Cedar Lake – Lake of the Isles Master Plan

Summary of Feedback on Draft Initial Park Concepts from 12/16/2021 through mid-March 2022

This document is a compilation of the feedback received through various forms of engagement between the release of the Cedar-Isles Initial Park Concepts on 12/16/2021 up through mid-March 2022. Feedback is organized as much as possible by topic and location. This document offers a summary of what has been heard to date and not a list of every individual comment. Bolded comments mean that comment has been mentioned more than five times.
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Guiding Principles Guidance

Prioritization of Principles in Survey Responses:

1. PROTECT
2. RESPECT
3. CONNECT
4. TELL STORIES
5. INVITE
6. CELEBRATE

Gaps In Guiding Principles

- Safety
  - Adapt quickly to climate change
- No gaps in principles
  - Very comprehensive
  - Could simplify plans to cost less
- Uniqueness
  - Each lake has different feel
  - Cedar is less developed than other MPLS lakes
  - Honor the character of each lake
- Respect for humans and the environment
- Affordability
- Maintain what is already there
- Significant gaps, primarily in supporting natural environment
- Principles don’t align with community results
- Empower volunteers to improve and maintain park

General

- Include impact on surrounding neighborhood
- General support for Guiding Principles
- Concern that people are supporting maximum rewilding to limit inviting more people to an urban park
- Can’t protect lake and invite new people here at same time
- Language is not clear and direct
- Don’t create false dichotomy between increased access at the detriment of natural areas
- Opposition to welcoming a “broader audience”
- Don’t understand how these guiding principles translate to reality
- The guiding principles are not said to not have a hierarchy yet one of them has priority in the wording. Clarify what is being prioritized if there is prioritization or clarify language.
- Reflect lofty ideals devoid of practical thought
- Disregard for nature in an urban setting
- Do not over-commercialize the lakes
- Add capacity number to parks
- What about the “How”?
- Metrics are missing to determine what success looks like in each category
- While mention access, no mention of ADA
- Stop focusing on social justice, it’s a distraction
- Understand the unintended consequences of each
- Challenge is to make park more accessible while restoring natural areas
- Protect and Connect make the most sense, the rest don’t seem as important
- Concept of accessibility should be added to Invite and Connect

**Topic-Specific**

**CONNECT**

- **Clearly promote walk/bike access and connections over vehicles**
- A modal priority framework for access is missing, there should be more emphasis on permanently keeping cars from recreation areas
- The Connect principle doesn’t clearly call out transit, and it should consider new LRT stop
- Permanent road closures aren’t adequately depicted
- A complete streets framework should be added to Connect
- Should be lowest priority

**PROTECT**

- **Protect is the most important**
- Top priority is protection of lakes
- Love the focus on environmental protection and stewardship
- Make sure climate change is a central driver in these plans
- Sustainability is hinted at, but not specifically outlined
- Protect doesn’t clarify the need to reverse damage to lake
- Seems that these plans don’t prioritize protect enough
- Someone needs to speak for the land, water, and trees
- Do not put mature trees at risk
- Needs stronger language with more detail

**CELEBRATE**

- Why do the guiding principles assume that more amenities is better?
- Could be combined with Tell Stories – Natural and cultural history
Lake of the Isles

Water / Climate Mitigation / Ecology / Wildlife

- **Support for increasing amount of shoreline plants**
- **Support for reducing turf areas and adding more wildlife spaces (Concept A)**
  - High pedestrian volumes coming from uptown – make sure to build in sufficient turf areas for people who are walking from these dense locations (ie 22nd and Euclid)
  - Could reclaim pavement/parkway to do this
  - Could rewild more of the western side of Isles due to use, not sure why there is proposed turf there
  - Make sure to keep some areas turf for people to be able to have picnics
  - East side of lake of the Isles is widely used and should be preserved in key places
  - Concern with losing all grass areas unless there is scientific reason to do so for water quality
- **Support for oak savanna and reducing turf (Concept A)**
- **Support for Concept B**
  - More turf for different activities
- **Opposition to rewilding Lake of Isles**
  - Steals parkland away from city dwellers. The park is well used and should continue to have open grass areas
  - Giving too much lawn to nature areas which reduces accessibility for park users (Concept B)
  - Concern about impacts to recreation
  - Just add some trees, and that’s it
  - Concern about monoculture and potential of tree disease with oak savanna
- **Maintenance to remove invasive species**
- **Support for improving water quality**
- Prefer prairie to oak savannah (Concept B)
- **Support for prairie restoration (Concept B)**
- **Do not block lake views with high plantings**
- **Would like to see something in between the two concepts. Like restoration, but would like turf for recreation**
- **Concern about impact to a water recreation, but generally support more wildlife**
- **Mixed thoughts on increase to aquatic and shoreline plants**
- **Preserve the “viewing areas” at Lake of the Isles**
- **Address flooding on the paths**
- **Many wildflowers along area where boardwalk is proposed**
- **Isles used to have a heron rookery. Is that still a prospect?**
- **Opposition to floating wetlands**
Circulation and Access

Parkway

- **Opposed to parkway closures (Concept A)**
  - Would be difficult to navigate and access is already limited
  - Residents needs to access these locations
  - Opposition to changing road traffic patterns
  - Concern about impact of parkway closures (Concept A)
  - Concern that parkway closures make area less accessible to folks who don’t live in area
  - In winter, the NE side of Isles will go completely unused due to proposed road closure (Concept A)
  - In winter, the NE side of Isles will go completely unused due to proposed road closure (Concept A)
  - Concern about rerouting traffic near school and church

- **Support for proposed parkway closures (Concept A)**
  - Increase green space
  - COVID-19 closures showed how welcome the parks can be without cars on the roadways
  - Add vegetative sound buffer
  - Lots of people gather near #5 (Concept A)

- Support for reducing cars on parkways, keep in mind folks who need ADA access to different areas of park

Parking

- Concern that parking isn’t being addressed as plans accommodate new users
- Will parking stay the same?
- Not enough parking near LOI
- Add drop off area

Trails

- **Support for two-way off-street bike trail (Concept B)**
  - Biggest benefit of plan
  - Restripe current path
  - Support for narrowing parkway

- **Opposition of two-way off-street bike trail (Concept B)**
  - Isn’t needed
  - Is not safe
  - Will take away space from walkers
  - Will take green space away

- **Keep bike traffic one-way at Isles**
- **Support for one-way bike lane around Lake of the Isles (Concept A)**
- **Opposition to on-street bike lane (Concept A)**
  - Concern about safety for bicyclists
  - Concern about safety for vehicles
- **Support for two-way bike connection around Lake of the Isles (Concept A and B)**
  - Part of commute currently, difficult to get home
  - Should be separated
- Suggestion for a shared road rather than protected bikeway
- Concern about narrowing parkway (Concept A)
- Support for the existing bike/walk/ski trails in area
- Support for pedestrian connections
- Improve SE corner of Isles – currently confusion between walkers and bikers
- Concern about striped bike lane on parkway
  - Concern with losing parking
- Propose to add bollards on on-street bike lane to separate cars from bikes (Concept A)
- Move bike/rolling path to outer perimeter (what is now roadway)

**Boardwalks**

- **Opposition to boardwalks on north Isles (Concept A)**
  - Disrupts existing shoreline
  - Difficult for running and jogging
  - Dangerous
  - No need for them
- **Support for boardwalks (Concept A)**
  - Great idea
  - Like that you can be closer to the water
  - Like this with the added natural edge along the lake
  - Resilient to climate change – can rise and fall with water height
- Concern about winter maintenance and safety of boardwalks

**General**

- **Add a bridge over narrow park of Lake of the Isles near 26th St.**
- Not safe for all users, should have a goal to create bike/walk connections for all ages and abilities.
  - Walk/bike trails are too narrow considering to how frequently they are used
  - Could create smaller walking loop option and would be great with the boardwalks. Also great to increase access for walk/bikers who don’t want to circle the whole lake.
- Don’t change any paths
- Support for new link to Midtown Greenway at southwest Isles
- Support for better connections between Bde Maka Ska and Isles
- Consider Nice Ride locations in plan

**Programming and Amenities**

**Warming House**

- **Support for new permanent warming house at Isles**
  - Would be nice to also be able to welcome skiers, along with skaters
  - Would like coffee and snacks offered in building
- Support for keeping warming house as existing location on east side of Isles (Concept B)
  - Better serves uptown residents
  - Draws people from all over the metro
  - Easier for residents on east side of the lake to access
  - Ice freezes first in this location

- Opposition to year-round warming house at Lake of the Isles
  - Already has this at Bde Maka Ska
  - Especially on east side of lake
  - Consider an updated, temporary structure

- Opposition to any new structures on Lake of the Isles
  - Isles does not need structures
  - Won’t be able to be maintained
  - Would increase need for more parking
  - Will be a dramatic disruption to natural beauty
  - Too much programming will ruin it
  - Bike stations already an eyesore

- Support new (NW) location for year-round warming house on Isles (Concept B)
  - East strip too narrow, dangerous for all modes
  - Like that it is closer to new SWLRT stop
  - Love this idea
  - More room
  - More opportunity to make use of the lake for skating

- Opposition to warming house at new NW Isles location (Concept A)
  - Concern that adding amenities on the west side of Lake of the Isles will compound traffic and parking issues
  - Doesn’t seem like it will improve access
  - Get in the way of the Loppet events
  - Major storm sewers at that location

- Concern about parking at new warming house location (northwest Isles)
- What would the year-round building be used for in the summer?
- Indifferent to warming house location
- Not sure whether a year-round building makes sense
- Suggestion to move ice rink further north on the east side of Isles
- Is there enough room for a year-round structure? (Concept A)
- Concern new warming house location would have a smaller ice skating rink
- Some research about when the lake freezes would be needed before committing to a permanent structure in new location on Isles.
- Support for the warming house location that offers largest ice skating rink
- Support for permanent amenities northeast side of Isles to support uptown residents
- If warming house is permanent, seems like a waste of money. Make sure it’s used year-round.
- Consider using Kenwood Rec Center as warming hut and move ice rink over fields near school
Activity Hubs / Structures

- **Opposition to any new structures on Lake of the Isles**
  - Isles does not need structures
  - Won’t be able to be maintained
  - LOI is a non-destination lake
  - Changes character
- **Support for Activity Hub on East Side of lake (Concept A)**
  - Closer to uptown population and transit connections
- Support for Activity Hubs concept
- Keep amenities grouped
- Having activity hubs so close together will add to congestion in the neighborhoods (Concept B)
- Opposition to Activity Hubs
- Does not like new proposed activity hub location, Cedar should accommodate new LRT users, not Lake of the Isles (Concept B)
- Opposition to lake decks
- Would adding activities have a negative impact to natural areas?

Gathering Areas and Amenities

- **Support for more passive recreation space (grass)**
  - Where will renters who live in the area go to hang out?
  - Leave turf, however, west side of lake is less used than east side
  - SW corner of Isles received heavy use from uptown, add more turf here
  - Grass is as important as paths
  - Don’t need as many structures, just open space
  - Need to keep picnic areas
  - Need a common area
  - Support for Living Lakes (Concept A) but should add more turf areas at Isles for uptown residents to be able to gather
- **Opposition to adding pavilions**
  - Expensive to maintain all of these additional structures (Concept A)
- **Support for new permanent bathrooms**
  - Support for new amenities
  - Creating more access to more people is important
  - Water/land deck on water would be nice
- Opposition to restrooms
- Opposition to amenities proposed on northwest Isles
- There are amenities at Bde Maka Ska, not needed at Lake of Isles
- Support for allowing passive, organic activities
- No need for formalizing “gathering spots”
- Add outdoor fitness center and/or athletic equipment

Water Amenities

- Support for formalizing access points/locations for canoes
Winter Amenities

- **Support for skating loop**
  - Great idea
  - Can it connect with ski trails?
- **Support for keeping ice skating rink in current location (Concept B)**
  - Better access to uptown
  - This area freezes first
  - Luminary Loppet uses other area for staging
- **Opposition to Ice skating loop**
  - Will cause unnecessary congestion for skiers
  - Cost concern
- Will there be additional parking to support new ice rink location? If not, seems to isolate people on east side of the lake.
- Would like to see more development around winter amenities (ice skating/skiing)
- Keep existing skating area on Isles maintained so it’s accessible and safe
- Consider skiing access locations for skiers (22nd Street and East LOI)
- Continue to make groomed ski trails a priority
- Support for cross country ski trails
- Support for existing ice skating and hockey rink
- Support for winter recreation proposals in both concepts

General

- **Support for Concept B**
  - Maintain pastoral feel
  - Keeps Lake of the Isles close to how it is now
- Dislike the amount of signage around Isles in concept B
  - Takes away from natural, pastoral feel
- Keep lake as is
  - Kenwood Park is a great place for gatherings and amenities
- Character of Lake of the Isles is unique – quieter and contemplative compared to other lakes in the chain.
- A more man-made approach does not make these lakes better
- Suggestion to add outdoor art or statues around the lake
- Acknowledge Indigenous culture
- Don’t overdevelop
- Great job prioritizing nature while providing careful access to community
Cedar Lake

Water / Climate Mitigation / Ecology / Wildlife

- **Support for keeping Cedar Lake natural**
  - Support for preserving wildlife habitat
  - Need for robust work
  - More forest bathing
  - Helps with mental health
  - Support for nature education
  - Protect nature
  - Restore nature
  - Unique for an urban area
  - Turn invasives into fuel for water quality improvement
  - Keep east side of Cedar wild
  - Undeveloped natural areas are valued

- **Importance of Water Quality**
  - Keeping lakes clean is a priority
  - Thank you for prioritizing health of the water
  - Support for water quality
  - Reverse damaged water quality
  - In favor of floating islands on Cedar
  - Address algae blooms
  - Water is getting more murky
  - Get rid of lawn area and fertilizer use adjacent to water
  - Biochar treatments

- **Support for increase to aquatic and shoreline plants**

- **Keep Cedar wild**
  - Buckthorn removal
  - Keep fundamentally the same
  - Keep secluded character of woods

- **Support for Concept A**
  - Keeping Cedar natural
  - Water quality and wildness are priorities and emphasized more in this concept
  - Best plan to keep Cedar wild

- **Support for nature education**
  - Young people are learning to love nature through fishing, oriole feeders, picnicking
  - Support birding

- **Opposition to (Concept A)**
  - No to expanded restoration
  - No to boardwalks

- **Support for Concept B regarding proposed landscape restoration**

- **Support for some aquatic and shoreline plant restoration**

- **Concern that the forest areas will become overprogrammed**
- Unsupportive of increasing aquatic and shoreline plants
- Support for Concept B regarding aquatic and shoreline plants
- Do not remove trees for pavement
- Do not overdevelop Cedar
- Too much access will destroy nature
- Support for keeping NE woods secluded

Circulation and Access

Parkway

- **Opposition to making Cedar Lake Parkway a one-way (Concept A)**
  - Find a different way to address trail contracts at northwest Cedar that isn’t a one-way for the parkway
  - Redirect traffic to France or neighborhood street
  - Paths and parkway work just fine as is
  - Add traffic bump outs
  - Not fair to residents in area
- **Support one-way along Cedar Lake Parkway (Concept A)**
  - Congested commuter road and dangerous trail congestion when trails divide (Concept A)
- Make all of Cedar Lake Parkway one-way to reduce dangerous trail congestion and reduce congested car traffic on parkway
- Expand the car-free parkway segment (Concept A)
- Provide measures for reducing vehicle speed on Cedar Lake Parkway (ex: speed bumps)
- Support temporary parkway closure (Concept B)
- Concerned about directional restrictions versus traffic calming to address pinch points along Cedar Lake Parkway
- Love idea of slowing traffic, but unsure about one-way. How would one-way impact rush hour traffic? (Concept A)
- Use other traffic calming measures rather than one-way such as stop signs.
- Private property should not be altered to increase density

Parking

- **Concerns about parking and/or traffic around East Cedar Lake Beach area as it relates to existing parking issues, proposed amenities, and new light rail stop**
- **Support for adding more vehicle parking by East Cedar Beach**
  - Conduct traffic/parking assessment as part of the plan.
  - Coordinate with City for traffic on 21st and Met Council for light rail use.
  - Add a turnaround drop off near Upton?
  - There should be a parking lot for South Cedar Lake Beach
  - Helpful to have more parking by South Cedar Lake Beach
  - Poor bus access to Cedar Lake area, which would address traffic without adding parking
  - Opposition to adding more parking
    - Too much unused as it is
Trails

- **Support for trail around Cedar Lake (Concept B)**
  - If path is not built, then should still be able to access trail from south cedar beach to Burnham.
  - Include biking trail
  - Boardwalk is a compromise but better than nothing
  - Important to improve accessibility in this area
  - Link up to Kenilworth channel
  - SE shoreline is currently used for private uses, should be public uses
  - Keep path simple and low impact
  - Make it paved

- **Opposition to adding a path around Cedar Lake**
  - More important things to be working on and thinking about than a path around Cedar
  - Keep as is
  - public will keep using the cow paths because they’re great

- **Make all of the shoreline around Cedar Lake fully public (ie no encroachments)**

- **Keep trails unpaved and natural as is**
  - Trails need to be integrated into the landscape with minimal impact to the ecosystem, especially northeast Cedar and along the channel
  - Do not pave

- **Support pedestrian path on north/northeast Cedar (Concept A)**

- **Support for formalizing existing trails on east side of Cedar Lake**
  - How is a soft surface trail maintained in winter?
  - Concern about adding mulch over paved for ADA accessibility reasons

- **Opposition to formalizing formal paths on east side of Cedar Lake**

- **Mountain bike connection between Midtown Greenway/Kenilworth Trail to Brownie and Theodore Wirth**

- **Would like paths to be more accessible in the East Cedar Beach area**

- **Consider widening the bike and pedestrian trails on the south side of Cedar Lake**

- **Install stop sign at Basswood and Cedar**

- **Separate walk/bike paths**

- **Mid-block crossings to access Cedar Meadows Wetland**

- **Improve access/crossings to Cedar Lake South Beach area**

- **Do not widen bike or pedestrian trails**

- **The circulation decisions made will greatly impact the lake**

- **Improve bicycle connections**

- **Adding pedestrian connections on east side of Cedar will make it more popular**

Boardwalks

- **Support for boardwalk on southeast Cedar Lake (Concept B)**

- **Opposed to boardwalk on southeast Cedar Lake (Concept B)**

- **Opposition to boardwalk at northwest Cedar Lake (Concept B)**
  - Would damage natural feel
  - Don’t understand need
- Support for the boardwalks proposed at Cedar Lake (Concept B)
  - Good idea to take a part of land that is already swampy and make it accessible
  - Support for smaller boardwalks more often
  - Provide more room for bike/walk trails
- Support for northwest boardwalk on Cedar Lake (Concept B)
  - Important to fix very narrow bike and pedestrian trails near Brownie Lake.
- Extend boardwalk at northwest Cedar Lake
- Concern about boardwalk at southeast Cedar Lake
  - Ice in spring
- Opposition to boardwalks
  - Year-round maintenance is problematic (Concept B)

General

- Improve pedestrian crossings for neighborhoods to the west and south of Cedar Lake.
- Look into Reserve Block 40 connection (in SW Service Area Master Plan)
- Address and improve bike and pedestrian crossings of the parkway at busy crossing locations (ex: South Cedar Lake Beach, Dean Parkway/Cedar Lake Parkway).
- Address safety of trails
- Improvements to trail walk experience around point beach needed, including pathway, width, lighting.
- There needs to be separation of all modes
- The lakes are for more than just people. MPRB mission includes care for non-human species in parks
- Improve functionality for all modes (bike, pedestrian, boat, car) around Cedar Lake
- Wayfinding is important for people unfamiliar with the area
- Do not prioritize bikes over cars

Programming and Amenities

Activity Hubs & Programming

- Welcome water sport equipment rentals on Cedar Lake
- Support for activity nodes
- Interest in new amenities on the NE side of Cedar – formal structure or bathroom to accommodate high traffic
- No amenities except port-a-potties. Existing bathroom at South Cedar is already too much.
- If keeping Cedar natural, why is there an activity hub?
- Cedar should continue to be a quiet lake – doesn’t need structures or signage
- No new development
- Do not over-commercialize

Gathering Areas and Amenities

- A lake deck should be added to Cedar, possibly off the side of East Cedar Beach
- Better signage for bikers and hikers to know where a trail goes and distance
- Provide better linkages between the trails
- Cedar Lake has more capacity to relieve crowding on other lakes. Make sure access and amenities emphasize this.
- Support for more pedestrian connections and amenities
- Support for improved access points to the shore.
- Cedar Point Beach should be noted as a gateway to welcome people

**East Cedar Beach**

- **Support for boat rental**
- **Opposition to boat rental**
  - Support for adding hard or paved surfaces at East Cedar Beach and mound for accessibility reasons
  - Support for adding year-round activities at East Cedar Beach
  - Consider safety at night near East Cedar Beach
  - Consider maintenance support for volunteers
  - Ok with nature center but keep nature as it
  - Opposition to “Activity Hub”
  - Concern about increased visitors
  - Concern about SWLRT impact – more people, more crime
  - If boat rental moves forward, reduce number of spots available
  - These plans do not address the horrible parking situation
  - Enjoy the calm and quiet feel of the beach
  - Keep the beach “hidden”
  - Support for permanent restroom
  - Too much development, making it like all the others
  - Address current and future safety issues

**South Cedar Point/North Point Peninsula**

- Lower picnic area next to boat ramp could be related to grass area
- Upper picnic area could remain and even enhanced with small pavilion
- Service road should be relocated (natural areas instead) to an area of landfill on east side of lake
- Current path not maintained. Make more friendly for pedestrians

**General**

- Preserve Cedar as natural. There are other places for programming. Should keep it as close to what it is now as possible.
- Add a viewing area for Cedar Lake
- Bullrush area north and south of East Cedar Beach is unique and important habitat. Ice rink and additional programming will impact this area.
- Both plans have great merit, please don’t lose natural feel when increasing access, amenities, and use.
- Should consider making use of scenic overlook planned for West End Triangle
- Concern adding new amenities will risk damage to natural areas
- Structures shown within the concepts feel cold and unfriendly, make sure they are inviting
- Support for more green space
- Consider Cedar Lake Parkway and 21st Street a gateway
- Consider 365-day use (trash, toilets)
- Consider a warming hut at Cedar for skiers
- Keep water fountain at South Cedar Beach on year-round

Water Amenities
- Cedar Lake on the west side near the south parking lot is used in the fall/winter for cold water immersion groups. Would like to see this reflected in plans.
- There’s paddle access near the southern part of North Cedar Point Beach
- Need to ensure intentional space for canoe/boat access for the heavy use
- Support for rental kiosk at East Cedar Beach
- Love open swim at Cedar!

Winter Amenities
- Support for skating rink on Cedar (Concept A)
- Opposition to adding skating rink at Cedar (Concept A)
  - Where would people park for ice skating on Cedar? Already limited parking
  - Could be a problem for habitat – if moves forward, place at swimming area and not in marsh and turn lights off at 10pm
- Cedar Lake is used for cross country skiing in winter
- Support for skating rink
- Support for existing cross country ski trails
- Concern the rink will be too far from a warming house (Concept A)
- Would like to explore an alternative method of constructing ice rinks that doesn’t include plastic fiber markings before proposing an additional ice rink on Cedar
- No reflection of cross-country skiing on Cedar Lake
- Ensure Cedar Lake will continue to accommodate xc skiers all winter
- Supportive of winter amenities at East Cedar Lake
- Before rethinking the warming house, change plastic use for creating the rinks each year

General
- Incorporate the remnant lands into the master plan
  - Address land adjacent to parkland to prevent additional development
- Improve maintenance at East Cedar Beach
  - Currently has heavy use
  - Volunteers cannot keep up with needed maintenance
- Floating community solar array on Cedar
- Opposition to both concepts
  - They take away the wild
- Perfect the way it is!
Cedar Lake Regional Trail

Circulation and Access
- Repave the trail
- Widen the trail to increase use
- Improve maintenance

Dean Parkway

Water / Climate Mitigation / Ecology / Wildlife
- Keep grass as is, no need to change
- Make the space more inviting
  - Add picnic tables
  - Benches
- Concern about impact pollinator nodes will have on existing trees

Kenilworth Channel

Circulation and Access
- Support for connection along channel between the two lakes (Concept B)
  - Support for formalizing pedestrian connection in the channel (Concept A)
  - Add paths on both sides of Kenilworth
  - This connection is currently missing
  - Should connect to East Cedar Beach
  - As it stands, bikers/walkers have to move away from the channel and lakes when traveling between them
  - Add shoreline buffer to protect the water
  - Soft surface trail, not paved
- Add lighting for safety
- Add bridge across the channel
- Do not add new amenities along Kenilworth Channel
- Opposition to adding a path along Kenilworth
  - Will disturb wildlife
  - Will increase traffic through forest
General Master Plan Area Comments

Water / Climate Mitigation / Ecology / Wildlife

- **Support for additional natural areas and rewilding**
  - Should be top priority
  - Concern proposed restoration will include cutting down trees
  - Increase habitat connectivity
  - Support for wildlife improvements
  - Plant more, invest in and care for trees
  - Support for less grass and more natural areas in plan
  - Full restoration will be difficult with all the buckthorn
  - Critical as plants and animals struggle with changing climate
  - Reduce turf
  - Leave the lakes wild
  - MPRB contains some of the last pre-settlement plant communities

- **Support for preservation of lake ecosystem**
  - Should be top priority
  - Address runoff and pollutants from park users, adjacent homeowners, and watershed
  - Need metrics/measurements for water quality improvements
  - Address milfoil and air transport contaminants
  - Restore wetlands
  - Implement all of the BMP options in both concepts
  - Address fertilizers, trash, plastic entering lakes
  - Concern that lake quality of both lakes is deteriorating
  - Mandate cooperation with MCWD, City, CWP
  - Look bigger than master plan area (other agencies)
  - Teach people proper use of de-icing salts

- **Support for balance of nature and recreation**
  - Wildlife and recreation can both be accommodated.
  - Climate mitigation and ecology are important as well as pedestrian trail between and around the lakes.
  - Prefer option A for opportunities to get people interested in wildlife, education, and natural recreation
  - These areas need more protections, especially from irresponsible users.
  - Concepts need to do more to reduce human use
  - There are many new housing developments planned near here. Important to recognize impact of new visitors and plan accordingly – spread visitors out to mitigate impact to parkland
  - With addition of natural areas, please keep in mind that people need to be able to access the lakes during all seasons, with boats in summer.
  - Concern that there is a trade off between water quality and increased access/circulation
    - does not want to choose as both are important

- Focus the plan on stewardship rather than use
- Nature *is* the entertainment, no need to build
  - This plan should be consistent with the standards, terms, and rankings as other MPRB plans
    - The plan should be able to explain by a ranking (from Natural Areas Management Plan) is being addressed or not.
  - Support for littoral edge expansion
  - Address flooding by rewinding area
  - Can existing pristine or wildlife intensive areas that should be protected for ecological function and habitat be identified in the wildlife survey?
  - Would like to see someone from MPRB to advocate for the natural areas - there are currently positions vacant that would typically fill this role
  - Support native plantings and ecosystems
  - Support for water quality strategies in Concept A
  - Support for expanding littoral edge while minimizing disruption to trails

Circulation and Access

Southwest Lightrail (SWLRT)

- How will SWLRT delays impact implementation of plan?
- LRT will not be a realistic arrival option for most visitors, people will continue to drive.
- There aren’t mitigation considerations given to visitors arriving by car/driving.
- Concern impacts light rail have on project
  - Drive design
  - Draw more people
  - Impact to habitat
- Opposition to Southwest Light rail
- Support connections and access to light rail

Parkways

- **Support for temporary parkway closures (Concept B)**
  - They used to do this years ago. Great idea.
  - Open parkways during week, close to cars on weekends
  - MPRB-sponsored Open Streets events
  - Worked great during COVID
- Opposition to temporary closures
  - Enjoy driving the parkways
  - Can create safe walk/bike networks without closures
- **Opposition to parkway closures**
  - Temporary ok
  - Do not reroute traffic
- Consider closing parkways to car traffic on Sundays
- Discourage vehicular use along parkways
- Support for closing parkways to cars
  - Go further, restore pedestrian trails to nature, move ped to bike paths, bikes to street
- Removing more cars from the lakes will improve user experience and help mitigate climate change
- Would enjoy less traffic on parkways – would reduce runoff into lakes and leave greater space for wildlife
- Need more information about temporary closures
  - How often, when, etc.

**Parking**
- Please conduct traffic and parking studies as part of the plans
- Consider more parking if you add more amenities
- Look at opportunities to partner with local businesses for parking if it’s a concern
- Remove parking lots to expand restoration
- Address parking and traffic issues generated by these city-wide attractions

**Boardwalks**
- **Support for boardwalks**
  - Support for experiencing the lake this way
- **Opposition to boardwalks**
  - Create pinch points
  - Runners will have a hard time
  - Put funding towards other parts of the city that are under-resourced
  - What is the cost of implementing these?
  - Impact to habitat
  - Winter considerations
  - Access for an aging population
- **Support for new paths and connections**
  - 46th Harriet segment between Minnehaha parkway – good example of asphalt to boardwalk

**Trails**
- Trails are congested here with multiple modes.
- Widen bike trails to accommodate riders of different speeds
- Concern about pedestrian safety with bike trails
- Support for keeping soft surface trails with any formalization of trails (Concept B)
- Create bicycle connections through master plan, separate from car traffic
- Clear bike signage
- Support for better bike access across parkland
- Separation of walk and bike trails
- Repave trails
- Choose soft surface trails whenever possible
- Widen pedestrian paths to accommodate congestion
- Year-round bike and pedestrian access should stay as is
- Need to design for electric bikes on trails
- Remove pedestrian trail near the water to expand littoral edge
General

- Prioritize non-motorized users over cars in plans
- Stop prioritizing bicycles
  - Prioritize cars, the elderly, and families
- Both plans prioritize access between East Cedar Beach and West Isles: prioritizes people coming from SW suburbs rather than MPLS visitors. This area is already congested to park at and will make these areas less accessible to access by car
- Plan for more than walking and biking – strollers, skaters, etc!
- Accessibility needs to be more explicit and defined early in the plans to ensure it is included in the final plans. Accessibility defined as making water, paths, and amenities available and safe for those are mobility, sight, or hearing impaired and for their companions or personal care attendants
- Parkway infrastructure for vehicles should focus on providing access to the park for people with disabilities
- Narrow bike/ped connection over tracks when traveling from Isles to Cedar
- Consider safety, seniors, and ADA accessibility so paths are for all users
- Support for concept B trail connections
- Would like to see better connections to light rail stations
- There will be more people coming to the lakes from the south with the new lightrail stop.
- Consider ADA accessibility for all paths
- Accommodate electric vehicles in the park
- Support for the improved pedestrian crossings in plan
- Proposed plans will hinder, not help, bike/ped safety
- Increase accessibility for all residents
- Maximize pedestrian access
- Separate walking and biking trails

Programming and Amenities

- Opposition to building more structures or adding more hardscape
  - Keep area natural
- Support for adding a permanent restroom
- Support for lake deck
- Support for adding picnic pavilion
- Support for a year-round structure in plan
  - Support for year-round warming house/restroom facilities on both lakes
  - Always something happening at the lakes so year-round building would be helpful
- Opposition to adding any new structures or amenities
  - Chain of Lakes has sufficient amenities and gathering spaces
  - “Hub” too big an idea
  - Concern that MPRB is adding more structure to get more money from Met Council
  - Too many “improvements”, not enough spaces to walk quietly among the trees
  - Structures limit future flexibility of parkland
  - Nature should be able to invite people in without needing amenities
- **Support for proposed amenities**
  - Need for more frequent and larger picnic pavilions for families
  - Support for adding active uses to invite more people
  - Support for lake decks
  - Support for small pockets of amenities at both lakes, helps encourage people to explore the lakes and not stay in one location
  - Add additional maintenance if more structures are built
  - Support for outdoor classroom

- **Opposition to boardwalks**
  - Remove trails and outdoor classrooms. Return everything to nature.
  - Opposition to outdoor classroom
  - Opposition to pavilions
  - Support for limiting amount of new structures or amenities
    - Too many structures proposed in both concepts
    - First round of responses didn’t support this.
    - Concern that many of the loved amenities don’t need new amenities, but MPRB is proposing them anyway
  - Support the access and distribution of amenities in Concept A rather than B because it makes it less likely areas will be over-populated
  - Better distribution of amenities is needed
  - Support for more year-round port-a-potties around the lake
  - Amenities should blend in with the environment
  - Locate activity areas near light rail
  - Need more diversity and seniors in these parks – there should be features that appeal to them
  - Support for clustering amenities to limit impact to habitat

**Programming**

- Support for new programming
  - Support for cultural and ecological programming
  - Support for adding Indigenous art or programming
  - Educational classes or lectures about natural setting and how to volunteer
- Spend less on programming in this part of the city, direct funds to areas of city of greater need
- Add bike parking
- Concept A is more natural because it pushes pavilions and traffic to Lake of the Isles. Struck at concepts pitting residents of the two lakes against each other.
- Add skate park
- Add a dog large dog park
- Formalize access point and reduce erosion
- Adding food truck at East Cedar Beach
- Add free kayak or canoe programming for lower income residents
- Listen to the volunteers at Cedar Lake
- Support restoration volunteer work
- Less programming, more nature experience
- More nature education staff to teach about importance of preservation and restoration (like the role of a national park ranger)

**Winter Amenities**

- Do not limit cross country skiing on either lake
- Grooming should be allowed for people to access cross country ski trails
- Add budget for trail grooming
- Better signage for skiers
- Snow show, cross country ski, and sled rental
- With climate change, do not add permanent warming house as the winter season will be getting shorter
- Do not prioritize or make decisions based on winter activities as it only lasts a few months (warming house)
- Support for ski trails
- Education about not walking on groomed trails

**Water Amenities**

- No mention of cross lake swimming or ice swimming communities

**General**

- **Concern about overuse of parkland/welcoming new people**
  o Concern that these plans advocate for increased use of the parks
  o Concern that bringing more people to these lakes will impact trash, parking, congestion
  o New SWLRT will impact park
- **Support for Concept A**
  o Love the rewilding concept
  o Great for wildlife and habitat
  o Concern about how MPRB will manage new areas
  o Do not add more hardscape
  o Takes parks in a forward-thinking direction for nature
  o Isles is managed in an outdated way that compromises ecological health
- **Support for both Concepts A and B**
- **Support for Concept B**
  o The lakes are for recreation visitors and a people refuge not a wildlife refuge
  o Atmosphere
  o Proposed access is better
  o Stays with current feel of lakes
- **Focus on what's already there, don't change**
  o Maintenance
  o Added costs
- **Opposition to Concept A and Concept B**
  o Take away organic and passive uses within the parks
  o These improvements aren’t needed
- Too overdeveloped
  - Will bring in more people, more congestion
- **Increase signage and wayfinding**
  - Multi-languages
  - Some areas difficult to navigate
- Improve or clarify concept graphics
  - Create a map showing dimensions of lake along Cedar Lake.
  - Image callout on the design for some features (ex: littoral edge)
  - What in lake water treatment is
- Support for more access throughout, but be careful with Cedar – keep it quiet and natural
- Incorporate human accountability to keep these parks maintained
- Opposition to Concept A
  - Too many structures and additions
  - Will crush home values
- Great presentation
- Would like a “None of the Above” option
- Plans go too far, ideas too big
- Keep it simple
- MPRB lack of concern for the public
- Too much overdevelopment
- Consider parks for each generation, young to old
- Education campaign
- Modify the vision to be less recreation focused
- Concern too much signage will have negative impacts
- Address trash better

**Character of area**
- Maintain the unique feel of each lake
- Concern that these plans change the characters of the lakes
- Consider project holistically with surrounding area and neighborhoods
- Concern about impacts of more visitors
- Changing character from scenic to “natural” doesn’t make sense
- One lake needs to be more passive than active
- Many of the proposed ideas are solutions looking for a problem
- Incorporate usage data and studies in the planning process to mitigate neighborhood impact.
- Preserve the “romantic” landscape by Loring and Cleveland: it is historically significant
- Support passive and spontaneous use at each lake, don’t over prescribe experiences
- Worry these plans try and make all the lakes the same
- Do not plan to accommodate more people
- Distribute use across parks so as not to over concentrate people

**Process and Considerations**
- These plans propose a lot of investment in an area that is economically prosperous already
- These plans are too expensive
- Spend funds in under-resourced parts of the city
- Concern neighborhood perspectives aren’t represented
- How does SHPO nomination of Grand Rounds and 1998 Last of the Isles master plan relate to concepts?
- Implementation related questions
- Support for master planning process
- Suggestions to approach master plan differently
- Plans should not be in service of SWLRT to make the transit system work better
- Redirect money that you would spend on improvements to crime prevention
- Don’t sell or give land away
- Too much focus on building amenities to bring people to a nature-based park
- Concerned about politicization of the Park Board

Maintenance
- **Concern about leaving future generations with future maintenance costs**
- **Consider maintenance costs**
  - Address how MPRB will be able to keep up with maintenance for any new facilities
- Concern about budget implications of many of the ideas
- If MPRB wants to center equity, why are they creating plans that are so expensive for this part of the city?
- MPRB is known for overexerting themselves – big vision, not enough maintenance
- Support long-term natural areas management
- Consider addressing lost and found items around the lakes

Construction Impact
- Some improvements would require removing habitat, which builds upon years of disruption
- Can you time the improvements with existing SWLRT construction?
- The neighbors don’t want more construction and more built things