



Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board
Cedar lake and Lake of the Isles Master Plan
Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #7

1/11/2022 6:00-8:00pm
Zoom Online Video Call

MPRB Staff and Consultants Present: Emma Pachuta (Project Manager), Adam Arvidson, Madeline Hudek, Tyler Pederson; Maura Rockcastle (TENxTEN), Erica Christenson (TENxTEN), Jason Naber (EOR)

CAC Members Present: Win Rockwell (CAC Chair), Aaron Shaffer, Anna Eleria, Eric Gangl, Adam Braun, Ben Surma, Constance Pepin, Drew McGovern, Jim Romlin, Joshua Christensen, Linda Mack, Michaela West, Nan Dreher, James Reid (Alternate), Will Stensrud (Alternate)

CAC Members Absent: Alice Lehman, Laura Kinkead, Lilia Theisen

Public: Throughout the evening approximately 25+ members of the public joined the meeting

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

Emma started the meeting by thanking everyone for joining the seventh Cedar-Isles Master Plan Community Advisory Committee Meeting. MPRB Commissioner President Forney and Commissioner Shaffer were then introduced and thanked for attending. Staff and consultants were also introduced.

Following introductions was an acknowledgement of Dakota land and an introduction for the evening's focus for the CAC Discussion: water quality. Emma then reviewed the project timeline, which is in the early design phase. Two concepts were recently released, neither of which is anticipated to be the final designs. There are still many engagement opportunities for this phase. Following engagement for the initial concepts, there will be one preferred design concept and another round of engagement will occur to refine it and get to a CAC recommendation.

After this introduction, Adam provided some clarification on the role of CAC. The CAC charge has a lot of points, one is to provide feedback on the draft plan. Another is to make recommendations to the MPRB Board of Commissioners. Between design and completion of the draft document is when the CAC will make recommendations. The hope is for a consensus on the recommendation. Staff can provide resources to the CAC for their work on discussing

iteratively the parts of the project and developing the recommendations. Following recommendations, the document will be drafted and put out for a public comment period. It will then be brought to the Board for final approval.

Emma then provided a brief overview of the guiding principles, the two concepts and an overview of initial community engagement findings (*see presentation for further detail*).

Next, Maura presents information related to water quality. Water quality is measures out outlined as well as a watershed context, which shows drainage areas of the watershed. The next diagram breaks down by pipesheds, which is an area of land that drains to a pipe outlet underground. Different than topographic watersheds.

There are ten water quality treatments and precedent images, which are then broken down by if they connect to nutrient removal, habitat improvement and diversity, and/or runoff prevention (*see presentation for detail*). Stormwater facilities are in pink because they need to operate at a larger scale than the land we have available. How these ten treatment show up in the two concepts is shown next. Concept A focuses on out of lake treatments while Concept B focuses on in lake treatments.

Emma then reviews CAC discussion guidelines. CAC: Cameras on, everyone speaks, raise hands, refrain from chatbox for this discussion. Public: cameras off, share a hope of concern, note it as hope or concern save comments for public time.

CAC DISCUSSION

Following the overview presentations from the project team, Win, CAC chair was introduced as the facilitator for the CAC discussion. Win started the discussion by outlining that water quality was the first topic selected because there had been pretty high consensus to date that water quality was a high priority and starting with a high consensus item would be a good way to start the discussions. Win then introduced and provided some profession background on Anna Eleria, CAC member, who works a regional manager for a local watershed district. Anna thanked Win for an introduction and raised two high level water quality considerations for CAC discussion.

High-level Water Quality Recommendations

(CAC) There are limits to what can be done in the project area. Can't protect water quality without looking at the watershed as a whole. Many agencies and homeowners are responsible for managing stormwater within the watershed Cedar Lake and Lake of the Isles are in. One recommendation would be reestablishing a partnership with multiple agencies focused on clean water – a Clean Water Partnership 2.0. Another would be the creation of a lake management plan for Cedar Lake and Lake of the Isles. The master plan focuses on what's within the project boundary. A management plan could take a deeper dive into the data to understand water quality causes in greater detail and establish goals, prioritize, and plan

around mitigation. These suggestions don't diminish recommendations brought forward in initial concepts, but look beyond the master plan at a watershed level to address water quality.

There was general CAC consensus by the CAC that Anna, Constance, Drew will start to draft high level watershed recommendations.

- (CAC) Good idea to expand the CAC scope to have an impact on water quality.

Priorities and Impacts on Water Quality Strategies in Concepts

(CAC) Three other potential water quality improvement topics to raise and discuss: Dredging; Boulevards as an opportunity area since street runoff has an impact on water quality; Measurable goals for tracking progress towards water quality

(CAC) Thrilled to hear broader viewpoint about watershed. Would like to know more about what the water quality options involve (ex: littoral edge).

Maura provided some additional information about the littoral edge and marsh restoration options that are shown in the concepts.

- Concept A:
 - The littoral edge, marsh restoration and floating wetlands do most of the work for the in-lake treatment and the oak savannah, mesic oak forest address runoff before they get into the lake.
 - This concept doesn't include in-lake chemical treatments, but it would be possible to include as well. The boardwalk in the northern arm of Lake of the Isles is there since littoral edge expands into where the current pedestrian path is.
- Concept B:
 - This concept includes in-lake chemical treatments, which could either be permanent structures or periodic treatments.
 - The littoral edge in the two concepts is similar. This one doesn't include as much prairie and oak savannah restoration.
 - The littoral edge is expanding the wetland buffer and would be partially underwater

(CAC) How does the littoral edge expand? What are the mechanics?

- (Project Staff) The littoral edge will act as a transition between land and water. Historically the lake had a large littoral edge before the lakes were dredged. The littoral edge expansion would expand plant species both towards the land and towards the water and broaden the fringe of emergent vegetation to the lake.

(CAC) Mitigation strategies showing the cost versus effectiveness. Another factor to think about is how these strategies may create barriers to access. Impact to park users is another thing to consider.

(CAC) Why is dredging not included as an option?

- (Project Staff) Dredging has not been raised as a water quality strategy. Has not been considered to date but could be something to consider for targeting removal of accumulated phosphorus.

(CAC) Isn't Cedar Meadows Wetland dredged?

- (Project Staff) MCWD does the maintenance for the wetland. When it was done will need to be verified and brought back to the CAC at a future meeting.
- (CAC) Dredging this facility is normal maintenance, not sure we need to address this.
 - *Project Staff confirmed this*

(CAC) Habitat removal and runoff prevention. Given that a partnership needs to be endorsed. Would like to distinguish the sources of runoff and the mitigation techniques. Opposed to dredging outside of the Cedar Meadows site because it's intrusive to the ecosystem. Think about nature-based solutions rather than technology and chemical. Should also look at the cost.

- (CAC) Proponent for looking at nature-based solutions, however when it pertains to a buildup of pollution in sediment, none of the nature-based solutions will address these. Dredging or alum treatment are the two strategies that can address pollution already in the lakes.

(CAC) For relocating trails and building boardwalks on Lake of the Isles: The cost to rebuild trails will be very expensive. The littoral edge could be expanded without having to relocate trails.

(CAC) Based on the watershed map looks like about 90% of drainage is to one outfall. Focusing dredging there may be most cost effective.

- (Project Staff) May be appropriate to target suction dredging. In a lot of cases dredging on lakes is done on a selective basis based on high priority areas, not the entire lake.

There are some species that we don't want to protect. Good to think about native species' ability to thrive over invasive species (ex: milfoil).

(CAC) Would like to see dredging added to the chart and recommendations for future consideration.

- (Project Staff) MPRB needs to verify dredging is a viable option.

(CAC) How tall does littoral edge vegetation grow to?

- (Project Staff) The primary species that would do well in the littoral edge would not grow to be more than about 3 feet tall. While there are other native and non-native species that could grow taller, these species would not be encouraged.

(CAC) Would there be impacts to views along the edge with the littoral edge?

- (Project Staff) Primary species that would be selected would not, no.

(CAC) How does alum treatment work?

- (Project Staff) Alum is discharged, typically from a boat. Charged aluminum binds to the phosphorus and sits at the bottom of the lake and is not accessible.
- (Project Staff) In lake treatment rather than alum was noted because there are different chemical treatment options to address different things. Any in-lake treatment options would need to happen periodically in order to maintain effectiveness. A plan for when they would occur would ensure long-term effectiveness.

HOPES AND CONCERNS

Tyler compiled hopes and concerns submitted by the broader public during the CAC discussion. Review hopes and concerns from the meeting on the [CAC #7 Hopes and Concerns Miro Board](#).

PUBLIC COMMENT TIME

Meeting was interrupted and ended early, so this portion of the meeting did not take place. Project staff are scheduling a follow up to this meeting to complete the CAC discussion on water quality and will provide public comment time during that meeting.

THANKS AND NEXT STEPS

Meeting was interrupted and ended early, so this portion of the meeting did not take place.