? Possible, would need to look into it further.

(CAC) At W 21<sup>st</sup> street, create pedestrian zones in area south of parking lot.

Bottom of page 17, proposed for section B – showing two yellow boxes with bikes and pedestrians. Wouldn't be how it is today, right?

- (Project staff) What's proposed no longer would be separated trails.

(Public) Is there an estimated price tag for all proposed amenities?

- (Project staff) Proposed cost estimates will be in draft master plan document.

(Public) The connection on the north side of Cedar Lake, haven't really discussed potential impact on that station for plan. Is there latitude for future impacts later on?

- (Project staff) Ideally this group will be considering that as this plan is being developed.

(Public) Page 11: Community initiatives and stewardship – What is involved in a volunteer restoration area? What do those relationships look like?

- (Project staff) The preferred park concept doesn't talk about it. The page recognizes these areas for informational purposes. Building on that work in the preferred park concept. Not proposing anything right now.

(CAC) Does MPRB follow an adaptive management strategy for plans? Is there a process for amending plans?

- (Project staff) The master plan document itself will have an amendment process in the document. Amending plans has been done before if there's some new that comes forward or something that wasn't anticipated.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT TIME**

- (Public) What are the primary funding sources and how will those be allocated?
  - (Project staff) State of Minnesota through bonding and constitutional sales tax amendment. An equity metric is used to determine when regional parks get funding, then another round of engagement is done to determine what will be implemented. Cedar Lake and Lake of the Isles are within Minneapolis Chain of Lakes Regional Park, which also includes Brownie Lake, Bde Maka Ska, and Lake Harriet.
- (Public) Disappointed about segments of this plan. Commitment to designing for all, but not sure how soft surface trails will allow for ADA access. Will eliminate access. Park Board should design for everyone. ADA is important for equity and access.
- (Public) On page 24, top of Lake of the Isles for the enhance welcome entry point: Crossing Franklin is a tricky situation. Is there any way to make that entry point easier to access or consider moving it to 21<sup>st</sup> to make it easier to access?
  - (Project staff) There is a proposed crossing at West 21<sup>st</sup> also. The Franklin intersection includes a proposed intersection improvement to help calm traffic in that area and also responds to items proposed in other adopted plans.
- (Public) Cedar-Isles Dean thanks you for listening and responding to resident feedback on boardwalks and improvements at Cedar Lake.
- (Public) What is the proposed cottonwood strategy?
  - (Project staff) Proposal would likely include protecting root zone where there's high erosion and heavy use along roots, the strategies would be to address issues here.
- (Commissioner Shaffer) Level of respect through the discussion sets the bar high. Commissioner Abene and I have put together an amendment to the issue with the easement on the lightrail and directed easement money to restoration work. Any of the reports SWLRT publishes will also now be coming to MPRB.
- (Commissioner Abene) Impressive meeting, excellent. Thanks to team and park board staff.