



Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board
Cedar Lake and Lake of the Isles Master Plan
Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Circulation Subcommittee Meeting #1

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

MPRB Staff and Consultants Present: Emma Pachuta (Project Manager), Madeline Hudek, Elsa Erling, Adam Arvidson; Maura Rockcastle (TENXTEN), Zakcq Lockrem (Asakura Robinson)

CAC Subcommittee Members Present: Aaron Shaffer, Adam Braun, Anna Eleria, Constance Pepin, Craig Wilson (Subcommittee Chair), Jim Romlin, Laura Kinkead, Linda Mack, Michaela West, Nan Dreher, Win Rockwell (CAC Chair), Joshua Christensen

CAC Members Absent: none

Public: Throughout the evening approximately 37 members of the public joined the meeting

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

Emma welcomed everyone to the meeting. She began with the land acknowledgment, then moved on to agenda, CAC group agreement, public online forum guidelines and briefly introduced the CAC members participating in the Subcommittee. Emma outlined where the process stands and previewed upcoming events and meetings. She shared an overview of public feedback received relating to circulation and access. She then reviewed the main circulation proposals in the Preferred Park Concept.

(CAC) In the chat, people are asking for data about the top things? It's kind of confusing. The timeframe is not specified.

- (Project Staff) Yes, I can share data, but I have to think about how it can best be presented.

Emma passed it over to Craig, the Subcommittee Chair, who welcomed everyone. He emphasized that a lot of work has gone into the meeting in the past weeks and he explained that the purpose of this meeting was to reach consensus on several items and vote when there is not clear consensus.

Public comments from the chat:

- It would be wonderful if you could record these meetings. These are important records for our community.
- Could you please provide data for these “top things”?
 - and we moved so fast, I was not able to read them
 - Can you supply all data? We'd like to see the same data that you are seeing.
- (Project Staff) Greetings, attendees. Thank you for joining us tonight. As Emma mentioned, we will have the chat open throughout, but we won't be responding to comments in the chat. The chat will be saved and is considered part of the engagement for the project. A public comment period will take place toward the end of tonight's meeting.

SUBCOMMITTEE GOALS DISCUSSION

Craig outlined three goals for the Subcommittee and asked for anyone who would like to move the motion forward with the goals and two CAC members announced their support of the motion.

(CAC) I'm just wondering about the definition of low-impact signage. Hopefully that doesn't mean low vision.

- (Craig) It would be something that doesn't take away from the scenic character of the park. Is that correct, CAC Member?
- (CAC) Yes.

(CAC) Where do electric modes of transport fit into these goals? This is a 30-year plan and those modes will only become more popular in the future.

- (Craig) That's a welcome friendly amendment, can we change it to “motorized electric vehicles”?
- (CAC) Isn't that just “motorized”?
- (CAC) I think it's different, we want to talk about electric scooters, bikes, etc.
- (CAC) The term we use is “electric micromobility.” Which would include scooters, e-bikes, skateboards, small electric things?
- (Craig) Do we need to clarify gasoline and electric?
- (CAC) I don't think we need to. I think “motorized” covers electric.
- (CAC) I like the addition of the “electric micromobility.”
- (Craig) Anything else?
- (CAC) What about rollerblades? They go fast on the bike path but aren't electric.
- (Craig) Good point, I don't know how to characterize that. Maybe CAC Member has another term for it?
- (CAC) I don't know. It hasn't really come up.
- (CAC) Someone mentioned “non-motorized human-powered” in the chat.

- (CAC) Some other kind of vehicle will always come up, so we should try to be general.

(Craig) There are three minutes left in this topic, so we're doing well. Anything else that comes to mind?

(CAC) I see the word "circulation" here, but not "access." Is there a reason why it's not included?

- (Craig) I would welcome the amendment to include "access." It looks like everyone agrees.

(CAC) The 10mph limit was talked about in the chat and that could be added somewhere in the priorities. I don't know how, but it could be included.

- (CAC) It seems like it should be discussed later but doesn't need to be included in the goals for the committee.
- (CAC) Okay fine, but I get whizzed by.
- (CAC) I know, it's an issue. I think it comes under visitor safety.
- (Craig) Okay, let's keep it at that.

(CAC) I think Goal Number 2 is getting a little over-stated right now. I don't think you need "non-motorized," wouldn't it be "electric"?

- (Craig) Strike "non-motorized" and call it "human-powered"?
- (CAC) Just strike that and call it "fast-moving pedestrians."
- (CAC) Why are we even talking about "fast-moving pedestrians"?
- (CAC) Can we put it as "rollerbladers"?
- (CAC) This is the problem with trying to include everything. We need to be general.
- (CAC) It could just be "bikes/rollerblades/etc."
- (Craig) I do want to emphasize that people who are walking should come first.
- (CAC) And be separate.

Craig moved on to the guidelines for the meeting. He underscored that there must be good reasons to change the Preferred Park Concept and changes must relate to the goals. He suggested that the CAC return to the goals later and move on to the discussion topics. Craig gave an overview of the ten discussion topics, which were broken down by location. He asked if anything was missing. As the CAC appeared satisfied with the list, he then returned to the goals.

A vote was held on the goals and the Subcommittee voted unanimously to support them. (see presentation for details)

Public comments from the chat:

- Many bikes are now electric and can drive at speeds in excess of 20 mph. What bicycles qualify as motorized vehicles?
- Agreed

- Electric bikes use batteries. Batteries are not motors.
- you could call them motorized micro modes and vehicles
- There is a speed limit on the paths
 - Should speed instead be the hierarchy? e.g. 5mph, 10mph, 20mph? This is how woonerfs are graded. Current bike speed limit is 10mph
- Human powered
- Neighborhood safety is also a concern w/ some of the proposed items. You should be aware of the rowdy behavior at the beaches at all hours of the night. Perhaps you could incorporate this?
- I do not think that statement non-motorized/human powered fast moving pedestrians is not a good descriptor. The intent is to cover wheeled things
 - (CAC) Fast-moving pedestrians on wheels are not pedestrians.
- Thank you Craig for elevating the Preferred Concept to its rightful position in this conversation.
- Is there a prioritized list of project principles like safety, environmental impact, etc? It seems like some goals are mutually exclusive and would benefit by such a list.
- Bicyclists are not, in general, pedestrians under the law

DISCUSSION TOPIC 1

Craig moved on to the first item up for discussion, which was a proposed amendment to redesign pedestrian and bicycle paths connecting to the Midtown Greenway and relocate a port-a-potty at the southeast corner of Lake of the Isles Parkway. Craig turned it over to Win to introduce the amendments.

(Win) This is a limited proposal, but for those who have biked along the Greenway and turned onto that ramp, it is too narrow, bikes are slowing down, pedestrians are coming up and down, and then pedestrians are supposed to go halfway down and then turn off, that's the signage. But people miss the signage and that port-a-potty is in the way and also blocks the view for cars. This is also quite a pretty area. The path to left goes along the channel and the other path goes along the parkway. By moving the port-a-potty, it improves the aesthetics. It currently doesn't work well and a thoughtful look at it will improve safety and access. That's it.

(Craig) Thanks, and that was about a minute. We're going to try to keep these to about a minute with a discussion of five minutes. Park Board staff, anything to respond to here?

- (Project Staff) Could you clarify Part A? The intent of the drawing was to clarify the modes of transit. Is there something you're proposing to improve on that?
- (Win) You've got the bike segment intersecting at right angles. That's gonna pose challenges. The way it goes now, there's a kind of sweep down to the parkway that gives people a chance to slow down, which is important because people are going quickly. I think a right angle is unsafe. And also, if there's some way of separating pedestrians and bikes on that ramp, there's room to widen it. Maybe bollards. There's no separation

now. You're showing a line there but I don't know what that is. This may be more advisory, but it's not a good design now.

- (Craig) Sounds like safety concerns related to bikes and pedestrians interacting.

(CAC) I agree about thinking about more curving lines that go with the way people bicycle so it's not so abrupt. Where did you want the port-a-potty?

- (Win) Right there, there's a flat spot there. It's definitely a nicer park if you get the port-a-potty out of there.

(Craig) Are people accepting of exploring this idea? Anyone who is opposed?

The CAC was in unanimous support of Motions A and B. Both motions carried.

(Craig) Okay, so A and B motions carry and we can move on to the next item.

(CAC) Referencing a comment in the chat, people who are walking should still be able to see that there's a port-a-potty. If we move it, make sure it's still visible from Lake of the Isles paths.

- (Win) The flat area is very visible.
- (CAC) And accessible safely for pedestrians. Because we're putting it right across a bike path. Is that the only spot?
- (Win) Practically, that's the only spot, and pedestrian cross bike paths all the time.
- (CAC) This is maybe a place to talk about better signage as this area is confusing.
- (CAC, *in chat*) This is Win's proposed area for Porta Potty

Public comments from the chat:

- Pedestrians on the LOI walkway need to be able to see the portapotty

DISCUSSION TOPIC 2

The next topic up for discussion was the pedestrian connection to the Midtown Greenway next to the dog park. The amendment proposed moving the connection from the west side of the dog park to the east. Craig introduced this topic and explained that moving the connection would shorten and straighten it and allow for better sightlines, which would improve safety.

(CAC) Soft or hard path?

- (Craig) Soft, right?
- (Project Staff) Yes.

(CAC) Would it take out trees?

- (Craig) It depends how it's done. There is quite a grade change. From my vantage point it would, but I'd like to know what the designers think.
- (Project Staff) We've looked at the location and there's feasibility for both of these locations.

- (CAC) Will there be any loss of trees?
- (Project Staff) There will be, but the soft surface path can meander around trees. That level of detail of which trees would be removed would be determined later.

(CAC) If the path was moved, is there a change for intersection with the road?

- (Project Staff) If you zoom in, there's a proposed green bump out. There's bump out infrastructure already here that we're working with it, but we're changing it from hard surface to soft surface. There's also the underground treatment location. So there's a larger improved moment in this area which wouldn't change with the new location of the path.
- (CAC) And the pedestrian connection would continue
- (Project Staff) Yes, that white line.

(CAC) Would you move the stairway?

- (Project Staff) We would try to connect the trail to the stairway. That is already a primary crossing moment.

(CAC) I didn't realize that there would be a new sidewalk all along the length of the dog park walkway.

- (Project Staff) Yes. The pedestrian trail is in a worn condition right now and we're proposing connecting it all the way over to the field.

(Craig) We have 40 seconds left. Safety is the primary driver of this for me, having to do with sightlines. Can we have a show of hands if you support the motion? It looks like it carries but isn't unanimous, so let's do a formal vote.

Motion A was put to a vote. Yays were 10. Abstentions were 2. Motion A carried.

(Craig) And if the consultants discover some reason why it makes more sense on the west, I'm open for them to come back and explain that.

Public comments from the chat:

- you're trying to increase pedestrian access, why not do both places to increase convenience and reduce impact on both?
- There are some very mature trees on that side of the dog park. NO TREES should be lost in this plan! NO TREES should be lost...ever in your planning process.
- Is there also an intersection planned where the dog park trail intersects the Greenway?
- are there existing desire lines already worn into either of these areas?
- Agree - no tree loss is important.
- The west of the dog park trail is better for being in nature, east of the dp trail has quicker connectivity with the Greenway.

- (CAC) The point is not to walk in nature but to get to the Midtown Greenway from LOI.
- Perhaps both

DISCUSSION TOPIC 3

The third discussion topic consisted of two motions related to bike access to the Kenilworth Trail and green space. Constance introduced the two motions. The first was to improve access to the Kenilworth Trail along Dean's Parkway and the second was to eliminate the bike connection on the northern shore of the Kenilworth Channel. On the second motion, Constance argued that there is already sufficient bike access to the Kenilworth Trail and additional improvement and infrastructural changes along the Kenilworth Channel would be extravagant and unnecessary.

(Craig) You're at one minute. Let's go first to conversation with the CAC.

(CAC) I thought I was hearing an either or and I'm not hearing an either or. Are we talking about the existing path at Dean's Parkway?

- (Craig) On the south side of the channel there is an existing path that connects to the Kenilworth Channel on Dean's Parkway.
- (Constance) And it's not just doing that if there's no trail. It seems like a missed opportunity.

(CAC) I live across the street. It's easy to bike in the street here already and it could be marked in the street. But the trick is getting up to the trail and people want to get up to the trail there and people want to get up there. We don't need to improve much at Kenilworth Place until it gets to the bridge. Are we talking as far as Burnham Road? That was favored in our earlier discussions.

- (Craig) The bike lane is in the street and then would go on a path, about half a block up to the Kenilworth Trail. And then it couldn't pass the lightrail, but there would be a soft pedestrian path continuing on. Is that correct?
- (Project Staff) Yes.
- (Craig) So what Constance is proposing is to eliminate the bike path.

(Constance) Yes, because I see it as redundant and expensive. Someone in the chat is saying, "Never make a bicyclist go out of their way to make a connection if a direct connection can be made." They're trying to make a connection to the Kenilworth Trail and we already do that, I think it's less than half of a mile. And I think they should improve that connection. It is a bias of mine, but I don't want to fill up the space with hardscape.

(Craig) Do you support A? It seems most people are warm to that. How about B?

(CAC) It seems like they're both arguing for the same thing?

- (Craig) It's the south side of the channel with A and north side with B.

(CAC) There's no argument for having the trail on the north side. Because that's the current recommendation, so there's no need to have a recommendation on that, right?

(Craig) Who is in favor of eliminating the bike trail on the north side of Kenilworth Channel? Three folks. So, CAC Member, do you still have a comment?

(CAC) I know this area well too. This is a path that's been used for a really long time for bikers. And I'm trying to understand what impact it really will have on existing habitat because it's such a short route. I don't see it as a major problem.

(CAC) Yeah, I think to clarify, it's not so much eliminating an access that exists. It's just to eliminate the plan to pave a two-way connection here. Can you zoom out?

- (Project Staff) Would you like the full circulation map?
- (CAC) Yes, so we can zoom in to explain the connection for Motion A.

(Project Staff) Can I answer the clarifying question? The proposed Preferred Concept does create a new formal bicycle connection which would mostly be on the street and then a portion of off-street trail. So what's proposed in this amendment is to remove that part of the plan so it would never be built. We have heard support for that connection as well as the Dean Parkway connection.

(Craig) Just to clarify, access would follow Dean Parkway and when it comes to Cedar Lake parkway, it would access there. Constance is saying it's redundant because it's so close together.

(CAC) The bikes won't stop at the Kenilworth Trail unless it's mulch. We should expect that bikes would continue.

- (CAC) It is a soft surface path.
- (Project Staff) We have heard concerns about that and we would be thoughtful about how to keep bikes off the trail.

(Constance) Comments in the chat say this is a strategic way to protect the area. Do bikes already use the existing connection up to Kenilworth Trail?

- (CAC) Yes.
- (Constance) So why does it need to be changed? If it's such a little hop.
- (CAC) They're going to use it anyway.
- (CAC) It's going to be fenced for the lightrail, for safety.
- (Craig) If it is such a short distance, if bikes are going to use that trail anyway, we want to separate them to keep it safe, going back to the goals. We can protect the pedestrians from the bicyclists there.

(CAC) On that small section, looks like a proposed paved ped path, soft surface path, and two-way bike paths. Are you suggesting taking all paved paths out of the concept?

- (Constance) No just the bike path, but now that you mention it, I didn't notice that the pedestrian connection is paved. Why is it paved?
- (Craig) For ADA access.
- (Constance) Okay well, I'm trying to align this with water quality and habitat so to me this is an optional thing. There are other ways to get to the Kenilworth Trail not far north and not far south. This is an intrusion into green space.

(Craig) We need to move forward. We're at 7 o'clock. Let's vote on the first motion.

Motion A was put to a vote. Yays were 10. Abstentions were 2. Motion A carried.

Motion B was put to a vote. Yays were 3. Abstentions were 2. Nays were 6. Motion B failed.

Public comments from the chat:

- I agree Constance!
- I agree Constance, unless I can hear compelling reason for the redundancy.
- Pre SWLRT, an easy passage from LOI to Kenilworth was afforded by the Greenway.
- It is unnecessary.
- Never make a bicyclist go out of their way to make a connection if a direct connection can be made. Remember we are trying to make it convenient to ride bikes instead of driving.
- Also, that Burnham intersection is a nightmare and needs lower volume shunted to it
- Protect habitat! The proposed bike connection isn't needed.
- Great point about redundancies, Constance. Let's be smart stewards of our natural, economic and human resources.
- The link from Kenilworth Place to Kenilworth Trail is an important neighborhood access that has existed in one form or another for years. It will be replaced by SWLRT when it's finished
- Very much agree with Constance. I think it's redundant and unnecessary. It would be like telling us we need direct car access to 394 through Cedar park because it's closer and more convenient.
- Could be routing on the streets to the LRT station at 21st St.
- Yes, eliminate that bike access
 - (CAC) Technically, it's not eliminating access, but eliminating *proposed* increased access for bikes there?
- keep channel wild, No need for a second connection here
- People can bike one or two blocks north via streets to 21st.
- It's going to be a problem once there is pedestrian path along the canal
- Once again, it is totally unnecessary!!! I mirror Public's comment. And Public's.

- We are thinking strategically about discouraging bikes in the woods. The existing path (which is suitable for bikes) is best for future preservation of the woods.
- There is NO reason for another route –
- Seems this invites bikes to the west into the woods. Which I don't think we want to encourage in order to protect the nature in that area.
- They won't stop even if it's soft surface. In fact many bikers will prefer soft surface
- it's just not needed
- Soft would NOT prevent bikes from riding on it
- Many bikers ride on all trails, no matter how thoughtful we ask them to be.
- I agree; this is not needed and people will ride their bikes under the bridge
- Yes, there should be a fence
- NOT TRUE!!!!
- it'll require cutting out more softscape and trees and putting in more hardscape on top of the channel. don't do it
- We want to keep bike traffic away from conservation zone on NE Cedar Lake. Otherwise Cedar Lake Park will be an off road bike park
- yes, smart to separate the modes when feasible for safety reasons
- Has anyone measured whether the slope in this area allows for ADA?
- Nature and water quality will take a big hit with the increased traffic along this beautiful little patch of land between the lakes.
- Totally "optional" and unnecessary. Once again. NO TREE loss.
- Totally agree. Kenilworth access currently at connection to Bde Maka Ska, Dean and further north along kenwood parkway

DISCUSSION TOPIC 4

Craig moved on to the fourth discussion topic, which concerned about two-way bike lanes around Lake of the Isles.

(Craig) This is a complex concept. The first motion is to reject the two-way segments as impractical and unsafe. The second motion is to amend the preferred concept to formalize a bicycle right of way going with the existing traffic on the parkway. There would be a striped lane either on the left or right side that would communicate to drivers and bicyclists that there's a designated bike lane in the parkway. Motion C is to take 6ft of the existing parkway to create a raised bicycle path off the parkway. Just to make sure everyone's on the same page, the last way the parkway was redone was 2009 with a 30 to 40 year plan. So the expectation would be for this to happen in 2039 or later. B is something that could be done immediately and C would come in the future. Let's open it up for discussion after Aaron speaks for a minute.

(Aaron) The way Craig described these is good. There's a short-term, immediate, low-cost option and the last option is more long term, when there's a reconstruction. I know a lot of people asked why there should be two-way bike access, so to talk about that, not everyone

wants to circumnavigate an entire lake. Sometimes people just want to get to the bandshell or get to ice skating quickly in the winter and not circumnavigate the entire lake. And there's future increased use of Lake of the Isles bike trails after the lightrail station opens. As we're making a 30 year plan, we need to consider that. These considerations avoid tree removal and adding pavement.

(Craig) I'd like to increase our discussion to 10 min, that's more realistic.

(CAC) Just a question on Motion B. Do we know what the impact would be on parking and rain gardens, with runoff etc.?

- (Craig) There would be no impact to parking or rain gardens. The stripe would just go into the current drive lane which is wide enough to accommodate this.

(CAC) I believe the one way around the lake and the one-way bike path are going the same direction?

- (Project Staff) No, they're counter.

(CAC) If the lane wasn't put in the same direction of traffic, it should be. It should be on the lake side to avoid getting doored.

- (Craig) It does need to be clarified because some of us have been visualizing different things. The city hierarchy needs to be followed.
- (CAC) Left would be the safest. And it is going in direction of the traffic.

(CAC) I agree with Concept B, though I was advocating for two-way all the way around. CAC Member made the effective point about cost and the long term won't happen in my lifespan. The bike lane gives the same visual impact as well.

(CAC) I think while the city might decide what side, we might suggest that we would want it on the left side rather than the right next to the parking. Given that the bike path is also shared with pedestrians during part of the year, I think we want to protect them.

(Aaron) I'd like to propose some kind of joining of B and C. That instead of raising up the bikeway along the parkway, create something more that a striped lane, with barriers, to make it a bike lane in the street and then write into the master plan that if it's working, we strongly recommend a separated bike path.

(CAC) The two disconnected segments of two-way really ignores human science. It's inviting conflict, people won't stop, it's a really bad idea, it should not happen. Secondly, the striping makes sense. Third, taking 6ft from the parkway and adding it, I oppose that because one of the qualities of all three lakes is the fact that they are more peaceful and safe places to go. Focusing on commuting and expediting commuting flies in the face of what many people feel is one of

the real values and qualities of that area. It's not necessary, we have ever-increasing good bike routes.

(CAC) I agree with A and B, but I think C should be included in the master plan. C is important for safety for diverse uses. With the school and recreation center, it would be much safer for kids if there was a raised bikeway around Lake of the Isles.

- (Aaron) That's what I was going to point out too. There's a lot of questions for what the demand is for people who are able bodied. 2.6 mi around Lake of the Isles is nothing for some people. But some people might not be able to go around the whole lake at all. Considering those people is important too.

(CAC) People are referencing the city, but the city has no jurisdiction on these roads, though the Park Board respects the city guidelines. Wouldn't the Park Board get to decide here?

- (Project Staff) Yes, that's generally true. We coordinate with city traffic when we're doing traffic changes. But in general the Park Board has jurisdiction over the parkways. We temporarily striped bike lanes on Minnehaha Parkway during construction in a similar situation.

(CAC) I agree with A and B. I really disagree with C. If this plan is supposed to be somewhat ecological and sensible, the thought of taking out curb, putting it in a landfill, and the cost of that. And the timeframe is unrealistic as it's not going to happen in the time this plan unfolds. This is something for people to look at in the future.

(CAC) Just speaking to B, that is the solution for now. But I would speak against bollards. If you just drive on Dean Parkway, we've got the painted lanes so the Park Board should figure out what is most consistent with what they do in other places. In the distant future we should consider the idea of extending the parkway so we can have raised bicycle paths. Maybe 30 years from now there'll be something other than concrete which wouldn't be such a nasty substance to use. I'd like to amend it to include that we can bring people around to this in the future.

- (Craig) We need someone to present the language.
- (CAC) I support CAC Member working on that language.

(Craig) Since it's 7:18, why don't we vote on the first two.

A vote was held on Motion A, which had unanimous support. Motion A carried.

A vote was held on Motion B, which had unanimous support. Motion B carried.

(Craig) Let's talk now about how C can be altered.

(CAC) Maybe we draw on Project Staff's wisdom because there's probably been other plans where there's things to be revisited in 20 years.

- (Project Staff) Yes, the group could recommend some kind of lever; when something happens, then we do something else. If there's a reconstruction, then we do something else. When that happens, I would expect that we would want to reduce parkways, as the parkways are very wide and it's part of our ecological approach. So there wouldn't be an increase in pavement, even if bike lanes were added. Even a foot of pavement reduction around LOI is a significant reduction. The group can put that lever into this, and we've done that before. Another option would be to not make a recommendation but ask for this to be revisited when the master plan is updated over time, as master plans do need to be updated. In terms of the parkways, it's not certain when it would be reconstructed, it depends on funding.

(Craig) Technology could improve things drastically. We may have different car ownership, we may share cars, we may not need the parking. No one has a crystal ball and can see into the future. What are the increments for master plans?

- (Project Staff) 20 to 30 years
- (Craig) So we're about 10 years into the parkway's lifespan, so the reconstruction would fall into that.

(CAC) I need to better understand, what is the opposition to creating an existing path that takes the pavement? Our goals speak to a raised bicycle path as it provides safety to families and kids who are non-commuters.

(Aaron, *in chat*) In future reconstruction, shrink driving lanes on Lake of the Isles Parkway to create a raised bicycle path around Lake of the Isles, off the parkway, with minimal or no new net pavement.

- (CAC) I was going to propose some general language about future consideration, but Aaron's suggestion is pretty good. So, as long as we talk about it as something to keep on the table and be open to the possibility.

(CAC) Project Staff talked about a lever. I can't imagine having a painted partition for 20 years is not going to be considered when someone is going to redo the parkway. So there's a built-in lever with Option B.

(CAC) I just believe that we don't know what's going to happen. We're out of our range here. The future planners will look at this. It feels like we're trying to control the planners 20 years from now. So it feels like this is an exercise in trying to lock something in that shouldn't be locked in as society and transit and recreation revolve.

(Craig) Who feels comfortable with the language as written?

- (CAC) Tell us what your two other options are.
- (Craig) I don't think I have to. If you are okay with the current language, that's the motion. Who feels comfortable? CAC Member and that's it. Thank you. That leads me to

believe that we do need to change the language or take it off the table. When the parkway is reconstructed, then this should be revisited in future planning effort. Who feels somewhat comfortable with this motion? ***(Nine CAC Members indicated their support by raising their hands.)***

(Craig) The alternative to that? It's sort of the same thing, just a little more specific, but the same thing. Okay. So, Aaron is there anything that you would add to C to help change it to be meaningful. Maybe 6ft is too specific?

- (Aaron) Yes that's what I'd change, I know from measuring that there's 6-8 feet.
- (Craig) The word I'd like to change is the command to "take." I think "consider."
- (CAC) "Consider narrowing" would get rid of the 6ft language.

(CAC) Could there be a traffic study and data behind this idea?

- (Craig) That would be part of the consideration.
- (CAC) Well it isn't in there right now. So it should be there.
- (Project Staff) That would be done as part of any reconstruction.

(CAC) Are we talking about a two-way path here or just a raised bike path?

- (Craig) We're talking about keeping the existing path and adding another path.

(CAC) Yeah C sounds like something that's going to make us feel good but it's just a bookmark way out.

(Project Staff) I saw something in the chat that I don't want to lose. It was about keeping net pavement the same.

- (CAC) I would say reduce net pavement.
- (Craig) I think that's too limiting. We don't know what the future will be. Minimum is more flexible than no.
- (CAC) So there's a scenario where this would create more hardscape around the lake?
- (CAC) Well we're not saying that.
- (CAC) Minimal new pavement includes the option that there would be more.

(Craig) We can't really foreshadow that based on what we know now. While we're finishing this, it is 7:30 and we have 15 minutes of public comment at 7:45. Anything we don't get through before then, we'll move on to the next CAC meeting.

- (CAC) I thought we have a second Subcommittee meeting.
- (Craig) Yes, August 18th.

(CAC) Are we going to have a vote on C before we move on?

- (Craig) Yes, this was Aaron's motion so Aaron are you comfortable with this language?
- (Aaron) Yes.

(CAC) I think you need to include two-way. Though Aaron said he was fine, but that's not clear.

- (CAC) That's really confusing now.
- (Aaron) That adds a new element
- (CAC) If that's not what you mean, we can take it out
- (CAC) It's going to be a raised one way now right?
- (Aaron) Yes, I don't know how to make it clear.

(Craig) "Consider narrowing the existing Lake of the Isles Parkway to create a raised opposite direction bicycle path around Lake of the Isles."

- (CAC) "Counterclockwise."
- (CAC) "One-way bicycle path."
- (Project Staff) The design team clearly understand what's intended here. The master plan won't have this exact language, it will have our own language and diagrams, so we don't need to wordsmith this hard.

A vote was held on Motion C. Yays were 11. Nays were 1. Motion C carried.

(Craig) Thank you. Job well done. Our most controversial topic.

Public comments from the chat:

- Could we have a cost estimate for (c)?
- Putting a dedicated bike lane NEXT TO THE PARK flowing the same direction as vehicular traffic would fit and would solve this issue. In this position it would not conflict w/ parked cars and endanger people cycling or parking.
 - My comment above also allows for families to cycle together and makes it easier for pedestrians crossing.
- Consider bikes traveling from LOI to LRT at 21st and back, what route will they take? Probably up to 24th or Kenwood Parkway.
 - Given my comment above, consider B and extend to Kenwood Parkway.
- COST. Let's talk cost. Rebuilding the entire parkway--roadway, lighting, curbs, and gutters. Tell us what is the budget and how it will be paid for.
- How many people bike to ice skate????
- Option b. also helps commuters and allows better access to Bde Mka Ska. Seems like a no-brainer.
- LOI has pocket parking
- Has there been a traffic study? An engineer consulted??
- It would also slow down vehicular traffic around the lake by narrowing the vehicular travel lane
- How many people ride their bikes in the winter to the warming house to go ice skating? I hear this being stated as a reason for needing a two-way bike path.
- you could test it w/ b and put it into future paving plans as c

- Concept B and C should be included in the master plan. Short and long term.
- Could someone comment on the safety of B?
- Motion B makes sense, and the streets will need to be plowed well on the left side. This will be harder with wobbly barriers.
- I would like to see the "demand" data on a two-way bike path along LOI. Help me out here. Who can provide that?
- I agree with (CAC Member)
 - Agree with (CAC Member) 100%.
 - I agree, (CAC Member). Well said.el
 - (CAC Member) is right!!!
 - I agree with (CAC Member)!
 - Thank you, (CAC Member)! The voice of reason.
- Please no bollards if you go with option b.
- Please do not add the wobbly lane dividers. Ugly, creates a false sense of security and interferes with snow plows.
- Don't do bollards on the parkway. Will create access/flexibility issues for drivers on the parkway, particularly in winter when there are no bikers to speak of. Striping is fine, as this is not a high accident area.
- In addition, I believe "C" has the second bike lane abutting the curb, allowing no margin of error (like swerves) between cyclists and car traffic.
- I don't think making a two-way bicycle path is safer.
- A wobbly barrier is a safety issue. It will make the the road very narrow in the winter, as well make the bike path hard to use after road has been plowed.
- Does Lake Calhoun or Lake Harriet have 2 way biking?
 - No. Only two-way biking between the lakes.
 - Why are we talking about two way when NO other lake has two way biking
 - All the other lakes' bike lanes are 1-wy except connecting trails and on Cedar where you cannot circumnavigate the lake
 - good point
- I actually think two-way bike traffic will be less safe for kids near the school. They need to look not only for car traffic, but would need to look for two-way bike traffic. Just adds a level of complexity and hazard that kids don't need.
- From an accessibility perspective, crossing 2 bikes lanes and car traffic is VERY challenging and unsafe for anyone pushing a wheelchair or stroller on a busy day of cycling.
- The cost for what they are talking about is CRAZY
- A neighbor has counted the need to relocate 75 light fixtures if C is followed.
- Well articulated (CAC Member)! B is especially powerful if you only focus on the sections currently being considered for 2 way
- PLEASE tell me how all this will be paid for.

- Why do you need a raised bike path ?
- more pavement = more runoff into the lake, and the #1 goal of all of this is to protect the water! or all this is moot
- “With paint or other cues...” What other cues would that be? Please no bollards.
- Tabling option (c) for 20 years would be fine. Let's see what actually happens when we're closer to the time. We have no idea whether or not we'll actually want to narrow the roadway in 20 or 30 years. Some may want to do so now, but that may not at all be the case so far into the future.
- Exactly right, (CAC Member).
 - Amen, (CAC Member).
- Opposition to the raised path - From personal experience, one can easily get stuck trying to push a wheelchair or stroller on a weekend from a sidewalk across car traffic on parkway and then bike traffic. Adding a 3rd field of traffic to dodge will not be safe. when one can not easily maneuver out of the way.
- thank you all for being open to the volume and intensity of input on the biking topic! Anyone who has faced 2 way lanes on a bike, or tried to cross over them on foot with a stroller or dogs knows how dangerous and stressful they are. They would become a barrier to safe and anxiety free access so it's great to stop that from happening!
 - I second that
 - I also agree with Public's comment.
 - I also agree
- When parkway is reconstructed or repaved, consider elevating it to improve safety
- If you live south of 24th it adds half a mile to a trip to the Whole Foods area. It was used by bike too. There is little habitat remaining. Unless a fence is erected it will exist There is no way to stop it. The fence is between LRT and trails. The trees are gone!!!! No tree's would be lost. This is a neighborhood issue. Think the big picture, like what is the purpose of the bike paths, who do they serve, how they fit the the citywide circulation system. The only section of LOI Parkway that was rebuilt in 2009 was the two way section between Sheridan and Dean. The buses had ruined it. Adjacent property owners would be assessed for part of the cost of parkway reconstruction. Remember that for some parts of the neighborhoods there is no way to get In and out by bike car or foot other than the parkways. When the LOI parkway bridge over the channel becomes unusable for want of maintenance circulation will much impaired. You should address this. The majority of the parkway was last touched in 1977-78
- can you word it to set a goal to reduce overall pavement and return some to softscape. the way it's being discussed sounds like a net much more pavement
- In terms of costs, in the Harriet--Bde Maka Plan, Cidna proposed a 120m land bridge over lake St. for peds-bikes at Thomas Av. A short distance from here at Bde/Isles the channel exists where all have the choice to pass under Lake St. through the channel--lets not get that hung up about costs for paths!

- Water quality was main goal of this group
- You would just be reallocating existing infrastructure
- Thank you for all of the discussion. One issue that is not
- What happened to ADA, elderly, mobility challenged members of our population--2nd class citizens?
- Include the words two way in C
- One of the safety issues that was raised was that of crossing the LOI bike path to get to the pedestrian path. I do think that should be considered at some point. Maybe signage would help, but bike riders rarely slow down when pedestrians try to cross the path. Yelling at people isn't a friendly solution.
- Upon potential future parkway reconstruction ...

DISCUSSION TOPIC 5

The fifth discussion topic concerned the Southeast Cedar shoreline. Craig and Win explained the topic and motions.

(Craig) Let's try to reach consensus quickly. I was able to walk this shoreline a couple times with different CAC members. All of us reached consensus so it will be interesting to hear what the rest of the CAC thinks. The first motion is to end all encroachments in 10 years and then after the shoreline is naturalized, then we consider a public path if it's deemed feasible and not going to destroy the natural habitat.

(Win) The Park Board had adopted a resolution to end the encroachments which is triggered by the transfer of property ownership. Realistically, people own properties for a very long time so we could be dealing with 40 years. The properties could be vacated tomorrow, so 10 years is a generous timeline. If they terminate then, the Park Board can do it all at once. For the second motion, that's not my position, so I'll let someone else speak to that, because I'm not in favor of the shoreline path.

(Craig) I will speak to the naturalized component. It's a very narrow strip of line with some wide areas, and there will need to be retaining walls because there's a slope. There will need to be a strategy to stop people stepping on the natural growth. Lake level bounce is another issue here. There just may not be enough space to have it all here. I suggest that we separate B and create C, advocating for the shoreline to be naturalized and then deem if it's practical.

(CAC) Another question for Project Staff related to naturalization. I was distressed to see riprap down there. That's not considered shoreline restoration, right?

- (Craig) The definition of shoreline restoration is not riprap as it doesn't not promote habitat.

(CAC) So we're talking about three options here? One is to take encroachments away, one to just naturalize. And a homeowner said there's not as much push back to naturalizing the shoreline. And C is the path.

- (Craig) So let's change B to naturalize the shoreline.
- (Public, *in chat*) Isn't shoreline naturalization already in the preferred concept?
 - (Project Staff, *in chat*) Motion b - Naturalize the shoreline, is in the Preferred Park Concept currently
- (Project Staff) The Preferred Park Concept has that already, so are you proposing something different? My assumption is you're not voting on that because it's in the park concept.
- (Craig) So we do not need to address if it's going to be naturalized. I think the reason it's written the way it was is because the sequence is important. Let's keep the motion as is.

(CAC) So I was on the walk, as Craig mentioned. It was enlightening to see how narrow that strip of land gets at parts. So putting a path through there is complicated. I don't want to rule it out but I definitely want to see the shoreline naturalized first. I like the wording there. I would point out, the area shaded light green down there, just as we're picturing the path, don't picture the path going the entire length of that, but a little path that goes out on the wide section with a dock at the end.

- (Craig) So, a hybrid. When it's feasible, have access and when it's not, end the access.

A vote was held on Motion A. Yays were 10. Abstentions were 2. Motion A carried.

A vote was held on Motion B. Yays were 8. Nays were 4. Motion B carried.

(Craig) That concludes our CAC meeting. We will move on with the items we didn't address. Thank you for all your work.

(CAC) I would love to continue to have the northwest Cedar Lake trail discussion at our next meeting.

- (Craig) It's on the agenda.

(CAC) I would also like to thank Craig.

- (Project Staff) Thank you all for your wonderful discussion and following our agreement.

Public comment in the chat:

- Are you saying the home owners will not be allowed to have a dock?
- Thanks to the CAC for dedicating additional time in the process. This has been a very well-run and productive meeting. Much appreciation to (CAC Member) for driving through this challenging engagement and making so much progress addressing these issues. Need to drop but look forward to next steps.
- Examples are in the preferred plan for reference as to what the naturalized shoreline looks like

- So it's already 45 years old. This seems like you folks are too concerned with little tiny details and voicing your opinions based on what you thought before you joined the CAC. So we the taxpayers are paying big bucks for you folks to voice your individual feelings. You don't seem to have full information - like the land survey that was done before this process and you are given incorrect information.
- Craig, you did a great job of facilitating!
- Thank you Craig for the effective and fair leadership.
- Yes, thank you Craig. Nice job!
- Absolutely - great job Craig (and everyone else too)!
- Well done

PUBLIC COMMENT TIME:

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.

- (Public) Okay, I'm going back to the Kenilworth Channel and the two-way bike section. Every bit of land along there is just vital. I kayak there and see mink and muskrat and numerous birds. Since you've already added a paved path, a soft surface path, and you've got a nice bike route to the south, I don't know why you have to add activity there. Your "thoughtful signage" is not going to work. I take issue with the CAC's vote.
 - (Public, *in chat*) Agree with Public!
 - (Public, *in chat*) I agree with Public
 - (Public, *in chat*) I also agree with Public!
- (Public) If we're going to have a two way bike path, one of the reasons is for people who couldn't go the whole distance around the lake. What we haven't considered is how someone is going to turn around. There's no good way to do that. There isn't a good way to cross the path at all. Bike riders don't give way to pedestrians. I think someone needs to think about what it's going to look like if someone wants to try to turn around.
- (Public, *in chat*) Please do not read my comments aloud. The are not well worded and are not complete.
 - (Project Staff, *in chat*) we won't read comments from the full meeting, just this time here.
- (Public, *in chat*) How can we keep Cedar Lake swimmable ?
- (Public) I want to speak to the integrity of the shoreline and water at Cedar Lake. The Preferred Concept seemed to be terrific from my perspective and the perspective of a lot of people who enjoy Cedar Lake. The idea of reconsidering paths along the shoreline, especially the eastern shoreline really needs to be reconsidered. If you're trying to preserve water quality, you can't quadruple the people walking on that path.

- (Public, *in chat*) Well said!
- (Public, *in chat*) Really well articulated.
- (Public, *in chat*) I would only add one point to what Public said about the feasibility of a path on the SE shore of Cedar: in addition to the ecological impact of a path, there are safety/security concerns in having a path so close to private homes. Safety is one of the 3 major goals of this subcommittee, so having an unlit path with little access for police, EMTs, etc. is not feasibility for security reasons too.
- (Public, *in chat*) Do you like more oxygen would help with the blue green algee issues?
- (Public) I just wanted to say this. I don't know what happened to circulation and access for ADA and mobility-challenged people. Excellent access for the park system means the park should be accessible for everyone. Cities should also ensure park access by a wide range of challenged persons by the elderly, infirm, and those in wheelchairs. This includes paved surfaces. This concept is putting these people as secondary citizens and it really needs to end. Thank you.
- (Public, *in chat*) Why not put the groundwater that the SWLRT pumps back into the lake, rather than pipe it down to Bassetts Creek into the Mississippi River. Cedar Lake need fresh groundwater to be healthy.
 - (CAC, *in chat*) The temperature difference could harm the lake and wildlife.
- (Public) The path from South Beach to South Cedar Point has been cleared of buckthorn and you're talking about a naturalized shoreline and no riprap. It's really in rough shape. The bank has eroded right up to the asphalt. The asphalt is just dropping into the lake. I'd like someone to take a look at it. If we're talking about circulation, we're going to have to do something about that.
 - (Public, *in chat*) Well said.
 - (Public, *in chat*) Thanks, and thank you for all your work on behalf of the park!
 - (Public, *in chat*) Thanks for bringing that up. We need to improve/repair the existing infrastructure before we add more.
 - (Public, *in chat*) Good point.
- (Public) I wanna make two comments and two suggestions. This has to do with the two-way bike trail. It's focused on minimal impact and cost. If we consider the relocation, repaving, drainage, electrical wiring, that cost to benefit, I think we really need to consider. I doubt what that benefit would be. If the lakes are only 2-3 miles around, are we gaining a lot for the impact its going to make? Suggestions are to be clear that one is a bike path only and one is a pedestrian path only. I know in the wintertime we let pedestrians on the bike path, but maybe money can go to plowing the pedestrian path, rather than construction. Also, maintenance, the lumps and bumps on the bike path are an issue.
- (Public, *in chat*) The habitat around Kenilworth Channel is precious. I kayak through there and have seen mink, muskrat and many birds. I don't understand why, since

you've already added a paved pedestrian path and a soft pedestrian path on the north side of the channel, you would increase the traffic, noise and disruption in the area by adding a two-way bicycle connection that is not needed, since there's a very adequate bike path connection close by. Project Staff spoke about adding "thoughtful" language to alert bikers not to push through off the connecting path, but we know bikers will ignore any such cautions in order to go where they want.

- (CAC, *in chat*) Project Staff, did I misunderstand in expecting that we were told cost estimates would be included in the Preferred Concept?
- (Public, *in chat*) The path around the south side of cedar is too close to the lake. There is no way to move it back
- (Project Staff, *reading chat*) I just want to point out that a painted bike lane (around Lake of the Isles) is not safe for all ages and all abilities. It needs to be protected by something stronger than flexi-posts and paint.
- (Public, *in chat*) Is the Park Board going continue to allow the building at 3700 Wayzata Blvd to use the groundwater for the air conditioning? Returning warm water to Brownie Llake

Emma wrapped up by thanking everyone for attending and reminding them of the meeting next Thursday. Various CAC Members also thanked Craig for leading the meeting.

(Project Staff, *in chat*) Strong work everyone!

(CAC, *in chat*) Yay Craig!