



**Nine Mile Creek Regional Trail - Edina**  
Community Assessment Team

**Meeting 3 Minutes**

February 17, 2010

Prepared by: Heather Gates, Planning & Development Secretary

Submitted on: February 22, 2010

**Present:** Kelly Grissman, Planner  
Jonathan Vlaming, Senior Manager of Planning  
Heather Gates, Secretary  
John Keprios, Director of Parks and Recreation – Edina  
George Butkovich for Richard Johnson, Segment 1 Representative  
Bob Lubar, Segment 2 Representative  
Robert Schwartzbauer, Segment 3 Representative  
Reid Kilberg, Segment 4 Representative  
Michael Wolff, Segment 8 Representative  
Harvey Johnson, Segment 9 Representative  
Wendy Amundson, Segment 20 Representative  
Brent Christensen, Graduate Engineer  
Alice Hulbert, Bike Edina  
Randy Lehr, Water Resources Manager  
Joseph Hulbert, Edina Park Board

**Absent:** Dave Henry, Segment 5E & 7 Representative  
Peter McCarthy, Segment 11 Representative  
Nancy Crain, Segment 19 Representative  
Kevin Bigalke, Nine Mile Creek Watershed District – Administrator  
Eric Burfeind, Edina High School Science Teacher

Meeting Start: 6:35 PM

1. Reviewed hand outs
  - A. Social, Technical, Environmental, and Economic Draft Assessment Criteria
  - B. Draft maps illustrating how data may be quantified
  - C. Blank Environmental Assessment Worksheet
2. Reviewed Draft Social Assessment Table
  - A. See attached table – changes in red
  - B. Park District acknowledged that all routes will be studied individually and that routes with two options (east verses west side of the street/creek) will also be studied individually. This will give an accurate representation of the items the CAT has requested the Park District to quantify.

- C. CAT member brought forward a concern that quantifying number of adjacent properties may be misleading because larger properties would provide a more ideal situation as the trail would be adjacent fewer properties than a segment with small adjacent properties.
  - i. Some CAT team members expressed concern that quantifying properties by size and/or value is elitist and that the City Council would likely not support this view.
  - ii. As an alternative, it was suggested and agreed that the number of adjacent homes relative to the trail route length will be quantified and will reflect density of the adjacent properties without implying preference/value to homes/properties with different acreages or values.
- D. CAT team members requested the Park District to look at properties on a case by case basis because in some instances a side yard acts more as a back yard or visa versa.
- E. Park District staff clarified that on past projects screening has been considered if the trail edge falls within 25' of the adjacent primary residence structure. CAT team requested that the same dimensions be used.
- F. Potential screening locations were discussed. Some CAT team members felt it important for the trail project to include screening based on the use (pool or other 'private' uses) of the adjacent private properties.
  - i. Park District staff clarified that the trail project and tax payers are not responsible for providing fencing/screening for use/benefit of private property. Adjacent property owners can provide their own landscaping/fencing on their own property.
  - ii. CAT team agreed that as an alternative the elevation of the trail verses the adjacent property should be quantified because this will give an indication as to the level of visual impact and privacy the trail may have on adjacent properties.
- 3. Reviewed Draft Technical Assessment Table
  - A. See attached table – changes in red
  - B. Trail will be designed to accommodate emergency vehicles.
  - C. Directness will be measured on route length verses comparing trail length to existing circulation patterns.
- 4. Reviewed Draft Environmental Assessment Table
  - A. See attached table – changes in red
  - B. CAT team was asked to review the blank EAW to determine if there are any environmental items that are missing. Any additional items for consideration should be emailed to Kelly Grissman as soon as possible so they can be added to the assessment work plan.
  - C. Mike Wolf presented his preliminary research on carbon impacts as a result of trail construction and vegetation loss.
    - i. Mike agreed to forward his research to Park District staff for review.
    - ii. CAT team agreed that measuring the carbon impact for the alternative trail routes is important and should be measured if the impact can be accurately determined through existing, valid research.
  - D. Quantifying trees is difficult because each tree may provide different benefit/value to private property and the community; and therefore, cannot just be counted and valued similarly. For example, a tree

serving an important screening function does not have the same value as tree only providing shade benefit. What trees are more important and why?

- i. CAT team agreed to quantify overall tree impact by multiplying trail route acreage by relative tree density.
  - ii. CAT team agreed to quantify tree impacts to private property by identifying location and role of significant private tree(s) which may be impacted.
5. Reviewed Draft Economic Assessment Table
    - A. See attached table – changes in red
    - B. Draft economic assessment is very thorough for a planning level study.
    - C. Draft economic assessment table was not reviewed item for item. CAT team was asked to review the economic assessment table and forward an additional items for consideration to Kelly Grissman as soon as possible so they can be added to the assessment work plan.
  6. Housekeeping
    - A. Park District will not provide postage account for CAT members to mail information to neighborhood members.
    - B. Park District will send mailing to all adjacent neighbors informing them of their representative's contact information, location of project information of the website, and procedure for requesting hard copies.
    - C. Next meeting date was proposed for March 24, 2010 to review the preliminary EAW findings.

**MARCH 24 WILL NOT WORK TO REVIEW THE EAW, PLEASE CHECK YOUR EMAIL FOR A LIST OF ALTERNATIVE MEETING DATES AND RESPOND TO HEATHER GATES AT [hgates@threeriversparkdistrict.org](mailto:hgates@threeriversparkdistrict.org) WITH YOUR PREFERENCE/AVAILABILITY.**

Meeting adjourned: 8:30 PM

*To the best of the writer's ability, this document accurately reflects the business transacted during the meeting. If any attendee believes that there are any inconsistencies, omissions or errors in the minutes, they should submit their proposed revisions to Kelly Grissman at [kgrissman@threeriversparkdistrict.org](mailto:kgrissman@threeriversparkdistrict.org) by Wednesday March 3, 2010. Unless objections are raised prior to March 3, 2010, the Park District and CAT will consider this account accurate.*

References discussed at this meeting and referred to in these meeting minutes will be available on the Park District's web site at a future date.

C: All invitees

## Draft Social Assessment

Greater Community			
Item	Significance	Quantifiable Method	Assumptions
<b>Service Area</b>			
.75 miles from corridor: Population	Serve areas with greater population provide opportunity for trail use to a greater portion of the population	Calculate population within .75 miles of the route	50% of trail visits are generated from within .75 miles of the trail corridor
<b>Adjacent Property</b>			
Are easements required?	Locating a regional trail on private property will require an easement, fee-title or other creative solution to secure land. Property owner(s) may not be willing partners	Location and estimated size of required easement.	Trails located within public right-of-way or City owned land do not require purchased easements. Regional trails require a typical 16' easement
Number of residential back-yards	Different areas of residential property offer varying levels of privacy and access which may be altered by the trail	Gross number of properties per segment & average number of properties per mile per segment	In general, backyard is most private/inaccessible and front yard is most public/accessible
Number of residential front-yards			
Number of residential side-yards			
Total number of adjacent residential properties	Location of trail adjacent commercial/office/industrial land use compared to residential land use may or may not be preferred	Gross number of properties per segment & average number of properties per mile per segment	
Number of commercial/business/industrial properties			
Proximately of adjacent homes	Homes closer to the proposed trail have greater opportunity for potential trail related impacts (visual, noise, privacy)	Measured average distance from home to property line. Measured average distance from estimated trail location and adjacent homes. Identified locations where homes are less than 25' from trail edge	For road based routes, trail is assumed to be located in lieu of a sidewalk. For routes through wetlands, trail is assumed to be located on the opposite side of the creek than the closest residential properties. For other creek based routes, trail is assumed to be 3/4 the distance on the upland side between the creek and adjacent property boundary.
Viewshed	Trail elevation above adjacent private property is more visually intrusive and has a greater impact on privacy	Identified locations where trail is expected to be located above adjacent properties	
<b>Access</b>			
Access to publicly owned land	Trail may increase access of park land to the public and may impact function of existing park land facilities	Identified routes primarily located on inaccessible, publicly owned lands and identified locations where existing park facilities may be impacted	
Authorized access	Frequent, convenient access increases trail accessibility to the local community	Located public access points	
Unauthorized, concentrated access points	Locating trail away from public access points may increase unauthorized access	Located areas with infrequent access points and potential for cattle paths created by trail users crossing existing undeveloped open space/parkland	
ADA Access: reviewed under technical assessment			
Emergency access: reviewed under technical assessment			
<b>Parking</b>			
Parking Impact	If a street needs to be redesigned to accommodate the trail, there may be a reduction in available on-street parking	Located on-street parking and calculated capacity for existing and conceptual conditions	
Parking Demand: reviewed as part of environmental assessment worksheet			
<b>Consistency</b>			

Potential Implementation and Funding Partnerships	Trail routes consistent with other planning/construction initiatives may provide opportunities to work together in implementing the trail	Review other City and regional plans and identify opportunities to partner	
Comprehensive Planning	Some routes provide greater opportunity to develop a comprehensive network of trails, bike lanes, and pedestrian facilities	Review other City and regional plans and evaluate connectivity of existing and proposed bike/pedestrian routes	

Trail User Preferences			
Item	Significance	Quantifiable Method	Assumptions
<b>Safety: quantified under technical assessment</b>			
<b>Stops</b>			
Interrupted travel	Trail users prefer continuous riding/walking	Location and frequency of trail stop conditions	
<b>Directness</b>			
Distance	Commuters prefer direct routes	Measured route length	
<b>Trail Aesthetics</b>			
Route location	Recreation trail users prefer routes through natural areas and open space	Identified if route was through park land or adjacent road	
<b>Walking Access to Destinations</b>			
Existing trail head amenities: parking, bathrooms, water, rest area	Access and connectivity to existing destinations is preferred	Type and location of destination within 1/4 mile of access points and within 1/4 mile of corridor	People will generally walk (non-fitness/recreation) up to 1/4 mile to reach out-of-route destinations.
Opportunity to add trailhead amenities			
Trails/bike lanes (existing/proposed)			
School			
Parks			
Retail			
Employment Centers			
Bus/LRT Routes			
Other			
<b>Biking Access to Destinations</b>			
Existing trail head amenities: parking, bathrooms, water, rest area	Access and connectivity to existing destinations is preferred	Type and location of destination within 3/4 mile of access points and within 3/4 mile of corridor	People will generally bike (non-fitness/recreation) up to 3/4 mile to reach out-of-route destinations.
Opportunity to add trailhead amenities			
Trails/bike lanes (existing/proposed)			
School			
Parks			
Retail			
Employment Centers			
Bus/LRT Routes			
Other			



## Draft Technical Assessment

Item	Significance	Quantifiable Method	Assumptions
<b>Trail Related Structures</b>			
Potential Structures	Trail related structures (bridges, boardwalks, tunnels, and walls) allow for trail construction in challenging locations	Identified potential structure locations and type	
Temporary construction easement required	Construction of retaining wall, bridges, and tunnels may require access to adjacent property	Located temporary easement areas and estimated size	
<b>Space Requirements</b>			
<i>Easements: quantified under social assessment</i>			
For road based routes: is there enough available ROW or will street redesign (narrowing lanes/remove parking) be required?	If adequate ROW is not available additional easements or street redesign may be required	Measured total ROW and available (unused) ROW. Evaluated potential road redesign options using Minnesota State Aid Standards. Identified potential easement locations	Trail corridor is typically 16' wide. City is open to street redesign options.
<b>Permitting Obstacles (non-environmental)</b>			
MnDOT	Some routes require MnDOT's approval because they are proposed on or over MnDOT ROW	Location of trail/trail facilities proposed on/over MnDOT ROW and preliminary MnDOT response	
<b>Physical Obstacles</b>			
Utilities	Utilities located within the regional trail corridor may be required to be relocated or buried	Location and type of utilities (communications box, electric box, electric pole, street light, gas line, hydrant, sanitary sewer, and storm sewer)	
Other Obstacles	Obstacles within the regional trail corridor may be required to be removed	Location and type of obstacle (fence, wall, sign, etc)	
<b>Compliance</b>			
ADA - 5% or less: quantified under trail geometrics			
Storm water Requirements: reviewed under environmental assessment worksheet			
Wetland Mitigation: reviewed under environmental assessment worksheet			
<b>Safety</b>			
Trail Geometrics	Following industry standards for trail design/geometrics (slope, size, clear zone, curve radius, etc) will promote trail user safety	Location where achieving regional trail standards may be difficult and type of potential regional trail deviation	Trail design/geometrics follow MN DNR, ASHTO, and ADA guidelines. Park District regional trails are generally 10' wide with 3' preferred clear zones (2' min), 5% or less, maintain a 2% cross slope, have a minimum 100' horizontal curve, and provide sightlines appropriate to the situation.
Driveway Crossings	Each driveway crossing will result in encounters between trail users and motorists and each encounter creates an opportunity for an incident	Location and type (commercial/industrial/business: high and low turnover and residential: single and multi-family) of driveway and anticipated volume and frequency of motorist traffic	See Attached.
Road Crossings	Each road crossing will result in encounters between trail users and motorists and each encounter creates an opportunity for an incident	Location and type of road crossing (signed intersection, signalized intersection, or midblock), speed, sightline conditions, and average daily traffic (ADT)	Roads with higher speeds, restricted sightlines, and higher ADT present greater safety concerns than roads with lower speeds, unrestricted sightlines, and lower ADT.

Emergency access	Frequent emergency access points may reduce response time and increase safety	Located emergency access points and measured distance between emergency access points	
Adjacent Road	Adjacent road may create opportunity for incidents between trail users and motorists	Identified speed, ADT, type and general use of adjacent roads	

