



Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board
Cedar Lake and Lake of the Isles Master Plan
Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Circulation Subcommittee Meeting #2

8/18/2022 6:00-8:00pm
Zoom Online Video Call

MPRB Staff and Consultants Present: Emma Pachuta (Project Manager), Madeline Hudek, Elsa Erling, Adam Arvidson; Erica Christenson (TENxTEN), Zakcq Lockrem (Mend Collaborative)

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

CAC Members Absent: none

Public: Throughout the evening approximately 28 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 the upcoming steps and anticipated final meeting. She reviewed the vision and guiding principles from the Preferred Park Concept. Emma then shared an overview of public feedback received relating to circulation and access. She concluded with a review of the main circulation proposals for Cedar Lake in the Preferred Park Concept.

Emma passed it over to Craig, the Subcommittee Chair, who welcomed everyone to the meeting. He reminded attendees of the accomplishments of last week's meeting, including the formation of three goals, and reviewed the meeting guidelines. At last week's meeting, the Subcommittee discussed five topics related to Lake of the Isles and the Kenilworth Channel, so the focus for this meeting was Cedar Lake and any general circulation topics. Craig allowed time for the Subcommittee members to suggest any additional discussion topics, but none were brought forward.

(Project Staff, *in chat*) FYI We currently have 21 attendees joining us this evening.

- (Public, *in chat*) Thanks – was curious about that!

DISCUSSION TOPIC 6

Picking up from where last week's meeting finished, Craig presented Discussion Topic 6, which consisted of three motions related to East Cedar Woods restoration efforts and trail system. The first motion was to retain a shoreline pedestrian path among the Northeast Cedar trails. The second motion called for the creation of a Natural Resources Management Plan. Craig noted that this motion had been slightly revised since the last meeting, to achieve more clarity. The final motion was to decide whether to include a soft-surface bike path among the trails or follow the Preferred Park Concept proposal to make the area pedestrian-only.

(Craig) Let's start with the first motion. Show of hands for those who support it? That looks unanimous to me.

(CAC) Can you clarify, is it soft surface or hard surface?

- (Craig) Soft surface

(CAC) There are several places where that existing path is literally falling into the lake. Would the motion come along with some work to make sure that shoreline is okay?

- (Craig) How about an amendment to improve that path?
- (CAC) To reduce erosion?
- (CAC) Sure, it needs work.
- (Craig) Thank you for that clarification.

(CAC) If we're talking about soft surface, we should be explicit and put it in the motion.

(Craig) Any other revisions? Let's vote now.

The Subcommittee was in unanimous support of Motion A and the motion carried.

Craig invited Constance to introduce the second motion, concerning the creation of a Natural Resources Management Plan.

(Constance) The recently published Natural Areas Plan, published by the Park Board, recommends the creation of these plans for all natural areas in the park system. In the working group for Cedar Lake Park, the creation of that plan emerged as the number one goal that was recommended by the working group. I was very disappointed with the general statements made about restoration, because we'd rather align with the Park Board's approach to do management plans and then decide what is the best approach.

(Craig) We're at a minute, thank you. I just want to get a sense of how controversial that is. Unanimous support. Let's vote.

The Subcommittee voted in unanimous support of Motion B and the motion carried.

Craig invited Aaron and Laura to present the arguments for and against the addition of a soft-surface bike path through the woods.

(Aaron) Thank you. I think to start with, right now a lot of folks who use this are aware that there's a conflict between those who use the park on foot and those on bike. I was disappointed to see that there was no solution for that in the Preferred Park Concept. I think part of why it's stressful for pedestrians right now is that there's no delineated paths, so everyone uses all of them. Someone commented that there's 20 paths in this area. I proposed taking this one that's far away from the shore, turn it into a bike path, and use clear signage to ensure that cyclists are using that and pedestrians are closer to the lake.

(Craig) Thanks, let's move on to Laura and review the motion. This would be to make this area pedestrian-only.

(Laura) This relates to wildlife habitat and visitor safety. We have to ask ourselves what problem we're trying to solve. If you're connecting on bike, and just go two minutes more and you're at Bryn Mawr station. This area is too small to support bikes and pedestrians. It's a place of rest and relaxation. Mountain bikes have scraped these hills clean and I think we need to restore that and invite people who want to wander back into this area. We've got Theodore Wirth nearby. I don't think we can bring a path through this area and expect the bikes will stick to that area.

(Craig) Let's have CAC discussion for five minutes.

(CAC) Pragmatically speaking, this is an area near a large bike trail, so there will be bikes using it.

(CAC) There already is a series of bike trails and they are the regional trails. Kenilworth is right near, and I think it's redundant to have bikes in the woods. There was a solution to provide signage and barriers. Bikes were never intended to be in these woods. I agree with Laura, if we're serious about restoring habitat, this is an easy way to achieve that goal.

(CAC) I agree that this is not an area where bikes can go without harming the habitat and also the human habitat, which has a very unique character. And the Kenilworth Trail is close.

(CAC) I support making this a pedestrian-only area. There are almost no other pedestrian-only areas. The priorities we set have been to pedestrians first. Project Staff indicated that they're hesitant to believe that there can be physical separation between pedestrian and bikes. We

have to assume that bikes will be moving off any path and moving to the others. Anyone that wants to commute has the Kenilworth Trail that covers the same area.

- (Project Staff) I just wanted to clarify to CAC Member's point. I do think there's research to support that giving bikes a dedicated path will keep them off other paths. What had come up in other meetings was trying to create a physical barrier to prevent bikes from getting onto other paths, but that becomes an issue with wheelchairs.

(Laura) We need to recognize that if we say it's pedestrian-only, we have to be serious about designing it for that. We have to design it so bikes cannot move there, if we decide that.

(Aaron) I want to challenge people to think about some of these other users of the park and what their motivations are. We're talking a lot about people who want to walk around and be in the woods. The fact that people are biking through there means people want to bike through the woods as well. If we don't design it for this, you're still going to get 30 years of people biking into the woods.

- (CAC) I just want to address the idea that we, pedestrian-onlys, aren't thinking of other users. Some of the other users we are thinking of is wildlife, birds and other animals. It's important to keep that undisturbed. If we have any means to design trails and follow the guidelines, we have to believe that we can do that. Making it pedestrian-only is easier in terms of keeping the bikes out of the woods. This is a redundant trail that is right next to the Kenilworth Trail.

(CAC) I think the only way I could support the bike trail is if there would be a completely separate bike trail that doesn't connect with the pedestrian trails in there. I think there would need to be a design where the pedestrian trails nearby would not be accessible by bike.

(CAC) I agree with Aaron that it's important to design at least one path in the area for bikes to use. I think if we have this entire area ped only, I think cyclists are going to go through there anyway.

(CAC) I also support the measure to create a dedicated bike path. It would improve safety in this area. The bikes in this area are often novices and they just wanna experience nature and they aren't necessarily mountain bikers. This path is also quite separated

(CAC) I agree with CAC Member and Aaron that there will be usage anyway. It's not a highly trafficked pedestrian area right now. It's not going to have an impact on wildlife in my view and it's going to fulfill an expectation for people to get off paved surfaces and get connected to the north trails.

(Craig) Project Staff, can you summarize the public comments in the chat?

- (Project Staff) Yes, I don't think there's anything new from what's been said by the CAC. The two sides are relatively evenly split. There has been some comments about ADA access and dogs on leashes. I think the CAC discussion captures most of what's been said.

(CAC) Somebody in chat reminded us of our goal to protect, connect, and sustain people and wildlife. Biking through the woods really contradicts this aim of protecting the natural resources.

(Craig) I heard a friendly amendment to Aaron's motion to have the bike path completely separated from pedestrian paths. It was CAC Member, do you want to speak to that and how to change this language to include that and would Aaron welcome it?

- (Aaron) I would welcome it.
- (CAC) Something along the lines of "include a bike path separated from pedestrian paths entirely."

(Laura) I want to speak to that. I would welcome understanding how you would do that with a soft surface path and make it clearly delineated. I don't know how that works.

- (Project Staff) We do separate quite a few of the biking and walking trails in Theodore Wirth Park. The key to that, is that on the southern end where the connection would be to the paved trail, we would need to get those trails separated around those land inholdings in those areas. So you're not having a decision point on a bike. You're getting on a bike trail and staying the whole way.
- (Project Staff) I would suggest that the trail connect directly to the road point.
- (Project Staff) Yes, that's what I was suggesting.
- (Craig) 21st Street?
- (Project Staff) I believe it changes to Upton?
- (Craig) So 21st/Upton continues onto the bike path.

(CAC) I just want to make the point again that this redundant bike trail conflicts with our goal to protect and restore natural resources. It's redundant because the Kenilworth Trail gets people where they want to go. It's really disappointing that our priority to protect wildlife and habitat isn't being considered.

(CAC) I'm having a great deal of trouble understanding why bikers can't bike on the Kenilworth trail.

(Craig) Any other questions? Let's look at the next motion. Anyone want to amend that? We're going to vote on both of these one after the other. "Include a soft-surface bike path, entirely

separated from pedestrian paths, through the woods to Cedar Lake Regional Trail,” and “make the East Cedar Woods pedestrian-only with no bike paths.”

A vote was held on the two parts of Motion C. Motion 1 received 6 votes, Motion 2 received 6 votes, and there was 1 abstention. The Subcommittee was evenly divided so Motion C neither passed nor failed.

Public comments in the chat:

- Improve as necessary
- Is voting limited to the committee members?
 - (Project Staff) All voting tonight will be by the subcommittee members.
- there are about 20 cow paths established in the N/E corridor through the woods--one bike corridor through here is a good idea!
- Thanks all!
- Thank you for your support of b.
- The public can't see who is voting. Can that be shown?
 - (Project Staff) Can you see people on the screens? They're raising their hands to vote.
 - No, I just see the map. Is there a certain setting?
 - (Project Staff) You might have to play with your View settings (upper right of your screen). Try “side by side gallery”
 - That isn't working. “View Options” gives only percentages of display.
 - (Project Staff) OK. Sorry about that. We'll try to make sure we tell the vote totals after each vote.
 - Thanks
- And this follows the groomed ski trail during the winter. Or much of it.
- specific pathways for bicyclists helps manage where they ride
- Well said, Laura
 - Absolutely agree with Laura!!
 - Agree with Laura!
- Are we talking about mountain biking or all bicycling because it's a mode to get from place to place?
- Reduce disturbance to nesting and resting birds and all other wildlife including pollinators by keeping bikes out of the woods. Regional bike trails are more than adequate!
- with only soft surface trails what access do ada/ mobility challenged/ elderly have any opportunity to fully access this "special area"
- In many locations the lakeside trail is too close to the lake for there to be a buffer planting. Sad. The only way to keep bikes out is to fence the area as is done at Eloise

Butler, Westwood, and Wood Lake. The bikers are mostly on non-commuting type bikes,

- Do a few things well! Walking paths only.
- Aaron is correct. You need to design to manage human behavior.
- Please understand that a bike path on any configuration will not prevent some cyclists from cycling on a walking path.
- A much bigger issue is figuring out how to manage people having their dogs of leash and disturbing wildlife and other path users
- This area is so underused--I travel through it frequently and rarely encounter more than 5 people from one end to the other--just having more bikers here would make the area "feel" safer. Perhaps we should close it all off and make it a wildlife refuge as per CAC Member
- The preferred concept states the plan goal is to “protect, connect, and sustain people, wildlife, and natural resources” Biking through the woods totally contradicts this goal.
- My 30 years of observation is that the cyclists in this area are almost all out for adventure. They aren't interested in using a paved path. Riding a bike anywhere but an official bike path is currently illegal . So maybe enforce the law.
- I support bike path and swlrt will run btwn lake and kennilworth trail so not redundant
- The proposed bike trail is in the ski corridor for half its length
- Bikes are not permitted in this area. There are signs that say no bikes. We do not need another bike path .Bikers can use the trails at Brownie Lake.
- I love biking but that is a special area that it is hard to find in the parks for people and the wildlife. Shame to keep building more paths.
- Consideration of equity is a strong concept to be addressed by MPRB and the Met Council—soft paths and exclusion are not embracing these requirements and goals!
- Make a bikes only path and then there is no reason to use a pedestrian path
- The pedestrian experience at Theodore Wirth “shared” routes is stressful and unpleasant
- I agree with CAC Member!
 - Thank you, CAC Member!
 - Good point CAC Member!
 - Well said, CAC Member
- I don't see a way a bike path is compatible with the PRIORITY goal of protecting natural resources and habitat. Do priorities mean nothing?
- This area has been restored with almost entirely volunteer labor and money. If bikers are going to have a dedicated trail, might they be willing to organize and volunteer hours to pull buckthorn, replant native species, pick up litter, etc.? The priority has be to restore the land.
- Perhaps the bikers want to connect to the west side of cedar lake
- Can someone answer CAC Member's question, please?

- Also, this bike path would encourage mountain biking south of East Beach.
- Bikes make the area unsafe for small children and adults who are not very nimble. For several years my family stopped walking in the area after several incidents of nearly getting hit by bikes. We only went back when our kids were older. If nothing changes, my spouse and I will have to stop using the trails in a few years.
- Restoration for the future will also need to address the devastating jumping worm infestation
- Yes, that area is a mess with cowpaths coming from every direction--how about limiting the # of cowpaths around there?
 - Agree with Public. Volunteers have tried to designate walking paths, but people continue to create new ones.
- Shouldn't the tie go to the runner? That is, shouldn't a tie mean that it goes to the originally written preferred plan?

DISCUSSION TOPIC 7

The next discussion topic centered on the Northwest Cedar trails.

(Craig) The first motion rejects a shared trail and proposes separated paths. What's presently proposed from the Y where the paths separate, one takes a lower route down to the Cedar Lake Trail. The other goes up to the bridge to cross over to Theodore Wirth and beyond. The lower path has everything merged. You have bikes and pedestrians all sharing the same lanes in contrast to everywhere else. This motion says we need to reject that and have separation for pedestrians. Win will introduce this motion further.

(Win) This isn't my motion but I'm happy to walk us through it. I think we need some wording changes. I believe we're focusing only going northbound from Cedar Lake, this motion only addresses the section from where the Y occurs further north. I believe that we're talking only about the section from the Y split to the Cedar Lake Trail.

- (Craig) Yes, the lower section of that.
- (Win) Given that, I think we should amend the language to make that more clear. I would propose inserting the words "between the Y and the Cedar Lake Trail." And then take out "entire" because it's not. And put a period after paths. "Rejects a shared trail between the 'Y' and the Cedar Lake Regional Trail and proposes separated bicycle and pedestrian paths." We should add "in that segment." I believe that's clearer.

(Craig) Does anyone want to speak to that?

- (CAC) Can we just delete that entire first phrase?
- (Win) The reasoning is that the Preferred Park Concept has a shared trail, so we've been asked to be clear if we're rejecting an element of the Preferred Park Concept. I think it's

helpful because it's a change. We're trying to be clear that we're recommending a change.

- (Craig) That is the intention. Any other comments?

(Win) Let me add one more thing. Anyone who has walked from that Y up to the Cedar Lake Trail, it's maybe 100 yards, not very long, there is ample room for widening that path. So the idea of separating the paths is not dead on arrival. There is additional room that can be made there without huge expense, without reconstruction.

(Craig) Who supports this motion? I think that's unanimous. So let's vote on it. "Rejects a shared trail between the 'Y' and the Cedar Lake Regional Trail and proposes separated bicycle and pedestrian paths in that segment."

The Subcommittee voted in unanimous support of Motion A and the motion carried.

(Craig) Okay, moving on. We're going to do the same thing that we did for the last topic on the woods. Win and I visited and he convinced me that you can't have both. Win will speak to Motion B and Aaron will speak to Motion C. Motion B is "Prioritize safety for pedestrians by widening existing paved path using existing goat trails to provide more dedicated space for separate bicycle and pedestrian path; if necessary use helical piers and retaining walls in narrow areas while preserving trees." Motion C is "Add boardwalk for pedestrians where space does not allow for a minimum 8 foot pedestrian path and 10 foot two-way bicycle path after attempting other remedies to reach those minimums." So B is widening the trail and C is a boardwalk.

(Win) Here again, I'm just trying to make sure we're clear about what we're voting on. If one votes for the boardwalk, then the pedestrians disappear from the upper pathway and it would be bikes only. That's my understanding. "Prioritize safety for pedestrians by widening existing paved path using existing goat trails to provide more dedicated space for separate bicycle and pedestrian path; if necessary use helical piers and retaining walls in narrow areas while preserving trees." So, if there were not a boardwalk, then the vote for this would say do the best you can in widening the combined bike and pedestrian path on the existing route, so that both bikes and pedestrians have more room to navigate. I think that's the essence of it.

(Aaron) I had intended for C to be a combination of B and C, because in a lot of spots the path is close to 11 feet, so in some places it would be possible to reach 11 and in other places it isn't possible. Picture users on the path right now, if there were two wheelchairs and two bikes all coming toward each other, they wouldn't be able to fit. I don't think that's accessible. We need to make sure that everyone, in wheelchairs or not, feels safe in this area and expanding a ped path to 8 feet, which is pretty wide, and that's your standard. For bike paths, right now that's an 8 foot path and that's a minimum standard right now. I think we need to really think about

the 30 year plan and what's in the Preferred Park Concept right now is good for a 5 year plan. I think the real solution is a boardwalk.

- (Craig) So what Aaron is suggesting is that this is not an either or. People can vote for B, but have additional infrastructure built out to support C. Win, are you open to these not being either or?
- (Win) I think people need to be guided by their own judgment. To me, they're irreconcilable but if people disagree, we should permit this.
- (Craig) Okay, so people can vote for both.

(CAC) I'm concerned that we have to be willing to deal with the space that we have. The minimum 8 and 10 feet, that's not the standard the Park Board is using. I believe that people have completely rejected a boardwalk. It would harm the shoreline and damage wildlife habitat. One thing I don't understand is why the helical piers wouldn't suffice in those few sections. I disagree that the minimums should be followed. The Park Board has much narrower paths in other places and they're working fine. I don't know why a boardwalk is being pushed when the public has rejected it. It would be dangerous in the winter and not even used there. Why wouldn't the helical piers be enough?

- (Project Staff) Just a clarifying point about boardwalks. We had our ecologist weigh in and there are ways of doing them sustainably. There is info about this on our website.

(CAC) I would agree with the idea of combining them. What I see is essential for C, and I think the boardwalks can have minimal impact on the environment, is that the bike and pedestrians will be separated in some way, however that may be achieved. Maybe there is space in some places, maybe something is jutting out in other areas. I think C should be amended to include something about that separation.

(CAC) This is a pretty important one. I've lived just north of here for 15 years. Since my son was three we tried biking this section. At a young age, it's too narrow for young people and families. I appreciated the friendly amendment earlier. I like C because it provides a measurable target, and this is an important thruway from people from the north to get to Cedar Point Beach, including families. I think there's a way to combine B and C. We're getting into specific strategies, and I think a feasibility study would be necessary to help define what is possible. I prefer going the less impactful route, but I do think the higher priority in this area is abiding to these goals.

(CAC, *in chat*) As it is, the bike path is almost on top of the roadway, with southbound bikes and northbound cars only separated by 2 feet.

(CAC) I agree with CAC Member and CAC Member. If it can be done effectively with B to get the widths, I would accept that, but it seems like that will be an impossibility, having walked that.

It's an area that will always be a pinch point and I'm not sure why there is such a strong opposition to the boardwalks when it's the only option that is feasible to achieve our objective.

(CAC) Can someone from Park Board comment on if it's difficult to maintain the boardwalks? I'm sure they're more expensive to construct and none of the paths are maintained in the winter anyway. I think we can leave it to the Park Board to decide the best way to separate the pedestrian and bike paths.

- (Project Staff) In terms of actual cost and relative scale of maintenance, I'm not the expert. Boardwalks are a last resort for us because they cost more in terms of installation and maintenance. So we have used them where it's necessary. In the chat, there's folks sharing examples such as Lyndale Ave at Minnehaha Creek. We did that because there was literally no other choice. The sentiment that there may be a goal here that is solved through a prioritized list of options, that would help us. We can't tell you how many linear feet of boardwalk it would be, but it would be good to reach a goal here.

(CAC) Just supporting what CAC Member said and what Project Staff shared. The bottom line is we have to solve for this area, which is unpleasant and unsafe. I get confused about these three options and it comes down to us having to solve this and think big.

- (CAC) I was going to make basically the same point. We should state our goals and let somebody else actually design it. We're getting into very specific things and it's better to state what we want to see happen.

(Win) A boardwalk along there, if it were continuous, would be 1,200 ft and we would not know if it would be floating, adjacent to the shore, what its impact would be. You wouldn't be able to exit it at the north end without going up stairs. There's quite an elevation change there. I would recommend Project Staff's approach where a boardwalk is the solution of last resort and urge that a solution be made to get a reasonable width. I don't think we can stick to 8 feet or 10 feet and there are places where we don't use those standards. If they have to drill down to create a solution without impinging on the lake, that can be done. I think the boardwalk is a very poor idea and that's the message we should send.

(Aaron) After hearing the last few folks, I suggest combining part of B with C. I think Win is kind of right. If there's a need for an 8 foot path for only 20 feet which would cause the boardwalk, then it's better to stick with the 8 feet. But I really think 8 feet should be our minimum.

- (Project Staff) The recommended path width is 6 feet for pedestrians and 8 feet for bikes. I'd set it at that with a desire for 8 feet and 10 feet where possible.
- (Aaron) I'm open to that.

(CAC) To put the actual numbers in, I think those are things that the Park Board figures out and they should be customized to the space. I wanted to ask Project Staff, I know there was a CAC looking at these trails 10 years ago. Was this discussed? It would be helpful information to get the benefit of whatever findings the Park Board documented for that CAC.

- (Project Staff) I unfortunately don't have experience from that CAC.
- (Project Staff) My understanding is that the main areas of that project were Dean Parkway and a portion of the west side. They focused on the parking lots by Cedar Point Beach and rerouting the bike path and changing how cars accessed the parking lot but they didn't make any big changes to the part you're discussing.
- (CAC) It's surprising that that didn't come up. Are there reports where we could find more detail?
- (Project Staff) Aaron, were you on the CAC for this?
- (Aaron) 2013? Yeah, I was on that. We had a very strict budgetary limit. We didn't touch anything major, just parking lots and a little section of trail near Dean Parkway, because it had flooding issues. It didn't address the area we're discussing now.

(Craig) I'd like to move on, because it's already 7:09 and we have three more discussion topics.

(CAC) We're not engineers and I think we've already passed A so it makes sense to have a resolution B that calls on the Park Board to use the least intrusive means possible to separate the paths and use a boardwalk as a last resort.

(Win) I second that. A boardwalk would be rejecting the Preferred Park Concept, so those words "only as a last resort" need to be in there. We should be recommending the expansion of the width at the current level should be used at the greatest extent to solve the problem.

- (Project Staff) When we talk about expansion, we are also talking about separation?
- (Win) Yes.

(Craig) Quick show of hands for who supports this? Almost unanimous.

(CAC) I would just say, it's going to be a minor miracle for TenxTen to squeeze into that much space. There's spaces with a 2 foot wide pedestrian path. If you look at it, there's no way to make it wider in many stretches there.

- (Project Staff) I see some language up above about how an engineer might look at that. It seems that we've taken out some specific language. I don't hear anyone opposed to that approach. The discussion was about keeping it flexible and there would be a further study. That's a good point, CAC Member.

Craig read aloud a draft version of Motion D.

(Win) Can I add one word? I would put in “existing” after “separated.” The whole idea is to expand the existing space without going to a boardwalk.

(CAC) I strongly urge us to remove that last sentence. I would say “prioritize safety for pedestrians by widening to a minimum of 6 and 8 feet, using the least intrusive methods to expand existing pedestrian and bike trails.” And then put boardwalk as last resort in parenthesis. There’s no reason to give another minimum besides 6 and 8 feet. the engineers have to deal with the space that exists. One thing we aren’t talking about is using the existing goat trails, will that be obvious or should we retain that language?

- (Project Staff) I think that will be obvious and this language may be changed slightly in the final document.

(CAC) The key thing is the fact that these should be separated. When they’re on top of each other, it still is a dangerous thing. Separated is a key part.

- (CAC) It’s in the second sentence. We already have separated.
- (CAC) Someone had proposed to remove the second sentence, so I wasn’t sure where we were.
- (CAC) No.

(Craig) Win and Aaron, how do you feel about this language?

- (Aaron) I would feel more comfortable with 8 and 10 in there. I think it’s important to be explicit with what we want, which is 8 and 10 feet. The boardwalk would still be a final resort.
- (Win) I think a minimum is a minimum. So 8 and 6 feet is a minimum and if they can do it wider, we hope and believe they would.
- (Craig) So would you keep this language in?
- (Win) No, I’d take it out. I think it’s implied, as it’s in an urban setting.
- (Craig) Aaron, are you okay with that?
- (Aaron) Yes, if the project team knows what we want.

(Craig) Okay, we have a motion before us. Please raise hands if you support it.

(CAC) The wording is awkward and I’m going to put one in the chat which I think is better.

- (Craig) Do you want to abstain?
- (CAC) Will you not consider my wording?
- (Craig) We have to move on, but we will consider it at the end.
- (Project Staff) These exact motions won’t appear in the master plan.
- (Craig) We will consider it at the end.

(CAC, *in chat*) Prioritize safety for pedestrians by widening existing paved paths to a minimum of 6 feet for pedestrians and 8 feet for two-way biking, using the least intrusive methods and keeping separate paths and a boardwalk only as a last resort.

A vote was held on Motion D, which was created as a combination of Motions B and C. Motion D passed with unanimous support.

Public comments from the chat:

- Why is there an added viewing spot added to the intersection area, further complicating the space?
- You could easily widen this section w/o making a boardwalk and infringing on the lake itself. Also, paved paths are very hard on runners and that's one reason why people make a path next to pavement. But this is weirdly narrow and could easily be widened.
- Thank you for supporting "a." on northwest trail.
- The entire area along this west section should be separated along this area from the parking lot north. It is dangerous and very busy bike area with bikes coming from Theodore Wirth--need pedestrian separation!
- There would be room for separated bike and walking paths if Cedar Lake Parkway were one way northbound and the other lane used for bike path. Might help with the afternoon pile up at Dean Parkway and Cedar Lake Parkway too.
 - This could be cheaply implemented. Much cheaper than boardwalks and more likely to be maintained.
- The pathway could be widened by cantilevering width where needed and not doing an invasive boardwalk.
- I'm sorry to be picky, but isn't there another name for "goat paths?" It's something like "desire paths." There really aren't any goats that walk around Cedar Lake. :-)
 - Off road runner's path.
- Boardwalk should be implemented--biking will only continue to dominate this area--time to get peds out of the way--safety for sure!
- Please no boardwalk - it would ruin the shoreline, impair lake access, be useless in the winter, won't be maintained, and is just ugly - particularly if you're on the water.
 - The neighborhood voted on this at the meeting and it was agreed that the neighborhood did not want the boardwalk.
 - Please no boardwalk
 - Hundreds of people at the Apr 30 meeting rejected the idea of adding boardwalks to Cedar. The community does not want added structures on the lakes.
 - no boardwalk as Cedar is to be as natural as possible.

- No boardwalk, please. The community is strongly against it. (The times two wheelchairs approach each other coming from opposite directions is probably about zero.)
- A regional park area goes well beyond a neighborhood influence--after all, the designs are funded by Met Council and state funding.
- No boardwalk. This is not in keeping with stated plan goals to prioritize the natural environment. No boardwalk. Not now. Or ever.
- We did reject the boardwalk, and it was not just the neighborhood.
- I walk and bike this segment often. It's not perfect as is, but is perfectly adequate, and the Preferred Park Concept will sufficiently improve it.
- on and off for pedestrians with a board walk would add chaos to walkers merging and continuing north toward Theodore Wirth.
- How about you craft b and c together to recommend an proper widening of the pathways to accommddate users w/o encroaching on the lake?
- Assuming no boardwalk at the narrowest parts could there be a railing that would provide that safety separation? Just where it's narrow - it could be a minimalist version
- How much will it cost to build and maintain? What will impact be to water quality?
- How often has Project Staff seen two wheelchairs and two bikes meet at one time in that location?
- There are boardwalks at eloise butler wild flower gardens, theodore wirth, M'haha creek corridor and Roberts bird sanctuary, quacking bog!
 - Regardless of whether it's sustainable, it will still be ugly, create a barrier for access, and won't be maintained.
 - please check out the boardwalk at m'haha creek and lyndale av/garfield av--it is aesthetically enhancing!
 - The boardwalks are expensive and don't age well. Just ride your bike out to Wayzata and you can experience them yourself. They also collect garbage. This seems like an agenda being pushed by planners? It makes no sense to encroach on the lake when restoring it and making the least impact on nature is the overarching goal.
 - Check out the boardwalk at Roberts, under water and dangerous and also the boardwalk at the Bog
 - It's functional but I'm not sure "aesthetically enhancing." It a lot of hard scrape that probably not great for the creek.
 - There are to many boards in Minneapolis Parks that have not maintained
 - where are all these boards not maintained? Everything nees maintaining over years of wear.
 - Minnehaha Creek below the falls on the west/south side. The Bog at Theodore Wirth. Robert's Bird Sanctuary. The Bog and Robert's need total reconstruction. Minnehaha Creek needs maintenance. It ends partway between two bridges

and the rest of the trail is very narrow on a very steep slope. There is no signage about the dead end and the path extension is dangerous. Even the stairs down to the falls are in disrepair and dangerous. MPRB just does not take care of its property.

- (CAC) The boardwalk in Roberts Bird Sanctuary is falling apart and very dangerous.
- Helical piers probably would work but you should consult a Professional Engineer
- What solutions did the Cedar Lake - Dean Parkways CAC promote? That work followed a public process
- Consider directing cyclists to the boardwalk
- I keep suggesting the scheme of making Cedar Lake Parkway one way north bound. Bikes use the freed up parkway peds use the current bike lane. Real cheap. It would get rid of the pedestrian paths that are way way way too close to the lake, What's wrong with my idea other than I'm not part of the group.
- This same plan was introduced in 1997 chain of lakes Renovation plan by the world renowned landscape firm--Michael VanVolkenberg & Assoc.
- What in the impact of freeze thaw and heaving of board walk at lake level?
- Boardwalk = loss of trees? Boardwalk plastic?
- I know we're not supposed to be talking maintenance costs but it took most of this biking season to fix the hole in the LOI. How are we going to maintain something much more complicated?
- As is, there is opportunity to expand the trail to the curb where is is grass and toward the lake with about 9inch level ground available.
- Instead of the word 'minimum,' use the word 'desired'
- Please remember the public comment related to boardwalks was remarkably one-sided: almost no one supported it and most were completely opposed. And there was much more public concern about boardwalks than there was about this stretch of trail.
 - You may be referencing the boardwalk around lake of the isles--not this really critical dangerous section?
 - No, the public has been concerned about any boardwalks on Cedar or Isles. This has been consistent. The public comment in the data the park board released was overwhelmingly in opposition to boardwalks, no matter which lake.
 - There was general rejection of boardwalks for Cedar as well as Isles
- That sounds like a great way to craft the recommendations, Project Staff
- the path from isles to bde maka ska has a railing.
- I agree with CAC Member—she is right on it
- A boardwalk would enhance the pedestrians water experience

DISCUSSION TOPIC 8

Having completed the discussion topics related to Cedar Lake, Craig moved on to the first of three general master plan topics. This topic consisted of two motions related to the acquisition of approximately 20 acres of land below the Kenwood and Lowry Hill neighborhoods.

(Craig) The Park Board is interested in acquiring that area and we haven't done much talking about it. I propose that it be set aside for wildlife habitat, to counteract the Southwest Lightrail land and trail land fragmentation. That is my presentation, let's move to discussion.

(CAC) I'd like to support that, yes!

(Craig) Okay if we're all supportive, please raise your hands. One vote no.

(CAC) The woods should be, but there's a lot of grassy stuff there.

(Craig) Let's do this again.

A vote was held on Motion A. The motion passed with 12 votes in favor and 1 vote against.

Craig moved on to Motion B, which proposed a new trail connection through the parcel of land.

(Craig) There is an existing trail that connects Douglas Ave to the new Bryn Mawr stop. This is roughly 20 acres, I threw this together. There's a crossing at Kenwood Parkway and there's a strip of sidewalk that connects to the sidewalk from Douglas, and then there's a trail that goes down the hill and leads to the future light rail stop. I think this should be formalized to an ADA trail. I'm assuming people from Kenwood and Lowry Hill are going to want to reach this stop. Can we look at some of the other images? You can get a sense there of what the trail looks like. This occurred to me later in the process and I'm putting it forward for your consideration.

(CAC) Yeah, I completely support the idea of having a trail there. I think it makes a lot of sense and encourages use of transit. But I don't know about ADA accessibility with that trail, it's quite steep and would need large zigzags.

- (Project Staff) Yeah, I was going to clarify that as well. I do think ADA accessibility would require a significant switchback or an elevator. I don't see a way to design that safely without there being stairs. That being said, there's no ADA requirement related to trails and we have proposed staircases in other places. Having it ADA-accessible would be a slightly different proposal.

(CAC) I wonder if we have any feedback from that whole neighborhood about how they would feel about more traffic coming through that area.

(CAC) The current language doesn't make a reference to ADA accessibility, and we should leave it that way, so the Park Board can interpret that.

(CAC) I hadn't thought much about this area and idea until this was presented. I'm looking at google maps and seeing almost a straight line from Douglas and that connects into denser neighborhoods in Minneapolis and connects them to transit which is a good thing. If there's already a path there, it's not much change.

- (CAC) Technically it's Kenwood Parkway, and not Douglas.
- (Craig) Yes, the intersection of the two.

(Craig) Any other questions? Let's go back to the motion. "Formalize the existing trail..." Maybe we should clarify "Kenwood Parkway and Douglas Ave," and technically it's called the "Bryn Mawr stop" at Penn Ave and Cedar Lake Ave. So let's get a sense raising hands who supports this.

A vote was held on Motion B. The motion passed with 11 votes in favor and 2 abstentions.

Public comment in the chat:

- (Project Staff) FYI: there are now 27 attendees in the meeting, in addition to the subcommittee and design team.
- One circulation issue that I don't believe you ever covered was considering a bike/ped something being considered for Burnham Road between Cedar Lk Pkwy and Burnham Bridge. Tons of people not in cars use this road. It's a wide road where cars speed and has terrible site lines. There are no sidewalks next to the road and no bike lanes. There are already sidewalks to nowhere on the little bridge by the sewage pump station and a sidewalk on the Burnham Bridge on the eastern side. It might seem redundant as a connector, but it's not really. Perhaps you could suggest creating a striped lane up the hill on the outside curve as a delineated lane on the road and/or a sidewalk on one side?
- Beware the oval. When the building were demolished many bricks were left behind. There are pollution monitoring wells on the property. The slope is manmade. Remember East River Road,
- "Grassy stuff" is not wildlife habitat
 - (CAC) Grasslands provide critical habitat for some species of birds and other wildlife.
 - It pretty much is grassland and scrub now--ideal wildlife habitat? I remember when the entire corridor from dean pkwy to the the cedar lake regional bike trail was just this landscape--prior to the 2001 kenilworth temporary bike trail was established.

- CAC Member has been carping about costs and thw park board unable to take care of what it has now—why should the park board purchase and take on more expenses at this time--?
- I’m confused about where that is. It is VERY steep on that hill.
- That trail is almost vertical,.
- Which SWLRT stop is that?
- Don’t formalize this trail. It is very steep and will need maintenance (read:salt) to make it useful in the winter.
- I thought maybe a zip line to the LRT station would be fun.
- I’ve been on that trail and I think taking it out and leaving the area for wildlife is a good idea.
- Why not use the trail from the bottom of the Kenwood Hill to the LRT station?
- CAC Member, it it VERY VERY steep!
- Don
- Agree that leaving that area for wildlife is a good idea. I often see wildlife coming from that trail
- More hardscape.

DISCUSSION TOPIC 9

Craig moved on to the ninth discussion topic, which was about improving wayfinding and signage. Craig pointed out that the language had been revised for clarity since the last meeting. Win introduced the motion.

(Win) I’ve commented from the beginning that I’m disappointed there hasn’t been more emphasis from staff on improving wayfinding. It’s very weak in the park system. I think the CAC has an opportunity to make a broad statement and creating a design system and use it for navigating. I’m less concerned about the examples because we get into micromanaging specific decisions. The main issue here is that the CAC recommends a significant improvement and increase in quality and specificity of wayfinding and signage.

(Craig) Thank you, Win. So an example would be having signage to communicate the distance and location of restrooms and creating welcome signage at the light rail stops.

(CAC) This is a great idea. My only concern is how do we make sure it doesn’t destroy the aesthetics. We want to improve it and have it be within the aesthetic parameters of the area. We don’t want to litter the area with signage. I don’t know if we can get that into this motion.

- (CAC) Just echoing what CAC Member said. I read this and get shaky about a lot more signage and visual noise. We already know there’s some redundant signs at South Cedar

Beach. I feel like the Park Board is already limited by Grand Rounds signage. This would need to be qualified so that it's not aesthetically overwhelming for park visitors.

- (Project Staff) At the concept level, design is not something that we draw on in the Preferred Concept, but master plans typically have guidance on signage. A lot of our signage is from a system-wide signage plan. If we were doing something brand new it would often be on a system-wide basis. But some recommendation on welcoming and wayfinding are helpful. With regard to aesthetics, major changes system-wide would involve community engagement. If aesthetics are important we can talk about that in the document.

(CAC) People in the chat are reminding us that maintenance is an issue with signs. Is there a way that the motion can include prioritizing repair and updating of current signage before a redesign could occur?

- (Craig) Let's focus on the word "improve." "Improve and repair"?
- (CAC) Yes, that makes sense. Maybe "repair" first.

(Project Staff) There's a fair bit of comments in the chat talking about digital wayfinding and connectivity.

(Win) I view all the comments as friendly amendments. You all make good points. Because of the restrictions of time, maybe we take this one thing offline and wordsmith it and bring it back at the last meeting. I'm not hearing disagreement but maybe we need some wordsmith.

(Craig) Let's get a general sense of support. That's unanimous. Let's table it for discussion at the CAC meeting. We can vote on it on Tuesday.

No vote was taken on the motion.

Public comment from the chat:

- I wish there was improved signage and wayfinding at Cedar Lake Parkway and 21st Street.
- More can be done on GIS for way finding, including identifying MPRB system public toilets etc.
- But signage should be discreet.
- so no amenities for cedar/isles due to expense; but purchase and maintain a large new parcel of land along cedar regional bike trail? I vote for a few so-labeled amenities
- Yes, aesthetics are critical!
- Low visual impact, high utility
- As CAC Member says — signage should be within aesthetics of nature.
 - Agree, CAC Member. We don't want sign, sign EVERYWHERE a sign!

- Totally agree with CAC Member
- 100% agree with CAC Member's point about making sure signage doesn't "litter" the landscape
- Thank you, CAC Member. Also, if you're going to do signage you MUST maintain it. The signs around Cedar Lake now are in terrible condition.
- Yes, there are signs around LOI ("deep water") that have been there for 30 years and serve no purpose
- Strategic signage and updated signage is a great idea. No one pays attention to the dilapidated signage. Many cities have excellent examples of appropriate signage to encourage and guide people.
- For example, before the SWLRT construction, I counted 21 signs within a 2-block area on Cedar Lake Road. My point being that signage does get out of control.
- Really suggest beefing up on line maps and using Avenza type apps to allow people to find their way on their phones while in the parks
- At Cedar South Beach there is so much signage and no one pays any head
- The "wildlife refuge" signs on the LOI islands also need to be replaced -- they're ancient and illegible.
- Don't need "welcome" signs. And remove unneeded signs
- It's still too bad the "Picidilly" designed signs were added to the generally prairie style years ago.
- I think doing anything on that slope could create a very unstable bluff situation. Didn't you familiarize yourself with the park you are planning? I dare anyone who voted for this to go down and up that slope and report back. Wear long sleeves and long pants because there is lots of poison ivy there. Sturdy gloves are also a must.
 - If anyone actually tries to create a sidewalk or path down that hill, they will understand what you're saying. I still like my idea of a zip line.
 - But I'm too old for a zip line. How about a cable car or ski lift (a la State Fair)
- Also edit and remove unnecessary/outdated signage
- Most of the signs I see around Cedar are grafetti enhanced--not aestgetic

DISCUSSION TOPIC 10

Craig introduced the final topic: additional pedestrian safety improvements.

(Craig) I'm going to simplify this. What we're talking about is adding a sidewalk along this west part of Cedar. Bikers complain that pedestrians walk in the bike lane because they don't want to walk around the entire loop. So this would add a sidewalk, or "landing pad," as it was called by Aaron. This would be at two specific locations.

(Aaron) You summarized this well. Just yesterday I was riding my bike right there and saw a family of four walking single file on the goat path with their kayak, overlapping the bike path.

Once again, this is an opportunity to design as solution. In that picture you see a mess of pavement, that's where people park. And there's no sidewalk there. So people cross over and there's no access to a pedestrian path, so they walk on a bike path. So this provides a solution to that problem.

(CAC) I'm really lost. Can the map be enlarged and can you walk us through again?

- (Aaron) The Point Beach parking lot is on the right there and by that truck is where 21st street intersects. So when people leave those cars, the only place they can go is the bike path right now.
- (Craig) Can we scroll through these images to clarify? You can see in this image, there's a bike path but no pedestrian path adjacent to it. This image is an example of a project from Longfellow area, where there's an adjacent side pedestrian paths that allows pedestrians to be clear of bicyclists
- (CAC, *in chat*) Project Staff, can you show us the map view from the plan of this area?

(CAC) This just adds more impervious surfaces. There would be tree loss. People prefer to use the goat path. That area was already built up with a lot of pavement, pedestrians only have to be off-trail for a short segment. I don't think there's enough time to really decide on this. I would request that more time is allowed and we table this one.

(Craig) I appreciate your comments. I feel strongly, I used to work on this side of the lake and I am very familiar with this path. During winter periods and when there's bad weather, pedestrians desire a direct path and I frequently felt uncomfortable with the hierarchy. I feel comfortable voting on this tonight but if others want to table it we can do that. Let's see where people are on this. Raise hands if you support. The majority of people do support this. Lets do a formal vote.

A vote was held on the Motion. The motion passed with 9 votes in favor, 1 vote against, and 3 abstentions.

(Craig) Alright, it is 7:44. We have finished with one minute to spare. CAC Member, did you draft new language for the motion?

- (CAC) Just now?
- (Project Staff) It's in the chat.
- (CAC) Oh, yes.

(CAC, *in chat*) Revised: Prioritize safety for pedestrians by widening existing paved paths to a minimum of 6 feet for pedestrians and 8 feet for two-way biking, keeping separate paths and using the least intrusive methods, considering a boardwalk only as a last resort.

Public comments from the chat:

- This is a very real situation.
- I'm one of those walkers who may not want to loop back. But I am not so spoiled that I demand a special path for that convenience. And when I do need to take the shortcut, I use the "goat" path.
 - I agree - this seems like just more pavement. Bikers can just yield to peds, like they need to everywhere else. And I say that as a biker myself.
- Great idea to create a pedestrian pathway along side the bike path so people don't walk in the bike path. Please separate them by a margin if possible bc people often turn and move into bike traffic w/o looking first.
- The cross walk leads to the ada access to the ped path at the parking lot. There is a ped path that runs along the parking lot for those that don't want to walk the lobe along North Point beach
- Bicyclists and pedestrians desire direct paths just like car drivers.
- I live on this path. No one wants to go down the steeper hill so they walk their kayaks to a less steeper area.
- Even with an added adjacent ped path, crossing the bike lane will still be necessary. Courtesy needs to be extended
- I wonder if the current long loop path could be removed and the more direct sidewalk added. The current loop path can be "natural"
- They are not mentioning the severe grade change to the walking path.
- Packed earth trails are as impervious as pavement.

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) I just want to respond to the comments about the narrowness of the Cedar Lake Parkway. Just an idea, is to consider some kind of very minimalist railing of some sort that would provide comfort for pedestrians, to know "I'm safe here." That's one idea that could help with the narrow-feeling part of it.
- (Project Staff, *reading from chat*) Craig, thank you for your facilitation and thanks to all the CAC participants through this process. Appreciation to staff and consultants as well.
 - (CAC, *in chat*) Thanks!

- (Public) I'm just going to make a general argument I've been making from the beginning. Cedar Lake Park has been Park Board land for a long time, but we are still dealing with a major issue of circulation around and through this park. This is the only lake that people cannot walk around. Isn't it time to correct this situation? Do we have to continue to use Burnham Road which has no sidewalks and two-way traffic? Access around the park should be one paved path that all of the public—ADA, elderly etc.—can use. There have been two times that I recall that woodchip trails have been employed and they have quickly broken down to nothing. Let's do something decent for this lake and for the people.
 - (Public, *in chat*) I completely agree
- (Public, *in chat*) What was the decision about the path to the LRT station off Douglas?
 - (Project Staff, *in chat*) I believe that motion passed.
- (Project Staff, *reading from chat*) Before getting into voting I suggest the CAC have a walking meeting looking at the recommendations and issue points.
 - (Public, *in chat*) Public's suggestion is a good one. Knowing many of the areas discussed tonight, there were some missed nuances to what actual exists now (and works well) vs “preferred concepts”
 - What Public is suggesting is totally inconsistent w/ rehabilitating this ecosystem and making this lake more resilient.
- (Project Staff, *reading from chat*) Lake of the Isles walking path is not plowed in winter. Is this true of the entire park system? If yes, why are cyclists prioritized over walkers in winter?
- (Project Staff, *reading from chat*) There is a steep grade at 22st St. People like to launch their kayaks near 21st st. It's hard to get a kayak down the hill. I live on the parkway there and I have a kayak.
- (Public, *in chat*) I believe walkers walk on bike paths because they are paved. Walking paths and bike paths should be plowed.
- (Public) Hello everyone. I just want to reiterate that the hill at Douglas is extremely steep. If you want to look at doing anything with that, you should go out and walk it and make sure that can actually happen.

(Project Staff) So I'll just pause here for another 30 seconds. Craig, we can either revisit something or end early.

- (Project Staff) I did get the language that CAC Member added in the chat.

(Craig) Let's look at what CAC Member added. “Prioritize safety for pedestrians by widening existing paved paths to a minimum of 6 feet for pedestrians and 8 feet for two-way biking, keeping separate paths and using the least intrusive methods, considering a boardwalk only as a last resort.” I'll give you a second to compare the two. I think this does further clarify things. Who would agree with that? I think that is unanimous. I think we'll revise the language to

reflect it as written by CAC Member. It is 7:53. I just want to take a minute to thank everyone for your patience and working through these challenging issues. Thank you for doing your homework. I just want to emphasize to the general public that many of us have gone to great lengths to walk and experience these paths with a critical eye, beyond living here for years.

(CAC) Sorry, that was an accidental raising of my hand. But I'll just say as a member of the CAC, this has gone so smoothly so thank you for your work on this.

(Project Staff) There is one more person who wants to speak.

- (Public) Hello. Okay, I just want to say that the whole reason we have anthropogenic, people-caused climate change is because people have been unwilling to make concessions to nature. And they consistently put their own convenience ahead of everything else. I think this whole discussion should take place within that context. That's all I have to say.
- (Public, *in chat*) I'm disappointed you didn't touch on the traffic issues at Dean and Cedar Lake Parkway.

As the meeting came to an end, many members of the CAC thanked Craig for his facilitation and the staff for their leadership. In the chat, members of the public also thanked Craig, the staff, and the CAC members. Emma thanked the CAC members for their collaboration and behind-the-scenes work. Emma wrapped up by thanking everyone for attending and reminding them of the final meeting next Tuesday.