



Nine Mile Creek Regional Trail - Edina
Community Assessment Team

Meeting 4 Minutes

April 5, 2010

Prepared by: Heather Gates, Planning & Development Secretary

Submitted on: April 9, 2010

Present: Kelly Grissman, Senior Manager of Planning
Heather Gates, Secretary
Randy Lehr, Water Resources Manager
Brent Christensen, Graduate Engineer
John Keprios, Director of Parks and Recreation – Edina
Richard Johnson, Segment 1 Representative
Bob Lubar, Segment 2 Representative
Robert Schwartzbauer, Segment 3 Representative
Reid Kilberg, Segment 4 Representative
Dave Henry, Segment 5E & 7 Representative
Michael Wolff, Segment 8 Representative
Harvey Johnson, Segment 9 Representative
Peter McCarthy, Segment 11 Representative
Kristine Thompson, Segment 13 Representative
Nancy Crain, Segment 19 Representative
Wendy Amundson, Segment 20 Representative
Alice Hulbert, Bike Edina
Ciara Schlichting, Planner with Bonestroo

Absent: Robert Peterson, Segment 5D Representative
Eric Burfeind, Edina High School Science Teacher
Joseph Hulbert, Edina Park Board
Jonathan Vlaming, Chief of Planning

Meeting Start: 6:35 PM

1. Introductions
2. Updates to the conceptual alternative trail routes (K. Grissman)
 - A. Changes based on:
 - i. CAT field walk-throughs and preliminary assessment work
 - ii. Preliminary Environmental Assessment findings
 - B. Please see attached map for areas of change and associated rationale
3. Presentation of Preliminary Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) Findings (Bonestroo: C. Schlichting)

A. Background

- i. Trails are exempt from an EAW; however, as a natural resource based park system, Three Rivers Park District is conducting a voluntary EAW.
- ii. The full EAW will be complete in April/May. Two public open houses will be conducted. They will likely occur in June/July 2010.
- iii. The EAW does not cover other segments of Nine Mile Creek Regional Trail. It only pertains to the Edina segment from Hwy 169 to France Ave.
- iv. Project boundary includes all the land considered for development of the regional trail and reviewed as part of the EAW.
- v. Conceptual trail route/corridor is 16' wide assuming a 10' paved surface with 3 foot shoulders.

B. Contaminated Sites

- i. Two contamination sites were found, one is a former superfund site the other is an old dump site.
 1. The dump site is located on park land west of Creek Baptist Church on Tracy Avenue and south of Hwy 62. This site is listed as close by Minnesota Pollution Control Agency.
 2. The address for the former superfund site is 5901 Lincoln Drive (appears to be the United Healthcare site). Information about the site is contained in the following link:
<http://cfpub.epa.gov/supercpad/cursites/csitinfo.cfm?id=0506623>

C. Woodland Findings

- i. There are 102 acres of woodland within the project boundary.
- ii. There are a total of 4.65 acres of woodland (not recognized as high quality) within all the proposed trail routes; however, this number assumes:
 1. All trail routes under consideration would be constructed;
 2. No trail routes currently exist; and
 3. Removal of all vegetation within 16' corridor
- iii. The Park District is only interested in constructed one contiguous route; therefore, 4.56 acres is over estimated.
- iv. For example, portions of route 4 follow an existing trail – thus reducing the potential woodland impact and routes 2 and 3 would not both be constructed – thus potentially reducing the amount of potential woodland impacted.
- v. A permit for tree removal is required (Edina City Code Section 830 – Tree Removal, Grading, and Excavations); however, there is no replacement mitigation requirement.
- vi. Largest woodland impacts include:
 1. Segment 2: .64 acres of potential woodland impact. Generally altered/non-native deciduous woods (cottonwood, boxelder, some elm/ash, and buckthorn)
 2. Segment 4: .51 acres of potential woodland impact; however, this is likely less due to presence and proposed reuse of

existing trail in Bredesen Park. Generally altered/non-native deciduous (cottonwoods, boxelder, and buckthorn) and aspen (quacking aspen and cottonwoods) woods.

3. Segment 11: 1.29 acres of potential woodland impact. Most non-native deciduous forest made up primarily of cottonwoods.

D. Wildlife Findings

- i. Trail is proposed in developed urban area and most wildlife is already introduced to humans.
- ii. Wetlands are comprised of mainly non-native plants but may provide habitat for several species including muskrats, amphibians, red-winded blackbirds, sedge wren, swamp sparrows, rails, deer, raccoons, ducks, geese, shorebirds, herons, egrets, and fish species.
- iii. Nine Mile Creek fluctuates from high water levels during/after rain events to shallow water levels during dry times.
 1. Fish species are limited to small species like minnows.
 2. Previous studies by the Watershed District indicate that the creek adjacent to Segment 5, 5D, 5E is considered Class C and has the potential for tolerant and intolerant species (better quality habitat). The remaining creek sections are classified as Class D with the potential for tolerant species (lower quality habitat).
- iv. Woodlands provide cover and habitat for raccoon, red fox, gray fox, white-tailed deer, woodcock, vireos, owls, and woodpeckers.
- v. Brush/grasslands are upland herbaceous areas with little tree cover. Depending on the time of year, the diversity of species found in these areas changes. Typical species include a variety of birds, pocket gophers, rodents, hawks, owls, and snakes. Insects are also prominent in these areas.
- vi. Lawn/landscaping provide habitat for some bird species including house sparrow, house finch, common grackle, European starling, and American robin. Several mammals (e.g. house mouse, domestic cats, raccoon, gray squirrel) are also common in these areas.
- vii. Threatened, Special Concern, and Endangered Species within one mile of the project area and reported by the DNR include Blanding's turtle, Peregrine Falcon, Common Moorhen, Forester's Tern, Northern Cricket Frog and Kitten Tails.

E. Additional Water Resources Findings

- i. Within the project boundary, water resources include Nine Mile Creek, 6 DNR Public Waters (3 lakes and 3 unnamed wetlands), and 21 wetlands.
- ii. Routes through DNR Public Waters will require permits/approval from the DNR and Nine Mile Creek Watershed District.
- iii. Wetlands were not delineated as part of the EAW work. Routes through or adjacent any wetlands will require wetland delineation as part of the design/construction/permitting processes.
- iv. There are two public water wetlands along route 2 that the DNR would need to issue permits for any impact.

- v. The total project boundary has 90 acres of wetland.
 - 1. There is a potential for impact to 2.9 acres of wetlands however, this assumes that all routes under consideration will be constructed and does not account for strategies to reduce potential impacts such as boardwalks in lieu of at grade trails.
 - 2. No wetlands in Segments 7, 8, and 20.
 - 3. Wetlands present along Segment 3 but no impact (road-based trail)
- vi. Although not required a wetland quality assessment called the Minnesota Routine Assessment Methodology (MNRAM) was conducted.
 - 1. Majority of wetlands are high value wetlands, the main reason is due to storm water retention.
 - 2. Of the 2.9 wetland acres of potential impact, 2.6 acres were classified as high value (9:1 replacement requirement) and .3 acres were classified as medium value (2.25:1 replacement requirement).
 - 3. Potential replacement is 24.06 acres; however, this assumes that all routes under consideration will be constructed and does not account for strategies to reduce potential impacts such as boardwalks in lieu of at grade trails.

vii. Mitigation Strategies

- 1. Avoid
- 2. Minimize wetland impacts (boardwalks, reduce trail width, use existing trail corridors)
- 3. Rectify – temporary construction impacts (repair, rehabilitate, restore)
- 4. Replace unavoidable impacts

F. The erosion and sedimentation assessment did not indicate any areas of highly erodible soils although there are some areas with steep slopes.

- i. Prior to construction this project will require a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)/ State Disposal System (SDS) General Stormwater Permit from the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) which will require erosion and sediment control regulations in all applicable regulations, ordinances and rules of the city, MPCA, and Nine Mile Creek Watershed District are met.
- ii. Erosion and sedimentation permits require projects to minimize runoff, improve the quality of runoff, and provide erosion control through best management practices and other low impact development techniques including:
 - 1. Reduce impervious surfaces (e.g., use narrow roads, efficient road layout, permeable pavement).
 - 2. Break up impervious surfaces to allow opportunities for infiltration.

3. Use ecological stormwater management techniques, such as vegetated swales, infiltration systems, and biofilter wetlands.
4. Provide energy dissipation and outfall stabilization.
5. Establish and maintain vegetated buffers around aquatic resources.
6. Minimize exposed soils. Phase grading of the site.
7. Avoid compaction of soil disturbance in areas with high infiltration capacity soils.
8. Avoid grading and exposure of soils on steep slopes.
9. Divert construction site runoff away from proposed retention and infiltration areas.
10. Conduct regular inspections and enforce compliance with the NPDES permit

G. The floodplain assessment used the Draft Hennepin County Flood Insurance Study (FIS). This is not yet approved but is more conservative as it uses full build scenarios rather than the 1970 land use data and utilizes 2 foot contours.

- i. There are 168 acres of floodplain in the project boundary.
- ii. The trail corridor may impact up to 4.43 acres (assuming the trail is built at-grade and all trail routes are constructed).
- iii. Edina City Code Section 850.21 allows trails within the flood plain.
- iv. Nine Mile Creek Watershed District allows construction of impervious trails that are 10' wide or less within 50 of the creek centerline (Rules Section 2.3.4).
- v. City of Edina allows fill in the floodplain if there is no change in the 100-year flood elevation.
- vi. Nine Mile Creek Watershed District allows fill if mitigation occurs within +/- 1 foot of the impact elevation.
- vii. Additional elements to consider:
 1. Boardwalk in floodplain requires minimal to no, floodplain mitigation.
 2. An at-grade trail has the potential for frequent flooding and maintenance (no compensatory storage required).
 3. Raised trail - would require fill in the floodplain and may require mitigation/compensatory storage.
 4. Pervious vs. impervious materials (infiltration).
 5. Design cross slope of trail to sheet water out of wetlands to vegetated swales or grass buffer strips to promote natural infiltration and filtration of runoff.

H. The parking assessment included completing a parking demand survey on 9/26/09 (weekend) and 10/7/09 (weekday). Potential parking impacts are only foreseen if there is a loss of parking as a result of reconfiguring the use of ROW to eliminate on-street parking to accommodate the trail along road based routes.

- i. Based on demand, there would be minimal impacts to on-street parking for routes 1-8, 9, 11, and 13 if parking capacity was reduced.

ii. Route 19 would have the greatest parking impacts if parking capacity is reduced. Potential mitigation strategies include:

1. Limit the trail to one side of the roadway, allowing residents to continue parking on the other side of the street.
2. Locate the trail on the east/south side of the street, as there is greater parking demand on north/west side; however, this requires more road crossings which is a safety concern.
3. Pentagon Park east and west buildings are proposed for redevelopment and conceptual plans account for a trail along the northern boundary thus mitigating potential parking concerns.

I. The cultural resource evaluation includes coordination with the State Historic and Preservation Office (SHPO) and local historic society.

- i. SHPO recommends additional archaeological survey for trail any trail routes adjacent to the creek prior to construction.
- ii. Structures older than 50 years may be considered historic; however, no impacts to structures are identified.
- iii. Other local historic/architectural areas of interest that were formerly located near route 8 include:

1. Cahill School - Frank Tupa Park (formerly Cahill and 70th) which was moved from Cahill Road to Eden Ave and Highway 100. This structure is on the National Register of Historic places and is the oldest building in Edina. Since the structure has been moved, there are no potential impacts associated with trail development.
2. Calvary Lutheran Church (5420 70th Street) became a residence in 1960 and received a concrete block extension. No potential impacts are identified.
3. St. Patrick's Catholic Church (7000 Cahill Road) was rebuilt in 1924 after the original structure was destroyed. It was a prominent structure in the past. No potential impacts are identified.

iv. A viewshed analysis was created to give local residents and future trail users a sense of what the trail may look like once it's built. The locations of these conceptual drawings were chosen by Three Rivers Park District to show a wide range of situations which are generally representative of all the routes under consideration.

1. The renderings show a 10' wide multi use trail and potential views of the trail along the Nine Mile Creek, residential roads, and through various parks.
2. Further design of the trail could change the final appearance of the trail in some renderings.

J. Questions

- i. Question: Could the Park District provide pictures of what the trail would look like from the perspective of looking towards adjacent homes? Focus on differences in routes such as 7-8 and 9-11.

Answer: Yes. We will include this as part of the social assessment in addition to measuring the average distance from the general alternative trail route location to residences, measuring the average distance from property line to residences, and identifying properties where the trail may be closer than 25' from the adjacent residences.

- ii. Question: What part of the City ordinance does it say that trails are an acceptable use in flood plains?

Answer: Edina City Code Section 850.21

- iii. Question: What is the schedule for when project will be presented to public/open house. When will the public have opportunity to provide additional feedback?

Answer: The EAW is expected to be complete in late April/early May. At that time, it will be forwarded to the Park District Board of Commissioners to 1) approve the EAW as accurate and complete and 2) authorize public distribution and the start of the 30-day public comment period.

During the 30-day public comment period there will be two open houses (likely in June/July 2010) revealing the EAW findings as well as the technical, social, and economic assessments completed by the CAT. The open houses are planned to include a presentation similar to tonight's presentation followed by a general open house format. Participants will be given the opportunity to provide written comment on the EAW and CAT assessment work.

Following the 30-day public comment period, the Park District is required to review and respond to all relevant EAW comments.

The EAW, technical, social, and economic assessments and corresponding public feedback will be forwarded as early as late July to the Edina Park Board, Edina City Council, Watershed District, School District, and Park District Board of Commissioners for their review and consideration in determining a preferred route Edina.

The public may elect to provide written feedback at any time during the planning process; however, specific opportunities for providing comments will be a part of the open houses and, as appropriate, at regulatory meetings.

- iv. Comment: Please send out a copy of the presentation and schedule via email/mail.

Response: The Park District will send out a copy of the presentation via email, mail and the web site. The general schedule will be included within the meeting minutes.

- v. Question: Has the Park District chosen a route/side of street because it looks as though it has?

Answer: No. The Park District needed to provide Bonestroo with one scenario for each route under consideration for purposes of completing the EAW. The route that was prepared by the Park District for use in the EAW represents all known information to date including information provided by the CAT at regular meetings and in the field, preliminary environmental findings, and preliminary technical/social analysis.

- vi. Comment: Need time for public comment at end of each meeting.

Response: Thank you for the feedback. The Park District will be happy to meet with public members after the meeting to discuss this request further.

4. Review Mailings to CAT Members and Residents

- A. Park District requested CAT members to identify significant destinations within 1/4-mile walking and 3/4-mile biking distance to the alternative trail routes. Information is requested by April 16, 2010.
- B. As requested by the CAT, the Park District mailed a letter to all adjacent property owners identifying who their representative on the CAT is and how to obtain additional project information.

5. Scheduled next meeting for May 17, 2010 from 6:30-8:30 at the Edina Senior Center in Classroom 2 (down the hall on your right).

Meeting adjourned: 8:20 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 by Wednesday, April 21, 2010. Unless objections are raised prior to Wednesday, April 21, 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